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Abstract

This paper sets out to give an overview of the impact of socio-economic and political thinking on the structure and esteem of services to children, young people and families, and the placing of subsequent services to meet the needs of service users.

Through an exploration of the works of key theorists and academic contributors in relevant fields the attempt is first to establish the socio-structural context within which services are structured and delivered before moving on to set out the journey taken in one inner city local authority to grapple with the challenges set out by the requirement to meet the complex needs of local people within an increasingly hostile environment for public services.

I call on extensive experience in the field to inform an opinion that, under neoliberal policy frameworks, services have become increasingly alienating to the people that come to call on them for support, and that, in so doing, they undermine their ability to function as required and in part, serve to exacerbate the very issues they set out to eradicate.

In particular, professional approaches have inadvertently accelerated this problem of alienation resulting in energies being spent on professional survival and legitimacy at the expense of the particularly complex and challenging issue of improving the lives of children and young people who experience difficulties.

Through the development of a new integrated, systemic and humanistic service which has striven to break down the barriers erected to identify the differences between professions at the expense of a focus on service users, it is felt that an opportunity now exists to re-focus the energies of services so that greater attention is placed on the role of the practitioner, the relationships they form with service users, and the engagement these relationships make possible. Looking forward, consideration is made of the possibilities this presents for service delivery that sees success in equipping children, young people and families with the tools to locate and express their voices rather than, in keeping with broader consumerist agenda, encourage service users to receive, rather than inform, services - which will require professionals to shift from a role of leaders to facilitators in the delivery of community development interventions.
Introduction

The focus of research guiding this paper is an exploration of the impact of neoliberal and subsequent managerialist agenda on services to children and young people, and the paper asks whether it is possible to structure services in such an environment so that the role of engagement and relationship can be promoted. Specifically:

• What impact have the neoliberal and subsequent managerialist policy agenda had on the possibilities for engagement and relationship-based services to children and young people as distinct from narrowly focussed, modular and time limited programmes and
• Is it possible, within such a policy environment, to structure children and young peoples services to promote the role of engagement and relationship-based support in order to shift services away from something that is done to service users, in these time-limited, policy-led modules, and towards a co-production between practitioner and client?

In attempting to answer this research question the paper shall be structured to address the following areas:

• A Historical View of the development of services to children and young people
• What is the neoliberal agenda?
• What is the impact of such an agenda - marginalisation and demonisation?
• Realism - the elitist rejection of positivism
• The rise of managerialism
• Young Hackney - challenging the limitations of managerialism

I approach this topic as an active practitioner, manager and leader in the field, with around 23 years experience of working with and supporting children, young people and families, as well as supporting and developing practitioners, teams and services to deliver.

My experience has challenged me to question why different practitioners employ differing approaches to responding to the needs presented by those who access their services, and in particular, why there appeared to be a significant difference between the approach of statutory and non-statutory services.
Most significantly, from my perspective, social workers and teachers, but also police officers, tended to be more reactive, punitive and dismissive of the behaviours and experiences of what were particularly troubled young people. On the other hand, youth workers tended to be more inclined to place the behaviours of young people within the context of the society within which they grew up, under structures that perhaps defined their sense of identity and expectations. Put simply, in my limited knowledge and understanding of the situation, statutory workers appeared more interested in the validity of their own professions, and so their own professional role and existence, where-as non-statutory workers (in the public as well as voluntary sectors) tended to be more concerned with engaging young people at all costs, at times at the expense of their role and existence.

It is the perceived difference in approach that motivated my desire to undertake the research presented in this paper.

I use the works of Pierre Bourdieu as my primary theoretical influence, to describe the way that society is structured and the impact this structure has on the behaviour of populations and individuals. Bourdieu has developed a narrative, reflected in this paper, that spans the development of Western societies from the days of Monarchism and feudalism, through classical and onto positivist understandings of society and people.

In particular, Bourdieu’s theories of ‘social fields’ to describe the social spaces that we each individually and collectively occupy; ‘habitus’, to describe the behaviours that these social spaces encourage; and the ‘symbolic violence/symbolic power’ that is used by the occupants of the various social fields to maintain people and groups in their respective social spaces, shall each be employed to inform the position that it is the very structure of society, with its class definitions and boundaries, that influence the behaviours and choices individuals and groups make.

It is the position of this paper that, if behaviours and choices are, at least in part, influenced by the social space in which one is placed, then it should be the role of public services, in a positivist manner, to appreciate the role of structural causation, and actively work to ameliorate any problematic result of such structural pressures - such as inequality. This paper takes the position that, modern public services, increasingly influenced and structured by the thoughts and approaches of realism, reject this understanding of structural causation and instead place the responsibility for choice and behaviour wholly within
the individual, who is then expected to take full responsibility, not only for the behaviour causing concern, but the success of any externally allied ‘fix’ to resolve the problematic behaviour. Importantly, rather than ignoring some notions of inequality-as-cause, as classicism has done, realism asserts that inequality can actually be seen as an indicator of a well-functioning society.

By way of proposing an alternative, this paper presents a new model of service structure when responding to social concern through intervention, support and challenge to children, young people and families. It is believed that such a model, Young Hackney, creates the necessary space for practitioners to find the room for support and reflection that can inform their practice and deliver healthier, more productive, engaging and relevant responses to communities. It is believed that Young Hackney is a suitable response to the restrictive, punitive, reductionist and deterministic structures that have become the accepted approach to service delivery under a realism and neoliberal-inspired modular managerialist approach to service structure and delivery.

Services to children, young people and families have had a varied history, from being the concerns of rich philanthropists, to the considerations of social scientists, onto the preserve of professionals and the bodies that represent them. Today, with talk of effective practice and a dominant what works agenda, it’s possible to convince oneself that these services have acquired the certainty and objectivity of the natural sciences. That the application of this method or that resource will deliver a definitive and predictable result.

In part, this is the result of a dominant neoliberal ideological environment that has little time for public service or those that deliver it, strives for simple answers to complex questions - although it must be acknowledged that neoliberals would argue that perhaps the questions aren’t that complex in reality - and seeks to limit the expenditure allocated to supporting the most vulnerable. On the other hand, in such a hostile environment, with increasing competition for resources, professionals and their representative bodies have sought to gain legitimacy in the policy debate and in so doing, have cloaked themselves in the language and practice of objectivity and certainty by assuming the character of the natural sciences to prove to policy makers that they have the answers to the issues facing society.
The theoretical and academic contribution to such services has succumbed to the same postmodern affliction that has affected the rest of society, no longer attempting to explain the workings of the world in holistic and historical narratives, but instead focusing on ‘issues’ that have no connection to anything else, simply issues in their own right, to be ‘fixed’ before we move on to the next focus of attention, that bares no relation to what has come before, nor what may still be yet to come. In so doing there is a rejection of the assumption of **causation** and the idea that socio-structural factors can impact on behaviour. By extension, there is a rejection of the assumption that those that come to call on social welfare services may actually be in such positions due to the way in which the structure of society influences their decisions and behaviour - and that public services may need to be shaped to understand, accommodate and respond to such structural influences upon individuals, groups and communities.

So what has been lost through all of this? In times past, perhaps simpler times, responses to people experiencing trouble were more humanistic and placed value in the interactions between people and saw the resultant relationships as the transformative elements that could deliver genuine and lasting change. In such responses, energies were placed in peoples’ lived experiences rather than placing the motivation for change in externally applied methodologies that promise much, but serve to deny the richness of human experience in favour of a cold, calculable, tick-box model of service delivery.

Clearly, times have changed, and the ideological, political, financial and administrative environment in which services are structured and delivered call for new responses. While this paper acknowledges such shifts, it also calls for a re-establishment of the role of relationship in our efforts to meet the varying needs of children, young people and families who experience distress, vulnerability and want.

Through a complete overhaul of service structure, the attempt, presented here, is to shift the focus of delivery away from an introspective professional gaze, back towards one that looks out into the world with confidence that people have the capacity to make constructive contributions to their own lives and the lives of those around them.

Part One of this paper analyses the social, political, cultural and material influences on the structure and delivery of social welfare services such as social work, youth work, proba-
tion, education and targeted services, as well as considering how such influences may affect the views held of those that use such services.

Part Two develops these ideas to analyse the impact of these structural influences within the field of social welfare services, particularly in terms of the positions, dispositions and resources of the actors in the field. Part Two concludes with the presentation of a new integrated service structure that attempts to answer the challenges presented by the structural influences explored in Part One; a structure that places the role and views of service users back at the heart of delivery so that, going forward, they may come to define the delivery of those services, rather than become passive recipients of intervention.

In Chapter One there is a review of the history of responses to children and young people in trouble in the UK, which looks at the changing attitudes to behaviours, from the classical, utilitarian assumption of rational choice and decision making onto the more positivist assumption of causation impacting on the behaviours of people and the decisions they make.

Chapter Two looks into the ideological developments of the twentieth-century and in particular, uses the works of Bourdieu to explain the way in which some views hold that people respond to the socio-structural environment they experience - that those experiencing difficulties and vulnerabilities, and so calling on social welfare services, may be in such positions because of the structural forces and influences that shape society. This chapter then goes on to express a counter argument that has come to prominence in neoliberal thought. Here, it is suggested, people only have responsibility for themselves and to expect others to consider one’s needs, according to Ayn Rand - a strong proponent of this neo-utilitarian viewpoint - is the very definition of injustice. Such views inevitably have major implications for the resourcing and delivery of public, particularly social welfare services, in that the neo-utilitarian, neoliberal viewpoint promotes the idea that social welfare services are an unjust imposition on the population, rather than a response to imposed social injustice.

The issue of ‘elitism’ and education is explored in Chapter Three, where consideration is made of the role formal education may play in social mobility, or conversely, establishing people in the social classes to which they were born. In particular, the works of Daniel Dorling and Paul Willis are used to illuminate this discussion. The assertion here is that those
who come to call on social welfare services through need and vulnerability are, in the most part, poor and working class, and that it is in many ways the decisions made by the elites in society that promote the maintenance of such social positions - rather than the dominant neoliberal assertion that people are poor because they make poor decisions.

Chapter Four looks into the changing profile of working class communities during the twentieth century. The demise in the esteem of council housing from a universal resource for all, to a response to those deemed to have failed will be developed into a more general discussion of the broader demonisation of working class, poor and vulnerable individuals, groups and communities.

Chapter Five uses the developments of social work and youth justice practice in particular to explore the impact theoretical and political movements have on service delivery and motivations, from the optimism of the 1960s Wilson administration, through the pessimism of the ‘back to justice’ and ‘radical non-intervention’ movement, and the shift from positivism to the impacts of right and left realism in establishing the role, function and esteem of welfare services to children, young people and families. The chapter ends with a look at the rise of managerialism in social welfare services.

Chapter Six explores a number of practice issues for services resulting from the increasing dominance of the realist and managerialist agenda, and the increasingly diminishing influence of positivism, including the role of risk management, desistance theory, differential association theory, and systems theory and the impacts these have on service structure and delivery.

In Chapter Seven the issue of service integration is introduced as are the efforts of one London borough from 2006 until 2011 to attempt to structure the resources available to them in order to take advantage of national governmental priorities to meet local needs. In particular, the Every Child Matters agenda is discussed before looking more closely at efforts to use structural change to answer previously intransigent problems of information sharing, partnership working and needs identification that had been identified in numerous serious case reviews around the country.

Chapters Eight to Ten explore, in increasing detail, the development and function of the new Young Hackney service, which has been developed to answer some of the issues and
challenges presented throughout this paper. In particular the de-professionalisation of services, the increasing alienation of service users, and the gaps in service delivery that have introduced challenges to keeping children and young people safe, and their needs and interests at the heart of provision.

In Chapter Eleven, by way of closing, the motivation and experience that led, firstly to the establishment of Young Hackney, but then to the completion of this paper, are set out, along with a discussion of the process of research and observation that made up the autoethnographical approach employed.

The closest established model of delivery to that proposed in this paper is social pedagogy, with its emphasis on holistically educating children through a focus on the ‘head, heart and hand’ and that emphasises the role of the practitioner developing relationships with children, sharing the same space, informing their practice through reflection, encouraging group and social interaction amongst young people and seeing the development of children within a social, rather than simply an individualistic context - i.e. child development is the responsibility of all in the community, including, but not limited to parents and practitioners. (Petrie, P., Boddy, J., Cameron, C., Wigfall, V. & Simon, A. 2006) - an approach that tends to resonate with the often-quoted African notion that it ‘takes a village to raise a child’.

However, for the purposes of the case study conducted and reported on in this paper, the decision was taken not to formally identify the approach as one of social pedagogy. Not due to a rejection of the elements but simply because the central aim of the Young Hackney model was to break down professional barriers to integration, and it was felt, rightly, that the introduction of yet another professional identity may work against this aim. It may well prove helpful going forward to recognise the social pedagogical aspects of the Young Hackney model and opt to adopt such a moniker.

Essentially, the focus of this paper, and the aims of the model developed through Young Hackney have been to move away from a reductionist and reactive method of service structure and delivery which serves to place the locus of responsibility for vulnerability
within the child and family receiving support, instead of looking to socio-structural causes of social ills. The model makes it possible to take the service to those spaces, and deliver in ways, that have greatest meaning for the children, young people and families being engaged. Through a more collaborative model, staff are supported and encouraged to identify and share good practice and reflect on their own professional and personal experiences in order to better inform their individual and collective practice going forward.

Most importantly, however, is the recognition that the service must work hard to value and respect children, young people and families, build healthy relationships with them that promote their own sense of value and worth and that, in order to cement these, practitioners must engage children and young people in processes that encourage a greater social and political awareness and assist them to develop the skills and tools to realise their own individual and collective voices so that they may better argue for their interests to be recognised and met.

This suggests the approach developed through Young Hackney is conducive with post-war developments in social pedagogy developed in Germany which was itself a reaction to collective social education being delivered uncritically and so being vulnerable to indoctrination of negative ideologies - in this case Nazism. So, following on from this, German-influenced social pedagogy developed a far more socially and politically critical approach to raising awareness so that those engaged in such processes could develop the tools to be more critical of and for themselves (Hamalainen 2003: 69-80). It is felt that such an approach continues to hold valuable lessons and opportunities for a model such as Young Hackney in the future, where children, young people and families may require support to challenge the impositions of a dominant neoliberal ideology that has resulted in their coming to require the support of public services.
Methodology

I have used a literature review as the building blocks of this research project. However, in order to engender a clear context I have developed a case study and ‘auto-ethnographic’ qualitative methodology in order to advance from the ‘context-independent’, facts-based approach of the literature review, onto a more ‘context-dependent’ (Flyvbjerg 2006:4) approach that allows such abstract knowledge to become applied to real life situations. According to Flyvbjerg, it is through such a shift that knowledge becomes embedded to the point that one can truly be said to ‘know’ - what Bourdieu termed the ‘virtuoso’ (Flyvbjerg 2006:4) and that to limit one’s learning, or presentation of knowledge, to the facts-based, context-independent realm more associated with text books and the like, can have the limiting effect of restricting one to the realm of the beginner.

It is important to start out with the context-independent approach, but in order to apply useful and meaningful knowledge, it is necessary to interpret such knowledge through the prism of a detailed, qualitative case study and ethnography - in this case, an auto-ethnography.

It is therefore not appropriate, in this context, to reject the usefulness of the single case study approach as too narrow in expression of knowledge and experience, since the detailed, qualitative case study is not presented in isolation, as the only representation of knowledge, but is instead used as a vehicle to give real-world, contextual interpretation and meaning to the abstract facts presented.

In addition, given the nature of research presented here, in that what is explored is the usefulness of a methodology of practice - relationship-based practice as counter to dominant time-bound, neoliberal and managerialist modular approaches - it is not possible to effectively present such research with any true effect, since the only way to establish such a hypothesis is to present it in the realms of realistic context, rather than the abstract, since for any useful and practical purpose, social science-based research has proven, understandably, insufficient in the context-independent sphere of knowledge, only really providing valuable contribution in real-world application:
‘….there does not and probably cannot exist predictive theory in social science. Social science has not succeeded in producing general, context-independent theory and, thus, has in the final instance nothing else to offer than concrete, context-dependent knowledge. And the case study is especially well suited to produce this knowledge.’ (Flyvbjerg 2006:5)

In other words, it is the use of the case study that makes any knowledge in this research practical for implementation - without the case study, it is not possible to claim the usefulness of the theories garnered through mere literature. It is the use of the case study that shifts the social science based study from the realms of ‘scientism’ to the realms of the practical.

As is always the case however, every effort should be made to avoid unnecessary, inappropriate and inaccurate generalisation. The case study used in this research is applicable to the test site in question - but the theories being tested are appropriate to the interactions in question, wherever they may occur. However, they may not be applied without question, to every interaction that may possibly take place, anywhere - only that, given the interactions in question (between practitioner and client) are common to all services to children, young people and families, and given, in this test site, the conditions were created to emphasise such interactions with the view to promoting the transformative effect of such interactions, the theories underpinning such a transformative effect, should be applicable in other sites where such questions are yet to be asked.

This was established in an example cited by Flyvbjerg (2006:12), whereby, research looking at links between people working with organic solvents and the possible development of brain damage, were able to successfully argue that, rather than observe a range of sites that would give a representative sample, they could locate one site and that, with the appropriate controls (cleanliness, air quality, etc) the results from this site could be applied to other sites with less tight controls. This, they term, ‘critical case selection’.

Therefore, for the purposes of this research, given the case study represents a piece of practically implemented work to create a structure of service delivery that would promote the transformative effects of the practitioner-client interaction over and above the transformative effects of other methodologies, as discussed in this paper, the findings could be applied to other sites where such interactions take place - whether the results of such a case study proved positive or negative (Flyvbjerg 2006:12). In other words, if it is not pos-
sible to establish the transformative element of the interaction as primary in practice in this research site, then it would perhaps not be possible to establish it in other sites that have not made such efforts to establish the transformative element of the interaction as primary in practice.

It could be argued that there is an inherent tendency towards bias in the adoption of a single case study methodology, as opposed to a methodology that relies on a large number of responses or cases to explore the validity of the hypothesis. However, it is felt that the nature of engagement with the qualitative, ‘small-n’ approach to research, as adopted here, has advantages over more quantitative approaches, in that the researcher is brought into closer proximity to the theories being explored, and is challenged as to the validity of such theories in a way that a remote relationship with a ‘large-n’ approach might not offer - in large-n approaches, it may be difficult to attribute deviations or affirmations to the underlying theories being explored, and so there may be no motivation to use these deviations or affirmations to challenge such theories.

‘The case study contains no greater bias toward verification of the researcher’s preconceived notions than other methods of inquiry. On the contrary, experience indicates that the case study contains a greater bias toward falsification of preconceived notions than toward verification.’ (Flyvbjerg 2006:19)

The qualitative nature of research employed in this study is considered further below, where the auto-ethnographic methodology conducted is discussed.

Souhami (2012) explores the issues raised in conducting ethnographic research in a live case work environment when she looked into the experience of an emerging Youth Offending Team in 1999. It is clear that the role played by Souhami, and the role I have taken up in my own study are not wholly comparable. Souhami had the distinct advantage of being an outsider that, while presenting issues and challenges at the outset - requiring permission to access the building, needing to build trust with staff, etc - many of these tended to be logistical rather than academic. I, on the other hand, had the opposite challenge. My position as a leader and senior manager placed me in a state of familiarity - physically, emotionally, intellectually, theoretically. However, it could well be argued that this posed a challenge to my own objectivity in a way that Souhami would not have experienced. There is also the impact my presence and approach may have had on the way in which the
whole experience panned out - did my agenda and drive contaminate the journey being studied? However, as Souhami acknowledges when discussing her own experience, the researcher, in whatever capacity, will have an impact on the subject matter being studied - and in my experience, it has been important to acknowledge this fact, rather than assume it disqualifies the findings. In doing so, my role becomes as much a part of the study as the changes in service structure and the role of practitioners being observed. In this sense, my research moves on from being a straightforward ethnographic study, such as Souhami’s, to one of auto-ethnography. As such, it was important for me to be honest at all times with all involved, that I was completing this paper that would be looking into the process of change being conducted.

While it is true that no ethnographic study can be thought of as wholly objective and without partiality (Shatz 2009:96) one advantage of the position I held as one of a number of proponents of change in the arrangements for delivering ‘youth governance’ (Pitts 2012) services was that I immediately - in a way that had not existed before - became placed outside of all peer groupings as suspicion and mistrust started to envelop the services subject to restructure. People who had previously struggled to trust me found their position easier to justify. Those who had previously accepted me as one of their own either shifted to a position of mistrust or found it difficult to evidence their association with me lest they themselves become tainted by my role (real and perceived). Therefore, inadvertently, my role and position offered a degree of objectivity I had not in fact planned for. Essentially I was seen as the person threatening to lose people their jobs - an unenviable position to take at the best of times; but in this instance one that did provide a degree of usefulness.

This ‘otherness’ was, in part, facilitated by the guidance and direction handed to me (and other leaders) as to the roles to be played. I was to interview every member of staff in my service area by way of offering them a chance to be ‘consulted’ about the proposed changes. I was then to interview every member of staff for the job(s) available to them.

In the consultation interviews I was accompanied by a member of the Human Resources (HR) team while the member of staff was accompanied by a union representative - which served to introduce a ‘them and us’ dynamic to what had previously been quite close and inclusive team relationships. In the job interviews, I was again accompanied by a member of the HR team, as well as a more junior manager - which placed me in the position of chairing the interviews, and thus having the final say on the decisions of the interview panels. As chair, it was also my responsibility to inform the staff member of the outcome,
provide any feedback requested, and in a small number of cases, lead the service’s response to industrial tribunals. In essence, any suggestion of me being ‘part of the team’ had been suspended while the restructure was in full swing. The role I played was also being mirrored by the Head of the Youth Service for the staff she was responsible for - and the Assistant Director also offered support. So the ‘them and us’ dynamic wasn’t solely directed towards myself - it was a senior management vs staff situation that proved upsetting at times, but essential for the effective delivery of the restructure, and consequently, offered the necessary objectivity and distance for conducting the work for this paper.

Another advantage of my position, which Souhami acknowledges was absent from her approach, was that I had professional or ‘expert’ knowledge of the field of observation - I was able to place occurrences within a context of professional service delivery rather than a mere abstract academic assessment of their importance, or lack of. I didn’t need to get bogged down with questions on the importance of case files over relationships with external partners; leadership roles over impacts of legislative requirements; corporate priorities over curriculum; etc. This insight left me free to focus on the primary aim of the research.

In Souhami’s research, she sees the interviews she conducted with staff members in the newly developing YOT service as a kind of therapeutic function, as staff, dealing with the various changes taking place around them, sought out opportunities to deal with the anxieties and conflicts they experienced (Souhami 2012:203). However, my role as an ‘outsider’ - or a source of anxiety - prevented staff from being able to confide in me in this way and so their own anxieties became played out in the ‘behind closed doors’ sphere of the office environment - not only away from public gaze, but also away - so they supposed - from my gaze, and that of other leaders.

While this served to introduce a significant amount of tension and anxiety into the change process, I would not suggest that it is significant for the purposes of this research. One could argue that any change programme of this nature and complexity is bound to introduce tension, conflict and anxiety (equally, the presence of a researcher, in any capacity, can also introduce it’s own anxiety as staff make assumptions about the purpose of such a presence). It should be stated that the unerring focus of all leaders in this process was driven in part by a desire not to be distracted by these dynamics - but that is the only relevance. The impact on staff morale and security - while of personal interest to myself, and possibly an area for future research - was not the focus of this professional or academic process.
I chose to research this area as it had real meaning to me, and I am passionate about service improvement and challenging established power structures that dictate areas of influence while demoting the less tangible, less ‘scientific’ to the role of support cast - a statutory/non-statutory service and practitioner dynamic. However, it became clear that, while an ethnographic methodology could facilitate the search for knowledge in the field, my own role within that field could be seen to undermine the objectivity many see as essential to an ethnographic study. It is for this reason that I happened upon the sub-genre of *auto ethnography*. Auto Ethnography offered one other suitability. I was not to research the *people* in the service as a central focus. Instead, their roles were to act to highlight the systems, procedures and processes - the structures - that defined the service and the notion of service delivery. The actor that *would* feature in this story would be myself, and so it was important to encase that role within a methodology that could comfortably accommodate such a potentially problematic relationship between the researcher and the area of study. Specifically, auto-ethnography acknowledges and accepts that the researcher does, and will, cross the boundaries (Reed-Danahay 1997:3) in ways often rejected by straight ethnographic methodologies.

I first began developing the practice ideas explored in this paper while working in a more junior managerial role in west London - and Hackney brought together a collection of senior managers who were predisposed to develop such ideas for their own professional and theoretical benefits and interests - we each brought conducive ideas to the table.

In fact, I had originally intended to explore and answer the research question primarily though a literature review, but happenstance gave rise to an opportunity whereby I found myself presented with the change programme in Hackney - a programme that would allow me to test out a new model that would be more humanistic and relationship-based, in an example of serendipity reflected in Laurel Richardson’s ‘Last Writes: A Daybook for a Dying Friend (2007:307-18), where she sets out to maintain a diary of her experience of supporting her dying friend, but eventually, this evolves into a full-blown ethnographic write-up. As already discussed, without this opportunity presenting itself, I do not think my findings, simply through a literature review, would have as much significance and gravity. It is also important to acknowledge that while my research benefited greatly from the change programme taking place, it had no influence on the outcome of that change programme. In this sense the two were independent of each other. If the change programme ran aground and resulted in nothing then I, and my academic supervisors, would be faced with a choice
as to whether to follow the change programme into the rocks and write what I saw, or choose a new focus of study.

It is an ethnographic, and more generally a research, truism, that one should choose an area of study that will sufficiently engage and interest them through the long challenging periods when every part of their being is telling them to give up, move on and perhaps find some drying paint to observe! The topic of this study has taxed me since I first began my career as a youth worker in south east London (circa 1991) and I was confident that the original question vexed me sufficiently to carry me through to completion. I approached this topic of study with an inherent belief that statutory professions lacked something fundamental in qualifying them to claim efficacy in supporting young people and bringing about change. I believed that they lacked the interest to genuinely walk in a young person's shoes, which I believed was truly necessary to engage, and keep engaged, young people navigating the challenging period of adolescence. This is the prejudice with which I approached this work. The process of research however, highlighted the more concerning and complex issue of service structures and the impact these have - on who is attracted and recruited to the different professions, how people are led to feel about themselves and their roles, how the overburdening of frontline staff, particularly statutory workers, can limit the space for indulgence when building relationships with young people. This body of research has been a journey for me that has significantly broadened my own understanding of the professional landscape I occupy.

The issue of power has to be acknowledged in any situation of this nature. However, given the points I've already raised about my, and other leaders, being placed in a state of 'otherness', I feel it should also be noted that, the dynamics of professional power amongst staff, and between staff and service users were of greater motivation and impact in this process of change than merely considering the way staff felt about their managers.

Of central motivation here were: the voice of service users in the provision and support they receive; the voice of non-qualified staff in the presence of those with recognised qualifications; the voice of non-statutory staff (e.g. youth workers) in the company of statutory staff (social workers / police / teachers). Essentially, it has to be acknowledged that there is inevitably an issue of power between leaders/managers and the staff they support and direct. I've already shown that this impacted on the way in which staff, consciously or not,
came together to oust leaders from their peer groupings - but again, this has not been the focus of this study.

However, throughout the entire process of change, and even preceding it, the issue of power has been an ever shifting dynamic depending on the interaction taking place. This was witnessed by Souhami in her research: ‘Such fluidity of power was particularly evident in the YOT.’ (Souhami 2012:205). Souhami also goes on to acknowledge that it is a part of the researcher’s makeup to side with those deemed less empowered in the dynamics of power. The harassed staff member at the hands of the manager, the dismissed unqualified worker at the hands of the social worker, etc. In my research I have recognised this throughout my experience. Indeed, the concern for the treatment of service users was a central motivation for discussing ways in which to improve services - as was a concern that services were losing too much by allowing unqualified and non-statutory staff to have their views dismissed as less legitimate than the views of qualified social workers. This has been evident in the motivation to ultimately assess and challenge the impact of a broader neoliberal policy environment that has ushered in a culture of managerialism - the real focus of this paper.

So power has played a major role in the motivation for this research along with change, and the dynamics of professional relationships and interactions as a direct result of the process of change. It is for this reason that I do not believe my role as a practicing leader in the subject of my own research can be seen to diminish the nature of this research. In fact, I believe my role enhances the nature of this research - and this is facilitated through an auto-ethnographic approach. Power dynamics occur wherever groups of individuals come together. That there may have been a feeling of disempowerment amongst some staff may perhaps have been offset by the power they experienced by coming together as separate from, and unified against, managers. But more importantly, as indicated by Souhami, and witnessed by myself, everyone involved in this process, staff and leaders alike, experienced fluidity that saw them empowered in some instances and disempowered in others - and this is in the nature of organisations and groups.

It is however, possible to assume that, without a formal outlet for such tensions and anxieties amongst staff, the process of change became more fraught than it otherwise needed to be.
Essentially, while the interpersonal dynamics of various staff and teams remains of personal and professional interest to me, I have to be clear that the nature of this research has always been about how services are structured and the impact such structures have on service delivery - can we structure services to better support more client-focused provision? The inherent assumption in this question is that, for whatever reason, services have lost this client-focus. While there is a clear focus on inter-professional dynamics, the nature of the research has not been about interpersonal dynamics and their impact on service delivery - although admittedly research into that would be of great interest. In this way, this research looks at a slightly different dynamic to that of Souhami’s, who describes her work as evaluating the changes ‘effected at the level of mundane professional practice’ (Souhami 2012:2) - a standard example of ethnography.

Importantly, this paper focuses on the space that floats above services, in the area that looks at differences and commonalities with and between the disparate service areas, rather than delving into the specifics of say youth work, youth justice, education, social work, etc. The dynamics of each of these obviously impacts on the direction this work takes, but for the purpose of this paper, it would not be beneficial to get caught up in the individual politics and dynamics of particular services or professions. Instead, the overarching ideology, politics and practices are explored that makes it unhelpful to focus on the dynamics of individuals or groups of individuals.

The main focus of this change programme was the transformation from a set of disparate services - youth offending team, youth service, health, youth support - into one integrated service - Young Hackney - the ‘critical case’. However, as is explained in the paper, the actual process of change encompasses elements and decisions that pre-date the move to Young Hackney and it cannot be said that these were the product of conscious decisions on my part towards the outcomes of this research. As noted above, the change programme, and its outcome, were independent of this research project.

However, my agenda, role and motivation throughout the process of change - dating back to 2007 when I began this paper - were to introduce a more client-focused approach to provision that resisted punitive and reactionary responses, improved the functioning of services, improved the support afforded to staff and understood the central importance of the relationship between staff and service users at the point of interaction as the transfor-
mative element, over and above any (what I considered) pseudoscientific methodology that staff were required or encouraged to adopt.

As a result, my role as a leader in services, as well as my role as a researcher for this paper, encouraged debates, discussions and considerations amongst service leaders and above, about the nature and objectives of our services, how they were structured, and how to achieve the aims mentioned above - importantly for my research, other leaders acknowledged the issues we had with service structure and provision and were committed to achieving similar outcomes to myself. So in effect, the researcher became one of a team of leaders, through a process of action research, actively exploring ways to improve services towards a group of shared objectives - the main difference in my role was that I would be writing about it, ethnographically, under academic supervision. But this should not diminish from the fact that, as will be shown, the journey recorded was one with a clear focus and direction that respected the fact that we were collectively asking questions that perhaps had not been asked before, and were arriving at innovative solutions that have served to inform the delivery of services to young people for, what I would argue, are the better. And I believe the role of research of this nature should be to evidence such innovative improvements - or at least explore why such has not been possible.

So, while at the outset it cannot be said that the establishment of new partnerships and structures for early identification of needs and structures for more effective information sharing were the aims, the process of enquiry into what would promote the role of relationship as the transformative element at the point of interaction between practitioner and young person led to the ‘discovery’ of new and innovative ways of working.
Part One
Chapter One
A Historical View of the Development of Responses and Services to Children and Young People

‘The relationship is the soul of casework. It is a spirit which vivifies the interviews and the processes of study, diagnosis and treatment, making them a constructive, warmly human experience.’ (Biestek 1961)

Introduction
Since the emergence of the ‘classical’ view of man as being objective and rational, a view that marked out post-feudal times in the UK, ideas around the behaviour of people and their contributions and impact on society shifted from being seen as the will or command of God, to actually being driven by the will of the individual (Hobsbawm 1997:244). This was evident in the area of offending and punishment, increasingly influenced by ideas of personal responsibility. Also evident here is the increasing wealth of certain individuals, brought about by the growth of capitalism and the industrial age, that encouraged them into the field of provision of service and support to society’s more vulnerable - philanthropy. Alongside this were developments in science that enabled an advance in the view of ‘childhood’ and adolescent development that allowed for the growth of services to young people that treated them as distinctly different to adults.

Classicist, Rational Thinking
In the area of crime, the 18th-century saw the emergence of ‘classical criminology’, which attempted to explain crime in terms of the individual behaviour of those committing it. This differed fundamentally from more feudal ways of thinking that may have ascribed more spiritual or possessive ideas around the drivers to deviance and so influenced the responses to such behaviours. Under these new classicist ideas, people were seen to play a far greater role in determining their own behaviour, choices and thinking through hedonistic impulses (Newburn 2007:114).

This was an important development as it opened up opportunities to consider responses to ‘deviance’ that understood the individuality of human action, and ultimately, in post-classi-
cist times, the role of human interaction in realising effective responses to such behaviours.

Classicist approaches to criminal behaviour were clear responses to the post-enlightenment realisation that more feudal responses to crime were often barbaric, arbitrary, disproportionate and extreme - for example torture, flogging and banishment by transportation (Newburn 2007:115) - as evidenced in the mass-emigration of convicts to the colonies such as Australia. Classical criminology sought to bring about a more rational and appropriate response to the deviation of individuals. What Pearson (1983:127) has described as a move away from

‘….the reliance on hanging, whipping and transportation that had dominated the ‘Bloody Code’ inherited from the eighteenth century, towards an essentially novel emphasis on the reformation of character through the discipline of the penitentiary.’

In other words, those who had wronged, were beginning to be seen as redeemable.

At the same time, the level of social order necessary to encourage the expansion of the fledgeling Industrial Age meant that previous chaotic approaches to the structure and arrangement of society were no longer acceptable. This time was also marked by the contributions of key thinkers including Jeremy Bentham, Voltaire, Montesquieu and Cesare de Beccaria (Newburn 2007:115). Later, the efforts of Foucault ('Discipline and Punish' 1977) would capture such developments through his reflections on the shift from ‘memorable man’ - who's individuality is defined by his role in a broader social system; to that of ‘calculable man’ - who's individuality becomes defined by the systematic measurement of every aspect of his body - in order to reduce him down to the units commensurate to the tasks of the emerging political and economic environment - something that makes him, in Foucault's terms, more amenable to the new structures emerging in the post-feudal landscape - schools, factories, prisons, armies.

Beccaria (1738-1794) had said that ‘it was better to prevent crimes than to punish them’ - a clear indication that ‘man’ could play a role in preventing what had previously been seen to be beyond his influence - and that the punishment too should be timely and proportionate to the harm done to others or the public good (Newburn 2007:116), and could serve as
a deterrent to onlookers. While these seem like reasonable statements today, given the feudal approaches that had preceded this time, these assertions were nothing short of groundbreaking.

This idea of using the punishment of one to deter the behaviour of others is reflective of this new enlightenment-led idea that individuals make rational choices in offending behaviour.

This notion of prevention of crime has since remained at the centre of the criminal justice industry as reflected in the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) which states that the principle function of the Act is the ‘prevention of offending’.

Building on this idea of rational thought and ‘agency’, Jeremy Bentham (1748 - 1832) laid at the heart of his philosophy the idea of pleasure and pain, and asserted that the lure of excitement, money, sex, etc were the motivations to deviance (Newburn 2007:117).

Therefore, the pain received through punishment should outweigh the pleasure gained from committing the crime as a way of preventing people making the choice to offend. In keeping with Beccaria, Bentham thought that the pain inflicted through punishment should only just outweigh the received pleasure - in other words it needs to be proportionate to the crime otherwise it would fail in its aim to encourage compliance. (Newburn 2007:118). Again, to the present day, this idea remains central to the crime and punishment discourse.

Both Bentham and Beccaria are classicists in that they view humans as rational, calculating actors (Newburn 2007:119)

One obvious inherent problem with classical criminological thought is that by treating all humans as equally rational, there is the strong tendency to overlook individual issues of incapacity through physical or mental impairment, through such things as age, learning difficulties, mental illness, etc.

As a result, further development in philosophical and criminological thought led to ‘neo-classicism’ which is said to treat all actors as rational while making allowances for such individual differences. (Newburn 2007:120; Pitts 1988:8). Issues of power and deprivation
also tend to be overlooked by classical thought - as in, why is it that the poor often tend to be most represented in the criminal justice system? If all offending behaviour is the result of hedonistic, pleasure and pain, rational decision making and thought, then surely all sections of society should be affected equally. Classical criminology doesn’t appear to be able to account for this disproportionate representation of the poor, or otherwise socially disadvantaged, in the administration of offending or the receipt of punishment. Similarly, the rational thought approach suggests that those who offend, make such decisions by calculating, rationally, the chances and impact of being caught, and so the punishments should take this into account. Classist though has been reflected more recently by proponents of realist thinking that promote the idea that increased punishments will deter criminality, because criminality is the product of rational thought - i.e. internal thought rather than external cause (see chapter six).

Classical criminological thought has rightly been extremely influential in the development of criminal justice by introducing the element of the human individual into dominant thinking. Seen in context, as a response to feudal approaches, it makes a lot of sense. However, with greater enlightenment, knowledge and understanding of the human experience, classicism cannot be seriously accepted as a way to structure our responses to offending behaviour today, particularly amongst the young.

Radzinowicz (1966) sums up these limitations thus:

‘Had our system of dealing with crime been confined within the pattern laid down [in the classical school]....virtually all the reforms of which we are most proud would have been excluded because they would have conflicted with the principle that punishment must be closely defined in advance and strictly proportionate to the offence. There would have been no discharge, no adjustment of fines to the means of offenders, no suspended sentences, no probation, no parole, no special measures for young offenders or the mentally abnormal’. (in Newburn 2007:120).

Moving forward, we shall see that the rise of positivism has contributed to developments in responses to offending that have given prominence to the way practitioners engage and build trust and relationships with those who have offended, while the rise of scientific
thought in society has created informed methodologies to better explain the process of offending and the responses to it.

‘The Relationship’ as the Vehicle of Engagement Through ‘Youth Work’

Around this time, other initiatives beyond the areas of criminology were developing, specifically aimed at the support needs of young people and attempting to identify those elements that would come to define such services’ existence.

‘During the early years of the Industrial Revolution a new pursuit surfaced - youth work. Gradually it developed a distinctive mode of intervention and focus so that by the end of the nineteenth century it had acquired a recognisable style and élan. It embodied a distinctive approach to work with young people. This approach was characterized by an emphasis on relationships and voluntary participation; a commitment to association; a belief that practitioners should be approachable; have faith in people and be trying to live good lives; and a concern with the education, and more broadly the welfare of young people’ (Jeffs and Smith 2002:39)

These developments were amongst the first to recognise that children and young people may have particular needs that set them apart from adults and so the responses to their needs should be tailored accordingly. This emergence of ‘youth work’, from these early days, would retain at its core the idea of voluntary engagement and the centrality of the relationship built up between the practitioner and the young person / young people as the vehicle of engagement.

In particular, youth work, in its origins, placed it’s endeavours in stark objection to prevailing political and economic developments that it saw as breaking down communities and collective, community action in favour of individuals better suited to the demands of the emerging capitalist economic system. If capitalism was to be challenged, young people and broader communities would need to strengthen their kinships and collaborations - the very kinships and collaborations that dominant thought of the time threatened to undo (Jeffs and Smith 2002:44).

And youth work’s primary focus in order to achieve this was to cultivate the interpersonal interactions, particularly between members of groups (Jeffs and Smith 2002:49).
This focus on group work and interpersonal relationships clearly marked youth work out from other developments made available to young people and families, particularly in its insistence that young people were social beings, defined by their social interaction and that this interaction, particularly in the group sphere, should define the shape of the intervention offered.

**The Contributions of Early Probation Work**

Turning to the development of probationary work as a model to further describe these times, the role of philanthropy is writ large - similar stories can be seen in most areas of development for what we now refer to as children and young people’s services - including education, social work, youth justice and youth work.

In Probation such philanthropists, devoid of modern-day, ‘evidence-based’ models of delivery, that purport to be informed by the objective rationality of natural science, developed their work, often delivered voluntarily, with the central concern of how to engage those they set out to help - and this led them to focus their efforts on building relationships that engendered trust and understanding, as well as faith in their ability to bring about change.

Following along these lines of thought, movements began in the mid-19th century, to insert a level of humanism into the responses to criminality by understanding that the backgrounds of those that had committed crimes had some influence on their behaviour. John Augustus is one such person to advance this way of thinking.

John Augustus, who was active in Boston from the 1820s onwards, is seen by many as the pioneer of probation work in America through his philanthropic efforts to engage and support people who had offended. Glueck (1939) described the work of Augustus thus:

> ‘His method was to bail the offender after conviction, to utilise this favour as an entering wedge to the convict’s confidence and friendship, and through such evidence of friendliness as helping the offender obtain a job and aiding his family in various ways, to drive the wedge home.’ (Vanstone 2007:47)
In other developments, Gamon, of Exeter College, Oxford was commissioned by the Toynbee Trust to observe the Police Courts and talk to missionaries, clergy and employ-ers. As a result he was able to observe their practice and identify what he believed to be the important elements of those deemed effective in their efforts, particularly focussed around the ability to support, challenge and build healthy relationships of friendship (Van-}

The Introduction of Scientific Thought - ‘Positivism’

The shift from classical thoughts about human behaviour onto neo-classical thinking introduced the idea that external factors could influence what were, at the time, considered actions borne merely of internal rational thoughts. According to Pitts (1988:9), this opened up the space for a broader consideration of what motivated human activity - the idea of causation.

As scientific thought grew to dominance in the mid-to-late 19th century, not least influenced by the works of Darwin, and his work that showed human thought and behaviour was influenced by natural selection rather than the work of God, criminological thought embraced such developments. (Newburn 2007:120).

While classical criminology can be summed up as reducing the severity and disproportion-ality of punishments seen in feudal times, positivistic criminology sought to build on these developments and work to reduce crime itself. (Newburn 2007:120)

Bottoms (in Newburn 2007:121) sums up this new approach to applying scientific methodology to social matters - something that had not been done before:

- The methods of the natural sciences should be applied, and could be applied, to the so-
cial world.
- The foundation of our knowledge of the world (our epistemology) is data derived from observation. The basis of scientific knowledge of ‘facts’ collected dispassionately by the scientist.
- Facts must be distinguished from values
- The core method involved is the collection of data, the development of hypothesis, and the testing of these for verification or falsification (hypothetico-deductive reasoning)
• The combination of natural scientific methods and deductive reasoning led to a ‘powerful preference’ for quantitative over qualitative data

While positivism has come in for heavy criticism since its development (see Realism in Part Two of this paper), the idea of using scientific methodologies to observe the social world has become established as an effective and appropriate way of understanding and explaining social phenomena. At its core, lay this preference for quantitative over qualitative data in keeping with the natural sciences that influenced it. This preference promoted the value of the measurable in social welfare support over the subjective, such as relationships and instinct. In particular, as shall be seen later in this paper, this scientific approach has been key to the developments of particular professions including probation, social work, youth justice and targeted services to young people. As shall also be seen, the realist reaction to positivism, with its incursion of definitive, deterministic and reductionist thinking has led to the demotion of the more subjective, humanist elements of service development and provision that have been touched on so far - the role of relationship in guiding the human interaction between the vulnerable, and those seeking to help.

