

Legal Compliance in Street-Level Bureaucracy: A Study of UK Housing Officers

Abstract

Street-level bureaucratic theory is now at a fairly mature stage. The focus on street-level bureaucrats as ‘ultimate policymakers’ is now as familiar as it is important. Likewise, the parallel socio-legal study of the implementation of public law in public organisations has demonstrated the inevitable gap between law-in-the-books and law-in-action. Yet, the success of these advances comes at the potential cost of us losing sight of the importance of law itself. This article analyses some empirical data on the decision-making about one legal concept - ‘vulnerability’ in UK homelessness law. Our analysis offers two main contributions. First, we argue that, when it comes to the implementation of law, the legal abilities and propensities of the bureaucrats must be taken into account. Bureaucrats’ abilities to understand legal materials make a difference to the likelihood of legal compliance. Second, we must also pay attention to the character of the legal provisions. Where a provision is simple, it is more likely to facilitate legal knowledge and demands nothing of bureaucrats in terms of legal competence. Where the provision is also ‘inoffensive’ and ‘liveable’ it is less likely to act as an impediment to legal conscientiousness.

Keywords: street-level bureaucracy; legal compliance; homelessness

Introduction

Street-level bureaucracy has long been an important focus for scholars of public policy and public administration. Foundational work by Prottas (1979), Brown (1981) and, perhaps most significantly, Lipsky (1980) has led to a burgeoning field of enquiry within the political sciences (Maynard-Moody and Portillo, 2010). Such research has revealed the significance of the structure of street-level work to the nature of the policies that are delivered on the frontlines of public services. Thus, researchers have revealed the significance to policy administration of organizational culture (e.g., Riccucci, 2005a), organisational settings (e.g., Jewell and Glaser, 2006), limited resources and excessive demand (e.g., Prottas, 1979; Lipsky, 1980), and the emotional demands of direct client contact (e.g., Guy, Newman and Mastracci, 2008). These conditions trigger various coping mechanisms that structure routine work (Nielson, 2006; Tummers et al, 2015). The inevitable discretion of frontline work (Maynard-Moody and Musheno, 2000; Riccucci 2005b) also creates a space into which wider cultural morality flows (Hasenfeld, 2000). Perceptions of deserving and undeserving citizens/clients can channel street-level work (Maynard-Moody and Musheno, 2003). Studies have also shown that the gender (e.g., Wilkins and Keiser, 2005; Wenger and Wilkins, 2009), ethnicity (e.g., Schoenholtz et al, 2014) and social status (e.g., Portillo, 2012) of street-level bureaucrats and clients can affect individual decisions on the frontline. In light of these myriad findings, street-level bureaucrats, rather than senior policy-drafting officials, have been deemed the “ultimate policymakers” (Lipsky, 1980).

In addition to political science, however, street-level bureaucracy has also been a significant focus for socio-legal studies (e.g., Cowan and Hitchings, 2007; Halliday et al, 2009; Pratt, 2012; Alpes and Spire, 2014). Lipsky’s distinction between the formal policies of senior officials and the actual policies delivered by street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky, 1980) resonates particularly well with socio-legal scholars, mapping nicely onto one of their own core sets of

1
2
3 distinctions: that between the law-in-books and the law-in-action (Pound, 1910; Halliday et
4 al, 2012). In keeping with street-level bureaucratic theory, socio-legal scholarship has
5 similarly stressed the significance of discretion (e.g., Hawkins, 1992), routinisation (e.g.,
6 Silbey, 1980), working conditions (e.g., Baldwin et al, 1992) and cultural morality (Hawkins,
7 2003) to the nature of the law-in-action produced at the frontline.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 Yet, a distinct feature of socio-legal work on frontline service delivery has been the particular
16 concern with the question of *legal* compliance (e.g., Loughlin and Quinn, 1993; Sunkin,
17 2004), querying the reasons why public service organisations fail to comply, not just with
18 legislative rules, but also with the guidance of the courts (e.g., Mullen et al, 1996; Halliday
19 2000; Hertogh and Halliday, 2004). Such studies – unsurprisingly in light of street-level
20 bureaucratic theory – have exposed the numerous barriers that stand in the way of legally
21 compliant behaviour on the part of governmental bodies (e.g., Sunkin and Le Sueur, 1991;
22 Loveland, 1995; Cowan, 1997). However, they have also been useful in pointing to the
23 significance of what might be termed the ‘legal abilities and propensities’ of street-level
24 bureaucrats for the extent of legal compliance. In particular, Halliday has set out a framework
25 to help us understand the gap between the law-in-books and the law-in-action within street-
26 level bureaucracies (Halliday, 2004). He has argued that the extent of the gap is determined,
27 in part at least, by the extent of street-level bureaucrats’ legal knowledge, legal competence
28 and legal conscientiousness. In other words, the law-in-action produced by the everyday
29 activities of street-level bureaucrats is affected by the fact that the bureaucrats are
30 implementing *law* and not just policy. Thus, the street-level bureaucrats’ varying ability to
31 understand and work with legal materials and their varying attitudes and stances towards the
32 importance of lawfulness is part of the broader context that affects the nature of the law-in-
33 action (Hertogh, 2010).

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

1
2
3 In this paper, we draw on qualitative research of street-level bureaucracies in the UK housing
4 sector to add further depth to the socio-legal scholarship on legal compliance. The paper is
5 founded on a puzzle that emerged from the empirical findings. For, unusually in light of the
6 thrust of street-level bureaucratic research, we discovered a small oasis of consistent legal
7 compliance across our three case studies – in the application of the legal concept of
8 ‘vulnerability’ within the context of homelessness law. In this way, we have been forced to
9 turn the common socio-legal research question about street-level bureaucracies – “how do we
10 explain non-compliance with law?” – on its head. Instead, the core research question of this
11 paper is: Why, amidst non-compliant street-level bureaucrats’ practices, do we find legal
12 compliance in relation to one particular aspect of their work? The answer, we suggest, lies in
13 the character of the particular legal provision demanding compliance and the effect this has
14 on the likelihood of street-level bureaucrats’ legal knowledge, legal competence and legal
15 conscientiousness. In this way, whereas much street-level bureaucratic theory focuses (in
16 broad terms) on the conditions in which bureaucrats work and on their identity and
17 characteristics, our study urges us additionally to maintain a focus on the legal provisions
18 demanding compliance. For the character of the law, in some circumstances, can decrease the
19 extent of the gap between the law-in-books and the law-in-action.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 This article proceeds in five main stages. First, to provide some context for our study, we
42 offer some descriptive background to the public administration sector that we examined –
43 English housing law as it affects homeless people. Second, we describe the research methods
44 that we employed in the study. Third, we then set out our findings descriptively in order to
45 substantiate the foundational empirical claim that, in one particular aspect of the legislative
46 scheme being implemented, we discovered a small oasis of consistent legal compliance.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 Fourth, we then analyse those findings in the light of existing socio-legal scholarship and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 seek to explain them. Lastly, we conclude with a consideration of the implications of our
4
5 study for future research on the production of law-in-action in street-level bureaucracies.
6
7

