

Youth & Policy Special Edition:
The Next Five Years: Prospects for young people

Youth Work

Tom Wylie

Abstract

This article focuses on the place of youth work which is presented as a distinctive form of practice with young people complementing other approaches such as schooling or social work. In summarising the place of young people in contemporary Britain, it notes the particular pressures of poverty and unemployment on their lives. The main features of the New Labour and subsequently the Coalition governments' policies towards youth work are identified with particular reference to the consequences of recent austerity policies that have taken place from 2010 onwards. It offers suggestions on how youth work can be re-built.

Key words: Young People; Youth Work; Social Policy; Voluntary Sector.

THERE HAS NEVER been a golden age for youth work in England.¹ Only occasionally has its contribution to the range of services for young people been appreciated and new funding allocated. These periods included a few years in the 1960s after the Albemarle Report (Ministry of Education, 1960), and again in the first decade of the 21st century with 'Resourcing Excellent Youth Services' (DfES, 2002) and 'Aiming High' (HM Treasury, 2007). Most of the time it has had to 'make do and mend'. With no capital to replace outworn buildings and, in the absence of national standards for what should be available in communities, recurrent spending has drifted towards capricious decision-making by local authorities mixed with voluntary endeavour and charitable fund-raising. From the late 1990s the National Lottery contributed *ad hoc* to different themes concerned with young people, but this source diminished with the demands of the 2012 Olympic Games. By then, the full force of the Coalition government's austerity programme was shredding much local youth work, especially those aspects funded by local authorities, and the likelihood of these cuts continuing casts a long shadow over the years ahead.

Sporadic policy interest in the contribution which youth work could make to the range of policies and services for young people often reflects a lack of clarity about the very term 'youth work'. For this author, the term 'youth work' encompasses three key features that make it distinctive when compared to other ways of working with young people such as schooling and social work. These three features are: a primary focus on the personal and social development of young people; the use of a distinctive methodology which may be described as 'experiential learning', alongside the crucial role of voluntary relationships with trusted and skilled adults; and adherence to a set of ethical principles which, *inter alia*, put the needs of young people first and sees them as individuals

rather than an undifferentiated mass. Since youth work is provided by a range of bodies in a myriad of settings it has often struggled to present a coherent definition to policy makers. This would be so, even if the disputatious youth field could itself reach agreement on its central propositions about how it meets the diverse needs and changing circumstances and interests of the young.

While many young people continue to flourish, substantial numbers lie within a population of some 13 million who are living in poverty (DWP 2014). The gulf is widening, in financial, human and social capital, between those who are doing well and those left behind (Dorling, 2013). Employment in secure jobs for young people and young adults has fallen sharply, often the only offering is of minimum wage jobs on zero hours contracts in a casualised labour force, thus entrenching poverty and deprivation (Shildrick et al., 2010). Social mobility has stalled and the constraining contours of wealth, class and privilege are evident. The recession of 2008-14 was particularly brutal for people without qualifications in those regions which have suffered long-term economic decline and changes to the social security benefits system (with added sanctions) have helped drive many young people deeper into poverty (Clark and Heath, 2014). The consequences of unequal, underachieving societies are well evidenced (Wilkinson and Pickett, 2010), but for young people in particular, a raft of poor welfare outcomes such as teenage pregnancy, youth offending and youth homelessness are often highlighted (Coles *et al*, 2010). Despite difficult economic times, public support for welfare has declined markedly over the last decade. A lack of social solidarity and collective commitment to spending on social welfare means that it is likely to be constrained for years to come. Personal debt and family poverty result in limited opportunities for new, imaginative cultural experiences. Anxiety about educational achievement and precarious future employment means that for many young people it is not a good time in which to grow up. For some, their natural exuberance and aspiration may change to passive depression behind closed doors; for others, their peer loyalties can imprison them in anti-social gang cultures. Despite its occasional extravagant claims, youth work cannot remedy all these social ills. Nevertheless, cuts in public spending are having a devastating effect on what is offered to young people in their leisure time by the local authority and voluntary sectors alike. A service such as youth work with a weak statutory base is always vulnerable during times of economic difficulty. In consequence, the approach to advocacy for young people and for youth work has to be re-thought and re-fought.