### Comparing Classism and Positivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of study</th>
<th>Classism</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The offence</td>
<td>The offence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The offender</td>
<td>The offender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the offender</th>
<th>Classism</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free-willed</td>
<td>Determined - i.e. the individual is impelled to offend by factors beyond their control. Driven by biological, psychological or other influences. Pathological i.e. something has gone wrong in the life of the offender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational, calculating</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classism</td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to crime</td>
<td>Punishment Proportionate to the offence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Treatment Indeterminate, depending on individual circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table highlights the main differences in approach between classicism and positivism, in which the foundations for later professions can be seen, particularly with the focus shifting from punishment to treatment, which would become the focus of psychoanalysis, probation, social work, youth justice and subsequently, if to a lesser extent, targeted services (Case and Haines 2009:53).

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a time when social sciences, in particular sociology, were being developed by the likes of Durkheim to answer, if possible through empirical evidencing learned from the natural sciences, questions of man and society.

Fundamentally, the development of positivism marked the shift from philanthropists using their, often new found, wealth to do what they felt was the right thing, often motivated by religion and humanistic considerations and a sense that man could make the world a better place, to a more informed position that led to individuals specifically trained in methods that, through a rational, scientific approach to cause and effect, would ultimately lead to the development of professions and professional bodies that would drive and safeguard the status and legitimacy of their practitioners.

‘They could observe that man’s scientific knowledge and technical control over nature increased daily. They believed that human society and individual man could be perfected by the same application of reason, and were destined to be so perfected by history.’ (Hobsbawm 1995:234-5)
And this conscious pursuit of legitimacy in a world enamoured by the rise and efforts of the natural sciences (chemistry, physics, biology) would have marked influences on the direction of the professions that were to follow.

Positivism was not without its major problems, not least the development of phrenology, which believed it was possible to apply scientific methodology to isolate physical deviances in criminals that did not exist in people who didn’t offend. These works included studies of the shape of the brain, lips or nose, as indicators of deviance. (Newburn 2007:121)

However, the time was right for positivism, as concerns about a ‘crises of control’ (Pitts 2010:14) emerged around the industrial cities - increasing numbers were moving from rural areas to the cities to find work and coming into contact with what they might describe as deviant ways - alcohol, drugs, prostitution and crime. Pitts sums up the impact of such concerns on the efforts of State and interested parties to develop statute and policy for the emerging responses to concern.

‘This crisis was seen to be a product of the effects of economic recession upon the capacity of the lower class family to exert control over its children. Alongside this were related concerns about the academic and physical fitness of British youth for military service and their capacity to resist the blandishments of a newly ascendant Bolshevism, as well as religious and philanthropic concerns about the suffering of lower class children and young people. These concerns triggered the proliferation of uniformed youth organisations and ‘street’ and club-based youth work (Kaufman 2001), radical educational reform, in the shape of Balfour’s 1902 Education Act, which brought Local Education Authorities into being, and the introduction of a new youth justice system by the Asquith administration in 1908 (Newburn 1995).’ (Pitts 2012:14)

In addition to these developments, Vanstone (2007) describes the work of Holmes, a Police Court Missionary (a fore-runner to the modern Probation Officer) in the late 19th and early 20th centuries:
'It involves, first, the development……of an intense personal relationship characterised by personal commitment, concreteness, concern and trust; second the use of moral and religious persuasion and influence; and third, the use of authority and coercion.' (Vanstone 2007:55)

It was clear that a good understanding of engagement was prevalent and necessary as was the need to balance this with an understanding of the real needs of those being supported, through a positivist approach to intervention. This is clearly evident in youth work of the time; as set out here, in descriptions about ‘clubs for working girls’, that the need to balance this engagement within a relationship that also challenges young people, was a difficult but necessary requirement:

‘Ladies who engage in this work without previous experience are too apt to be carried away by their sympathy with the hard life of these work girls, to remember their long hours of wearing work, to look at their pale, careworn faces, and to think that they will add to their hardships if they in any way reprove them or do not allow them their fling once they are off work and….come to the club. But this is a great mistake; there is nothing a girl will value more than the thought that she is improving herself, that she is learning something.’ (Macmillan 1891 quoted in Bunt and Gargrove 1980:13)

And:

‘Some [Superintendents] saw all the things that should have escaped their vision and left unseen the things that mattered; they saw the girls little weaknesses and missed their painful sensitivities and suffering which sometimes vaunted itself in loud behaviour, the desire to be useful which needed stimulating, and should certainly not have been snubbed….before long we decided to do without Superintendents. We wanted to keep our girls.’ (Montague quoted in Bunt and Gargrove 1980:22-23)

Common to both of these assertions is the understanding that the very personality of the practitioner delivering the service to young people is central to the way they work and the impact they have on the young people accessing their services and support.
However, as the recognition of need amongst the vulnerable and those deemed deviant continued to grow, and the positivist school of understanding of the causes of that need expanded, there emerged a move to providing specific responses to specific needs, identifiable by the development of distinctions between the different services, alongside more structured funding arrangements - away from charity, towards State.

‘Youth workers also engaged in individual casework, just as they organised formal educational classes to supplement school provision, and residential accommodation where members could live or recuperate after illness. However such blurring of the boundaries waned as formal education for post-school age students developed; social, court and after-care work expanded; state income maintenance was introduced, and the provision of both institutional and community health care spread (Spence, 2001). Mainstream youth work as a consequence acquired a discernibly different persona from institutional provision and individualised casework. Unlike the former, it was based upon a voluntary relationship.’ (Jeffs and Smith 2002:43)

Returning to Probation, Cecil Leeson was a Probation Officer in the UK when he wrote the first extensive work on the probation system in 1914. While this is almost a century after the early work of Augustus in Boston, and the rise of positivist thinking had become established, the relationship still remained a core element of this developing and emerging area of social welfare:

‘The probation officer should assume the attitude of a ‘sensible friend’; that he should be neither a sentimentalist nor a ‘dictator or bully’; and that the essence of the relationship is friendship.’ (Leeson quoted in Vanstone 2007:64)

Leeson’s work was extremely important in the development of this work and was seen by many at the time and to this day as providing a blueprint for a professional Probation Service. Vanstone (2007) suggests:

‘Leeson is particularly interesting…On the one hand his writing reveals clarity about the shortcomings of practice that relied completely on person-
ality but on the other, it indicates that personality was the single most important element in probation work.’ (Vanstone 2007:68)

So it can be seen that, before the modern focus on theory and methodology and claims of delivering ‘what works’, ‘evidence based’, scientifically-informed practice, when people had to learn through their own practice, the common thread to run through the first one hundred years or so of work with young people as well as those subject to criminal justice interventions was the tool inherent to all; their own personality and their ability to use this to engage people in a relationship that could be used as a vehicle to support them through change and development. This tied practitioners directly into the knowledge-base required to develop responses. It shall be shown later in this paper that the rise of managerialism and the ‘what works’ agenda, while sold as a positive approach to the development of services, has actually served to drive a wedge between the practitioner and their professional knowledge base (Pitts 2007:16), while, as Pitts himself has suggested, despite its claims to the contrary, ‘the ‘evidence-base’ was scant’.

Even through these times of rapid advancements in scientific understanding, attempts were made to establish the role of the worker-client relationship in stone. In Burt’s 1925 book ‘The Young Delinquent’, the role of Probation is defined as:

‘not ‘mere surveillance’ but an intimate and active relation, which deals with all aspects of the child’s life.’ (Burt 1925 quoted in Vanstone 2007:69)

And this can be seen to be echoed in the welfare approach to youth justice from the 1960s onwards, but also captured in the earlier 1933 Children and Young Persons Act which placed the welfare of the child at the heart of all relevant services - even if this conversely led to an increase in the numbers of children being prosecuted, because such action was now seen to offer them an access to welfare (Pearson 1983: 216) where previously, little existed.

**Marx, Freud and The Frankfurt School**

A clear example of positivistic thought is the work of Karl Marx, whose central thesis is about how the structure of society influences behaviour and thought. By the mid-twentieth century, Marx’s grand narrative about capitalism being the root of its own undoing, to be
replaced by a socialist society was well established. Services, particularly youth work, but
to a lesser extent, the other services of social welfare, had become heavily influenced by
the idea that public service could, in some way, ameliorate the inequalities that had be-
come inherent in the capitalist model. In particular, the idea that human beings were de-
termined by their social being - in other words, people couldn’t expect society to change
simply by wanting a more equal society, because the unequal society itself served to keep
men and women in their social classes. So social welfare services needed to encourage
people to become alert to the impacts of a capitalist society.

‘it is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the
contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.’ Karl Marx
(1859), Preface to *Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*.

Which can be seen in Bourdieu’s (1991) (see chapter two) ideas of habitus emanating
from one’s social field. Marx presented the ideas of class consciousness, which said that it
is only by becoming aware of the inherent contradictions of the opposing forces of capital-
ist society that individuals can liberate themselves and change society. This, he called the
dialectic, which was the imbalance of capitalism which delivers great wealth and resource
accumulation whilst delivering poverty and want at one and the same time. By realising
this contradiction, according to Marx, the working classes will inevitably bring capitalism to
an end (Soja 1989).

However, the uncritical and deterministic thrust of such thought has, itself, proven a hin-
derance to the adherence to this aspect of Marxist thought. By being deterministic, the line
of thought automatically rejects an alternative outcome for society - the contradictions of
capitalism will be its downfall and the result will be the emancipation of working class peo-
ple through the realisation of a socialist society. If such a thought is assessed dialectically,
a notion the thought itself introduces, then there must be the possibility that the experience
of the working classes could deliver a future whereby capitalism does not destroy itself,
nor is it successfully challenged by class consciousness.

This is a notion that has come to play a central role in the thoughts emanating from the
‘Frankfurt School’ theorists. In other words, it is important to apply dialectical reasoning to
the line of thought being presented and by so doing, expose the possible contradictions inherent within such thought.

That capitalism has managed to reinvent itself in the face of mounting criticism throughout the 20th and into the 21st century is perhaps an indication that the application of the dialectic is appropriate, particularly given that a sustainable ‘socialist’ state has yet to be realised. Theory and practice must be engaged in a never-ending dance of reflection, comparison and challenge with each other.

Theorists within the Frankfurt School moved beyond Marx’s deterministic thoughts about working class emancipation, and integrated them with the thoughts of Freud in order to identify the barriers to class consciousness and the possible solutions. In pursuit of Horkheimer’s (1976) goal of seeing ‘critical theory’ as ‘the emancipation of human beings from the circumstances that enslave them’ (Horkheimer 1976:219 - 224), the Frankfurt School sought to combine the works of Marx - in that the purpose of class struggle is to bring about change - with the efforts of Freud who identified the sources of individual neurosis that, according to the critical theorists, once identified, could be overcome as a way to resolve the individual distractions that divert energies away from collective action and class emancipation.

According to Freud (1915:36), the Ego would eventually develop from the pursuit of pleasure, which can be seen to be inward looking and focussed on hedonistic pursuits of instant gratification, towards a ‘reality principle’, which would acknowledge the real world as it is.

Looking at this through a post-marxist perspective, once freed from the distractions that occupy the ‘pleasure ego’, individuals become able to see the world for what it is, leaving them open to seeing the oppression that capitalist societies inflict on them. They become aware of the ‘circumstances that enslave them’.

Such positivist thoughts and theories, during the middle part of the 20th century, came to heavily influence the development of social welfare services, and such thoughts and theo-
ries also lend themselves well to holistic approaches such as social pedagogy mentioned earlier in this paper, which aim to develop, in children and young people, a more critical outlook towards society that people such as Paulo Freire would argue, could assist in realising their emancipation. The structure proposed through the new Young Hackney model, later in this paper, also retains the potential to facilitate such enlightenment.

**Post-Freudian / Kleinian thought - Bowlby**

Following on from the work of Freud, and the ideas that experiences in childhood inform later adult behaviour, Melanie Klein developed these ideas, not uncontroversially nor without challenge, into her ‘Object Relations Theory’ in which she stated that experiences in infancy become internalised as ‘objects’ in adulthood and these objects illicit behaviours that recall memories of when they were first experienced, and affect the relationships that the adults form, as well as their more general behaviour.

Despite the challenges lodged against these findings, not least from Freud’s own daughter, Anna Freud, Klein’s theory became well established and went on to inform the work of John Bowlby, who used Object Relations Theory in the development of his own ‘Attachment Theory’, which identified the fundamental importance for human development of attachment from birth (Schwartz J 1999:255) and how attachment, or lack of, in early childhood could go on to influence later adult behaviour.

Significantly, whereas Klein, Bowlby’s supervisor during his studies, identified the source of ‘Objects’ as internal to the infant in that they were fantasies about the child’s mother, Bowlby went on to reject this idea and place the source externally, and see the relationship between the mother and child as the important element in the development of healthy or unhealthy behaviours in later life.

Bowlby was commissioned to write the 1951 World Health Organisation (WHO) Report ‘Maternal Care and Mental Health’, which, despite rejection from his contemporaries, (Rutter 1995), who refused to believe the relationship with the mother was an important part of parenting, became hugely influential and came to inform the treatment and approach to
children in care. These findings were later followed up in a further WHO report by Bowlby’s colleague, Mary Ainsworth (1962).

Fundamentally, these works established the importance of children’s early attachment in their later psychological development - an idea that, at the time, was new and groundbreaking.

These are clear examples of shifts away from, perhaps gut feelings and religiously-inspired approaches, towards social welfare services becoming informed by the sciences, and what this work (Freud / and post-Freud) led to was the establishment of therapeutic techniques that could be used to treat identified disorders in children and adults. Therapists trained to the required standard would be qualified and skilled to identify causes and solutions to the behavioural and psychological issues people experienced. This marked a move away from volunteerism, philanthropy and the general good will of people, and towards the early developments of professional responses to the issues of society.

Not surprisingly, these theories that explained the behaviours of children played a crucial role in informing relevant legislation, not least the 1933 Children and Young Persons Act and the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act (CYPA) - the latter being the product of the Wilson administrations in-depth consultation with social scientists at the time (Pitts 1998).

These pieces of legislation played central roles in informing and shaping the increasingly professionalising responses to children (as well as adults) in trouble, particularly through social work and probation services. Important, the 1969 CYPA gave social workers the exclusive role of carrying out the orders of the juvenile court, removing the role of probation officers from the execution of youth justice (Pitts 1998:14) - and thus shifted the focus of intervention from a national one to a local authority one.

The idea that a child could display certain delinquent behaviours because of detachment or a complete lack of positive regard in their infant relationships not only allowed for the development of retrospective responses that aimed to understand the behaviours of children and adults in trouble, it also allowed for, in particular, social workers to develop re-
responses that aimed to affect, positively, the relationships parents (mothers) developed with their children in order to prevent poor outcomes later in life.

Significantly however, while these social welfare responses have clearly become, rightly, informed by such findings and theories, it would not be correct to assume that this equated to social - and other - workers and probation officers playing the same role as therapists. However, in later decades, as practice became increasingly ‘informed’ by a scientific and medical model, youth justice workers, probation officers, youth workers, targeted support workers and in particular, social workers, all claim (or are told) they can deliver various therapies in their interventions. Such therapies include motivational interviewing, cognitive behavioural therapy, solution focused interventions, social learning theory, amongst others. Importantly, while qualified therapists generally tend to complete 3-7 years in training, these social welfare practitioners generally tend to complete 3-5 days of awareness-raising sessions that allow them to claim the names of such therapies in their interventions (Pitts 2007:17). Importantly, such interventions shift the focus of support away from engaged relationship-based activities, towards interventions that are done to young people.

As such, there exists a danger that the lines between therapist and social welfare practitioner becomes dangerously blurred, whereby appropriate responses to vulnerability receive inappropriate responses. As well as this, with a basket of ‘therapies’ in the armoury of responses, there is an increased risk of applying such responses inappropriately to children and young people who would perhaps benefit from generic interventions rather than therapy - or allusions to therapy, in effect resulting in a sort of intervention inflation that diminishes the stature of generic interventions and causes the specialist intervention to become generic.

What this does however, is reflect the continuing pursuit of scientific explanations and directions for the work delivered within the realms of social science. But despite this desire to embrace the objectivity of the natural sciences, as Hobsbawm illustrates, the social sciences may not in fact lend themselves at all well to quantitative approaches that distill all efforts down to the measurable and consistently knowable rationality of chemistry, physics or biology.
‘The social and human sciences operate entirely, and by definition, in the explosive zone where all theories have direct political implications, and where the impact of ideology, politics and the situation in which thinkers find themselves is paramount.’ (Hobsbawm 1997:268)

Despite this, according to Pitts (1988:17), this embrace of social science was clearly evident in the developing profession of social work under the post-war Labour (particularly Wilson’s 1964) administrations.

The growth of these social sciences provided the tools to question the very being and behaviour, thoughts and deficiencies of people in a new, enlightened way, never before possible under religious doctrine and it is within this ‘explosive zone’ that modern services to young people were developed, starting in the 1970s, with the USA-inspired ‘Radical Non-Interventionist’ movement (Cooper, et al 1995:103), reflecting an aversion to intervention by public service professionals, before building on this mistrust through the imposition of a neoliberal-inspired managerialist doctrine that gained increasing dominance from the 1980s onwards.

**The Albemarle Report**

The Albemarle Report, into the structure and role of youth work, was the result of a committee commissioned by the Minister for Education in 1958, which presented its findings to Parliament in February 1960 (Bill Cox, President F.D.Y.W. November 2010)

What this report makes clear is that youth work was seen very much as a form of education - informal education that could compliment the formal educational process delivered through Schools. In fact, many youth work facilities were based in schools.

‘The Youth Service is an integral part of the education system, since it provides for the continued social and informal education of young people in terms most likely to bring them to maturity, those of responsible personal choice. It is now an accepted commonplace in education that the infant learns by play, and nursery and infant school teaching is based on this concept; but recreation can be as educative to the adolescent as play is to the infant, and as important in promoting the physical, intellectual and moral development necessary to turn the teenager into the responsible
adult citizen... Flexibility and tolerance are essential in the approach to young people in clubs and in the spontaneous, self-programming, single activity groups which we hope to see developed.’ (Ministry of Education 1960: 103)

The purpose of youth work was to provide young people with ‘association, training and challenge’ (Ministry of Education 1960: 36).

However, such a trilogy in the focus of youth work should not be over-emphasised as a ‘new direction’ or in some way a response to the new challenges of the time. The trilogy can in fact be seen very much as a continuation of existing philosophies of work with young people (Smith and Doyle 2002). ‘Challenge’ was central to the work promoted by Baden-Powell and the Scouts movement, ‘association’ from the established work of girls and boys clubs, and ‘training’, according to Smith and Doyle (2002), ‘could have come from the pages of one of Josephine Macalister Brew’s (1943; 1947; 1957) books’ - Brew being a particularly influential pioneer of informal education.

So the thrust and influence of the Albemarle Report, while clearly important - bringing these three philosophies into one unified approach towards the needs and issues presented by working class youth - should not be emphasised as revolutionary. What it did manage to do was establish the importance of youth work and establish it within the national agenda, thus seeing to the deliverance of substantially increased resources. Significantly, the report helped shift the Youth Service from a predominantly volunteer-led service to a professional service with paid workers and managers and importantly, from a charity-led, to State-funded service.

The approach of youth work was recognised in its informal relationships with young people which were often unstructured and defined more by the spirit of the relationship than a projected aim of engagement.

... the beginnings of "citizenship" can be seen as much in the subtlety and tact of social relations in a good youth club, even in a tough area, as in straight-forward discussions of good citizenship. (Ministry of Education 1960: 39)
The report itself was a response to growing concerns about a ‘bulging’ adolescent population due to a post-war baby boom, the emergence of a ‘teenage’ culture with spending power and social unrest that had led to race riots in London and Nottingham. Concern amongst MPs centred around a Youth Service that was in a ‘state of depression’ and so possessed limited ability to respond to such issues presented by the growing adolescent population.

According to Smith and Doyle (2002) the report lacked a genuine theoretical underpinning and was in fact a rushed response that identified a growing concern around crime and delinquency, understood this to be the result of a growing ‘youth problem’ and then presented this as a predominantly working class problem. Therefore, the Youth Service, post-Albemarle, became structured as a national and local State and voluntary sector response to a perceived working class youth population that were at times seen as a problem, but whose potential was recognised.

The developments set out in this chapter have culminated, during the 20th century, in what Halsey (1995:132) has referred to as the ‘century of the child’. This is because numerous provisions were made in social care, youth justice, education and welfare through legislation which was unreservedly, unashamedly and unmistakably about children and young people - to the exclusion of others. In particular, such developments built on the positivistic ideas of societal causation; that the structure of society, and in particular inequality and oppression, were contributory factors in the behaviour and vulnerabilities that people experience, and social welfare responses needed to aim to ameliorate such structural impositions.

And yet the century ends with families feeling less secure, education being more divided and elitist, children being more susceptible to the influences of crime and drugs, mental and physical health concerns, and if the media stories are to be believed, vulnerable to the poor delivery and care of services that fail to keep them safe and may even let them die.

The ideological developments that have contributed to these shifts are explored in the next chapter.
Chapter Two

The Ideological Struggle for Public Services - The ‘Left’ and the ‘Right’ Hand

‘A multitude of men are made one person when they are by one man, or one person, repre-resented; so that it be done with the consent of every one of that multitude in particular. For it is the unity of the representer, not the unity of the represented, that maketh the per-son one.’ Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan

Introduction

According to Marx and Engels (1848) in their landmark, ‘Communist Manifesto’, the history of societies has been one of class struggle whereby the interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat have conflicted - and it is through this eternal conflict that societies develop. From the end of Monarchism and feudalism, to the emergence of middle class interests and wealth accumulation, to the establishment of communism as a legitimate political and economic system, onto the post-‘Great Depression’ concessions by the elites that delivered welfare states in various countries (Dorling 2011). Changes that were championed by increasingly confident movements for equality and social democracy around the world.

Each of these major developments have been borne of the struggle between the interests of the various classes in society. Since the 1970s, neoliberalism - which, it is argued, promotes the interests of a burgeoning middle class - has come to have a dominant influence on the way people think and act and in particular, for the interests of this paper, has come to define the structure, value and delivery of services to the vulnerable. Throughout these major shifts in the political, social and economic landscapes, it is possible to argue, as Bourdieu (2001) and Halsey (1995) have done, that the elites (or ‘nobility’) have retained the reigns of control and it is with their blessings, or concessions, that such structural shifts have been countenanced. In fact, Bourdieu has argued that neoliberalism, far from representing a revolution in the structure of society - as neoliberalists have been known to claim (a revolution that brings to an end the dynamic shifts between the left and right extremities of conservatism and socialism) - it is merely an evolution in conservative rule and thought.
This chapter explores in further detail the ideological markers that have signified the responses to the structural influences in society. Bourdieu’s thoughts help explain the way in which the structures of society affect the behaviour of individuals, groups and families, and the assertion is that such influences require social welfare responses to ameliorate the impacts of such societal pressures - in particular inequality. Rand’s thoughts on injustice are then used to explain how the positivist views of causation have become rejected in a neoliberal approach to society that pits individuals against each other rather than in concert. The implications for social welfare services being that they are no longer required to concern themselves with positivist ideas of causality, and instead focus more on control and containment, in order to stop individuals from preventing others' utility to pursue self-interest.

The Left Hand and the Right Hand

In this chapter the works of Pierre Bourdieu will be used to highlight the way in which such capitalist and neoliberal ideologies can work to disenfranchise those without voice. It shall also be suggested that the role of public services to children, young people and families should once again re-visit the role of counter-weight to the efforts of this dominant neoliberalism to make people subjects of control. By way of describing his thoughts on the State apparatus and the agents of class struggle that work within it, Bourdieu adopts the phrases ‘the left hand’ and ‘the right hand’ of the State. The former, he describes as those who work to ameliorate the negative impacts of the State and the market, including the financial industries, which he calls the right hand. Importantly, both are opposite sides of the State.

In a by-gone era youth work held at its core, a purpose of political agitation against the State, both local and national, as a way of engaging, empowering and motivating young people to come to understand their own sense of self and place. In keeping with this, Bourdieu describes the role of public sector workers - which he refers to collectively as ‘social workers’ (‘family counsellors, youth leaders, rank and file magistrates, and also, increasingly, secondary and primary teacher’) - as the left hand, working against the right hand of finance and bureaucracy. :

‘They constitute what I call the left hand of the state, the set of agents of the so-called spending ministries which are the trace, within the state, of the social struggles of the past. They are opposed to the right hand of the state, the technocrats of the Ministry of Finance, the public and private
banks and the ministerial cabinets. A number of social struggles that we are now seeing (and will see) express the revolt of the minor state nobility against the senior state nobility.’ (Bourdieu 1998:2)

This was Bourdieu’s response to a question about a secondary head teacher bemoaning the fact that ‘Instead of overseeing the transmission of knowledge, he has become, against his will, the superintendent of a kind of police station’, which, it could be argued, resonates with the experiences of some youth workers who might describe their roles less as one of engagement and empowerment and more one of supervision of spaces occupied by young people.

In this chapter the concepts and ideas of the individual and the collective, their relationship to one another and most importantly, their influence on society, the way people think and see themselves and their neighbours shall be explored. Most importantly for this paper, the notion that these tussles have come to define the way in which we view public services and the role they can usefully play in society.

In order to achieve this, there will be a focus on the works of Pierre Bourdieu and Ayn Rand and their very different ideas of what Bourdieu refers to as ‘symbolic violence’, which can be seen in Rand’s ideas of ‘injustice’.

**Pierre Bourdieu - The Social Field**

Pierre Bourdieu developed a theory based on his challenge of the work of linguists, which he accused of having too simplistic a view of the way language was used and developed. In particular, Bourdieu felt that linguists held a view that the use of language took place on, what might be considered, a level playing field which assumed everyone was equal. Instead, Bourdieu applied a variety of political views to develop a theory to explain the way in which people relate to the use and imposition of language (Waquant 1993:134).

In particular, he developed the central ideas of social fields and habitus. Social fields can be seen as the semi-physical, semi-political/economic/cultural positions we occupy as individuals and social groups. The habitus is the behaviour we embrace and develop to act out in our social field.
This social field plays out in our psyche and so has a great deal of influence on behaviour. It influences our relationships with ourselves and others. This idea follows on from the work Freud presented suggesting that the ego acts out and so influences behaviour - here Bourdieu can be interpreted as suggesting that the ego is influenced by the structure of the society that surrounds it, and thus influences behaviour.

**Symbolic Violence**

The social field defines us. But more importantly, through its relationships with those in other social fields, gives rise to a form of abuse which Bourdieu terms ‘symbolic power’ or ‘symbolic violence’ - terms which shall be used interchangeably in this paper.

‘....symbolic power is that invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or that they themselves exercise it.’ (Bourdieu 1991)

So, to place Bourdieu’s thoughts in real world terms, we each occupy particular social fields which could be the result of our class - working class people occupy a different social field to middle class people who occupy yet another social field to the nobility or elite. As a result of these fields, we learn, through the application of social norms learnt through our parents, peers, media, and our own observations of others, to take on a particular habitus that defines acceptable and expected behaviour commensurate with our social field. For example, the nobility may come to develop a habitus that contains an inherent assumption to rule over the lower classes, while the working class may develop a habitus more inclined to accept the rule of others over them or alternatively to rebel against the other classes - and this rebellion may take various forms, from all out class action, to far more subtle examples such as the adoption of behaviours known to be at odds and despised by the other classes (as seen in some forms of antisocial behaviour and criminal activity, as well as refusing to conform to certain ‘middle class values’ - similar to Paul Willis’s ideas around education, explored in the next chapter). This habitus comes to influence what we come to define as acceptable thoughts, expectations and behaviour and the result is that we each become locked into our particular social fields.

**Self-inflicted symbolic violence**
Building on this, Bourdieu says that we each commit acts of symbolic power on ourselves and others. Similar to physical power, symbolic power is inflicted and received, but lays in the symbolic rather than material world. For example, if the nobility were to abuse the use of the labour of working class people by maintaining them in situations of poor working conditions while exploiting their labour to retain an excessive profit for themselves, this would be considered symbolic violence. Equally, if one working class person were to actively inflict behaviour on another with the result of maintaining them in their position or field, this too would be deemed symbolic power - for example, through ridicule or other forms of bullying or grooming. In contemporary terms, this ‘sideways’ exertion of violence on one’s peers/siblings can be witnessed in the behaviour of groups of young people, particularly in the realms of ‘street gangs’ whereby, through an evident hierarchy between people occupying the same social field, physical and symbolic violence is dispensed and experienced as a method of maintaining the dynamics of the group through expressions of control.

Socialism’s deep held belief that one day all persons will become informed enough to rise up and take full responsibility for themselves and their neighbours, by directly challenging the right of the elite to rule over them, can be seen as an ideal - and the perpetual shortfall from such an ideal serves to illustrate this idea of self-inflicted symbolic violence; the socialist ideal is something to aim for, but there are genuine hurdles (symbolic violence) that prevent it being achieved - the marxist (Engels) idea of false consciousness. Our egos insist that we have an element of control and direction in our lives, so we construct, through ideology, the idea of control and direction in our lives - false consciousness - despite our being made subject, daily, to the apparatus of State and capital that perhaps have little interest in our own interests. This distraction can lead people to lack sufficient interest, on a day-to-day basis, in the problems of others that do not directly cause a problem for themselves. There are simply too many distractions. Only a Brechtian awakening will snap us out of our contentment.

In fact, that modern society throws up so many things to be dissatisfied about serves a useful and opiate-like function on the masses since it gives them their very own soap-opera to engage in, where those taking up positions in their personal existence are actors living out roles narrated by the individual. This serves as enough of a distraction and occupation to satisfy the individual that change is hardly worth the effort. Instead of being able to see ‘the whole picture’, as it were, it becomes practical to focus on those issues that
resonate most, which ultimately gives rise to ‘single issue politics’: a state that can serve to
distract from the complex efforts required to assess the socio-structural drivers that repre-
sent inter-field symbolic violence.

‘citizens are inserted in a web of constraining relations “independent of
their consciousness or will,” as famously put by Marx’ (Waquant 2005:3)

Slavoj Zizek (1989) built on this idea and challenged the central Marxist premise that the
workings of capitalist society served to keep hidden the true reality of life for the working
class man and woman. Instead, in Zizek’s proposition, our ideologies are seeped in cyni-
cism because we in fact know how far our ideological view of the world differs from true
reality - we simply choose not to do anything about it - perhaps our own personal soap op-
eras prove too engaging after all. Sloterdijk (1983) suggests that we accommodate this
cynicism through what he terms ‘kynicism’- irony and sarcasm as a filter to define and in-
terpret the dominant ideology, which we can use as a buffer to protect ourselves from hav-
ing to deal with the knowledge that our true interests our not being met.

As Bourdieu (1998: viii) has said, the point is to break ‘the appearance of unanimity which
is the greater part of the symbolic force of dominant discourse’. So, to paraphrase the film
‘The Usual Suspects’, the greatest victory of neoliberalism was to advance the idea that
there was no alternative - as proposed by one Margaret Thatcher. Or the phrase more re-
cently adopted by David Cameron, ‘we’re all in this together’.

Paulo Freire talks about ‘the existential duality of the oppressed, who are at the same time
themselves and the oppressor….they nearly always express fatalistic attitudes towards
their situation.’ (Freire 2000:61) – This can be seen often in vulnerable young people when
they struggle to see the value of engaging in intervention, stating ‘what’s the point?’, or
when those young people engaged in some of the more violent and risky behaviour in our
communities fatalistically proclaim they ‘don’t care if they die young’. Again, turning to
Freire, he describes this as a form of internalised oppression so that the young people are
acting out behaviour appropriate to their vulnerabilities.

‘Submerged in reality, the oppressed cannot perceive clearly the ‘order’
which serves the interests of the oppressor….chafing under the restrictions
of this order, they often manifest a type of horizontal violence for the petti-
est of reasons.’ (Freire 2000:62)

Claude-Henri Saint Simon said that individuals have to learn how they are oppressed in order to change the way things are. In interactions with children and young people, there is a clear role for services to play in supporting people to understand the way society is structured, not as a way of dismantling society, as is, but in order to realise a more inclusive and safer environment. If young people are engaged and challenged, honestly and positively, they can come to understand and place their own aspirations and develop realistic goals to achieving these. Interestingly, the Albemarle Report, mentioned in the previous chapter, and itself the product of a Labour administration, recognised the role of youth work in producing politically literate citizens within a social democratic society. In modern services, such aspirations are rarely, if ever, realised.

This horizontal violence is illustrated by Young (1999) who talks about ‘cultures of machismo’ and the denial of respect:

‘Young men facing such a denial of recognition [by a meritocratic society] turn, everywhere in the world, in what must be almost a universal criminolog-logical law, to the creation of cultures of machismo, to the mobilisation of one of their only resources, physical strength, to the formation of gangs and to the defence of their own ‘turf’. Being denied the respect of others they create a subculture that revolves around masculine powers and ‘re-
spect’. ’ (Young 1999:12)

Other examples of self-inflicted symbolic violence would be the use of alcohol, drugs or television to lighten the load of an oppressive social field. These can be interpreted as forms of social violence committed upon the self as a result of the alienation experienced in the social field of oppressed and disenfranchised people alienated from the vehicles of expression and representation. These diversions give the appearance of making the here and now manageable but also prevent or discourage engagement in bringing about any real change through challenging the social structures that maintain incidences of oppres-
sion - Marx’s ‘opium of the masses’ reference to religion.
The central position of this paper, the opinion promoted here, is that public services should have the purpose to engage children and young people in developing, for themselves, the views that come to define them. In so doing, they will come to understand the importance of setting out their views to others and ensure their voice is heard. It should not be the role of public services to direct young people in how to think - but it should be the role of services to give volume to their voice. That public services to children, young people and families are no longer structured and resourced to provide this role is not a recognition of the fundamental role of services. Instead it is a result of conscious decisions made by States as to the ideological drive behind provision, and financial imperatives of the age (Pitts 2012:18).

**Learning from the Hooligans**

It should be acknowledged that the casting of the working classes as potential assailants to middle class sensibilities and values, both culturally and physically, is not new nor the exclusive preserve of neoliberal thought. As Pearson (1983) has so clearly illustrated, it has been the inclination of elite and powerful politicians and their supportive press - in what he has termed ‘a predominantly masculine discourse’ (Pearson 1983:208) - to raise concerns about the behaviour of, particularly, boys as though they threaten the very fabric of an idealised and perhaps mythical, British society. At each juncture the narrative has served to present the cultural presentations of the working classes - boys’ behaviour as well as mothers’ parental omissions (Pearson 1982:17) - as something that must raise the collective concern of all right-minded and decent people through the expression of what Pearson terms ‘respectable fears’; that should result in increased activities of the right-hand of the State.

‘On each occasion, the same metaphorical appliances spell out that ‘things have gone too far’, that the common people have gained ‘too much freedom’, and that the reigns of government must be held more firmly.’ (Pearson 1983:230)

And, as Pearson has shown, at each moral panic, the presentation is as if of something new and never before seen. In fact, the physical manifestation may have been new - such as the arrival of cinemas portraying depraved American story lines, the music halls that allegedly introduced impressionable boys to foul language and behaviour, or the bicycle, that allowed the working classes (not to mention women) to travel further, bringing them
into quiet and decent middle and upper class neighbourhoods. But the sensibilities underlying each response were an ever-present. It was a response to, and expression of, the fear and discomfort generated when the working classes dared to get ideas above their station. (Pearson 1983:63-8)

A historical perspective, such as Pearson's, might serve to establish the idea that deviation from the ‘norm’ has been an ever-present in British life and one that might require the acknowledgement of structural responsibility and causation, rather than the excluding demonisation that often results.

In fact, the Conservative Party who have championed the imposition of neoliberal ideas in British social, economic and political thinking have not always assumed personal responsibility to lay at the root of deviance. In 1946 their policy document ‘Youth Astray’ stated clearly that:

‘The misbehaviour of boys and girls is mainly the outcome of conditions, social, economic and to some extent hereditary, for which they themselves cannot be blamed. The blame - for blame there is - rests largely upon society.’ (Pearson 1983:14)

However, by 1959 this thinking had disappeared and been replaced by the now more recognisable ideas of Conservative Party thinking:

‘We reject the notion, propagated by sincere but misguided idealists, that society shares the guilt of its criminals; that most malefactors are the victims of their environment.’ (Pearson 1983:14)

And this shift was able to lay the ground for the more fundamental shift in policy that the provision of State support through public service or social security could actually serve to promote rather than ameliorate the existence of deviance amongst sections of the population - in particular, through the State's interference in family life and reducing parental responsibility for the actions of their children (see Chapter Six - realism).

Following on from this, In 1978, Dr Rhodes Boyson stated that ‘crime has increased parallel with the number of social workers’ (Pearson: 1983:5) - a statement that has the inherent
proposition that deviance is, at least in part, the product of being too soft on those that fail to take responsibility for themselves or those around them. That the interventions of the State simply serve to relieve people of such responsibility that results in the various blights on society such as crime and welfare dependancy.

One thing that Pearson’s work points to is the ever-present desire to find solutions to the perceived threat and damage of an undesirable section of society, cast as an imposition on the, reckoned to be, clean and good-living and that, whether through the indulgences of parliament or the panic of an ill-informed and disengaged public, there have been regular attempts to control and respond to such ‘threats’ - ‘class legislation: enacted by one class for the betterment of its lower class brethren; not for the correction of its own habits.’ Pearson (1983:153). However, rarely have such responses matched the threat they perceive, either arriving after the fact, failing to understand the disconnection between deviance and consequence - offenders rarely consider getting caught - or getting caught up in a series of urban myths and folk tales that rapidly become disconnected from the original act deemed to be the threat - leading to moral panics. There is often a failure to engage with and understand the very people deemed to be offensive. In fact, the obsessions that parliamentarians in the mid-nineteenth century are reported to have had with the allegedly luxurious meals afforded ‘garotters’ (Pearson 2983:148) is in no small way similar to the obsession the coalition government of 2010 have displayed about benefit ‘scroungers’ living sumptuous lives at the tax payers (‘the strivers’) expense.

Ayn Rand - The Victory of the Individual

This section explores the concept of ‘selfishness’ and ‘altruism’ in the sense promoted by Ayn Rand, who held a particularly specific idea of how society should be structured, and felt strongly that altruism, and by extension, the provision of welfare and public service, were a direct injustice inflicted on the freedoms of the individual to pursue his or her own interests. In Rand’s ideal, there would be no public services, and there definitely wouldn’t be any services to children, young people or families, vulnerable or not, as this would be an exercise in injustice that allowed the weak to feed from the efforts of the strong. Such thoughts have come to influence key policy makers in the neoliberal mould, and language that Rand used to explain her ideas have also been evident in later statements - ‘There’s no such thing as society’; ‘scroungers’ and ‘parasites’. The argument promoted in this paper is that it is views such as Rand’s, amongst others, that have come to dominate neoliberal thinking around the provision of public services, including those to children, young
people and families, and such views have found their greatest expression in the theories of 'Right Realism' which shall be discussed in Part Two of this paper.

Rand outlined her philosophy in the interestingly titled *The Virtue of Selfishness*. It could be argued that Rand’s choice of title to explain her political philosophy, with its prominent use of the word ‘selfishness’ marks a clear pathway to the inherent ‘evil’ that lies within her thoughts. That hers is a philosophy that justifies the damage to others. As Rand herself acknowledges,

‘In popular usage, the word “selfishness” is a synonym for evil; the image it conjures is of a murderous brute who tramples over piles of corpses to achieve his own ends, who cares for no living being and pursues nothing but the gratification of the mindless whims of any immediate moment.’ (Rand 1964:vii)

However, Rand attempts to clarify her thinking by suggesting:

‘….the exact meaning and dictionary definition of the word “selfishness” is: concern with one’s own interests.’ (Rand 1964:vii)

Despite the various definitions, Rand’s sensitivity to misinterpretation is well placed and her riposte, accurate by some references. But, as with so much else in the use of language, interpretation is contextual, based as it is, on the position the interpreter places themselves on the political spectrum - as Bourdieu insisted, the assessment of language cannot assume all people occupy a level playing field. To those of a more communal and altruistic persuasion, the power inherent in the word ‘selfishness’ derives from its fundamental challenge to the notion of giving oneself up for the collective, reciprocal good of others. To allow this power to take root opens society up to the danger of regressive, divisive and damaging policies and activities.

However, the notion of selfishness is not unique to Rand and is in fact inherent in Adam Smith’s *invisible hand* that posits that people make inherently selfish decisions and so long as this remains true, economics will always produce the most beneficial outcomes for humanity, because the 'invisible hand' driven by the collective pursuance of self-interest
would not rationally work against humanity’s own interests - and as a result, there remains little role for an interfering State.

This has become the basis upon which most economic thinking has developed and can be seen writ-large across neoliberal thinking - small States with little regulation and intervention, leaving markets to deliver prosperity, because markets left to their own devices are the most beneficial and efficient way to organise society. However, more recently studies in behavioural economics, particularly by Tversky and Kahneman (1970s) have shown that, unlike neoclassical economic thought - ‘free marketeers’ - people don’t actually make economic decisions based on selfish drives, but in fact are mostly influenced by inter-relational motivations such as love, jealousy, grief, etc (Edmund Conway 2009:188).

However, while such behaviouralist considerations to the actions and motivations of people have started to challenge classical economic perspectives, these views remain dominant.

To those sharing Rand’s perspectives, the word _selfishness_ holds no danger. In fact, absence of selfishness is where the danger lies. For Rand and her followers, the word ‘selfishness’ is empowering. It captures the essence of freedom itself. According to Rand, to promote one’s own interests is to honour one’s role as a human being. To fail in this task is a fundamental denial of freedom. Importantly, the mere idea that there could be any danger in a word like ‘selfishness’ is a construct of the ‘ethics of altruism’ (Rand 1964:viii).

Putting aside any arguments about the true nature of altruism, and whether human beings can in fact genuinely ascribe to altruistic behaviour without, at heart, a selfish motive - a concept Rand herself explore’s in her bestselling novel, _Atlas Shrugged_, the interest for this paper is the impact of such diametrically opposed understandings of what, on the surface, appears to be a pretty simple concept - that of ‘selfishness’.

What Rand advances is the idea that, ethically, the received wisdom around altruism is flawed because, basically it boils all human existence down to the concept that only actions that are for the good of others deliver any value and meaning to humanity (the premise of public service) - and that any actions that are solely for the benefit of oneself are naturally evil (Rand 1964: viii).
Rand calls her philosophy *Objectivism* which concerns itself with ‘rational self-interest’.

‘The Objectivist ethics holds that the actor must always be the beneficiary of his own action and that man must act for his own rational self-interest.’ (Rand 1964: x)

In a clear forerunner to Margaret Thatcher’s ‘there’s no such thing as society, just individuals and families’ comment, Rand, in her 1961 essay, *The Objectivist Ethics* states

‘….there is no such entity as “society”, since society is only a number of individual men’. (Rand 1964:15)

And so these ideas have a broader impact on the way in which Rand feels individuals should interact with the world - because if they are only to have concern for their own interests, then by definition, there is no room, in Rand’s thinking, for the concerns for the welfare of others (Rand 1964:30).

And thus we see these ideas making their way into modern social and political thought, primarily of the right, but increasingly seen within mainstream discourse when discussing issues around immigration and welfare recipients:

‘It is intolerable that a large number of people choose to abuse the benefits system. Many people now see the benefits system, with its elaborate system of entitlements and payments as an alternative to work. This gives rise to a parasitic underclass of "scroungers", which represents both an unreasonable tax burden on the working population and is a factor in many social pathologies such as crime, anti-social behaviour and educational under achievement.’ *UKIP Policy Statement – ‘From Welfare to Workfare’ 2010*

Whereas Bourdieu thought of violence in the sense of it’s symbolic power over others (or oneself), Rand found use in the definition of violence in the sense of ones own deprivation from individual, utilitarian, material progress:
'The only proper, moral purpose of a government is to protect man's rights, which means to protect him from physical violence - to protect his right to his own life, to his own liberty, to his own property and to the pursuit of his own happiness. Without property rights, no other rights are possible.' (Rand 1964:36)

Which is a bit of a challenge to those who buy into Marx's 'all property is theft' idea. Both Rand and Bourdieu transcend the physical state by talking of violence in its symbolic form. However, they represent opposite poles of the political spectrum and their ideas around the role of violence have come to define their broader political philosophies.