9 10 **The Context: English Homelessness Law**

11 In international terms, Englandⁱ is unusual in giving homeless people a set of justiciable
12
13 rights (Fitzpatrick and Stephens 2007). The right to housing is enshrined in a specific piece of
14
15 legislation. The original legislation dates from 1977 and, despite amendments and re-
16
17 enactments, remains largely unaltered in its basic structure. The UK Parliament has devolved
18
19 the task of implementing what is known as ‘homelessness law’ to the most local level of
20
21 government, known as local authorities. When someone applies for housing, the local
22
23 authority must conduct certain stipulated enquiries if it has reason to believe that the
24
25 applicant may be homeless. The housing duty is triggered only if applicants are assessed as
26
27 being (1) eligible to apply (in relation to their immigration status); (2) legally ‘homeless’; (3)
28
29 in priority need; and (4) not intentionally homeless. Thus the legislation has been described
30
31 as constituting something of an “obstacle race” for housing applicants (Robson and
32
33 Watchman 1981). The focus of our project and this article is on the third of the ‘obstacles’ set
34
35 out above: the notion of having a “priority need” for housing.
36
37

38
39
40 The concept of ‘priority need’ is defined in the legislation.ⁱⁱ It includes the dependence of
41
42 children. However, if there are no dependent children, the status of having a ‘priority need’
43
44 will generally only be granted to an applicant:
45
46

47
48 who is vulnerable as a result of old age, mental illness or handicap or physical
49
50 disability or other special reason...ⁱⁱⁱ
51
52

53
54 Accordingly, local authority decisions on whether a housing applicant without children is
55
56 legally ‘vulnerable’ often turn on the use of medical evidence.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The notion of “vulnerability” is not further defined in the legislation. Instead, its meaning has
4
5 been developed and refined through case law. At the time of our fieldwork, the leading case
6
7 was that of *R. v Camden LBC, ex p Pereira* (1998). Here, the Court of Appeal stated that
8
9 vulnerability means an applicant being:
10

11
12 less able to fend for himself than an ordinary homeless person so that injury or
13
14 detriment to him will result where a less vulnerable man will be able to cope without
15
16 harmful effects (per Hobhouse L.J., 330).
17
18

19
20 The Court of Appeal gave further clarification six years later in *Osmani v. Camden L.B.C.*
21
22 (2004):
23

24
25 One has only to attempt to apply the *Pereira* test to any particular case by asking the
26
27 question whether the applicant would, by reason of whatever condition or
28
29 circumstances assail him, suffer greater harm from homelessness than an ‘ordinary
30
31 homeless person’, to see what a necessarily imprecise exercise of comparison it
32
33 imposes on a local housing authority ... For the purpose of applying the vulnerability
34
35 test a local housing authority should take care to assess and apply it on the assumption
36
37 that an applicant has become or will become street homeless, not on his ability to fend
38
39 for himself while still housed. (per Auld L.J., para. 38)
40
41
42
43

44
45 Both of these case law developments on the meaning of vulnerability were reflected in
46
47 subsequent governmental guidance for local authorities implementing the legislation (CLG
48
49 2006). Generally speaking, where legislation gives public officials discretionary decision-
50
51 making powers, it is common in the UK for that discretion to be the subject of governmental
52
53 guidance via statutory codes. The specific terms of such codes are not legally binding, but
54
55 must nonetheless be taken into account by local authorities when making their decisions.
56
57 Thus, they are best thought of as ‘soft law’ documents (Sossin, 2004). At the time of our
58
59
60

1
2
3 fieldwork, the Code of Guidance relating to homelessness law, which had been in place since
4
5 2006, reiterated, albeit without naming them, the decisions in both *Pereira* and *Osmani*.
6
7

8
9 10.13... the local authority should consider whether, when homeless, the applicant
10
11 would be less able to fend for him/herself than an ordinary homeless person so that he
12
13 or she would suffer injury or detriment, in circumstances where a less vulnerable
14
15 person would be able to cope without harmful effects.
16

17
18 10.14... The applicant's vulnerability must be assessed on the basis that he or she is or
19
20 will become homeless, and not on his or her ability to fend for him or herself while
21
22 still housed.
23
24

25 26 **Rights of Review / Appeal**

27 Applications for housing under the homelessness legislation are quite high – over 100,000
28
29 each year in England alone (CLG, 2014). Only about 50% of applications, however, are
30
31 successful. Those whose housing applications are rejected have a right to an internal
32
33 administrative review of that decision, though the take up of these rights of review has been
34
35 surprising low (Cowan, Halliday and Hunter, 2006). If the original decision is upheld at
36
37 internal review, applicants may then appeal to the county court on a point of law. Thereafter,
38
39 appeals may be made to the Court of Appeal, similarly only on a point of law. There are no
40
41 available data on the number of homelessness appeals in the County Court. However, given
42
43 the low level of take up of internal review, it seems likely that proportionately very few cases
44
45 go to this very first stage of appeal. Even fewer will reach the Court of Appeal.
46
47

48
49 Virtually all decisions of the Court of Appeal are published and available via legal websites.
50
51 Decisions of the county court, however, are generally not published and so are much less
52
53 visible. These differences in visibility reflect the difference accorded to them in terms of their
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 importance. In terms of the definitional development of legal terms and concepts, the key
4
5 cases are those that proceed to the Court of Appeal.
6
7

8 9 **Research Methods**

10 The public administration of homelessness law has been a popular site for socio-legal case
11
12 studies of street-level bureaucracy in the UK (Loveland, 1995; Mullen, Pick and
13
14 Prosser, 1996; Cowan, 1997; Cowan and Halliday, 2003; Halliday, 2004; Watts, 2013). This
15
16 is because, despite the fact that the number of court cases is very low relative to the number
17
18 of applications made for housing, the incidence of homelessness court cases relative to
19
20 judicial reviews about other matters has traditionally been very high (Sunkin, Bridges and
21
22 Meszaros, 1996). Accordingly, a focus on homelessness decision-making has provided fertile
23
24 ground for exploring issues of street-level bureaucratic compliance with the dictates of the
25
26 courts, in addition to the legislative rules.
27
28
29

