	Pastoral Workers (n=570) %	Non-pastoral (n=150) %	Volunteers (n=159) %	All (n=879) %
e	40.5	26.0	47.2	39.2
d	3.7	8.0	—	3.8
	2.1	4.0	9.4	3.8
ean	3.7	—	—	2.4
	1.6	—	—	1.0
ast	2.6	—	1.9	2.0
ub-Continent	4.2	16.0	5.7	6.5
East Asia	3.2	—	3.8	2.7
st	6.3	14.0	5.7	7.5
ania	1.6	—	—	1.0
st Africa	7.9	12.0	1.9	7.5
outh & East Africa	1.1	10.0	1.9	2.7
Latin America	1.6	2.0	1.9	1.7
Central America & Caribbean	1.6	2.0	20.8	18.1
North America	20.0	8.0		

Port-based welfare workers for seafarers

Summary report 2010
by Erol Kahveci

Port-based welfare workers for seafarers

Summary Report

By Erol Kahveci

Working Lives Research Institute,
London Metropolitan University

Foreword

Seafarers bring the good to our shops, the food we need to survive, the fuel, which keeps the country going. These skilled people, who work long hours in a tough and dangerous profession, are human beings who are supporting families and yet who often manage to miss the services and assistance which we ashore take for granted: being able to telephone their loved ones, leave their place of work to go to the shops, or have contact with people who are not part of the crew with whom they live and work. They are strangers and as such can be exploited and abused.

The ITF Seafarers' Trust has been providing funds to assist the welfare of seafarers for almost 30 years. We are constantly seeking to improve the targeting of our charitable funding to ensure that the life of a working seafarer does not commit them to constant isolation. Port welfare workers and ship visitors provide a door to the world outside the ship, and the people who work for the charities who support seafarers directly in the ports of the world are the key to ensuring that seafarers get a welcome for the short time that they are in port.

This research was commissioned by the ITF Seafarers' Trust to investigate the working lives of the welfare workers. It follows on from research done in 2007 by the Seafarers International Research Centre at Cardiff University, which looked at the welfare needs of seafarers and how they have changed over the previous ten years. The research was called *Port Based Welfare Services for Seafarers* and this highlighted the deterioration of shore leave in both quantity and quality over the previous ten years. As so many seafarers cannot get off their ships while they are in port, whether due to pressure of work or lack of facilities, welfare workers have had to adapt to these changes in order to do their work of assisting seafarers. This has meant an increase in services provided by welfare workers on board the ships themselves (such as mobile wireless internet) and in ship visiting.

These kind of issues should not be the preserve of a few charities. Every employer, every port authority should take responsibility for the treatment of seafarers on their ships and in their ports, and work with the experts to ensure that the isolation of seafarers is minimised. Port welfare workers work under difficult circumstances, which can be made much easier if their work is recognised by the local authorities and made much more difficult if they have to fight for access to facilities and services. This report highlights some of the difficulties that they face, but also illustrates the satisfaction and value of the incredible work that they do to help others. We hope that the recommendations of this report get wide circulation within the shipping industry, that there is an increased understanding of the pressure under which seafarers and welfare workers operate, and that seafarers get better welfare facilities as a result.

David Cockroft
General Secretary of the ITF
Secretary to the Trust

Contents

Preface

This summary report presents the main findings of a research project on port-based welfare workers funded by the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF) Seafarers' Trust and with the involvement of the International Christian Maritime Association. The project covers the period July 2008 to December 2009.

The report is organised by themes and begins with an executive summary and the aims and methods of the research. The following sections cover different aspects of the lives and work of port-based welfare workers for seafarers, including:

- **A background describing the work of port-based welfare workers for seafarers in a changing maritime environment**

- **What do port-port based welfare workers for seafarers do?**

- **A profile of welfare workers**

- **What problems and obstacles do welfare workers face?**

- **Is there a best strategy for ship visiting?**

- **How do welfare workers for seafarers respond to challenges?**

- **Communication networks for welfare workers**

- **Why and how do welfare workers for seafarers deal with seafarer justice cases?**

- **How well are transport, telecommunication facilities and information for seafarers used and what are the problems associated with them?**

- **Is there any need to have a seafarer centre?**

- **How effective is the training welfare workers receive?**

This is a summary of the research and provides simple descriptive statistics supported by oral evidence, some illustrative tables and

observations in ports. The full research results with further statistical analysis, illustrative tables and anonymous first person accounts are available on the websites of the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF) Seafarers' Trust (www.itfglobal.org) and the Working Lives Research Institute (WLRI) (www.workinglives.org).

Executive summary

Professor Erol Kahveci of the WLRI at London Metropolitan University was asked by the ITF Seafarers' Trust to conduct research into the work and views of port-based welfare workers. The main research tools were an internet-based survey and face-to-face interviews with 20 specialists on port welfare from all the main organisations involved in service delivery and with 29 port welfare workers in 21 different ports; a further six workers kept diaries describing their daily routines. In addition there were ten periods of observation accompanying port welfare workers in their activities.

The majority of the 1,107 port welfare workers who responded to the on-line survey were pastoral workers (63%, mainly port chaplains). Nearly one in five respondents (19%) were non-pastoral workers, with almost half of these being managers or duty managers of seafarer centres and a similar proportion of the total (18%) were volunteers.

Over a third of the port welfare workers answering the survey were based in seafarer centres or port ministries in ports in Western Europe or North America; smaller proportions were from South East Asian and Southern and Eastern African ports with small numbers scattered at ports throughout the rest of the globe. This reflects the current uneven concentration of port welfare facilities.

Overall three quarters of all the survey respondents were male, although in contrast to pastoral and volunteer workers, non-pastoral workers were as likely to be female as male.

Port welfare workers are a mature group whose average age is over 50. However their length of service is under 12 years, suggesting they have come to port welfare work mid-career or even following retirement from a previous career. Most show no intention of retiring from port welfare work.

Port welfare workers have a considerable degree of autonomy in their work, but would welcome greater participation and recognition from their organisations and would like them to be more responsive to change.

Average weekly working hours for pastoral and non-pastoral welfare workers are around 43 hours and are often irregular and at times that conflict with social and family time.

These average weekly working hours vary geographically and are higher in ports in Latin America, the Middle East, the Indian Sub-Continent, South East Asia and West Africa, where there are fewer welfare workers and facilities.

Four out of ten pastoral welfare workers serve their parish or local congregations as well as serving seafarers in their ports. One in ten had other paid work and half worked exclusively for the faith-based maritime organisation that employed them.

A central part of welfare workers' role is dealing with grievances arising from seafarer's living and working conditions – nearly one in five handle one case a week on average and the majority of these cases are referred to the ITF.

The intensification of work with faster turna-rounds of vessels and increased operational duties when in port has had a major impact upon port welfare workers' jobs, making access to seafarers more difficult and giving seafarers less time to visit Seafarer Centres.

There is also evidence that the opportunities for port welfare workers to visit ships and access ports have also become more constrained as a result of the stricter regulation of ports and terminals by the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (ISPS Code).

The increasingly multi-national character of crews provides challenges for port welfare workers, in terms of language and communication, but also of religious and spiritual provision.

There was evidence of ecumenical working, particularly at port level and strong support for this approach.

Port Welfare Committees can play a key role in coordinating and supporting welfare work in ports.

In response to changes in the shipping industry welfare workers expressed the view that services needed to be more ship focused, including visits, but also that there could be more emphasis on mobile communication facilities that could be taken aboard vessels. Whilst some questioned the continuing value of seafarers' centres, the majority of survey respondents said there was still a need for them. In the context of the 24 hour culture of the shipping industry they also suggested extending the hours and times when services and facilities were available.

The most common form of training for welfare workers is learning on the job. This is particularly the case for non-pastoral workers and volunteers.

Welfare workers expressed the need for training in a number of areas, with the greatest demand being for training on handling seafarers' grievances. Non-pastoral workers were more likely to identify training needs than pastoral workers.

Aims and methods

The port-based welfare workers for seafarers are at the frontline in delivering services and running facilities for seafarers' welfare. Interestingly when references are made to welfare workers the term is often used as if there is one type or a uniform welfare worker. In reality, their relation to their organisations, the port they work in, the resources that are available to them and their personal circumstances differ enormously. This study aims to find out: What makes them work in ports? What is their workload like? What sort of training have they had? What challenges do they face? How do they respond to the challenges? How do they collaborate with other agencies in their ports? What sort of support do they get? Also, it is important to know about their living and working experiences, career plans, and their views on how they could improve welfare services and the facilities for seafarers. This is where this report comes in.

This report builds on the "Port-based welfare services for seafarers" study that was completed in 2007 for the ITF Seafarers' Trust (Kahveci 2007). This study documented the views of seafarers on what sort of port based welfare facilities and services they needed and used. However, there is still a gap in terms of the needs and aspirations of port-based welfare workers for seafarers and their working conditions. This project is *for* port-based welfare workers and organisations that are concerned with seafarers' welfare, rather than just *about* them and it aims to provide information and analysis which can support the improvement and more effective delivery of port based welfare work for seafarers.

This project is based upon research into the work and lives of welfare workers for seafarers conducted in 2008 and 2009. It draws upon survey data on 1,107 port welfare workers; observations in 21 ports around the world, further in-depth interviews with 29 port welfare workers, 20 key informant interviews (in ports and maritime societies) and six reflective everyday diaries of port welfare workers.

In order to represent the diversity of port-based welfare workers for seafarers three different questionnaires were designed for three different groups. These were categorised as follows:

1) Pastoral welfare workers: directly employed by Christian or faith based maritime ministries in a full or part time capacity - including port chaplains (ordained and lay), deacons, pastors and other lay personnel occupying similar positions.

2) Non-pastoral welfare workers: employed by secular or faith-based organisations in a full or part time capacity in seafarer centres - managers, duty managers, administrators, centre workers, shop/bar keepers – as well as "non-pastoral" ship visitors, drivers, and other personnel occupying similar positions.

3) Volunteer welfare workers: who work part-time or full-time to provide welfare services to seafarers, including those who serve on port welfare committees.

It should be noted that both theologically and practically it is difficult to identify three distinct groups of welfare workers, as there are certain overlaps between them. However, for practical reasons we have done so, and throughout the report these groups of seafarer welfare workers will be referred as "pastoral", "non-pastoral" and "volunteer" welfare workers. To address the groups as a whole the terms "respondents" or "seafarers welfare workers" will be used interchangeably. Regardless of their categories this report is about port-based welfare workers for seafarers.

The surveys were conducted online through Bristol Online Surveys (BOS). Responses were identified through the websites of maritime ministries, International Christian Maritime Associations (ICMA), the International Committee on Seafarers' Welfare (ICSW) and the North American Maritime Ministry Association (NAMMA). Over 2,000 emails addressed to individual port welfare workers and a further 500 e-mails were sent to various seafarer centres around the world. E-mails consisted of a covering document and a letter attachment inviting port welfare workers to participate in the surveys with link pages to the relevant online survey. The letter of invitation was also publicised on the websites of the ICMA, the NAMMA and the UK Merchant Navy Welfare Board. Outgoing e-mails from the ITF Seafarers' Trust and the ICMA Secretariat publicised the survey with a link to the questionnaires and encouraged participation. The online surveys were live for a four- month period between 6th of October 2008 and 6th of February 2009. At the end of the four-month period we had 699 responses from pastoral welfare workers; 213 from non-pastoral welfare workers and 195 from volunteer welfare workers. These responses represent around 30 per cent of the total number of pastoral welfare workers and about 10% of the global total of the estimated number of non-pastoral welfare workers. It is difficult to estimate the number of volunteer welfare workers in the seafarers' welfare sector. However, volunteer respondents to our survey represent the core section of this population (see Data Appendix for further information). The questionnaire was originally designed in English; however, in later stages it was also translated into Spanish to maximise responses from certain world regions.

The global distribution of survey respondents' ports and the organisations they work for are broadly in line with the current global pattern of services. Pastoral welfare worker respondents came from a minimum of 339 different ports, non-pastoral welfare workers from 135 and volunteer welfare workers from 147. Some

ports overlapped according to different groups of respondents. However, overall we had responses from a minimum of 460 different ports.

Interviews with port welfare workers and key informants took place in 21 ports, with a wide geographical distribution, including The Black Sea, Latin America, Western Europe, South East Asia and Far East. There was also a good balance of ports according to size, cargo specialisations and the nature of welfare provision in terms of structure (i.e. ports with seafarer centres and without) and organisation (i.e. with a particular denomination or ecumenical). We are confident that the sample we have is representative.

Background

The work of port-based welfare workers for seafarers in a changing maritime environment

The face of the shipping industry has changed hugely over the last 30 years. Globalisation and competition have led to fast turnarounds, reduced crew sizes, the increasing employment of mixed nationality crews, the restriction of shore leave, and new port developments away from accessible shore-based facilities. The challenges faced by maritime welfare organisations and their workers as a result of these changes will be examined in detail in the following sections of this report.

It should be emphasised that over the past three decades changes in the maritime industry have also had an impact on the organisation and structure of the maritime welfare sector. In the shipping industry there used to be a well-established division of labour in the promotion of welfare services for seafarers from the traditional maritime nations, such as North America, Western Europe, Scandinavia, and Japan. Within this division of labour, trade unions provided services to their members for matters concerning technical training and employment contracts. Charitable foundations, like the UK Merchant Navy Welfare Board, and the Norwegian Government Seamen's Service provided liberal education, libraries, sporting activities and so on, sometimes with state assistance. Personal welfare, pastoral care and port-based recreational facilities have been mainly handled by the Christian maritime ministries. Overall these bodies provided an adequate welfare regime for seafarers when they were in port.