From Rand's neo-utilitarian perspective, we see that the State should be small and non-intrusive, and individuals should be free to pursue their own interests. We see the right to accumulate property is paramount. Which suggests that, in order to retain such a right, the State may have a role to play after all - a role in securing and maintaining the rights of individuals to live free from hinderance in the pursuit of self-interest.

So, in Rand's view, the State is limited to the 'right hand', enforcing in simplistic and minimalist terms, individuals' rights. The role of the State in the neoliberal view is to 'protect' from harmful interference - the police; child protection services; community safety; the armed forces; all serve such functions and are promoted in the 'right realist' policy agenda - this is discussed further in Part Two of this paper.

Following on from this, if Rand's views are accepted as a 'pure' idea of how people should be allowed to function - free to maximise their own utility - then under neoliberal policy structures it can be seen that there is an acceptance that freeing individuals to pursue their own self interest may inadvertently inflict violence / injustice upon the vulnerable. In Rand's 'pure' views this is seen as an acceptable consequence in the pursuit of utility. However, in practical application, neoliberal policies accept a role for the State in ameliorating such impositions and so, as the pursuit of utility advances, the role of the State, particularly the local State, increasingly becomes one defined by the loose term of 'Community Safety' - 'left' and increasingly 'right-realist' enforcement responses to limit the negative impacts of the pursuit of self interest: environmental enforcement; trading standards; domestic violence; crime; noise abatement; etc - responses to the behaviours of people living as individuals rather than communities.
The influence of Friedrich von Hayek

Rand is not the only clear influence that has shaped the thoughts and ideas around the structure of society and the shape of neoliberalism. Of particular note is the work of Friedrich von Hayek, who developed his classical liberalist ideas around the nature of individualism, particularly his ‘true individualism’ and subsequent thoughts on State intervention versus freedom to compete (Rand’s idea of justice). Hayek was a notable member of the Austrian School of Economics, that went on to inform much of subsequent neoliberalist thought.

The similarities with Rand are clear to see - although von Hayak’s work was accepted as being intellectually superior, more complex in nature and he did call for a system of social security as a form of universal insurance or a ‘safety net’ for those that find themselves in desperate situations - something Rand had no time for. However, this should not be confused with a call for government intervention to redistribute wealth, which he saw as an unacceptable intrusion on individual freedom.

In Celebration of History - The Impact of Post-Modernist Thought

It’s not possible to develop a complete view of the world in which we live today without owning a historical perspective of theory and practice (Bourdieu and Waquant 1998); an idea that’s also central to Gramsci and other Marxist thinkers. Bourdieu’s central rejection of neoliberal policy and thought, and its general post-modernist moorings, is that it presents itself as ahistorical, as a product of now, reflective of our time and superbly placed, by its very nature, to define our social, political and economic functions.

But as Bourdieu has expressed, the very nature of current neoliberal thought has its genesis in history, in particular, a conservative view on the inherent legitimacy of its own rights to power and control, so that, rather than current neoliberal thought being seen as the revolution that it is presented as, that has come along to change and improve human experience by rejecting the either/or dichotomy of socialism and conservatism, it is in fact an evolution of conservative thought and retains and maintains much that defines conservatism - which in fact leads us to locate, what is generally referred to as the political centre where all contemporary major parties place themselves, as actually residing somewhere to the right of the centre. The view that we are experiencing Fukuyama’s ‘end of history’ pro-
vides a convenient veil to conceal this historical truth and present neoliberalism as unchal-
lenged and irreplaceable, the logical final resting place after centuries of class struggle -
the persistent attack on public services and their consideration for the provision of welfare
to the vulnerable is justified and irreversible.

Neoliberalism is a product of postmodern thought that breaks all issues down to the act of
their very, realist, existence and rejects this history or any contributory elements that war-
rant closer attention. Therefore there is a danger of accepting the ‘truth’ of neoliberalism,
as is, in that it encourages a reactionary, knee-jerk response to the issues presenting
themselves in society today. So, in effect, we respond to the symptom and not the cause.

For example, in modern social policy, policies and interventions are geared towards the
issue of young black men and their disproportionate presence in the criminal justice sys-
tem, or the vulnerability of young women to sexual exploitation, and develop theories and
policies to rectify these phenomena, in typical post-modernist, post-structural, reductionist
fashion, rather than setting these experiences within the context of historical concepts of
the ownership of power and control that, themselves need to be challenged and readjust-
ed - a rejection of Bourdieu’s social fields and habitus.

Of course these serious ills must be tackled and rectified, and the very real suffering of in-
dividuals and groups has to be acknowledged and obliterated, but it’s important that re-
sponses have real and lasting effects that deliver genuine equality and justice. It would be
more valuable and sustainable to focus the impact of responses on supporting young peo-
ple and families to develop the ways in which they view themselves and the world around
them rather than focussing on fire-fighting the symptomatic issues that people find cause
to present. Ultimately, a more informed population is then able to work collectively to chal-
lenge restrictive and damaging social structures.

Instead, for example, responses to disproportionate numbers of young black men in the
criminal justice system receive the response that services to young people begin to target
young black men as a ‘problem’ and come to define the issue as one of deficiency
amongst those young black men rather than placing their experiences and responses to
these experiences within the broader context of the youth population - in other words, ser-
vices, along Rand-like principles, come to define young black men as problematic and in
need of responses, rather than coming to define them as young people first and foremost,
who have particular social structures imposed upon them as a result of their race and
class (as Bourdieu would propose). This is similar to the issues mentioned earlier in this
paper in which Pearson (1983) discusses historical responses to deviance.

In discussing issues of crime and responses to such behaviour, James Q Wilson
(1975:49), in ‘Thinking About Crime’, rejects the sociological arguments for crime promot-
ed by criminologists of the time; in particular, the ideas that crime might be caused by
poverty and racial discrimination - most notably Sutherland & Cressey as well as Cloward
and Ohlin, amongst others. Wilson finds it difficult to see how the pursuit of such causes
can provide any useful contribution to social policy.

‘If it is hard to plan to make the good better, it may be impossible to make
the bad intolerable so long as one seeks to influence attitudes and values
directly. If a child is delinquent because his family made him so or his
friends encouraged him to be so, it is hard to conceive what society might
do about his attitudes. No one knows how a government might restore af-
fection, stability and fair discipline to a family that rejects these characteris-
tics.’

Such views release policy makers from seeking socio-structural solutions that may change
the way people are valued and come to value themselves - and lead to what are referred
to as ‘Realist’ (left or right) responses - discussed later in this paper. Instead, the causes of
deviance are rooted in the relationships and influences individuals are subjected to, or
choose to seek out, in their immediate social circles, and any responses of policy should
refrain from attempting to intervene in such dynamics.

In keeping with such views, it can be seen that, through funding structures and mecha-
nisms, agencies employing, on the whole, people from black communities are funded to
‘fix’ the issue of young black men and crime, and so the issue receives a black response to
a supposedly ‘black problem’ - since only black people will have a useful understanding of
the problem and solution - further alienating the issue from ideas around social structures
and Bourdieu’s habitus and symbolic violence, and couching it solely in the field of ‘race’
while denying that race itself is a social field with its own associated habitus’. In other
words, the effects of class and race can visit multiple vulnerabilities upon communities and
individuals, but the sources of these vulnerabilities are similar and the habitus that ampli-
fies the vulnerabilities becomes obscured in the fog - *these vulnerabilities aren’t done to people, they are the result of peoples’ own deficiencies and active choices.*

This chapter has explored Bourdieu’s ideas of the *left* and *right* hand of the State to indicate the interventionist, supportive and engaging services of the local and national State (left) and the enforcement, punitive, controlling activities that have more recently taken prominence.

However, Pearson’s ‘*Hooligans*’ warns us against knee-jerk reactions towards real or perceived social problems involving the working classes as these are often more representative of the fears and insecurities of the ruling elites that fail to see the systemic impacts of social structures on communities.

Never-the-less, these lessons of history have been rejected or ignored as inconvenient and a neoliberal, neo-conservative, neo-utilitarian rise has occurred that promotes the interests of the individual over any notion of community or society, so that social welfare services are discouraged from positivist ideas of responding to structural causation and instead become more ‘right hand’, and as such, less concerned with the needs and interests of people who use such services, and more interested in preventing their imposition on those prepared to pursue their own utility.

Later in this paper the ideas of ‘differential association’ shall be looked at, which Wilson critiqued in order to develop his ideas. However, instead of seeing such a theory as a reason for non-intervention, the argument presented in this paper is that the mechanisms that can lead to problematic behaviour should instead be employed to bring about changes in behaviour that lead to more positive and constructive outcomes - the relationships young people and families develop with agencies and practitioners can be a focus of transformation which facilitates their own personal and social interactions and relationships.

In this paper the attempt is to show that history does still have a role to play in understanding where we are today and what we need to do in order to improve our collective experience. History is not something to be feared or dismissed but instead, should be trawled studiously to assist in pointing to future pathways. To dismiss history and its role in defining current behaviour is to condone through public service, the condemnation of those subject
to the more punitive, blaming, divisive, regressive and reductionist of policies that are promoted as the complete opposite.
Chapter Three
Politics, Elitism and Public Services

‘We are all human, but no one is superhuman. We work and live better if we are not divided by caste, class or classroom. All this we are still learning.’ Dorling (2011: 88-92)

Introduction
So far in this paper, it has been shown, in chapter one, that the history of services to young people has been a journey of discovery, whereby, often the powerful and rich, have come to realise, with increasing clarity, the human needs and structural pressures that their poorer neighbours experience and have, through the input of philosophical and other learned contributors, come to develop responses to these needs that aim to improve the lives lived, while also aiming to reduce the impact of the poor on broader society. In the previous chapter the ideological considerations of these responses were explored and it was shown that, while these have shifted between assumptions of structural causation to individual deficiency, at all times the over-riding power and influence of the elites has remained constant.

It has been shown, for example, through the works of Bourdieu and Rand that there are opposing ways in which to view the world, and that these views have specific impacts on the way society functions, and in particular, these views have consequences for designing the public services which emerged out of the efforts set out in chapter one.

In this chapter it shall be shown that, contrary to a neoliberalist view that public services, and in particular, welfare support, structure the shape of society - it is in fact the dominant ideology of any time that serves to shape the very services that the poor and vulnerable come to rely on.

Through a discussion of the role of the elite in British society that encourages an increase in inequality for their own ends, to the role of education in cementing such inequality, onto the role of social housing in shaping a broader societal view of the poor that ends with a general demonisation of the working class - it shall be shown over these next two chapters that the very people who come to rely on public services, under a neoliberal system that
has turned its back on universality, have come to be portrayed as the cause of their own vulnerability - as if, in some way, a throwback to classicist post-feudal times.

Later in this paper this concept will be develop to look at the state of public services to children, young people and families that have come to deliver punitive rather than engaging and empowering responses to service users in keeping with prevailing realist and neoliberal thought.

**Education as a tool of elitism**

Education can take many forms and can serve a variety of functions, whether individually, collectively, locally or nationally. People can choose to engage in the educational process at various ages - particularly as adults - or they can feel compelled to receive education - particularly as children. Education can be uplifting, engaging, empowering and enlightening - it can also, and at the same time, feel like a chore. Education can be delivered in a variety of environments utilising a variety of methods and approaches. It can be formal or informal. Importantly however, rightly or wrongly, education is a method used by governments and elites, to shape and structure society and so it’s important not to assess education as a passive process. In fact, in its structure and delivery, education is a rampantly active process that serves to define the way people see themselves and define the roles they can play in society.

In this section the aim is to focus mainly on the formal educational experience of children that is, on the whole, delivered through the school environment and managed by education authorities as agents of the elite sections of society and increasingly, directly by Whitehall through the emerging Academy and Free School movement.

In particular, it shall be shown that, despite very narrow formal definitions of educational exclusion, the actual function of education serves to exclude large sections of society from the functions that drive decision making - whether they choose to engage or not - and remains heavily influenced by national and international developments in equality and inequality. The result of such mass exclusion is to condemn children to situations almost wholly based on class differentiations, and not, as is often suggested, merit (Halsey 1995:181).
Education, in this view, is a tool to maintain people in their social and class positions, so that, in general terms, the elite remain in positions of power and influence while the working classes are educated to fulfil their roles of subservience and the middle classes are primed to administer and maintain the functions of a class-based society.

In the previous chapter it was shown that the social fields people occupy can define the roles they play in society. It could be a useful role of education to challenge the impacts of such social fields and the resultant habitus’, but in reality, it appears that the role of education is actually to confirm such symbolic and material structures, which results in society becoming structured along more Randian ideas of progress for those that have the means for doing so, and alienation for the rest - a survival-of-the-fittest approach to society and success.

The journey of formal education in the United Kingdom is one that has been dictated both by concerns about what society should do with the children of the poor and feckless as well as about creating a labour force that is competent to operate the machinery on the factory floor without wantonly or accidentally burning the place down. Fundamentally, education has been developed by those sections of society deemed best placed to make such decisions and visited upon those deemed most in need of fixing.

This isn’t to suggest that formal education is something that is simply about what middle and upper class people do to working class children. Obviously, the children of those occupying the higher strata of society receive an education but, it will be shown here that education does not come in a one size fits all container - thankfully - but that the stratification of education is not driven by interest and desire but instead by an established notion of privilege, elitism and exclusion.

As Dorling (2011) has shown, as with most other societies, the UK has developed along elitist lines and this has dictated the approach to education as it has other areas of public and private life:

‘Under elitism education is less about learning and more about dividing people, sorting out the supposed wheat from the chaff and conferring high status upon a minority.’ (Dorling 2011: 35)
Willis (1977) has shown in ‘Learning to Labour’ that the education delivered to working class boys - and the way they choose to engage or disengage - is very much premised on the ways in which the different stratifications of society understand each other and interact.

Dorling (2011) also shows how changes across the world drove the elites to develop and implement a movement to drive wedges between the different classes in order to cement the elite’s position as superior to all others.

Bourdieu ‘considers schools to be the preeminent institutional machinery for the certification of social hierarchies in advanced nation states, and for this reason a central ground and stake in democratic struggles.’ (Waquant 1993) Clearly the dynamic at play here is the interaction between teachers and students (young people), but also, by extension, the policy agenda driven by local and national States and the acceptance and/or challenge from parents for the role of teachers / schools in their children’s lives. To a lesser extent, these same systemic features occur in services to children, young people and families and the importance of the relationship between the young people and the people delivering such services share an equal prominence as a site of Marxist conflict, class suppression and ultimately, enlightenment and mobilisation.

‘….the school supplies a sociodicy in action of the existing social order, a rationale for the inequalities and the cognitive and moral basis for its conservation.’ (Waquant 2005:135)

The ‘Spectre’ Arrives
In broader society in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the established order of elites, and lower classes went by, pretty much unchallenged (Dorling 2011:76) but for certain pockets of resistance and challenge that failed to disrupt the established order of things.

Men stood supreme at the expense of female subordination and the voices of minority cultures, particularly from the colonies were still to gain in confidence and volume. Working class communities festered in squalid conditions, the elites enjoyed high society and the middle classes occupied themselves with aspiring to move up the rankings while buffering the two extreme classes from the affront of having to have anything much to do with each other.
Capitalism was continuing to establish itself as the primary economic model and while communism enjoyed a certain notoriety, it didn't have any real foundation from which to establish itself - so the established inequality seemed secure.

However, following the 1917 revolution in Russia, communism gained a new and powerful champion and finally a potentially viable alternative to the status quo of capitalism stood on the international stage. Suddenly, those who had remained quiet, or otherwise without voice, found themselves with a new paradigm to attach their hopes to and as such, the voices of women (suffragettes), workers (labour movement) and the colonies (independence movements) grew louder. (Dorling 2011)

As the presence and presumed validity of communism grew, and fed the hopes and aspirations of those doing less well out of the status quo, the champions of capitalism, in particular Western Europe and the USA, began to better appreciate the threat posed.

The response, as history has shown, was mainly two-fold - appeasement and fear. Firstly, there was a move toward appeasement of those angling for greater equality and an end of the supremacy enjoyed by the elites. This included, amongst other things, girls staying in school for the same length of time as boys, increasing numbers of children learning to read and write, larger numbers of young people staying in education until they achieved a qualification, and finally, increasing numbers of the population going onto achieve undergraduate and post-graduate University qualifications - these latter two points previously being the preserve of the elites.

Particular responses in the UK were the late 19th century state funding of services to the vulnerable, such as children and young people (previously the preserve of churches and philanthropists) and the post-war establishment of the welfare state, a national house building programme and the NHS, delivering universal access to support, irrespective of income or social standing. While these developments were clearly positive, they were not without inherent attempts by the elite to exercise social control in order to shape society, so that the role of professionals in these emerging social welfare services became one of assimilating deviance into behaviours acceptable to the elites (Young 1999:5).
Secondly, there was a campaign of fear across the Western world against the dangers of communism, and by extension, equality - a move to temper the drive for equality designed to compliment, and nurture acceptance of, the offer of appeasement. The post-war McCarthyism campaign in the USA is well documented and targeted many in the Civil Rights and equality movements.

At each of these junctures, according to Dorling (2011), the preserve of the elite was challenged as educational achievement became universalised, thus reducing the prestige of standard qualification outcomes. As a result, the elites needed to find new ways in which to retreat into exclusivity and so by the 1950’s elitism became far more about which institution you attended rather than the level of your qualification - resulting in the modern-day situation of ruling political elites in the UK being primarily educated at Eton and other similar institutions - places inaccessible to the majority (Dorling 2011: 19).

In addition to this, Dorling (2011) shows how the responses of the elites included a drive to testing (e.g. The 11+ in the UK) and ‘IQism’ - the idea that the elites were inherently better placed to occupy positions of power because they habitually fared better in the tests that they were rolling out across the world.

Put simply, by ensuring the recipients of a new and broader formal education system - itself now extended to girls - were all given standardised tests, it would be possible to show that some - the elites - were smarter than others and so justified in filling positions of power. The working class would fair poorly in such tests which would generate low expectations in this cohort while the middle class would fair ok, thus establishing their sights at the clerical and managerial sections of society - in essence, IQism would cement people back into the roles that had existed prior to the drive for equality and the impact of communism coming along and raising everyones hopes of a different world. (Dorling 2011: 33-89)

The Positivist Dream in the Delivery of Education and Broader Welfare Services

In the enlightened post-war years there was a clear drive to increase the number of children engaged in compulsory education and through the 1950s and 60s this contributed to a noticeable reduction in inequalities across Britain as wages rose, health improved, increasing numbers of children attended state comprehensives rather than grammar schools
all in all, by the 1970s inequalities were at an all time low as the comprehensive package of welfare developments challenged the ‘five giants’ of ignorance, want, idleness, squalor and disease - to capitalise on the post war affluence brought about in part by the USA-funded Marshall Plan (the European Recovery Programme designed to prevent the spread of communism across post-war Europe) and continued to appease any moves for challenging the established social order.

This post-war period represented a time of plenty as re-building created jobs which in turn created a working class population that had a disposable income like never before – a time that Hobsawm has defined as ‘The Golden Age’ – and saw the masses move from the country to the cities to fill these jobs (Hobsbawm 1994:293).

If the early part of the twentieth-century had seen a clamour for equality and perhaps socialism, the post-war appeasement delivered social democracy in which, if you played your part, you were afforded a slice of the pie - and so in theory, everyone is happy, though perhaps not ecstatic.

There was subsequently a push for people to go on to higher education in order to attain the necessary qualifications required of the professionalising and broadening welfare services - Probation, Social Work, Youth Work, Teaching, etc. These new professional services, expanding in response to growing social concerns (clearly social democracy didn’t answer everyone’s questions), looked very different to the services that exist in the early 21st-century. The distinctions between the various disciplines were not as sharp and defining, and even Social Work had a far more community orientated approach and structure. Youth Justice itself was delivered by both social workers and youth workers through the Intermediate Treatment programmes of the 1970s and 80s - themselves based on a Social Work response developed in the 1960s to meet the needs of young people and families with complex needs. Significantly however, these social welfare responses were clearly structured around ideas that the issues and vulnerabilities individuals and groups experienced had causes rooted in the way society was structured, and it was the role of these responses to redress the balance - to work to reduce inequality (Pitts 1988:1).

The Neoliberal Reversal - as seen through the Education System
Further influence on social policy arrived in the shape of the OPEC Oil Crisis of 1973 which marked a shift in the power balance on the international stage. Prior to this the West had enjoyed unfettered growth and unchallenged access to the oil resources that fuelled this growth. When the major oil producing nations decided to create a cartel and increase prices, it became clear that things would never be the same again.

However, OPEC can be seen, not as the cause of the change in Western governmental policy, but the excuse, as elite and wealthy circles had already begun to question the drive for equality marshalled in through post-war polices - this relaxedness about redistribution came under pressure by the early 1970s, due to the very consequences of that redistribution:

‘Before jobs went at the end of the decade [1970s], before insecurity rose, it was a great time to be ordinary, or to be average, or even above average, but the early 1970s were a disconcerting time if you were affluent. Inflation was high; if you were well off enough to have savings then those savings were being eroded. (Dorling 2011: 61)

Previously, across the western world, since the heyday and subsequent crash of the 1920s, what Dorling calls the ‘gilded age’, the argument seemed to have been won about striving for greater equality and better distribution of wealth and resources. After all, the greed, exclusion and elitism of the late 19th and early 20th centuries had led to ‘The Great Depression’ so a fertile ground existed for talk of doing things differently (elitist fear generated by the rise of communism combined with the push for greater equality created the perfect-storm for change).

But the post-war euphoria, matched as it was with near full employment and general affluence across Western Europe and the USA, meant that, on the whole, the drive for greater equality met with little resistance, and even government policies around welfare, education, health and housing created unprecedented reductions in levels of inequalities throughout the 1950s/60s and 1970s. By the 1970s most children in Britain were attending the same schools, with significant reductions in the numbers of children being segregated into elite educational establishments.
As an indication of the post-war impact on inequality that such policies achieved, the rate of poverty in Britain fell from around 30% in 1936 to under 3% by 1950, so that poverty itself could no longer, at that time, be considered a phenomenon (Halsey 1995: 102).

The 1970s were a different story all-together and marked a significant change in the way public service responses were viewed, valued and resourced - changes that continue to influence the structure and esteem of services into the 21st Century. While everyone is doing well, the affluent can relax that they are still doing well in a well functioning society. However, Dorling suggests, once the financial crises developed following 1973, the affluent were less willing to be considerate to the needs of others and across the rich economies of the world, a return to elitism and exclusivity began that was to accelerate through the 1980s under Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, amongst others around the world.

In Britain, Thatcherism saw the introduction of ‘assisted places’ to reverse the trend of universal education at comprehensive schools and introduce State funded places in private schools as affluent parents began to question why they should forgo theirs and their children’s security at the expense of the less well off (Dorling 2011: 61)

So as the economic situation placed mounting pressure on the affluent, political pressure to re-establish the old order of elitism increased. Public spending came under pressure, and the calls to ensure that the affluent could feel secure that their children were receiving a different service to the rest of society became louder. This itself, partly due to OPEC concerns and the feeling that public money shouldn't be used to shore up the failing lower classes when the elite themselves were suffering. It is at this point that the seeds of the later demonisation of the poor were sown. This will be explored further, in chapter four.

Importantly, this separation, politically, couldn’t be achieved simply by shifting wholesale, public expenditure to the elites and middle classes (which would have entailed shutting down public services), so the neoliberal drive to shift finances from the public to private sphere (using public finance to resource private activities) began to gather pace (Dorling 2011: 61).

This was eventually, in later decades, to lead to the startling statistic that by 2009 - according to the OEDC - the UK, particularly through the assisted places programme, was spend-
ing more of it’s education budget (public finances) (23%) on a ‘tiny proportion of privately educated children (7%) than did almost any other rich nation.’ (Dorling 2011: 61)

So by the time Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan were to establish their cross-Atlantic political and ideological union, the ground was ripe for elitism to turn the clock back on the gains towards equality that the post-war years had seen. On the surface of things, it looked like little had changed. Grammar Schools continued to decline in number in favour of the more general education of Comprehensive Schools, but the neoliberal machine that these two leaders championed had more subtle ways of re-introducing the wedges that divided society, including the ‘assisted places’ programme and league tables (Dorling 2011: 79).

School league tables that refused to account for differences in resources or the different socioeconomic starting points of each school and its cohort. The same differences that meant some parents had the drive to push for assisted places while others were primarily preoccupied by more mundane concerns such as feeding and clothing their families.

So the sum result of the Thatcher administration’s drive to introduce ‘the market’ into the structure and delivery of education in the UK was that society became increasingly segregated by what was seen as educational choice - i.e. a return to which institution you attended.

The dogma of market-driven education policy was to ensure that, despite the rhetoric of universality through state comprehensive schools, increasing numbers of parents made strides, or at least retained ambitions, to work to get their children to the best schools, and avoid having to make use of the more mediocre establishments, even if, or perhaps especially if, these happened to be their most local school. The market dictated that schools would no longer enjoy a monopoly over local children in their catchment areas and instead would be subject to the pressures of competition to attract the best and brightest pupils able to travel.

‘As the arch monetarist, less government more self-help guru [Sir Keith Joseph] of what was beginning to be called ‘Thatcherism’, his agenda was to reduce public expenditure of education and minimise the influence of bureaucrats and professionals. He also wanted to raise levels of achieve-
ment and make what went on in education at all levels more relevant and useful to the worlds of making and spending; and generally to bring the education service more in line with a market place characterised by informed consumers choosing from among competing providers.' (Gilchrist, Jeffs and Spence 2001:240)

Clearly, the stated logic was to push up standards by encouraging all schools to be the best they possibly could so that families would be spoilt for choice and have to make genuine decisions between relatively equally high performing schools. If this were the case then the local school would still retain a near monopoly because all schools, according to the market, would be punching at similar weights - simply in order to ensure their survival.

As with so much of elitist policy making, in order to take it at face value, one needs to suspend cynicism and accept that all factors are equal. All schools are equally well resourced - including being able to attract the best staff; all children are equally able because they all enjoy socioeconomic circumstances that promote advancement in formal education; all families are equally informed and able to fight for the best for their children.

In fact, schools are not all the same - some enjoy advantages of location, some enjoy prestige of history, some have amazing leaders who attract and retain amazing staff.

Some families enjoy dual incomes - and not because mum holds down two early morning cleaning jobs; some families are able to place a high value on education; some families are able to resource their children to travel distances to the best schools; some families are able to compliment formal education by resourcing a plethora of extra-curricular activities.

Some children have space at home to complete their homework; some have breakfast before leaving for school in the morning; some aren’t disadvantaged by learning disabilities and difficulties.

Some schools; some families; some children - are/do not.
The Return of the Two-Tiered Education System

In effect, things are far from equal and so inevitably, what happens in a market-driven system such as developed in the 1980s onwards was that some schools developed a monopoly on some of the most advantaged children and families, and the rest had to make do with whoever they could get. And so the outcome of such a system was that, despite the noises coming from policymakers, it was clear that there were differences within the education sector that some usually more canny/middle class parents were very much aware of - hence buying into catchment areas of the best schools or enrolling children in appropriate extracurricular activities. Pitts (2008) has spoken about the ‘residualisation of education’ in which the children of the poor become concentrated in poor schools in poor neighbourhoods of acute social disadvantage, which he has suggested can lead to the ghettoisation of some schools and it is at these schools that the parents often lack the means to manipulate the market-driven access to ‘choice’ through their lack of ‘cultural capital’, which is discussed later in this chapter.

One impact of introducing the market into education has been to cause increasing numbers of parents to make efforts to ensure their children are spared the mediocrity of local state schools by moving home or lying about religion or paying, to ensure they get access to the best educational opportunities. Clearly, while on the surface, the rhetoric is of a universal education system, there is still a great deal of stratification in Britain, especially if parents need to be in possession of additional resources to source the best. As has been established by the Sutton Trust, increasing numbers of parents - those that can afford to - are paying for additional private tuition, in addition to the State education that their children receive (The Sutton Trust 6th September 2013).

Further evidence of the influence of social class on educational outcomes is seen in a report by the Office for National Statistics - ‘Population Trends’ - which shows that the children of parents of higher social classes go on to achieve higher social qualifications:

‘It found that among men aged 23-26 living in a two-parent family in 1981, 43% with a parent in the highest social classes (professional and managerial) achieved a higher education qualification.'
Of those with a parent from the two lowest social classes (semi-skilled and unskilled), only 14% achieved the same level of education.' (Population Trends, No. 121, Autumn 2005)

In addition, various research studies have shown a link between schools that perform well in terms of performance tables and increases in local property prices in the USA (Cheshire and Sheppard 2002; Black 1997), suggesting that firstly, affluent and socially mobile parents are prepared to move to neighbourhoods that have identifiably successful schools, but also that such areas become inaccessible to poorer families as property prices become exclusionary, further adding to polarising pressures in educational access and attainment.

Added to this, Bradley and Taylor (2003:6) in the UK, mention the additional dynamic, not simply of parental choice, but of schools cherry-picking pupils as a way of maintaining their league table positions:

‘….it is well known that pupils from middle-income families are more likely to perform well at school and will consequently be attracted to schools with a ‘good’ exam performance. To the extent that schools that perform well can ‘cream skim’ the market, which is likely when a school faces an excess demand for places, then the outcome will be a greater concentration of those pupils with the best chance of success ending up in the ‘best’ schools. The reverse will happen in those schools with a ‘poor’ exam performance, and consequently the operation of the quasi-market could lead to a more socially segregated school system.’

In each case it is the children of the less economically sound and secure that experience less choice and are more vulnerable to poor educational outcomes. However, in a market-based educational system, it is precisely the provision of choice that suggests that success is accessible to all that want to grasp it. Leaving those unable to capitalise on such arrangements to consider their own failings (Dorling 2011: 35)

**Internalising inequality**

This segregation can have a significant impact on the children who don't do so well from this market-driven approach to educational placement. It can impact on the way they view themselves and the roles they can usefully play in society. Importantly, by promoting this idea of personal failure, they may find it difficult to muster the motivation to strive, and may
even exhibit behaviours which suggest their educational placement is justified - a self-filling prophecy.

Cloward and Ohlin (1961), in talking about delinquency and deviance, suggest that young people exhibit certain responses to the pressures of structural inequality - which may be identified as a ‘retreatist’, passive and internalising response; or an active and expressive response - expressed through the conduct of violence or crime. The former can be seen in the consumption of drugs and alcohol or otherwise withdrawing from engagement, which can be seen in the schools environment whereby children may find it difficult to engage in the expectations of the formal educational environment. The narrative conducted about lower class children and their propensity to violence or criminal activity as barriers to educational inclusion is well established. Cloward and Ohlin describe these behaviours through the concept of street gangs, but such expressions can equally be described through the behavioural difficulties often experienced in the schools environment where children reject the norms of wider society and seek value, respect and meaning in the subcultures of deviance and delinquency (Cloward and Ohlin 1961:22). It should be noted that these two cohorts need not be thought of as mutually exclusive (Cloward and Ohlin 1961:43). Later in this chapter the ideas of Paul Willis are discussed, where he talks about the ‘counter-school culture’, and Cloward and Ohlin’s thoughts on delinquency and deviance are well placed within such a counter culture.

It is in poor schools in poor neighbourhoods that such expressions are most evident, resulting in poor performing schools becoming those spaces reserved for those unable to access the rich successes which the market provides (Pitts 2012:13).

So the segregation across the education sector was established and over the following decades, moves were made by successive administrations to further entrench the differences between the best and the rest. These included introducing the Academies programmes under the Blair government which opened schools up to private investment and sponsorship and the following 2010 coalition administration’s drive to expand the Academies system as well as introduce Free Schools.

Both of these moves increased the polarisation of schools as money and other resources become concentrated in those establishments that appear attractive to investment be-
cause they continue to achieve positive educational and inspection outcomes, and thus continue to attract the children with least disadvantage.

It is true to say that there have been particular schools in troubled neighbourhoods that have been showcased as triumphs against adversity - or perhaps triumphs that highlight the ineptitude of the naysayers who want to claim structural disadvantage in the persistence of educational and societal inequality. Such schools have often been identified through their acquisition of a so-called ‘super-head’ - a renowned and experienced head teacher who can cut through the perceived navel-gazing, procrastination and ideological indulgence and deliver an efficiently and successfully run school that breeds order, respect and the much sought-after progress up the performance tables.

The relative success of such schools is not disputed. To do so would be to dispute the idea that working class children can succeed - which isn’t the case. What such schools show is that, where resources and energies are focused on particularly narrow definitions of success - which, it could be argued, is the role of formal education anyway - and staff are not distracted by ideological concerns about class, deprivation, inequality and pupil-preparedness, schools can indeed produce fantastic results that buck the trend often seen in schools educating the poor and working classes. Educational and behavioural problems don’t appear as apparent as in other schools in similar neighbourhoods.

Often, such successes cannot be viewed without an appreciation of the role of ‘selection’ and formal exclusion.

Meanwhile, the other schools are charged with supporting disproportionate numbers of children who experience factors that may make a calm, industrious and progressive environment difficult to maintain - educational and behavioural difficulties (EBD), including spectrum disorders like dyslexia and autism; language issues; ADHD; parental stress - poverty, substance issues, mental health; housing issues - including overcrowding. Effectively, these schools become dumping grounds for children that the luckier schools don’t want and the result is that, as reported by The Sutton Trust in June 2013, of the supposedly selection-free comprehensive and Academy sector, the top 500 had selected disproportionate numbers of high-achievers compared to their less-well performing contemporaries.
‘England’s highest performing comprehensive schools and academies are significantly more socially selective than the average state school nationally and other schools in their own localities’

And that:

‘95 per cent of the top 500 comprehensives have a smaller proportion of their pupils on free school meals than their local areas, including almost two thirds (64%) which are unrepresentative of their local authority area, with gaps of five or more percentage points.’

These policies have been pursued despite the evidence that points to the fact that, where greater integration takes place amongst children’s education, society as a whole benefits. In other words, where children have the opportunity to socialise, learn, challenge and be challenged by other children from a variety of backgrounds, all children grow into more well-rounded individuals with a greater sense of connectedness with other children from various backgrounds (Goldberg, T.D. 2009).

Once these differences between the schools become entrenched then families become involved in further moves to retain and establish their children’s positions in well performing schools - going as far as making sure the correct clothes are bought, the right language or colloquialism is spoken, the right circles are moved in - and thus further separating the different education sectors (Dorling (2011: 127)

Or what Paul Willis, Bourdieu and Halsey have referred to as cultural capital. In effect, parents are striving to ensure that, through social mobility, their children come to imbibe a different habitus to the one they learnt - one which will offer the possibility of social and economic mobility. These are the very things that prepare children to become the leaders in society - the very things that children of the poor and working class are denied through their schooling and so the very things that ensure that inequality in society becomes ever more entrenched.

In pre-industrial and industrial Britain, where class was a primary designator of one’s role in society, material capital, according to Halsey (1995:135) differentiated the classes through their relationship to capital and production and:
‘….education basically served to put a stamp of class culture on fates already decided by class origin. The social reproduction of generations was primarily a transmission of material capital and therefore of its attendant inequality.’

But this changed as society developed and advanced, technically, so that such stratifications were no longer clearly maintained and this production or transmission of class became less reliant on material, and more so on cultural capital (Halsey 1995:135).

**Internalising Elitist Placement**

It is useful to consider the impact of poor housing and poor schools, poverty and demonisation on the children who grow up under such circumstances. In ‘Learning to Labour’, Paul Willis (1977) interviewed a cohort of just such a group of boys, ‘the lads’ as he called them, and looked into how the children of the working classes are schooled to fulfil working class roles in life - which is itself at odds with the neoliberal, meritocratic claim of social mobility.

‘….there is a moment - and it only needs to be this for the gates to shut on the future - in working class culture when the manual giving of labour power represents both a freedom, election and transcendence, and a precise insertion into a system of exploitation and oppression for working class people. The former promises the future, the latter shows the present. It is the future in present which hammers freedom to inequality in the reality of contemporary capitalism.’ (Willis 1977: 120)

So, the very act of being, of functioning, of thinking and doing within such limiting class boundaries empowers children and adults to experience agency while cementing them within the limits they may aspire to escape. Their agency is limited by the confines of class habitus – internalised class structures and class barriers - and it is the acceptance of these limits that define their class position, even though their agency is expressed.

After all, observing two separate classrooms in two separate schools, one working class comprehensive, one private, socialising the leaders of the future, it is clear to see that the behaviour of the children in each classroom is different. The privately educated may sit, attentively, signed up to the burden of their future. Those in the comprehensive may be
less inclined to submit to the expectations presented before them. And it is in these responses, according to Willis, that children live out, reject and at the same time cement their class futures (Willis 1977: 122).

Willis explores the distance between cultural interpretation and assumption of school education and the actual experience and interpretation of that education from the perspective of working class boys. In particular, there is a gulf between a middle class acceptance that education and subsequent qualifications are an inherently good thing, and the lads’ ideas that the qualifications they are being prepared for are far from inherently productive since they are below the standards expected of other children, and so they develop a collective, perhaps unspoken, narrative that undermines the drive to educate them - what Willis calls the ‘counter-school culture’. In particular, ‘the lads’ focus, quite understandably, on the conflict between the amount of work and sacrifice they will be required to give in order to achieve, what they perceive to be sub-par rewards, with the loss of ‘immediate gratification’ - something Willis describes as never changing, and able to deliver rewards throughout their lives.

However, in the immediate consideration of the choice before them, working class children weigh up the benefits of complying and engaging in an educational system they struggle to relate to (conform) with the benefits of peer validation, which in itself, may hold the seeds to class emancipation - although it could never be said that this was the motivation for rejecting conformism - as Willis shows, rejection comes from a desire for instant gratification.

‘The cultural choice is for the uncertain adventure of civil society against the constricting safety of conformism and only relative or even illusory official progress.’ (Willis 1977: 126-7)

In other words, ‘the lads’ can give up their day to day cultural reality in the pursuit of someone else’s cultural reality only to find that the reward at the end of that sacrifice is restrictive, unrewarding and lacking in relevance.

This is a useful portrayal of the working class experience of middle class education systems - that are themselves, the object of elitist direction (increasingly evidenced through the sponsorship-focused Academies programme) - that seem to fail to place themselves in spaces and cultures of relevance to the children they are attempting to engage - as though
losing sight of the legitimate role such targets of learning have to play in their own development - which is what Paulo Freire explored in his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 

It is a dynamic often played out in environments of less formal educational settings, such as youth work and targeted services, including those concerned with youth justice. The narrative is one of youth involvement and participation, which leads one to assume that a genuine desire to empower exists - only for closer inspection to reveal no such confidence in children and young people and a real agenda to limit the parameters of involvement to safe choices such as what colour paint to choose for the youth club toilets, or how to spend a small proportion of an overall budget - with final oversight always retained by adults. Returning to Willis and the formal educational environment:

‘….there is a common educational fallacy that opportunities can be made by education, that upward mobility is basically a matter of individual push, that qualifications make their own openings. Part of the social democratic belief in education even seems to be that the aggregate of all these opportunities created by the upward push of education actually transforms the possibilities for all the working class, and so challenges the class structure itself.’ (Willis 1977: 127)

That is to say, being working class is not a structural issue but one borne of individual inability to claim the prizes offered by an indifferent education system. That the education system has no drive or agenda of its own, apart from making opportunities available - it is up to individuals to realise this and grasp such opportunities to rectify the curse of being working class - that the elites and middle classes are such nice people for making available the opportunities for emancipation. The education system itself - so the train of thought goes - could never actively work to maintain people in a position of class subservience to those that deliver such opportunities.

However, this view serves to place an inaccurate value upon the role and drive of education. As though it were education that were the driving force of progress - which, to be fair, we are led to believe. Willis counters that, contrary to this belief, it isn’t education that forms the drive towards upward mobility but is instead, the economy. Or as Halsey (1995:156) has said, ‘*Education can create neither wealth or welfare.*’ However, despite the neoliberal clarion call to leave the employers free to drive the economy ever upwards,
the opportunities provided by this one-way drive are few, and in no way enough to justify ideological commitments to leave the creation of opportunities to the free hand of the market.

And it’s Willis’ assertion that working class children subjected to such educational ‘opportunities’ are sophisticated enough to know that said opportunities hold little relevance to their lives - even if they are unable to articulate these feelings in ways acceptable to middle class audiences.

However, where the ‘upward pull of the economy’ (Willis 1977: 127) no longer provides opportunities deemed relevant to the lives of the working class children being taught, there is an increased possibility that the pull of ‘the street’ gains greater relevance, and such children become evermore vulnerable to the potentially negative attentions of those without their best interests at heart (Pitts 2008:61).

In fact, Willis (1977:128), echoing Bourdieu, goes on to suggest that working class education has little chance of challenging class structure because advancement actually lies in ‘cultural capital’ - ‘knowledge and skill in the symbolic manipulation of language and figures’ of the dominant classes (knowing how to play the game) - and that it is the dominant classes themselves that possess the ability to pass these life lessons onto their children, thus cementing class difference within society outside of the established educational systems in place.

So given these structural dishonesties, Willis indicates that the observable objection to educational certification and ‘advancement’, rather than an inherent consequence of one’s degeneration through class, is in fact a moment of empowerment through a realisation of the slight of hand (Willis 1977: 128).

Given working class children go on, in general, to become working class adults, with working class jobs, in working class communities, their ‘education’ in counter-culture sets them up well for the shop floor, in Willis’ view, since they are rarely going to move on to become the factory or office owner. Therefore they may perpetually be in a state of working for others, and will need to protect themselves from overt exploitation (Willis 1977:130).
It is in their interest to ensure the employer does not hold too high an expectation of their abilities lest they find themselves asked to do over and above what their peers are tasked with - or worse, they set the bar higher and expectations of the entire workforce are raised - which could ultimately result in them becoming ostracised by their own class while being seen to serve the functions of other classes - they are effectively marooned.

It is worth noting that the working class referred to by Willis is less prominent in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. It is difficult to define people by their relationship to an industrial infrastructure. In current times, people have a greater relationship to a service sector that bestows less the image of traditional working class imagery - physical labour - and more the clean lines of office work - the so-called white collar workers. In this sense, it is difficult to equate current experiences with those observed by Willis and other commentators and authors. Today, those products of a state education system that delivers people into pre-destined societal roles will fit a description more akin to middle class imagery in Willis’ time. And as Halsey (1995) has observed, the general trend has been towards an upward mobility so that the working class cohort has shrunk in favour of a burgeoning middle class. If, in Willis’ time, the working class were unlikely to move beyond the restriction of employment to end up owning the factory, today there exists a lower middle class that is unlikely to emancipate itself from its office job and become company director.

However, that there has been a recognised upward mobility, it is noted by Halsey (1995:154) that this still represents a difference in class as indicated by educational attainment. Those rising up a class have attained less, educationally, than those already in that class, and equally, those dropping a class have attained more than those already in the lower class. This suggests that those new occupants of the modern middle classes will tend to share many characteristics with the working classes of Willis’ time rather than the established habitus of traditional middle class communities.