30
31 Our data reported here comes from a study funded by the UK's *Economic and Social*
32
33 *Research Council*, which examined the decision-making of homelessness officers for
34
35 applicants who were vulnerable. The study focused particularly on the use of medical
36
37 evidence. It employed a mixed-method qualitative case study approach with the case studies
38
39 located in three different local authorities across England. The authorities (London Borough,
40
41 Northern City and Eastern Town)^{iv} were purposively selected to include both urban and rural
42
43 jurisdictions, large and small authorities (in terms of the annual number of homelessness
44
45 applications), and different approaches to assessing medical evidence. Two of the local
46
47 authorities employed the services of external medical advisors, albeit to different degrees,
48
49 while the third did not. Experience of legal activism was not a selection criterion of the
50
51 fieldwork sites. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that our three case study authorities were quite
52
53 different in this respect too. In both London Borough and Northern City there were a number
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of cases that proceeded to internal administrative review of decisions on vulnerability. In
4
5 such cases, the applicants were usually represented by lawyers, who would write lengthy
6
7 letters setting out the relevant case law in some detail. There was no such evidence in
8
9 Eastern Town.
10

11
12 In each of our fieldwork sites, the implementation of homelessness law was conducted in
13
14 municipal offices. Generally speaking within the UK, applications for housing under
15
16 homelessness law are sufficiently high that most local authorities have dedicated teams of
17
18 officers whose work is entirely devoted to dealing with homelessness applications. This was
19
20 certainly the case in our three fieldwork sites. Each had a team of specialized frontline
21
22 officers supervised by managers (albeit of differing sizes: 4 in Eastern Town; 14 in London
23
24 Borough; 6 in Northern City). Frontline officers would interview homeless applicants,
25
26 conduct inquiries where necessary, and make a determination about whether applicants
27
28 qualified for assistance under the legislation. These frontline officers were generally career
29
30 civil servants (at a local government level).
31
32
33
34
35

36 Fieldwork took place between 2011 and 2012. The case studies in each fieldwork site
37
38 comprised four elements. Firstly, a semi-structured in-depth interview was carried out with
39
40 the local authority manager (or senior representative in an equivalent role) responsible for
41
42 assessing homelessness applications. Interviews explored each local authority's
43
44 organisational policies and procedures as regards the use of medical evidence (in both
45
46 applications and internal administrative reviews), and explored the rationale behind the
47
48 different approaches adopted.
49
50

51
52 Secondly, a focus group was undertaken with frontline homelessness officers who had
53
54 handled applications and/or reviews involving medical evidence. These involved between
55
56 four and six participants, depending upon the size of each local authority. Vignettes – short
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 written scenarios intended to illicit responses to typical situations (Hill 1997) – based on
4
5 ‘real’ anonymised cases, were used across all three case studies. This enabled consistent
6
7 comparison of different organisational cultures.
8
9

10
11 Thirdly, individual homelessness application case files were examined in detail. Across the
12
13 local authority areas forty-one case files of the most recent decisions (including both cases
14
15 that were accepted and rejected), where a decision on vulnerability involved taking into
16
17 account applicants’ medical issues, were examined. In addition, nine of these cases
18
19 proceeded to internal administrative review and this review stage of the case file was also
20
21 examined. This enabled the research team to analyse real cases and assess the actual medical
22
23 evidence that was requested and provided in the case and how influential that medical
24
25 evidence was in the final decision.
26
27

28
29 Finally, following the case file analysis, a semi-structured in-depth interview took place with
30
31 the officer(s) handling each individual case. The researchers conducted forty-six interviews
32
33 with decision-making homelessness officers regarding the individual decisions on each of the
34
35 case files, including those that went on to internal administrative review. With reference to
36
37 each case, interviews explored: officers’ understanding of the application of the law to a
38
39 particular case; their understanding of and response to the medical evidence before them;
40
41 whether they sought particular types of medical evidence; how and to what extent medical
42
43 evidence (from various sources) influenced their decision on the case; any other factors taken
44
45 into account.
46
47

48
49 The interview and focus group data were subject to thematic analysis, having first been
50
51 transcribed. The coding scheme aimed to capture the bureaucrats’ perceptions of the role of
52
53 law and legality in relation to their routine decision-making about ‘vulnerability’. This
54
55 included references to a legal test of vulnerability, as well as references to relevant court
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cases, and the legal test developed in these cases (or phrases similar to the test). Additionally,
4
5 drawing particularly on prior socio-legal work on homelessness decision-making (e.g.,
6
7 Loveland, 1995; Mullen et al, 1996; Cowan, 1997; Halliday, 2004), these data were coded for
8
9 the features of the broader decision-making context that militated against legal compliance. A
10
11 similar exercise was also undertaken with all the documentation from the different
12
13 authorities, both from the individual cases and from policy/procedure documents.
14
15
16
17

18 Findings

19 As noted already above, previous empirical studies of the general implementation of
20
21 homelessness law have highlighted the unlawful features of routine bureaucratic practices
22
23 and the barriers that stand in the way of full legal compliance (Loveland, 1995; Mullen, Pick
24
25 and Prosser, 1996; Cowan 1997; Halliday 2004). In many respects, and unsurprisingly, our
26
27 findings were similar. We observed a variety of practices that could be characterised as
28
29 legally dubious. For example, at the time of fieldwork, as a matter of procedure, Northern
30
31 City asked medical practitioners for their view of whether an applicant was vulnerable and in
32
33 practice took this view as decisive. Case law has long made it clear that such practice is
34
35 unlawful. The decision on vulnerability is squarely one for the local authority itself and not
36
37 external advisors.^v
38
39
40
41

42 Nonetheless, in one respect, our data marked something of a contrast. Whereas the general
43
44 thrust of research on street-level bureaucracy has been to document and explain failure to
45
46 comply with law and formal policy, our data revealed a small oasis of legal compliance – in
47
48 relation to the substantive test to be used when determining whether an applicant was
49
50 vulnerable. In this respect, despite being purposively sampled to represent different size,
51
52 locality and decision-making arrangements, our three local authorities were all legally
53
54 compliant.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 So, for example, in Northern City, the letter template asking the external medical advisors for
4
5 their opinions included a statement of the “Test of Vulnerability”:
6
7