The 'New Labour' legacy

History will judge how successful the Labour government of 1997-2010 was in managing the UK economy in the face of global corporate power; on its approach to reforming public services; and on its funding of social welfare including hospitals and schools. There can be no doubt, however, that despite occasional bursts of financial sunshine and sporadic policy interest, it missed the opportunity to develop a vibrant youth work sector which would have the resilience to ride out what became an ice storm once a Conservative-led Coalition took office. In the later Labour years there was a little capital to improve the decayed building stock. A few short-term programmes were

introduced; marginal improvement was made to the legal basis for youth work; and some attention paid to strengthening the voice of young people in decision-making. Little was done to enhance professional training, although there was some attempt to encourage generic training for various youth-facing professionals working in different sectors (Davies, 2008). Many of those who worked in the youth sector felt diminished by the absence of consistent policy support for their values and approaches, by unpredictable funding and by the endless re-structuring of services, especially for work with those aged over 16.

Labour's eventual configuration, from 2005, of local Children's Services followed the botched design and clumsy implementation of its previous Connexions policy and structure: this even sought to suppress the name 'youth worker' in favour of 'personal adviser' (who was intended to have a triage function and not actually do much by way of personal and social development). Similarly, authors of official documents struggled to use the term 'youth work', which they saw as too vague and dangerously *laissez-faire*, preferring to speak of 'positive activities' to imply the brisk air of vigorous intervention and target-setting favoured by New Labour (albeit with echoes of Baden-Powell). Despite its good intentions, the all-encompassing concept of 'Every Child Matters' (DfES, 2003) served to further marginalise the place of young people as distinct from children; of their personal development as distinct from safeguarding; and of youth work as a profession which can complement others and not be subsumed by them. This new structure reflected a continuing search for the holy grail of joined-up services – another New Labour mantra – but came with a good deal of vagueness about what it meant in practice for local youth work, for support to voluntary bodies, and for the roles of those in the workforce. It also sought much greater reporting of perceived outcomes for the young – preferably to be immediately apparent – which did not sit easily with the general philosophy of youth work and its emphasis on process rather than product (Ord, 2007; Spence and Devanney, 2007; Young, 1999).

The Labour government's 'Aiming High' review of July 2007 held out the prospect of a 10 year strategy which would give greater access to a wide range of opportunities, stronger approaches to youth empowerment and the development of a skilled work force (HM Treasury, 2007). Importantly, as it was led by the Treasury, this review had both policy and financial heft, but any leap forward was derailed by the banking crisis and then by the change of government.

Enter a Coalition government

Despite their rhetoric, modern general elections rarely provide a critical break between the approaches of different administrations. There is often much continuity in policy, albeit with some stronger emphases, for example after 2010, towards reducing welfare support and promoting the academies programme for schools. More profoundly, the Conservative-led coalition elected in 2010, introduced severe levels of cuts on public services which fell disproportionately on urban and northern local authorities and on youth work everywhere (Taylor-Gooby and Stoker, 2011). It

also emphasised three underpinning themes in its approach to young people. First, encouragement of high levels of individual (and family) responsibility: young people were to become the authors of their own destiny and take increasing responsibility for establishing individual career paths and managing their personal lifestyles. Deep-rooted social problems, including poverty, were thus to be seen as an expression of individual dysfunction, rather than vice versa. Young adults who could not manage to find housing which would enable them to live independently were expected to stay in the family home. All were to be inculcated at the age of 16 into civic responsibilities through a scheme of National Citizen Service. Second, as a matter of principle not just of financial stringency, the role of the state towards providing wide-ranging local opportunities for the personal and social development of the young would be reduced. Instead, national government emphasised the need for local decisions rather than offering national direction or setting standards for local practice (Padley, 2013). Third, within a rather nebulous concept of the ‘Big Society’, the private, philanthropic and voluntary sectors were expected to fill the gap left by the withdrawal of the state; indeed, they were encouraged to do so by devices such as commissioning and, if possible, by ‘payment by results’ mechanisms (Barnard, 2010). Since few voluntary bodies have the financial capacity to operate to any scale, especially while awaiting payments for their services, they are tempted into acting as ‘bid candy’ to enable larger organisations or profit-making companies to win government contracts. Absent was a clear system of local democratic accountability. Nor was there an adequate balance of those responsibilities to be carried by individuals, as a reflection of their personal agency, and those to be discharged by the state through supportive and enabling social structures.