This coalition of trade unions, state-aided charitable foundations and maritime ministries, was well established in traditional maritime countries and their colonies. These countries were also where capital and labour in the shipping industry were concentrated. With the globalisation of the

shipping industry, this traditional division of labour started to disintegrate. The relocation of capital and labour resulted in declining membership in seafarer trade unions in Western Europe, Scandinavia, Japan and other traditional maritime countries. The grant aided charitable seafarer welfare foundations in these countries also scaled down their operations. As a result nationally provided trade union services and nationally provided charitable and state-aided services declined. The maritime ministries, which were already organized on a global basis, have come to the fore and now represent the main welfare support for seafarers in foreign ports.

National trade unions now provide inspectors for the ITF as well as officials who work with their own members. These inspectors have become part of the network providing support and assistance to seafarers worldwide. There are currently about 140 ITF inspectors located in 46 countries. This report makes reference to the ITF inspectors in relation to their contacts with the port-based seafarers welfare workers, although they have not taken part in the surveys or interviews. It should be acknowledged that they often assist with welfare activities for seafarers as part of their work, and they often work as part of the welfare structure of a port.

Whether pastoral, non-pastoral or volunteers, the vast majority of welfare workers for seafarers are attached to the Christian maritime ministries, and this is reflected in the responses we have received and in this research. This does not mean that everyone working for them is Christian, and their organisations have worked for decades for seafarers of all faiths including those with none. In this context this report makes reference to religion in general and to the Christian denominations in particular.

As we will see later, maritime ministries and other seafarer welfare organisations have also needed to adjust their work to take account of changing social and economic conditions.

What do port-based welfare workers for seafarers do?

It is useful to begin by demonstrating what would happen in a port where there was no port welfare worker to provide professional advice and support to seafarers who needed them. Back in 2001 a group of Italian high school students embarked on a project to find out what it meant for visiting seafarers to come to a port where there was no port welfare worker to provide any assistance. As part of the project, the students were taken to the port of Marghera (the industrial and commercial port of Venice) where they became 'seafarers' for three hours. They were divided into six groups. Their journeys began at different times from the main gate of the port. Each group had three students and they were each given a separate nationality and a mission to complete, for example transferring money back home, making a phone call to a home country (it had been arranged for people to receive the phone calls in China and so on), visit a church, send a parcel home, visit a shopping centre and some other conventional tasks. Shore leave was for three hours. They were only allowed to speak in English (lingua franca of the sea) and were given US Dollars to spend according to their missions. They kept diaries during their three-hour experiments. One of the groups consisted of Ghanaian, Indian and Romanian 'seafarers'. Their missions were to find a shop selling African food, visit a street market, and hire a bicycle and go to a park. Here are some extracts from the diary:

"We found a bar and asked the barmen directions for the town centre but the information we had was very confusing. We found out we need to take a bus and need to buy a ticket in advance but there is no place we can buy a bus ticket. … There are no directions for the town centre and we have been walking for 30 minutes already. … We decided to change our US dollars and asked in a shop for directions to a bank. … In the bank we have learned that we have to pay 7 US$ commission. We only have 17 dollars on us and we decided not to change money in the bank. We have looked for an open-air market but English is [an] almost unspoken language here. They cannot understand what we are looking for. …We can't rent a bike because we either need an address or have to have a car to leave in the car park. We had to give up! In the end we came back to the port entrance one hour late because somebody gave us a wrong bus number."

The experiences of other groups were no different; some did not have their parcels accepted in the post office due to inadequate packaging, others were not able to talk to a priest because the priest accepted the general public only on Saturdays, others had walked onto a carriageway with no pavement because they could not find public transport or had to walk across the fields but only managed to reach a power station and others could not pay the high cost of the long taxi ride from town back to the port (interviews by EK). As we shall see most of the services that these 'seafarers' sought are provided on a daily basis by port-based welfare workers. The students' activity revealed how the social and welfare needs of seafarers would be unfulfilled without the port welfare workers.

The research undertaken for this report confirms that the provision of port based welfare services and facilities are heavily reliant on port-based welfare workers. The services which were listed in the survey as being provided by the welfare workers were: ship visits, selling telephone cards, transferring and exchanging money, sending parcels, and providing free magazines and newspapers (paper copy, USB plugs or CDs). They organise local minibus services for shopping and sight seeing and make hospital visits. They run port-based seafarers' centres, typically providing shops, recreational facilities, telephone and internet access, library facilities, bars and cafes. Welfare workers also offer counselling and pastoral care and this was rated as an important port-based welfare service in major surveys of the world's seafarers' in 1996 and 2007 (ITF/MORI 1996, Kahveci 2007). They hold religious services on ships, such as blessings following a death on board. The port welfare workers not only provide what is often the sole source of social and welfare support for seafarers when they are in foreign ports, but they also constitute a worldwide network which can illuminate the abuses and illegal practices which seafarers may be subject to.

The seafarer welfare workers also provide a bridge between the local community and the seafarer. They aim to reduce the isolation which seafarers face on long contracts with little chance to get ashore and little time to interact with people outside the ship. They may be from the same nationality as the seafarer, and many ports have welfare workers of Philippino or East European origin so that the seafarers have a chance to speak their own language whilst on-shore.

Profile of port-based welfare workers for seafarers

The survey had a good response rate and provides a profile the port welfare workers as a whole. Overall it suggests they are a mature population, since average ages for the respondents in each of the three groups were 54 (pastoral), 52 (non-pastoral) and 61 (volunteers).

Overall over 77 percent of the respondents were male. However, whilst this was as high as 85 per cent for pastoral workers and 75 per cent for volunteers, amongst non-pastoral workers there was an almost equal distribution of male and female respondents.

As far as the formal education level of the respondents was concerned, 77 per cent of the pastoral workers had first degrees or post graduate qualifications. Non-pastoral workers and volunteers were less highly qualified, but nevertheless 44 per cent and 59 per cent of them had first or postgraduate degrees respectively. Their degrees included "PhD in Organizational Development", "M.A. in Sociology", "Diploma in Pastoral Theology" and "Bachelor degree, Deacon and Social Worker".

The majority of the pastoral workers were port chaplains and some of them also functioned as managers or directors of seafarer centres. Others described their positions as missionaries, lay chaplains, seamen's pastors, deacons, assistant or honorary chaplains, ship visitors and welfare officers.

Almost half of the 'non-pastoral' workers functioned as managers or duty managers of seafarer centres. Others described themselves as ship visitors, centre workers, administrators, welfare secretaries, fund raisers and drivers.

Of the volunteers, some described their positions as administrator, welfare officer, ship visitor, port

welfare committee member, driver and port missionary. Others did not specify.

As we have seen above, the respondents represented a mature population. However, in comparison with their age profile, their work experience in the seafarer welfare sector was relatively short. On average their length of service in the seafarers' welfare sector was just under 12 years for pastoral workers, under ten years for non-pastoral workers and under seven years for volunteers. This indicates that, in general, welfare workers come to the maritime sector mid career and in fact some of them following retirement. Some were former seafarers, and some pastoral workers moved from their local parishes to maritime ministry.

Overall, nine per cent of the pastoral and eight per cent of the non-pastoral workers were 70 and over – this was as high as 30 per cent for volunteers. So the welfare workers under review here had no fixed retirement age. This became more apparent when they were asked how many more years they thought they would be working in seafarers' welfare. A 65 year old pastoral worker said, "as long as I am able to climb a gangway and be useful - hopefully another 7-10 years". A 45 year old pastoral worker said, "I intend to

continue this work for as long as they'll have me, so I would say 30 years or so". An 81 year old volunteer said "indefinitely". The majority of the welfare workers regardless of their groups expressed similar sentiments.

Seafarers welfare workers liked what they were doing. They enjoyed working for people from different cultures and backgrounds. Each group of welfare workers had distinct motivations. As might be expected pastoral welfare workers felt that they were called to the maritime ministry as "an expression of their Christian faith" and framed their work in terms of charity or social justice:

> *"Religious obligation to "welcome the stranger" provide hospitality, assistance."*

> *"As a Christian, I think my duty is to serve other people. In this case the seafarers. I like it very much."*

> *"I want to reach out to the more vulnerable members of society and to make a difference."*

> *"A need to maintain social justice for seafarers. To be there to offer spiritual and practical support."*

Non-pastoral workers and volunteers framed their work more in more instrumental terms with employees dependent upon the income that working in seafarers welfare sector provided. However, a number had been seafarers themselves and overall the motivations of both groups also reflected a belief in social justice with paid and unpaid work valued because of the support they provided:

> *"I like helping seafarers, I give them image of their families, sisters and mother."*

> *"I was a seafarer for 37 years. I had been welcomed in many seamen's clubs in the world and I feel I've to give back what I've received."*

In some ports, particularly ports in Western Europe, Scandinavia, North America and Oceania, maritime ministries had been providing services for seafarers for over a century. They were established by the churches of traditional maritime countries (such as Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, Sweden, the UK), and organised along national lines to maintain contact between seafarers and their homes and provide spiritual guidance. They were originally stationed on the main trade routes and big ports where their nationals called regularly. These ports were historically in Western Europe, Oceania, North America, Scandinavia and important ports in South East Asia with colonial links (such as Hong Kong and Singapore). Today these world regions are still the places where port welfare workers are placed. For example there are over 30 seafarer centres in the UK but less than 20 in the entire area of Latin America.

The regional distribution of the survey respondents reflects the uneven concentration of port based welfare services for seafarers around the globe. Overall 39 per cent of welfare workers were based in ports in Western Europe (UK, Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany) and a further 18 per cent in ports in North America (United States and Canada). Oceania (Australia and New Zealand) and South & East Africa regions each represented 7.5 per cent of respondents. About 7 per cent of respondents were based in ports in South East Asia (Singapore, Hong Kong, Philippines, Indonesia and so on). The

remaining respondents came from ports in the Baltic Sea and Scandinavia, the Mediterranean, Black Sea, Middle East, Indian Sub-Continent, Far East, West Africa, Latin America and Central America and Caribbean (Table 1 for further details).

Table 1: Regions where the survey respondents are based

Regions	Pastoral Workers (n=570)	Non-pastoral Workers (n=150) %	Volunteers (n=159) %	All (n=879) %
	%	%	%	%
Western Europe	40.5	26.0	47.2	39.2
Baltic Sea and Scandinavia	3.7	8.0	—	3.8
Mediterranean	2.1	4.0	9.4	3.8
Black Sea	3.7	—	—	2.4
Middle East	1.6	—	—	1.0
Indian Sub-Continent	2.6		1.9	2.0
South East Asia	4.2	16.0	5.7	6.5
Far East	3.2	—	3.8	2.7
Oceania	6.3	14.0	5.7	7.5
West Africa	1.6	—	—	1.0
South & East Africa	7.9	12.0	1.9	7.5
Latin America	1.1	10.0	1.9	2.7
Central America & Caribbean	1.6	2.0	1.9	1.7
North America	20.0	8.0	20.8	18.1

Respondents worked for various maritime welfare organisations. A substantial number of them worked for seafarer centres or port organisations organised at local port ministry or local diocese level. These organizations were mainly based in the United States and Canada. This category also included some seafarer centres in the Black Sea regions. Some major (in terms of their global networks) maritime ministries also had a good representation in the survey respondent group including Apostleship of the Sea (AoS), Mission to Seafarers (MtS), Deutsche Seemannsmission e.V. (DSM), Danske Sømands- og Udlandskirker, Suomen Merimieskirkko, Sjömanskyrkan I Sverige (SiS), Sailors' Society and The Seamen's Christian Friend Society (SCFS) (Table 2).

Table 2: Respondents' Organisations

Organisation	Pastoral Workers (n=576)	Non-pastoral Workers (n=141)	Volunteers (n=156)
	%	%	%
Apostleship of the Sea	18.8	25.5	34.6
Danske Sømands – og Udlandskirker	2.6	2.1	
Deutsche Seemannsmission e.V. (DSM)	8.9	—	5.8
Mission to Seafarers	18.2	25.5	9.6
Sailors' Society	6.7	2.1	—
Seafarers Centre/ Port Ministry/ Local Dioceses *	32.4	36.2	48.1
Sjömanskyrkan I Sverige (SiS)	3.1	2.1	—
Suomen Merimieskirkko	2.6	6.4	—
The Seamen's Christian Friend Society	6.7	—	1.9

The majority of them from North America – this category also includes independent seafarer centres or seafarer centres operated by non-religious organisations.

With the exception of seafarer welfare workers attached to local parishes or seafarer centres and those working for the Apostleship of the Sea which is organised on a national basis (such as AoS UK or AoS the Philippines), all the other port welfare workers worked remotely from their central management. For example, the Mission to Seafarers has its headquarters in London but has port chaplains in 230 ports in 39 countries. The Sailor's Society has its headquarters in Southampton and has port chaplains covering 100 ports over 30 countries. The German Seamen's Mission has its headquarters in Bremen but covers chaplains and deacons in over 15 countries and 42 different ports.

One pastoral worker who was interviewed in South East Asia whose head office was in Western Europe reported that "we decide everything so I am left a free hand". Other pastoral workers also emphasised that all the operations were run by themselves. They only got chased by their central office if they did not send their periodical activity reports. Seafarer welfare workers who responded to our survey did not suggest anything different, they had autonomy, but they knew what was expected from them. They seemed to have flexibility in terms of the organisation of their everyday work and the majority of them were satisfied with how their roles were defined by their 'employers' - when the welfare workers for seafarers were asked whether they were happy about how their role was defined, ninety per cent of them said "yes".

Although welfare workers were satisfied about the definition of their roles by their 'employer' they were concerned with the responsiveness of their organisations to change. They sometimes felt that the senior management had limited knowledge of their ministry and expected more participation in and more publicity about their work from their management. The lack of financial support and funding were other issues raised. Some felt that their work was not appreciated.

