



Exploring the complexities of understanding vulnerability and adult safeguarding within Christian Faith Organisations"

Journal:	<i>The Journal of Adult Protection</i>
Manuscript ID	JAP-02-2015-0004.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Vulnerable, Faith, Safeguarding , Church, Policy, Christian

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3 **“Exploring the complexities of understanding vulnerability and adult safeguarding within Christian**
4 **Faith Organisations”**
5
6

7
8 ID: JAP-02-2015-0004
9

10 **Abstract**

11 **Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to report the findings from a study exploring the
12 understanding of vulnerability and adult safeguarding within Christian faith based settings. The
13 article concludes with recommendations for practitioners involved in safeguarding adults in faith
14 based Christian settings.
15
16
17

18 **Design/methodology/approach** – The paper considers a survey (n=3182) into understanding of
19 vulnerability and adult safeguarding for individuals who attend Church regularly or work in a
20 Christian organisation
21
22
23

24 **Findings** - This paper is the first to be undertaken with a UK sample and highlights a range of factors
25 informing adult safeguarding practice within Christian organisations. This includes:- complexity
26 linked to understanding vulnerability and its role in safeguarding activity; lack of clarity about what
27 to do with a safeguarding adult concern, and the need for safeguarding training pertinent to the
28 particular needs of faith based settings.
29
30
31

32 **Research limitations/implications** - As there is currently a dearth of research in this area this paper
33 makes a valuable contribution to the developing knowledge base around safeguarding and
34 vulnerability within faith based organisations.
35
36
37

38 **Practical implications** - Professionals need to develop increased understanding of the complexities
39 involved in safeguarding activity, and specifically how those working in the wider context of
40 supporting vulnerable adults make sense of safeguarding processes and procedures.
41
42

43 **Social implications** – It is important that all organisations, including faith based settings, working
44 with adults have an understanding of their roles and responsibilities with respect to safeguarding
45 those at risk of harm.
46
47

48 **Originality** - This paper is the first UK study to consider safeguarding adults at risk of harm in
49 Christian faith contexts
50

51 **Key Words: Vulnerable, Faith, Safeguarding, Church, Policy, Christian**

52 **Paper type:** research paper
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **“Exploring the complexities of understanding vulnerability and adult safeguarding within Christian**
4 **Faith Organisations”**
5
6
7

8 **Introduction**
9

10
11
12 This paper reports on some of the findings of a survey into understandings of safeguarding adults at
13 risk of harm in Christian faith contexts. This research represents the first UK study exploring
14 knowledge about safeguarding adults within the Christian faith. It highlights some important themes
15 concerning the meanings attached to terms such as vulnerable adult or adult at risk of harm, and the
16 impact of this on safeguarding practice within Christian faith settings. The survey resulted from the
17 findings of a learning review into the death of a young woman who had been attending a church and
18 could be considered to be vulnerable. Some of the findings of this review suggest inherent
19 difficulties with understanding the requirements around safeguarding adults and providing effective
20 support in faith settings, issues around communication of information and responsibility for
21 responding and understandings of mental health. The findings include uncertainty concerning terms
22 such as ‘vulnerable adult’ (V.A.) and ‘adults at risk of harm’ which have been used interchangeably
23 within adult safeguarding practice. This paper will focus on some of the complexity which impacts
24 upon understandings of vulnerability and adults of risk of harm within Christian faith based settings.
25 It is anticipated that future work will expand into other faith groups.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Definitions**
39
40

41 As our understanding of safeguarding adults has developed the terms and definitions used to
42 describe adults who are or may be at risk of abuse or harm have similarly changed.

43 Under the Care Act 2014 and the accompanying Care and Support Statutory Guidance (2014:13-14)
44 the concept of promoting wellbeing for adults includes ‘protection from abuse and neglect’.

45 Whereas in the safeguarding arena for children there has been inter-agency guidance since the late
46 1990’s, the latest version being Working Together to Safeguard Children (2013), there has not been
47 any similar multi-agency safeguarding guidance related to adult protection on a statutory footing.

48 Under the Care Act 2014 local authorities now have new safeguarding duties which include leading a
49 multi-agency local adult safeguarding system to prevent abuse and neglect.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The term V.A. was defined in the No Secrets (2000) document and despite changes in safeguarding
4 practice this definition is still widely used, particularly within guidance documents issued by faith
5 organisations as:-
6
7

8 A vulnerable adult is a person aged 18 or over:

9
10 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or
11 illness, and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him/herself
12 against significant harm or exploitation'(Department of Health and Home Office, 2000).
13
14

15
16 This definition depicts vulnerability as inherent to a person's individual characteristics, defined by
17 factors such as age, gender, illness or disability. However, such an approach also suggests that
18 'inherent vulnerability will often lead to situational vulnerability, and a 'vulnerable adult' will, in
19 many cases, be doubly vulnerable' (Dunn, Clare and Holland, 2008: 5).
20
21
22
23
24