At the outset of the Coalition’s term of office, youth work in England still found itself as a policy responsibility of the Department for Education with one of the junior ministers as its political lead, along with his usual extensive list of other responsibilities, such as children in care. A year after taking office the government launched its main, indeed only, policy document entitled ‘Positive for Youth’ (DfE, 2011). As in several previous Labour documents, this sought to cover the wide landscape of policy areas affecting young people and youth work as such, had a relatively marginal place and little specific policy drive or associated initiative. Much reference was made to the important contribution of young people’s views on provision both locally and nationally, but despite such warm words the actions drew back from the more specific steps which the previous Labour government had begun to take to strengthen the role of young people, for example in participatory budgeting and local service design (HM Treasury, 2007). Saying more about an enhanced role for the British Youth Council or the UK Youth Parliament was little compensation, especially as there was little evidence that government actually listened to them, though some local authorities and a few commercial bodies continued to see benefit in drawing on the views of young people in designing and delivering their services.

The only significant new development with youth work implications was the introduction of National Citizen Service, intended as a blend of a personal development programme and

community service in school holidays and targeted, at least initially, at a small section of the 16-year old cohort. The Department of Communities and Local Government funded a modest grant programme for some uniformed youth organisations such as the army cadets and the Scouts but the dominating narrative throughout the whole term of the Coalition government was the savage reductions in overall financial support to local authorities and thus, inevitably, to services less sheltered by statutory obligations. Youth work was a major loser in this process.

Since government no longer collects reliable figures, and Ofsted has effectively ceased to inspect youth work, it is difficult to provide an accurate account of the reduction on Youth Service spending across England since 2010: one official figure suggested over 20% but most estimates put it nearer a third, with some authorities making reductions of 100% (Network of Regional Youth Work Units, 2014). Inevitably, the bulk of these cuts have been made to those clubs, centres and detached work provided directly by local authorities. Some places have attempted to shift responsibility to local or national voluntary bodies but the scale, diversity and probably the quality of provision, have fallen sharply. As overall levels of volunteering in disadvantaged areas has diminished with the recession, much has been left to the continued commitment of a few individuals. What remains in the local authority sector has often moved away from open-access provision to more targeted work sometimes using general ‘hubs’ rather than neighbourhood centres. There has been a small-scale emergence of ‘mutuals’ – forms of worker /community co-operatives – though these still need to secure finance from somewhere (Network of Regional Youth work Units, 2014). The voluntary sector, which has long sought a larger role and has been, on occasion, critical of the perceived priorities and expectations of local authorities, now often finds itself over-burdened and under-supported for the task; a demonstration of the injunction ‘be careful what you wish for’. A number of voluntary bodies, for example Rathbone and Fairbridge, have gone into liquidation or merged. Any hope for substantial commercial entrepreneurial activity has not been fulfilled as individuals and bodies can find it difficult to marry charitable purpose with profit. Several universities have withdrawn from providing qualifying training for professional youth and community work as it no longer fits the academic profile the institutions seek and, in any case, the job market in direct youth work for such graduates has fallen substantially, affecting recruitment.

The all-party Education Select Committee, alert to the sudden decline in leisure time opportunities for the young, mounted an Enquiry. Based on the traditional approach of a series of hearings from expert witnesses, it produced a report strongly critical of the DfE’s overall stewardship of youth work and very sceptical of the National Citizen Service (House of Commons, 2011). While recognising the important place of open-access provision and urging the youth sector to be more concerned about demonstrating its effectiveness, it expressed doubts about some form of ‘payment by results’ from government, including social investment bonds, and about the prospects of the private sector stepping in to invest in such unfashionable work. It called for more leadership from the DfE, especially in respect of setting expectations and standards for local authorities. It did not get it. The DfE, especially its then zealous Secretary of State, was pre-occupied by his agenda of

re-modelling the school curriculum and qualifications and in turning all schools into academies. He also wanted to shield his schools' budget by shedding the Department's more marginal functions. In the summer of 2013 policy responsibility for youth work was transferred from the DfE to the Cabinet Office: for the first time since direct state intervention began in 1939, youth work was no longer rooted in educational policy.

Reports by HM Inspectors had regularly described the effective contribution youth work made to young people's lives (HMI 1987, 1990) but the sector was not well-equipped to face harsh economic winds. Since these now bore down on all public services, how was youth work to argue its case in competition with cancer screening or care for the elderly? Or even with other parts of the wide children's and young people's sector including early years and youth justice. Making the case for investment in youth work had rarely been more important. Or more difficult.