Pastoral welfare workers in a sense are industrial chaplains as they focus on workplaces – ports and ships. However, pastoral welfare workers distinguished themselves from other industrial chaplains and also from hospital or prison chaplains. They commented that the people they serve come from a much wider cultural background. They have limited time with seafarers as they come and go with a very tight time schedule. They also reported that they visit seafarers when they are in hospital or in prison. Many pastoral workers felt that their status was lower than the other industrial chaplains as seafarers were invisible to the public and their role unrecognised by wider society. They also emphasised that their role was wider than other industrial chaplains – they had a lot of administrative work, they had to raise funds and work irregular and anti-social hours.

Average weekly working hours for pastoral and non-pastoral welfare workers showed similar patterns of around 43 hours. Volunteer welfare workers on average put in 26 hours a week. It needs to be emphasised the average weekly working hours of pastoral and non-pastoral workers exceeds the average European Union weekly working hours which is 39 hours (EWCS 2005).

The regions where pastoral welfare workers were located had an impact on their working hours and average hours varied widely. Pastoral workers located in Oceania worked an average of 35 hours, those based in the Baltic Sea, Scandinavia and North America 40 hours; those in the Far East and Western Europe worked an average of 43 hours. Pastoral workers located in Latin America and the Middle East averaged 53 hours, Indian Sub-Continent 58 hours, South East Asia 60 hours and West Africa an average of 63 hours a week. It is evident from our survey results, and interviews with port welfare workers that locations where pastoral welfare workers had relatively shorter weekly working hours

were in regions where there were relatively high concentrations of port-based welfare workers for seafarers. In other words welfare workers with relatively shorter working hours were more likely to have other welfare workers working in their ports (pastoral non-pastoral and volunteers) from their own and other organisations.

This is illustrated by two ports visited in Western Europe, which were close to each other (about 2 hours drive). One of the ports had seven seafarer centres, nine pastoral welfare workers and dozens of non-pastoral welfare workers and volunteers. The other port had four seafarer centres, six pastoral welfare workers and a similar number of non-pastoral and volunteer welfare workers. In contrast, a pastoral welfare worker who was interviewed in Latin America covered two major ports with two part-time non-pastoral workers and there were no volunteers at all. He had had only one volunteer in his long career as a port chaplain and they only lasted two weeks. Such conditions increased pastoral workers' working hours and were generally found in Latin America, Middle East, Indian Sub-Continent, South East Asia and West Africa.

Pastoral workers who worked in the maritime ministry as part of their local parish or dioceses had parish duties as well. During a port visit a port chaplain who was in his 70s indicated that he came to the maritime ministry three years earlier. He was appointed by his Bishop as a director of the seafarers' centre. He was also Minister in his church and he could only spend 12 hours a week on maritime ministry related work. In fact, 40 per cent of the pastoral welfare workers who participated in the survey indicated that as well as serving seafarers in their port they also had their parish or local congregations. A further nine per cent were in other paid work (such as teacher at the nautical college or technician) and three per cent engaged in unpaid work (such as refereeing sports). Forty-seven per cent who said they did not undertake any non-seafarer related work had extensive administrative responsibilities entailing long hours. In other words, as far as survey respondents were concerned, only about

half of pastoral welfare workers for seafarers work exclusively in the maritime ministry. For some pastoral welfare workers maritime ministry also included fishers and 24 per cent of them ministered to fishers as well as merchant seafarers.

The research confirmed that welfare workers represent a mature population, especially volunteers. They have relatively long working hours. It is most likely that port welfare workers come to the sector in mid career or as a second career choice. Despite coming to the sector late they want to stay as long as possible and are happy about how their organisations define their role and they like what they are doing.

As far as pastoral welfare workers' profiles are concerned regional differences are manifested in two interconnected ways: provision of port welfare work is heavily concentrated in certain world regions including Western Europe, North America, Baltic Sea and Scandinavia, Oceania, and Far East and pastoral workers working in these regions have relatively shorter working hours.

What problems and obstacles do seafarers welfare workers face?

Observations in ports and in-depth interviews with port welfare workers revealed that they face some challenges. Some of these challenges stemmed from the changes in the shipping industry, some were related to their own organisations and others were more to do with the agencies in their ports.

The International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (ISPS Code) altered the access to ports and ships beyond recognition. The Code came to force in 2004 and sets the global minimum-security requirement for ships and ports. However, in the ports visited, access to the ports by welfare workers varied enormously. In some ports a smile from the welfare workers still opened all the barriers and gates but in others the access to ports and terminals had become very complicated or difficult. In some terminals the procedures were so complicated welfare workers did not attempt them.

In some ports seafarer welfare workers were not allowed to take their vehicles inside the port area, instead they needed to use a shuttle bus service provided by the port authority. Sometimes welfare workers had to wait for up to an hour for the shuttle bus even when the ship they wanted to visit was only two minutes walk from the main port gate. In one port in South East Asia access to each terminal was different, some terminals provided passes valid for up to three years, others needed daily special permits, and for two terminals access was prohibited for seafarers' welfare workers. Some terminals needed special ID cards, some terminals magnet cards and others a pin code. There was an overall consensus among respondents that the ISPS Code made welfare work more difficult. The main difficulties were associated with the bureaucracy involved in getting access and different interpretation of the

Code by different authorities in different ports or even by different terminal operators within the same port.

In the survey, we asked the question "What was the impact of the ISPS code?" 48 per cent of the respondents said the ISPS code had no impact on their work. However, 44 per cent said that the Code made their work more difficult. Only eight per cent said that the Code made their work easier, but this seemed to contradict the port observations and interviews. Closer examination of the respondents who said the ISPS Code had no impact on their work showed that a number did not have any experience of working in the sector before the period the Code was introduced, others said they had always had good relationships with the authorities in their ports and the introduction of the Code did not have a major impact on their work others talked about the elimination of many unauthorised personal from their ports (such as petty traders, sex workers and so on).

In most ports where the port observations took place the information about ship movements were published on the websites of the port authorities. In most cases the information provided the name and flag of the ship, berth, cargo, estimated time of arrival and departure, previous and next port of call. In some busy ports this information was updated every 15 minutes. Seafarers welfare workers used either login information provided by the port authority to access a website or used general public access. In some ports this information was faxed to the seafarers welfare workers. In other ports, welfare workers needed to call pilotage or signal offices to get information about ships in their ports. Based on this information or some other arrangements (i.e. request by ships crew) welfare workers would schedule a number ship visits within the range of an area for the day. However, one of the main challenges was fast ship turnaround times. Welfare workers might get delayed onboard a ship maybe because of a lengthy conversation or other matter being raised. By the time they left the ship the other ships they were due to visit would be

gone. Turnaround times were so fast in some trades (i.e. container, tanker or car carrier) that seafarers' welfare workers had little chance to get aboard these vessels at all.

Working with mixed nationality crews was another challenge for port-based welfare workers for seafarers. It was reported that some ships have 13 different nationalities aboard amongst 20 or so crewmembers with none being a native English speaker. Welfare workers emphasised that the greatest challenge was communication – understanding seafarers and being understood.

The distance from the ever-expanding ports and new terminals to any welfare facilities was another challenge. Seafarers and welfare workers have been largely ignored in the design of new ports and usually there is no public transport available, and if there is it can be very expensive. In some cases, due to the distance and heavy traffic, it takes up to three hours to get between a ship and centre.

Another impact of fast-turnaround times for ships was that they put pressure on seafarers to work intensively and finish the port work. Apart from loading and unloading the cargo there were so many other operations taking place in ports: taking provisions, bunkering, engine maintenance, cargo watch, dealing with port state control, immigration, the port health officer, ship surveyor, cargo surveyor, just to name a few. During these intense operations port welfare workers might not get aboard a ship or if they could get aboard they were largely unnoticed by the busy seafarers. Technological developments in shipping and cost cutting exercises have resulted in a reduction in crewing levels. Coupled with the intense workload in ports, smaller crew sizes make it difficult for ship visitors to have contact with seafarers. It was also evident from survey results that fifty-five per cent of the respondents in one way or another had been refused access to ships at the top of the gangway by crew members. Welfare workers who were not allowed onboard vessels by crewmembers reported that the working schedule of the crew

was one of the main reasons. A further aspect of this was that the time needed to build a rapport with seafarers was limited. Welfare workers talked about seafarers living in an enclosed space month after month without their conventional community support system and needing outside contact and space to talk about sensitive matters (such as personal worries, stress onboard, family problems, economic worries or difficulties in marriage).

Survey results also confirmed what was observed during the port visits, that welfare workers found some type of vessels particularly inaccessible. As far as vessels types were concerned, overall 21 per cent of welfare workers said that tankers with dangerous cargoes (such as oil, gas and chemicals) were the most difficult to visit. This was followed by passenger/cruise ships (14 per cent of respondents found these the most difficult ships to visit), container ships (11%), car carriers (6%) and bulk carriers with scrap metal cargo (3%). It also needs to be emphasised that the ships that welfare workers find the most difficult to visit (i.e. tankers, cruise ships, container and car carriers) are the ships where the seafarers have the least opportunity to take shore leave due to fast turnaround, workload, port security and terminal locations. The location of the ship (such as being at anchor) and location of terminals (such as remote or private) was also mentioned by eight per cent of respondents as making visits difficult.

Crew nationality composition was also presented as a factor that makes for difficulties due to the language barrier. Ships with Russian (12%) and Chinese (10%) crew were particularly mentioned by respondents. The language barriers seem to be more pronounced for volunteers as 36 per cent of them said that it was difficult to visit ships with Russian and Chinese crew.

As emphasised earlier not all the challenges faced by welfare workers developed from organisational changes. Economic difficulties in welfare organisations for seafarers have seen a reduction in their personnel. Many welfare workers emphasised "without the contribution of volunteers port-based welfare services would not operate". Most financial problems have stemmed from the decline in seafarers' use of port based seafarer centres. This is not to say seafarer welfare centres were not needed or seafarers' welfare needs are getting less, but that seafarer centres have become less accessible.

A combination of parish duties and maritime ministry was also a challenge for some pastoral workers. Some challenges were due to lack of training or experience in maritime ministry which was highlighted by some pastoral workers. A pastor interviewed in one of the Western European ports felt that his training and the skills he developed over the years have been parish based and his aim had never been to be a missionary. He said:

"Because we had a system in the church for hundreds of years and we are trained in sitting and waiting for someone to come, then it was for sure that someone would come here if I sit here long enough. We are in a way trained for that."

Some pastoral workers reported that they had been combining parish and seafarer ministries for some time. A pastoral welfare worker with a 20 year career reflected on this. In fact, when he first started in the maritime ministry the circumstances were more suitable to his training as seafarers had time to come to the seafarers centre,

so in a sense he had his congregation coming to 'his' place and they had some time to stay there. However, the new maritime environment required the main work to be done aboard ships:

"But it's also a challenge because when we are here we are at home, and they are our guests and they feel at home here because it's their church and that is the tradition. … And when we go onboard … we are more, so to say not at home, and because we are visiting a place where people work its like visiting a factory or an office, we have to cope with the new environment, you enter in a room where ten men are sitting and eating they have 20 minutes break from their work, they like perhaps to feel free to talk about anything together they want to relax, and here I am dropped into this situation, a lot of things you really have to be sensitive about. I never felt that I was not welcomed or something like that but it is a very difficult situation for me."

Welfare workers also talked about what other services and facilities they could provide, they wanted to provide more services for seafarers on board reflecting the changes in the shipping industry has been changing the need for their work to be more ship focused. They reported that most seafarers were not able to leave their ships when they were in port therefore they wanted to provide mobile communication facilities that could be taken aboard vessels such as mobile phones and lap tops. Some others suggested that this could be also achieved by providing kiosks or drop-in type small seafarer centres with basic facilities (including free Wi-Fi) inside the port area near to berths. In the ports where there were seafarer centres welfare workers felt they needed to open these facilities for longer hours. Some seafarer centres had morning and evening opening hours and the others from late afternoon till late evening. Welfare workers felt that shipping businesses in their ports operated 24 hours a day, everyday, therefore they needed to increase their opening hours.

They also wanted to provide better transport services for seafarers. Some welfare workers talked about not having a vehicle to provide transport, others reported not having suitable vehicles to meet the demand.

Welfare workers also talked about what the obstacles were preventing them from providing these services and facilities. They reported that the lack of finance and funds were the main reasons preventing them. They also talked about the absence of pastoral welfare workers, non-pastoral welfare workers and volunteers. Welfare workers felt that although they wanted to provide more services and facilities for seafarers they were already overstretched. The ISPS Code and other commitments/parish duties were also mentioned as an obstacle to providing seafarers the desired services.

Whether welfare workers felt that they should provide more services and facilities for seafarers than they provided currently was also examined in the survey. Overall 63 % of the welfare workers felt that they should provide more services and facilities for seafarers than they do today. This was as high as 67 per cent for pastoral welfare workers. Welfare workers who indicated that they needed to provide more services for seafarers were also asked what other services and facilities they needed to provide. Their responses overlapped with the responses give in interviews in the port visits. In the survey some respondents listed only one service and facility and others listed many. Most mentioned that the service that they most needed to provide was up-to-date mobile/hand set telephone facilities and this was mentioned by 135 respondents. Need for transport was almost as high (n=129). These were followed by Computers (lap-top) with wi-fi and internet access (n=99), Increased ship visits (n=75), More time with/for seafarers (n=62), Longer opening hours of seafarer centres (n=61), More and up-to-date leisure and entertainment facilities (n=61), More personnel (n=41), Sport events/facilities (n=37), Drop in seafarers centre inside the port (n=35), Newspapers/reading materials (n=34), Worship facilities/materials (n=22), Pastoral

care (n=17), Better access to ports and terminals (n=16), Training of welfare workers (n=15) and counselling (n=11) (Table 3).

Table 3: What additional services did seafarer welfare workers feel they should provide?