25 The Adult Support and Protection Act (Scotland) 2007 moved away from the term vulnerable adult
26 to use of the term adult 'at risk of harm'. The introduction of this term did not reduce difficulties
27 associated with accurate definitions as being 'at risk of harm' is also complex, and 'categories of
28 harm are not discrete: there are blurred boundaries' (Mackay et al. 2011:1).
29
30
31

32 The term 'risk' is often interchangeable with probability and relates to a negative outcome in the
33 future rather than the term vulnerable adult which refers to present issues (Parley, 2010). In
34 practice, definitions of individuals who come into this category usually describe the 'risk' in terms of
35 vulnerabilities of the individuals (Greenfields, Dalrymple and Fanning, 2012) and therefore although
36 the terminology is different the reality of the inclusion criteria can be argued to remain largely the
37 same. Boland, Burnage and Chowhan (2013: 1) suggest that, 'the core concept of vulnerability is a
38 challenge'. 'No Secrets' was repealed by the Care Act 2014 on 1st April 2015. The Act contains
39 replacement and mandatory requirements around adult safeguarding, which are set out in chapter
40 14 of the 'Care and Support Statutory Guidance'.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 A key challenge in safeguarding adults who may be vulnerable or at risk of harm is the diverse range
50 of individuals and presenting issues that these terms encompass. The terms V.A., 'adult at risk' and
51 'safeguarding adults' appear to infer one homogenous group of individuals. In practice vulnerability
52 occurs for a variety of reasons (Greenfields, Dalrymple and Fanning, 2012), and may include adults
53 who are incapable of looking after any aspect of their lives, to individuals experiencing a transient
54 episode of illness or disability. Another key distinction is between adults who have mental capacity
55 and those who have impaired mental capacity. Parley (2010: 39) summarises the difficulties in
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 definitions and notes that although there are a range of interpretations 'a clear unambiguous
4 definition remains elusive.
5
6
7

8
9 Similar concerns are raised by Stevens (2013) who states that the notion of thresholds is unclear,
10 and therefore when an individual becomes vulnerable and 'at risk' of abuse is unclear. The ways in
11 which legislation and policy have constructed 'vulnerability' are problematic as they build upon
12 externally driven objective assessments of being 'at risk' rather than a more person-centred
13 understanding of the subjective experience of vulnerability for the individual (Dunn, Clare, and
14 Holland 2008). The term 'vulnerable' can therefore stigmatise the individual resulting in
15 disempowerment and paternalistic approaches underpinned by assumptions that an individual is
16 less able to make decisions about his/her own life. Further issues such as temporary vulnerability
17 through bereavement give rise to confused understandings of the term V.A. Matters become
18 more complex when trying to put into practice multiagency working including professional's
19 understandings about roles and responsibilities with regards to vulnerable adults and the current
20 lack of universal agreement about thresholds and scope of adult abuse (Stevens, 2013) .
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 More recently the Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP) guidance encourages a more person-centred
32 approach to safeguarding in which 'people are empowered and able to manage their situations'
33 (LGA, 2015 :6). The emphasis is on working in partnership with adults to promote involvement,
34 choice and control over safeguarding issues and concerns. In line with the Care Act (2014) this
35 supports an approach which is person-led and outcome-focused, and the emphasis shifts from
36 depicting the individual as vulnerable to depicting the individual as having a key role to play in the
37 safeguarding process. As a result the emphasis is on exploring 'how to support and empower people
38 at risk of harm to resolve the circumstances that put them at risk' (LGA, 2014: 5).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Faith based organisations may constitute one agency involved in safeguarding adults at risk of harm
47 and it is therefore important that practitioners involved in safeguarding develop understanding and
48 awareness of issues of religion and belief (Furness and Gilligan, 2010) and their potential impact
49 upon safeguarding practice. To date there has been scant attention given to research into the care
50 of adults within churches. Whilst there has been much focus on the safeguarding of children,
51 especially in relation to clerical abuse within the Roman Catholic Church (Dunne, 2004; Hidalgo,
52 2008; Mercado et al., 2008; Gilligan, 2012; Böhm et al., 2014) there has been little work undertaken
53 in relation to the care of V.A., or the harm adults can experience within churches and faith
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 communities. This is despite the role that places of worship and the clergy play as key entry points to
4 disclosing abuse. As Rudnick and Teaster (2013:327) point out:

5
6
7 'Places of worship have long been considered safe community locations to obtain information about
8 trusted matters. Clergy can play an important role in identifying and assisting victims of abuse and
9 domestic violence; clergy are often the first point of disclosure about abuse and serve as trusted
10 entry point into the abuse reporting system – especially for women.'