Advocating for the cause

The decimation of youth work has not gone unchallenged. A number of localities have campaigned against the loss of particular youth provision in their neighbourhoods though generally with little success. But the national campaigning voice is weak especially when compared, say, with the arts or library sectors. A coherent, consistent argument has not appeared and national media engagement has been virtually zero. By contrast, in the run-up to the general election of 1997, the National Youth Agency had drawn together all the key representative bodies – of local authorities, voluntary sector, trade unions and young people themselves throughout the UK, to agree a persuasive campaigning text, 'Agenda for a Generation' (NYA 1996) – and backed this up by running events at party conferences, engaging with parliamentarians, and securing a regular national media presence throughout the Labour years. Now, faced with the much greater challenge to the very survival of youth work across the country, the sector fragmented and key national bodies, including the National Youth Agency and the National Council for Voluntary Youth Services, have retreated from playing their part on a joint battlefield, hunkering down and defending their own organisational interests. The most vigorous campaigning has been left to the Community and Youth Workers section of 'Unite', the trade union, with support from the 'In Defence of Youth Work' (IDYW) network which has sought valiantly and persuasively to articulate the key features of youth work's principles and practice (IDYW, 2009). One difficulty in creating a common voice for youth work is the longstanding disagreement between parts of the diverse voluntary sector, which do not always define themselves as doing youth work, and elements of the professionalised local authority system which helped to maintain the infrastructure and financial support as well as providing directly in some places where the more traditional voluntary sector was reluctant to tread. Some academics have long urged the voluntary sector to keep its distance from the state, to rely on organic development in communities, and even seemed to prefer the use of the term 'informal educators' rather than 'youth workers' (Jeffs and Smith, 1992).

Structural issues aside, this author has written elsewhere of three different approaches to how the case for youth work is often made (Wylie, 2013). The three traditions of advocacy may be caricatured as the ‘romantics’, the ‘managerialists’ and the ‘pragmatists’. The first tend to emphasise the stories of how youth workers support individuals and groups of young people and generally eschew any talk of outcomes (the IDYW network has been a key proponent of this argument). Instead of metrics, they assert the enduring nature of the voluntary relationship and the convivial conversation round the pool table. Although this is an important dissenting, almost quixotic, position to hold in the face of a target-driven culture, tales of personal success with individuals can add colour to a narrative but, in the experience of this author, rarely convince even sympathetic politicians or civil servants in good times. The second approach seeks to win support by accepting the latest ideology or national policy approaches. In recent years such approaches have sought to identify or target particular groups and specify outcomes. It is this approach that is reflected, for example in work commissioned from The Young Foundation (McNeil et al, 2012). Those who pursue a rather mechanistic, target – driven approach appear to have little understanding of how good youth workers, whether centre – or street-based, engage with young people in their communities over the long term. The third group – the ‘principled pragmatists’ – endeavours to draw from the deep well of youth work values but believes that youth projects need to be able to express cogently their contribution to the broader goals of contemporary social policy, using appropriate metrics as well as stories to demonstrate impact. In the case of ‘Unite’ and others (including this author), they argue for an important continuing role for the state as a facilitator and, where necessary, as a provider (Unite, 2010, 2013).

As the Coalition has continued its slash-and-burn approach to local services, some ideologues have gladly asserted their intention to ‘shrink the state’, though they have not been so keen on picking up the bill when the consequences arrive by way of unemployment or poor health (Dorling, 2013; Kessler, 2007). The ‘Big Society’ has proved not to be the solution for the more intractable social issues or problematic localities and the term has faded from the political rhetoric.

Funding pressures during this long period of pitiless austerity re-opened a longstanding debate on priorities. Youth work has always aspired to be universal and has usually resisted any suggestion that it should focus, or target, its activities just on those disaffected with life or in trouble with society’s institutions (Davies, 2008; IDYW 2009). Moreover, services for the poor often become poor services, as well as extremely stigmatizing. Nevertheless, the weak funding of local authority youth services may reflect not only doubts about their efficacy, especially in the form of seemingly unstructured activity in youth clubs (as illustrated in a misused and damaging study (Feinstein et al, 2007)); it also expressed a lack of engagement by middle class parents on behalf of their children who were not encouraged to participate in council-run provision. Whatever the explanation, money has never been made available for youth work to be established as a universal service and, in practice, local authority youth services, and some voluntary sector projects, have tended to concentrate in areas of socio-economic disadvantage in order to offer opportunities otherwise

denied. This can be argued as a wise allocation of limited public resource; indeed as one which is socially just and representing an approach sometimes described as ‘progressive universalism’ or what some theologians call ‘the option for the poor’. This focus – of providing opportunities for the more disadvantaged – is a rather different stance on how to shape priorities than by targeting particular individuals or groups, such as those caught up in the justice system; but youth work as a whole has been reluctant to embrace it, even in respect of public spending in the sector.