Education and broader public and social welfare services should not be seen as indifferent and inert but instead active tools which help impose the structures of society by establishing class boundaries and responding to service users by defining them within those class boundaries - as such, the dominant neoliberal narrative of meritocracy and social mobility can only be seen to go so far.
As individuals, groups and communities, we are, in part, defined by the social fields we occupy, and also, according to Willis, we come to define ourselves by such fields. Therefore, it is problematic for educational and social welfare services to respond to service users as somehow deficient when they are in fact, more often than not, products of the society in which they live. That society is in no small part, consciously structured by the elites to cement such class boundaries makes it imperative that educational and social welfare services work to empower rather than contain. Instead, developments that have ushered in an end of universal services in favour of targeted services that are only able to respond to specific need, leads to the provision of services becoming a part of the problem by contributing to the demonisation and containment of those that come to rely on their provision. This is explored further in the next chapter.
Chapter Four
The End of Universalism

‘As inequality rises people begin to treat others less and less as people and begin to behave towards others more and more as if some are a different species’ (Dorling 2011: 126)

As discussed in the previous chapter, the 1970s, as with social policies and services across the western world, were hit by a new pessimism propelled by the OPEC Oil Crisis that led to Governments reassessing priorities and challenging previously taken for granted assumptions about what was possible for State services and provision. In particular, and in keeping with dominant policy thinking, there was a move away from seeing welfare as part of the social contract that holds healthy societies together, towards a view that public finances were increasingly to be reserved for those placing the neoliberal, consumerist model at risk (Pitts 2008:133-4).

In order to justify this shift, the way in which governments spoke to the population changed to become more demonising of those in receipt of support, in particular by casting the discussion around the element of crime (Pitts, 2003:5).

The result of this has been to lead the general population to become far less sympathetic towards those in receipt of public support, whether through social welfare services, social security (since renamed ‘benefits’) or council housing (since renamed social housing), and much more demanding of more retributive responses to their perceived laziness - because people are far less supportive of spending public funds on people deemed to be harming their interests.

In Bourdieu’s terms, the left hand receded in favour of the right hand. The Government’s role became less proactive, more passive, in welfare terms, as the ground was left to private sector contractors to define the pace, quality and vision of social house building (Hanley 2007: 122), while more State efforts become increasingly focused on enforcement activities to contain and control those deemed to be falling short of expectations - community safety, restrictive and punitive welfare regimes, and importantly a shift from social welfare to youth governance (Pitts 2012).
Looking at developments in social housing from the 1970s as an illustration, it can be seen that the view of such provision began to solidify across Britain as places to avoid if you possibly could, devoid of inspiration and riddled with poor quality workmanship (Hanley 20017). Increasingly, as the next decades progressed, social housing became the preserve only of those who couldn’t do any ‘better’ - i.e. rent privately or secure a mortgage of debt to buy a property outright for themselves. Increasingly, communities broke down as people moved on in pursuit of betterment, while others were left behind.

‘In short, as had long been predicted, communities [were giving way] to individuals linked in anonymous societies.’ (Hobsbawm 1994)

This only served to increase the sense of exclusion and separateness between the social fields that existed. However, it wasn’t just housing that had been affected. The world was changing and a drugs epidemic that had swept across the USA - through it’s proximity to South American cocaine production - was beginning to manifest in Europe (Pitts: 2008) and this new development in the crime portfolio found happy breeding grounds within housing estates that were not only physically neglected, but the residents themselves began to develop their own habitus as forgotten and alone, as local authority housing policies began to concentrate the most vulnerable and problematic families together. (Hanley 2007: 123-4).

With the emerging exclusive society becoming exacerbated through the neoliberal policies of Margaret Thatcher, the problems experienced by those left abandoned on council estates became distilled into ever increasing concentrations of misery and suffering as those who could afford to move, did so, leaving the least mobile and most vulnerable (physically, mentally and/or economically) to make the best of whatever situation they faced on a daily basis.

‘...Hooligans is a warning from history that sustained exposure to acute social and economic disadvantage spawns forms of crime that have catastrophic effects upon the vulnerable populations amongst whom and against whom they are perpetrated.’ (Pitts 2008:33)
‘Estates mean alcoholism, drug addiction, relentless petty stupidity, a kind of stir-craziness induced by chronic poverty and the human mind caged by the rigid bars of class and learned incuriosity.’ (Hanley 2007: 7)

The Prime Minister that unilaterally announced that ‘there is no such thing as society’ betrayed further ideas of human behaviour when she wrote off whole swathes of the population with her comment that:

‘....a man who finds himself, beyond the age of 26, on a bus can consider himself a failure.’ Margaret Thatcher (Hanley 2007:14)

Which served to sum up the view that some people were worthy of praise and esteem, perhaps because they had managed to retain a job that paid a reasonable sum; one that afforded them the opportunity to buy a car and encourage a bank manager to trust them with a mortgage so that they could lay claim to a property - people who only had as many children (if not less) as they could afford. While others deserved their lot as the forgotten people who didn’t deserve help because, through their own fecklessness, they wouldn’t know what to do with opportunity even if they were fortunate enough to receive it (Hanley 2007: 10).

However, according to Pitts (2008:57), what Hanley (2007:10) refers to as this ‘sick logic’ is a fundamental aspect of modern social policy as successive governments attempt to restructure the social world in accordance with the demands of the market, so that State efforts become focussed less on protecting the vulnerable and more on turning people towards the consumer behaviours necessary for a successful market-led economy through the provision of social welfare provision.

The thrust of Conservative thought during the 1980s and 1990s towards the underserving poor was reserved for those who refused or failed to take advantage of the opportunities to become pseudo-land owners and stake their claim to their own English-man’s castle. The only people who lived in council-owned properties, following this view, were those who wanted to be, and didn’t care that they were, failures (Hanley 2007).

As the financial crises of 2007/8 was letter to show, the deserving poor, who managed to escape such stigmatising treatment and attention, often only managed to do so by over
stretching their financial means, so that the combination of their debts, dreams and delusions helped them climb out of the squalor that was reserved for those left to survive social housing property. And so estates shifted from a once idealistic vision of contributing to the creation of an equal society in the post-war years to spaces, dumping grounds, to contain these people, and social welfare services slowly shifted in their purpose towards this drive to contain, to limit - limit their movement, their aspiration, but most importantly, limit their impact on the rest of society. So the language of public service increasingly defined the poor by the level of ‘risk’ they posed to themselves and most importantly, the risk they posed to others - whether physically or symbolically (in the most part, economically) - a subversion of Bourdieu’s symbolic violence. And it is in this branding of the poor as ‘risk’ that we come to confirm the existence of that risk rather than the reverse:

‘….there is a paradox at the heart of protection and there are risks with risk. Whenever we promise to protect, we confirm the existence of a threat; we legitimise and reinforce fear’ (McNeill 2009:22)

The Encroaching Grip of the Right Hand

Estates shifted in their purpose from community housing where professionals were part of those communities and lived side by side with other members of those communities. Doctors, nurses, police officers, teachers, dentists (Hanley: 2007) were all housed on council estates during the initial phases. However, by the 1970s and 80s, with the assault on the feckless poor, the physical neglect of the housing stock, the rise of Dorling’s exclusion, prejudice and greed and the new spectre of ‘right to buy’, those that could, ran from estates as fast as their salaries would carry them.

No longer were police officers on hand to build relationships with local people, including young people, and engender a sense of expectation, responsibility and understanding, invested with local knowledge and relationships to ensure responses to social issues were measured and reasonable. Increasingly, the interaction between police/professionals and council estate residents became one of professional settings. For the police this would come to have particularly significant impacts on local communities, for while it could be argued that this was the time of community policing, with officers allocated to build local relationships with local people and thus enhance relationships, trust and intelligence, it can
also be noted that such officers were not ‘from’ such areas and so, despite their ‘community’ approach, remained ‘outsiders’ to local communities, rather than of communities.

From this time, the interaction between local people, particularly young people, and the constabulary became anonymous and driven by strangeness, conflict and mistrust which perhaps accounted, in part, for the rise in numbers of young people being processed formally through the youth justice system in later decades. Recalling Bourdieu’s (1998) ‘left hand’ and the ‘right hand’ of the State, it can be argued that such communities of the lower classes increasingly experienced more of the ‘right hand’, in restrictive and enforcement approaches, while the ‘left hand’ increasingly receded to their offices, their remits increasingly restricted to the management of risk - which itself becomes a hinderance to engagement, consideration and understanding - instead promoting service delivery responses that are reactive, punitive and blaming.

As social housing properties became increasingly alienated from broader communities - areas to avoid unless you were unfortunate enough to live there - and their populations became increasingly distilled down to the most vulnerable in society, bereft of their own voices to complain; disillusioned enough to accept their position in society, the social problems associated with vulnerable people forced to live on top of each other with little to aspire to because all they see day and night are reflections of their own social conditions, borne out in others, the symbolic violence that exists between people navigating particularly dysfunctional social fields became intensified and experienced almost exclusively in the only place they knew and felt they belonged - the council estate.

According to Jones (2011), the result of such policies and attitudes to social housing and the people who lived there resulted in a significant shift in demographics which resulted in many social housing estates becoming, what has popularly become known as ‘ghettoised’.

[In 1979] ‘a fifth of the richest 10 per cent were council house dwellers. Council housing became increasingly reserved for those who were most deprived and vulnerable. It was in the 1980s that council estates got their bad name as dilapidated, crime-ridden, and deeply poor: exaggerations in part - and any elements of truth were the direct result of government policies.’ (Jones 2011: 62)
Hanley cites the comparative research conducted by Anne Power and Rebecca Tunstall, from the LSE in 1981 and 1991.

‘[T]hey found that the proportion of lone-parent families on the estates had doubled from 9 percent to 18 percent in the intervening decade, compared to 4 per cent in Britain as a whole. (Households with one parent are almost invariably among the poorest.) Concentrations of unemployment and tenants without qualifications or skills increased vastly disproportionately on these estates to the rest of society, and, according to their findings, ‘were far more disadvantaged’ by the end of the 1980s than they had been at the beginning of the decade’ (Hanley 2007: 124)

And this justified and contributed to the ideological shift to demonise the ‘feckless’ working class. Categorised as damaged by the very welfare measures established to eradicate such suffering, the narrative generated around those on estates and in broader society, who had come to experience difficulty became one of demonisation and blame - in effect, they came to be seen as the cause of societies problems, rather then the victims (Pitts 2012:3).

**Distilling Poverty**

During the 1980s the flagship housing policy of the Thatcher era was the now infamous ‘Right to Buy’ scheme. In keeping with the approach to public services - that they should impact on the public purse as little as possible - and the neoliberal drive to push as many people off of, what they perceived as, dependency and into self-sufficiency, the administration promoted and rolled out a controversial scheme, encouraging council house tenants to purchase their socially rented council flat/house from the Local Authority. The impact of this, much touted at the time, as now, was to reduce the stock of social housing available to councils to house people. This effect was further compounded when the Conservative Government of the time barred Local Authorities from using the money raised from this mass sell-off to build new social housing to replace the lost stock.

‘In the first fifteen years of the Right to Buy policy, 1.6 million homes were bought from councils leaving their housing stock so depleted - particularly in areas where high sales were matched by high demand for social housing, such as the inner London boroughs - that it became almost impossible
for anyone not in extreme housing need to become a council tenant. By 1995, 95 per cent of those housed by local authorities qualified for some form of means-tested state benefits’ (Hanley 2007: 137).

Compare this 95% qualifying for benefits in 1995 with the fifth of the richest 10% being council house dwellers in 1979 (Jones: 2011) and it becomes easy to see how, in just 16 years, such policies contributed to the further ghettoising of social housing and as a result, distilling poverty into increasingly concentrated areas.

So, across the country, the availability of social housing dwindled putting further pressure on councils to make tough decisions on who should and should not receive this increasingly limited resource. Over the following years and decades, those with the resources bought up and moved on, while those without became ever-more marginalised in their council properties.

In fact, the Right to Buy scheme was heavily promoted across the popular press (Hanley, 2007:135) and held up as evidence that affluence and prosperity was no longer the preserve of the upper and middle classes but was actually attainable by all sections of society that could reach out and grab it.

And so the concentration of the poorest and most vulnerable on council estates accelerated, and entered a spiral effect as there were less people to impress or be impressed by, so that people spent less time looking after the places in which they lived, and collectively came to see their estates as places no-one wanted to live - the ‘Joneses’ that people used to want to keep up with had moved on (Hanley 2007: 138).

With the associated cuts to public services in general, council estate tenants, often the least mobile, physically or symbolically, experienced ever-reducing contact with the local Authority. Housing offices closed resulting, often, in the only contact local people had with the local State being through youth workers in the local youth club or social workers entering the home in response to crises - with the attentions of the local constabulary being an ever-present reminder of your place. Even bin collections were being privatised to remote companies. So that, increasingly, living on a council estate became a particular experience, alien to anyone fortunate enough to have escaped.
‘Most in Need’

It should not be assumed that the focus and targeting of welfare resources towards the most vulnerable and ‘in need’ has always been the case, nor that all societies have decided that such a method of redistribution is the way forward for them. Many left-leaning and centrist governments - particularly in northern Europe often decide that a system of welfare that places universality at its heart is the most beneficial approach to reducing inequality, while those governments of the right - particularly in the USA and UK - often focus their energies on targeting, what they see as limited resources, on those deemed ‘most in need’.

The universal approach sets out to understand that welfare is the product of contributions made by all earning citizens, in what Tawney (1952) referred to as the ‘pooling of surplus’. Universality therefore assumes that if everyone has contributed, then the benefits of a welfare system should be available for all and that by employing such an approach, inequality is reduced because proportionally, the benefit of welfare to the poor outstrips the benefit experienced by the non-poor (Korpi and Palme 1998:6).

Importantly, in order to justify targeting the provision of welfare, it is necessary to draw a line that defines the poor from the non-poor - in a universal system this isn’t necessary and so no means-testing is required. However, the impact of this ‘line’ is to break down the possibility of ‘coalition’ between the poor and non-poor, and in effect, divide the views of the working class, through which the line is drawn. The result is that, unlike universality, the targeting of welfare serves to create an environment of ‘them and us’ amongst the working class - welfare shifts from being a function of society and redistribution, to a gift from one section of society to another - a reluctant gift. Once this divide occurs, it becomes more difficult to generate universal support for welfare, particularly since most will not be in receipt of it.

‘The poverty line, in effect, splits the working class and tends to generate coalitions between the better-off workers and the middle class against the lower sections of the working class, something which can result in tax revolts and welfare-state backlash. In an institutional model of social policy, however, most households will directly benefit in one way or another. Therefore this model “tends to encourage coalition formation between the working class and the middle class in support for continued welfare state policies. The poor need not stand alone”’ (Korpi and Palme 1998:7)
So, amongst academics, the support for targeting has gradually decreased as a recognition of the benefits of universality become more established. However, this trajectory has been in direct contrast to the movement amongst policy makers as governments become more sold on the neoliberal agenda (Korpi and Palme 1998:7).

**The Trouble with Families**

A case in point is the ‘Troubled Families’ programme of targeted support funded through Central Government monies with the precise aim of ‘fixing’ those families deemed to harbour such fecklessness that, left untouched, their damaging ways will leak out into society and impact on those around them. The inherent assumption of such policy agenda, including the Family Intervention Projects (FIP) that preceded the Troubled Families programme, is that the problems families experience are of their own making and in no way a product of socio-structural or cultural factors beyond the influence of families.

While Halsey (1995:129) admits there has been no ‘utopia’ in the history of the family unit that recalls, romantically, days gone by where all was right in the world, the early half of the 20th century did represent a time when ‘….the traditional family system was a coherent strategy for the ordering of relations in such a way as to equip children for their own eventual adult responsibilities.’

As the century advanced families experienced certain assaults of modernity which chipped away at the foundations of family structure and security - greater freedoms for women (for example, employment and birth control), less certainty for men (shorter working hours, less job security, greater expectations placed upon them domestically), and children and young people coming into their own, with their own culture and spending power taking them beyond the immediate jurisdiction of their parents.

This placed a requirement on the State to step in and make provisions for the health, safety and education of the nation’s children in ways it had not previously, if the individual units of the family were to contribute to this new world (Halsey 1995:129). However as set out in earlier sections of this paper, this State responsibility has not been maintained.
While Halsey goes on to acknowledge the accompanying major socio-cultural changes that affected family life, such as the rise in abortions, divorces, one-parent families and unmarried cohabitation, he asserts that, due to the deterioration of such public services that should attempt to fill the space created by the arrival of family members increasingly focussed on their own individual existences, where children born into families where there was less than ideal interest taken in their development by attentive parents, which, he suggests occurs in greater numbers in lower income situations:

‘Such children tend to die earlier, to have more illness, to do less well at school, to exist at a lower level of nutrition, comfort and conviviality, to suffer more unemployment, be more prone to deviance and crime, and finally to repeat the cycle of unstable parenting from which they themselves have suffered.’ (Halsey 1995:130).

However, it must be acknowledged, as Halsey himself does, that not all children born to attentive and able parents will thrive and not all children born to unstable parents will suffer poor outcomes. But there does appear to be a correlation. Importantly, Halsey suggests that parents are increasingly held accountable for the behaviours of their children, despite the mounting and challenging influences on those children becoming ever more invasive, and effectively beyond the capacity of parents to cope with, for example, rising crime and drug levels, influences from the street, mass media and youth cultures, influences which, in the most part, children cannot escape. (Halsey 1995:132).

So the response of policy makers is to devise schemes that are able to bypass the inconvenience of such concerns, and deliver programmes such as Troubled Families.

As Pitts (2012:2) notes in his assessment of this programme:

The troubled families programme was

‘….., brought into being in the wake of the August 2011 riots, and headed by erstwhile Anti-Social Behaviour Tsar, Louise Casey. The Team is charged with identifying and intervening with the 120,000 troubled families whose children are most likely to become rioters and gangsters. But how shall we know them? We shall know them, it seems, because ‘scientific
evidence’ derived from New Labour’s Family Intervention Projects (FIPs), over which Louise Casey also presided, is said to indicate that they will be beset by five or more of the following risk factors:

1. A low income,
2. No-one in the family is in work,
3. Living in poor housing,
4. Parents have no qualifications,
5. Mother has a mental health problem,
6. One parent has a long-standing illness or disability
7. The family is unable to afford basics, including food and clothes.’

And on the face of it, there would be general agreement that each of these indicators by themselves would have a damaging impact on those experiencing them - so their existence in combination should be increasingly problematic - so surely the Government has the right idea in trying to identify these issues and eradicate them? After all, does society really want to think of itself as one that happily leaves families alone to suffer the consequences of poor housing, mental health or a lack of food and clothing? Of course not.

But the point is less in the identification of the social ill, and more in the location of responsibility for the existence of that ill. As Pitts (2012:3) points out:

‘at least six of these risk factors are indicators of poverty rather than criminality,’

But in modern political and governmental policy environments, there is little energy to acknowledge any structural causation of inequality or of the individual suffering that policies might visit on the poor and those unable or ‘unwilling’ to capitalise on the divisive policies that currently pass themselves off as growth-delivering - and by implication, of benefit to all.

By repackaging the experiences of those subjected to government initiatives as concerns for society because of the negative impact these factors might have on the hard-working, the narrative shifts from concern about leaving people behind, as expressed through the Keynesian post-war policy agenda, to one of control and containment of those who fail to
respond to treatment of individual deficiencies and so justifying the targeting of ever-diminishing public resources on those deemed ‘most in-need’ - an argument that itself, becomes a justification against universality.

On the surface, the term ‘most in need’ appears particularly unproblematic, especially to a person with leanings towards a more humanist, social paradigm that values people and wants to ensure that all have access to the support and resources that will ensure they can thrive. Is it not the sign of a responsible and supportive society that it prioritises its resources to ensure those ‘most in need’ are targeted through welfare and public service provisions?

Considered in isolation, this is a reasonable conclusion to derive from such a seemingly inert phrase. But in order to give real meaning to the phrase ‘most in need’ we need to also consider the way in which those in receipt of such assistance, primarily the social housing dwelling and working class, have come to be demonised by policy makers and the media, with the result that, to be considered ‘in need’ of any assistance, has come to be synonymous with being a failure through one’s own inherent deficiencies.

**Demonising the Vulnerable**

The original Bevanite understanding of social issues that affect communities being the result of structural inequalities that, through Keynesian intervention, require the hand of the State to ameliorate has given way to the dominant view that the market can provide all, and those feckless enough to fail to grasp such opportunities, through their own inadequacies, are underserving, unmotivated, unskilled, uneducated, and by extension, mad, bad and dangerous (by being a threat to a consumerist, market society) and if they fail to improve themselves, they deserve every punitive and exclusionary policy that rains down on them.

Policies that, in the most part, will be delivered through public sector interventions and initiatives designed to contain and control rather than deliver on the original welfare state principles of raising up to a standard in the pursuit of equality. No longer are these interventions designed to provide a safety net to ensure no one falls through the gaps and is left to fester in depravity - instead, this safety net now has the function of a trampoline, to force people up to the standard deemed suitable for a market economy, and those too weak or feckless to capitalise on the forward, upward thrust of such interventions are
deemed to have failed, making it clear that the blame for such issues lays squarely in the individual decisions that families make rather than any issue of policy that may shape their lives.

In his 2011 book, *Chavs - The Demonisation of the Working Class*, Jones sets out an account of how the once cherished working classes have fallen to the point of becoming the butt of society’s jokes and vitriol. In a perhaps extreme example, Jones opens with an account of an entrepreneur who feels particularly aggrieved. He quotes Richard Hilton, Chief Executive of Gymbox, as offering the following observation:

‘If they are not institutionalised by the age of twenty-one they are considered pillars of strength in the community or get ‘much respect’ for being lucky.’ (Jones 2011: 4)

As suggested, this is an extreme view and not particularly representative of the majority of views in Britain in the early 21st Century - not one that most people would admit to holding. It does, however, betray a certain perspective of what is expected of working class people. That they are inherently deviant which will result in their institutionalisation and that dominant expectations of such people are so low that it is a positive result if they somehow manage to avoid such outcomes. It also points to an increasingly dominant view held about public service, including social work, youth work and youth justice, which is to respond to the effects of the feckless through containment and control.

However, Pitts (2012), underscores the complexities of such analysis because evidence does suggest that there is a link between the poor (particularly the young) and behaviour that could lead to their engagement in State machinery - however, the assessment from Hilton’s quote above places accountability for such outcomes in the hands of the people who come to warrant such State responses. More thoughtful assessors of the situation tend to apply more structural explanations to the situation.

‘As Robert Macdonald (2008) has argued, in the UK, what Wacquant (2008) refers to as ‘advanced marginality’ is primarily, a condition afflicting poor, lower class, young people. Between 1984 and 1997 the numbers of 16 to 24 in the labour market shrank by nearly 40%. In January 2010, one in five White and one in two BME 16-24 year olds was unemployed (IPPR,
During this period, 10 to 20 year olds were responsible for almost one third of all recorded crime and 50% of all recorded violent crime (Pitts 2012:15).

As Jones continues:

'It is easy to gasp at Hilton’s unembarrassed hatred, but he has crudely painted a widespread middle-class image of the working-class teenager. Thick. Violent. Criminal.' (Jones 2011: 4)

Pitts (2012) goes on to place this marginalization within the context of governmental impotence resulting from the impacts of globalisation that leaves their own forms of control subsequently limited. In essence, increasing globalisation creates greater insecurity and thus impacts on behaviour. However, because the source of this insecurity is beyond the scope of governments to control, the responses they may have to resultant problematic behaviour is limited. It therefore becomes necessary to find ways to characterise those causing concern as problematic to society, thus justifying governmental enforcement activities - *the right hand*. What Mathews (2005) has termed 'populist ventriloquism' (Pitts 2012:4)

And it’s this ‘populist ventriloquism’ that has come to form the central basis of the narrative that describes those subject to social housing, in receipt of welfare or experiencing any vulnerability that leads to them calling on the national or local State for assistance. Those experiencing Bourdieu’s symbolic violence of structural inequality (social fields) and requiring the assistance of ‘the left hand’, become defined within Rand’s idea of ‘injustice’.

This is seen most clearly in the area of children’s social welfare responses - or what Pitts (2012) has called ‘youth governance’ - where provision has shifted from the universal, in the form of youth services open to all, to the current state of play that sees provision restricted and targeted at those deemed problematic and in need of ‘fixing’ before they bring harm to those around them.

‘... individuals, groups or communities are ascribed a public, negative reputation associated with pathological malevolence often popularly represented as ‘evil’. While ideological in construction and transmission
As Scraton has shown above, in the most part, young people’s behaviour is identified in terms of it's criminal connotations rather than an indication of their own vulnerability. But by targeting them as such - whether as vulnerable, or as criminal - they are set apart from other young people who do not require the attention of the State. As a result, those seen to have failed, even at their tender age, deserve whatever they get - no matter how punitive, divisive or destructive the State machinery may turn out to be.

Margaret Thatcher’s comment on there being no such thing as society wasn’t a stand alone concept, but indicated a deep-rooted drive against collective action, collective bargaining, class consciousness and all elements of society that could possibly promote the voice of the working class and vulnerable - or more generally, a voice against the interests of accumulated capital - what social welfare responses originally set out to ameliorate.

So Trade Unions were castrated, the language of socialism became taboo - the mutterings of deranged and ill-informed dinosaurs - and market economics pervaded everything until the soul of communities hibernated. Even public services became subject to marketisation and, through strategic financial cuts, gradually became restricted - from universal to targeted services, only available to those ‘most in need’. The move from universal provision serving to identify those in receipt of services as somehow different from the rest of society. And so began the demonisation of the poor (Jones 2011: 48).

With the dismantling of collective efforts to define and improve society, people were pitched further apart than ever and in many cases, pitched against one another, whether by class, profession, geographical region or even neighbour against neighbour. No longer could it be justified to spend resources on helping each other out - resources were scarce, and if you didn’t claim what was yours, your neighbour would and you’d be left behind. So better you focus on looking after yourself and your family and leave others to look after themselves. If the weak should flounder in such conditions, so be it.

The effect of Thatcherism was to cast working class communities as old, bleak, and out of fashion. What would you rather do, work down the mines with its dirt and soot and danger-
ous working conditions, or work in a nice, clean office with windows where the sun can shine through and everyone smiles? Working class became synonymous with being outdated and backward while the future was decidedly middle class - if in a very restricted, limited idea of middle class-ness.

‘To be working class was no longer something to be proud of, never mind to celebrate. Old working class values, like solidarity, were replaced by dog-eat-dog individualism.....The new Briton created by Thatcherism was a property-owning, middle-class individual who looked after themselves, their family and no one else. Aspiration meant yearning for a bigger car or a bigger house.’ (Jones 2011: 71)

Running parallel to this assault on working class values and experiences was a cultural assault. One that ran throughout many echelons of British society and complimented the ideological drive against the working class by pointing the national psyche towards a definition borne of the most extreme cases of poverty and working class behaviour; something that Goffman (1990) would identify as mere performances in an environment that deemed the only legitimate experience a landed, propertied, consumerist experience.

Remembering the work of Bourdieu and the idea of social fields and symbolic violence helps highlight the key issues at play here. As Jones points out, this is about the ‘middle class’ and the ‘working class’, two social fields that encourage different habitus’ in their relative populations. Two social fields encouraged to be at odds with each other through mutual misunderstanding and mistrust. Two social fields perceived to live in completely different worlds (Jones 2011: 7).

And it’s this idea that the welfare state and public services have come to define society, rather than being a result of the definition of society that has pervaded, that is of greatest interest here. The idea that hard working ‘strivers’ are being conned out of their hard earned money by thieving ‘scroungers’ who sit at home all day watching day time television.

These scroungers that come to call on public services through their laziness, criminality, poor lifestyle choices, fecklessness, poor budgeting which leaves them wallowing in social housing rather than ‘owning’ a mortgage. However, re-defining the recipients of public
support in such pejorative terms actually serves to define the services that offer such support. In a number of sketches in the popular ‘Little Britain’ TV series, it was not simply the abhorrence of the working class that was depicted, but the gullibility and pointlessness of those that set out to help them.

The view proposed in this paper is that public services that support children, young people and families, rather than used by successive governments to beat down, contain and control those unable or unwilling to rise to the challenge of the markets, should in fact have as their central aim, the support and encouragement of people to develop the necessary skills to genuinely engage in the debate, collectively so that political systems become more relevant, democracy develops greater meaning, politicians, policy makers and leaders are held to genuine account and the disenfranchised no longer have to remain voiceless, because collective representation will promote their interests. This is a role of facilitation rather than leadership. It should not be such services’ role to lead the disenfranchised into class battle. But it cannot be an effective role of public service to keep the vulnerable in positions of ridicule.

This is something that Halsey (1995:235-5) has championed in his ideas about ‘democratic politics’ in which he suggests that it takes active, knowledgable and engaged citizens to challenge oppression:

‘Democratic politics is essentially a system in which citizens actively mould the final decisions binding on all. It works only if liberty of thought and expression is ranked first among rights and the active exercise of citizenship first among duties. Political action is inevitably carried on by imperfect people in public office. Hence the constant need for alert and knowledgeable citizens, to defeat oppression and to prevent the public services from degenerating into organisations which serve the private interests of public servants.’

What is clear is that the dominant economic and political system of capitalist neoliberalism isn’t working for an increasing number of people, while the super rich continue to raise the drawbridge that ensures their continued prosperity results in the masses being left behind with little or nothing. Resources continue to be leched from the ground and the people and accumulated in modern day castles and forts, beyond the reach of people whose
benefit could possibly bring about stability. With no such consideration, the people are left without a voice or representation.

Public services are playing a role that only serves to extend the blame on those in hard times - when this dynamic is played out with children and young people who have played little part in their circumstances, the affront is all the more offensive.

Increasingly, people find themselves isolated and disenfranchised from mechanisms that can vocalise their concerns and their plight. It seems now is a good time for public services to re-visit their role in giving the people the tools to stand up and be heard in the face of vested interests that are only concerned with their own longterm survival in increasingly uncertain times. The message that people convey must be theirs alone - but it can’t hurt to ensure it is heard.

Social housing is a helpful barometer to gauge the way in which the views of society have shifted from a Keynesian, positivist attempt to provide for all, towards a reductionist and neglected approach to those calling on social welfare services. As universalism became restricted, the poor and vulnerable became concentrated in ever-decreasing spaces, as previous social provision became privatised.

These developments were matched by shifts in the policy arena that guided social welfare services so that, increasingly the cohort of the population that relied on social welfare provision came to be defined as the architects of their own suffering. From this platform it has become common for the poor and vulnerable to be demonised as a threat to stable and well-functioning society, rather than the victims of inequality.

As a result, social welfare services have become reactionary, punitive, blaming and in no small way, contributing to the demonisation of those that rely on them.

This shift from positivism to realism is discussed in the next chapter, before the paper moves on to present a new service delivery model that aims to challenge the impositions of realism and subsequent managerialist models of delivery.
Part Two
Chapter Five
Realism and Managerialism

‘The cold climate in public expenditure was requiring services of all kinds to be clearer about their outcomes and benefits.’ (Gilchrist, Jeffs and Spence 2001)

Introduction
In Part One of this paper it has been shown how dominant ideologies have shifted over time and this has impacted on the views held, in particular, of the working classes, poor and the vulnerable. These ideologies come to define the policies that shape public services, particularly social welfare services, and such policies tend to be a reaction to the views held of those that require the intervention of such services - whether through a positivist idea of causality that places service users as victims of structural inequality, or a neoliberal idea of service users being a drain on resources and so requiring control and containment. Variations of this latter view have gained particular traction since the 1970s, and this shall be explored in this chapter.

Social welfare provision has travelled a path through the adoption of the ‘medical model’ in the 1930s, through the case work model becoming the dominant service delivery structure in the 1960s and onto the ‘nothing works’ radical non-intervention movement of the 1970s. As Pitts (1988:83) points out, the 1970s marked a significant juncture in the journey of social welfare approaches, in effect bringing an end to attempts to establish the causes of youth criminality and in particular, following a number of American theorists, identifying the youth justice responses themselves as the locus of the problem.

In the UK such thinking influenced the development of a new radical strand of criminology particularly marked out by the works of Lea and Young, amongst others. Jock Young (1973), in ‘The New Criminology’, describes the positivism of the late 1970s:

‘Positivism was perhaps the main enemy: its ontology was seen to take human creativity out of deviant action, its sociology erected a consensual edifice from which deviants were bereft of culture and meaning, its methodology elevated experts to the role of fake scientists discovering the
‘laws’ of social action, and its policy, whether in mental hospitals, social work agencies or drug clinics, was self-fulfilling and mystifying.’ (Young, 1998: 17) in (Newburn 2007:255)

The 1970s was marked by a pessimism of policy for social welfare services. A belief that the very delivery of service was more harmful to young people than to provide no service at all. The approach was cynical and shortsighted. As Pitts (1988:84) says, the approach ‘appropriated theories but broke them at the stem leaving their ideological and political roots in the ground’. This was a time when the traditional boundaries between left and right, in youth justice, could no longer be identified with confidence. The result of this was seen in the ‘back to justice’ and ‘non-intervention’ movement.

Each point in the development of modern services, including this ‘radical non-intervention’ stop-off, was driven by a desire to bring rationality and efficiency to the efforts of practice, in an environment where funding became limited and had to be justified in a world dominated by the empirical, objective and measurable.

Importantly, the political landscape of the 1960s spreading into the 1970s was marked by the end of post-war optimism and a growing realisation that the classless society may be out of reach and beyond the abilities of parliamentary efforts. A ‘new left’ emerged that wanted to ‘smash the State’ (Pitts 1988), whom it accused of selling out on its pursuit of working class emancipation. In the realm of youth justice, this new left movement sought to elevate the young criminal to the role of victim and in so doing, made the fundamental mistake of ignoring the actual victims of juvenile crime and thus opened the door to the development of a new focus, one that first developed on the right and one that claimed to dispense with causality and placed its energies in considerations of the real experiences of social issues - in the area of crime this meant a focus on victims, not criminals. This marked the arrival of realism. Realism represented a rejection of positivism.

**The Wilson/Murray Thesis**

From the 1980s onwards, Britain has witnessed a continued State retreat from the provision of public services and support, which has increasingly become distilled down to a focus on those deemed most in need. (Cooper, et al 1995:1020)
To an extent this has been influenced by the work of James Q Wilson (1975) who was an advisor to Republican Presidents in the USA - Presidents Reagan (1981 - 1989); Bush Snr (1989 - 1993) and George W Bush (2001 - 2009).

Wilson rejects the positivist approach to criminology, in part represented by the sociologically-based descriptions set out by Cloward and Ohlin, who suggested that the structure of society influenced people’s behaviour, and in particular, caused people’s criminality.

In providing a critique of the positivist agenda of the post-war years, in which prevailed a Keynesian assumption that State intervention could ameliorate the harsher impacts of capitalism, Wilson suggests that it is such intervention that has caused harm to society, rather than led to social justice.

‘Wicked people exist. Nothing avails except to set them apart from innocent people. And many people, neither wicked nor innocent, but watchful, dissembling, and calculating of their opportunities, ponder our reaction to wickedness as a cue to what they might profitably do. We have trifled with the wicked, made sport of the innocent, and encouraged the calculators. Justice suffers and so do we all.’ (Wilson 1975:209)

It can be seen that Wilson’s theory is based on a particularly pessimistic view of human nature that is at odds with the thinking that had dominated the post-war era. Wilson’s thoughts are in keeping with the ideas of Rand and Hayek, amongst others, discussed in Chapter Two. In particular, and in rejection of the sociological assessment, or the ‘causation analysis’, Wilson presents the counter position of the ‘policy analysis’; in which he refuses the invitation to consider causation because, in his view there is little the policy-makers can do to ameliorate structural, biological or psychological causes - without either great expense or great intrusion into peoples’ individual and collective lives. Instead, it is better to focus on what can be achieved by public services (Wilson 1975:53).

Wilson’s contributions gave rise to what is known as ‘right realism’ which believes that the ‘free hand’ of the market will deliver the best outcomes for society - and that this should be at the expense of the State’s role to intervene - and that inequality is an acceptable by-product of such arrangements. By extension, with some people doing quite well out of a
free market, some people who lack the ability or moral fibre to succeed will inevitably struggle financially and materially. It is this inequality, in the right realist, neoliberal assessment, that will motivate people to succeed as they come to realise the State will not be there if they fail. Those unable to succeed through legitimate means will therefore be motivated to avoid failure through illegitimate means - they will be motivated to commit crime for material and financial gain - and this serves as an indication of a successful capitalist society because it shows that people aren’t waiting around for the State to rescue them.

So the choice for society becomes one between a poorer but more equal world, or a richer but less equal world where the extremes deliver greater potential wealth alongside greater potential suffering. Wilson however, suggests that this is a false choice because the electorate, being selfish (in Wilson’s pessimistic view) won’t elect politicians that will tax them to look after the poor in a social welfare arrangement. Wilson also argues that the poor themselves reject this dichotomy of affluence or equality, saying they want to be affluent and that politicians should be tougher on the crime that results. So that the pursuit of a right realist policy agenda, inevitably justifies a shift in local and national State effort towards a ‘right hand’ over a ‘left hand’ focus, as governments respond to the electorates’ desire to see the deviant punished and controlled rather than indulged and supported - and thus committing Rand’s injustice.

And this rejection of redistributive policies and the call for tougher approaches to crime come to influence right realist responses to crime and social policy - because they are based on peoples’ real experiences, and importantly, peoples’ real demands. The decline of social welfare responses and the parallel demonisation of those that come to rely on State support, as outlined in Chapter Four are the results of such thinking.

Building on from this approach, Charles Murray (1996) spoke about the British ‘Underclass’. This notion of an underclass has been discussed by many theorists, including Waquant, but it has often been taken as a discussion on black working class communities in the USA - under the notion of the ‘ghetto’. Murray develops the idea of a section of society beyond political and financial influence in Britain, as in the USA, and defined not simply by their poverty, but perhaps more importantly, by their behaviour (Murray 1990:1).
In particular he speaks about the role of family as the lynchpin to a stable society. Not in the French Rousseauian notion of family, seen as the basis of a communal society that forms the model of a collective State. For Murray, in keeping with utilitarian and individualistic notions of how anglo-saxon societies are formed, holds that the family is the model to keep family members in check and stop them impacting negatively on society - in particular, two-parent families will promote positive behaviour because young men and women will have role models in the home and will develop a work ethic and views on healthy, stable family life. Single parent families will be unable to do so as successfully and so, by extension, single parent families (mothers) are seen as a problem for society - not just in the present, but also through their passing on their lifestyle traits to their children - 'In a few years, the situation will be much worse, for this is a problem that nurtures itself.' (Murray 1990:11).

This is an important point in the right realist narrative because, according to Murray, the welfare state is responsible for encouraging single mothers to raise children by rewarding them to have children out of wedlock - and in so doing, encouraging the development of a criminogenic underclass that fails to share the moral values of a decent society. The result is that young women choose to marry the state (welfare) rather than young men - an allegation often promoted through the idea that young women get pregnant in order to secure a council flat. Therefore, by cutting off the supply of welfare, young women are 'starved back into marriage'.

As for the young men in Murray's analysis, they also have a significant role to play in healthy communities because, being 'essentially barbarians' they must get married and face up to the responsibilities this forces upon them. By contrast, young men:

'...who don't work don't make good marriage material. Often they don't get married at all; when they do, they don't have the ability to fill their traditional role. In either case, too many of them remain barbarians.' (Murray 1990:23)

Interestingly, just as Lea & Young (1984), and Halsey rejected the left/right dichotomy as the solution to society’s challenges, so too does Murray, who argues that the right’s desire to cut welfare and arrest more criminals will have a minimal impact on the social problems that concern them, while to the left he suggests that the dream of full employment hasn’t
curbed criminality in the past and so it cannot be said to hold the answers to future stability. The underclass, Murray suggests, will remain.

Worryingly, Murray admits that politicians and policy makers simply don’t know how to eliminate the underclass because all of the social interventions tried have failed to change people’s lives and behaviours. What he is able to promote however is the idea of local communities taking over the role retained by national States in a move he calls ‘authentic self-government’. (Murray 2990:34)

It could be argued, quite legitimately however, that such an arrangement could lead to greater inequality and injustice as those communities with the greatest social, cultural and financial capital will find it far easier to advocate on their own behalves, jettisoned of the requirement to consider their neighbours in nearby communities, while those currently most in need of the efforts of centralised provision may find they slip further down the social ladder as they become left to their own devices and perhaps find their access to resources or the means to claim them, increasingly wanting.

Both Murray and Wilson insist that the issues of society have individualistic rather than sociological origins and that the causation thesis is redundant. Wilson in particular rejects causation because he suggests that it paints a particularly problematic picture of human nature - one that relieves people of free will and free determination and suggests that they have little or no control over their actions, because sociological causes are so overwhelming.

Such a position has been rejected by a number of sociologists - a fact that would cause little surprise or concern to Wilson, Murray and other similar thinkers.

**Left Realism**

Right Realism in the US focused particularly on the issue of ‘black-on-black’ crime. The response of the liberal/left in criminology was to reject the right realist argument on the grounds that it ‘blames the victim’ - of socio-structural policies - and diverts attention from an unequal society and a racist police force and justice system - in so doing the liberal/left attempted to reassert the notion of structural causes to social problems and move away from individual blaming.
In what could be seen as the early throws of what would become Tony Blair’s ‘Third Way’, two radical criminologists John Lea and Jock Young in *What is to be Done About Law and Order*? (1984) challenged the pessimism of right realism while, importantly, rejecting the idealism of left thinkers of the time who often wanted to ignore the reality and the impact of working class deviance as a distraction from the structural injustices imposed on the poor by the elites - in so doing, *left idealists* often overlooked the injustice that working class crime inflicted on working class communities. The work of Lea and Young served a similar function as the efforts of Halsey when he rejected the dichotomy between Marxism and liberalism, in that both contributions sought a path between two extremes to place their efforts, as right realists did, in the practical realities of peoples’ lived experiences. Most tellingly, in terms of the impact of Lea and Young on later developments in social policy, particularly those that led to the development of what has become ‘Community Safety’, they broaden out the definition of criminality to encompass elements of ‘antisocial behaviour’ including harassment, playing loud music in the early morning, inconsiderate driving (Lea and Young 1984:59). However, more than the acts themselves, it is the impact they have on the way people feel about themselves and the communities in which they live - it is the sense of fear and insecurity that results from the ‘lack of respect for humanity and for fundamental human decency’ (Lea and Young 1984:58).

While such a broadening of concern may leave this approach open to the criticisms that were later to be applied to the community safety and wider youth governance agenda - that those elements of social control were increasingly encroaching on more and more sections of society that were previously left un-targeted by enforcement responses that had themselves replaced more generic and universal services, such as youth work - importantly, Lea and Young do not reject that such social ills are the product of the ‘malaises generated by capitalism’, and in so doing, call on positivist explanations for deviance. Later incarnations of community safety that moved on from this left realist approach towards the more cynical right realist explanations of human behaviour would be less appealing to those of the left. What left realism did usher in however was a practical approach to identifying responsibility for deviance within the individual that committed that deviance - and it managed to do so in a way that was acceptable to significant cohorts of both the left and the right - the latter seeing crime and deviance as products of individual choices that undermined capitalism, the former seeing crime and deviance as products of social structure. Left realism was able to speak to both of these narratives, while rejecting their more ex-
tremist bed-fellows.

‘The conservatives stress that crime is a product of the individual separate from the social structure, whereas the radicals point to the paramount effect of structure bearing down on the individual. Both of these positions are wrong: it is individuals who make meaning of the world, but it is the structures that make available a world of which to make meaning.’ (Lea and Young 1984:60)

In this way social policy moved beyond violent wrenches from left to right and back again and began its dalliance with the centre ground of politics. However, recalling Bourdieu’s proposition that the elites have retained the tools of control and influence since the times of the noble elites, and Halsey’s suggestions that excursions into left-leaning post-war political experiments were only made possible with the permission of the elites, it was only a question of time before ‘centre-based politics’ began its shift toward the ‘right of centre’ - such an individualising approach to social policy was to become central to the development of managerialism under broader neoliberal policies, on this journey.