11
12
13
14
15 Many of the Christian denominations in the UK have produced guidance for churches and places of
16 worship including the Church of England (2006a; 2006b), the Methodist Church (2010a; 2010b) and
17 the Baptist Church of Great Britain (2006). These guidelines have used the No Secrets V.A. definition.
18
19

20 21 22 **The role of churches in supporting and safeguarding vulnerable adults**

23
24
25 This research was concerned with how those in the Christian faith context understand their
26 responsibilities to protect and safeguard adults. Churches play an increasingly important role in
27 supporting vulnerable adults who not only attend churches as part of collective worship but also
28 receive social care support through the use of food banks, homeless projects, debt counselling
29 services and similar (Lambie-Mumford et al. 2014; Downing et al. 2014). Therefore, it is essential to
30 identify current knowledge, understanding and safeguarding adults practices in faith based contexts
31 to inform best practice. This research represents the first UK study exploring knowledge about
32 safeguarding adults within the Christian faith, and therefore offers an original perspective on the
33 topic.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **The Study**

44
45
46 The research findings presented in this paper are based on the Vulnerable Adults in Christian
47 Communities Survey (VACC). The questions were derived from the findings of a learning review
48 undertaken by Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) & the Churches' Child Protection
49 Advisory Service (CCPAS) of a safeguarding case involving an adult who attended a church. CCPAS is
50 the leading independent safeguarding charity which works across the faith sector in safeguarding
51 children and vulnerable adults.
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 The survey represents a broad exploration of the opinions of those either regularly attending Church
59 or working in Christian faith organisations.
60

1
2
3
4
5 The link to the survey was distributed by CCPAS to approximately 7000 of their members. It was also
6 placed on social networking sites and advertised via Christian publicity and media outlets (e.g.
7 United Christian Broadcasters). It was open for a period of 13 weeks from 8th August to the 31st
8
9 October 2014.
10
11

12
13 The survey was designed in accordance with the British Psychological Society ethical guidelines for
14 conducting online research (BPS, 2007). It was approved by the Department of Interdisciplinary
15 Studies, MMU ethics board and developed in accordance with SurveyMonkey University IRB
16 procedures for research involving human subjects. Emails sent to members of CCPAS and notices on
17 social network sites provided an outline of the research, the link to the survey and the inclusion
18 criteria . The inclusion criteria was that you had to be a regular attendee at a Christian church or
19 work in a Christian organisation. Participants who followed the link were provided with much more
20 detailed information about the research design, aims and purpose.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Prospective respondents were asked to indicate consent to take part in the research via an agree
30 button on the survey. The survey consisted of a range of open and closed questions. In order to
31 minimise possible distress the open questions did not ask about personal experiences of being or
32 working with a V.A or safeguarding issue. Rather they focused on current knowledge and training
33 needs. Other potential ethical issues were considered including anonymity. Participants email
34 addresses were not automatically collected. Only participants who chose to leave their email
35 addresses were contacted for the second phase of the research.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The survey questions began with demographic information before collecting responses about
44 understandings of the term V.A. and moving to questions of safeguarding training undertaken and
45 areas for safeguarding training development. The closed questions were analysed using Survey
46 Monkey's tool for descriptive statistics. The open question responses were analysed using an
47 overarching qualitative approach. This approach was taken to develop understanding of the key
48 themes and explore the 'multifaceted reality' of the participants (Snape and Spencer, 2003: 20). The
49 aim was to explore issues in depth and 'with concepts, meanings and explanations developed
50 inductively from the data' (Lewis and Ritchie, 2003: 167), and this was achieved by a thematic
51 analysis of emerging themes within the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research

The overarching aim of the research was to explore ways in which vulnerable adults and safeguarding are perceived within Christian organisations. A number of questions were used within the overall survey design to explore these key elements. There were three specific questions in the survey, which addressed the issue of definitions and understandings of the term V.A. These were

Q1 – I am confident that I know what the term 'vulnerable adult' means

Q2 -What does the term 'vulnerable adult' mean to you?

Q 3 -I am confident that I would be able to identify a range of factors that MAY contribute towards vulnerability in an adult, (i.e. mental ill-health, bereavement, disability etc.)

There were three other questions, which did not directly focus on the topic of definitions. However, the answers to these questions are pertinent and relevant to this paper's focus on safeguarding.

RQ 4 – Have you had any training about safeguarding vulnerable adults?

RQ 5 -Are there any particular areas of safeguarding vulnerable adults that you do not feel confident with?

Results

In total 3,152 people completed the survey. Respondents were from a wide variety of denominational backgrounds and ranged in age from 18-70 with the majority aged between 30 and 69 years. 68% of respondents were female and 32% were male this is reflective of general gender distribution in Church attendance (NCLS, 2013) 71% of respondents held a safeguarding position in their organisation, the other 29% may have worked with adults in the Christian faith context or just be attendees at a Church with other adult members. The researchers recognised that holding such a position could impact knowledge about V.A. and responses to survey questions. Therefore, a filter was applied to the survey responses to differentiate results based on whether or not individuals held a safeguarding role. The results of those who did and did not hold a safeguarding role showed no significant difference and are therefore presented below holistically. Comments in italics are direct quotes from respondents.