Good youth work; prospects for practice

The popular and dominant academic perceptions of youth often view them rather stereotypically, frequently focusing on the ‘deviants’, the deficits and on intermittent moral panics such as gang culture or teenage pregnancy. In fact, notwithstanding considerable diversity in the youth cohort, the adolescent years overall remain a dynamic developmental phase in the life cycle that can offer a chance to build on physical and neurological changes, to help some young people over the emotional roadblocks of disorderly homes or insecure environments, and to change the trajectory of their lives for the better. Effective educational practice can use the assets of these years, not least their concern for others, their friendships and their personal drive for agency. Some services are better placed than others to help facilitate successful transitions to adulthood; schools for instance, may often be seen as purely instrumental and controlling institutions and, in any case are not present in over 80% of young people’s time, nor do many concern themselves with young people’s needs in the round. Effective non-formal education and support through youth work can make a difference by establishing dialogue and reciprocity with the young. Youth work’s core strength lies in the fine grain of how trusted adults build and sustain voluntary relationships with individuals and groups, aiming at their growth and development. It can offer young people space for reflection, new experiences, even moments of joy – for youth work is concerned about young people’s lives in the present not only about what they may become. It requires workers who can seize encounters ‘on the wing’, not just in structured programmes. Workers who will stick by those often deemed as ‘troubled’ who may have few continuing, supportive relationships with adults. Over time, successful practice helps those young people who need it to make changes in their behaviour and take those chances which are within their reach. As well as helping individuals with benefit claims, sexual exploitation or brushes with the justice system, it also involves encouraging access to cultural experiences such as theatres and galleries and thus strengthens their skills and confidence to participate freely in unusual surroundings.

Increasingly, a key activity will be that of building partnerships and working with others for changes which will improve the lives of young people in their communities and in those institutions, such as schools, which are meant to serve them. Such tasks, and curriculum design and evaluation in non-formal settings, have always demanded a high level of skill from youth workers. So the development of a competent, idealistic workforce, both voluntary and professional, requires a training system nationwide to make available a range of qualifications to meet the needs of

individuals in different roles. Good youth workers think about their practice and take responsibility for becoming better at it; the stories of youth work can have impact if they are shared and analysed by practitioners themselves for the nuances of how they make contact and work developmentally with young people (IDYW, 2013). All youth workers need continued professional development if they are to keep their skills and knowledge up to date. They have to learn how to apply their approaches and values in changing circumstances, for example in handling potentially confidential disclosure, in working with gangs or dealing with embryonic political extremism. Youth workers need easier access to research; to cogent interpretation and critical analysis of policy; to stimulating journals; to reasonably priced seminars and conferences shaped to promote debate not conformity; and to international experience to redress the insular perspectives of much English youth work. The sector needs champions: bodies and alliances which help youth work better express its role, inform and lobby parliamentarians, celebrate young people's achievement, and challenge not only policy-makers but also the sector itself. Perhaps reflecting a general distaste for quantitative approaches, the youth sector is not good at building a cogent economic case with evidence of impact and the conditions which make it so. Ensuring youth work receives the recognition it deserves requires a commitment to build a strong evidence base to support its potential impact (Wenham, 2015).

While consideration of the roles and skills of adults and the structural configuration of local services are important, it is also necessary to enhance those structures and processes which enable young people, individually and collectively, to give their own testimony about their needs, to be involved in local budget-setting, to support their peers, and to learn how to make decisions by creating and running more projects for themselves. Good youth work, through assisting the voices of young people to be expressed, can influence wider policies and services affecting their well-being (Right Here, 2014). As with local youth councils, they also play a part in developing democratic civic engagement, a feature which will be even more necessary if the franchise is extended to age 16.