What additional services did seafarer welfare workers feel they should provide?	Pastoral Workers (n=372) [d1]	Non-pastoral Wokers (n=73)	Volunteers (n=85)	All (n=530)
Up to date mobile/hand set telephone facilities (including calling and sim cards)	90	21	24	135
Transport	87	24	18	129
Computers (lap-top) with WI-FI and internet access	60	15	24	99
Increased ship visits	51	9	15	75
More time with/for seafarers	54	3	5	62
Longer opening hours of seafarer centre	28	15	18	61
More and up-to-date leisure and entertainment facilities	30	14	17	61
More personnel	28	2	11	41
Sport events/facilities	30	4	3	37
Drop in seafarers centre inside the port	29	4	2	35
Newspapers/reading materials	19	7	6	34
Worship facilities/materials	22	—	—	22
Pastoral care	8	—	9	17
Better access to ports and terminals	9	3	4	16
Training of welfare workers	15	—	—	15
Counselling	11	—	—	11
Others	19	—	—	19

It is clear that seafarers welfare workers are facing challenges in the provision of welfare services and facilities for seafarers from many different directions. The ISPS Code, fast turnaround

ships, mixed nationality crews, expanding port locations, work intensification in ports and the limited time to build a rapport with seafarers, economic difficulties of their organisations, the combination of maritime ministry and parish work, are emphasised. What was interesting here was that in spite of these challenges port welfare workers wanted to provide additional services for seafarers than they already did and to adapt services to the changed circumstances.

Is there a best strategy for ship visiting?

Most of the challenges reported by welfare workers limited their opportunities for ship visiting. It is worth looking at some of the problems and challenges associated with ship visits and also at the different approaches to ship visiting taken by seafarers welfare workers.

One chaplain who combines parish and maritime ministry felt that most of his time is spent on parish work and he visited ships one day a week, on a fixed day. On the day he checks the ships in port on the port authority website and plans his ship visits, by starting from the furthest ship in terms of distance he works his way towards the centre. He takes daily newspapers with him to hand out to seafarers. He visits three or four ships depending on the circumstances aboard.

As far as ship visits were concerned there were clear differences between pastoral welfare workers with parish duties and those without. It was clear that pastoral welfare workers with parish duties were facing challenges but it would be wrong to assume they were less successful as port-based welfare workers for seafarers as a result of this. Pastoral welfare workers without parish duties displayed some differences in their approach and attitude to welfare provisions. An example of this was one Pastoral welfare worker X who felt that port chaplains were there for seafarers' pastoral care and that selling phone cards or taking newspapers aboard ships was not a duty for a pastoral welfare worker. This pastoral welfare worker did not take any merchandise (including free newspapers) aboard ships and did not permit any other member of staff to do so either. Another pastoral welfare worker Y had a different approach, he had years of experience in the maritime ministry and worked in a port where there were many other port chaplains working as a team. He believed that he needed to be on board ships for longer times to build rapport with seafarers so he made himself available to seafarers

whether they needed him or not at that particular time. He also had great concern for seafarers who were hospitalised and would visit and spend time with them.

Pastoral welfare worker Z in contrast worked in a very busy port with very fast turnaround times and his intention was to visit as many ships as possible. He believed that communication, information leaflets about the port and provision of news for seafarers were very important. He developed a unique method of ship visiting. His interaction with seafarers was rather limited but on average he visited about 400 ships a month, particularly ships that had seafarers on board with very limited shore leave opportunities.

It is very difficult to judge which is most successful from the seafarers' point of view but Pastoral welfare workers X, Y and Z all spent time reaching out to seafarers and felt that they did what was right for the seafarer. To some extent their work was determined by their circumstances, the working patterns of the seafarers they visited and the nature of the ports that they worked in. In order to highlight these different approaches, Text Box 1 and Text Box 2 provide two further ship visiting strategies deployed by two different Pastoral welfare workers – Pastoral worker Y and Z.

Text box 1

Pastoral welfare worker Y has been a port chaplain for over 40 years. He begins his working day by checking the list of ships in his port over the internet. There are several other welfare workers in his port from different maritime ministries and he chooses ships that he knows will not be visited by other welfare workers. He specialises in visiting tankers and bulk carriers. After identifying the ships that he would visit, if the ship is not known to him he tries to identify the crew nationalities aboard so that he can take relevant newspapers, and DVD's containing news and recordings of sport events (football, cricket) of the previous day – someone produces them for the seafarers at a very low cost.

His first ship for the day was a full Chinese crewed dry bulk carrier in a very remote terminal. The communication was very difficult at first but pastoral worker Y sat in the control room and waited patiently. He handed Chinese newspapers out and eventually the conversation developed. He found out that there was a problem with the discharge of cargo and the ship would be there for another week. He organised with the crew that he would go to the ship the next day and take half of the crew for shopping in town at 10am and drop them back at 4pm. He would do the same for the rest of the crew the following day.

Another ship he visited on the day was a big container vessel in dry dock. He went to the control room and said hello but he had no reply, everyone was very busy. A crewmember took him to the upper deck to the crews' messroom. The Chaplain sat in the messroom for one hour but there was nobody around. He thought he could wait till tea break of the crew at 3pm. While waiting he reflected on his ship visits - it was a changing scene from day to day and the reception he got on some ships was either very friendly or completely negative.

He thought about another ship in the dry dock that he went aboard everyday for a month and tried to be friendly but got nowhere. He took newspapers and telephone cards aboard everyday but he was never offered a cup of tea or even a glass of water. He sat in the corner day after day, he couldn't quite understand that, it was difficult but he never gave up. He knew that he had pursue this and go back to again. At 3:10 pm aboard the container ship the chaplain was still waiting in the messroom, by 3:20 pm people started to come and suddenly he was surrounded with 10 seafarers who were trying to buy phone cards or exchange money. They asked for phone cards they could use in Japan and in Europe and the admin officer also came, he phoned the engine room and the bridge and told people that the Chaplain was on board. The room was suddenly full of seafarers – 20 of them. Some wanted to exchange Euros for native currency, some wanted to change Singaporean or US Dollars to native currency. The chaplain did not say no to anyone, he made phone calls to find out the exchange rate for Euros and for Singapore and US Dollars. …

Text Box 2

Pastoral worker Z works in a very busy port. He begins his day by downloading 60 different newspapers into his Flash drive. He has an electronic personal organiser where he logs every detail of each ship he visited – name of the ship, crew nationalities, date of the visit and what the crew had requested. His personal organiser has the details of a couple of thousand ships that he had visited. This helps him to prioritise the ships he would visit and also take the necessary items with him (i.e. SIM cards for certain countries and so on).

In the morning he visited six ships. However, aboard the first three ships he was not able to go beyond the seafarer on watch at the top of the gangway (reasons given included ships being about to leave and crew not being available) but the pastoral welfare worker left some materials and port information leaflets with crewmembers on watch. On the forth ship he spent about 10 minutes aboard. In the control room, the officer of the ship downloaded various newspapers from the memory stick.

On the fifth ship the officer in the control room talked with the crew over his walkie-talkie and purchased some SIM cards on their behalf. Again the ship's officer downloaded newspapers from the memory stick. In the sixth ship the officer in the control room downloaded some newspapers on to the ships computer too. What was interesting was that the six ships the chaplain visited in the morning had altogether almost 150 seafarers aboard but he only met eight of them very briefly.

After ships visits he took a short break in his office. Pastoral welfare worker Z took some extra phone cards and went to the port again. In the next ship he was not able to go beyond the ships control room either. When the pastoral worker offered to download newspapers to the ships computer, the officer said that all the external drives in the ship's computers were disabled by the company to stop potential viruses.

After this ship, he saw another three ships alongside. Pastoral worker Z checked his personal organiser and found out that he had visited one of the ships a week earlier and the other one some months ago but he did not have any record of the third ship in his organiser. So he decided to visit that ship first. Aboard these three ships the procedures were more or less the same, he did not spend more than 10 minutes aboard vessels but delivered newspapers, telephone cards and SIM cards. Yet again despite visiting many ships the number of seafarers we had contact with was very limited. In some ships there were communication difficulties with Chinese and Burmese seafarers and in another ship despite spending up to 20 minutes he only saw one or two seafarers. Over the lunch break the pastoral welfare worker entered the details of the new ship into his personal organiser and updated the details of the other ships he visited which were already in his electronic system. He felt that the port was very big and there were hundreds of ships coming in every day, his main priority was to visit as many ships as possible and provide important services (telecommunication and news) to as many seafarers as possible. The pastoral welfare workers' port specialised in one type of vessels that had very fast turnaround times with extremely busy crew during their port calls.

Seafarer welfare workers rated the ship visits they made as the most popular service amongst seafarers (see appendix 2 for the full list of most popular services). However, as emphasised above, there was no uniform practice of ship visiting procedures. Welfare workers adopted a strategy best suited to their circumstances. The question still remains to be answered about the best strategies for ship visiting. Should pastoral welfare workers visit ships primarily for the pastoral care of seafarers? Is it better to reach as many seafarers as possible with a limited contact with them? Or, is it better to reach a limited number of seafarers but build a good rapport with them?

How do welfare workers respond to challenges?

Welfare workers suggested various strategies to improve seafarers' usage of and access to, port-based facilities and services. They suggested that these strategies would also improve welfare workers' contact with seafarers. One welfare worker said, "we need to be more proactive, instead of waiting for seafarers to come to us we need to go to them." Another welfare worker added, "we need better training to respond to the changes such as how to communicate with multi-national crews". In fact outreach welfare work and more training to this end was the most frequently mentioned strategy.

Welfare workers also stated that better and closer cooperation and communication with the agencies in port would improve seafarers' access to welfare facilities and services ashore. They emphasised that in this way the other agencies in ports would understand the welfare needs of seafarers when they are in ports.

Providing information about the existence of available facilities and services for seafarers and for the other agencies in port was another strategy suggested by welfare workers to increase seafarers' usage and access to and other agencies in ports. One welfare worker said "Seafarers need to know what is available for them when they do come ashore."

Fundraising by welfare workers was important for maintaining their services for seafarers. In the survey 55 per cent of the welfare workers said that they raised funds. This was as high as 61 per cent for pastoral welfare workers, 44 per cent for non-pastoral welfare workers and 43 per cent for volunteers. In the interviews with welfare workers, fundraising and effective strategies of fundraising were also discussed in detail. They reported that sending letters of appeal out on a regular basis and sending out newsletters was one of the most effective strategies to

raise funds. Others added that they gave talks in various venues and asked for donations in local parishes. Others also reported organising banquets, golf tournaments, boat tours, annual balls and Christmas bazaars, all of these were considered effective fundraising strategies.

In the survey, welfare workers were asked about who provided financial support for their work apart from their parent organisations and the ITF Seafarers' Trust. Almost a quarter of them (201 out of 891 – 23%) indicated that they did not have any other source of financial support apart from their parent organisation or/and the ITF Seafarers' Trust. Others identified one or more organisations or individuals providing financial support for their operations in ports. Donations from the public were mentioned more frequently than any other (492 times), this was followed by the port authority (162 times), ship owners (also mentioned162 times), and port welfare committee (72 times). However, "other" sources were mentioned 420 times. These included financial support from the national or local government, help by local churches, donations from seafarers, fund raising activities, renting out spaces, income generated through selling phone cards and basic goods at seafarer centre shops, donations from the business community and in some cases welfare workers supplementing the seafarer welfare activities by taking up paid employment.

Availability of volunteers varied substantially from port to port. In one port in the Mediterranean region a welfare organisation had over 80 volunteers. However, another organisation in a port in Latin America had only one volunteer working two hours a week. In the survey pastoral and non-pastoral welfare workers were asked whether they had volunteers working with them and 62 per cent of them responded affirmatively.

In interviews in ports and in the survey the best strategies of recruiting volunteers were investigated. The most common and perhaps the most effective form of recruitment was through existing volunteers and word of mouth. The respondents also reported visiting local churches, universities, and writing articles about volunteering in their newsletters. Some others talked about using the local media (i.e. short articles) for recruitment of volunteers.

Pastoral and non-pastoral welfare workers also talked about how they kept their volunteers motivated. They emphasised that most of their volunteers were highly motivated anyway. They also mentioned keeping in contact with volunteers regularly via face-to-face or team meetings, text messages and e-mails. Others talked about having regular training sessions. Some welfare workers explained that they could not reward their volunteers enough or as often as they wanted to. Others said that Christmas dinners and gifts, birthday parties and thanking them and not taking their service for granted were their way of rewarding volunteers.

Welfare workers were asked about how they meet the spiritual needs of seafarers (including provisions for non-Christian seafarers). One pastoral welfare worker who worked in an Islamic state said "I cannot provide any support for non-Christian seafarers because of the situation in my port." Many respondents said that they have prayer rooms or quiet rooms in their seafarer centres where there is a section allocated to different religions. Others said that they are in regular contact with local churches, temples or mosques where they could refer seafarers if there is a need or request their services. Further responses were that they often provide transport to seafarers wherever they want to pray in the local area. Here are some first person accounts to highlight these:

"Respect their faith and encourage them to keep it."

"We have contact with all faiths when seafarers ask for it."

"We have Bibles in all languages for free, chaplains are always ready to respond to individual needs, "Room of Silence" where they find altars for the 7 world-religions to give their belief a personal space with guestbook to express their feelings."

As we have seen, one of the best strategies for effective welfare provision in ports was cooperation between the different agencies. In some ports this was given a formal structure in the shape of Port Welfare Committees (PWC's) (see Appendix 3 for background information on PWC's).

A few ports visited for the study had PWC's in their ports. Welfare workers and other key informants interviewed in the ports mentioned that they did not need one as they have other informal structures in place to serve similar functions to PWC's, or simply said that they did not need to have one. Others said such a body was not recognised or was not known in their particular country. Many welfare workers expressed that there was a lack of interest from other bodies in their ports, in particular from their port authorities. Some others said that past attempts to form PWC's in their ports had failed. However, quite a few welfare workers stated that there was some work being done towards forming a PWC in their ports at the time of the survey.