Confidence in knowing what the term 'Vulnerable Adult' means




Fig 1 Answers to the question – I am confident that I know what the term 'Vulnerable adult means'

2758 participants answered this question, 87% of total respondents stating that they were confident that they knew what the term V.A. means. Only 4% were not confident.

Defining the term 'Vulnerable Adult'

The question 'what does the term Vulnerable Adult mean to you?' led to 2,637 open text responses. Five superordinate themes emerged from the analysis of this data which were, Needs, Being 'At risk', Physical disability, Age and Limited capacity. These themes are discussed below with supporting data from the survey responses in italics.

The most prevalent theme emerging from the data was 'needs'. 731 responses referred to needs due to specific vulnerabilities or general support requirements.

'This can include adults with a mental health need, learning disability, physical disability, substance misuse need, elderly or frail or an acquired brain injury'

'Adult in need of additional support due to illness, disability of other particular need'

'Someone who may need support to participate fully in society'

It is interesting to note that these responses align vulnerability with specific conditions

1
2
3 rather than life experiences which may lead to vulnerability such as bereavement or other
4 life events.
5
6

7
8 The second most prevalent theme was that of being 'at risk', this was present in 471 responses.
9 Respondents suggested that the term V.A. incorporated the notion of the adult being 'at risk' of
10 harm from a variety of factors or from being taken advantage of and more vulnerable to this risk
11 than other adults. Further, a number of responses suggested that the term adults 'at risk' should be
12 used rather than the term V.A.
13
14
15
16

17
18
19 *'Someone who is at risk, which could mean risk of being exploited, risk of becoming*
20 *homeless, risk of being affected by alcohol or drugs, risk of the implications of mental*
21 *health issues, etc.'*
22
23
24

25
26 *'Any individual who is at risk of abuse or being taken advantage of'*
27
28

29 *'Someone who is at a greater risk than normal risk of abuse due to being an elderly*
30 *person who is unwell, frail, or confused, and people with learning difficulties, physical*
31 *disability or mental illness'*
32
33
34

35
36 *'We use the term adult at risk now rather than vulnerable adult'*
37
38

39 Physical disability was included in 393 of the responses as a reason why someone might be
40 vulnerable.
41
42
43

44
45 *'An individual over 18 who may be vulnerable due to) physical or sensory*
46 *disability'*
47
48

49
50 *'Anyone over the age of 18 who is infirm physically'*
51
52

53 Age was included in 378 responses to this question with participants stating that the term V.A.
54 referred to those over 18. However, there were 26 responses, which included the ages of 16 and 21.
55
56
57

58 *'A vulnerable adult is aged 18 or over'*
59
60

1
2
3 *'Someone over 18 years of age'*
4
5

6
7 *'Any person over 16 who permanently or temporarily lacks the capability to manage their own*
8 *affairs'*
9


10
11
12 *'At risk individuals over the age of 21 ...'*
13

14
15 148 responses included discussions of limited capacity of V.A. included the limited capacity to
16 consent and to care for or be responsible for themselves.
17

18
19
20
21 *'a person over the age of 18 years who can be "vulnerable" from lack of capacity to consent'*
22

23
24 *'An adult who no longer has the capacity to fully care for themselves'*
25

26
27
28 **Confidence in identifying factors which may contribute to vulnerability**



46 Fig 2 – Answers to the question – I am confident that I would be able to identify a range of factors
47 that MAY contribute towards vulnerability in an adult (i.e. mental health, bereavement, disability
48 etc.)
49

50
51
52
53 2770 participants answered this question, 90% stated that they were confident in identifying factors,
54 which may contribute to vulnerability. Only 2% of total respondents were not confident in
55 identifying factors, which contributed to vulnerability. 8% of respondents stated they were neither
56 confident or unconfident.
57
58
59
60

Have you had any training about safeguarding vulnerable adults?

1
2
3
4
5 2652 participants answered this question, 53% of respondents indicated that they had received
6 training about safeguarding vulnerable adults, while 46% indicated that they had not. Of those who
7 had received training 56% had received this from either their Church or a Christian organisation, 44%
8 had received training at work or by a statutory agency.
9
10
11

12
13
14 Are there any particular areas of safeguarding vulnerable adults that you do not feel confident with?
15
16

17 There were 1,304 open text answers to this question. Most of the responses will be analysed in a
18 further paper to be published to allow detailed exploration. However, one of the superordinate
19 themes identified was that of definition, which is clearly relevant to this paper. Participants noted
20 feeling unconfident about understanding and being able to apply and use a definition of V.A. and the
21 perceived inadequacy of this definition.
22
23
24
25

26
27 *'Definitions of who is a vulnerable adult are somewhat 'slippery' and difficult to pin down'*
28
29

30
31 *'There are many adults who most people would consider vulnerable but who don't fall within the*
32 *'official' definition'*
33
34