8 In some areas of law, “vulnerable” is used without much in the way of further
9
10 definition. However, in homelessness cases vulnerability means that an applicant is
11
12 “less able to fend for himself than an ordinary homeless person so that injury or
13
14 detriment will result were a less vulnerable man will be able to cope without harmful
15
16 effects”; that is to say a person is vulnerable if he has a lesser ability than that of a
17
18 hypothetical “ordinary homeless person” to fend for himself that he would suffer
19
20 greater harm from homelessness than would such a person. The test must be applied
21
22 on the assumption that he is or will become street homeless not on his ability to fend
23
24 for himself while still housed.
25
26
27

28
29 As we can see, this directly reproduced part of the decision in *Pereira* and also reflects the
30
31 decision in *Osmani*. The same was true as regards Northern City’s decision letters to
32
33 applicants where priority need was denied. Among the 11 cases we examined, three different
34
35 formulations were found. All three formulations set out “the test”:
36
37

38 when homeless, would you be less able to fend for yourself than an ordinary homeless
39
40 person so that you would be likely to suffer injury or detriment in circumstances
41
42 where a less vulnerable person would be able to cope without harmful effects?
43
44
45

46 In two of the formulations, the *Pereira* case was referenced in full. Further, it was apparent
47
48 that the above paperwork represented more than shallow technical compliance for the
49
50 purposes of appearances. Rather, it reflected the officers’ convictions about the appropriate
51
52 test to be used. Northern City’s officers made reference to the case law when discussing how
53
54 to make vulnerability decisions:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Again it's looking at *Pereira* – would he be any less vulnerable than any other street
4
5 person? Would he be more vulnerable on the streets than an average Joe Bloggs
6
7 really? (NC focus group)
8
9

10 ...on the balance of probabilities would this person be just as able to cope as the
11
12 average homeless person. (Case officer NC/7)
13
14

15 We've got to look to the test and we've got to...use the test to see whether or not
16
17 they're vulnerable. (Case officer NC/11)
18
19

20 The same legal compliance on this point was found in Eastern Town. Its senior manager
21
22 asserted:
23
24

25 We use the *Pereira* test [...] and we apply the *Osmani* rules. So hopefully most of the
26
27 time we get it right.
28
29

30 At frontline level, local authority officers made frequent reference to these cases in discussing
31
32 how to make vulnerability decisions:
33
34

35 ...when you look at the *Pereira* test, you're looking at the different issues, and I
36
37 believe he was more than capable of dealing with most things in everyday life. (Case
38
39 officer ET/3)
40
41

42 My biggest concern in all of this is what would happen if he would become street
43
44 homeless and with the *Osmani*. It's not how he is coping now, I've got to look at how
45
46 he will be if he becomes street homeless.... (ET focus group)
47
48
49

50 In relation to some of Eastern Town's cases we were able to see front-line officers' full
51
52 reports of their decisions. These too revealed compliance with the legal test for vulnerability.
53
54

55 For example, in ET/1 the report noted:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 I have carried out a Pereira Test and the indication would be that this is not a priority.
4
5 However, I am of the opinion that the combination of his medical issues would lead to
6
7 him being vulnerable if he became street homeless.
8
9

10 In interview, the officer explained further:
11

12
13 I quickly changed my mind once I researched into [his medical condition] [...] In my
14
15 opinion he wouldn't have passed the *Pereira* test, it was mainly the *Osmani* bit that,
16
17 the effect that if he was street homeless, obviously his mental health would have
18
19 suffered, in my opinion, because he needed the toilet facilities for the Crohn's disease,
20
21 ... if he'd been street homeless that would have brought on his OCD. (Case officer
22
23 ET/1)
24
25
26

27 As regards London Borough, the legal requirements of vulnerability decisions were designed
28
29 into the day-to-day documentation used by its front-line officers. For example, the internal
30
31 guidance produced for officers included a section on determining vulnerability:
32
33
34

35 Determining vulnerability is a matter of judgement and all relevant factors must be
36
37 taken into consideration before making a decision. In all cases one must apply the test
38
39 of vulnerability: *By law, when deciding whether someone is vulnerable, you must look*
40
41 *at whether they are unable to fend for themselves, when homeless, so that they will*
42
43 *suffer injury or detriment in circumstances where a less vulnerable person would be*
44
45 *able to cope without harmful effects. R v London Borough of Camden ex parte*
46
47 *Pereira (1998) (italics in original).*
48
49

50
51 Equally, in each of its decision letters about vulnerability exactly the same italicized section
52
53 was included. The centrality of the legal test was reflected in how frontline officers discussed
54
55 the reasoning behind their decisions, albeit without direct reference to the legal cases:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [The test was whether the applicant was] vulnerable when compared to someone else
4
5 who might have less significant problems or less of an impact on themselves... (Case
6
7 officer LB/11)
8
9

10
11 As a double amputee I would just, I would imagine he would certainly be in priority
12
13 need as somebody who was less able to fend if left without accommodation. (Case
14
15 officer LB/8)
16

17
18 based on the further information that we received, it, it, it was pretty clear that he, he
19
20 wouldn't be able to fend for himself, you know, if he, if he was to become homeless.
21
22 (Case office LB/3)
23
24

25 26 27 **Analysis of Findings**

28 Our findings above present themselves as an interesting puzzle: why amidst variable and
29
30 unlawful practices do we find a small oasis of consistent legal compliance in relation to the
31
32 vulnerability test? The answer, we suggest, lies in the character of the legal provision
33
34 demanding compliance, and the significance of that character for the likelihood of street-level
35
36 bureaucratic legal knowledge, legal competence and legal conscientiousness (Halliday,
37
38 2004). More specifically, we suggest that the vulnerability test within the homelessness
39
40 legislation is (1) simpler than other aspects of the legislative scheme; (2) less offensive to
41
42 frontline officers; and (3) more accommodating of the pressures within the decision-making
43
44 environment that countervail against legal compliance – what Sunkin (2004) has called the
45
46 “liveability” of law. We flesh these arguments out below.
47
48
49

50 51 **Simplicity**

52 The vulnerability test articulated in the key cases of *Pereira* and *Osmani* lent itself easily to a
53
54 short and straightforward abbreviation. When compared to other legal elements demanding
55
56 compliance from the local authorities, the vulnerability test had an attractive simplicity about
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 it. A comparison with one of other ‘obstacles’ (Robson and Watchman, 1981) within the
4
5 legislation - that of the “intentionality” of homelessness - is instructive. The concept of
6
7 ‘intentional homelessness’ has been the most heavily litigated aspect of the homelessness
8
9 litigation (Loveland, 1991). The basic idea underscoring this provision was that an applicant
10
11 for housing may be deemed intentionally homeless:
12