By way of illuminating the political proximity of right and left realism, Halsey’s call for an engagement of citizenry is strikingly close to Murray’s call for ‘authentic self-governance’. Both believe that the locus of emancipation lies with the people. However, for one, emancipation is from the imposition of structural injustice; for the other it is from the interference of State. One maintains a clear role for the State as engaging the people in their emancipation; the other sees the role of the State as protecting the peoples’ freedom from interference. In the UK, the development of the community safety movement has developed along lines that has echoes of both approaches. Most importantly however, realism, of both descriptions, cleared the way for a neoliberal approach to social welfare services that increasingly placed responsibility for service decisions in the hands of managers.

The Rise of Managerialism
As the 1984 ‘Short Report’ recognised, it is ‘overwhelmingly, the poor who enter public care and that the state should therefore pursue a broad-based preventative strategy which strives to make good the material and personal deficits experienced by child and family.’ Cooper, et al (1995:104). While the Short Report concerned itself primarily with the issue
of children and care, it’s assertion that the poor enter public care can be extended to most welfare-based public services, including social housing; general children’s social care, generic youth work, youth justice and targeted youth provision.

In 1985, the Public Inquiry into the death of Jasmine Beckford at the hands of her father, found that social workers were too optimistic in their belief in parental love and so failed to notice the danger facing Jasmine. In effect, the social work profession, through this report, was cast as grossly ill-equipped to perform the functions asked of them:

‘The tragedy occurred, it seemed, not because of deficiencies in the system or some of its agents but because of deficiencies in the beliefs and attitudes that underpinned the practices of an entire profession. The report suggested that social workers were going about their task in wilful ignorance of their legal responsibilities and with scant regard for the realities of the lives of endangered children.’ (Cooper, et al 1995:105)

This was at a time when the conduct of public services was under increasing pressure and mistrust from a neoliberal administration that had little time for the public sector. It can be assumed that the inquiry simply served to reflect the emerging dominant ideology and policy framework of the time (neoliberalism and realism), but its lasting impact has been to suggest that social welfare service practitioners are ill-placed to develop and deliver the solutions to the issues faced by society’s vulnerable, and as a result, cast them as in need of more intrusive managerial oversight and direction (Cooper, et al 1995:105).

And so the ground was laid for the advancement of a new approach to the delivery and oversight of public service, not just social work - Managerialism.

In Thatcher’s neo-Utilitarian, neoliberal world, as mentioned earlier, the State was to become non-interventionist as it left families to manage their own affairs. Public services that held on to an idea of their role as one of advancing universal support for families who wanted it were to get short shrift. Increasingly, through this developing neoliberal, neo-Utilitarian doctrine, public, and particularly welfare services were to be the preserve only of those feckless enough not to have the where-with-all to fend for themselves - the demonised poor. It could be simple to assume that this increasing separation of the State from the experiences of families and individuals could have been the result of a reducing
need for such intervention - but as Cooper, et al (1995:107) suggest, this was actually a time of increasing hardship for many families; a time that commentators concluded, represented a 'moral crisis' - that perhaps called for greater, rather than less, public service and welfare support. However, the government and press found it convenient to cast these public services as part of the problem, breeding dependancy and robbing families of the motivation to make their own way in the world.

‘The political response of the Thatcher government, the popular press and most political and moral commentators to this contradiction at the core of Thatcherism was to blame social workers, left-wing school teachers and lax parents for undermining family values and encouraging deviant lifestyles.’ (Cooper, et al 1995:107)

‘Deviant lifestyles’ that were apparently responsible for an increase in births outside of marriage, rising unemployment, a reversal in the post-war decrease in inequality and the decimation of the industrial base of the country that had hitherto provided plentiful employment for the working classes. But the powers-that-be were, famously, not for turning.

It was the resultant legal annexation of social work practice and social science theory that led to the shift from an exploration of ideas, to the pursuit of ‘evidence’ - hard, irrefutable evidence - that can be used in a court of law (Cooper, et al 1995:109).

From this pursuit of evidence over exploration has come the desire of the social science based public services to present themselves as definitive answers to social problems, and for social science to be presented as equally objective and infallible to its natural science cousins - an approach that has previously been criticised by Karl Popper and Friedrich von Hayek as ‘scientism’

‘a false understanding of the methods of science that has been mistakenly forced upon the social sciences, but that is contrary to the practices of genuine science.’ (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedrich_Hayek)

This legal annexation of social welfare services was accompanied by an encroaching managerialism that Cooper, et al describe as concerning itself with:
‘….the detail of policy, practice, beliefs and values in an organisation. It is concerned with individual customers or ‘service-users’, and this concern extends neither beyond that person’s contractual involvement with the organisation nor to similarly afflicted individuals who have no such involvement.’ (Cooper, et al 1995:109)

In essence, managerialism is the embodiment of the post-modernist outlook on the world, that refuses to acknowledge any linkages between any two occurrences in society.

‘Managerialism echoes the minimal statism of Thatcherism and the radical non-intervention espoused by the back to justice movement.’ (Cooper, et al 1995:109)

The ultimate impact of this dual assault of managerialism and the legal annexation of policy and practice was to lead to the de-professionalisation of public services and their practitioners, as employees increasingly abdicated decisions to managers whose concerns were limited to the here and now - the minimal intervention, the minimal resource allocation, the minimal incursion into the lives of families - irrespective of the needs presented.

While the motivation of managerialism is less interested in the status experienced by professions, it is interested in evidencing the impacts of decisions made about funding and direction - if not product. In other words managerialism at once conflicts and conflates with professional drives and motivations towards status and legitimacy - which, in themselves, have contributed to the associated, and necessary drive to demonise the subjects of intervention because, the greater the perceived ‘problem’, the greater the status and legitimacy of those that can be seen to fix such problems. Which provides an intellectual and professional conundrum for practitioners (Piper 2008:197).

Managerialism insists that everything becomes quantifiable and measurable. The consequence of this insistence is that the place of the individual worker, as informed contributor and agent, is demoted in favour of the impersonal and objective. This demotion of the individual affects not only those that are to receive the service but also those professionals that deliver. Neither enjoys a particularly high status when decisions about service structure or delivery take place. However, paradoxically, managerialism promotes the role of the
individual. The practitioner must take sole responsibility for case loads delivered through an approach to case work that must make itself open to audit and be seen to be accountable, which leads to one-case-load-to-one-worker situations - that lies at the centre of the case work model. The individual accessing services must, at the same time, take responsibility for the success or failure of the interventions provided (Piper 2008:74).

Failure is discussed in terms of an unwillingness on the part of the recipient to effect change in their circumstances - the alcoholic, the offender, the lung cancer patient who smokes, the obese, the educationally excluded - are all weak, deviant, damaged or unwilling to take advantage of the support on offer.

Managerialism has little time or interest in debates about the socio-economic impacts on individuals and communities and actively rejects the majority of that set out in part one of this paper. What managerialism does, in keeping with its realist moorings, is to accept that some people have greater struggles than others. At one level there is the clear belief that these struggles are in the most part due to deficiencies within the individual, rather than structural, societal factors such as poverty, inequality, racism or poor education, etc.

‘Two themes that have been common to all explanatory models, however, are that individuals are increasingly conceptualised in modern society in ways that are ‘reductionist’ and that privilege rational understandings of human behaviour; and that ‘there has been an increase in bureaucratic responses to the uncertainty, complexity, risk and anxiety which are inherent in social work practice’ (Barlow and Scott 2010:8).

The convenience of this is that it becomes far easier to measure what efforts and resources are put into working with an individual and what results, or ‘outcomes’ were realised, than it is to measure individuals’ and communities readiness to challenge and change society for the collective good - a motivation that can be identified with the community development agenda in youth work and social work in the late 1960s and early 1970s. If this latter ideal were the motivation and desired outcome, it would be near impossible, say in one parliamentary term, to arrive at anything that looked presentable to the electorate - unless, of course, the electorate were successfully engaged in a dialogue about the nature of the society they may wish to occupy and pathways to achieving it.
So the two drivers - professional legitimacy/status and managerialism - converge for very different reasons into service structures that emphasise the individual over the collective; reduce the role and status of the individual professional and practitioner; place the responsibility for vulnerabilities at the door of the individual accessing services and support; blame the individual for any failure to change; place an emphasis on those things that can be measured empirically - to deliver status and legitimacy to the profession by employing the language of the natural sciences, and to justify policy decisions at Government level in a way that can be communicated easily to the electorate.

The unfortunate result of these two drivers has been a series of services that failed to respond to the needs of the people they were established to support and instead insisted that service users bend to the needs of services.

Additionally, through the reduction in universal services, these developments led to fewer opportunities being available to young people in general, and in particular to vulnerable young people whose parents couldn’t fill the gap themselves, through their own extra-curricular activities. Increasingly services had to re-profile themselves as funding became ring-fenced around identified social ills, in particular crime and the prevention of crime and targeted at those ‘most in need’. Increasingly, the concept of universalism faded.

**Making Communities Safer**

In particular, from 1996 these managerialist developments informed the emerging discipline of ‘Community Safety’, which tended to dispense with notions of structural cause and effect and instead employed a more realist, reactive, often ‘situational crime reduction’ strategy. Such an approach relied increasing on an enforcement agenda that focused on people’s actual, lived experiences and placed responsibility for ills and cures on the shoulders of the individual protagonist. In particular, the community safety movement became disproportionately interested in the governance of young people (Gouldson 2008:80).

It can be noted that, while this realist-informed, community safety approach came to define the increasingly dominant governmental agenda, as with most professions and practitioners in the youth governance field, the agenda did not necessarily reflect the views of all of those that were required to deliver it. This was a point made by Pitts (1988:60) when discussing the tendency for law and order inspired administrations to eventually discover that
they actually need to increase welfare services in order to realise their wishes - which results in such administrations having to increase the number of people they employ who may not actually agree with their ideological agenda.

Importantly, early developments in Community Safety, particularly defined by the policies and efforts of the Tony Blair, *New Labour* administration - although the Community Safety agenda pre-dated the arrival of the Blair premiership - were heavily influenced by the left realist approach and so were more palatable to a broader cohort of practitioners who were perhaps struggling to accommodate the broader managerialist movement. Subsequent developments were to shift the emphasis to a more right realist agenda that remains in the ascendancy.

However, by establishing the realist agenda (left or right) as dominant, eventually such roles become the only ones available to people who may, personally and/or professionally, disagree with the approach. That said, as time has advanced, the realist agenda can be seen to be delivered by an increasing body of practitioners who appear to be quite comfortable with the approach - in particular, the fields of antisocial behaviour and gangs interventions; two areas that have noticed a shift away from intervention and support to one increasingly defined by enforcement methods. Given the proximity between left and right realism, the language used to explain them both is often similar, and interchangeable - with the rhetoric appearing to be ‘socially inclusive’, while the practice is ‘socially exclusionary’ (Gouldson 2008:80).

One of the motivations for the reliance on more realist approaches to crime and other social issues is that whereas the positivism approach has endeavoured to explain some of the observable, proximal drivers of behaviour, it has failed completely in being able to offer politicians and policy makers the distal, underlying, definitive causes as to what encourages these drivers (Wikstom et al 2012:4) - realist approaches therefore bypass this debate about causes and look instead at the real, actual impact of behaviours, irrespective of what may or may not encourage them. However, in doing so, there lies a danger that this impact becomes over emphasised in relation to broader societal concerns, that positivist causes of genuine concern become ignored and that the experiences of a minority of affected people define the narrative about society.
Such concerns have not been evident in the Wilson/Murray approach to policy, and the position promoted by such theorists is compelling in that it cuts through, what could be considered, the indulgence of positivist thinking that appears to lose sight of the impact of behaviour in its pursuit of identifying and responding to causality. The Left Realist compromise promoted by Lea and Young made the realist approach more appealing to a broader cohort of policy makers and politicians and this paved the way for more acceptably reactive and controlling service provision. However, this compromise was not one between left and right to find a happy medium straight down the centre of policy, balancing the needs of victims with the needs of those who's behaviour causes concern - although left realism perhaps appears to be an adequate attempt at such a compromise.

Instead, left realism is a compromise by the Left, at a time when the elites have reasserted their dominance and the results of such a compromise have been a shift in service focus away from engaging, supportive and empowering provision that aims to bring about change by supporting communities to develop their own capacity, towards individualised, time limited and modular interventions, that have lost faith in the abilities of professionals to create successful interventions, and instead shifted towards services that quantify delivery and success as an accountant addresses a spreadsheet, ignoring the inconvenient truths that social beings, whether as practitioners or service users, present. This is developed further in the next chapter.
Chapter Six
Considerations of Practice

The managerialist approach to service delivery focuses very much, in realist, post-modernist fashion, on the here and now, looking at the individual in question and attempts to define provision according to the concern presented. As such, the ability of practitioners - be they statutory or non-statutory, social workers, teachers, youth workers or targeted service providers, including youth justice practitioners - to develop an understanding of that individual - or group - by taking the time to engage them and build relationships that can lead to understanding, consideration, empathy and effective challenge is limited by the managerialist requirement to define and ‘fix’ the perceived problem - bypassing the notion that solutions to the issues communities face might actually reside within those communities themselves and that the role of social welfare services might be to support individuals, groups and communities to locate and develop such solutions. This chapter explores some of the established approaches to intervention that have become limited in the rush to contain, control and correct.

Relationships are Key

The support provided to young people in contact with social welfare services can shape the adults they become and influence the view they hold of themselves. If they are led to see themselves as outsiders and criminals by the adults around them, their esteem and self-perception may be irreparably set in stone.

This idea was explored by Frederick Thrasher when looking into notions of gang behaviour in 1927. He identified the idea of ‘differential association’ in that individuals tend to take on the behaviour of those they come to be most exposed to. This is not the same as ‘labelling theory’ which suggests that individuals take on the characteristics that others identify them with - for example, telling someone they are deviant may lead to them displaying deviant behaviour. Instead, differential association is more concerned with individuals coming to reflect the behaviour they see in the influential people around them - peers, parents, professionals, etc - whether that behaviour is deemed positive or negative (Newburn 2007:194).
So, for example, if criminal activity can be promoted through relationships and engagement with people who extol the virtues of offending, it follows, from Thrasher’s findings, that ‘positive’ and ‘constructive’ relationships should be used to counter such influences and engage young people in notions of pro-social behaviour that focus on their positive and enhanced role in the local community, thus bestowing upon them the sense of purpose and value they may otherwise have obtained from the profile offending behaviour might have given them (Batchelor and McNeill 2005:1).

But unlike some aspects of mentoring, which is often delivered in isolation and in response to a perceived deficiency, these positive and constructive relationships must be nurtured in the context of adolescent development that sees the value and potential of young people as such, and not as something to be contained and ‘fixed’. In other words, rather than engaging young people in mentoring relationships that focus on telling them what not to do, it would be far more beneficial to engage them in discussions that accept their need to make their own mistakes while knowing there are people around them who will guide them when they need. In traditional, close-knit communities, this would have been possible through daily life. As communities become more disparate and disjointed, the role of those employed or volunteering to support young people becomes of greater importance in providing a constant that young people can relate to and bounce off. For those children and young people with sound and supportive family networks, the importance of practitioners may be less evident, however, particularly where such supportive networks are lacking, or such influences struggle to impact positively on children and young people’s lives, the guiding, supportive, informing and challenging impact of practitioners can become key.

The nature of service delivery that is aimed at those deemed to be offending or at risk of offending, or in some other way deficient, tends to promote the practice that children and young people become grouped into situations where the people they associate with through engagement with such services are themselves identified as offenders or at risk of such behaviour.

Similarly, in school situations, those who find formal learning environments the most challenging and come to display objectionable behaviour to those around them, find
themselves ejected to pupil referral units where the majority of children they engage with display similar attitudes and behaviours. This results in the very services and responses aimed at ‘fixing’ issues, coming to promote the advancement of those issues through distilling relationships down to the problems they set out to eradicate - and carry out this distillation in isolation from more positive behaviours amongst the general population - be it in schools or the broader community.

‘Differential associations vary in intensity, frequency and duration, and it is those....that last longer, are more intense and occur earlier in life that are likely to be more influential’. (Newburn 2007:194)

Th principles of differential association were summed up by Sutherland and Cressey (1947) in nine propositions and can be assumed to relate to more general behaviour than simple offending:

1. Criminal behaviour is learned.
2. Criminal behaviour is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication.
3. The principle part of the learning of criminal behaviour occurs within intimate personal groups.
4. When criminal behaviour is learned, the learning includes (a) techniques of committing the crime, which sometimes are very complicated, sometimes very simple; [and] (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalisations and attitudes.
5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of legal codes as favourable and unfavourable.
6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of law over definitions unfavourable to violations of law. This is the principle of differential association.
7. Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity.
8. The process of learning criminal behaviour by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all the mechanisms that are involved in any other learning.
9. While criminal behaviour is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values since non-criminal behaviour is an expression of the same needs and values. Thieves generally steal in order to secure money, but likewise, honest labourers work in order to secure money. The attempts by many scholars
to explain criminal behaviour by general drives and values, such as the happiness principle, striving for social status, the money motive or frustration, have been and must continue to be futile, since they explain lawful behaviour as completely as they explain criminal behaviour. They are similar to respiration, which is necessary for any behaviour, but which does not differentiate criminal from non-criminal behaviour. (1970:75-76) in Newburn (2007:194).

As Cloward and Ohlin (1961:41) have also noted,

The great bulk of delinquent behaviour appears to occur in association rather than isolation from other like-minded persons.’

Much of this also lends itself to the idea that interventions are better based on group work than the individualising nature of one-to-one work, so long as the dynamics of those groups are reflective of the communities children and young people experience daily, and not artificial groups that have come about for the convenience of service delivery - as, for example, in the case of pupil referral units, offending behaviour workshops and weapons awareness groups - often experienced in schools, youth justice and youth work respectively - and serve to ‘other’ young people from the general community through a focus on that behaviour that causes concern.

Responding to ‘Risk’

Pitts (2008:33) describes two main themes in the analysis of youth crime: ‘crime-averse criminologies’ and ‘risk-factor paradigm’. The former attempts to minimise concerns about youth crime by suggesting it is a normal result of adolescence that has been evident for many years and is nothing sensational or new - the ‘Left Idealist’ viewpoint. The latter attempts to show that youth crime is in fact different and predictable, if only the correct risk factors can be identified early enough to prevent the onset of youth crime in the first place (Pitts 2008:33)

Whereas crime-averse policies can be seen in more welfare based, as well as non-interventionist approaches to young people, risk-factor paradigm policy initiatives, such as Every Child Matters (ECM) and other realist policy movements are clearly couched in an unchallenged acceptance of the prevalence of risk that can be identified and eradicated.
These children with identifiable risk factors would, under ECM, now be liable to intervention, despite not actually having committed any offence or being identified as requiring what might have previously been deemed a statutory social services or youth justice intervention.

Unsurprisingly, and in keeping with broader advances in managerialism, ‘evidence-based practice’ and the desire for professional legitimacy, the insistence on the risk factor approach, referred to as the Risk Factor Research (RFR) has been couched in the assertion that it delivers scientific certainty and objective identification of the issues to be ‘fixed’ (Case and Haines 2009:13-14), in ways more suitable and productive than relying on the subjective judgements delivered by a reliance on professional expertise (Case and Haines 2009:261).

However, not surprisingly, RFR has its critics and in particular, these criticisms suggest that the approach is more about promoting a governmental political mindset:

‘that prioritises the efficient governance, control, monitoring and management of, in this case, offending populations, over concerns such as welfare, justice or rehabilitation’ - otherwise referred to as ‘governmentality’ (Case and Haines 2009:5)

and that, again in keeping with broader developments, places too much emphasis on the responsibility of the individual - in effect, RFR lends itself well to the dominant motivations that currently shape services - a drive for legitimacy through science and accountability through objectivity of managerial oversight of professional assessment and input. In particular, RFR promotes a more punitive, reactive, reductionist and individualising approach to service delivery by reducing professional efforts to the identification and management of ‘risks’, seen in isolation of any positivistic causes (Case and Haines 2009:14).

Even the antonym of risk factors (protective factors) are defined by their relationship to risk and the avoidance of poor outcomes, rather than an indication of positive behaviour (Case and Haines 2009:41)

RFR is especially suited to a post-modern analysis of youth offending and other targeted services because it is simplistic, convenient and uncluttered. In a world dominated by a
media engine that has an affinity to these simplistic explanations that can be readily delivered to an ill-informed and disengaged public for consumption, and answers many insecurities amongst policy makers, it is not surprising that RFR has taken hold so strongly.

According to Barlow and Scott (2010:20-1) a better approach to understanding risk is captured in ‘complexity theory’ - which has many similarities to the more widely recognised ‘chaos theory’.

Complexity theory is promoted to understand the factors that could lead to a child facing harm, usually in the home - but the theory can lend itself to other situations in which children and young people find themselves. The work they highlight can also be used effectively to understand the complexity of the young person’s life and where they may experience risk, ‘to’ or ‘from’, as well as where aspects of their lives may not develop in ways they or their families might wish.

‘A complex adaptive system has a pattern and, from this pattern, a range of likely outcomes can be indicated, but not predicted. Indeed, some of the outcomes will be unforeseen. Given the dynamic and live nature of the complex adaptive system, linear analysis of risk is inappropriate. Non-linear approaches to working with risk are much more relevant to the real nature of the system surrounding the child.’ (Stevens and Cox 2008)

In a nod to chaos theory, which is often used to describe weather patterns, Stevens and Cox (2008:20) use the example of a weather system to demonstrate the way in which principles derived from complexity theory have relevance to safeguarding. Weather arises due to an interaction of factors and this combination creates a complex adaptive system able to undergo self-organisation. This means that while we can know that a particular set of factors is likely to lead to a hurricane, it is nevertheless not possible to predict when or whether such hurricanes will occur. The factors that lead to children being harmed or causing harm can similarly be viewed in this way: practitioners can identify factors that contribute to the occurrence of abuse or criminality, but have difficulty predicting whether or when harm or deviance will occur. Linear approaches, such as RFR, suggest that it is possible to predict outcomes because effect directly follows cause (Barlow and Scott 2010:20). By understanding behaviour and risk to be integrated aspects of the systems that young people occupy (family / peers / schools / services / spaces / etc) it becomes
easier to understand how RFR may be limited in its ability to predict risk - children and young people do not occupy linear systems, they influence, and are influenced by, complex, often chaotic, systems, that can both limit and promote aspects of behaviour, often in unpredictable ways.

The authors criticise RFR on the basis that the units being observed (such as family or educational attainment) mean different things to different young people, and what could be deemed problematic to one may seem acceptable to another. The responses to these variables are then quantified, according to Pitts (2003a) as though they each carried equal weight, meaning and value to the respondent (young person) or in society in general. In practice, these assumptions are actually applied by the practitioner who assesses these variables in the young person's life and decides how protective or problematic (risk) they are. So the criticism still stands - that practitioners are required to make assumptions that A might cause B.

However, complexity theory - and other systems theories such as systemic discussed later in this paper, and central to the new service structure proposed - make the assumption that the practitioner is a thinking and assessing being, capable of adjusting their position and decisions according to newly emerging factors - something RFR refuses to acknowledge. The subjectivity of each practitioner also opens up the real possibility that each child will receive a different interpretation of risk and thus subsequent service depending on the practitioner they are assigned. (Case and Haines 2009:20) In other words, they'll receive a tailor-made service rather than an 'off the shelf', one-size-fits-all response.

By removing the assumption of subjectivity, RFR attempts to sterilise the input and output of interventions. By simplifying the process of provision, it becomes possible to apply blame when things go wrong, because the relationship has followed a linear path. This leads practitioners, working in this blame culture, to take fewer risks themselves, and the result is that children and young people increasingly receive restrictive and controlling interventions that shut down the possibility of risk, rather than empowering, engaging, mobilising and uplifting interventions that support the child or young person’s development and growth (Stevens and Cox 2008:21).
The model of social care developed in France (discussed in chapter Eight), that places a greater emphasis on the relationship and discourse between practitioner and family lends itself well to this idea of a non-linear assessment of risk and service provision.

Later in this paper a new service model will be discussed which includes what is being called the ‘Unit Model’. It will be shown that systems theories point to the efficacy of the Unit model which allows for the constant joint review of cases through discussion and reflection so that changes can be responded to in a timely fashion rather than assuming that a specific set of resources or efforts will result in a specific, predictable outcome.

Encouraging Joined-up Thinking
Following publication of the Laming Report into the death of Victoria Climbié and in order to drive both the overriding Every Child Matters (ECM) and specific Youth Matters agenda, the Government of the time insisted on the creation of Children’s Trusts in each Local Authority area that would bring together Children’s Social Services (renamed Children’s Social Care), Education, Youth Services, the new Youth Offending Teams, Targeted Youth Support Teams and Connexions Services into one Children’s Services Directorate (led by a Director of Children’s Services (DCS)) so as to promote a more coordinated, joined up service structure and delivery, because the lack of cooperation and coordination between these providers was identified as a key problem to promoting the safety of children and young people. (Barlow and Scott 2010:83; Smith 2005)

Within these Children’s Trust arrangements, further details emerged of how services were to be structured, bringing the different professions into closer proximity, delivering from common venues, and introducing the idea of a change to the professional terms and conditions in place:

‘To achieve all this Youth Matters, the green paper for youth proposes:

• bringing together a number of existing programmes currently focusing on specific issues into a more integrated 'holistic' approach to young people.

• establishing local youth support teams focused on preventative work and early intervention with targeted individuals. These teams
of youth workers, advisers, education welfare and social work staff might be based in extended schools and community centres.

• introducing a system of lead professionals to ensure that every young person who needs support has someone to ‘take care’ of their interests.’

(Smith 2005)

Under ECM and Youth Matters there was a strong and evident belief that the divisions and barriers between the different professions were not conducive with the effective delivery of support and interventions to young people. Through the Children’s Workforce Development Strategy the issue of terms and conditions was raised with the view of micromanaging the way practitioners were employed and deployed to support young people, breaking down the restrictive barriers between professions, and even introducing a single qualification for the children’s workforce (Smith 2005).

As well as Children’s Trust arrangements, the Government also introduced what came to be known as Integrated Youth Support Services (IYSS). As the name suggests, this was an attempt to improve the levels of integration between those services providing support to young people. In particular, a new service was introduced - Targeted Youth Support Teams - whose aim was to shift provision in a targeted way towards those deemed most in need under ECM outcome criteria - in other words, those least likely to achieve the five outcomes and so most likely to go on to require a statutory (more expensive) intervention later (through youth justice or social care), if not challenged now. In many areas IYSS became a collaboration of TYST, Youth Service and Connexions - while in other areas this mix was joined by YOTs and/or other adolescent services. In the most part, the aim of IYSS was to shift services towards prevention and early intervention (Piper 2008:69).

Unfortunately, the Government’s attempts to force services to integrate through IYSS were rarely, if ever, realised and what generally tended to be the result locally, was an integration of management teams so that fewer managers were responsible for the same number of distinctly characterised service areas. Services were integrated through communication rather than service delivery. In other words, each service retained its individual identity and it can be seen that the Government faced the same issues that it faced when suggesting
that statutory services (in particular, social work and teaching) could be integrated into one workforce. Individual professions didn’t want to see their individual identities disappear.

It can be seen that the development of, firstly, the Connexions Service and then the TYSTs was a direct attempt to circumvent this intransigence on the part of established services/professions. On the whole, Connexions was established through the recruitment of people from youth work and careers backgrounds, but by restricting its remit too narrowly to information, advice and guidance (IAG), it ran into a cul-de-sac and soon fell out of favour within ten years of its inception (Jeffs and Smith 2002:56).

If Connexions was a first, universal attempt at providing youth support services, the second was more direct and limited in its reach. Targeted Youth Support Teams would target those young people deemed ready to fall short of Government defined measures of success - the five outcomes. While the target remit for TYST was narrower, the range of professional backgrounds recruited to deliver was far broader and included youth workers, social workers, teachers and specialist health practitioners - especially in the fields of substance misuse, sexual and mental health.

The main issue with TYSTs was that they didn’t provide anything new and didn’t replace any services that were already providing within the TYST remit. Children’s Social Care continued to deliver on the safeguarding agenda, YOT Prevention Services continued to deliver on the crime prevention and risk agenda, and in particular through Youth Inclusion and Support Panels (YISP) and Youth Inclusion Projects (YIP), delivered to the broader preventative agenda beyond simple crime prevention. Given TYSTs were non-statutory in nature, the statutory youth justice agenda remained with YOTs. This created confusion, overlap and duplication on the ground and resulted in different arrangements in each local area to meet the differing political landscapes and agenda present. In addition, the narrow and restrictive remit of TYST prevented such services from engaging young people on a generic basis and so the need for universal youth services remained - and such spaces and delivery continued to see ‘issue-based’ interventions as their remit - leading to further confusion and duplication.
Towards a Better Understanding of Young Peoples’ Needs

Clearly, there is a need to shift the focus of service structure and delivery away from a managerialist obsession with total risk aversion, towards one that recognises the journey that young people travel (Barlow and Scott 2010:13).

The approach of practitioners is required to focus on recognising young peoples’ social interactivity as a way of countering the internalisation of young peoples’ own fears and vulnerabilities and the only real way to achieve this is through the development of young peoples’ ability to communicate and socialise with the people around them, to challenge and be challenged through healthy, open and strong interpersonal relationships (Button 1974:1).

It should not be surprising that many of the young people who cause the most concern in our communities have difficulties socialising and communicating with their peers and adults around them. These are the very young people who are in most need of professionals who can take the time to build relationships of trust, to stand firm when mistakes are made and offer guidance where it is sought (Button 1974:8).

The impact of practitioners needs to focus on the personal and social development of the young people they come into contact with; to identify their vulnerabilities and needs and to engage them in a process of change that places the young people at the centre of any intervention and to be conscious of the impact they can have.

‘We are influenced in much of our behaviour by the need to matter, to be somebody, to have significance. Much of that significance comes from the reflections of ourselves that we see in the eyes of other people, and is therefore bound up with the relationship with other people….’ (Button 1974:11)

Practitioners need to understand the power they have when supporting young people, particularly the most vulnerable, and to use this power to involve them in developing their views of themselves, of the world and the place they occupy in that world. The relationship between a practitioner and young person has been seen as key to effective working, but the space for this relationship has been limited, and often undermined, by the presence of heavy workloads, bureaucracy and budgetary limitations (Barlow and Scott 2010:24)
Desistance Theory

McNeill and Weaver (2010:3-4) identify a number of key elements that must be present in any interventions attempting to bring about sustainable change in people subject to offending behaviour responses. In the case of their ‘desistance theory’, desistance from offending behaviour is an approach that is relevant to all people engaged in services where the act of social interaction is the function that delivers change and transformation, rather than externally applied, pseudoscientific tools and methods that themselves dispatch responsibility for change onto those taking part in such transactions.

In summary, the elements of desistance theory are:

1. **Be realistic**: It takes time to change entrenched behaviours and the problems that underlie them, so lapses and relapses should be expected and effectively managed.

2. **Favour informal approaches**: Criminalising and penalising children and young people runs the serious risk of establishing criminal identities rather than diminishing them, so it should be avoided as much as possible by favouring informal measures.

3. **Use prisons sparingly**: Stopping offending is aided by strong and positive social ties, by seeing beyond the label ‘offender’ and by reducing or avoiding contacts with other ‘offenders’. Prison makes all of these things much more difficult.

4. **Build positive relationships**: Like everyone else, offenders are most influenced to change (and not to change) by those whose advice they respect and whose support they value. Personal and professional relationships are key to change.

5. **Respect individuality**: Since the process of giving up crime is different for each person, criminal justice responses need to be properly individualised. One-size-fits-all approaches run the risk of fitting no-one.

6. **Recognise the significance of social contexts**: Trying only to ‘fix’ offenders can’t and won’t fix reoffending. Giving up crime requires new networks of support and opportunity in local communities and a new attitude towards the reintegration of ex-offenders.

7. **Mind our language**: If the language that we use in policy and practice causes both individuals and communities to give up on offenders, if it confirms and cements the negative
perceptions of people who have offended as risky, dangerous, feckless, hopeless or helpless, then it will be harder for those people to give up crime.

8. **Promote ‘redemption’**: Criminal justice policy and practice has to recognise and reward efforts to give up crime, so as to encourage and confirm positive change. For ex-offenders, there has to be an ending to their punishment and some means of signalling their redemption and re-inclusion within their communities.

From this list it is clear that the structure and delivery of support and service to young people in trouble or otherwise in need of direction, must start at the point of engagement and be guided by the individual (or group) accessing such support. It is wholly unsuitable to attempt to squeeze young people into ‘off-the-shelf’ programmes that serve only to simplify the experience of the service in limiting the complexities of delivery. Services must accept and engage with the concept that all human beings are their own individual people, with their own experiences, motivations, aspirations, strengths, limitations and social networks. Such networks must be identified, acknowledged, engaged and integrated into the efforts to bring about positive change in the young person’s life, so as to ensure that change is genuine and sustainable.

When discussing the *Good Lives Model*, a motivational offender management programme for adults in the probation service, McNeill (2009:33) suggests that a balance must be struck between the management of risk the service user might pose with the support to achieve personal goals that may deliver contentment, and that, in order to achieve this, the practitioner must build a relationship with the client

‘Too strong a focus on personal goods may produce a happy but dangerous offender; but equally too strong a focus on risk may produce a dangerously defiant or disengaged offender. The practitioner has to create a human relationship in which the individual offender is valued and respected and through which interventions can be properly tailored in line with particular life plans and their associated risk factors.’

So, practically speaking, ‘the relationship’ in services to children, young people and families has been negatively affected and downgraded by the managerialism that has come to define modern services. However, theoretically speaking, the relationship is ever-present.
and the actors continue to play their respective roles but the structures impact on the emphasis that relationship has, as well as its productive nature.

By way of concluding the discussion around the placing of the *relationship* in services for young people, Batchelor and McNeill (2005:8-9) suggest that this demotion is, as has been suggested in this paper, part of a wider shift in emphasis that has promoted the cold measurable and objective (and called this ‘effective’) over the engaging, subjective and inter-personal (what might be seen as effective, but *fluffy*)

‘In many respects, these central arguments may seem obvious, particularly to experienced practitioners. That they now seem to require re-stating, perhaps merely underlines the extent to which programme talk has become dominant in discourses around evidence-based practice….a case could certainly be made that the emphases on programmes rather than processes, on packages rather than people, on tools rather than relationships, on external and academic as opposed to professional expertise, and on (supposedly) technical as opposed to ideological or moral questions, sit all too comfortably with the requirements of managerial control, modernisation and penal populism.’

In order to illustrate the complexity of the worker-client relationship and the importance of the personality the practitioner brings - which Trotter (2009:149) has listed as *‘Personality traits and beliefs such as optimism, fairness, punctuality, reliability and honesty’* - Rose (1947) sets out a wish list of skills and qualities for the increasingly professionalising Probation Service of the time:

‘…a professional outlook; high efficiency; the human motive of friendship; inner warmth and sincerity; sympathy; optimism about human nature; a capacity to see the probationers point of view; a preparedness to establish the right to be critical; knowledge of poverty and deprivation; knowledge of the probationers neighbourhood; the skills of guidance not compulsion; being moralistic; good physical and mental health; intelligence; a thought out philosophy; fluency in both verbal and written expression; streetwise attitudes; maturity; leadership qualities; flexibility and prescience; industriousness and decision-making skills; reliability; and a commitment to increasing

Or as Batchelor and McNeill(2005:8) suggest

‘Relationship skills are essential to achieving positive outcomes and these involve the worker being open and honest, empathetic, able to challenge rationalisations, non-blaming, optimistic, able to articulate the client’s and family members’ feelings and problems, using appropriate self-disclosure and humour’

A Word on Identity

In an article for The Observer, author Maaza Mengiste, (What makes a ‘real African’? The Observer 07/07/13), writing about the tendencies to lump all authors from the African diaspora into one convenient basket called ‘African Writers’, suggests that by doing so, essential elements of identity are denied the individuals who make up such a rich and diverse contribution to literature.

It is the same with services to children, young people and families. By failing to open service delivery up to the diversity of personalities, experiences, tensions and challenges of those that come to call on our services we in effect deny the existence and reality of individual and collective identities that should form the basis of our responses to them. By forcing service users to bend to the will and needs of our service structures, we distill them down to a unified sameness that robs them of their character and potential to stand out and make a difference in this world.

As Mengiste summarises’

‘we’ve become comfortable with our own myopia. It’s easier than forcing ourselves to tread the tricky waters of ambiguity and individuality.’

Because to do so would require of us a rejection of ‘what works’ methodology as the first port in structuring our responses. It would require us to call on our own individuality and diversity, to make a stand and demand the space required to be more human in our interaction
Responding to the needs of those requiring support and intervention is not necessarily the same thing as ignoring the impact their behaviour has on those around them. However, by focusing on a rush to fix perceived deviance, the time and space to engage, not only the individuals and groups in question, but also the families and communities that form their systems and networks, becomes limited, and the meaning of interventions may be lost, so that the chances of creating sustained change are reduced.

It is necessary to accept that those subject to support, challenge and intervention are social beings, not mere cells on a spreadsheet, and as such, their reality is a product of the social interactions they experience - what they do and what is done to them. It therefore becomes incumbent on those wishing to bring about change, to understand their own role in the systems that service users experience, and avoid intervening in ways that may deny a human, social experience - in effect, services and practitioners have a responsibility to respond to the social space, the systems and the networks that individuals and groups experience, rather than denying the existence of such entities and reducing service users to quantifiable problems that can be defined and corrected in isolation from such entities. In the next chapter, using the experiences in one inner London local authority, the considerations and decisions made in attempts to structure services with these principles in mind are discussed.
Chapter Seven
From Service Chaos to Service Integration

Introduction
Over the remaining chapters of this paper I will present the efforts, considerations and decisions that have resulted in the development of a new integrated service that aims to place the needs and interests of children, young people and families at the centre of its provision by focusing on engagement of service users and creating the time, support and space for practitioners to use this engagement to build open, honest and productive relationships with those they support, in order that service users can play a more enhanced and central role in defining their needs, and the solutions to those needs.

I recognise that I have been a shaping force in what transpired throughout the change process that led to this new service, and not simply a fly-on-the-wall. I have discussed at length in the Methodology of this paper, the considerations around objectivity when playing such a role in one’s own focus of research. Ethnographic research is never completely objective, but when the researcher is a part of the service being observed, there calls for a different approach. For this reason, I have incorporated my role as researcher and subject into a sub-section of ethnography, called auto-ethnography.

In Chapters Seven to Nine I shall set out the change process embarked upon. My own experience and impact in this process will be discussed in Chapter Ten.

Between 2006 and 2012 I was fortunate to be involved in an ambitious and innovative change programme that has tested some of the assumptions and considerations set out in this paper. As discussed in the methodology earlier, the change programme fortuitously accommodated a process of auto-ethnography undertaken by myself, that allowed me to observe the impact of service structure on delivery and test the impact of a particular setup that aimed to promote the role and placement of relationship and engagement. The result of that change programme was the establishment of the Young Hackney model, which is discussed in the remaining pages of this paper. By extension, this paper is itself a product of that change programme which has been written under academic supervision for the
stated aim of submission for the degree of the professional doctorate in Leadership in Children and Young Peoples Services.

The change programme had its roots in senior management considerations of how to structure disparate services that had been deemed to be of low quality and insufficient to meet the complex and varied needs of local children, young people and families. My role in this began as an Operations Manager for prevention services and culminated in my role firstly as Head of the Youth Offending Team and subsequently, and finally, as one of two Heads of Service in the new Young Hackney model.

Services to children, young people and families in the London Borough of Hackney have embarked on a gradual but determined effort to improve the way services are structured and how they respond to the needs of those requiring support. Importantly, the collective desire has been to make resources more responsive to the needs of service users rather than service users responsive to the needs of the service - the latter being a consequence of the developments explored in previous chapters - particularly issues of managerialism.

In particular both the Youth Service and the Youth Offending Team were the subject of extremely poor Her Majesty’s Inspectorate inspections. Children’s Social Care (CSC) had its own problems with poor staff morale and concerns about the high number of children being taken into care and the poor outcomes that existed for those children. Across the Directorate there existed a conviction that children supported to remain in the family home stood a far better chance of achieving positive outcomes than those subjected to corporate parenting. However, with a deeply demoralised workforce and a management structure that struggled to respond to the requirements of frontline staff, decisions on casework were often poor leading to chaotic case management and resultant increased stress levels for staff and managers alike.

Also in 2006, as part of the Government’s roll out of the Youth Matters agenda, Hackney Council introduced the Youth Support Teams (the national programme that these teams related to was called Targeted Youth Support but the decision was made by Hackney Council to drop the word ‘targeted’ in order to assist with coordination with universal services). Youth Support in Hackney was to be delivered by four neighbourhood teams and
focus on a range of ‘risk factors’ such as poor attendance and behaviour in school amongst young people and provide support as early as possible.

Part of the work of these teams was to step in to fill a gap emerging from a receding statutory social care provision that was increasingly defining its role as a response to acute and immediate risk. In keeping with the broader policy agenda, the remit of the YST was defined by the perceived deficiencies in the target cohort.

**First Attempts at Integration**

YST in Hackney was to be delivered through the existing Youth Service and work to a broad remit. This wasn’t necessarily reflected in other boroughs across the country and the role of YST was given greater or lesser prominence depending on local interpretations of what YST was there to achieve. In some boroughs YST (or TYST as it was more commonly known) provided the impetus to review services and move towards greater integration under the banner of Integrated Youth Support Services (IYSS) - the overarching drive through which Every Child Matters (ECM) was to be delivered.

This idea of integration is crucial to the understanding of the development of services to young people in recent years. IYSS, on the surface, was a great idea. Why have various different services causing young people, families and other services confusion over role and function? Instead, why not have one integrated service for people to relate to?

Unfortunately, where IYSS existed, integration rarely resulted in integrated services, with only 8% of local authorities describing their IYSS arrangements as ‘integrated throughout’ (NYA / CFBT Education Trust 2010) although many areas did report a subjective improvement in service delivery to young people, suggesting that greater integration is in keeping with service improvement and ‘better’ outcomes for young people.

However, the low number of areas reporting ‘integrated throughout’ would suggest that, perhaps for political reasons (as opposed to reasons promoting the interests of service users), or simply due to missed opportunities, effective restructure and re-alignment was not realised through the IYSS agenda or its wider ECM umbrella.

It can be reasonably argued that ECM was a Government response to the recognition that expensive statutory services and practitioners could not continue to expand in response to
growing need amongst communities in a society of increasing inequality (Dorling 2011). Also, due to shrinking public finances, there was a need to find alternatives to expensive statutory providers. So, a need to respond to increasing need while also reducing the cost of public services - a particularly tricky equation to solve, resulting in non-statutory services, that held, at their core, a voluntary relationship with service users, being developed and supported to take up much of the work previously delivered through statutory services, and in particular, CSC. The roll out of YOTs in 2000 had already introduced non-statutory and unqualified practitioners into the field of youth justice delivery.

Therefore, ECM set about creating a framework that made it clear what roles non-statutory practitioners and professionals were to play - at the heart of this was the role of 'lead professional'. This meant that, while a statutory social worker could hold the legal, statutory responsibility for managing a case, the work could, within the ECM framework, be passed to a non-statutory, and thus cheaper, practitioner in another service - for example, a YISP worker.

In Hackney, at that time, integration didn’t appear to be an option. Due to the two high profile, failed inspections it was decided not to cause wholesale upheaval but instead to throw senior management support and resources behind the new management teams of the Youth Service and YOT. In particular YST, it was decided, would be a service delivered within the existing Youth Service, rather than something which threatened to take over the role delivered by the Youth Service - as was mooted, and in some cases, delivered in other areas - leading to targeted services subverting the power, role and influence of universal services - something which Hackney decided to avoid. It was at this point that I took up my post as Operations Manager for Prevention Services at the YOT, and so these decisions about service alignment at the time were made without my input. I arrived to join a new management team in the YOT that included a new Head of Service and three other Operations Managers and a Business Support Manager - collectively we would steer the YOT through the challenges ahead, and it must be said, these were extremely challenging times. Particular challenges were experienced in gaining the trust of a staff team that felt it had been let down on countless occasions be previous leadership teams, but who importantly, had very clear ideas of how they felt services should be delivered to the local community. My role at this time was very much about engagement of staff, establishing new policies for delivery and setting out a vision that my teams could buy into.
The YOT was allowed to retain its responsibility for the development and delivery of, what was at the time, a fledgling youth crime prevention service. As will be seen, this YOT prevention service was to grow into one of the most innovative and responsive youth crime prevention services in the country.