35
36 *'Identifying exactly who is and isn't a vulnerable adult in terms of the legal definition'*
37
38

39
40 *'We meet with people who do not meet the statutory definition of vulnerable adult, but who are*
41 *vulnerable'*
42
43

44
45 *'The definition is so broad that policy formation is almost meaningless since anyone*
46 *and everyone could be a vulnerable adult at any given time'*
47
48

49
50 Further, participants specifically noted the complexities of defining V.A. within a Church
51 context.
52
53

54
55 *'I think the definition of a vulnerable adult is confusing to a lot of people so within a church setting*
56 *the area is very grey and subjective'*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

'Definitions -there are differing views on what constitutes a vulnerable adult especially in my church where decisions are arbitrarily used to include/exclude people'

'Not sufficiently understanding the definition and not knowing enough about the issues facing a church seeking to care for vulnerable adults'

'I am not confident that the pastoral team, let alone the wider church understands concepts of vulnerability, mental capacity, inclusion and acceptance of diversity'

Discussion

The purpose of this survey was to identify current understandings and knowledge about V.A. and safeguarding in the Christian faith context. This survey, being the first of its kind in the UK, represents a considerable contribution to knowledge. As stated earlier, there is a need to continue to explore this issue in relation to other faith groups.

Some key messages emerge from the survey. The first issue, and a key focus of this paper, is that of definition. It was clear that most participants drew upon the 'No Secrets' (2000) definition of V.A. in their understanding, including a focus on support needs of vulnerable adults or needs related to specific vulnerabilities, in particular physical disability was discussed. This highlights some of the constraints of definitions of vulnerability which link vulnerability to inherent characteristics of the individual, rather than the subjective experience of being vulnerable (Dunn, Clare, and Holland 2008). An element of many responses was informed by respondents understanding of capacity to care for and look after oneself. Stevens (2013) notes the complexity of understanding capacity and the very real challenge of supporting V.A. without disempowering individuals or conversely exposing them to risk. This challenge was also recognised by the respondents in the survey, with a number identifying the difficulty of judging capacity and supporting individuals without either rendering them a child or placing them at risk of harm. Respondents' answers also illustrated their concern about making the wrong decision. Allen and Brodsinzi (2009) note the increased difficulty of making such decisions in a risk adverse society. These responses perhaps illustrate that at the time of the study the impact of changes to safeguarding policy and practice as a result of the Care Act 2014 and Making Safeguarding Personal had yet to impact upon Christian faith organisations. In particular approaches to safeguarding which

1
2
3 focus on empowerment and partnership with those at risk of harm are rarely evident within the
4 respondents' responses.
5
6
7

8
9 There was a clear focus in many answers on the age of 18 as an indication of when somebody
10 could be considered to be a V.A. The respondents were making a distinction between child
11 protection and safeguarding adults. Many respondents noted that all individuals under 18 came
12 under child protection policies however; it was much more complex to identify vulnerability in
13 adults. Similarly, Collins (2010) recognises that within child protection vulnerability, capacity and
14 duty of care are more or less given however, within adult safeguarding things are much more
15 complex. It should be noted, that although the majority of answers specify the age of 18 there were
16 some misunderstandings with some including ages of 16 and 21.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Responses to the survey indicate that the vast majority of people answering the felt confident in
25 their ability to identify factors that may be connected to vulnerability. However, one of most
26 interesting findings was that in answer to the question 'are there any areas of safeguarding
27 vulnerable adults you do not feel confident with?' many participants asked for greater clarity about
28 the definition of a vulnerable adult and the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Fanning and Dalrymple
29 (2011) note that the concept of vulnerability is not stable and that individual adults may be classified
30 and declassified as vulnerable throughout their lifespan. The lack of clarity resulted in a request for
31 further safeguarding training in the survey. Respondents asked for training to include definitions of
32 vulnerability and how to use these in practice. Many respondents reflected Stevens (2013) concern
33 that current definitions do not clarify thresholds of vulnerability. Some respondents noted that
34 current definitions are unhelpful in a Christian faith context. The inability to define this term
35 effectively led to feelings of concern or a lack of confidence when wanting to support vulnerable
36 adults effectively in a faith based context. It was clear that individuals wanted to offer the best
37 support to those who came to the Church or Christian organisation context. However, the current
38 difficulties associated with defining the term V.A. clearly impacted the ability of the organisations to
39 feel confident that they were able to offer the level of support they wished to.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 A number of respondents noted the introduction of the term adults 'at risk' of harm and suggested
54 this now to be more appropriate than the term V.A. However, in explaining the meaning of adults 'at
55 risk' of harm most participants once again drew heavily on the 'No Secrets' (2000) definition and
56 focused on the ways in which individuals may be vulnerable (Greenfields, Dalrymple and Fanning,
57 2012), and this often linked directly to the inherent characteristics of the individual (Dunn, Clare and
58
59
60