13
14 if he deliberately does or fails to do anything in consequence of which he ceases to
15
16 occupy accommodation which is available for his occupation and which it would have
17
18 been reasonable for him to continue to occupy. [...] [A]n act or omission in good faith
19
20 on the part of a person who was unaware of any relevant fact shall not be treated as
21
22 deliberate. (Housing Act 1996, s. 191)
23
24

25
26 In contrast to the vulnerability test, this intentionality test was rather complex. As we can see,
27
28 it involved questions of intention, causation, availability of accommodation, reasonableness
29
30 of accommodation, good faith and relevance of facts. Each of these has given rise to litigation
31
32 where the statutory concept has been developed through case law. The case law on
33
34 intentional homelessness has been extensive and, in places, rather convoluted (Arden, Orme
35
36 and Vanhegan, 2012). As a legal concept, it was far from simple and did not lend itself to
37
38 easy abbreviation. Indeed, its abbreviated discussion in the central government’s Code of
39
40 Guidance (CLG 2006) extended to seven full pages of text.
41
42
43
44

45 Likewise, if we consider the legal demands of natural justice or due process in the decision-
46
47 making process, they are much more complex than the vulnerability test. The case law – even
48
49 that restricted to homelessness law - is sufficiently expansive to accommodate competing
50
51 models of bureaucratic justice (Halliday, 2004). Accordingly, much depends on context
52
53 (Elliott and Thomas, 2012). The legal requirements of natural justice are best thought of as
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contingent rather than clear. By way of contrast, the vulnerability test was both contained and
4
5 straightforward.
6

7
8 This is not to say, of course, that the legal test of vulnerability is not *contestable*. The notion
9
10 of the “ordinary homeless person” has been the subject of much critique by those who
11
12 represent homeless applicants (see, e.g., Madge-Wyld, 2013). Although the meaning was
13
14 settled at the time of our study, we must recognize that stable and relatively straightforward
15
16 legal provisions can be rendered more complex and uncertain through litigation. Indeed, the
17
18 vulnerability test has recently been subject to such litigation in the Court of Appeal and the
19
20 Supreme Court.^{vi} In the light of this decision, local authorities will have to rethink how they
21
22 approach decision-making on vulnerability. However, our point here is that at the time of our
23
24 fieldwork, the test was short, easily intelligible and thus straightforward to apply.
25
26

27
28
29 The significance of legal simplicity for the existence of legal compliance lies, first, in the
30
31 affect it has on the likelihood of legal knowledge on the part of street-level bureaucrats.
32

33
34 Knowledge of the legal provision demanding compliance is clearly a fundamental pre-
35
36 requisite of legal compliance (Loveland, 1995; Mullen et al, 1996; Halliday, 2004). Legal
37
38 simplicity aids the translation of case law specifics to general bureaucratic guidelines and
39
40 templates. We can see this in the encapsulation of the abbreviated vulnerability test in the
41
42 central government’s Code of Guidance (CLG 2006) and in the London Borough practice
43
44 manual for frontline officers. It is also evident in its inclusion in the decision-letter templates
45
46 in London Borough and Northern City.
47
48

49
50 Secondly, legal simplicity also has significance for the legal competence of street-level
51
52 bureaucrats. Halliday’s discussion of ‘legal competence’ referred to the fact that much of the
53
54 English public law aimed at regulating public administration operates at a level of general
55
56 principle (Halliday, 2004). Whereas the courts are clearly adept at applying legal principles to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the particular facts of litigated cases, it is a very tall order to expect street-level bureaucrats
4
5 similarly to be able to extract the relevant principle from a case law judgment and then re-
6
7 apply it to their full set of work tasks. However, where the particular aspect of public law
8
9 demanding compliance is sufficiently simple and contained, legal competence in the way
10
11 described by Halliday is not required. In other words, legal simplicity extinguishes legal
12
13 competence as a necessary condition of legal compliance. As we can see, in relation to the
14
15 vulnerability test, the requirement for doctrinal reasoning skills are absent. The test invites
16
17 easy application rather than skilled interpretation.
18
19

20 21 **Inoffensiveness**

22 As was noted in the introduction to this article, street-level bureaucratic theory stresses,
23
24 amongst other things, that the inevitable discretion of street-level bureaucrats opens up a
25
26 space into which cultural morality can flow (Hasenfeld, 2000). Perceptions of deserving and
27
28 undeserving citizens/clients channel street-level work (Cowan, 1997; Maynard-Moody and
29
30 Musheno, 2003). Thus, legal provisions that militate against cultural norms are less likely to
31
32 attract compliance (Hawkins, 2003). Equally, in policy contexts that have an excess of rules,
33
34 street-level bureaucrats make discretionary choices about which rules to apply (Prottas, 1979;
35
36 Sainsbury, 1992), often influenced by the dictates of cultural morality.
37
38
39

40
41 However, our focus on the vulnerability test demonstrates that fidelity to law and fidelity to
42
43 cultural morality are not always in opposition. As Maynard-Moody and Portillo remind us:
44
45 “we must move beyond the false dichotomy between street-level discretion and rule-based
46
47 implementation” (Maynard-Moody and Portillo, 2010: 13). The vulnerability test set out in
48
49 the legislation and further articulated in the key cases of *Pereira* and *Osmani* did not, in and
50
51 of itself, ‘offend’ the cultural morality of our research subjects. Rather, it was structured in
52
53 such a way that it could be applied faithfully without coming into conflict with any
54
55 convictions based on cultural morality. It preserved the discretion of the street-level
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 bureaucrats, in other words. The vulnerability test, including its development by the Court of
4
5 Appeal, required the street-level bureaucrats to conduct a comparative exercise (that is, about
6
7 whether the applicant would be less able to fend for himself than an ordinary homeless
8
9 persons if street homeless); but it did not determine the outcome of that comparative exercise.
10
11 In this way, legal compliance was not positioned in opposition to the dictates of cultural
12
13 morality.
14
15

16
17 The vulnerability test, then, was not likely attract the ‘legal cynicism’ observed by Hertogh in
18
19 his study of Dutch public administration, whereby, even though street-level bureaucrats were
20
21 knowledgeable of the law, they felt alienated from its terms: “They generally [did] not feel
22
23 that their own values [were] sufficiently reflected in the law” (Hertogh 2010, 218). Rather, in
24
25 relation to vulnerability decision-making, it was more likely that officers would be ‘legal
26
27 loyalists’ (Hertogh, 2010), feeling free to be ‘legally conscientious’ (Halliday, 2004). In other
28
29 words, a basic commitment to legality, to acting lawfully, would not be overwhelmed or
30
31 dislodged by the demands of cultural morality.
32
33