So, services to young people in Hackney could be said to be well resourced and cover a wide range of issues experienced by young people. From universal, open access services delivered through the Youth Service, to issue-based provision delivered through YST (particularly focussing on those young people experiencing issues in school - or at risk of being ‘not in education, employment or training’ - NEET), onto those young people requiring specific support to prevent them entering into offending behaviour and onto the statutory responses delivered through the YOT and CSC - a real continuum of services to respond to the continuum of needs experienced and presented by a youth population in an average inner city borough.

A Disjointed Approach to ‘Risk’
There appeared to be a genuine and well-placed logic to this set up. Except that, just as IYSS, in the most part, didn’t deliver integration of services, the situation in Hackney, as in many other localities, failed to recognise that young people don’t conveniently fit into packaged categories of need and in particular, they can experience various levels of need simultaneously.

So that, a young person deemed to be at risk of offending can also be a young person at risk of becoming NEET through school exclusion, while also being subject to a child protection plan. Such a young person would, according to the structure of services in Hackney at the time, warrant support from the YOT (prevention), YST and CSC - as well as universal and potentially targeted responses within the school environment; and any physical and mental health provision deemed necessary - with few, if any, coordinated plans of support and intervention across these services.

Clearly this was an inefficient way to deliver services but due to the requirement to ensure each service had its own specific remit - otherwise how do you justify resourcing each service as a separate entity - it was often difficult to prevent a young person receiving multiple and conflicting interventions from the various services, despite commonality in the ‘risk factors’ for each of the social ills each service was to ‘fix’. The alternative outcome of these
arrangements were for certain services to refuse to intervene because other services were involved - which leads to the danger that either no agency responds, or the least appropriate agency takes the lead.

Because each service restricted itself to a limited remit, this would mean certain needs amongst the particular service user going unmet. In other words, the risk factors that supposedly lead to youth crime are similar to the risk factors that lead to a risk of school exclusion, poor decisions around sexual health or substance use. Having different services carving these issues up according to their own agenda did not reflect the experiences that young people and families lived - and simply resulted in service users lives being compartmentalised to satisfy the needs of services.

This confusion was replicated between CSC and YOT prevention whereby, CSC staff, required to manage overwhelming caseloads would pass responsibility for the delivery of intervention plans to YOT prevention services, particularly the Youth Inclusion and Support Panel (YISP) - a Children’s Fund / Youth Justice Board initiative - or the Youth Inclusion Programme (YIP) - a Youth Justice Board (YJB) initiative.

Because YJB initiatives existed in addition to the ECM programme - although they were required to adhere to ECM principles - YOTs continued to develop them despite the onset of YST. The remit of both were strikingly similar, although quite often the YISP would work with a younger age group - as low as 5 years old in some borough’s but often 8 years and above. YST was a distinct response to 11 year olds (in some areas 13) and older.

There’s a reason that all of this sounds confusing - it was! It was a confusing way to establish and structure services. It caused confusion to partner agencies; and service users and practitioners were confused and particularly protective of their own roles and remits - and so the status quo continued.

**An Explosion of Preventative Initiatives**

All of this was taking place during a time when the national Government, and those that followed or led its agenda, had entered a period of rapid service development. TYST was just one initiative introduced. Later programmes would include point of arrest Triage, Youth Safety and Assessment Toolkit (YSAT - called Youth Safety and Assessment Support Matrix (YSASM) in Hackney), Tackling Knives Action Plan (TKAP), Youth Crime Action Plan
(YCAP), Challenge and Support, Family Intervention Projects (FIP), the scaled approach and the Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO) - among others. Apart from the final two, which were statutory responses to young people on criminal court orders, all of these initiatives were attempts to prevent young people and families from developing one deficiency or another.

In Hackney, much of this was delivered through the YOT, and where there was no statutory requirement underpinning it, through YOT prevention, managed by myself, often including partner agencies - particularly the police. In fact, in the space of around three years between 2006 and 2009/10, Hackney YOT prevention services grew in staff numbers from around 8 to over 50 - delivering a broad range of support services which included innovative gangs interventions, school-based support, parenting support, therapeutic interventions, detached provision and coordinated partnership interventions.

Again, much of this increased the sense of confusion as it wasn’t clear which government department was truly responsible for leading on these initiatives. The, as it was then, Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), under Secretary of State Ed Balls, appeared to want to rest control away from the Home Office and subsequently the Ministry of Justice (the MoJ came into being as a result of the break up of the Home Office after it was deemed too unwieldy and uncontrollable after a series of scandals). In particular, the DCSF had the responsibility for the ECM agenda while YOTs and Youth Crime sat with both the Home Office and MoJ - in the most part through the Youth Justice Board (YJB).

While the Home Office and MoJ initiatives retained the youth justice feel of identifying young people as displaying problematic behaviour that needed to be resolved, the DCSF initiatives were more youth work oriented in their approach. So the range of YCAP initiatives focussed on developing and delivering community support that young people could decide to engage in. Examples of these were the ‘After School Patrols’, that placed youth workers (in Hackney these were YOT prevention team staff) in the community in close communication with a dedicated police unit who together would engage with young people and promote their safety on their journeys home from school. Another was the ‘Street Based’ teams initiative, that placed detached workers on the street to engage young people in activities they wanted to do - again, with the view to promoting the young peoples’ safety in the community. Operation Staysafe, another YCAP initiative, was more directive as it involved patrolling youth crime hotspots late at night to identify young children, usually
under the age of 13 years, and support them to go home to reduce the risk of them becoming involved in problematic and risky behaviour - in particular activities that may leave them vulnerable to grooming by gangs. However, this initiative failed to take hold in Hackney as the practitioners rarely came across any young children late at night. The Family Intervention Projects (FIP) were also a YCAP initiative.

As a result of such confusion, services to children, young people and families in Hackney attempted to develop beyond this piecemeal approach to service structure and improve the logic underpinning the way in which services were established and streamline the processes of communication and information sharing so that services could become more responsive to the needs of those in the community. These efforts have culminated in the establishment of the ‘Connecting Young Hackney’ (CYH) change programme, discussed in the next chapter, but the foundations for this development can be traced back to those two failed inspections in 2006 and a commitment, at senior level, to improve services (both structure and delivery).

The confusing and confused service structures outlined above were, in the most part, the result of a reluctance amongst senior management to implement knee-jerk decisions in response to the two inspections. They were, as has been shown, also the result of uncoordinated central government policy and funding initiatives that failed to join up the thinking at the most senior level. What resulted in Hackney was an approach to partnership working that had an impressive impact on the way services developed.

The first decision has been outlined above - to place YST within the existing Youth Service rather than move to the IYSS model that many other boroughs were introducing. This decision was reviewed in 2008 and YST moved within the management structure of the YOT, but remained, as before, a distinct service area.

**Information is the Key - Poor Quality Referrals**

Secondly, it was clear that the flow of information within and between services and partners was chaotic and inefficient. This led to duplication, gaps and difficulty in mapping levels of risk and vulnerability amongst young people and families, and so difficulties in agreeing coordinated responses to these. Services were conscious of high profile media stories involving perceived failures in other areas of the country, including the Victoria
Climbie and Baby Peter cases in the neighbouring London borough of Haringey (Barlow and Scott 2010:2).

In Hackney increasingly, issues of safeguarding, in keeping with the broader ECM agenda, were no longer to be seen as CSC issues to be dealt with by CSC alone. Wherever possible, a more preventative approach and response was to be developed, whereby all services and partners were to be more responsive to the management of risk and vulnerabilities. In order to realise effective prevention, needs would have to be identified at an earlier stage - preferably before families required statutory intervention.

Given the increasing pressures on CSC brought about by these high profile media stories surrounding child deaths, the pressures and workloads placed on CSC were increasing - all services now had a clear role to play in creating a continuum of service response ensuring that only those cases that clearly required a legally obliging statutory response ended up with CSC. In short, irrespective of the individual agency remit for working with young people and families, the management and reduction of risk and vulnerabilities were to become paramount on all services’ agenda - a realisation of the original 2004 ECM agenda. The specific area of development from the ECM objectives however, were that agencies identifying non-acute safeguarding issues were no longer expected to make referrals to CSC, further adding to social care case loads. In this new culture of joined-up responsibility, non-statutory services were required to take full responsibility for service decisions and delivery.

For services to young people this required a more consistent and common approach to the sharing of information and decision making processes. It also required a more sophisticated understanding and assessment of risk. Previously, risk had been primarily defined by the service in question, with CSC focusing on the ‘risk to self’ idea of vulnerability, whereas other services focused more on the ‘risk to others’ idea of the risk young people might pose to the community - a view particularly prevalent in youth work, youth justice and targeted services. In Hackney there was a commitment to marrying up these definitions into one understanding of risk that could assess young people and families as at once, experiencing and presenting risk, and developing interventions accordingly - with the intention of developing services that understood the Young Hackney experience and not just perceived deficiencies.
The first steps towards this were discussions regarding referral pathways. It had been noted that referring agencies were making decisions about where to send referrals based on which services they were aware of, rather than professional assessments of need, and where these needs could be best met. The result was often that referrals were made to the wrong service (‘poor quality referrals’). In these cases, ‘referred to’ services often failed to respond and inform the referrer of the error, nor did they send the referral to the correct agency - they didn’t see it as their responsibility as they hadn’t made the initial error. So the case didn’t receive a service and the child, young person or family could be said to ‘slip through the net’ - and if the identified needs prompting the initial referral escalated, through inaction, then this may result in the need for a statutory response - which would represent a failure of the overriding collective services strategy.

In addition, knowing there was a risk that referrals wouldn’t be picked up, referrers would often panic and refer to a number of different services at the same time as a way of trying to increase the chances of an intervention being provided. Unfortunately, this often then led to children, young people and families receiving duplicate, often conflicting interventions from a number of different agencies that failed to talk to each other and so never had a grasp on the number of agencies providing a service - or the range of interventions being attempted.

It was therefore decided that one, universal referral panel was required. This would be the only place that referrers would refer to. The panel would be made up of managers with a knowledge of risk and vulnerability assessment, a good knowledge of the range of services available locally and an ability to make professional decisions based on these, as well as the authority to commit resources. This is reflective of a more general trend in children’s services across the country, which attempts to broaden out the notion of risk to better reflect the lived experiences of children and families (Barlow and Scott 2010:3).

**Information is the Key - ‘Youth Safety Assessment Toolkit’**

At around the same time, similar issues were being recognised in other service providers and in particular, the Metropolitan Police Service in London had growing concerns about the number of young people being drawn into the youth justice system that, in the Met’s view, should have received a more preventative, diversionary response from partner agencies long before the onset of offending behaviour. Failures in this area not only placed an
unnecessary drain on police resources, they also led to poor outcomes for the young people involved (Piper 2008:163).

Through a pilot project in a partnership between the Metropolitan Police, the London Serious Youth Violence Board and the London Boroughs of Greenwich, Lewisham, Waltham Forest and Havering, the Youth Safety Assessment Toolkit (YSAT) was developed. Taking slightly different forms in each area, the core to this work was a re-visit back to the 1996 *Misspent Youth* report and its basket of risk factors, presented as indicators of poor outcomes, such as school exclusions, offending behaviour or poor health.

The pilot re-assessed these risk factors and checked to see if anymore could be added, based on new academic research or professional experience. They then agreed, locally, a matrix that matched individual criminogenic risk factors with vulnerability risk factors to arrive at conclusions as to which children and young people required early intervention services to reduce these criminogenic and vulnerability risk factors and increase the protective factors.

‘Building on learning from the Youth Safety Assessment Toolkit (YSAT) pilot - we will consider how best to develop arrangements for pooling local authority and police information to help identify those young people at risk of offending or victimisation.’

LCJB Business Plan 2009-10

Work around YSAT in Hackney included the YOT, Police, Learning Trust (Local Education Authority) and YST. The decision was made early on that the development of a paper based matrix (as had occurred in the pilot areas) would not be responsive enough to the needs of services and clients in Hackney. This was because the pilot areas were managing their information through fortnightly multiagency meetings. In Hackney, efforts were being made to develop co-located teams that managed live information as it was generated. Therefore, an ICT-based solution was sought.

Each service area brought in their respective Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and data analyst staff to look into the option of combining the data sets of the respective databases across each service. The idea was to use the XML resource, common in each database, to allow them all to ‘talk to each other’, thus overcoming the inherent dif-
difficulties presented by the fact that each service used different systems to record and evidence their work.

It was soon realised that this was a task beyond the capabilities of the individuals and agencies involved (the database manufacturers themselves would need to lead a project of this nature - which was not in keeping with their own business models - profit and sustainability) and so it was decided to attempt a smaller project between just the YOT, Police and Learning Trust looking at a more narrowly defined cohort to see their pathways to offending.

The cohort decided upon was those young people who had been subject to school exclusion and arrest and conviction, and so in receipt of a YOT intervention. This meant that they would appear on the databases of each of the three services. Unfortunately, the information generated could not be assessed as being of any use to any of the agencies - individually or collectively - and so it was reluctantly decided to abandon the project. In other words, there was nothing to be gained from attempting to link up different databases in this manner.

**Information is the Key - ‘Partnership Triage Unit’**

However, given the close partnership approach to services that had developed in Hackney, it rapidly became clear that lessons from the YSASM project could be applied to attempts to deliver the universal referral panel mentioned earlier, which had now adopted the name Partnership Triage Unit (PTU) - (See Appendix Three and Four for a schematic and PTU Objectives). As a result, the YSASM project outcomes were passed to the PTU project board and a decision was made to avoid trying to get databases to talk to each other and instead develop a unique and dedicated PTU database that would sit independent to each of the agency’s databases and would provide the facility for each database to talk to it. In other words, agency’s databases would talk to a common database rather than attempt to talk to each other.

It was then agreed that the PTU would be a co-located unit with each agency represented at one, common location with direct access to their own databases. This would allow all cases to be handled ‘live’, in real time and professional discussions to be held that could lead to appropriate decisions on forward pathways based on genuine information about which services had been involved previously or currently, what needs had been identified,
which intervention(s) had been tried and the impact - in particular, what levels of engagement had been realised.

Equally, it was decided that, wherever possible, agencies or individual practitioners that could be identified as having a positive relationship with the child, young person or family would be identified and asked to lead on interventions going forward - irrespective of what the agency was - in other words, it wouldn’t be left to statutory services to lead if they didn’t have a positive relationship, as the priority was to engage and effect change rather than continue to deliver interventions that wouldn’t work because the relationship prevented this - any statutory responsibilities were the responsibility of the local authority, and managed through the efforts of the Partnership - with advice and guidance from all relevant agencies and providers.

Within this there was an inherent desire to move away from a situation that blamed children, young people and families for failing to engage and instead to understand and accept that different people develop different relationships with different agencies / individuals in different circumstances and that the Partnership had a responsibility to accommodate this issue and do whatever it could to ensure effective interventions could be delivered in ways that made sense and had meaning to those requiring support. As Munro suggested, this level of process integration is necessary to improve service delivery:

‘Improving the way professionals share information and dovetail their services has been the holy grail of child welfare reform for decades’ (Munro 2003). (Piper 2008:78)

It can be seen that these efforts towards coordinated partnership working in Hackney were in keeping with the desire to place children, young people and families at the heart of practice because the skills required to build relationships with clients are often the skills required to build effective partnerships with other agencies

‘Some of the core skills involved in relationship-based practice (eg relational awareness, authenticity, openness, mutual respect, responsiveness and presence - Freedberg 2008) are also core to partnership working, which we will suggest is a central aspect of relationship-based practice....’ (Barlow and Scott 2010:25)
The focus on responding to incidents (rather than pre-identified risk factors) as done through Partnership Triage Unit (PTU) as a method of charting and intervening in concerns manifesting themselves at the family level can be likened to the onset of universal elementary education in the early 20th century, which brought far more children into the gaze of the state through the schools system. (Piper 2008:58)

This greater visibility served to highlight the prevalence of poor health among the population and can be seen to have led, indirectly, to the provision of free school meals and school medical inspections. Similarly, the Education Act 1870 which resulted in more children attending school, highlighted the extent of parental abuse on their children and contributed to gradual shifts in the State’s attitude towards intervening in the family unit (Piper 2008:90)

In other words, creating structures which pose questions that may have previously gone unheard (or unasked) generates a responsibility to find answers. And in both cases, universal elementary education and PTU, the agenda is an investment for the future so that those subject to such interventions can make positive contributions. The aim of PTU is to move away from responding to symptoms or misplaced ideas around risk factors and begin to challenge, early, the fundamental causes of familial stress that can contribute to poor outcomes for children, young people and families - (See Appendix Three for an Outcomes document that shows the work and impact of PTU).

PTU attempts to move beyond the dominant reductionist approach by bringing together a broader range of services to meet the broader range of needs exhibited. Housing and employment remain difficult to include resulting in even the PTU delivering an individualistic response - but with the inclusion of a range of health agencies (the local general hospital, GPs and mental health services) progress is increasingly being made towards affecting the structural pressures that affect communities.

In most circumstances service structure and delivery dwell in the status quo making shifts in agenda difficult to action - in other words, interventions tend to contain recipients in their current circumstance rather than enabling genuine, fundamental change. This is particularly the case with targeted services, including youth justice, that tend to identify children,
young people and families as problems prior to intervention, often in order to justify intervention in the first place.

For this reason, at the local level there is often a requirement for a change in national policy direction. PTU avoids the need for this by illuminating those areas in need of investment that might otherwise go ignored. Areas of need that PTU was able to successfully identify for investment were domestic violence / missing children / children missing education.

**Information is the Key - The ‘Merlin’ System**

Equally important to the development of common and consistent structures, which found its greatest manifestation in the creation of PTU, was the development, by the Met of the ‘Merlin’ system - (See Appendix One for a background to Merlin and it’s integration with PTU). Prior to Merlin the police used a system of forms, notably the P78s, to record interactions with children and young people and then make efforts to communicate these interactions with social workers and YOTs in the home borough of the child or young person.

So, if a young person was arrested, or concerns about their safeguarding occurred, in Westminster for example, but that young person actually lived in Hackney, Westminster Police would make attempts to communicate this to Hackney CSC or YOT - whichever they deemed most appropriate to inform. There were two key shortcomings with this system. Firstly, there was an assumption that the police were best placed to make a professional judgement as to what service should be informed, and secondly, given the transfer of the form didn’t lead to any outcomes that the police were measured on, it could not be guaranteed that the form would be transferred and so once again there was a risk of a child or young person falling through the net.

With the onset of ECM it was clear that the police needed to tighten up their systems to try and ensure that the correct information was communicated to the correct services in a timely fashion. After all, the Laming enquiry into the Victoria Climbié case had shown that all agencies had a responsibility to share information in order to safeguard children, irrespective of that agency’s core remit.

Therefore, the Met developed the Merlin system which required police officers who encounter children and young people, whether for issues of offending or safeguarding, to consider if the child or young person was at risk of failing to achieve the five ECM out-
comes and to record this on the Merlin form along with information about the incident that led to the interaction. This Merlin was then passed onto the police’s Public Protection Desk (PPD) where the decision was made regarding forward referral.

This system was later updated by the PENY (Police Electronic Notification of YOT’s) system whereby, PPD would send the Merlin related to offending behaviour, electronically through secure email, to the relevant YOT Police Sergeant. This Police Sergeant would then sift through the Merlins that arrived each day and decide if any of them warranted further investigation through a YOT or CSC assessment and possible intervention.

While PENY clearly simplified and improved the flow of information and reduced the likelihood of vulnerable cases going astray, it didn’t fix the problem that, despite best efforts and intentions, the police were perhaps not best placed to decide on appropriate action when dealing with children and young people in difficulty.

In Hackney, it was discovered that the vast majority of Merlins arriving through the PENY system resulted in ‘no further action’ (NFA) as the relevant police officer decided they didn’t warrant further assessment. This was because these decisions were being made on the basis of the information contained in the Merlin alone - so for example, if a child had been arrested for shoplifting in which a bar of chocolate had been stolen, the decision would be that this was a minor incident and so NFA’d. However, questions weren’t being asked as to whether there were services already involved with that child that perhaps needed to know the child had been arrested, nor would questions be asked as to why the child was stealing food in the first place - for example, was this simply youthful testing of boundaries, or was the child hungry due to neglect in the family home?

So the Partnership in Hackney decided that it wanted to change this system and improve the decision making arrangements. It was clear that the Police Sergeant at the time wasn’t doing anything wrong - they were making decisions based on the information available to them at the time. However, the Partnership decided that decisions needed to be made with as much information to hand at the time to arrive at more appropriate decisions and better manage risk and vulnerabilities.

Partnership Triage would provide the answer to this issue. It was decided that all Merlins would be passed from PPD, through the PTU (rather than PENY) and each agency
present (in this co-located Unit) would interrogate their database to see if the child was known, what the identified issues had been, what interventions had been attempted and what the outcomes had been. Once each agency had uploaded this information to the common PTU IT system, ‘Insight’, the PTU manager would review the case and make an informed, professional decision as to where, if anywhere, the case should be sent. Considerations and decisions about each case were guided by the partnership-developed Hackney Child Wellbeing Framework, (http://www.chscb.org.uk/files/Hackney%20Child%20Wellbeing%20Framework.pdf) which established the parameters by which decisions could move beyond the rigid adherence to thresholds, and become more responsive to individual, presenting need (see Appendix Five for a copy of the framework).

On conclusion, this manager would then click a button and a single summary report would be generated that could be emailed out to relevant parties. This report would contain summaries of all information held by all agencies.

The Merlin system provided a useful route to pilot the effectiveness of the PTU. In the beginning, PTU consisted of the YOT, YST, Police, CSC, and Learning Trust. Subsequent discussions secured agreements with Community Safety to pass all cases involving children and young people involved in anti-social behaviour through the PTU so that better, more informed decisions could be made about appropriate interventions - rather than rushing into enforcement responses. Discussions with health led to their involvement and information was later provided by the local General Hospital regarding children and young people admitted for injuries which cause hospital staff concern - such as stabbings. In addition, GPs and schools started asking if they could make referrals to PTU where they had concerns or think further intervention and support may be required - further advancing the journey to the universal referral system PTU set out to become.

In these situations, the assumption by PTU is never that an intervention is the answer. PTU will establish if an intervention is already being provided by an agency and inform that agency that further concerns have been raised by partners and ask them to review the intervention plan. However, the agency in contact with the child, young person or family could decide that they don’t have the resources or skill-set to effect change and so a decision can be made by PTU to escalate the case to another agency.
It's clear that the development of PTU has led to a vast improvement in the quality of decisions made and the sharing of information securely, with those that require it. In particular, early success stories include a greater identification of those 'children missing education' who had previously gone unnoticed by the local partnership. This allowed support and interventions to be delivered which served to re-integrate these children back into education. In addition, the sheer number of children caught up in domestic violence situations - either as witness (the vast majority) or perpetrators (for which there isn't a positive arrest policy) led to partnership work between services to youth and community safety to better coordinate resources and responses.

But there will always be cases that arise through PTU that appear so complex, where a number of agencies have already attempted interventions, or there simply doesn't appear to be any movement and improvement for the child, young person or family. It was therefore agreed that in these situations, a more in-depth discussion would be required amongst senior managers from all the partner agencies to attempt to remove any structural / organisational barriers that may be impeding progress, or simply decide if further support can be given to the agency currently managing the case. For this reason the Youth Partnership Resource and Review Panel (later renamed the Children and Young Peoples Resource Panel) was created to complement the PTU where senior managers could discuss individual cases that continued to cause concern. The membership of this panel would be broader than PTU and include all PTU agencies as well as agencies that provide interventions, whether practical or therapeutic, so that a rich mix of skills and knowledge could be applied to each case presented. Often, discussions at this panel focus on the number of agencies involved and identify one to take a lead and often request that others remove themselves from the case so as to reduce confusion for the children, young people and families involved. In addition, each manager present is required to attend with information about any previous knowledge about the family through interventions provided - or any informal knowledge they might have.

It can be seen that the Partnership in Hackney has identified a number of structural issues that prevented the effective delivery of services to children, young people and families. The efforts to resolve these issues can be seen to have been well thought through and delivered to a high standard - as evidenced in the reduction in the number of children and young people who progressed onto statutory interventions through CSC or the YOT. The impact of these partnership structures has been to remove responsibility from the individ-
ual agencies for decisions around referrals. All they are left to do is provide effective assessments and subsequent interventions - thus freeing them up to focus on building effective relationships that can facilitate useful engagement.

**Reclaiming Social Work**

It had been decided by the Hackney Senior Management Team - the management team across the whole of the local authority - that all services to children, young people and families would be comprehensively restructured. The first to embark on this task was Children’s Social Care (CSC) in 2007-2009 and the result was Reclaiming Social Work (RSW).

RSW involved a complete overhaul of the way CSC was structured in Hackney. Instead of teams of social workers operating in isolation and managed by a team manager who was removed from the delivery of interventions, RSW introduced the concept of 'Units' whereby a small team of practitioners with various backgrounds would jointly manage a case load and share professional oversight on a weekly basis. The units would be led by a 'Consultant Social Worker' (CSW) who themselves would have overall responsibility for the shared case load and would actively contribute to delivering interventions. This served to reduce the gap between the manager who was responsible for decisions about risk and vulnerability, and practitioners, who were responsible for providing the interventions to reduce risk and vulnerability. Because the gap had been too large in the previous model, managers were often making decisions about risk and resource allocation without a clear picture of what was happening in service delivery which led to poor decisions and staff feeling unsupported, unclear of organisational and cultural priorities and as a result, feeling over-worked / stressed.

In the Unit model, decisions and practice around risk and vulnerability management all occurred in the same space - the Unit. Each unit would consist of a CSW, a social worker, a family therapist, an ‘unqualified worker’ (originally this meant anyone who wasn’t a qualified social worker, irrespective of their professional qualification, but the title was later changed to ‘children’s practitioner’ as many of these posts became occupied by newly qualified social workers - and offered opportunities for development and gaining valuable experience) and a unit coordinator to handle all the business support functions of the unit.

**Restructuring Broader Services to Children and Families in Hackney**
Because not all services to young people reside necessarily in the social work field, the remainder of the services, managed by the YOT and Youth Service would not follow the exact path taken by CSC. In addition, conducting the Connecting Young Hackney (CYH) restructure after CSC, afforded the opportunity to learn lessons from that first change programme. It is here that myself, and other senior managers, in 2009 embarked on the Connecting Young Hackney Change Programme, building on lessons from the Reclaiming Social Work experience.

For the broader services to young people and families, the restructure would provide the opportunity to challenge and address some of the systemic issues that had become entrenched in the service structures. As well as the problems of duplication and confusion set out above, the CYH restructure would allow for the interaction and relationship between those using the service and those providing it to be placed at the centre of provision and supported as the main focus of delivery, building on the principles started in PTU whereby lack of engagement is seen as a structural issue for services to resolve rather than a failure of the child or family.

The attempts at service integration through IYSS have been discussed above. As already mentioned, decisions were made not to follow the IYSS agenda at the time due to new management teams being in place in the YOT and Youth Service that needed time to settle and establish their own ideas of what was needed to improve services.

In 2009-10, The CYH change programme provided the opportunity to revisit the idea of integration by attempting to rebuild services from the ground up. In addition, it also provided the opportunity to identify those individual characteristics that signified the different service areas and established what was necessary, what was expendable and where commonality lay. Fundamentally, it presented the opportunity to explore the challenges presented by the encroaching managerialist agenda, and test new ideas that could ameliorate some of the limitations that agenda had imposed. Most notably, this included a refocus on relationship-based provision that placed the human interaction at the centre of provision; a rejection of professionally imposed boundaries that often served to create gaps in provision and thus increase the risk and vulnerability experienced by communities; and a more reflective approach to provision that supported staff to develop interventions based on experiences of individual need rather than reactive and limiting provision that simply served the needs of the service.
The result was a fully integrated service (called ‘Young Hackney’) that saw the individual service definitions being disintegrated in favour of one generic service, with a generic workforce that delivered all the required functions of each of the three services. To all intents and purposes, the YOT, Youth Service and YST would cease to exist and would be replaced by the new Young Hackney (YH) service. From RSW would be taken the ‘Unit model’. However, given the different remit, the job titles and functions would deviate from the RSW model, and as such, despite the central role and function of the Unit model, it could not be said that the YH and RSW models were the same. But the core direction of both models was to refocus on the importance of building and maintaining the relationships with clients as a vehicle to improve and encourage engagement so that needs can be better identified, solutions achieved and services delivered, gaining greater relevance for the children, young people and families supported.

With the YH model, there was necessarily a greater focus on the lives and experiences of young people as adolescents, rather than how children experience the family.

In particular, under YH, notions of ‘qualified’ and ‘unqualified’ were different and the breadth of responsibility and the methods of delivery varied from those seen in RSW. This was most evident in the emphasis on group work and a return to delivering case work in the community.

What was common with RSW was the impact the Unit model had on case work - allowing a move away from the one-worker-one-caseload model that the previous structures insisted on but which also caused so many difficulties in terms of accountability, risk / vulnerability management and decision making.

The general policy agenda for services and support for children and young people in the UK is one focused around preparing them to become responsible adults, rather than investing in their ability to enjoy being children and giving them the time, space, support and challenge to assess the world in which they grow up and their interaction with that world. Instead, services ‘adultise’ and ‘responsibilise’ children by asserting that it is the recipients of these services that have the choice of whether or not to engage - and if they don’t they will face enforcement, under realist constructs of need and response. In the new Young Hackney model, the adults managing and delivering these services must hold the greater
part of the responsibility for engaging what are often young people and families experiencing chaotic lifestyles. It is for this reason that this paper insists that the focus should be on who works and not what works.

Through YH children, young people and families have their full needs assessed at the first point of contact and then can agree to have these needs met there and then, in one place. Previously, multiple assessments have been required because each agency only assesses what’s in its remit, so service users are required to undergo assessments each time they engage with a new service. Previous assessments are of little use because they won’t have asked the questions relevant to other agencies. As set out above, this was partly due to structural and remit issues that meant that different agencies and services needed to justify their existence and funding by evidencing their distinction from others.

In Young Hackney the Units are composed of a CORE Leader, a Young Hackney Worker (qualified or with substantial relevant experience (qualifications in youth work, social work, probation, health and education are equally valid), a Young Hackney Practitioner (newly qualified or unqualified), a Unit coordinator, and access to specialist advice and support through dedicated Units in mental health, substance misuse and also individual family therapists. This therapeutic support was structured to assist each unit to apply a therapeutic, and in particular, a systemic lens, to the cases they were managing. In addition, therapists are required to practice alongside generic YH staff where the relationships with young people are established and built - school, community, family home. This is at odds to previous structures where children and young people are expected to attend therapeutic sessions at the clinic, on the therapists terms.
Chapter Eight
The Young Hackney Model Summarised

‘In selecting a TEACHER, moral influence is less easily tested than intellectual attainment. Of the two, it is the more important.’ Mr C G Heathcote 1898 (in Pearson 1983:54)

The French social work system is based on the concept and practice of éducation, which Cooper, et al (1995:156) define as:

‘….one of the central concepts of French social work, it denotes something much broader than just teaching or learning, including the idea of the child’s total social, emotional, and environmental development and well-being.’

This can be seen as similar to the social pedagogues that are seen in many places across the Continent.

This broader idea of service provision, over and above the immediate response to perceived or assessed deficiency, is what lies behind the concept of Young Hackney (YH), where services and support are structured around the child’s engagement in school, community, family and the youth justice system. The service encourages a consistent language, message, meaning and value that are defined by the behaviour and interests of the child but also aim to support the child to identify the role they wish to play in society, through a series of interventions that challenge and support their sense of self. This leads the service, and its broader partnership context and providers, to see the interests of the child as being in those spaces where consistency and continuity are most likely to be experienced - in the family home and remaining in education - in other words, long-term responses to criminality, substance misuse, trauma, etc, are placed within the context of family life and social and formal education, so that such responses develop more sustained relevance to the young people in question.
So what exactly is this new humanistic, integrated service that seeks to rectify the problems of managerialism, re-professionalise practice and place children, young people and families back into the heart of its considerations? This all sounds like a pretty big ask.

Recalling the works of Bourdieu, that said meaning comes from relationships between things rather than the things themselves, and the thoughts of Barlow and Scott, that spoke of a systems-based, chaos theory type approach to assessment, called *complexity theory*, that looks to the interconnectedness of relationships in order to locate value and meaning in peoples’ lives, the Young Hackney model of delivery, as with the Reclaiming Social Work model, is built on the principles of *systemic* practice and theory.

Systemic theory, as the name suggests, is about systems and the ways in which these systems, or structures, impact on one another and inform and influence change. It’s a theory that accepts that if you change one thing in a system, all other things can be affected to a lesser or greater extent. So, for example, in a family, if a parent loses a job, systemic theory asks what impact this might have on the thinking and behaviour of the other members in the household. Systemic theory suggests that, as practitioners, the way we approach a family will have an impact on the way they see our service, as well as how they feel they should, or shouldn’t, engage with our efforts. Systemic theory shows that the esteem of services themselves, is influenced by the way they see, and are seen by, other services, service users, policy and decision makers. Systemic theory looks at the relationships *between*, in each of these situations and seeks to find meaning through observation of those relationships. In the managerialist approach, the response to behavioural problems will necessarily focus and respond to the behaviour, rather than spend time looking for the cause. Systemic theory suggests that the cause is often to be found by looking at the systems that impact on the child’s life - family, school, peers, environment, services, etc.

Systemic theory is complex, but this in itself is recognition that the world in complex - unlike the managerialist tendency to distil experiences down to the simple and measurable - systemic theory recognises the soul of human experience and interaction, embraces this soul and gives it pride of place in seeking solutions for the issues families face.

However, systemic, and other systems theories, remain situational in that they respond to families as they exist. It is not, in and of itself, a positivistic approach to the issues families
and communities face in that the process of systemic assessment is simply that, an assessment of the way systems affect people and people affect those systems. Socio-structural causes can be considered, but are not the central plank of systemic thought. It is necessary to create service structures that give practitioners the space to consider the impact of structural causes as part of grand systems. In other words, systemic practice is not enough, by itself, to challenge the structural pressures faced by children, young people and families, nor is it planned to. But by creating the space for relationship and engagement, service users may become empowered to challenge these issues for themselves - with the support of Young Hackney.

In order to facilitate the development of systemic practice that’s based on such an approach, there has been a requirement to develop a structure that can allow staff to indulge in this complexity, support and challenge each other - rather than work in isolation - reflect on their practice and the development taking place in the families they work with, and share the task of change and empowerment amongst the community. Therefore, as in RSW, the Unit Model has been taken as the most appropriate model of delivery. Within the Unit model, staff meet weekly to discuss each case on their shared case load, check progress, identify any barriers, seek and offer support and suggestions, and importantly, take collective responsibility for meeting the needs of the young people, families and communities they are working with.

Importantly, the role of the Units is to engage children, young people and families in relationships that may engender a sense of ownership over the solutions to the needs they experience, to develop resilience to the structural pressures they experience and a collective, community engagement in order to explore solutions to these.

Thinking systemically, these Units take responsibility for the whole experience of a young person’s interaction with services, whether this be at the youth club, in the community, through school, in the family home, at court, in the police station - wherever the young person is, is where the Unit deliver their support and intervention - rather than the realist and managerialist tendency to require service users to bend to the needs of services; in YH services respond to the child wherever they may be and in ways and places that contain most meaning for the young person and family.
In keeping with this desire, interventions, wherever possible, will be delivered through group activities rather than through isolating, one-to-one situations. Clearly, there are times when one-to-one support is required - for example, children and young people subject to statutory court orders may have specific interventions they need to complete; or they may have their own issues involving their education or careers, for example, that are better pursued through individually tailored interventions. However, these will be delivered in addition, rather than at the exclusion of interventions that recognise that the child or young person is just that, a child or young person, a social entity that is in the process of establishing their own identity through social interaction with their peers and the adults around them.

The Unit model comprises five members of staff who can be from a range of professional backgrounds seen as relevant to the task of supporting children, young people and families - youth work, social work, teaching, probation, health - professions are seen to provide equal contributions to meeting the needs of young people and families, rather than being placed in competition with each other (such as in the managerialist-fuelled fight for resources).

Each Unit is led by a Core Leader who’s task is to manage the Unit, lead weekly case meetings, and get involved in practice. The work of each Unit is defined by the children, young people and families they are working with at any one time. Some of those cases will be statutory court work in a youth justice setting; some will be schools-based work, aimed at reducing the chance of a child being excluded; the Unit will manage sessions at a local youth club, so assisting in building open-ended and positive relationships with the community; they will be involved in community work with youth and adults ensuring they have a visible presence so that the community know who to turn to if they seek assistance at any time; importantly, the same Unit will accompany each child and young person through their journeys of growth and development. They won’t close a case because a child that was receiving substance misuse support suddenly gets a court order for offending behaviour; they won’t transfer a case to another team or service because the young person is leaving school and needs careers advice; it is the duty of each Unit to marshall their experience, expertise and bring in additional resources to ensure that the required support and responses are available to children, young people and families where they are - and not send them off to someone else.
Other members of the Unit include; a fully qualified and experienced Worker; an unqualified or newly qualified practitioner, a dedicated business support officer to deal with admin and other tasks that often pull front line staff away from face-to-face work (database entries, booking appointments, answering phones, writing up minutes of meetings, etc), and importantly, a therapist / clinician that can advise staff about therapeutic considerations in all cases, but can also take a lead where a clinical need is identified as the most pressing issue in a particular case - for example, issues of mental health, special educational needs, spectrum disorder issues, trauma (including PTSD), etc. This way, what can be quite alienating interventions with clinicians are delivered through the same Unit, with the same people that the child/young person and family are already familiar - thus reducing anxiety, and encouraging engagement and progress.

While researching the comparisons and differences between the French and English approach to child protection, Cooper et al noted:

‘….as several English participants enviously noted, there was much easier access to psychological resources, in the form of a team psychologist, who could be routinely drawn on by the French social workers, not only for assistance in work with clients but also as a source of information and support for themselves.’ (A. Cooper, et al 1995:56)

One significant difference between the French system of the time, observed by Cooper, et al, and the models developed through RSW and YH is that psychodynamics is the therapeutic method of choice adopted in France, which focused on the relationships between family members, while in Hackney, behavioural psychology was preferred, particularly influenced by the Anglo-American area of learning theory - and more specifically in Hackney, social learning theory. For the purposes of this paper, it is not deemed necessary to explore the specific advantages or legitimacy of one therapeutic method over another - only to acknowledge the central importance of insisting on the presence and value of a consistent therapeutic methodology for the efficacy of the broader model and approach of service delivery.

By working in this way, service users can build strong relationships with the Unit rather than having to tell their story each time there is a new development in their ever-changing lives. This improves the levels of engagement and trust that can develop - it also means
that, because the whole Unit lead on the case, service and support doesn’t stop due to staff illness or leave - there is always someone available.

In addition, staff are supported and encouraged to develop their skill-sets and knowledge base in order to extend the support they can provide. Unfortunately, with the advent of multi-agency models, such as experienced in Youth Offending Teams, where each professional takes responsibility for separate aspects of the child’s life, the child becomes compartmentalised in unnatural ways, having to engage with numerous adults and is rarely seen as a complete person. In addition, staff are discouraged from developing their skills and knowledge because everything outside their remit is someone else’s responsibility. By delivering everything through the Unit, everything becomes their responsibility - and staff are motivated to keep developing new skills and knowledge in response to the people they are supporting.

Assessments shift out of the individualised deficit approach common in services today - in part because staff are too busy to stray from the prescribed tools they are given and so end up imposing assessments on service users, rather than engaging them in a process of discovery. In the Unit model, assessments become live and collective activities that are discussed weekly and take into account the entire experience of the child, young person or family - recognising what’s working as well as where support is needed. Through this narrative approach, service users are supported to identify, for themselves, the work they would like to see happen and are placed at the centre of efforts to achieve this - the Unit is there to support the child, young person and family to realise change, not to impose change upon them. By engaging children, young people and families in the identification of the issues they face, the plan is that they come to realise the barriers to their own progress and begin to take a lead in motivations to bring about change, in supportive environments that help to prevent them becoming overwhelmed and disengaged.

Where cases are open to another service, for example, Children’s Social Care, it can be agreed, depending on inter-service relationships and agreements, that the support and interventions continue to be delivered through the Unit, rather than transferring or duplicating support through two services. Statutory requirements around care and child protection can continue to be held through the CSC social worker, but the bulk of the interaction continues to be delivered through the Unit, where the relationships have already been established.
The important aspects of this YH model are that the focus is shifted away from placing responsibility on the child or family to effect change, and onto the Unit to facilitate engagement in the process of change; interventions are taken to young people and families rather than forcing - through rigid structures - families to bend to the requirements of services; staff are afforded space to think and reflect as a way of developing their own practice and avoiding alienating and reactive responses to children, young people and families who develop in their own time.

It is this time to think and reflect that is the central strength of the model. Recalling Part One of this paper, we see that dominant neoliberal ideology imposes on communities, emphasising difference and separateness, discouraging the expression of voice and opinion, alienating people through policies that work against their interests, promoting inequality through consumerist and elitist policies that aim to serve market principles and aims.

In the early section of Part Two it was shown that this dominant neoliberal ideology had served to encourage a managerialist approach to service structure and delivery which resulted in services becoming restrictive, reactive and like the impact of such policies on broader society, demonising. Practitioners have found that their space to think and reflect is receding rapidly and their function has become one of containment and control - defined by a limiting assessment of risk to others.

Through the YH Unit Model, staff have time and space not possible under managerialist approaches. The model doesn’t promote classicist or positivist approaches, nor is it a realist (left or right) response to modern day, postmodern cynicism. The aim of the model is to support and encourage more humanistic approaches to provision through the Unit model and systemic approach shown above.

By placing a greater emphasis on engaging children and young people in their natural groups rather than through one-to-one support, the Units can support service users to develop their interpersonal relationships through support and challenge in safe environments. This can contribute to children and young people developing more communal and collective ideas of themselves that recognise their place in communities - rather than the individualising pressures of market-led, divisive and managerialist approaches that simply
serve to set individuals against each other through the insecurity encouraged by postmodern, neoliberal policies.

By working with service users in environments that have meaning to them - the home, community, youth club, school - children and young people can locate the emphasis of change in their own worlds rather than placing this drive externally, within an imposed service expectation - such as occurs at times in youth justice and targeted services that bring their own, limiting and reductionist definitions of young people and families that serve their own purposes rather then the purposed of service users.

By supporting children and young people to place themselves and the focus of change and development in the communal and collective, it becomes possible to challenge young people, through the safety of the collective, to challenge their own ideas of their identity and placing in the world. Then, as Waquant, Bourdieu, Gramsci, Freire and others have emphasised, children, young people and families have a greater chance of identifying their own oppression and the oppression they visit on others.

Suddenly, the transformative element for change in the interaction between services and service users ceases to be the soulless ‘evidence based practice’ and ‘What Works’ methodologies and intervention tools that attempt to treat everyone the same. In the YH model, which, like the ‘desistance model’ touched on earlier, emphasises the interactions and relationships between individuals and groups of human beings, the transformative element for children, young people and families becomes their own awareness of self and the lives they want to lead.
Chapter Nine

The Young Hackney Model in Detail

Introduction

In the previous two chapters I laid out the observations I made on the development of the new Young Hackney model and the local changes to service structure as well as national developments in policy. In this section I shall attempt to outline the key points of the YH model, and show how they are structured to support staff practice and development, in order to promote the engagement of children, young people and families as a way to support them to play positive roles in their communities. For more detail of the model and methodology please see Appendix Four.