Of the pastoral and non-pastoral welfare workers who responded to the survey 42 per cent of them said they did not have a PWC in their ports and 40 per cent said they did. However, 18 per cent were not sure about the existence of PWC in their own ports. Welfare workers who said they already did have a PWC in their ports were asked to comment on whether the existence of the committee has made a positive contribution to seafarers' welfare in their ports. What is interesting here is that an overwhelming majority (circa 80 per cent) of the respondents answered affirmatively. Some emphasised that the existence of PWC in their ports provided or generated some extra funds to maintain and develop existing services and facilities in their ports. Others said it resulted in better coordination of services, some emphasised that through PWC they get to know other key players in their ports, others talked about the benefits of sharing information and best practices. The findings of the survey were confirmed by the fieldwork in ports which followed it. Here are some examples to highlight these points:

"It's a very good forum for seafarers welfare...we managed to get telephones & other equipment for the seafarers benefit."

"Positive contribution as it keeps welfare matters in front of the various organisations working in the port."

"It is very important to have a committee as an umbrella-organisation to cover broad interests among seafarers. Alone is not strong in this case, together we can do much more!"

"It gives us a chance to exchange ideas and consolidate our efforts."

"Identify and discuss any welfare problems that have occurred in the port with a view to finding solutions for the future."

"Discussing problematic situations regarding seafarers, to improve networking and knowing each other better, to organise conferences and other activities."

Welfare workers also commented about the frequency of PWC meetings in their ports. From their responses it emerged that the two main patterns of meeting were monthly or quarterly. However, they also emphasised they would have emergency meetings at short notice if there was a need to do so. A very few also mentioned about a PWC meeting irregularly or rarely in their ports. It had been reported that during PWC meetings generally each member presents an activity report. Further, funding issues, suggestions to improve joint efforts, coordinating and allocating tasks, improvement of facilities and services for seafarers were some of the items that were regularly discussed during the PWC meetings. Here are some first person accounts to illustrate the discussions had at PWC meetings:

"Discussing seafarers' welfare topics: bus transport, toll-free tunnel passages, sports field renovation, information leaflets and so on."

"Discuss difficulties experienced by ship visitors and improvements to facilities and services for seafarers."

In the survey, welfare workers were asked to rate the cooperation they receive from various agencies in their ports, including: port authorities; ship agents; port immigration officers; port security/police and the ITF inspectors. When we combine neutral ('neither good nor bad') and negative comments ('bad' and 'very bad') port immigration officers accumulated 28 per cent, port security/police 23 per cent, ship agents 22 per cent, port authorities 19 per cent and the ITF inspectors 13 per cent. It is worth mentioning that the proportion of the welfare workers that had PWC's in their ports was much lower in these categories than where they did not. It is also worth mentioning that welfare workers working in ports where there were PWC's reported having better access to ports and terminals.

As we have seen welfare workers suggested strategies about how to best respond to challenges. These strategies included: outreach work and training to this end, close communication and cooperation with the other agencies in ports, publicising information about the services available to seafarers, adopting effective strategies for fund raising and getting financial support, recruitment of volunteers and how to keep them motivated, meeting spiritual needs of seafarers form different religion and belief systems, and the usefulness of the port welfare committees in responding to challenges.

Communication networks for welfare workers

In some ports maritime welfare work was carried out by non-religious organisations and in others there was only one maritime ministry. In these circumstances there were no reports of issues arising from ecumenical working. In many other ports there were two or more Christian denominations involved in maritime ministries. Overall ecumenical cooperation worked very well in the maritime ministries but there some problems were reported in some ports. On these occasions references were made to the particular pastoral workers' personality or method of working rather than their denominations. Ecumenical working or partnership was also examined in the seafarer welfare workers' survey in some detail.

A quarter of the respondents work for the organisations that are the sole welfare service providers in their ports, whilst 63 per cent of the respondents had one or more welfare worker in their ports that worked for another seafarer welfare organisation. About 12 per cent of the respondents said that they did not know whether there were any other welfare workers working for any other organisations in their ports. What is interesting here is that 29 per cent of the volunteers fell into the latter category, although only eight per cent of both pastoral and non-pastoral welfare worker groups did so.

As noted above, nearly two thirds of the respondents said there were other welfare workers working for other organisations in their ports. A substantial majority of these organisations were maritime ministries. When the respondents (the majority who work for maritime ministries) were asked whether other welfare workers contribute to or hinder their own work, overall 65 per cent of the respondents said that their contribution was positive. Twenty-nine per cent of the respondents said they had no positive or negative impact. Only six per cent of the respondents expressed the view that the existence of welfare workers

from other welfare organisations was hindering their own work. This percentage was very low amongst pastoral welfare workers (four per cent) (see Table 4).

Table 4: If there are other welfare workers in your port working for other organisations, in what way do they contribute to or hinder your work?

	Pastoral workers (n=426)	Non-pastoral workers (n=102)	Volunteers (n=99)	All (n=627)
They have no impact	31.0	23.5	27.3	29.2
They contribute to my work	64.8	64.7	63.6	64.6
They hinder my work	4.2	11.8	9.1	6.2

Welfare workers were also asked how often they communicated with other seafarer welfare workers in their port, nationally and internationally. Twenty-three per cent of the respondents said that they met with other welfare workers *in their ports* daily, 32 per cent once a week or a few times a week; 18 per cent once a month or a few times a month; 18 per cent rarely and nine per cent never (see Table 5).

Table 5: How often do you communicate with other chaplains/welfare workers in your port?

	Pastoral workers (n=450)	Non-pastoral workers (n=108)	Volunteers (n=126)	All (n=684)
	%	%	%	%
Daily	24.0	25.0	16.7	22.8
Weekly/a few times a week	30.7	27.8	38.1	31.6
Monthly/a few times a month	20.0	8.3	21.4	18.4
Rarely/occasionally	16.7	30.6	11.9	18.0
Never	8.7	8.3	11.9	9.2

Welfare workers who communicated with their counterparts from other organisations in the same port were usually from ecumenical seafarer centres or centres run by different welfare organisations. In other words they shared the same building or office space. Other welfare workers said that periodical meetings (ICMA or port welfare committee meetings) in their ports were the occasion when they communicated. However, for a substantial majority of them, communication depended on 'need' or 'occasion', this could be daily, weekly, monthly or very seldom. In some cases the occasion to require welfare workers to communicate did not arise at all.

Seafarers' welfare workers were also asked what means of communication they use when they communicate with their fellow workers in their own ports. Formal or informal face to face communication was the most common means of communication for seafarer welfare workers who share the same building, centre or office. Monthly meetings of port welfare committees or scheduled ecumenical meetings were other occasions for face to face meetings. Organisation of joint activities such as ship visits, dealing with seafarer justice cases or transport of seafarers were mainly dealt with by the use of a mixture of communication tools such as face to face, by telephone or e-mail. There were a few cases where communication took place through an intermediary such as a seafarer, port worker or other seafarer welfare worker.

Frequency of communication with other welfare workers nationally shows a different pattern. Overall 84 per cent of the respondents communicated with their fellow workers *in other ports nationally*. Only three per cent of them said they communicated daily. The combined percentage of welfare workers who either said "Rarely" or "occasionally" was 62 per cent (see Table 6 for further details). In a few cases there were no other ports in the respondents' country. Again a few kept in touch regularly by telephone or e-mail. Other contacts were rare or depended on national training events or meetings and seafarer cases that they needed to follow up.

Table 6: How often do you communicate with other chaplains/welfare workers in other ports nationally?

	Pastoral workers % (n=480)	Non-pastoral workers % (n=93)	Volunteers % (n=126)	All % (n=699)
	%	%	%	%
Daily	1.9	6	5.0	3.0
Weekly/a few times a week	11.9	12.9	5.0	10.7
Monthly/a few times a month	29.4	9.7	17.5	24.5
Rarely/occasionally	46.9	61.3	32.5	45.9
Never	10.0	9.7	40.0	15.9

Overall, only six per cent of the welfare workers communicated with other welfare workers *in other ports beyond their national borders.* Fifteen per cent of the welfare workers communicated once or a few times a month, whereas 52 per cent rarely or occasionally and 27 per cent never (79 per cent combination of the later two). As far as different groups of welfare workers were concerned, 57 per cent of the pastoral welfare workers rarely or occasionally and 56 per cent of the volunteers never communicated with other

welfare workers in other ports internationally (see Table 7). It needs to be emphasised that other welfare workers included welfare workers from their denomination or where it was applicable from their parent organisations.

Table 7: How often do you communicate with other chaplains/welfare workers in other ports internationally?

	Pastoral workers (n=450)	Non-pastoral workers (n=96)	Volunteers (n=108)	All (n=654)
	%	%	%	%
Daily	1.3	3.1	-	1.4
Weekly/a few times a week	4.7	9.4	-	4.9
Monthly/a few times a month	18.0	12.5	5.6	15.1
Rarely/occasionally	57.3	43.8	38.9	52.3
Never	18.7	31.2	55.6	26.6

Another question examined whether welfare workers wanted to improve their networking with *other* national and international organisations concerned with seafarers' welfare. Overall, 68 per cent of the welfare workers said "yes". This was as high as 71 per cent for pastoral workers. However, overall, 32 per cent said "no" and this was as high as 43 per cent for non-pastoral workers (see Table 8).

Table 8: Do you want to improve your networking with other national and international organisations concerned with seafarers' welfare?

	Pastoral workers (n=543)	Non-pastoral workers (n=141)	Volunteers (n=141)	All (n=825)
Yes	70.7	57.4	68.1	68.0
No	29.3	42.6	31.9	32.0

Welfare workers who wanted to improve their national and international networking with other organisations concerned with seafarers' welfare emphasised that by doing so they could benefit from the experiences of other organisations by gaining new ideas and working models. They also emphasised that seafarers with problems or working on substandard ships move from one port to another and national and international networks could help to follow up these cases. Others emphasised that networking could help to overcome some rivalries between different organisations. It is worth reading their own words:

"We are working in the same sector and seafarers go from one port to another. It is important that we coordinate and share our experiences."

"I might get new ideas and inspiration. We might be able to cooperate around certain problem areas."

"When dealing with line ships it is helpful if you know a fellow chaplain working in the other port where the ship is sailing to."

"I believe it is always helpful to learn from others, especially in my case where I have not been in this type of ministry all that long."

"By working cooperatively, it can only mean a greater level of service for seafarers. People working at cross purposes only waste each other's time."

"We cannot ignore the fact rivalries between organisations exist, so, networking is necessity. Through networking, different organisation will have the chance to work together and will improve the groups level of performance, issues can easily be discussed and followed up regarding to a certain port issues/problems can easily be known to all members of an umbrella organisation."

Some respondents who did not want to improve their national and international networks with other seafarer welfare organisations emphasised that their workload would not permit such activities. Others simply said that they already have these networks in place and therefore did not need to develop them any further. Some others gave personal reasons such as being close to retirement age or negative past experience with these types of networks. Different ways of working amongst different organisations was also highlighted as a reason for not communicating.

When welfare workers were asked whether ecumenical working was a good thing, three quarters of them were affirmative. Only one per cent of them expressed a negative view. However, 24 per cent said it did not have any negative or positive contribution to their work. Welfare workers who said ecumenical working was a good thing emphasised that the seafarers they serve in general come from different religious backgrounds and belief systems and that aboard vessels these seafarers from different religious cultures work together - thus different denominations in ports needed to complement this by working ecumenically together. Some others said ecumenical working in ports gives one voice to them when dealing with different agencies in ports (e.g. port authority). Others pointed out that working together would bring

more efficiency; prevent duplication and helps to share limited resources. The other point was that ecumenical working created a better working environment for non-pastoral welfare workers. Here are some first person accounts to illustrate these:

"Seafarers have different religious backgrounds, so we should be able to cooperate with other ecumenical partners."

"It is good for the seafarer in that we plan our ship visiting together and so don't all arrive at the same ship. The seafarer receives the same information and support irrespective of who visits. If there is a denominational issue the chaplains pass on the issue to the relevant chaplain."

"We used to have separate ministries and the competition was horrible and it confused the seafarers, so working together and pooling our resources and staff is better stewardship of what we have."

"Strengthens our brotherhood; is a witness to outside world of unity of the churches despite diversity; gives us one voice with port authorities etc."

"Seamen do not ask which church I am working for."

It is also clear that there are some problems in some ports as far as ecumenical work is

concerned despite the parties involved in these coming from the ICMA member organisations. However, it needs to be emphasised that in most cases working practices or personalities of pastoral welfare workers seem to be entangled with the denomination of the organisations that they represent. Perhaps the following quote from a pastoral welfare worker sums this up:

> *"We have our differences, it is a personality problem more than a denomination. I am sure if there was another person instead of the current one I would not be experiencing the same problems."*

Why and how do welfare workers deal with seafarer grievances?

We have seen earlier that the reasons that pastoral welfare workers came to work in the maritime ministry included "reaching out to more vulnerable members of the society" and "the need to maintain social justice for seafarers". Seafarer welfare workers were asked about the nature of those seafarers' justice cases that are reported to them by seafarers. They commented on the different types of justice cases they come across and in a sense their testimonies highlight the living and working conditions of many seafarers: here are some examples of the nature of the justice cases (or grievances) they handle:

> *"Back wages, repatriation, missing seafarers, accident cases, compensation cases, mysterious death cases on board, assisting the families of the piracy victims."*

> *"Delay of salary, no food, no drinking water, diseases, illness, death on board, abandonment, spiritual problems."*

> *"Unpaid overtime and other forms of unjust wage practices, physical and mental abuse, poor working conditions, inadequate food provisions, inadequate medical service, discrimination, and unexplained job dismissal/ repatriation."*

"Non-payment of wages, bad food, contracts finished but not allowed to leave ship, captain using physical violence, unsafe ship or working conditions."

"Poor working conditions, wages, benefits, inadequate provisions (food, water), physical and mental abuse, discrimination, inadequate medical attention."

"Unseaworthiness of ship, crew suffering from lack of adequate care, food, water etc. withholding of pay, intimidation and bullying."