1
2
3 Holland, 2008). Therefore, it became clear from the research that changing the term V.A. to adult 'at
4 risk' of harm still does little to address the key issue which is that defining key terms in this area is
5 deeply problematic. The Care and Support Statutory Guidance (2014) is likely to do little to alter this.
6
7 The guidance states:
8
9

10
11 "Wellbeing" is a broad concept" (Page 1) and goes on to say that this includes 'protection from
12 abuse and neglect.'
13
14
15

16
17 One matter that raised concern within the survey was the limited amount of safeguarding adults
18 training received by participants. In their information booklet on working with vulnerable adults
19 CCPAS recognise that while much attention has been paid to child protection training in faith-based
20 settings there is a need to ensure the adults at risk from harm and abuse are equally protected
21 through appropriate training(CCPAS, 2013). One factor worthy of note was that whilst many
22 respondents were confident that they could identify factors related to vulnerability only 53%
23 received any training in this area. It is therefore unclear on what basis respondents felt able to
24 identify vulnerability indicators. It is a matter of concern that the confidence reported may be
25 misplaced, especially considering how complex it is to clearly identify vulnerability (Parley, 2010).
26
27 The survey illustrated that issues in defining vulnerable adults are further complicated by faith-based
28 settings. Respondents reported being unsure of how to apply definitions to individuals, they met in
29 the Christian context. Many answers reflected the opinion that in this context current definitions
30 and recommendations for practice either do not work or failed to reflect the complexity of
31 relationships within a faith context. One respondent noted the impact of unclear definitions led to
32 individual decisions about inclusion and exclusion to this category. This resonates with the work of
33 Parley (2010) who noted that a lack of clarity in care settings led to workers bringing their own
34 meanings and interpretations to the term and their practice.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Many respondents noted the boundaries of faith-based contexts are not clear. For example, many
49 families are connected to the Christian context through weekly clubs or community outreach events.
50 The survey illustrated a very real concern with understanding who could be considered vulnerable
51 and who was responsible for identifying this. Difficulties arise when trying to determine whom the
52 church or Christian organisation could be considered responsible for in terms of safeguarding. For
53 example, church or Christian organisation may meet families of individuals who attend regulated
54 activities but who do not themselves attend. There were many questions about the limits of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 responsibility. It should be noted that there were many comments about boundary issues within the
4 Christian faith context. The topic of boundaries will be explored more fully in a future paper.
5
6
7

8
9 It is interesting to note that respondents clearly indicated the distinct complexity of safeguarding
10 and working with vulnerable adults in faith-based contexts. Currently many adults who receive
11 safeguarding training obtained this from their work or statutory organisations rather than from their
12 Christian context. The findings of this survey suggest the requirement for bespoke safeguarding
13 adult training which recognises and incorporates issues pertinent to faith based contexts. It should
14 be noted that limited training is an issue across agencies involved in adult safeguarding.
15
16
17
18

19
20 Domac and Haider (2013) highlighted the significant gap in inter-professional education of social
21 workers in the area of adult safeguarding. They note the impact this has on the competency and
22 confidence of professionals to safeguard appropriately. A seminal study in Canada in 2003 looked at
23 responses to elder abuse in faith communities (Podnieks et al., 2003) finding that faith leaders
24 lacked knowledge about abuse and this was a barrier to responding effectively. A similar study
25 undertaken amongst clergy in Kentucky, USA in 2013 found that half of the clergy responded that
26 they were unaware of either relevant legislation or who to report concerns to, concluding that
27 education and training are key to meeting the needs of faith communities (Rudnick and Teaster et al.
28 2013). It would seem that generally there is a significant need for increased focused training in the
29 area of adult safeguarding within faith settings.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 The survey results illustrated that a number of individuals holding the position of safeguarding adult
41 lead in churches were employed in a professional occupation that was somehow related to this role.
42 A number of respondents reported feeling confident in their church or organisational response to
43 safeguarding because of the professional background of their lead. However, many also noted that
44 the majority of individuals who are engaged with leading church activities are volunteers and cannot
45 be expected to fully understand issues of safeguarding and vulnerability. However, Perkins et al.
46 (2007) highlight the necessity for any agency involved in the care of V.A. to have a clear
47 understanding of their safeguarding role.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 It is clear from the results of this survey that there needs to be further work in this area. Current
56 definitions of vulnerability and risk are clearly limited. There is an obvious need for definitions that
57 can be used to guide policy and practice in this area. Further, this survey presents a clear indication
58 that there is a requirement for careful thought and further research about the complexities of
59
60

1
2
3 safeguarding adults within faith-based contexts, especially in how the Care Act 2014 and
4 accompanying statutory guidance is understood.
5
6
7