As well as the variety of specialist voluntary organisations, there remains a place for the neighbourhood open-access centre, ideally acting as a gateway for groups and individuals to engage in more structured programmes or experiences as well as association with their peers. Local services for the young need to be able to adapt quickly in order to meet immediate, often complex needs, as well as offering longitudinal provision which can be there routinely as young people grow up. Careful consideration is required on where youth work should position itself alongside other local services for the young, notably schools and colleges but also the neglected arena of the arts, especially drama, music, film, dance and the social media. At its best, youth work has been a service shaped by local imperatives so, as a national drive to offer direction diminishes, the consideration has to be how it can establish its place within varied local structures which identify needs and determine, plan and fund the shape of provision for young people, for example through local authority Health and Wellbeing boards as well as the more traditional educational structures, now increasingly fragmented.

While youth work has an educational role, concerned primarily with personal and social development, it can play its part before problems become deep-seated. Whether this role can be funded through some form of social investment is more doubtful since it is immensely difficult to attribute long-term outcomes to particular interventions except in very narrow circumstances (See Coles et al., 2010). But just as doubtful is whether the form of Youth Service structure envisaged by the Albemarle and Thompson Reports (DES, 1982) can now be re-created as the organisational basis within which the distinctive approach of youth work can be secure and its practice develop. The post-Albemarle years created a space for a secular approach to youth work whose style was well articulated in the influential ‘Social Education of the Adolescent’ (Davies and Gibson, 1967) and in other contemporary writing on group work (Batten, 1967; Button, 1971). Individuals and organisations motivated by their religious beliefs will continue to play an important role in provision for the young, not least the more marginalised, but local diversity is essential in order to maintain choices for young people; one reason why the faith sector should not dominate as local authorities decline or move away from open-access provision into excessive targeting on specific groups.

Conclusion

The recent years of austerity have shredded local youth services and these will take decades to rebuild. In many places the sector has returned to the condition it had in the 1950s. We need to rethink the role of the state and how it can better support and empower young people in their communities. This will mean some re-making of the respective roles of national agencies, local government and voluntary sector (Elvidge, 2014). The latter can bring important strengths in securing local community involvement. It can often take risks to road test new approaches but does not have the capacity to take bright ideas to scale. It also lacks the democratic mandate of local authorities and the latter’s ability to connect across different public services. It is now essential that parliament places an explicit duty on the Secretary of State for Education to promote and secure sufficient youth services – with youth work at their heart – focussed on the personal and social development of young people and achieved through partnership between local authorities, voluntary organisations and young people themselves. This core national duty would underpin central government’s leadership role and from it would follow the functions of setting national standards, providing adequate funding and rebuilding a skilled workforce. The latter should focus particularly on the needs of the disadvantaged young; building their resilience, physical and social skills and creativity and encouraging them to remain hopeful in what are extremely difficult times. The central moral purpose of youth work is the exploration with young people, individually and in groups, of the question ‘what kind of person do I want to be?’ and helping to create the opportunities for that question to be answered. In a barren and bleak landscape where the language of the utilitarian, neoliberal marketplace often holds sway, youth work should advocate the politics of the common good and demonstrate, in numbers as well as stories, how good youth work achieves it. To adapt some words of Robert Kennedy, it is the great task of youth work: ‘to see injustice and try to end it; to see prejudice and strive to overcome it; to see potential and seek to nurture it’ (Schlesinger, 1978).

Despite the best efforts of families, schools or voluntary groups, little is likely to change for the better in many young people's lives, or in what youth work can do to support them, until central and local government re-discover their own enabling and leadership roles. But young people and their needs will still endure. It is especially incumbent on those in leadership roles in youth work to develop more coherent, consistent and compelling arguments to campaign on their behalf. And, bound together by common values, to demonstrate a greater sense of solidarity with others in the sector as well as with the young.