"Wages not being given on board for months, people being signed off because of a personal conflict without proper payment, injuries that were not treated properly, insufficient food, contaminated freshwater, accidents that were covered up, working conditions or pay that was worse than what the contract stipulated."

"Medical reasons, i.e. physical and mental, wage disputes, poor working conditions, lack of provisions in galley."

When asked about the frequency of handling justice cases overall only 11 per cent of welfare workers said they did so 'rarely', 'sometimes, or 'seldom'. This was as high as 24 per cent for non-pastoral workers, but only eight per cent of the pastoral workers fell in this category. Overall, 18 per cent of the respondents said that they handle at least one justice case a week, and some of the welfare workers in this category said 'almost daily'.

Welfare workers were also asked about where they referred the justice cases that they came across. Some welfare workers, depending on the nature of the case, said that they referred them to more than one agency (i.e. port authorities and as well as the ITF inspector). However, overall, 64 per cent of the respondents referred cases to the ITF inspector or the ITF Head Quarters in London, solely or alongside other institutions. Reporting the cases to the ITF was as high as 68% for pastoral welfare workers. The other agencies welfare workers referred the cases to included Port Authorities (11%), Seamen's Church Institute of New York and New Jersey (SCI) (11%), welfare workers' own head office (i.e. Mission to Seafarers, German Seamen's Mission, Sailors' Society and so on), Homeland Security/ Police (8%), Local Seafarers' Union (6%). Cases which were received by non-pastoral volunteers were referred to the port chaplain (6%), a few cases were also referred to ships' agents, International Seafarers' Assistance Network (ISAN), local church, seafarers' Embassy in the country, and the ship owner (see Table 9).

Table 9: Where were seafarers' justice cases referred?

	Pastoral workers (n=500)	Non-pastoral Workers (n=93)	Volunteers (n=90)	All (n=683)
	%	%	%	%
ITF – inspector or Head Office in London (n=439)	68	65	43	64
Port Authorities (n=76)	14	3	4%	11
Seamen's Church Institute of New York and New Jersey (SCI) (n=76)	12	17	-	11
Homeland security/ police (n=51)	9	-	8	8
Own head office (n=67)	8	15	16	10
Local seafarers union (n=38)	6	4	2	6
Ship's Agent (n=19)	3	3	-	3
ISAN (n=23)	2	8	4	3
Local church (n=15)	2	-	8	2
Embassy (n=8)	1	4	-	1
Ship owner (n=5)	1	2	-	1
Port Chaplain (n=42)	-	16	30	6

Note: percentage is based on the frequency (how many times) of each item being mentioned by respondents (i.e. some respondents mentioned more than one referral point) therefore the total percentage does not add to 100.

How well are transport, telecommunication facilities and information packs for seafarers used and what are the problems associated with them?

As we have seen, transport (from ship to shore facilities) is one of the services most appreciated by seafarers. In the survey, eighty-five per cent of the respondents stated that their organisations provided transport for seafarers in their ports. However, 15 per cent said their organisations did not provide transport for seafarers.

Welfare workers who provided transport to seafarers in their ports were asked about where they took seafarers when they offered this service. Overall 55% of them said that they take them to many different places on demand such as the seafarers' centre, shopping centre, health clinic, sightseeing, museums, city centre, airport, and so on. Twenty-four per cent of the welfare workers said that when they provide transport for seafarers they take them shopping or to a shopping centre and super stores ASDA, Best Buy and Wal-Mart were mentioned quite often. However, a further 21% of the seafarer welfare workers said that they provide transport only between ships and seafarer centres (see Table 10).

Table 10: Where do seafarers go when they use your service?

	Pastoral workers (n=480)	Non-pastoral workers (n=126)	Volunteers (n=123)	All (n=729)
	%	%	%	%
To multiple places on request (n=402)	54.9	61.9	51.2	55.1
To shopping/ shopping centre (n=171)	22.8	16.7	31.7	23.5
To seafarers' centre only (n=150)	21.0	21.4	17.1	20.6
To a place of worship only (n=6)	1.2			0.8

All the welfare workers who provided transport for seafarers, regardless of where the seafarers went when they used the service, were asked how the cost of the transport was met. According to our respondents, for the majority of them (53%) the cost of transport for seafarers was met by the overall operational budget of their organisation or the Maritime Mission/Church that their organisations belonged to. They emphasised that the transport cost was included in the overall operating budget. It was mostly subsidised by the takings from the sale of seafarer telephone cards. Some others also emphasised that because they do not charge seafarers for the service they could only provide limited transport such as from ships to seafarer centre and back again.

Nineteen per cent of the respondents said that transport costs were partially covered by the service users – seafarers themselves. Some had flat nominal fee for transport, others left it to seafarers' voluntary donations. Some others provided this service free of charge as long as it was from ships to the seafarers centre but transport beyond this was charged a flat fee per trip.

Eleven per cent of the respondents said that donations from (non-seafarer) individuals and organisations help them to maintain their transport services for seafarers. Another 11% mentioned contributions from port authorities, port levy and port welfare committees towards their transport costs. About 6% of the respondents said their transport costs were met by contribution from various organisations.

Overall, one quarter of the welfare workers did not have any particular problem associated with providing transport for seafarers. However, 18% mentioned time constraints. Some mentioned that the transport of seafarers takes so long that it had a negative impact on their other duties, such as ship visits, attending the seafarers' centre and so on. Others emphasised that seafarers had very limited time; therefore everything needed to be done at speed. Others talked about the lack of time against a very high demand for the transport service. Seventeen per cent of them said meeting the running cost of this service was a challenge for them. The price of petrol, cost of maintenance, repairs, insurance and drivers was mentioned. Fifteen per cent of the seafarer welfare workers associated the limited space available on their vehicles as one of the problems with providing transport and a need for a bigger/larger mini van emphasised. Fourteen per cent of the seafarer welfare workers identified the lack of personnel (i.e. a full-time driver and volunteers) to drive vehicles as being another problem they faced. Five per cent of the welfare workers saw over zealous application of the ISPS Code related security measures as being an obstacle to their transport services – the fact that vehicles were not allowed inside the port was mentioned regularly. Only a few mentioned seafarers not being willing to pay for the service, seafarers being drunk, taking advantage of their service, and seeing it as a taxi service that they could request to go anywhere.

As we have seen, some welfare workers do not provide transport for seafarers and others limit their services due to their circumstances. These welfare workers stated that they call taxis for seafarers when they cannot provide transport, or when seafarers request destinations that they are not able to take them due to their workload. In

these cases they use reliable local taxi companies that will not overcharge. They often act as translators to explain to the drivers where seafarers want to go, "I usually explain where the seafarer wants to go because of language barriers" said one. However, relations with the taxi drivers are not smooth everywhere and on some occasions welfare workers follow up cases where seafarers were overcharged. In some ports issues were more serious as taxi drivers see port welfare workers as competitors taking their business away from them. Some welfare workers reported experiencing slashing of tyres of their vans, and verbal and physical abuse from local taxi drivers.

As well as transport, communication facilities were the most used and appreciated service for seafarers according to the welfare workers, but 18 per cent of the welfare workers indicated that they do not provide this service. Some of the pastoral workers and volunteers do not work in any established facility in the port - non-pastoral workers' responses are a better indicator as they are mainly employed by seafarer centres where one would expect there to be communication facilities. However, nine per cent of the non-pastoral welfare workers said that they also did not provide any communication facilities for seafarers. These workers were mainly from South and East Africa and South East Asia regions and there was also one case from the North East of England. Nevertheless, overall a substantial majority of them (82%) provide telecommunication facilities for seafarers.

The provision of telecommunication facilities mainly consists of telephone and internet, but there are large differences in provision between ports. In some cases WIFI services require seafarers to have their own wireless enabled devices. In other cases they only provided phone cards which seafarers could use at the nearest public phone box.

Almost all the respondents sold seafarer phone cards with very competitive rates. For example a 10 US$ phone card gives up to 120 minutes call time for calls from Europe to the Philippines.

Income generated from these phone card and SIM card sales usually subsidises free use of internet for seafarers. Some seafarer centres charge a nominal fee for internet use.

Problems associated with providing telecommunication facilities and services for seafarers varied considerably. Some mentioned lack of computers and telephone lines to accommodate the demand from seafarers. Maintenance costs, computer viruses and different telephone cards available in the market were mentioned as other problems associated with provision of telecommunication facilities for seafarers.

Sometimes there is a problem of not enough seafarers using the telecommunication facilities in seafarers' centres or clubs. In fact, many welfare workers emphasised that distances between ships and centres made access difficult for seafarers. Others said that not all seafarers come off their ships due to lack of shore leave and seafarers preferred mobile communication facilities that could be brought aboard their vessels.

We also asked welfare workers about their experiences with petty traders providing telecommunication facilities for seafarers in port areas. Many emphasised that before the ISPS Code there were some problems with them as seafarers did not get good deals from the purchases made through petty traders, however, the ISPS Code limited their access to ports and ships. In some ports these traders still found a way to get into the ports and aboard vessels but welfare workers seem to have good relations with them, and most of the time they exchange information about the

ships. Some others said that there is no competition because selling phone cards onboard vessels is not their job.

The Study of Port based welfare services for seafarers (Kahveci, 2007) identified that one of the areas that would improve seafarers welfare when they were ashore was the provision of information about the ports. The Maritime Labour Convention 2006 guidelines state 'Information should be disseminated among seafarers concerning facilities open to the general public in ports of call, particularly transport, welfare, entertainment and educational facilities and places of worship, as well as facilities provided specifically for seafarers'. Seafarer welfare workers were asked whether they had an information pack for visiting seafarers. For example, information regarding their services, port facilities, an area map and so on. Overall, three quarters of the respondents said 'yes' and a quarter said 'no'.

When the welfare workers were asked about what their information pack contained, it became clear that they all came in different formats, leaflets, booklets, flyers and so on, but they all contained basic area information, and information about transport, services available, shops, useful telephone numbers. Some were published in different languages too.

In summary, there were quite a few ports where there was no provision of transport services for seafarers and a further fifth reported that they provided a very limited service. In most cases costs for this service were met by the welfare organisations although seafarers sometimes paid a nominal amount. Associated problems with the provision of transport included time constraints, running costs, the limited space in vehicles and lack of personnel to operate them. Some seafarer welfare workers also experienced problems with local taxi drivers as taxi drivers saw them as competitors. One fifth of the welfare workers did not provide telecommunication facilities for seafarers. Seafarer welfare workers who provided this service reported that it mostly consisted of telephone and internet. The cost

of the telephone/telephone cards was always charged but meeting the internet cost varied, some charging a nominal fee, others providing the service free of charge. The main problems associated with these services were in some ports lack of equipment to meet the demand and in some other ports not having enough demand was the problem. Maintenance costs were also one of the main problems associated with these services.

Is there any need to have a seafarer centre?

Not all the ports visited had seafarer centres. However, where there were seafarer centres their usage by seafarers varied enormously. When the seafarer centres were located very close to the ships or inside the port area they were well used. Some of the seafarer centres visited were buzzing with seafarers and they had almost a party atmosphere every evening. Seafarers using telephone booths, watching television, using karaoke machines, playing table tennis, billiards, sitting around the bar area, in the computer room and so on. In some other centres the situation was different. One seafarer centre where the researcher spent a week had hardly more than a handful seafarers a day despite the centre being in the vicinity of the one of the busiest ports. The centre was well equipped and had two minibuses for transport but did not have any personnel to drive the minibuses. Similarly in some ports seafarer centres were shut because of their distance to ports, which created access and transport problems. In another port the seafarer centre was so quiet in the evenings that the centre workers locked themselves in for the fear of their personal safety.

In the survey, welfare workers were asked whether they needed to have seafarer centres in their ports. One said "there is a need to provide 'community', as an individual l cannot do that, but l also work in isolated locations where it would be impractical to provide centres". A few had similar mixed feelings about having a seafarer centre, but the substantial majority of the respondents had strong opinions either in favour or against having a seafarer centre. A quarter of the seafarer welfare workers said that they did not need the infrastructure of a seafarer centre in their ports. However, three quarters of them agreed by saying that there was a need to have a seafarer centre.

Reasons for a need for a seafarer centre included that seafarer centres provided a change of environment for seafarers; they were identified as "focal points" and "sanctuaries", other welfare workers emphasised that in some places it was almost impossible to work without a centre and others talked about a need for a place to be based or provide an identity. Seafarer centres were also identified as places where all the services and activities could function under one roof. Here are some first person accounts to illustrate these and other points put forward about the need for a seafarer centre in port.

"It is a safe place away from the ship to talk."

"Focal point for seafarers, port community and hub of volunteer operations."

"Yes I can just visit ships and spend time talking with seafarers but in reality they do want to phone home, use the internet, have a drink and go shopping and for all that a Centre is part of what we can offer to seafarers."

"This is the only chance they have to come ashore, relax, make contact home, meet locals."

"The shopping centre doesn't yield itself to deep, personal conversations. People are looking at all the things around them. I don't plan on going to a strip club so I won't be able to talk with seafarers there. But the seafarers' centre is our baby. We can receive people into it as we would into our own home. It is more than a self-service Internet cafe or telephone centre. We want to decorate it like a home. We don't have anchors all over the walls. We don't use overhead fluorescent lights. I would like to have real coffee mugs and table clothes. There are things you can say and do in a seafarers' centre that you can't do on the ship, especially if the captain tries to keep everyone under his thumb."

Welfare workers who felt they did not need a seafarer centre in their ports had the opinion that it was difficult to finance and maintain them. They also pointed out that not many seafarers visited them because of their distances from ever expanding ports, seafarers' limited opportunities to go ashore, and there were other ways of providing services and facilities without a seafarer centre. Others said that their outreach work mostly took place away from the seafarers' centre. Here are some examples to highlight what they said:

"Quick turnarounds and many seafarers now have mobile phones and personal computers. Seafarers don't come to our centre as much as they used to."