34 35 **Liveability**

36
37 As we saw above, Halliday’s discussion of ‘legal conscientiousness’ (Halliday, 2004) and
38
39 Hertogh’s discussion of ‘legal cynicism’ (Hertogh, 2010), both point to the fact that law is
40
41 but one of the normative pressures – or “social spheres” (Galligan, 2007) - under which
42
43 street-level bureaucrats operate. In addition to cultural morality, there are other normative
44
45 systems within the environment, such as performance audit, financial management, local
46
47 political accountability, etc., that may similarly dislodge a street-level bureaucratic
48
49 inclination towards legal compliance.
50
51

52
53 Nonetheless, our argument here is that certain legal provisions may have an unusually
54
55 accommodating character within the decision-making environment – what Sunkin has
56
57 described as the “liveability” of law (2004). Specifically, we suggest that the vulnerability
58
59
60

1
2
3 test has a kind of Teflon quality, whereby it can enter the public administration environment
4
5 without causing any friction. Thus *notwithstanding* the existence of general competition
6
7 between legality and other normative pressures within the street-level bureaucratic
8
9 environment (Halliday, 2004), the character of the vulnerability test managed to avoid that
10
11 competition and so facilitate legal compliance.
12
13

14
15 Much like the findings of previous studies, the local authorities we studied in this project
16
17 were subject to a range of environmental pressures that would ordinarily militate against legal
18
19 compliance. For example, there were clearly some financial pressures at play that in turn gave
20
21 rise to time pressures for the decision-making process. This came out much more in the
22
23 interviews with managers than in the interviews with front-line officers around individual
24
25 decisions. For example, in Northern City, the manager explained that the officers were
26
27 working to “numbers in bed and breakfast and temporary accommodation”:
28
29

30
31 I would be expecting some feedback on anybody who we’ve had in bed and breakfast
32
33 for more than a couple of weeks, what we’re doing, where we are, so that they would,
34
35 they would need to prioritise and, and provide information and make sure they were
36
37 chasing up the information in order to make a decision.
38
39

40
41 In London Borough the manager referred to the pressure of having targets for investigation
42
43 times and occupancy of temporary accommodation. The importance of target time of
44
45 investigations was also reflected in the focus group:
46
47

48
49 ... if these specialists or the GPs are taking forever to come back with the information,
50
51 obviously we are certain times when we have to make decisions. We may be basing
52
53 the decision just on the information that we have in front of us.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, although these financial and time pressures impacted on the investigative process
4 leading up to a decision and so threatened compliance with the legal requirements of due
5 process and procedural rationality (Halliday, 2004), they did not impinge on the application
6 of the vulnerability test itself. Rather, the correct legal test would still be applied, albeit
7 sometimes to a more limited range of evidence in order to comply with time pressures. In
8 other words, an abandonment of the legally correct vulnerability test was not required in
9 order to be responsive to the alternative normative pressures. Adherence to the correct
10 vulnerability test did not endanger the meeting of financial or efficiency targets. Given that
11 the test was irrelevant to the routine competition between law and the other normative
12 systems within the decision-making environment, there was no temptation or pressure on
13 street-level bureaucrats to move away from a commitment to legal compliance.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Conclusion**

30 Street-level bureaucratic theory is now at a fairly mature stage, given that it is now almost 40
31 years since the political sciences turned their attentions towards the frontlines of public
32 services in an attempt to fully grasp the realities of policy delivery (Maynard-Moody and
33 Portillo, 2010). The focus on the inevitable distortions of formal policy and the depiction of
34 street-level bureaucrats as the “ultimate policymakers” (Lipsky, 1980) are now as familiar as
35 they are important. Likewise, the parallel socio-legal study of the implementation of public
36 law in public service organisations, much of which has drawn explicitly on street-level
37 bureaucratic theory, has demonstrated the inevitable gap between the law-in-books and the
38 law-in-action (Halliday and Scott, 2010). And yet, the success of these empirical and
39 theoretical advances comes at the potential cost of us losing sight of the fact that, in some
40 circumstances and in some respects, the policy drafters can still be the ultimate policymakers.
41
42 The aim of this article has been to analyse some empirical data that revealed one such
43 instance – the application of the concept of ‘vulnerability’ in UK homelessness law.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our analysis has offered two main contributions to street-level bureaucratic theory. First,
4
5 drawing on the socio-legal scholarship on the implementation of public law, we have argued
6
7 that scholars of street-level bureaucracy must pay attention to the fact that, when it comes to
8
9 the implementation of public law, including its developments in the courts, the legal abilities
10
11 and propensities of the bureaucrats must be taken into account. Bureaucrats' abilities to
12
13 understand and work with legal materials, and their attitudes towards the importance of
14
15 lawfulness make a difference to the likelihood of legal compliance. In their review of street-
16
17 level bureaucratic theory, Maynard-Moody and Portillo suggested that:
18
19

20
21 The expression of street-level agency occurs in the context of three core relationships:
22
23 with the immediate supervisors, with peers, and with clients and citizens. (2010: 13)
24
25

26
27 To that list we would add of fourth relationship: that with legality. Thus, the study of street-
28
29 level bureaucrats' legal skills as well as their 'legal consciousness' (Cooper, 1995; Halliday
30
31 and Scott, 2010; Hertogh, 2010) is an important direction for research.
32
33

34
35 Our second and related contribution has been to argue that, in addition to studying the
36
37 structure of street-level work and the identities and characteristics of street-level bureaucrats,
38
39 we must also pay attention to the character of legal provisions demanding compliance. We
40
41 have demonstrated that the character of a legal provision can alter the likelihood of legal
42
43 compliance – by virtue of the effect it has on the legal abilities and propensities of street-level
44
45 bureaucrats. Where a legal provision is simple, it is more likely to facilitate legal knowledge
46
47 on the part of street-level bureaucrats and demands nothing of them in terms of legal
48
49 competence. Where the provision is also 'inoffensive' and 'liveable' it is less likely to act as
50
51 an impediment to legal conscientiousness. Thus we can expect legal compliance rather than
52
53 deviations from the terms of the law.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Of course, the intricacy of our argument serves also to demonstrate how difficult it can be for
4
5 law makers, whether the legislature or the courts, to create law that matches the conditions
6
7 we have outlined. Studies of legislative process in the UK have demonstrated that much
8
9 legislation is the result of political negotiation and compromise (Page, 2001), where concerns
10
11 of simplicity, inoffensiveness and liveability are likely to be difficult to anticipate and easy to
12
13 sacrifice. And the primary concern of the courts is to resolve retrospectively a specific claim
14
15 of unlawfulness, rather than to prospectively create law for future and general application. In
16
17 short, there is much in the routine business of lawmaking that stands in the way of crafting
18
19 legal provisions that facilitate compliance. And yet, our study shows that it is not impossible
20
21 and some such provisions do exist. They may be exceptions to the rule but, in some respects,
22
23 are all the more important because of that. In any event, if we want to understand the reality
24
25 of policy delivery on the frontlines, we must not close our eyes to their existence and
26
27 possibility.
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