8
9 The Care Act (2014) and Making Safeguarding Personal guidance represent a cultural shift in
10 safeguarding policy and practice away from notions of vulnerability to embrace a more person-
11 centred and empowering approach to those who may be at risk of harm. It is important that all
12 organisations that offer support to adults who may be at risk of harm are aware of these changes
13 and their responsibility within safeguarding practice. Although respondents report confidence in
14 their ability to identify factors related to vulnerability, they lack confidence in their ability to define,
15 support or work with vulnerable adults within the context of adult safeguarding. There is a need for
16 more detailed and bespoke training for safeguarding officers and those involved in safeguarding
17 roles within faith-based contexts. It is clear from the results of the survey that there is a desire from
18 faith-based organisations to safeguard adults. In order to do this there needs to be a much greater
19 understanding of the issues related to safeguarding adults in faith-based contexts.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

References

Allen, V., and Brodzinski, E. (2009) Deconstructing the toolkit: creativity and risk in
the NHS workforce, *Health Care Analysis*. Vol. 17 No. 4 pp. 309-17.

Boland, B., Burnage, J., and Chowhan, H. (2013) Safeguarding Adults at risk of harm, *British
Medical Journal*. 2013; 346:f2716.

Böhm, B., Zollner, H., Fegert, J. M., and Liebhardt, H. (2014) Child sexual abuse in
the context of the Roman Catholic Church: a review of literature from 1981-2013.
Journal of child sexual abuse, Vol. 23 No.6 pp. 635–56.

Bouclin, M.E. (2006) *Seeking Wholeness: Women Dealing with Abuse of Power in the Catholic
Church*. New York: Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press

Church of England (2006a) *Promoting a Safe Church -Policy for safeguarding adults
in the Church of England*, available on line at

<https://www.churchofengland.org/media/37405/promotingasafechurch.pdf>

[Accessed 5 Jan 2015]

1
2
3
4
5 Church of England Archbishops Council (2006b) *Responding to Domestic Abuse:*

6 *Guidelines for those with pastoral responsibility*, available online at

7 <https://www.churchofengland.org/media/1163604/domesticabuse.pdf>

8
9 [Accessed 5 Jan 2015]

10
11
12
13 Collins, M. (2010) Thresholds in adult protection. *Journal of Adult Protection*, Vol. 12 No. 1 pp. 4-14.

14
15
16
17 Department of Health and Home Office (2000) *No secrets: Guidance on developing and*
18 *implementing multi-agency policies and procedures to protect vulnerable adults from abuse*, London:
19 HMSO
20
21

22
23
24 Department of Health (2009) *Safeguarding adults: report on the consultation on the review of No*
25 *Secrets*, available from

26
27 [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+www.dh.gov.uk/en/Consultations/Responsestoconsult](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+www.dh.gov.uk/en/Consultations/Responsestoconsultations/DH_102764)
28 [ations/DH_102764](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+www.dh.gov.uk/en/Consultations/Responsestoconsultations/DH_102764)
29
30

31
32
33 Department of Health (2014) *Care and Support Statutory Guidance Issued Under the*
34 *Care Act 2014*, London: HMSO
35

36
37
38 Downing, E., Kennedy, S. and Fell, M. (2014) *Food Banks and Food Poverty*, London: House of
39 Commons Library Standard Note SN06657
40

41
42
43 Domac, S. and Haider, S. (2013) *Interagency safeguarding adults training for protection*
44 *and prevention. Journal of Inter professional Care*, Vol. 27 No. 6 pp. 520–522.
45
46

47
48
49 Dunn, M.C., Clare, I.H.C., and Holland, A.J. (2008) *To empower or protect? Constructing the*
50 *'vulnerable adult' in English law and public policy. Legal Studies*, Vol. 28 No. 2 pp.234-253.
51

52
53
54 Dunne, E. A. (2004) *Clerical child sex abuse: The response of the roman catholic*
55 *church. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 14 No.6 pp.490-494.
56
57

58
59
60 Furness, S. and Gilligan, P. (2010) *Social Work, Religion and Belief: Developing a Framework for*
Practice. British Journal of Social Work, Vol. 40 No. 7 pp. 2185-2202.

1
2
3
4
5 Gilligan, P. (2012) Clerical Abuse and Laicisation: Rhetoric and Reality in the
6 Catholic Church in England and Wales. *Child Abuse Review*, Vol. 21 No.6 pp. 427– 439.
7

8
9
10 Greenfields, M., Dalrymple, R., and Fanning, A. (2011) *Working with adults at risk from*
11 *Harm*. McGraw-Hill Education UK.
12

13
14
15 Hammond, G. and Owen, S. (2006) *Safe to Belong* (First Edition), Oxford: Baptist Union of
16 Great Britain Alden Press Ltd
17

18
19
20 Hildago, M.L. (2008) *Sexual Abuse and the Culture of Catholicism: How Priests and Nuns become*
21 *Perpetrators*, The Haworth Maltreatment and Trauma Press.
22

23
24 Lambie-Mumford, H., Crossley, D., Jensen, E., Verbeke, M. and Dowler, E. (2014)
25 Household Food Security in the UK: A Review of Food Aid Executive Summary Food Ethics Council &
26 The University of Warwick DEFRA February 2014, University of Warwick
27