"Most of our work is now on the vessels. This is primarily because of time constraints for the crew's free time, and currently in our port restrictions on crew coming ashore. The centre visits account for only about 10% of our contact and service with seafarers."

"Not really. The real benefit of our two centres is just that they are a quiet safe haven away from the ship. An alternative four walls. The facilities are very limited and needs are easily met by walking in to the towns that are situated very near the ports."

"Our centre is used somewhat infrequently, but when someone needs to check e-mail, there are precious few places around the city for them to do so."

"The areas the ships come to are often far from the Club. Also, the seafarers rarely have time to come ashore."

"Distances between our centre and the port terminals are getting bigger."

"Ministry can take place without a place to take the seafarers. We are learning that now."

"The centre is becoming a burden to plan, to get funding to run and to have workers to man them."

> *"We don't need it at the moment. Since the closure of the xx Seamen Centre, we continue our mission minus the centre."*

> *"Current centre does not solve the welfare needs of seafarers. There should be a better way to serve seafarers."*

> *"Just a drop in structure would be enough. We have a big place 3km away from the sea and it is very difficult to maintain. It is very expensive."*

As the above first person accounts suggest almost exclusively all the seafarer welfare workers who said they did not need a seafarer centre did have or used to have seafarer centre in their current ports. On the contrary, a substantial majority of the welfare workers who did not have a seafarer centre in their ports said that they did need one.

How effective is the training welfare workers receive?

Welfare workers often mentioned that a good and ongoing training was necessary to do their jobs well. One port welfare worker reported that "I did not have any training. I had to work it out on my own" and another added "I had no formal training at all, self taught and a few things from my predecessor". Interviews with welfare workers indicated that on the job training was the major form of training for welfare workers and this was particularly so for non-pastoral welfare workers and volunteers.

In fact the survey results confirmed the port based interviews with port welfare workers. When welfare workers were asked about the training they received to do their current jobs, overall, 38 per cent said they learnt it by doing it, in other words their 'training' was on the job (OJT). This sort of training was 27 per cent for pastoral workers and as high as 60 per cent for non-pastoral workers and 58 per cent for volunteers (see Table 11). Their (welfare workers with

OJT) average length of service was 13.4, 8 and 7.8 years respectively.

As we have seen already, as far as formal education was concerned, many of our respondents were well educated. Some of their education (e.g. degree in social work, pastoral theology) was directly relevant to their current roles as port-based welfare workers for seafarers. Seafarers welfare workers also have further opportunities for training organised by their parent organisations, by ICMA, ICSW, and Houston Maritime Ministry Training Program (see Appendix 4 for some training opportunities for port welfare workers).

Over a third (38 %) of welfare workers did not have any formal training to do their current jobs. Eighteen per cent said that they had multiple training courses before and during their current posts as well as having a relevant formal education). This was as high as 23 per cent for pastoral workers and as low as five per cent for non-pastoral workers.

Thirteen per cent of the respondents said that they did not have any particular training after starting their jobs but they came to the seafarer welfare sector with a relevant degree to begin with. Such as "University - pastoral counselling", or "Graduate of Christian Ministry."

Eleven per cent said that they had completed the ICSW Ship Welfare Visitors Course. This course seemed to be more or less equally attended by different groups of welfare workers: pastoral, non-pastoral and volunteers. Their attendance rates were 10 per cent, 14 per cent and 10 per cent respectively.

Overall eight per cent of the respondents received the ICMA Seafarer Ministry Training either in Hong Kong or Rotterdam. This training is mainly for pastoral welfare workers and 12 per cent of the pastoral workers within the respondents had attended. This was one percent for non-pastoral workers and two per cent for volunteers.

One said "I had a two day training programme by the head chaplain". Similar short crash course

training practices were reported by eight per cent of the respondents. A further four per cent of the respondents attended the Houston Maritime Ministry Training Program.

Table 11: What training have you received to do your current job?

	Pastoral workers (n=540)	Non-pastoral (n=129)	Volunteers (n=150)	All (n=819)
	%	%	%	%
Formal education relevant to the function	15.6	11.6	4.0	12.8
None/learnt it by doing	27.2	60.0	58.0	37.7
ICMA SMT	11.7	1.2	2.0	8.4
Houston School	3.9	1.2	4.0	3.7
ICSW ship welfare visitor course	10.0	14.0	10.0	10.6
Crash course/ short training	7.8	7.0	12.0	8.4
Multiple courses/training (including most of above)	23.9	4.7	10.0	18.3

It would be useful to see whether there has been any change over time in the training patterns of the port welfare workers. When the two age groups of 39 years and under and 40 (with the average age of 32) and over (with the average age of 57) are compared, there is a decline on the OJT training rate from 28 per cent for over 40s to 22 per cent for under 39s. Again the younger group of port welfare workers come to service with higher formal education experiences (22%) relevant to their posts compared with older groups (14%).

Both ICMA SMT and Houston School training are orientated towards new chaplains/welfare workers therefore it would be expected that the experiences of younger generations with these training programmes would be higher. In fact this is also the case.

One would expect that because of the older age categories of the volunteer workers, they might have influenced the changes in training patterns over time. However, this does not seem to have any impact on the differences over time because length of service corresponds with the age groups to say that average length of service is 5 years for under 39s and 13 years for over 40s. It would be relevant to compare the two groups as the age of the respondents corresponds with the length of service – the older the seafarer welfare workers are the longer the length of service. Older generations are more likely to have done more Ship Welfare Visitor courses, and had a shorter training ("crash course") compared with younger generations (see Table 12).

Table 12: Pastoral workers' age/length of time in service and training experience

	Age 39 and younger (n=69)	Age 40 and over (n=468)
	%	%
Formal education relevant to the function	21.6	14.1
None/learnt it by doing	21.7	27.6
ICMA SMT	13.0	11.5
Houston School	8.7	3.2
MNWB/ICSW ship welfare visitor course	4.3	10.9
Crash course/short training	4.3	8.3
Multiple courses/training (including most of above)	21.7	24.4
Average Age	32.4	57.0
Average years of service in seafarers welfare sector	5.1	12.7

Pastoral welfare workers were asked whether the training provided by the ICMA Seafarer Ministry Training (SMT) or Houston School matched the reality of their work. The majority (63%) of the pastoral workers emphasised that they did not have experience of either training courses. Twenty six per cent had experience of these training courses and found the courses relevant to their experience. Ten per cent attended these but said that the training was not relevant.

Pastoral welfare workers who said they did not have any experience of the ICMA Seafarer Ministry Training (SMT) or Houston School highlighted that their lack of experience mainly stemmed from lack of information about these courses. It also needs to be emphasised that some of the pastoral welfare workers who said "yes" that these courses were relevant to their work had some reservations. For example, they emphasised that these courses were "mostly relevant"; "only some subjects covered some parts of the job".

Some pastoral welfare workers who had experience of the ICMA Seafarer Ministry Training (SMT) or Houston School said that their experiences did not comply with reality in port and the way they operate their ministries. Some others were critical about the competence of some of the instructors. Others talk about lack of cohesiveness.

Seafarer welfare workers were asked to comment on their training needs in areas of: how to raise funds, how to handle seafarers justice cases, dealing with bereavement of a fellow seafarer or family member, dealing with family problems, working with multinational crews, working with multi-faith crews, financial management of a centre or welfare work in port, guidance on ship visits, how to recruit and retain volunteers, cooperation with other agencies in port, effective running of port welfare committees and the general knowledge of the shipping industry. For each area seafarer welfare workers were given three options to choose from including: a) I already had some training in this area; b) No I do not need training in this area; c) Yes I do need some training in this area.

When we look at the percentages of items where welfare workers who said "Yes I do need some training in this area", the item related to how to handle seafarers justice cases leads the way by 45%. This was followed by effective running of port welfare committees (40.2%); general knowledge of the shipping industry (34.8); how

to raise funds (34.6); dealing with bereavement of a fellow seafarer or family member (33%); working with multi-faith crews (32.4%); financial management of a centre or welfare work in port (28%); working with multinational crews (28%); dealing with family problems (25%); co-operation with other agencies in port (24%); and guidance on ship visits (19%) (see Table 13). What is interesting here is that there were some differences in the training and skill needs of each group. Non-pastoral workers stood out in each item of training because their training needs were well above the average percentage of three groups combined (i.e. "All").

Some items, including, seafarer justice cases, port welfare committees, knowledge of the shipping industry and working with multi-faith crews had a prime training importance for all the welfare workers regardless of their groups (percentages were relatively high and did not differ according to different groups).

Table 13: Training and skill needs – Percentage of who said "yes I do need some training in this area"

	Pastoral Workers	Non-Pastoral Workers	Volunteers	All
	%	%	%	%
How to handle seafarers justice cases (n=363)	42.5	54.5	45.7	45.0
Effective running of port welfare committees (n=321)	42.3	42.2	30.4	40.2
General knowledge of the shipping industry (n=282)	33.5	40.0	34.7	34.8
How to raise funds (n=282)	34.3	45.7	25.0	34.6
Dealing with bereavement of a fellow seafarer or family member (n=264)	25.6	53.3	41.3	33.0
Working with multi-faith crews (n=264)	30.7	40.0	31.2	32.4
Financial management of a centre or welfare work in port (n=225)	23.6	45.5	28.3	28.0
Working with multinational crews (n=228)	26.4	40.0	27.1	28.0
Dealing with family problems (n=204)	20.1	42.2	27.1	25.0
Co-operation with other agencies in port (n=192)	23.0	31.8	19.1	23.8
Guidance on ship visits (n=150)	14.7	31.1	20.4	18.5

One of the opportunities for welfare workers to meet their training and skills needs is the maritime ministry conferences. They could be host society conferences (such as AoS, MtS or NAMMA) or ICMA Conferences (regional or world-wide). Pastoral seafarer welfare workers were asked about their views on their host society conferences. One port chaplain said "not interested". And another said "It's not interesting for me". However, their views were very isolated. More or less everyone else had something positive to say about the host society conferences. They expressed the opinion that they were "informative", "good for networking", "good for education", "important for daily work", "valuable experience",

"team building", "information sharing", "provide opportunities for training" and so on.

An overwhelming majority (90.5%) of the pastoral workers were in favour of having inter-denominational regional conferences. Only just under 10% of them said they were not. The reasons that pastoral workers were in favour of regional conferences showed similar patterns to the national conferences. Strengthening networks, sharing experiences and learning from each other, training and networking mentioned regularly. In addition the importance of inter denominational and ecumenical cooperation were also highlighted. Some pastoral workers who were not in favour of regional interdenomi-national conferences said they simply did not gain much from them. However, others said no were not necessarily against the idea but had some constrains (lack of time, money and so on) to attend to such events.

Pastoral welfare workers were also asked about the importance of having interdenominational world conferences and 72 per cent said "yes" but 28 per cent said "no". Pastoral workers who were in favour of the worldwide conferences emphasised that the ship industry was global and seafarers sailed all over the world therefore it was important for the chaplains to get together on a global basis to exchange ideas and build global networks. They also talked about not having it very often – every five-years seemed to be a preferred option. Some also expressed that this would give port chaplains a global voice in working for seafarers' welfare work. Others also mentioned about ever changing times and emphasised that these occasions could give opportunities to discuss the future direction and respond to changes. The cost of organising and attending a global event and also the time spent on it were some of the main concerns of pastoral welfare workers who were not in favour of global interdenominational chaplaincy meetings.

Conclusions

Port-based welfare workers for seafarers have had an increasing significance for seafarers in the face of the decline of other service providers. For over a hundred years they have been providing important personal and pastoral services for seafarers, but as the maritime environment has changed so their role has changed. Seafarers have become more confined to their vessels and it has become very difficult for them to have access to shore-based services and facilities without the help of port welfare workers.

However, welfare workers for seafarers and their organisations are facing increasing challenges. The most immediate challenge seems to be the ageing profile of port welfare workers. Although they are willing to work as long as possible and some beyond retirement age the mature average age of the welfare workers suggests that the sector is facing challenges in recruitment and renewal. Perhaps the low status of port welfare workers is a concern. This might not only affect potential new comers to the sector but also their relation with other agencies in port.

Port-based welfare workers have tradition-ally been able to rely on the flexibility of ships' working routines and a sufficiently lengthy port stay to establish a relationship of trust with seafarers in need of personal advice and support. However, fast turnaround times of ships, reduced crew levels, the busy ship environment and intense workload when ships are in port, the location of new ports and terminal developments away from existing services (i.e. telecommunica-tions, transport), mixed nationality crews, and new port security regimes have placed increasing pressure on individual seafarers and seafarer welfare workers trying to provide port based services and facilities for seafarers.

The maritime missions and other maritime welfare organisations have always had to adjust their work to take account of changing social and economic conditions. The missions are voluntary organisations. They undoubtedly do good work.

They do not restrict their services to those of their own religion; in some instances they provide prayer rooms, which are available to all faiths. Despite all this, they depend on voluntary financial help and services and are almost everywhere under-funded. Sometimes seafarer welfare workers need to cover more than one port and those ports that have seafarers centres may not have sufficient staff or money to meet the needs of all seafarers, who may be increasingly unable to take advantage of port-based local services.

This study confirms that port welfare committees could play an important role in the provision of welfare services and facilities for seafarers. They also have potential to resolve the problems of access to vessels, strengthening the relations between port welfare workers and the other agencies in ports such as port authorities, port security officers, ship agents, and trade union representatives.

Training on the job is the most common form of training for port-based welfare workers and this is particularly so for non-pastoral workers and volunteers. These two group of welfare workers expressed greater training needs than pastoral workers. Training on how to handle seafarers' was identified as a particular priority by all port-based welfare workers.

Most of the port-based welfare workers had the view that seafarer centres strengthened their identity and there was a need for them. However, the fact cannot be ignored that the majority of port-based welfare workers who expressed the view that there was no need for seafarer centres in their ports already had them.