The Young Hackney model is a response to the managerialist approaches to service delivery that have been discussed in this paper. In particular, the attempt has been to create the space for practitioners to avoid the reactionary, knee-jerk focus on symptomatic behaviours that often exist in communities as a result of the structural and systemic pressures that children, young people and families experience. By creating a structure that promotes reflection amongst staff, that encourages reciprocal support, and places service users in positions of influence over the direction and content of support and provision, the Unit model creates an effective counter-weight to the often dominant managerialist pressures towards short term, punitive and reductionist provision that defines communities as problems to be fixed.

One worker-one case load vs ‘The Unit Model’

The YH model has been developed with 30 individual Units, most of which are generic, taking on the range of issues children, young people and families experience, including youth justice, preventative work, family support, school-based, and community-based youth work provision. There are a small number of specialist Units, such as a court-based Unit, which exists to support the transition from a specialist YOT structure to the more generic YH approach. Each generic Unit manages around 40 cases. In the previous structure individual case workers would hold around 17-25 cases each.
In part, the Unit model builds on what has been termed ‘transdisciplinary’ working, which moves away from the multiagency approach (as seen, for example, in YOTs) of different staff working to differing, possibly conflicting agenda, to one where staff, irrespective of their background, come together to share aims and agenda and develop a common method of approach. The Unit model developed in Hackney has been recognised as a model of best practice by Barlow and Scott:

‘This model of transdisciplinarity is consistent with a model of the hybrid professional who works within a range of multidisciplinary settings, but also recognises the value of different professional skills and identities. [Our research examines] recent evidence about the ways in which such transdisciplinary working can be achieved, alongside a number of innovative models of safeguarding practice that are now being applied (eg Reclaiming Social Work in Hackney).’ (Barlow and Scott 2010:19)

The development of YH allowed for discussions around frameworks of engagement and in particular, to challenge the way in which services have developed into one-worker-one caseload, case work structures which have become popular in modern social work and subsequently all services to children, young people and families. The Unit model developed through RSW is an example of how this notion has been successfully challenged and YH has built on this for its own service structure and delivery.
Outside of this work it has previously been recognised that providing practitioners opportunities to share their working experience can result in feelings of greater security and thus accountability.

‘Working as part of a team appears to promote a sense of solidarity that makes each team member feel more secure and more able to work with flexibility. Shared decision-making spreads both responsibility and accountability; this in turn provides an opportunity to be more imaginative as well as more elastic in planning possible courses of action.’ (A. Cooper, et al 1995:56)

Through the development of YH it became clear that the allocation of case loads to individual staff encouraged a complex and problematic dynamic. On the one hand, staff came to identify themselves through their case load - for example, those with statutory cases viewed themselves as being of greater status than those holding non-statutory work. In keeping with this perspective, staff would identify levels of importance with the number of cases held.

However, on the other hand, the case load was a constant source of ill-feeling and identified, by staff, as the cause of stress, over-work and of limiting creativity - because staff were required to move from one case to the next with little time to review work done or explore better ways of progressing - the case load structure encouraged staff to fall on established methodologies that didn’t call on their own professional insight or contribution. These arrangements proved to be detrimental to staff, service users and services alike.

However, from a management perspective, the gap between service delivery (where responsibility rested with the case worker) and managers (where decisions regarding the management of risk were made) was too large. Often managers didn’t have the information required to make informed decisions, but the case worker, who would be held responsible if things went wrong in their management of cases, was not empowered to make the fundamental decisions (for example, resource allocation) that could bring about real change for the young people they were supporting.
The Unit model allows for this gap between delivery and decision making to be reduced by ensuring that all decisions are made in the same forum that delivery takes place, with the CORE Leader sharing responsibility for the cases with the Unit they manage and engaging in weekly discussions about cases. Even where input was sought from a senior manager, this would often take place in the weekly Unit Meeting - in fact during the development of YH I made a point of attending at least one meeting of each Unit, making myself available to observe the processes undertaken and offer my own managerial oversight. I found that Unit members were welcoming of the opportunity to receive senior management input in the spaces they occupy to discuss cases, rather than the previous arrangement where discussions often occurred in isolation and behind closed doors.

In addition and of equal importance, because all cases are held in the Unit, the family can build a relationship with that Unit so that there is always someone available to deal with any issues. Even if someone is away on leave, provision can continue because the family have a relationship with the Unit, not an individual and all in the Unit have a working knowledge of the family’s situation, because each case is discussed weekly. This serves to promote the value of the relationship between the family and the service, ensuring that decisions about the case are based on this relationship first, rather than the needs of the service.

In addition, one of the main drivers behind the move to the Unit model has been an attempt to affect the way in which practitioners work through their cases. There has been a clear desire to spread the responsibility and oversight on cases through the Unit. In addition, there was a real concern that staff were relying more on a model of case management rather than case work. The difference between the two is quite substantial (Jeffs and Smith 2002:57).

With case management, seen often in adult services such as probation, as well as many CSC services, staff have extremely high case loads for which they have sole responsibility. Given they could not possibly deliver all of the required interventions in each case because they have so many cases, they refer on to other service providers and expect the work to be delivered. If there is a failure in delivery the practitioner wouldn’t really have the time to follow this up and so it could end up with the client being breached for the failure, in the case of justice services, or plans advancing towards care proceedings in CSC.
In case work the practitioner has sole responsibility for the case and delivers much more of the provision required. This is beneficial for young people as it reduces the number of people they have to develop new relationships with. For those providing services to young people, where case loads don’t generally tend to rise as high as they do in adult services, there is much more scope for case work. However, there is a conflicting pressure from managers, particularly within multiagency settings, to refer cases on for specific specialist intervention which has the effect of losing the opportunity to hold the case in one place and develop strong relationships with the young people that makes them feel valued.

**Systemic Practice**

The development of RSW involved a commitment to building interventions around the provision of systemic theory through dedicated family therapists. YH retained this commitment and like RSW asks all staff to inform their practice through a systemic lens. However, there is a clear distinction between services to children and services to adolescents.

Systemic practice in RSW often doesn’t focus on the child in question but instead attempts to support parents and other family members to look at their own interactions and see how these could be affecting the child’s behaviour. Social Learning Theory is employed to help the adults in the family understand and change their behaviour so that it has a more positive influence on the children. Much of this practice is delivered through the social work qualified practitioners and the therapists. This approach is reflective of the way the French social work system has developed.

‘Child protection work in France is first and foremost a family affair. It is not the individual child who is the primary focus of concern and intervention but the child-as-part-of-the-family and the whole thrust of the French system is towards maintaining children as part of their families of origin.’ (A. Cooper, et al 1995:6)

The adoption of a systemic model of practice can be seen as an attempt, by social care and YH practitioners, to find the space for reflection and contemplation that counterparts in places such as France enjoy as a result of the contrasting professional culture and philosophy. In England, the legal environment and the culture of blame that informs a large aspect of decision making, particularly in the realms of safeguarding children, dictates risk minimisation - risk to child / risk to service and corporate reputation. It also serves to en-
courage knee-jerk reactions to issues before those issues can be placed within a broader context of family and networks (A. Cooper, et al 1995:11).

In YH the focus on systemic and social learning theory remains as does the commitment to challenge the systems that are important to the young person - the family, the peer group, the school. However, given YH is dealing with young people, as opposed to children, the idea is that adolescents aren't passive vessels simply soaking up whatever treatment they receive but are in fact actors with their own agency that have a significant role to play in their circumstances. Through the recognition of this agency YH attempts to ensure that young peoples' voices are heard both in the delivery of interventions but also in the way services are shaped.

The focus on relationships within the family tends to encourage interventions that are means to ends - the ends being the improved relationships and family dynamics. So practitioners, in the French system, as well as the RSW/YH models, engage the families in activities that may not look particularly productive, or appear to be aimed at eradicating a concerning behaviour, but are in fact effective through their ability to encourage family members to learn new ways to value and support each other within the family context. So for example, a family that has child neglect issues, where children are attending school in soiled clothing and without having been fed in the morning, could receive interventions from practitioners that focus on family life - trips and activities, shopping together, family hygiene, cooking for each other, establishing an interest in each others' daily activities, etc. Through these activities the family comes to value each other and the role they play in each others lives and so are motivated to look out for each other and evidence the value they hold for each other.

This significantly contrasts with the dominant English model which tends to be more reactionary towards behaviours of concern, in-situ, and to intervene in such behaviours in ways that may not allow the families in question to develop mechanisms that place their relationships in more healthy contexts.

As Cooper, et al observed:
'These [interventions in the English system] emphasise the management of problematic behaviour in order to minimise family disruption rather than a quest for the meaning of that behaviour.' (A. Cooper, et al 1995:58)

In order for such an approach to be possible, a great deal of trust has to be established and this is made possible by a focus on establishing relationships with families that the more confrontational and blaming approach may not encourage.

Cooper, et al describe the work of a French social worker operating in this manner:

‘Her aim was to work with the families ‘dysfunctional communication’ by tackling it on a number of different levels, using a variety of methods. This complex mixture was guided by a strategy based on a psychological analysis which drew on psychoanalytical and systems theory. She saw the different concrete elements - dirty children, school absenteeism, educational difficulties - as tangible problems that she could work with by providing educational support and by helping to clean the home. However, she also viewed them as manifestations of the ‘deeper’ problems of this dysfunctional family. The suspected child sexual abuse was also viewed as being both a problem in its own right and as symptomatic of the family’s confused communication. She used her participation in bedroom cleaning with the children to signal the problem of ‘boundaries’ and to propose that the youngest child be moved out of the parental bedroom. The children were taken on a three day mini-camp organised by the team in order to engage them and observe the sibling relationships and the children’s relationships with others. At the same time, [the social worker] Michelle’s aim was to work with the parents on their underlying communication problems by talking with them about the difficulties within their relationship and with their children (she knew that they were hitting them). Her aim in doing this was to assist them to recognise these difficulties and to develop ‘a capacity for change’. (A. Cooper, et al 1995:58)

In this example it can be seen that the social worker is able to take the time to develop a plan of intervention that is not reactionary, and focusses on building relationships, gaining trust, engaging the family members in becoming the solutions to the issues they face and
avoiding any concept of finger pointing in defining problems. Throughout the intervention, the aim was clearly about keeping the children in the family home as the most productive place for them to be. In contrast, it can be assumed that a similar situation in the English system would have struggled to see beyond the incidences of physical and sexual abuse of the children and reacted accordingly. Cooper, et al (1995:57) describe this approach as 'in-depth' work, which focuses on the ‘....‘real’ or ‘underlying’ problems of intra-familial dynamics and the emotional aspects of family relationships' alongside the equally necessary and effective ‘more concrete work, which was seen as addressing the everyday ‘symptoms’ of these problems’.

In other words, it was not seen as effective to enter the family home and begin by discussing the ‘real’ issues with the family as a way of introduction.

Importantly for broader responses to children, young people and families, the relevance of this approach isn’t limited to acute services that ultimately aim to prevent child deaths. At the other end of the spectrum, universal services based in the community, such as generic youth clubs, equally emphasise the need to build relationships with young people in order to facilitate engagement before attempting to intervene in the ‘real’ issues that might be causing them concern, such as careers/employment/education/behavioural issues, or more entrenched and personal issues, such as behavioural, physical or mental health concerns.

In such situations, practitioners in universal, community settings choose to focus on relationship building by ‘proving’ themselves to young people through the provision of acts that are of benefit to the child or young person’s interests (tools of engagement) - sports, leisure, etc - as a way to gain trust, before utilising this trust to explore ‘symptom’ issues, such as peer relationships, social education (e.g. Sexual or substance misuse awareness), personal development (including self and social awareness) before, by making themselves available for young people to choose to share their own concerns, working to arrange partnership responses to any ‘real’ issues they might be experiencing.

It is this, supposed linear approach (in fact it is anything but linear - which is what makes it difficult to measure), to meeting the needs of young people that has become undermined by the encroaching agenda of managerialism that seeks to impose time limited curriculums
that attempt to squeeze young people into ‘issue-based’ workshops that can be quantified, as a way of measuring the activities of youth workers, and the young people they support.

**Process vs Outcome**

‘A wide range of political and cultural factors have shaped the ways in which public services are delivered in the UK. The landslide victory of the Labour Party in 1997 saw a continued focus on the development of performance management frameworks initiated by previous Conservative governments, across health, education and social care, with a change in the language from outputs to outcomes.’ (Barlow and Scott 2010:8)

Before the arrival of managerialism as a driver of service structure and function it was common to discuss youth work as a ‘process’. In other words, the mere act of ‘doing’ was enough to justify the act - the process was an integral part of the intervention, and in some ways, was the outcome. So engagement of young people, discussions with them, challenging taken for granted assumptions amongst them, were all commendable acts in and of themselves and the results were of less importance - the ‘process’ would assist the young people develop the personal skills to face the challenges of life for themselves.

This is because working with young people was seen as something that existed to support them in their own discoveries of the world rather than to lead them to already defined conclusions.

Many interventions in youth work were therefore focussed around raising young peoples’ political, personal and social awareness and supporting them to have their voices heard. These are process activities that leave the outcome to the young person. In other words, its a worthy risk to have a politically aware and astute individual that chooses to say nothing, than a vacuous, ill-informed loudmouth.

In such arrangements, the ‘process’ of intervention is its own purpose, from a service delivery perspective, because the relationship is a positive and productive source of movement that would not be possible without such engagement.

Unfortunately for managerialism this simply wasn't good enough. No resource can be applied to any process that simply goes on with no intended end in sight. The Every Child
Matters policy agenda was an example of an approach that shifted the emphasis in service delivery from inputs and process towards placing outcomes-based approaches at the heart of delivery (Barlow and Scott 2010:15).

Any interventions that insisted on modelling themselves as such didn’t warrant funding and as a result services changed to fit in with the new agenda - that of the ‘Outcome’ (Piper 2008:174).

Outcomes are measurable and tangible - they are either achieved or they’re not. Plans can be made and agreed through a clear understanding of desired outcomes. Because youth work stubbornly held to the notion of ‘process’, policy makers lost patience and introduced a whole new raft of services and insisted that they work within discreet timescales towards clear outcomes. Connextions, Youth Justice Prevention Programmes (YIP/YISP), YST are clear examples of targeted services that were brought in to do what traditional youth work refused or failed to do. Unfortunately, in the pursuit of outcomes, and more importantly, in the complete rejection of process, it is as if the substance and personality have been lost from services to young people across the board.

No longer is it acceptable to support and encourage young people to organise themselves politically. Indeed, it’s fine to engage them in discussions about what colour to paint the youth club toilets - that’s involvement. But should the youth club face a funding crisis it would not be deemed appropriate to discuss how and where political decisions are made lest the young people learn that the decisions that directly affect them are actually made by accessible people just down the road - a little bit like Dorothy finding the Wizard behind the curtain.

The pursuit of outcomes leaves little time to work within the chaotic, open-ended time-frames that young people live their lives. It fails to respond to the simple yet fundamental truth that young people make mistakes and could often do with more than one bite of the cherry. It effectively fails to acknowledge that young people are just that, young people, rather than inanimate objects that conform to mathematically defined behaviours. Young people aren’t adults-in-waiting, but are instead young people going through a process of growth, development and discovery. Importantly, the pursuit of outcomes has no time for nonsense discussions about relationship because relationships are subjective, take time,
trust must be built, and they have to grow according to the wishes of the young people and families being supported - relationships can’t be imposed.

This isn’t just true of youth work; it is evident in social work and particularly teaching. Obviously, where children and young people are at immediate risk then responses must be immediate, but the follow on work that takes place to ensure concerns don’t continue will be just as much built on the relationship that exists between the social worker/teacher and the child as between the youth worker and the young person trying to establish his or her own identity.

‘Young people have varying experiences of professionals, with many having a different range of professionals involved in their lives at the same or different times. They describe those professionals that are most helpful to them as being the ones that treat them with respect, listen to them and consequently earn their trust.’ (Piper 2008:117)

Because it is crucial to all services that hope to engage and support positive change amongst children and young people, YH has been clear that it needs to re-visit the process-outcome interaction and ensure that, through the Unit structure, staff are supported to own and understand the notion that outcomes are the result of process, and process is engagement and relationship used as vehicles to deliver outcomes with the aim that staff can arrive at more meaningful interactions with young people and families. In other words, to move beyond the idea of outcome for outcome’s sake.

In particular, through adopting the UK Parliament-endorsed ‘In Defence of Youth Work’ approach to reflective story boarding of those interactions with individuals and groups of young people, progress in the establishment of relationships, that develop over time and across multiple interventions and interactions, can be mapped and positive work can be identified that perhaps doesn’t fit easily into the time-bound, tick box, spreadsheet-driven approach of outcome measurement, but through the reflective nature of practice encouraged by the Unit model, can come to better inform practice through engendering confidence in the process of engagement.
Assessments vs Assessment Tools - Re-Focus on Plans

Under the ECM agenda the Common Assessment Framework was introduced in order to limit the number of assessments service users were required to sit through. The idea was that the CAF would enable them to tell their story just once and agencies would share this information when deciding what services and interventions to provide.

However, the CAF was never designed to replace statutory assessments or their tools so in effect it could never provide the ‘common’ role it claimed to. In addition, it carried no compulsion for agencies to respond to the results of an assessment, so in effect, rather than being an assessment of need, it turned out to be a mere request for service - which agencies could decide to ignore if local resource implications dictated so.

By failing to challenge the hegemony of statutory assessments over others, while also failing to facilitate joined up intervention plans, the status quo was retained and the opportunity to effect real change was lost. In effect the division between statutory and non-statutory services remained. This is despite the fact that service users’ needs don’t easily fit into this statutory/non-statutory structure and will often require both types of intervention - particularly if the latter is ill-conceived leading to an escalation of need and requiring the former.

However, because services are separated, young people and families may not receive the responses they require because their needs don’t fit conveniently into the inflexible structures of services. This offers great risks for the safeguarding of children and young people because services may struggle to respond to complex needs and so focus on those issues which fall within their own delivery remit - see the earlier responses in Hackney that led to the development of the Partnership Triage Unit.

In addition, with the development of managerialism, assessments have become steered by assessment tools (rather than the reverse) such as the Asset and Onset in youth justice settings and APIR in Connexions. These are simply tools which have been designed to make it ‘easier’ to capture and evidence the issues practitioners uncover when conducting their assessments. However, in the bean-counting culture of managerialism, which is interested in the number and timeliness of assessments, rather than the content and quality of the assessments - because this is more difficult to quantify - practitioners, through management pressure, appear to have forgotten the art of assessment in favour of the skill of completing the assessment tool.
'…an over-simplification of risk has been demonstrated by crude factorisation processes, developmental determinism and psychosocial bias within youth justice practice. Therefore, the introduction and widespread use of Asset as the cornerstone of youth justice practice both exacerbates and replicates the methodological weaknesses inherent within the flawed body of original RFR on which the tool is based.' (Case and Haines 2009:266)

As previously demonstrated, services have come to develop an over-reliance on what has been called RFR (the previously discussed risk factor research) and this is particularly demonstrated in the area of assessments. Rather than practitioners engaging children and young people in open-ended relationships that can explore the lived experiences under consideration, there is instead a focus on pre-defined risk factors that may or may not be relevant to the young person in question. These risk factors serve the purpose of pre-defining the range of issues that the young person can present which in itself becomes limiting - as anything beyond this list is not considered for the purpose of assessment or intervention. This is particularly evident in the case of risk in that youth justice practitioners often miss issues of vulnerability (risk to the child) while CSC staff often fail to consider risk to others because their respective assessment tools are not geared to promoting such questions. The youth justice Asset assessment tool is 48 pages long and so it is easy to understand why it has become common to limit oneself to only those areas prioritised by such a tool.

In addition, the tools fail to acknowledge that the dominant, deterministic approach of RFR adopted by many services, including youth justice, are not the only models able to bring relevance to assessment and intervention, and that other approaches could encourage services to be more developmental and constructive, particularly focusing on more positivist ideas of why a young person may have come to require assistance (Case and Haines 2009:267).

To develop an appropriate and healthy approach to assessment will require practitioners to rediscover the professional practice of assessment of the child, young person and family they are working with, seeing them as whole people within systems rather than tasks to be completed before moving onto the next chore. The professional grounding of most practitioners is steeped in a genuine understanding of human interaction, development, learning
styles and motivations. Impersonal assessment tools fail to recognise the real person involved - whether as practitioner or service user - and so are limited to a one-size-fits-all contribution to service delivery.

In reality, those that design such tools would argue that they are simply that - tools - and are not expected to replace the human interaction that only an experienced and/or professional practitioner can bring. Unfortunately, due to the alienating way in which services are structured, practitioners often find that their professional input is the last thing that managers are interested in.

‘[Our] review calls for a new conceptual model for safeguarding - one that will bring provision on the ground into alignment with policy and indeed go further in realising the ambition of a child-welfare approach. This means safeguarding practice that is more clearly rooted in what we know about child development. It means approaches to assessment which reflect what we know about parent-child interaction and the complexity of families’ social worlds. It means an approach that sees the sustained client-practitioner relationship as key to successful therapeutic work with abusive parents and abused children. And it means organisational contexts that facilitate holistic reflective practice.’ (Barlow and Scott 2010:3)

Assessments begin as soon as a case is allocated. Simply by seeing a client’s name a practitioner begins to make assumptions about the case and what might be needed. They discuss with colleagues to see if the person is already known and what others’ experience of them is. They check with other services, or in Hackney, they read the PTU Handoff report. They complete checks to generate a chronology of service experience, they meet in the family home and gain a great deal of information from the condition of the home and the quality of human interaction between family members present and they ask questions about those that are absent, they piece information together and draw conclusions based on the evidence they have gathered and key questions about risk and safeguarding are answered.

‘It is suggested that assessment should be an ongoing process, undertaken by practitioners who are adept in developing trusting relationships with children and families, thereby providing the basis for the development of
Assessment tools don’t generally tend to function in this way. They are developed for the narrowly defined remit of the service they have been created for - in youth justice this generally tends to be the management of risk, particularly risk to the public. Risk to self - or vulnerability - while a consideration, doesn’t share the same priority. This has resulted in qualified social workers who operate in YOTs completing assessment tools - Asset/Onset - and failing to consider or evidence elements of vulnerability amongst the young people on their case load - an issue that has been raised in successive inspections, across the country. Additionally, elements that focus on the development and interests of the young person, or could facilitate and encourage engagement, occupy an even lower priority.

‘Practitioners have been given little opportunity to explore risks that are not included on the Asset inventory, to examine risk as an experience or process that is constructed and negotiated by the young people, or indeed, to conduct a detailed investigation of the meaning of different risk from the young person’s perspective. An approach originally intended to improve the quality of assessments and interventions with young people, therefore, when mixed with modern managerialism and a cursory and / or biased knowledge and understanding about risk factors, has resulted in a highly prescriptive, yet ultimately reductionist form of risk-based policy and practice.’ (Case and Haines 2009:267)

It can be assumed that the skills to conduct thorough assessments remain in these practitioners, but the tendency to be drawn away from these skills by being led by the assessment tool has meant that the act of assessment has become confused with the act of completing an assessment tool.

‘….although the Asset risk assessment process has been couched in a language of autonomy and discretion, practitioners actually work under what could be seen as practical and theoretical duress.’ (Piper 2008:271)

Because of these two issues: assessment tools replacing assessments and practitioners being restricted by the narrow remit of their service and approach to assessment - YH has
concluded that CORE Leaders be trained and supported to prioritise assessment over the use of assessment tools. This is easier in the Unit model as there is joint oversight of case work where assumptions can be challenged and questions posed and the Unit model within YH allows for the different professional perspectives to be combined into the one assessment.

Furthermore, it was agreed that, given practitioners have all come from differing professional backgrounds, with different exposure and experience to assessment tools, the focus will be moved to the resultant plan that is generated from the assessment. This way it doesn’t matter which tool or assessment is conducted, statutory or non-statutory, education, welfare or risk based, all assessments have to result in a set of interventions aimed at answering questions raised at assessment and this is what is common to all service interactions with clients.

Therefore the Common Support Framework (CSF) was developed within YH, out of the CAF, taking into account the other existing assessments that are completed across the services. As time passes, the new service will be able to engage staff to develop an approach to assessments and planning which is consistent for all, but until that time the focus will be on the package of interventions that practitioners decide are necessary - ‘The Plan’.

**Truly Integrate to challenge the existence of ‘Professional Elitism’**

Goffman (1959) refers to ‘fronts’ to describe the ‘expressive equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance’. Examples used in Goffman’s descriptions included military personnel required to take on tasks outside of their rank or nurses expected to perform tasks that convey the responsibility of doctors. In both situations, Goffman asserts, the individuals concerned are forced into taking on ‘fronts’ that perhaps don’t fit particularly well with the performance they themselves feel is required, due to their personal or professional background and the expectations these convey. This can cause disruption as people spend time grappling with the disparity between reality and expectation rather than spending such energies on delivering the function required.

For example, in YH, a number of roles were changed from the previous service structures to better match these expectations and realities. In fact, in the most part, the restructure recognised that individuals were previously expected to either perform tasks for which they
perhaps weren’t adequately remunerated, or the ‘front’ they were expected to adopt prevented them from delivering on the tasks that were important for the effective delivery of the service.

In particular, main-grade, lower paid workers who were required to deliver the main face-to-face interactions with young people and families, as well as do much of the running around to ensure tasks were completed, were, in the old structures, under paid and under valued. In the new, YH structure, these roles were regraded upwards to reflect the importance of the roles required and expected, with the additional advantage that those occupying such roles could feel more confident in themselves and also the service could feel confident in attracting a higher competence to perform such tasks - resulting in such workers enjoying a higher professional status amongst other services.

In another situation, middle managers (what eventually became Core Leaders) were paid to lead service areas but the ‘fronts’ (captured in job descriptions) these pay levels bestowed prevented them from ‘getting their hands dirty’, so to speak, and so they would, in the most part, be reluctant to perform front line tasks that were seen as the preserve of main-grade workers. In the new YH structure, these positions were regraded upwards so that pay scales increased, but the fronts required were broadened to ensure these individuals saw it as part of their roles to deliver direct work with service users.

In both situations, the restructure changed, fundamentally, the ‘fronts’ employed by individuals and the way in which they were viewed and the expectations placed upon them changed.

Building on from this, Goffman talks about ‘dramatic realisation’ to explain the role we all play in performing the tasks we do and the way these are seen by others, and the subsequent value they place on the roles they observe us performing. Examples can include the role and execution of assessments, but equally we can see evidence of this concept in the different ways in which different professions are seen in the environment of services delivered to children, young people and families. On the whole, the profession of Youth Work, through its own endeavours, is seen as something at the lower end of the theoretical spectrum due to the nature of its ‘dramatisation’ - effectively, its seen as something that is delivered in the practical rather than the cerebral sphere. Activities such as play and sport are seen as akin to the ‘fronts’ associated with Youth Work. Whereas society bestows a
greater status on enforcement functions delivered by Police Officers or Social Workers because there is a tangible function of society observed through such dramatisations - children protected from harm, young people arrested and sent to court, families being challenged to perform more productive and positive functions in their communities. The fact that these are all functions of Youth Work and subsequent practices, is of little relevance because these are not the visible functions that come to define such roles (in the same way that engagement is a function of social work, but is not seen to define that service). In effect, they occupy a lower status in the public’s eyes and the eyes of professionals.

Goffman uses an example from Lentz (1954), whereby surgical nurses are seen more favourably than medical nurses by patients and families because the work of the surgical nurse is visible to the observer - ‘changing bandages, swinging orthopaedic frames into place and [the observer] can realise that these are purposeful activities. Even if she cannot be at his side, he can respect her purposeful activities.’ (Goffman 1959:41) The medical nurse on the other hand is occupied in activities that are less visible to observation and so raise doubt in the observer as to the purpose of the medical nurse - ‘he doesn’t know that she is observing the shallowness of the breathing and colour and tone of the skin. He thinks she is just visiting.....the nurses are ‘wasting time’ unless they are darting about doing some visible thing such as administering hypodermics.’ (Goffman 1959:41)

In the Unit model, tasks are ‘owned’ by the Unit, not by individuals, and practice is observed to be the responsibility of the integrated collective, irrespective of the professional or experiential background of individual staff members. Essentially, tasks are completed by the person best placed to do so - either through engagement and relationship, or simply because they happen to be available at the time - and concepts of status and legitimacy become ones of the Units rather than hierarchy or professional background.

In addition, the ‘dramatic realisation’ of the Unit is one of support, collectivism, reciprocation and shared values and agenda and so the ‘act’ interpreted is one that counters the pressure towards individualisation, thus we see a practical attempt to re-realise the original drive of youth work and other services to ameliorate the pressures of dominant ideology that serves to break collectivism in favour of neatly packaged individual consumers.
Chapter Ten
Discussing Young Hackney

Introduction
When discussing the creation of YOTs out of old social services-based youth justice teams, and the requirement for social workers to relinquish their professional identities as the sole answer to the problems faced by children in trouble, Souhami (2012:24) notes that the issue was exacerbated by the requirement of social workers to relocate out of the Social Services Departments - cutting ties with colleagues, access to training, and professional identities - into the new, stand-alone YOTs. In comparing this to the change from disparate services to youth in Hackney, into the YH service, that I both observed and co-led, it is worthy of note that the restructure represented a far more limited transition.

As the Head of the YOT, I was able to observe that this was reflective of the place that youth justice now holds in the basket of services to youth and has travelled a journey from being a sub-set of social work, to being a major player in the field of services (marshalled by its own dedicated board of senior leaders and partners, locally; and the Youth Justice Board, nationally) to the situation it finds itself in today as, in some ways, just one of a number of targeted services aiming to provide answers to the questions posed by children and families. In this sense, the impact on staff of any professional background is likely to be less than that witnessed by Souhami, since the professional role in targeted services has already been substantially diminished. This observation is not to champion such a shift, simply to acknowledge its occurrence and consider, within the context of this paper, the reasons for such a relegation and the implications going forward.

However, it is acknowledged that the experience of one inner city borough cannot be taken as indicative of all localities in England and Wales. But common to most, if not all localities is the idea that youth justice work is no longer the preserve of any one profession, and indeed, more often than not, the broader understanding of youth justice work is now delivered by staff with little or no youth justice professional or experiential grounding.
The Dangers of Mystification of Practice

As Souhami (2012:33-4) discovered in her discussions with youth justice workers during their transition to becoming a YOT in the English Midlands, the perceived specialist nature of those workers served to define their role and isolated their practice from other social services teams. Youth justice was seen as something only they could deliver, and they were reluctant to allow other, ‘generic’ social workers to intervene in the young peoples’ lives due to a perception that they wouldn’t receive the required quality of service. They saw themselves as ‘Not like social workers at all’ (Souhami 2012:24).

Group identity serves to create cohesion, but also marks out difference from others (Souhami 2012:35) in that it says, we are not like them, and they are not like us. We’re different. And through this perception of difference comes separateness and the seeds of professional elitism - Only we know how to meet the needs of our young people. ‘They’ work very differently to us - they’re not as effective / they’re not as interested / they’re not as professional / they’re not as important as us.

‘As countless folk tales and initiation rites show, often the real secret behind a mystery is that there really is no mystery; the real problem is to prevent the audience from learning this too.’ (Goffman 1959:76)

Goffman highlights this drive for mystification and elitism through the example of communication within universities:

‘….in universities, professors, using elitist rhetoric, try to tell others that the world is complicated and only they are able to understand or make sense of it; they will let you see a glimpse, they say, if you listen, but you cannot expect to understand; it takes years of immersion in academia, they claim; complex words and notions are essential, and they see understandable accounts as ‘one-dimensional’.’ (Goffman 1959:34)

It is through this mystification that we, as social and professional individuals, create barriers to entry and promote an idea that only we and our peers possess the capacity to perform this role - a capacity borne of qualification, experience, study or social/professional standing. Whichever the justification, and whatever the method, the result is to create divisions, insecurities and feelings of incompetence - irrespective of the actor’s actual ability
or their own competence for the task or role. The consequence is to shift our focus away from the needs of children, young people and families as we become embroiled in ‘one-upmanship’ to ensure our roles and professions retain legitimacy. Systemically, the effect is to impact on the way we view ourselves and others - our feelings of esteem are the result of how we perceive and are perceived by others.

Importantly, every major case review into child harm and specifically, child deaths, identifies the issue that services fail to communicate effectively, and fail to work together in the interests of the child. Care review reports highlight that such failures create gaps that allow risks to children to continue. It is unfortunate that group dynamics and professional identity are not seen as the locus of such failings because, until greater genuine integration is achieved - as has been started through the YH model - it is possible that such gaps and failings will continue as professional boundaries and insecurities continue.

I was able to observe such dynamics throughout my time at Hackney, whether as an Operations Manager leading a broad range of preventative services that struggled to establish their legitimacy amongst statutory providers or in the development of Young Hackney, where clear resistance existed when people felt their own professional identity and legitimacy was being eroded in favour of faceless generic positions - generic positions, they felt, that would struggle to communicate their experience and expertise to other agencies.

When creating Young Hackney, there were numerous discussions with social workers who refused to allow the title ‘social worker’ to be removed from their job title and description - even though their established professional qualification would be unaffected. Despite assurances that their role and function would retain those of social work, this became a point of contention that is yet to be resolved. Bourdieu (1991:240), when talking of social fields and the symbolic nature of ‘naming’ suggests that agents (individuals) will work hard to retain the ‘symbolic capital’ that a name bestows even if this were to result in a reduction in pay. It is the message contained in the title that others perceive that holds the greatest capital, and one which won’t be relinquished easily. As mentioned above, this was the experience during the transition into YH.

‘The professional or academic title is a sort of legal rule of social perception, a being-perceived that is guaranteed as a right. It is symbolic capital in an institutionalized, legal (and no longer merely legitimate) form. More
and more inseparable from the educational qualification [Dip He; BSc, MA], by virtue of the fact that the educational system tends more and more to represent the ultimate and unique guarantor of all professional titles, it has a value in itself and, although we are dealing with a common noun, it functions like a great name (the name of some great family or proper name), one which procures all sorts of symbolic profit.’ (Bourdieu 1991:241)

According to Bourdieu, the actual function of the job role is of less importance in establishing the legitimacy than the institutionalised value of the title (Bourdieu 1991:241). In other words, and as I observed in the shift to the Young Hackney model, while the core functions of the various roles may be common, such as engagement and building relationships, assessing need and delivering interventions, perhaps because these were common, they were not the elements that defined the value of the individual roles. Instead, the value and legitimacy of the professional title determined the value that was placed on the role. So the institutional value of social work enjoys a greater perception of value than youth work, and in this case, generic roles, so there is resistance to losing the title of social worker - despite the minimal impact such a change had on the delivery of the service to children, young people and families.

‘…[T]he objective delimitation of constructed classes [or professions], of regions of the constructed space of positions, enables one to understand the source and effectiveness of the classificatory strategies by means of which agents seek to preserve or modify this space [e.g. The struggle to retain the social work title on the one hand, and to introduce generic titles on the other], in the forefront of which we must place the constitution of groups organised with a view to defending the interests of their members.’ (Bourdieu 1991:241-2)

And within this there is the implied and perceived legitimacy of those established to ‘defend the interests’ of members.

Post-Munro, there was a conflict between the newly formed, and government-backed ‘College of Social Work’ and existing bodies for the legitimacy and right to represent the members of that profession, which can be seen as an expression of Bourdieu’s assertion.
However, this is not to argue for the abolition of professional bodies, since their original roles remain essential in representation as well as the important task of maintaining high standards of practice - they retain the function of applying sanctions and disqualification for practitioners who fail to adhere to such expectation (Goffman 1959:68).

It may be that such elitism is a necessary consequence of retaining professional bodies for the preservation of standards - but at the point of delivery there appears to be no such requirement to retain divisions that are counterproductive to the promotion of the needs of service users.

‘….it often happens that the performance serves mainly to express the characteristics of the task that is performed and not the characteristics of the performer. Thus one finds that service personnel, whether in profession, bureaucracy, business, or craft, enliven their manner with movements which express proficiency and integrity, but, whatever this manner conveys about them, often its major purpose is to establish a favourable definition of their service or product.’ (Bourdieu 1991:83)

Meaning that actors in their roles are more committed to the promotion of positive regard toward their role than toward themselves - possibly because we come to be defined by our roles in the professional environment and so it’s important to advance the legitimacy of these roles, and as a result, we feel our own legitimacy benefits.

Equally, this phenomenon can be observed in the situation of peer groups who will perform their roles as part of the group - as they consider expectation dictates - even if this role is somewhat at odds to the person they are in other situations. Often parents and teachers will talk of not knowing such and such a young person when they are observed in the company of their friends. Such behaviour can lead to peer group participants engaging in behaviour and activities that don’t sit right with themselves, but when challenged, group dynamics may dictate that a position of bravado and dismissal of the challenge is expected.

In each case it is the subjugation of the individual in favour of the collective (peer group or profession) that takes place. And in recognition of this we see further evidence of the inad-
equacy of individualising service responses when attempting to support young people. Young people find value and meaning in the company and definition of their peers and to deny this in service delivery simply serves to deny that which makes them feel legitimate as people.

During my experience managing services in Hackney, as well as other roles I have held, I observed the various professions responding to children, young people and families spending time rubbishing other professions that impact on their professional space, thus cultivating a culture of professional elitism that discourages cooperation for the interests of service users and advances a separateness that actually works against the interests of children, young people and families by creating gaps between services that can mean information isn’t shared, collaborations don’t happen and risk and needs go unidentified and unmanaged.

I observed statutory services feeling, and warranting, greater value than non-statutory services because they have a legislative underpinning that dictates their superiority - local authorities have to deliver educational or specific social care responses before considering more preventative responses (whether preventative social care, preventative youth justice or youth work). This legislative, or lack of, quality affects the culture of that service and the way the practitioners feel about themselves and the role they deliver. It affects the sense of legitimacy and value felt by the practitioner.

Preventative services are granted the status of existing to meet the needs of statutory services, irrespective of whether they actually enjoy greater value and meaning in the eyes of service users. This is something that was key to the development of the Every Child Matter (ECM) agenda. Within ECM lay the concept of the Key Worker, or Lead Professional, and in keeping with the broader agenda of bringing a greater number of practitioners into the field of safeguarding rather than increasing the number of social workers to safeguard children, non-statutory staff were granted the role of key worker on the basis that they may enjoy a better relationship with the child and family, but were not granted control over the plan of intervention - this role would be retained by the statutory worker - the social worker - despite that social worker being too busy to fully engage with the family and often not enjoying a particularly healthy relationship - often because their workload prevented them from doing this - and so their role is seen by families as problematic, as simply existing to break up families and cause problems. So the result has been that social workers who en-
tered the profession to engage and help, become case mangers (rather than case work-
ers) with little meaningful contact with service users, and non-statutory workers enjoy the contact but have little influence on the direction the relationship takes because they are working to someone else’s agenda.

This dynamic lay behind the motivation to create a truly integrated service - Young Hack-
ney (YH). Admittedly, there remains a separation between YH and the local authority’s statutory social care requirements. However, its statutory youth justice functions are now delivered in the same spaces, and by the same practitioners as its non-statutory youth work and targeted responsibilities. This has served to dismantle the professional barriers between practitioners and create the space to focus on the actual needs of the young people and families requiring support, rather than remain caught up in concerns of professional legitimacy.

**Views of Organisational Culture**

In describing organisational culture, Souhami (2012:39), referring to the work of Martin and Meyerson, talks of three distinct interpretations of culture. There is a tendency, they say, to assume culture is merely that which is shared by those in the organisation. In other words, those things that are common amongst staff come to define their culture. This is the ‘integration’ perspective of culture. However, there are two further ways of viewing culture, which are lost if one simply focuses on the common ground amongst staff. In particular, deviations and conflicts, through the integration perspective, are dismissed as unrepresentative. But these are just as important in understanding the workings and dynamics of organisations as those things that are shared. So the ‘differentiation’ perspective can be used to emphasise these differences and through this, organisations can be seen as collections, not simply of things shared, but also subcultures, often competing and conflicting with one another. The integration perspective can explain the culture within these subcultures, while the differentiation perspective explains the culture between them. ‘….culture is not homogenous: diversity and disagreement is at its core.’ (Souhami 2012:39) The third perspective is that of ‘fragmentation’. The issue with the first two perspectives is that they assume culture - and the people that present and experience it - is always static. However, fragmentation accepts that, at different times, people occupy different spaces, values, understandings, allegiances, differences, conflicts, etc - they find themselves in different subcultures and their positions are fluid depending on the activities and interactions.
Fragmentation allows us to understand the true complexities of organisational culture and explains why it is difficult to predict the impact of organisational change - because at its core, organisational change is dealing with, and impacting on, people. And people are complex and so their impact on culture is complex.

The key, however, is not to rest on one single perspective of organisational culture. At any one time, each perspective will be evident, and it is therefore necessary to hold each perspective when considering the culture of any organisation.

I observed such fluid cultural dynamics in the run up to, and the implementation of Young Hackney. I was able to notice the tensions and struggles that individual practitioners experienced when attempting to establish their own legitimacy, while also navigating the professional landscape that served to define their role and influence. As such, I saw individuals and groups embarking on, often conflicting roles as they attempted to negotiate their way through the different cultural spaces they occupied - professional partner, engaging practitioner, competent worker, etc.

So, for example, as increasing numbers of staff encounter roles where they are perceived to be delivering within the broader youth justice remit, there becomes increasing tensions, both within themselves, and between them and other professionals. A clear example is that of youth work. Youth Workers will traditionally see themselves as ‘on the side of’ young people. But increasingly, their role is becoming defined by their efficacy in diverting young people away from crime. So, in their practice they strive to build relationships with young people which are open, honest and built on trust. In their interactions with other agencies - courts, police, social workers - they are increasingly required to secure legitimacy as a way of being welcomed ‘around the table’ when considerations are being made about particular young people. There is a clear tension here - but the tension is made worse by the conflict in themselves as they consider whether they wish to be seen as someone who has the answers to the problems young people face (and so gaining legitimacy amongst professionals) or whether they want to be seen as someone who merely befriends young people and so is simply there to carry out the desires and directions of more legitimate professionals who understand the societal requirements to reduce risk and contain young people. Souhami (2012:52) observed a similar tension amongst youth justice case workers and their interactions with sentencers at Court.
The reality is that all professionals must grapple with such complex tensions. They are just played out to differing degrees depending on the way we each place ourselves, and come to be placed by others. However, by removing the need to define professionals as separate entities, and instead define them by the common agenda of supporting the holistic needs of young people and families, the intention is - through the integration of practice (Young Hackney) - these tensions become reduced.

The Common Transformative Element

‘You can spend ten minutes and get nothing done, or you can go out, not see them once a week and try to understand the situation, but you’ve not kept to National Standards. Keeping to National Standards is what’s going to be important. As long as you’ve dotted your i’s crossed your t’s and your files are kept up to date, as long as you feel that you can justify what you’ve done, it’s very easy for social workers to do that, very easy to make your files look fantastic, very easy to write up and make it look like we’ve all done our work, while at the other end the young person may not be getting the service.’ (Gary, Social Worker - in Souhami 2012:67)

Souhami (2012:64-68) describes the ‘ambiguity’ of social work in that its central transformative element is the relationship social workers develop with young people, but because this relationship is based in the complex, individual and varied sphere of human nature and human interaction it is firstly, difficult to quantify and distill into a meaningful and communicable description or function, but also, it is difficult to distinguish this function from the functions performed by other professions - as Neill has pointed out:

‘….the knowledge, skills and values which, at a fairly abstract level, are indeed common to all forms of “social work” in Britain are also common to occupations that are explicitly not regarded as “social work”, for example, youth work, counselling, psychology and psychiatry.’ Neill (1995a:36) in Souhami 2012:68

Rather than this being seen as a problem for social work, it should be seen to create the opportunity to progress beyond the demarcations of professional identity, at the point of delivery, and move towards a focus on the support and delivery to young people and families, based on ideas of who, how, where and what best meets their needs in the most en-
gaging and meaningful way. Put simply, an intervention is always an intervention, irrespective of which profession delivers it, and it is that point of engagement that creates the commonality between professions that provides the opportunity to remove the barriers to inter-professional practice - integration.