28
29
30 Lewis, J., and Ritchie, J. (2003) Generalising from Qualitative Research. In *Qualitative Research*
31 *Practice A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* (Eds) J. Ritchie and J. Lewis, London:
32 Sage Publications
33

34
35
36
37
38 Local Government Association (LGA) (2014) Making Safeguarding Personal: Guide 2014, Available
39 from [http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/5854661/Making+Safeguarding+Personal+-](http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/5854661/Making+Safeguarding+Personal+-+Guide+2014/4213d016-2732-40d4-bbc0-d0d8639ef0df)
40 [+Guide+2014/4213d016-2732-40d4-bbc0-d0d8639ef0df](http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/5854661/Making+Safeguarding+Personal+-+Guide+2014/4213d016-2732-40d4-bbc0-d0d8639ef0df) [Accessed 05/01/2015]
41

42
43
44
45 Local Government Association (LGA) (2015) Making Safeguarding Personal: A toolkit for responses,
46 4th Edition, Available from
47 [http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/6869714/Making+safeguarding+personal_a+toolkit+for](http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/6869714/Making+safeguarding+personal_a+toolkit+for+responses_4th+Edition+2015.pdf/1a5845c2-9dfc-4afd-abac-d0f8f32914bc)
48 [+responses_4th+Edition+2015.pdf/1a5845c2-9dfc-4afd-abac-d0f8f32914bc](http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/6869714/Making+safeguarding+personal_a+toolkit+for+responses_4th+Edition+2015.pdf/1a5845c2-9dfc-4afd-abac-d0f8f32914bc) [Accessed 05/01/16]
49

50
51
52
53 Mackay, K., McLaughlan, C., Rossi, S., McNicholl, J., Notman, M. and Fraser, D., (2011). Exploring how
54 practitioners support and protect adults at risk of harm in the light of the Adult Support and
55 Protection (Scotland) Act 2007. Research Report University of Stirling Available from
56 <http://www.storre.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/3524/1/ASP%20research%20report%20finalx.pdf>
57 [Accessed 05/01/2016]
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Mercado, C. C., Tallon, J. A. and Terry, K. J. (2008) Persistent Sexual Abusers in the Catholic Church:
6 An Examination of Characteristics and Offense Patterns. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35 pp. 629–
7 642.
8

9
10 NCLs (2013) Gender profile of Church attenders [www.http//ncls.org.au](http://ncls.org.au) accessed on 8th March 2014.
11

12
13 Parley, F.F. (2010) What does vulnerability mean? *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*. Vol 39, pp.
14 266-276.
15
16

17
18 Perkins, N., Penhale, B., Reid, D., Pinkney, L., Hussein, S. and Manthorpe, J. (2007) Partnership means
19 protection? Perceptions of the effectiveness of multiagency working and the regulatory framework
20 within adult protection in England and Wales. *The Journal of Adult Protection*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 9-23.
21
22
23

24
25 Podnieks, E., and Wilson, S. (2003) An Exploratory Study of Responses to Elder Abuse in Faith
26 Communities. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 15 No. 3-4 pp. 137–162.
27
28
29

30
31 Rudnick J.D. and Teaster, P. B. (2013) Elder Abuse and Neglect: A Survey of Clergy Awareness,
32 Knowledge, and Intervention Preferences. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 25 No.4 pp. 323–
33 338.
34
35
36
37

38
39 Snape, D. and Spencer, L. (2003) The Foundations of Qualitative Research. In *Qualitative Research*
40 *Practice A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* (Eds) J. Ritchie and J. Lewis, London:
41 Sage Publications
42
43

44
45 Stevens, E. (2013) Safeguarding vulnerable adults: exploring the challenges to best
46 practice across multi-agency settings. *The Journal of Adult Protection*, Vol. 15 No. 2
47 pp. 85 -95.
48
49
50

51
52
53 The Churches' Child Protection Advisory Service (CCPAS) (2013) *Help I want to protect vulnerable*
54 *adults*. Information help booklet, available from
55 <http://files.ccpas.co.uk/documents/Help-VulnerableAdults.pdf>
56
57

58 [Accessed 1 Feb 2015]
59
60

1
2
3 The Methodist Church in Britain (2010a) *Policy for the Methodist Church Safeguarding*
4 *Adults -A Methodist response to the protection of adults when they are vulnerable*, available from
5 <http://www.methodist.org.uk/downloads/safe-update-4-1110-adults.pdf>
6
7

8 [Accessed 1 Feb 2015]
9

10
11 The Methodist Church in Britain (2010b) Practice Guidelines to Support
12 The Report Domestic Abuse And the Methodist Church Taking Action, 2nd Edition, available from
13 <http://www.methodist.org.uk/downloads/safe-update-6-1110-domestic-abuse-guidelines.pdf>
14
15

16 [Accessed 1 Feb 2015]
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review