The 1997 study on port-based welfare services for seafarers documented that two-thirds of seafarers did not see a port-based welfare worker aboard their vessels during their contracts at the time. It needs to be emphasised that although the figure seems very low, looking from the perspectives of port-based welfare workers and the obstacles they face, reaching a third of the seafarer population aboard their vessels is an achievement. The findings of this study suggest that this figure could increase in the future as a substantial majority of the port-welfare workers emphasised the importance of outreach welfare work. However, how they will overcome the challenges preventing this remains to be seen.

The respondents suggested a number of policies and practices that could be successfully introduced or developed by port-based welfare workers, their organisations and the other agencies concerned with seafarers' welfare. Among these, the following recommendations could be adopted to improve the services offered by port-based welfare workers for seafarers. As documented by this study, some of these recommendations are already in practice, however, they need to be more widespread across the welfare sector.

- **Port-based welfare organisations need to review their recruitment strategies and to consider balancing the age profiles of their employees and volunteers.**

- **There is a need to emphasise the importance of the work of port-based welfare workers. The maritime welfare organisations should increase the profiles of their employees and volunteers.**

- **Maritime welfare organisations should recognise their employees' and volunteers' work and provide feedback.**

- **Despite it being six years since its introduction, the ISPS Code remains one of the main obstacles to welfare workers visiting ships and gaining access to ports. Therefore there is a need to address the negative impact of the ISPS Code on the work of port-based welfare workers for seafarers.**

- **Welfare workers for seafarers identified the ship visits they made as being one of the most popular services. However, there is a need to review the purpose of the ship visits and the most effective way of visiting ships. Pastoral welfare workers' ship visits primarily for the pastoral care of seafarers**

do not always meet the general needs of seafarers. It is recommended that when visiting ships the broader needs (transport, communication and so on) of seafarers should also be taken into account.

- It is recommended that when visiting ships in busy ports it is better to reach as many seafarers as possible and offer basic services (telephone cards, transport, news, information leaflets and so on) to meet the general need of seafarers. However given the opportunity, the best practice is to reach a limited number of seafarers and build a good rapport with them.

- It is recommended that ships visitors should provide information to seafarers about the existence of available facilities and services and about other agencies in port as this helps to increase seafarers' usage and access.

- There is a need to have full time dedicated chaplains/welfare workers to better meet the needs of seafarers.

- There is a need to address the concerns of welfare workers about the excessive time being spent on fundraising and administration activities.

- The existence of PWCs in ports provides or generates some extra funds to maintain and develop existing services and facilities. The PWCs resulted in better coordination of services and through PWCs port welfare workers get to know other key players in their ports. Some talked about the benefits of sharing information and best practices. It is recommended that all the agencies in the seafarers' welfare sector should recognise the importance of the PWCs for seafarers' welfare.

- Extra efforts need to be made for the establishment of PWCs in ports where the system does not exist.

- There is a need to conduct a further study to identify the best working models of the PWCs. This study should also highlight the challenges faced in forming and running of these committees.

- Seafarer welfare workers need to be encouraged to communicate with other welfare workers in other ports within and beyond their national borders. Obstacles preventing such activities need to be addressed (such as workload of welfare workers, personal reasons (such as being close to retirement age or negative past experiences) and different ways of working amongst different organisations.

- The importance of Ecumenical working for seafarers' welfare needs to be emphasised and encouraged.

- There are quite a few ports where there is no provision of transport services for seafarers and in some other ports there is a very limited transport service provided. Welfare organisations, in particular The ITF Seafarers Trust need to resolve these problems.

- Associated problems with the provision of transport included time constraints, running costs, the limited space in vehicles and lack of personnel to operate them and problems with local taxi drivers need to be addressed.

- About one fifth of the port welfare workers did not provide telecommunication facilities for seafarers, a service which is appreciated. The main problems associated with the provision of telecommunication facilities such as lack of equipment to meet the demand and maintenance costs need to be resolved.

- A considerable number of welfare workers did not have experience of the training provided by the ICMA Seafarer Ministry Training (SMT) or Houston School due to these courses being aimed at trained

pastoral welfare workers. Organisations that provide this training need to devise training content aimed at volunteers and seafarers' centre staff.

- A sizable number of welfare workers who experienced these courses emphasised that they did not match the reality of their work. The organisations providing these courses need to continuously review and appropriately regulate the content, relevance and quality and competency of course modules and presenters

- Training needs of the port welfare workers in particular: how to handle seafarers' justice cases; effective running of port welfare committees; general knowledge of the shipping industry; how to raise funds; dealing with bereavement of a fellow seafarer or family member; working with multi-faith crews; financial management of a centre or welfare work in port; working with multinational crews; and co-operation with other agencies in port need to be addressed.

- Some of these training areas including seafarer justice cases, port welfare committees, knowledge of the shipping industry and working with multi-faith crews, had a prime training importance for all the welfare workers regardless of their groups. Training in these areas in particular needs to be prioritised.

- One of the opportunities for welfare workers to meet their training and skills needs is the maritime ministry conferences. They could be host society conferences, inter-denominational regional conferences or interdenominational world conferences and need to be organised at regular intervals.

- The main problems for welfare workers which prevent them from attending these

events are cost and the time spent in attending which should be addressed.

- In view of the general declining ability of the pastoral welfare workers and seafarers' centre staff to attend international conferences and training events, subsidies and grant-aided support should be available to all welfare workers wherever they work or reside.

- Welfare workers suggested best strategies about how to respond to challenges in their services for seafarers. These strategies included: outreach work and training to this end, close communication and cooperation with the other agencies in ports, publicising information about the services available to seafarers, adopting effective strategies for fund raising and getting financial support, recruitment of volunteers and how to keep them motivated, meeting spiritual needs of seafarers from different religions and belief systems, and the usefulness of the port welfare committees in responding to challenges. These suggestions from the welfare workers need to be taken into consideration by the organisations and agencies concerned with seafarers welfare.

- Welfare workers expressed some strong views for and against seafarer centre buildings. It is recommended that current problems associated with the effective running of seafarer centres need to be reviewed.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Data

There are no statistics available on the number of welfare workers for seafarers. However, The International Christian Maritime Organisation (ICMA), which represents 27 various Christian churches and communities, through its members represents 526 seafarers' centres and 927 chaplains in 126 countries. There are also non-ICMA member Christian organisations such as The Seamen's Christian Friend Society (SCFS), which is active in 40 ports around the world. Additionally, there are seafarer centres run by the government or trade union or non-profit organisations. For example, United Seamen's Service (USS) currently (March 2010) has seven port centres open.

The analysis of the ICMA online directory suggests that on average there are 2.1 pastoral welfare workers per seafarer centre. This alone brings the total number of the ICMA member pastoral welfare workers to around 1,100 pastoral welfare workers. There are ports without seafarer centres where pastoral welfare workers provide welfare services attached to the local parish or other organisations. It is also clear from the ICMA Online Directory that in some cases pastoral workers cover more than one port. In some cases as many as five different ports. Moreover, not all ports have a seafarer centre or welfare workers for seafarers. It appears safe to assume that there are around 2,000 pastoral welfare workers for seafarers around the world. Therefore, our sample of 699 pastoral port welfare workers represents about one third of all the pastoral workers.

Non-pastoral welfare workers, such as centre managers, duty managers, administrators, centre workers, shop/bar keepers, "non-pastoral" ship visitors, drivers and trainees, usually work attached to a seafarer centre. Seafarer centres vary in size and functions. Some of them are ecumenical centres shared with many maritime ministry welfare workers and other welfare agencies and some others are drop in centres run

by one or two personnel. It would be realistic to expect on average four (full time equivalent) non-pastoral workers working per seafarer centre. If we estimate the number of seafarer centres at around 600, it is safe to assume that there are approximately 2,400 non-pastoral seafarer welfare workers. Our 213 non-pastoral worker respondents represent around 10 % of all non-pastoral workers.

It is very difficult to estimate accurately the number of volunteers. The respondents to the survey averaged 26 hours of work per week and a length of service of an average of 20 years. These are the kind of people upon whom the welfare sector depends very heavily and who are considered by the societies to form the backbone of the work. We are therefore confident that we have covered well this very important sector of the welfare population within this study.

Appendix 2: The most popular services

When asked what the most popular service that they provide for seafarers was, overall 32 per cent of the respondents said ship visits. This was followed by telephone facilities including phone cards (28%); Transportation (14%); spiritual

care and religious literature (11%); News and Newspapers (5%); local information and maps (5%); counselling (4%) and internet and Wi-Fi (3%).

The most popular service that you provide to seafarers

	Pastoral Workers % (n=564)	Non-Pastoral Workers % (n=135)	Volunteers % (n=150)	All % (n=849)
	%	%	%	%
Ship visits	36.7	20.0	24.0	31.8
Telephone/ telephone cards	25.0	44.4	26.0	28.3
Spiritual care/ religious literature	14.4	4.4	2.0	10.6
Transportation	9.6	17.8	28.0	14.1
News/ newspapers	4.3	4.4	6.0	4.6
Counselling	4.3	-	4.0	3.5
Local information/ maps	3.2	2.2	10.0	4.2
Internet/Wi-Fi	2.7	6.7	-	2.8

Appendix 3: Port welfare committees

A document prepared by the UK Merchant Navy Welfare Board (MNWB, 2009), states that Ports Welfare Committee (PWC) is a forum in which representatives of all those organisations concerned with the welfare of seafarers visiting their ports (it could also include domiciled seafarers in the port area) can meet on a regular basis. A Committee can focus on one large port or cover a wider area that might include a number of ports of various sizes. In some states PWCs can be part of a National Welfare Board, which will act as the coordinating organisation for each committee. Currently, only those states that have ratified ILO Convention 163 are obligated, under Recommendation 173, to set up Port Welfare Committees (and Welfare Boards). The ILO Consolidated Maritime Convention 2006

includes all the requirements and recommendations laid down in 163 and 173 and will be more widely ratified.

A main function of the PWC is to ensure that the welfare needs of seafarers using the port/s, or domiciled in the area, are met as effectively as possible without unnecessary duplication of services. This may include: The provision of pastoral and non pastoral care and advice; the provision of seafarers' centres with a range of services; low cost telecommunications and Internet facilities. Easy access between the ship and local amenities within the necessary constraints of port security and safety regulations, access to medical services, access to legal advice, access to places of worship and so on. Of course similar functions could be performed in a port without PWC's by voluntary, state aided or maritime ministry organisations in a port. However, PWC's has the potential to bring all the shipping industry constituencies together and ensure minimum standards are met in seafarer welfare facilities and provisions for seafarers.

Membership of a PWC should include all those organisations who, directly or indirectly, may become involved in welfare issues. Including port authorities, port operators, local ship owners, crew agencies, local ship agents, port chaplains or ship welfare visitors, seafarer centre managers, trade union representatives and so on.

Appendix 4: Some major training courses available for port welfare workers

The ICMA flagship training programme is called Seafarers' Ministry Training (SMT) which is run annually. The programme is managed by two teams, one based in Rotterdam and the other in Hong Kong. The venue of the SMT alternates between the two cities, and has recently also moved to other parts of the world to enable more chaplains to attend. The training follows the terms of reference set by ICMA, and offers its students presentations on prescribed themes delivered by expert resource persons. In the 2009

training programme there were four students from Africa, four from South America, one was from Bangladesh, another from the UAE, and four from Europe. The attendance of students from developing countries was made possible by a grant received from the International Transport Workers Federation Seafarers' Trust.

Port chaplains who are employed by ICMA member societies and who have no more than 18 months' experience of seafarers' ministry may be considered to participate in the SMT programme. Each application must be endorsed by the management of the employing society.

The other training program being developed by ICMA is the Crisis Preparedness Training. The objective of this training is to prepare port chaplains for crisis situations experienced by seafarers such as accidents and disasters which may involve death or injury. The course deals with how port chaplains could provide care in such circumstances to minimise the damage to people's psychological, wellbeing and aid their recovery. The course is also intended to teach chaplains how best to attend to seafarers from various Christian traditions and other religions. It alerts students to the sensitivities of faith communities to dealing with death and crises. This course is deemed to be suitable for all chaplains and will shortly be available through online training.

The ICMA also has International Sailing Chaplains' Training. The objective of the course is to give a basic introduction to the sailing Chaplains ministry. It enables participants to work as sailing chaplains aboard different vessels. The course subjects include STCW-95 basic training. The STCW is an IMO convention which sets the standard for seafarer certifications. Chaplains here obtain experience equivalent to minimum requirement certificate training to ease to process of gaining opportunities to sail as chaplains. The course takes place in Finland and a substantial part of it involves Chaplains being trained in a maritime training centre. Further course subjects include an introduction to health issues on board, a general overview to

the ship and those living and working on it. Also how to assist a person on board using limited resources and how to deal with disaster and crisis. This training is suitable for experienced seafarer welfare workers.

Another course available to all seafarer welfare workers is the Ship Welfare Visitors Course. It is currently run in cooperation between the UK Merchant Navy Welfare Board and the International Committee on Seafarers' Welfare. It is a two-day basic training course equipping ship visitors with a full appreciation of protocol, personal safety and security issues relating to port facilities and ships. The course provides standard-ized training for maritime welfare practitioners. The full administrative responsibility for the international roll-out of this course now resides with the secretariat of the ICSW.

Houston Maritime Ministry Training Programme (The Houston School) is developed by the pastoral staff of Houston Seafarer Centre. It is annual international maritime ministry training for port chaplains, other pastoral team members, ship visitors and seafarer centre managers. The course places 12 students and the candidates are required to have at least one year's experience of working in the maritime ministry. The topics range from practical knowledge of ship visiting to legal and contractual issues dealing with seafarers.

References

ITF/MORI (1996) *Seafarers' Living Condition Survey*, International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF), London

Kahveci, E. (2007) *Port-based Welfare Services for Seafarers*, Seafarers International Research Centre, Cardiff University, Cardiff