Cases

R. v. London Borough of Lambeth, ex p. Carroll (1987) 20 HLR 142

R. v Camden LBC, ex p Pereira (1998) 31 HLR 317

Osmani v. Camden L.B.C. [2004] EWCA Civ 1775; [2005] HLR 22

Crossley v Westminster C.C. [2006] EWCA Civ 140; [2006] HLR 26

Hotak v London Borough of Southwark [2013] EWCA Civ 515 and [2015] UKSC 30

Johnson v Solihull MBC [2014] EWCA Civ 752 and [2015] UKSC 30

Kanu v London Borough of Southwark [2014] EWCA Civ 1085 and [2015] UKSC 30

References

Alpes, Maybritt Jill and Alexis Spire. 2014 “Dealing with Law in Migration Control: The Powers of Street-level Bureaucrats at French Consulates” *Social and Legal Studies*, 23(2), 261-74

Arden, Andrew, Emily Orme, Toby Vanhegan. 2012. *Homelessness and Allocations*, 9th Edition, London: LAG

Baldwin, John, Nick Wikely and Richard Young. 1992 *Judging Social Security: The Adjudication of Claims for Benefit in Britain* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Brown, Michael. 1981 *Working the Street: Police Discretion and the Dilemmas of Reform* New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Communities and Local Government. 2006. *Homelessness Code of Guidance for Local Authorities* London: CLG

- 1
2
3 Communities and Local Government. 2014. *Housing Statistical Release (Statutory*
4
5 *Homelessness)* London: CLG
6
7
- 8 Cooper, Davina. 1995. "Local Government Legal Consciousness in the Shadow of
9
10 Juridification" *Journal of Law and Society* 22(4): 506-526
11
12
- 13 Cowan, David. 1997. *Homelessness; The (In-) Appropriate Applicant* Aldershot: Dartmouth
14
15 Publishing
16
17
- 18 Cowan, David and Simon Halliday. 2003. *The Appeal of Internal Review* Oxford: Hart
19
20 Publishing
21
22
- 23 Cowan, David, Simon Halliday and Caroline Hunter. 2006. 'Adjudicating the Implementation
24
25 of Homelessness Law: The Promise of Socio-Legal Studies' *Housing Studies* 21(3)
26
27 381-400
28
29
- 30 Cowan, Dave, and Emma Hitchings. 2007 "“Pretty Boring Stuff”: District Judges and
31
32 Housing Possession Proceedings" *Social and Legal Studies*, 16(3), 363–82
33
34
35
- 36 Elliot, Mark and Robert Thomas. 2014. *Public Law* 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford Univ Press
37
38
- 39 Fitzpatrick, Suzanne and Mark Stephens. 2007. *An International Review of Homelessness*.
40
41 London: Communities and Local Government
42
43
- 44 Galligan, Denis. 2007. *Law in Modern Society* Oxford: Clarendon Press
45
46
- 47 Guy, Mary, Meredith Newman and Sharon Mastracci. 2008 *Emotional Labour: Putting the*
48
49 *Service in Human Service* Armonk: ME Sharpe
50
51
52
- 53 Halliday, Simon. 2000. 'The influence of judicial review on bureaucratic decision-making'
54
55 *Public Law*, 110-122
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Halliday, Simon. 2004. *Judicial Review and Compliance with Administrative Law*, Oxford:

4
5 Hart
6
7

8 Halliday, Simon, Nicola Burns, Neil Hutton, Fergus McNeill and Cyrus Tata. 2009 “Street-

9
10 Level Bureaucracy, Interprofessional Relations and Coping Mechanisms: A Study of

11
12 Criminal Justice Social Workers in the Criminal Justice Process” *Law & Policy*,

13
14 31(4), 405-28
15
16

17
18 Halliday, Simon, Jonathan Ilan and Colin Scott. 2012 “Street-Level Tort Law: The

19
20 Bureaucratic Justice of Liability Decision-Making” *Modern Law Review*, 75(3), 347-

21
22 67
23
24

25
26 Halliday, Simon and Colin Scott. 2010. “Administrative Justice” in Peter Cane and Herbert

27
28 Kritzer (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Empirical Legal Research* Oxford: Oxford

29
30 University Press
31
32

33
34 Hasenfeld, Yeheskel. 2000 “Organizational Forms as Moral Practices: The Case of Welfare

35
36 Departments *Social Service Review*, 74(3), 329-51
37
38

39
40 Hawkins, Keith. 1992. “The Use of Legal Discretion: Perspectives from Law and Social

41
42 Science” in Keith Hawkins (ed) *The Uses of Discretion* Oxford: Clarendon Press
43
44

45
46 Hawkins, Keith. 2003. *Law as Last Resort: Prosecution Decision-Making in a Regulatory*

47
48 *Agency* Oxford: Oxford University Press
49

50
51 Hertogh, Marc. 2010. “Through the Eyes of Bureaucrats: How Frontline Officials Understand

52
53 Administrative Justice”. In *Administrative Justice in Context* edited by Michael Adler