References

- Barnard, H. (2010) *Big Society, Cuts and Consequences*, London: Cass Centre for Charity Effectiveness.
- Batten, R.E. (1967) *The Non Directive Approach in Group and Community Work*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Button, L. (1971) *Discovery and Experience*, London : University of London Press.
- Clark, T. and Heath, A. (2014) *Hard Times; the Divisive Toll of the Economic Slump*, Yale.
- Coles, R., Godfrey, C., Keung, A., Parrott, S. and Bradshaw, J. (2010) *Estimating the life-time costs of NEET*, London: Audit Commission.
- Davies, B. (2008) *A History of the Youth Service in England: the New Labour years* (vol 3) Leicester: National Youth Agency.
- Davies, B. and Gibson, A. (1967) *The Social Education of the Adolescent*, London: University of London Press.
- DES (1982) Experience and Participation; Review of the Youth Service (*The Thompson Report*), London: Dept. of Education and Science.
- DfE (2011) *Positive for Youth*, London: Dept. for Education.
- DfES (2002) *Resourcing Excellent Youth Services*, London: Dept. for Education and Skills.
- DfES(2003) *Every Child Matters*, London: Dept. for Education and Skills,
- DWP (2014) *Households below Average Incomes*, London: Department for Work and Pensions.
- Dorling, D. (2013) 'Generation Jobless', *New Statesman* 16-22, August.
- Elvidge, J. (2014) *A route map to the enabling state*, Dunfermline: Carnegie UK Trust.
- Feinstein, L. Bynner, J. and Duckworth, K. (2007) *Leisure Contexts in Adolescence and their effects on adult outcomes*, London: Centre for research on wider benefits of learning.
- HM Inspectorate (1987) *Education Observed; Effective Youth Work*, London: DES
- HM Inspectorate (1990) *Education Observed: Responsive Youth Work*, London: DES.
- HM Treasury (2007) *Aiming High for Young People; a ten year strategy for positive activities*, London.
- House of Commons (2011) (Education Select Committee). *Services for Young People*, London.
- IDYW (2009) *Open Letter, In Defence of Youth Work*, available at <http://In defence of youth work.com> [accessed 10/4/14].
- IDYW (2013) *This is youth work; stories from practice*, London: IDYW, Unison, Unite.

- Jeffs, T. and Smith, M. (1992) 'Putting Youth Work in its Place', *Youth & Policy* 36, pp.10-16.
- Kessler, R. C., Amminger, G.P., Aquilar-Gaxiola, S. Alonso, J., Lee, S., Ustün, T.B. (2007) Age of onset of mental disorders: a review of recent literature, *Curr Opin Psychiatry*, July 20 (4) pp.359-364.
- McNeil, B., Rich, J. and Reeder, N. (2012) *Framework of outcomes for young people*, London: The Young Foundation.
- Ministry of Education (1960) Youth Service in England and Wales (*The Albemarle Report*) London: HMSO.
- National Youth Agency et al (1996) *Agenda for a generation Leicester*: NYA.
- Network of Regional Youth Work Units (2014) *Youth Services in England*, Leicester: NYA.
- Ord, J. (2007) *Youth Work; Process, Product and Proactive*; Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing.
- Padley, M. (2013) 'Delivering Localism: The Critical Role of Trust and Collaboration', *Social Policy and Society*, 12, pp.343-354.
- Right Here (2013) *Case studies of innovative approaches*, London: Mental Health Foundation
www.mentalhealth.org.uk
- Schlesinger, A. (1978) *Robert Kennedy: Life and Times*, London: Deutsch.
- Shildrick, T., MacDonald, R., Webster, C. and Garthwaite, K. (2012) *Poverty and Insecurity: Life in low-pay, no-pay Britain*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Spence, J. and Devanney, C. A. with Noonan, K. (1997) *Youth Work; Voices of Practice*, Leicester: NYA.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. and Stoker, G. (2011) 'The Coalition Programme', *Political Quarterly* 82,14-15.
- Unite (2010) *Benefits of Youth Work*, London: Unite.
- Unite (2013) *Choose Youth: Manifesto*, London: Unite.
- Wenham, A. (2015) 'Innovations in the Measurement of Youthwork' in (ed.) N. Stanton, *Innovation in Youthwork: thinking in practice*, London :YMCA George Williams College.
www.ymca.ac.uk
- Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009) *The Spirit Level*, London: Allen Lane.
- Wylie, T. (2013) 'Youth Work in a Cold Climate', in eds. S. Curran, R. Harrison and D. MacKinnon, *Working with Young People* (2nd edition). London: Sage, pp58-67.
- Young, K. (1999) *The Art of Youth Work*, Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing.

Note

- 1 *Policy developments and documents referred to in this chapter are primarily concerned with England. Policy on youth work in the other UK jurisdictions did not have such frenetic features in the period being reviewed though youth work practice grappled with similar issues. The prospect is of increasingly divergent policy and structures across the UK.*

[Back to Contents](#)