54
55 Oxford: Hart Publishing
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hertogh, Marc and Simon Halliday. 2004. *Judicial Review and Bureaucratic Impact:*
4
5 *International and Interdisciplinary Perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press
6
7
- 8 Hill, Malcolm. 1997 “Research Review: Participatory Research with Children” *Child and*
9
10 *Family Social Work* 2: 171-183
11
12
- 13 Jewell, Christopher and Bonnie Glaser. 2006 “Towards a General Analytic Framework:
14
15 Organizational Settings, Policy Goals, and Street-Level Behaviour” *Administration*
16
17 *and Society*, 38(3), 335-64
18
19
- 20
21 Lipsky, Michael. 1980 *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public*
22
23 *Services* New York: Russell Sage Foundation
24
25
- 26
27 Loveland, Ian. 1991. “Administrative law, administrative processes and the housing of
28
29 homeless persons: a view from the sharp end” *Journal of Social Welfare Law*, 13(1),
30
31 4-26
32
33
- 34
35 Loveland, Ian. 1995. *Housing Homeless Persons* Oxford: Clarendon Press
36
37
- 38 Loughlin, Martin and Peter Quinn. 1993. “Prisons, Rules and Courts: A Study in
39
40 Administrative Law” *Modern Law Review*, 56, 497-527
41
42
- 43 Madge-Wyld S. 2013 “Protecting the vulnerable” *Inside Housing* July 19, 2013
44
45 <http://www.insidehousing.co.uk/protecting-the-vulnerable/6527824.article> (accessed May 4,
46
47 2015)
48
49
- 50 Maynard-Moody, Steven and Michael Musheno. 2000 “State-Agent or Citizen-Agent: Two
51
52 Narratives of Discretion” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*,
53
54 10(2), 329-59
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Maynard-Moody, Steven and Michael Musheno. 2003. *Cops, Teachers , Counselors. Stories*
4
5 *from the Frontlines of Public Service* Ann Arbor: Univ of Michigan Press
6
7
8
9 Maynard-Moody, Steven and Shannon Portillo. 2010 “Street-Level Bureaucratic Theory” in
10
11 *The Oxford Handbook of American Bureaucracy* edited by Robert Durant, New York:
12
13 Oxford University Press
14
15
16 Mullen, Tom, Kathy Pick, and Tony Prosser. 1996. *Judicial Review in Scotland* Chichester:
17
18 John Wiley & Sons
19
20
21 Nielson, Vibeke L. (2006) “Are Street-Level Bureaucrats Compelled or Enticed to Cope?”
22
23 *Public Administration*, 84, 861–89
24
25
26
27 Page, Edward. 2001. *Governing by Numbers: Delegated Legislation and Everyday Policy-*
28
29 *Making* Oxford: Hart
30
31
32 Portillo, Shannon. 2012 “The Paradox of Rules: Rules as Resources and Constraints”
33
34 *Administration and Society*, 44(1), 87-108
35
36
37
38 Pound, Roscoe. 1910 “Law in Books and Law in Action” *American Law Review*, 44, 12-36
39
40
41 Pratt, Anna. 2012 “Between a Hunch and Hard Place: Making Suspicion Reasonable at the
42
43 Canadian Border” *Social and Legal Studies*, 19(4), 461-80
44
45
46
47 Prottas, Jeffrey. 1979 *People-Processing: The Street-Level Bureaucrat in Public Service*
48
49 *Bureaucracies* Lexington: Lexington Press
50
51
52 Riccucci, Norma. 2005a *How Management Matters: Street-Level Bureaucrats and Welfare*
53
54 *Reform* Washington DC: Georgetown Univ Press
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Riccucci, Norma. 2005b “Street-Level Bureaucrats and Intrastate Variation in the
4
5 Implementation of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Policies” *Journal of*
6
7 *Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(1), 89-111
8
9
- 10 Robson, Peter and Paul Watchman. 1981. “The homeless persons' obstacle race parts I and
11
12 II” *Journal of Social Welfare Law*, 3(5): 1-15 and 3(6): 65-82
13
14
15
- 16 Sainsbury, Roy. 1992. “Administrative Justice: Discretion and Procedure in Social Security
17
18 Decision-Making” in Keith Hawkins (ed) *The Uses of Discretion* Oxford: Clarendon
19
20 Press
21
22
23
- 24 Schoenholtz, Andrew, Philip Schrag and Jaya Ramji-Nogales. 2014 *Lives in the Balance:*
25
26 *Asylum Adjudication by the Department of Homeland Security* New York: NYU Press
27
28
- 29 Silbey, Susan. 1980. “Case Processing: Consumer Protection in an Attorney General’s
30
31 Office” *Law & Society Review* 15(3/4), 849-82
32
33
- 34 Sossin, Lorne. 2004. ‘The Politics of Soft Law: How Judicial Decisions Influence
35
36 Bureaucratic Discretion in Canada’ In *Judicial Review and Bureaucratic Impact*
37
38 edited by Marc Hertogh and Simon Halliday, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press
39
40
41
- 42 Sunkin, Maurice. 2004. “Conceptual issues in researching the impact of judicial review on
43
44 government bureaucracies” In *Judicial Review and Bureaucratic Impact* edited by
45
46 Marc Hertogh and Simon Halliday, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press
47
48
- 49 Sunkin, Maurice, Lee Bridges and George Meszaros. 1996. *Judicial Review in Perspective.*
50
51 *2nd edition* London: Public Law Project
52
53
54
- 55 Sunkin, Maurice and Andrew Le Sueur. 1991. ‘Can Government Control Judicial Review?’
56
57 *Current Legal Problems*, (44) 161
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tummers, Lars, Victor Bekkers, Evelien Vink and Michael Musheno. 2015 “Coping During
4
5 Public Service Delivery: A Conceptualization and Systematic Review of the
6
7 Literature” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*
8
9 (doi:10.1093/jopart/muu056)
10

11
12
13 Watts, Beth. 2013. *The Impact of Legal Rights to Housing for Homeless People: A Normative*
14
15 *Comparison of Scotland and Ireland* Unpublished PhD thesis
16

17
18 Wenger, Jeffrey and Vicki Wilkins. 2009 “At the Discretion of Rogue Agents: How
19
20 Automation Improves Women’s Outcomes in Unemployment Insurance” *Journal of*
21
22 *Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 313-33
23

24
25
26 Wilkins, Vicki and Lael Keiser. 2005 “Linking Passive and Active Representation for
27
28 Gender: The Case of Child Support Agencies” *Journal of Public Administration*
29
30 *Research and Theory*, (16), 87-102
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 ⁱ The Housing Act 1996 applies in both England and Wales, and there is similar legislation in Scotland.
39 However, post devolution homelessness law is diverging across the three jurisdictions. This study focuses on
40 three local authorities in England.

41 ⁱⁱ Housing Act 1996, s.189

42 ⁱⁱⁱ In 2002 the priority need categories were extended to include some other groups of single people e.g. all 16
43 and 17 year olds and 18-21 year old care leavers, together with others who also had to be “vulnerable” as
44 defined such as former prisoners or members of the armed forces. Equally, a single person may be in priority
45 need by virtue of being homeless as a result of an emergency. None of these were included in the study.

46 ^{iv} These geographic descriptors are used as pseudonyms for each of the study areas throughout the rest of the
47 paper so as to preserve their anonymity.

48 ^v *R. v. London Borough of Lambeth, ex p. Carroll* (1987)

49 ^{vi} In December 2014 the Supreme Court heard three appeals from Court of Appeal decisions on the
50 meaning of “vulnerable”: *Kanu v London Borough of Southwark* [2014]; *Johnson v Solihull MBC* [2014] and
51 *Hotak v London Borough of Southwark* [2013]. The decision of the Supreme Court was given in May 2015.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60