**Changing Established Professional Practice**

Souhami (2012:113-116) discusses the role of professional identity in the change from a youth justice team to a YOT, and the challenge that changing practice had on this identity. In particular, there developed a tension between social workers, who had come from the original youth justice team, and probation officers, who were new to the team and helped form the transition into a multiagency YOT. The social workers wanted to continue to practice as they had previously, and this entailed visiting young people in their homes to discuss and work through the elements of their orders. Conversely, probation officers, coming from the stricter, more punitive culture of adult services, were more interested in emphasising to the young person that they were engaged in a piece of work that was specifically aimed at punishing them and altering their offending behaviour. So probation officers insisted on young people attending the service’s office rather than the staff member visiting the child’s home.

I noticed similar tensions develop in the transition to Young Hackney. Interestingly, after 10 years of the YOT model, youth justice workers from the YOT had developed ideas along the lines expressed by the probation officers above, that children should attend the office as this was how youth justice cases were managed - admittedly, home visits were conducted but these were usually for specific reasons, such as assessments at the start of an order. Youth support staff were in the habit of meeting young people in their schools if possible given that the main focus of their work involved behavioural issues at school, or considerations about careers. Youth workers generally, but not exclusively, tended to see young people in youth clubs, or in their local areas.

The tension around the transition into Young Hackney was primarily about where young people should be seen. Unlike Souhami’s experience, there didn’t appear to be a resistance amongst staff - there was an uncertainty about how to deliver on the aims of the new service, in what they experienced as a complex situation. Given a young person was to be supported by the same small Unit of staff along their journey through adolescence, irre-
spective of the directions that journey took, how and where were staff to engage young people and deliver their support?

Clearly, with the aims of YH, it would not be appropriate to replicate the old ways of working by continuing to divide young people’s movements up according to their needs and behaviours - i.e. Meet young people on court orders at the Office base, then visit them at home for general or family support, before arranging to meet them at school to discuss any behavioural issues, while arranging to provide detached support in their local areas so that they can be observed and assisted in their peer environment.

From a management perspective our answer was always the same - and probably, in the first few months, failed to completely acknowledge the complexity of what was being asked of staff - nor what staff were asking us, as managers, to clarify. The management line would always be ‘meet young people wherever is more meaningful for them’. Which is laudable and completely in keeping with what Young Hackney was trying to achieve. However, quite rightly, staff wanted specific, logistical guidance to navigate professional and cultural tensions they were experiencing, perhaps for the first time.

How was one to engage with a young person in a youth club, or other universal setting, when that young person was subject to a court order that required that same small Unit of staff to deliver more restrictive and socially controlling interventions that would deliver a clear message and expectation that their offending behaviour was unacceptable and needed to change? How was one to engage a young person in a school setting if they had also had to take responsibility for sending the child back to court (a breach) for lack of attendance / engagement / completion of their offending behaviour interventions - particularly if that young person had continued to engage with the Young Hackney Unit in other settings - for example, through detached provision, at the youth club, in school, etc?

Clearly, managers needed to come up with something more sophisticated than ‘meet young people wherever is more meaningful for them’. Young people’s movement, engagement and behaviour was more complex than this instruction acknowledged.

There were two responses. The first was structural. One of the Units in the new service was retained specifically to deliver what was referred to as ‘court work’ - provide the interface with courts and take responsibility for the quality of pre-sentence reports and other
reports requested by the courts (such reports would be completed by the generic Unit engaging with and supporting the young person in question, but by way of quality assurance and consistency, the Unit based in court would ensure all reports were of the required Young Hackney standard). The logistical response to the tension experienced by staff was to instruct all instances of breach to be referred to the Unit based in court for them to progress - the Young Hackney Units would write to young people warning them that their continued lack of compliance with their court order would result in their return to court and we wished to avoid this. However, if the lack of compliance continued, they would be contacted by the Unit based in court, who would advise them of the breach process and their return to court date - it was also assumed that the generic Young Hackney Units would be communicating expectations and processes verbally to young people as they saw them in their daily and weekly engagements. It was felt, by managers, that this offered the necessary degree of separation between voluntary intervention and the more punitive elements of the youth justice system.

The second issue was more subtle. As managers we realised that, in such a complex set of relationships, if Young Hackney was to be successful, we needed to support staff to have the confidence to have the open and honest discussions with young people they were used to having in their more familiar professional capacities. It was essential that the Units were clear with young people about what they should and could expect from the Unit supporting them and their family, from the outset, and to use this honesty as the basis to forming their relationships.

The feeling and logic behind this was to mirror the relationships in the family home where parents are loving, caring, supportive, understanding, but at the same time need to be guiding, directing and limiting. It is not enough for staff, in any situation, to be too much of one and not the other. By focusing on building open and honest relationships, it was felt, children and young people would come to feel safe and secure in the knowledge that they were building consistent and fair relationships with the Units supporting them. And this is how the Units went on to manage these tensions. That’s not to suggest that some tensions didn’t remain, or that some staff struggled to develop the confidence to work in this way. But the template for operation had been established, and where staff and Units felt clear and supported they tended to feel confident enough to deliver their service in line with the aims of the Young Hackney model.
Above I stated that, on the whole, there didn’t exist a resistance amongst staff to working to the requirements of the new model. This was in part due to the extensive induction and training that I and other managers had provided to all staff. Each week I also ensured that I attended at least one of the weekly Unit Meetings that each Unit held - here I could observe their conduct to ensure they were discussing cases, group work, schools work and universal provision in a systemic way that promoted the aims of Young Hackney, and I communicated, through my actions, that I was available and interested in hearing their feedback and concerns. On the whole, my actions in this respect were extremely well received and appreciated by all staff.

However, it is more than this. Most staff in the new service had been recruited from the old services. About \( \frac{1}{3} \) of the previous staff team had decided not to apply for positions in the new service, or had been unsuccessful in their application and so were made redundant. All successful staff had been through the process of transition led by myself and other senior managers - a consultation interview, a union meeting, a recruitment interview, an induction and an extensive training programme that included a presentation by Professors Pitts and Coleman on ‘Agency in Adolescence’. So all staff knew exactly what was required and expected in the new service. This learning was supported by an extensive online manual accessible through the service’s intranet facility.

I am clear that this level of guidance and support was necessary in the vulnerable state of transition such a change programme entails. We were supporting staff who had become used to, and in some cases dependant on, a managerialist culture that guided much of what they did. The success of Young Hackney was not going to be realised simply by taking all this direction away and leaving staff and Units in a free-for-all, do-as-they-please situation - in fact, given the innovative nature of the new service, staff were actively seeking such guidance. But I have to admit that the future success of the model will rely on managers being able to create the space for Units to develop a level of autonomy guided by the cases they happen to be presented with. But the service must learn to crawl before it can walk and hopefully run.

However, the important element of this transition process was less to do with what staff were told about how they should function - the important element was that, through this process they had come to understand that there was no alternative - continuing to function as they had before was not a possibility because those roles and services had now
ceased to exist. Attempting to operate in ways that were at odds to the YH model would be difficult because the Unit model and systems of supervision made it extremely difficult to operate outside of the model. Essentially, staff came to realise there was no other way to operate.

This was by no means an accident. When discussing my methodology earlier in this paper I showed that the focus of this paper and the restructure that delivered Young Hackney was about exploring the ways in which services can be organised in order to improve the delivery of support to young people. I also suggested that the interactions of staff were of interest, but were not the primary focus. It is this clear and focused commitment to delivering a specific model of delivery that has made this possible - essentially, the aim was not to test out various ideas to see which improved service delivery the most. The idea was to commit to an idea (total professional and service integration) and test whether it could be delivered successfully. That has been the change programme that delivered Young Hackney.

In order to ensure that the change programme was progressing as required I, along with the other senior managers, HR, recruitment, finance and project management officers met each Monday morning to assess progress, identify emerging issues or difficulties, monitor the progress of recruitment, discuss the completed, and outstanding, content on the online ‘Connecting Young Hackney’ staff intranet site (protocols, policies, practice guidance and exemplars, case studies, contact lists, etc) and ensure the training budget was being allocated appropriately. It was at these weekly ‘Project Board’ meetings that issues of tensions and insecurity amongst staff were explored and tasks allocated to managers in response to these.

This clearly has the feel of a Marxist/Leninist imposition of a pre-ordained utopia where there are concerns that the prevalent competing professional, structural and economic tensions may serve to diminish the chances of any success, so it may be best to limit the scope of such tensions. In this, Souhami (2012:131) identifies the important role of managers in establishing clear guidance to practitioners who may feel unsettled, unstable or otherwise vulnerable in a process of change.

The impact of such an imposition on staff was to establish the required ethos and values of the new service in order to encourage them to abandon their own ideas of occupational
and professional identity in favour of that which was being offered by the new model. If a change process was to be performed like this again, I would be extremely interested in conducting a parallel inquiry into what impacts, if any, such an imposition has on staff - their morale, their identity, their motivation, their efficacy.

That isn’t to suggest that there was no overt or covert challenge to the ideas being put forward during consultation with staff, and in communications with Unions. As Souhami (2012:120) observed, social work staff in the old youth justice teams felt that their knowledge, experience and professional expertise as social workers and in particular, youth justice social workers, were being undermined and dismissed by the suggestion that non-social workers could be brought into this new thing called a YOT and deliver youth justice work - something only youth justice social workers were trained and qualified to do.

Similarly, in the proposals put forward for Young Hackney, youth justice workers in the YOT felt strongly that managers could not seriously be asking youth workers and targeted support workers to deliver youth justice interventions - interestingly, this was most vociferously put forward by YOT staff who were unqualified, and had themselves, previously been questioned about their abilities to deliver in a YOT setting by the qualified social workers in the team.

As with the breach issue above, the management team accommodated these concerns by ensuring there were enough staff across the whole service with sufficient experience to mentor and offer guidance to staff new to report writing and court appearances. In addition, as the lead for youth justice and safeguarding (particularly the interface with CSC) in the new service, I was clear about my own responsibility to make myself available to all staff in order to allay fears and encourage confidence in their inherent abilities - in fact, all managers were able to see themselves in such a role in order to better encourage the successful implementation of the new service.

Interestingly, while YOT workers were happy to tell non-YOT staff that they couldn’t do youth justice work without the requisite years of experience, youth workers and youth support workers easily got caught up in this narrative and bought into the idea that YOT staff enjoyed a higher status because the work they delivered was more complex and more important - which reflects the points raised above about mystification, legitimacy and social capital and completely misses the point that it is often the non-statutory work, that has no
established sanctions (e.g. breach) that offers the greatest complexity in establishing legitimacy and engagement with young people in chaotic situations. The establishment of the Unit based in court was a way to ease the transition into the new service in a way that didn’t alienate those without the confidence to deliver statutory court work. However, it was made explicitly clear by the management team that this was a transitionary arrangement, and going forward, there would be no specialist Unit leading on enforcement duties - this would be the role of all Units, who would need to develop the confidence to deliver, as well as the openness and honesty to build the required supportive yet challenging relationships with the young people they work with. Senior management’s role in creating the conditions for this to happen remain central to the success of the model.

Resting on the Tools of Delivery

Referring back to Souhami’s ‘ambiguity’ in social work practice, discussed earlier, it can be seen that, as stated, there is commonality across all services to children, young people and families in that the transformative element is the relationship established between practitioner and service user, but given the uniqueness of the human interaction, it becomes especially difficult to quantify this relationship. Therefore, if issues of status are being promoted and accepted amongst practitioners, it becomes clear that it is not the element of service delivery (i.e. the relationship) that conveys this supposed status - it is the tools of delivery.

So YOT workers and social workers aren’t claiming status because of their skills in building relationships with young people and families - which is actually the effective element of delivery and change. They are claiming status because of the tools that are used in their roles - for example court reports and statutory assessment tools (Core, Asset), etc. What makes this even more strange is that, the staff that accept this notion of elevated status of statutory workers - youth workers, youth support workers and other non-statutory staff - don’t have these tools and so come to place greater value and emphasis on the transformative element of change in their own practice - the relationship - which is common to all staff.

So the thing that is common across all staff and services, and is actually the element that brings about change, is rejected in favour of tools that only serve to mystify and distract attention from the process of transformation. As Souhami (2012:182) notes in her recollec-
tion of youth justice social workers’ relationship with recording their work (which was seen as particularly pedantic and overwhelming, to the extent that practitioners described it in terms of a necessary but unwelcome task - a way of covering one’s back in case of inquiry or investigation into their practice)

‘Performing their accustomed routines appeared to reinforce practitioners’ sense of being a youth justice social worker, and the values and traditions this was felt to represent.’

And so it can be said for the more modern tools imposed upon, and employed by social workers and youth justice workers, that serve to identify them as different from other professions, resulting in these tools acting to exclude the involvement of others from practice.

This was equally evident when the Young Hackney Unit model changed practitioners’ relationships with their caseloads. In the old structures, caseloads had been allocated to each practitioner, with some holding caseloads of up to 25 cases at one time. The effect of such an imposition was to cause a great deal of stress to the individual practitioner, and this stress would be articulated at various opportunities to both managers and colleagues - ‘do you know how many cases I’ve got? I got x cases on my case load - I’m really busy.’ This narrative would be further embellished by discussions about how many children on the caseload were deemed ‘high risk’ or in custody.

So a logical assessment of this would suggest that removing the burden of a caseload from the responsibility of one practitioner would be welcomed without question. So the Young Hackney model proposed the Unit model, that shared a caseload amongst a small Unit of staff. The result being that responsibility for the support provided to the young people and families is shared and so a better level of service can be achieved.

However, protests soon emerged from YOT caseworkers that managers shouldn’t take their caseloads away - only they know how to meet the needs of their young people, sharing caseloads will result in a reduction in service and oversight, it will introduce confusion to young people and families, etc.

As a manager and observer, I was surprised that the element of the service that had been purported to cause so much stress and anxiety was now being held onto. As Souhami
shows with her observation of case recording above, while there is a level of discomfort about the caseload, it is the caseload that provides a level of professional identity - and to remove the caseload threatens to attack the very identity the practitioner has come to adopt, a concept that also recalls the observations of Goffman (1959).

As a manager in this process I simply focussed on the debilitating nature of one practitioner holding a caseload and espoused the advantages of sharing an, admittedly larger caseload (from 25 previously, to 40) with a dedicated and supportive Unit that would work to assist these practitioners in their service delivery. It became difficult for practitioners to mount a sustained defence of retaining the status quo.

On another point, when the transfer to Young Hackney threatened to take away the title of ‘Consultant Social Worker’ from a small number of team leaders and replace these titles with the generic ‘Core Leader’ titles, there was uproar amongst the four members of staff affected. As Souhami (2012:184) observes from her own fieldwork, ‘The removal of these clarifying and legitimating supports of their professional identity brought about a consequent loss of a sense of occupational belonging.’

Goffman (1959) sets out the idea that we are all actors in our own theatrical presentations and that the roles we play are influenced, and influence the roles played by other actors and observers - which is a view in keeping with a systemic idea of service structure.

There’s an assertion within Goffman’s work, that we each assess the situations in which we find ourselves and, through inference, decide on behaviour that we feel will convey most efficiently, the messages that we feel others want to hear or need to hear in order to hold us in a positive light. (Goffman 1959:16) - for example, Goffman refers to the female student in the dormitory who will allow herself to be called on the phone a number of times before responding in order to cultivate the message within others, that she is in fact, popular. Such a message would be difficult to convey if the girl didn’t consciously work hard to ensure that others around her were able to notice she was being called - for example, if she responded to the phone on the first call.

‘…..when an individual projects a definition of the situation and thereby makes an implicit or explicit claim to be a person of a particular kind [for example a fully qualified Social Worker], he automatically exerts a moral
demand upon others, obliging them to value and treat him in the manner that persons of his kind have the right to expect. He also implicitly forgoes all claims to be things he does not appear to be [for example, a Youth Worker, or some other individual that is not a qualified Social Worker] and hence forgoes the treatment that would be appropriate for such individuals. The others find, then, that the individual has informed them as to what is and to what they ought to see as the 'is'.’ (Goffman 1959:24)

This could equally be applied to young people attempting to project an impression of themselves upon their peers or indeed, a face to face interaction between two individuals, such as a worker and young person.

So it is no surprise that CSWs don’t want to lose their title because it has come to define the person they see themselves as.

‘If the activity of an individual [or profession] is to embody several ideal standards, and if a good showing is to be made, it is likely then that some of these standards will be sustained in public by the private sacrifice of some of the others. Often, of course, the performer will sacrifice those standards whose loss can be concealed and will make this sacrifice in order to maintain standards whose inadequate application cannot be concealed.’ (Goffman 1959:53)

So the focus on child protection for social workers or the focus on targeted provision for youth workers - or data recording - at the expense of more holistic, preventative activities maintains the performance in the eyes of the audience who may not understand the little differences between these types of provision, simply that services are maintained. Thus the efforts of policy makers to limit service provision to that most measurable and immediate is sanctioned both by the performer and the audience.

Speaking of the ‘rhetoric of training’ [the idea that in some circumstances, the qualities and advantages gained from a period of training that may lead to a professional qualification, may not be as beneficial as the training or the body sanctioning it makes it out to be], Goffman (1959:55) states:
'labour unions, universities, trade associations, and other licensing bodies require practitioners to absorb a mystical range and period of training, in part to maintain a monopoly, but in part to foster the impression that the licensed practitioner is someone who has been reconstituted by his learning experience and is now set apart from other men.'

This is despite the fact that often, it is those unqualified to practice that can offer the most prescient insights into what is effective in working with particular young people - but their contributions will either be rejected out of hand or will need to be 'qualified' by the input and oversight of a qualified practitioner.

'Thus, one student suggests about pharmacists that they feel that the four-year university course required for license is 'good for the profession' but that some admit that a few months’ training is all that is needed.' (Goffman 1959:55)

And this could be true of those professions working with young people, such as social work and youth work, given so much of what is learnt is actually the product of many years of experience whether unqualified or post-qualification, but those newly qualified actually enjoy a higher status and value than the unqualified with many years experience.

At its heart, Young Hackney attempts to put right what Souhami (2012:192-3), describing the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 suggests is a ‘….lack of philosophical and ideological coherence’ which results in practitioners having ‘….little indication about the principles that should govern the way they worked.’ This same lack of coherence can be observed in broader targeted services, as well as more modern attempts at youth work that have become devoid of any political or moral developmental guidance for the young people it engages. In effect, services to young people have lost sight of what they are trying to achieve because they've lost sight of why they exist. In Young Hackney the attempt has been to return first to the basic assumption - that in order to intervene in a meaningful way, we must first engage in a meaningful way and so come to be guided by the interests, desires, motivations and needs of the people we serve.
Chapter Eleven

Young Hackney - On Reflection

My original motivation for exploring the ideas set out in this paper stretch back over 20 years when I first began practicing as a youth worker in south east London. I was hit by an observation that the children and young people I had the greatest relationships with were the very people statutory services struggled to engage and excluded (schools), arrested (police) or closed cases (social work). In this observation, unbeknown to myself, my experience mirrored that of the Wincroft Youth Project, in Manchester, in the late 1960s, which spent three years engaging young people in a detached social work capacity that were deemed hard to engage by other practitioners.

‘One of Wincroft’s most remarkable achievements was that it made and sustained contact, over a three-year period, with young people who were selected because other professional workers had found this insuperably difficult.’ (Pitts 1988:76)

The key difference between Wincroft and my experience was that I, and my youth work colleagues, were not targeting young people, but were simply making spaces available for them to occupy, and where we could conduct our practice. And within this arrangement lay the fundamental contradiction of this voluntary engagement approach:

‘The central contradiction of youth work is that we come to affect the way young people think; they simply come to play with their mates.’ Malcolm Ball, Senior Youth Worker, South East London, circa 1994

At the time, in terms of the inability of others to engage these young people, I struggled to justify such professional differences and in my naivety concluded that youth work’s unwa- vering focus on the journey young people take and the commitment to being led by that journey, no-matter what direction it took, allowed me to locate my efforts in spaces of relevance and value to the young people I supported. I also concluded, again, in my naivety, that the statutory professions were too often caught up in the sense of their own importance, as professions and professionals, which restricted them from the flexibility to re-
spond to the wavering paths young people took, and discouraged them from stepping outside narrow definitions of what ‘professional practice’ defined as acceptable. In the experience of Wincroft, such an approach (as I experienced in my youth work practice) was identified as ‘permissiveness’:

‘One further aspect of the method of working in Wincroft deserves some comment, since it has been widely misunderstood, this is the use of permissiveness as a technique and must be distinguished from permissiveness as an ideology. Permissiveness as a technique to keep open a relationship where the client can and will break it off if he is subjected to the disciplines that normal adolescents would accept. It has particular value to the withdrawn child who may need to be encouraged to act out some of the aggressive feelings that he normally conceals because he is fearful of the consequences, and also to the child who tests adults out in order to prove that they will punish him and do not love him. (Smith et al, 1972:264 in Pitts 1998:77)’

Interestingly, Pitts shows that the time in which Wincroft was able to thrive, the dominant political and ideological environment that delivered a professional Youth Service - through the Albemarle Report - as well as the 1969 Children and Young People’s Act - both a result of a Labour administration enjoying the dying embers of post-war optimism - represented a chance to bring about an integrated social service of youth workers, community workers and social workers who were able to recognise the benefits of a commonality of practice and approach - not too dissimilar to the efforts attempted through the Young Hackney model presented in this paper. Unfortunately, the markedly changed political landscape that greeted the arrival of the 1970s and discussed in this paper, meant that such professional optimism could not be capitalised upon.

Through more than 20 years of practice, these stated concerns of professionals’ engagement (or lack) of young people remained with me as I continued to see statutory services restrict their responses to increasingly vulnerable and chaotic young people and families, often at times of most need. As national and local agenda transformed, this trend simply appeared to increase - the relationship between the police and young people seemed to deteriorate in material fashion (not just symbolically); I witnessed social workers close cases on young women subject to grooming by sexual predators simply because they re-
mained ‘hard to engage’; increasing numbers of, particularly young black men became subject to permanent exclusion from formal education due to often loosely defined ‘behavioural issues’ - at times, the vulnerabilities some of these young people experienced were re-interpreted as ‘risk’ to the rest of the school environment and so used to justify the exclusion (‘for the safety of all concerned’).

This notion of ‘hard to engage’, or ‘hard to reach’ was of particular interest to me. It has been an ever-present concept that has defined young peoples’ experiences of services. Its content suggests that there is something inherently wrong with the children and young people in question when on closer inspection, it is often the case that it is the services, including youth work, that are themselves hard to engage through their own inflexibility and reductionist definitions of the young people they are trying to support. Young people who fail to conform to the narrow definitions of services were finding themselves excluded or controlled.

However, as my experience, profile and responsibility increased I came into closer partnership situations with these professions I so failed to understand. I began to recognise that the spaces they were forced to occupy were so much more restricted than my own professional space; I realised that they seemed to value there own ability and role to bring about change as being greater than my own, professionally; I began to realise how often their own narrative espoused the values of restrictive and punitive practice, as if by way of protecting their own right to serve, rather than focusing on protecting the challenging service users. Such close proximity also brought me to question whether my own professional environment was indeed lacking in some way when it claimed to contribute to improving young peoples’ lives - the profession I had entered in 1992 and found to be occupied with passionate, committed and ferociously determined individuals driven by a genuine desire to support communities to find and flex their own voices - personally, politically, philosophically - seemed to have diminished to, by comparison, little more than a leisure service interested in occupying young peoples’ time so they don’t inflict themselves on law-abiding citizens.

I began to fear that there was a collective crisis in our services.

The opportunity, therefore, to research and write this paper has been of immense value to me, and I am indebted and grateful to the University of Bedfordshire for accommodating
my interests but most importantly, to the London Borough of Hackney, for their ever-present commitment to innovation and taking little for granted, for creating the environment where these ideas could be explored and challenged.

It's a truism that as you get deeper into practice and leadership, your space for reflection becomes evermore limited - something I find dangerous to the commitment to practice improvement - researching this paper has put me back on the path to exploration and I am extremely grateful to all that have made this possible.

What I initially accepted as inherent flaws in statutory professions I have been able to now trace back to political and ideological developments that have enforced real cultural change on practice and served to limit the roles we can all play as professionals. This drive to restructure society and change the language used to describe the world through a neoliberal, postmodern narrative has encroached on every aspect of life and public service has been far from immune from this - nor have the people who come to rely on it for support and protection.

While statutory services may have been the first to succumb to such pressures because their role is so clear to define, youth work's strength has also ultimately been its greatest weakness. In refusing to define itself in tangible forms for so long, neoliberal efforts to pigeon-hole the practice continually failed where social work, probation and teaching were much easier to wrap up in the managerialist commitment to the smallest presence possible. However, this refusal of youth work to state its claim to effective practice also resulted in the top-down imposition of challengers to its throne - targeted services that claimed to embrace the voluntary nature youth work holds so dear while imposing the structure of time-limited case work so valued by statutory services. The game was up and the space claimed and granted to youth work began to recede.

The biggest victims in all of this were the people and communities that relied on these services. Through this paper I have shown how responses to service users, from early beginnings, have focused on the interactions between human beings and the resultant relationships. This, to some extent, remained the case through the golden age, the post-war years of welfare and equality, as the powerful elites bowed their heads in contrition following their excesses in what climaxed in the ‘gilded age’ and the subsequent Great Depression.
However, with the arrival of neoliberalism this drive for equality was abandoned and ever since there has been a land-grab for resources and space once afforded the public services that support people in need, and communities in general. As these services have become increasingly starved they have become increasingly insular and introspective - giving rise to what might be termed ‘neo-professionalism’, which aims, in my view, to improve the status and esteem of professionals amongst partners and policy makers, more so than the communities they serve. This is a reverse of the community development, common agenda of the 1960s, where professionalism was seemed to be defined by one’s impact at delivering effective change for the people being engaged and supported. This isn’t unique to children’s social care, and can be seen to have occurred within teaching and policing as governmental managerialist attentions were imposed upon them.

As neoliberal policies have turned neighbour against neighbour, drowning hope in a wash of insecurity, so have such policies affected professions and their practitioners - causing them to work against each other in competitions for legitimacy and ever decreasing resources. In such situations, children, young people and families can never be the single focus of their concerns.

Progress through the post-war years that worked to reduce inequality has been reversed by the imposition of neo-liberal, neo-utilitarian, neo-conservative thinking that has served to cast the poor as feckless and responsible for their own exclusion - through elitist approaches to education, housing, social welfare and class. By doing so, the services that are charged with fixing such exclusion become tasked with containing and controlling rather than engaging and empowering.

The Connecting Young Hackney change programme was written by the Assistant Director and approved by the Director of Children’s Services. However, the influences, theoretical and practical, were broader and include myself to a noticeable degree. When I previously worked in West London as a Prevention Team Manager, managing a locality-based Youth Inclusion Programme (YIP), I struggled to engage the subjects of our targeted efforts - the ‘Top 50’ as they were referred to in Youth Justice Board speak. However, what struck me was that I and my team would attend the local youth club and see the same young people that struggled to engage in targeted 1-1 interventions. Lack of engagement clearly had little to do with our relationships with the young people and more to do with the expectations we placed upon them to fit into our targeted approach. I therefore drew up an agreement
with the local voluntary organisation and the Local Authority to take responsibility for the youth club where I and my team would deliver universal services, and engage in small group and 1-1 interventions, with the young people we were required to target. In other words, I established a model to deliver targeted provision in universal spaces, thus removing the expectation on young people to fit into our agenda, and instead shifted the focus of our approach to responding to their agenda and movements.

Around the same time, still in West London, I became concerned with the lack of coordinated and informed decision-making around referrals to services, in particular, by neighbourhood police officers who, through their commitment to building good relationships with local young people and services, placed themselves well to identify young people with additional needs, but were perhaps not best placed to assess where those needs could be best met. Instead, they tended to refer young people to the services they themselves had relationships with - which often resulted in the young people being referred to inappropriate services. I felt that a coordinated and centralised system for making and processing referrals would improve this situation. All the referrer would be required to do was notify a central referral panel of their concerns and partners would come together to decide the most appropriate course of action. I left West London before this could take shape, but the manager who replaced me, and the Chair of the Steering Committee for my project progressed the idea and created a universal referral panel that met fortnightly.

When I arrived at Hackney I began discussing these ideas and found that I was in supportive company - particularly the Head of the YOT (who later became the Assistant Director who wrote the Connecting Young Hackney structure). As an active member of the YOT management committee I was often amazed at how accommodating other managers were to what I thought were potentially controversial ideas - such as avoiding language that described young people by their perceived behaviour (young offender, NEET, hard to reach, etc), or my already established concerns about the problematic interactions that would occur between services or between statutory and non-statutory practitioners.

I was given a great deal of flexibility by the Head of Service to develop my ideas through my growing preventions staff team, and through my roles on Directorate and Corporate Boards, such as the Equality and Diversity Board, I was able to challenge ideas around the developments of broader programmes, not least Reclaiming Social Work.
So when we finally got the go ahead to develop Young Hackney I already had a noticeable vested interest in seeing it succeed, or rather, see it implemented and developed in ways I felt agreed with my own ideas. But Young Hackney was not my idea, I was just one of a number of contributing officers and consultants that resulted in the model.

For example, while I can claim to have tested out the idea of delivering targeted services within universal spaces so that they can be more accessible and responsive to young peoples’ needs and experiences, I cannot claim to have developed the Unit Model, as this was something created through Reclaiming Social Work. In fact, I was initially skeptical of the model, feeling that it didn’t do enough to challenge the established hegemony of statutory social work amongst the broader partnership. That was until I was tasked with introducing the model into the prevention services within the YOT. I was tasked with developing four Units to deliver the Family Intervention Projects (FIP) and soon realised I could develop many of my ideas through the model - for example, managing statutory work, such as court orders, through the same Units as preventative work, thus integrating statutory and non-statutory provision.

I can claim to have decided, in West London, that we needed a universal referral panel, but The Partnership Triage Unit far exceeds any idea of co-location and integration that I might have had. Partnership Triage clearly incorporates my desire for universality and centralism, but the Head of Service and the consultant that drew up the model took my ideas and left my thinking in the dark ages. I am still extremely impressed with the way Partnership Triage operates and even to this day continue to imagine new ways that it can improve partnership working, assessment, information sharing and resource allocation - a simple universal referral panel meeting once a week or fortnight, as I imagined, pales in comparison.

I clearly had very strong opinions as to how services should be developed and structured, and this often placed me in conflict, particularly with my management colleagues. I was often critical of what I perceived to be the vested interests of statutory services - their influence over the allocation of resources, or their demotion of the value of non-statutory services. I experienced these points of conflict as empowering and illuminating, but I don’t think those I challenged necessarily experienced it in the same way. I was fortunate to have a supportive manager who felt some of my ideas were worthy of investment - there were other ideas that didn't progress beyond their first airing. This is simply the normal dy-
namic of progressive services; some you win, some you lose, but it was clear, through the developing narrative, that I was a member of a management team, and a broader Directorate, that were committed to challenging the established ways things had been done. However, being also involved in the writing of a thesis on the matter probably motivated me to be more challenging than I might otherwise have been.

I found the actual implementation of the Connecting Young Hackney change programme particularly challenging. I, along with other leaders, became unpopular and subject to suspicion and rejection - this was a particularly uncomfortable place to find ourselves. I, and I believe other leaders / managers, were convinced of the strength and qualities of the new model - but then I would say that, wouldn’t I? The new model delivered much that I had been seeking for most of my professional career. I have to acknowledge that others, including managers and leaders, perhaps didn’t experience the change in the same liberating and empowering way that I did. For some, particularly statutory social work and youth justice practitioners and managers, their taken for granted assumptions about the structure and placing of services was being challenged in ways they could not have imagined - I was aware of the discomfort this would cause, but I didn’t allow that awareness to challenge my own ideas as to the suitability of the model. This single-mindedness was a strength, I believe, but it could so easily have jeopardised the whole project - if leaders above me were minded to let it do so. So I must acknowledge the fortunate position I found myself in. To other managers / leaders, it may have appeared that I was getting many of the things I wanted - but where was their windfall? Clearly this created tensions, and much of this tension remained unspoken. Rather than being an indication of my influence however, I believe the ownership over the change programme that the Assistant Director and the Director of Children’s Services exercised is what really brought the model to successful fruition - without their sanction, the competing and conflicting pressures to keep things the way they were, or to make less ambitious changes may have succeeded.

However, what may have been perceived as my strength of position, I feel ultimately came to challenge me and my position. Having invested so much into the idea of what became Young Hackney, and having a pure idea of how that should develop and grow, it is perhaps unsurprising that I became frustrated at how, once implemented, the model had to become limited by pragmatism in order to meet the demands of so many stakeholders, including staff, managers, leaders, inspectors, partners, children, young people, families and councillors.
The work conducted at Hackney that has, on its journey, brought improved structures to support front-line practice, space and confidence through Partnership Triage, and resulted in a service integration model, through Young Hackney, that government imposed directives failed to realise (including Every Child Matters), has been, in my view, extremely valuable - not just to myself, but I genuinely believe, to the exploration of practice improvement wherever such questions are being asked. I am proud to have been involved in such an environment.

However, I am no longer involved in the Hackney experiment - for what else can we call something that changed, so radically, taken for granted assumptions about practice, and yet is still to be effectively evaluated. I fear that established models of evaluation - that lend themselves to dominant, managerialist questions of time and motion and outcomes - will fail to truly capture the value that such an innovative model brings. On my research journey I have looked into realist evaluations as an approach that is more readily suited to the qualitative value of human social interactions that form the transformative elements of change. When the time comes to properly reflect on Young Hackney, I can only hope that it is given the space that it is trying to give its practitioners, children, young people and families.

My reasons for no longer being involved with Young Hackney are simple. Firstly, I found it impossible to lead such an innovative and fast-paced service and complete a paper of this nature. There came a time when it was appropriate for me to step back and capture my experiences in exploring the very issues that had vexed and concerned me for much of my career.

However secondly, and of equal importance, as touched on above, I had to recognise that, having spent so much time asking such questions, and suddenly being given the opportunity to implement possible answers to those questions, I was always going to retain a very pure idea of how those answers should be lived out. As with ideology, such purity, whether we like it or not, can only ever be an aspiration and it must be accepted that implementation of such ideas will, in the most part, be impractical.
Young Hackney is continuing on its journey. In the most part, it retains the structure set out in this paper. As with Reclaiming Social Work (RSW), changes are being made that were perhaps not the intention of the original architects.

RSW was an ambitious, innovative and valuable programme that delivered real change to the way social workers in Hackney saw themselves. However, if the name chosen to describe this programme is to be taken literally, then it must be said to have failed to deliver on its promise. The suggestion is that the model aims to re-visit, re-capture, re-claim, the core practice that made social work such a force during the community development years of the 1960s and 1970s. That practitioners were to be liberated from their desks and released out of the office to re-engage with communities so that genuine and sustained development could be achieved, in coordination with others attempting to deliver such change.

This did not happen. In an ever encroaching neoliberal and managerialist culture RSW was more a way of re-structuring to better prepare for and deal with, the incessant demands of such a dominant culture and policy drive. Social Workers were not re-engaged with communities under RSW. Instead, the steady retreat out of communities continued, the steady retreat of thresholds continued to restrict the provision of social care, and ultimately, the steady re-definition of Children’s Social Care as an acute service continued, so that today, CSC no longer concerns itself with preventative initiatives, instead choosing to re-define Young Hackney as an ‘edge of care’ service, ultimately working to the agenda of Children’s Social Care, in a way not too dissimilar to how the youth justice ‘risk’ agenda has come to re-define the approach of universal services such as youth work and schools-based work, in recent times.

For this reason, Reclaiming Social Work hasn’t so much reclaimed social work practice, as reclaimed the social work profession - following derision in the media after child deaths and subsequent enquiries. It is for this reason that I believe the term neo-professionalism is appropriate, because the inward gaze of professions today has not simply made them less responsive to the actual needs of those that call on them, this introversion has given them an enhanced focus on their own status, esteem, value and standing - and it is these that now define their professionalism.
If RSW can be seen as a tacit acceptance of the new world order, Young Hackney is an acknowledgement of such change, while attempting to be a response to it that creates the space to practice. I am relaxed about it being seen as an edge of care service, just as I am relaxed about it being an edge of custody, crime preventative, exclusion preventative, health inequality preventative, child boredom preventative service.

In defending Charles Murray’s right, as a ‘classical liberal’ to criticise the poor, David G Green, writing the preface to ‘The Emerging British Underclass’, suggests that:

‘The most important reason is that you cannot have a free society without morally-responsible citizens and you cannot have morally-responsible citizens unless we all take the trouble to tell each other when we are at fault and when we are doing well.’ (Murray 1990: viii)

Similarly, James Q Wilson (1975:36) suggests that public services, particularly the police and politicians, are often ill-equipped to intervene in the issues that trouble local communities because such issues are borne of the expectations local people have of how each other should conduct themselves, in the neighbourhood. For this reason, Wilson holds that such issues should be left to the inhabitants of communities to resolve themselves, and public services intervention should be kept to a minimum.

However, both these positions (Green and Wilson) overlook the fact that not all people have equal access to media in order to express our feelings and opinions about how we feel our fellow citizens are doing, nor do we all have the requisite levels of confidence, articulation, knowledge or esteem to convey such messages. Green is correct in that we should be morally-responsible, but the purpose of this paper is to recognise - as Green over looks - that we are not all equal, and that public services, particularly those in the business of social welfare, should see it as their role to level this playing field by supporting those they are in contact with to find their voice and give it volume. Clearly, the fundamental difference between the classical liberal view and the views in this paper is that Green et al, when happily identifying the flaws in others, are inspired to tell that person of their own culpability - the position in this paper is conversely that, while there may indeed be a level of personal responsibility to be acknowledged, this must be done in tandem with a recognition of the structural and symbolic violence inflicted on citizens, individually and collectively, by the very ‘freedoms’ imposed by classical liberals. Where the positions of
Green, Wilson, et al and the points promoted in this paper conflate is to assert that public services should avoid imposing their will on communities. The view expressed in this paper is that public services should be enablers of community action. The alternative is to maintain those accessing services in a position of consumption rather than production.

It is perhaps notable that there exists a commonality within previous policy positions from classicist to positivist to right realism and onto left realism. At each of these junctures there has been the assumption, held within their body of thought, that theorists and practitioners can provide the answers to the issues people face and in some aspects, can speak on behalf of those subjects of intervention or policy because such theorists and practitioners are qualified to know what people need and want. This position is borne of convenience. It takes courage, time and investment to reject such short cuts and develop belief in the abilities of people to be able to work through their own issues and hold the answers.

'It is worth fighting for the recognition of the universal right to speak, and to speak to ensure the return of the socially repressed' Bourdieu, quoted by Wacquant 2005

In the purest nature that the services can aspire to be, Young Hackney can return to the motivations that I first encountered as a youth worker. A commitment to seeing the whole young person, wherever they happen to be, whatever they happen to be doing, however they happen to conduct themselves. As such, it becomes irrelevant how people decide to define the service - whatever preventative label is required - because in effect, and done effectively, the service becomes defined by the needs of the young people accessing it. And if they happen to be at risk of care/exclusion/crime/boredom, then the service needs to respond to such needs.

It is the structure of the response that is of most importance, and I believe, through Partnership Triage and the Unit model, staff can re-discover the space to reflect - and through reflection comes effective practice.
Appendix One (referenced under ‘Information is the Key - The ‘Merlin’ System’ in Chapter Eight)

PTU Agenda Item 5a

‘1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 In order to meet their responsibilities under Sections 10 and 11 of the Children Act 2004, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has reviewed the way information on children at potential risk of harm is processed.

The previous policy required officers to report interactions with children at potential risk of harm by way of a Merlin\(^1\) ‘coming to notice’ report (also known as a Police 78), which was automatically forwarded to the local Child Abuse Investigation Team (CAIT).

In Hackney, these reports were forwarded to Access and Assessment. While some of the issues identified were clearly child protection, others were less significant e.g. police being called to a disturbance at a house where there were children present even if they were asleep in another room.

As part of the new Safeguarding Process, the Merlin system is being adapted to so that it can capture the information needed to generate a CAF Pre Assessment Checklist (upon which the Hackney CAF Part 1 is based\(^2\)). The threshold for referral has also been reviewed and now captures a wider range of concerns (see Appendix 1) which will be recorded by all police staff and where appropriate, shared with partner agencies, both statutory and voluntary.

Over the past year, the police ECM Programme Board has considered how best to ensure that all information the wider MPS had access to is accurately recorded, analysed, developed, shared and acted upon to reduce risks posed to and by children and young people.

From April 2008, each borough will have a public protection desk that will filter and pass information to appropriate agencies. It will also allow the Borough Operational Command Unit (BOCU) “to proactively identify concerns about a child’s well being and ability to stay safe, provide actionable intelligence to focus activity towards safeguarding children, task action to address those who present a risk to vulnerable people; and task action to address those involved in criminal activity. This will provide more intervention activities across the continuum of offending and victimisation, will help prevent violent crime and will increase confidence in policing.”\(^3\)

\(^1\) Merlin is a MPS computer system that provides a single source for a wide range of information on missing persons, the protection of children and young people and persons and bodies found.

\(^2\) The Hackney CAF Part 1 differs from the Pre Assessment Checklist in that it includes more information about ethnicity and the child’s family.

\(^3\) MPS Every Child Matters Implementation Update, Report 8, 13 December 2007
Each day, there will be a “review of information in respect of vulnerable people (including children), dangerous people and dangerous places, assessing the opportunities for development of that information into proactive opportunities, then progressing through the established NIM (National Intelligence Model) tasking process.”

The working of these Public Protection Focus Desks is shown as a diagram in Appendix 2. In Hackney, the desk is based in Shoreditch and has been operational since April 2008. It is operated by a Detective Sergeant, Detective Constable and four members of staff. It was accredited in June 2008.

1.2 At the same time as these desks are being set up across London, Hackney is also participating in Operation Blunt 2. As part of the prevention strand of this initiative, the borough is required to use a systematic analysis of police data to inform a multi-agency assessment to identify one hundred young who are at risk of offending.

While the aim of this process is to identify young people likely to offend, it is well known that the characteristics of young people and their families who will show risk factors in respect of criminal activity may also fall into other categories and it may well be that the appropriate service response to those young people is more focused on one specific aspect of their lives (e.g. securing an appropriate school place).

1.3 What is important here is to note that it does not matter which service provides the response to the young person as long as that service provides a response that has the best chance of achieving a good outcome and works for that young person and their family.’

Merlins and public protection desk
From April 2008, each borough will have a public protection desk that will filter and pass information to appropriate agencies. It will also allow the Borough Operational Command Unit (BOCU) “to proactively identify concerns about a child’s well being and ability to stay safe, provide actionable intelligence to focus activity towards safeguarding children, task action to address those who present a risk to vulnerable people; and task action to address those involved in criminal activity. This will provide more intervention activities across the continuum of offending and victimisation, will help prevent violent crime and will increase confidence in policing.”

‘While the aim of this process is to identify young people likely to offend, it is well known that the characteristics of young people and their families who will show risk factors in respect of criminal activity may also fall into other categories and it may well be that the appropriate service response to those young people is more focused on one specific aspect of their lives (e.g. securing an appropriate school place).

---

4 Ibid.

5 Operation Blunt is the MPS corporate response to knife enabled crime. It was introduced to Hackney in 2005.
Operation Blunt

1.3 What is important here is to note that it does not matter which service provides the response to the young person as long as that service provides a response that has the best chance of achieving a good outcome and works for that young person and their family.'P2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Behaviours Put Child/Young Person at Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh and/or Ineffective Parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoning Problem Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to Cope with Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse of Child/YP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse of Child/YP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Own Behaviours Put Child/Young Person at Risk       |
| Non Offending                                      |
| Low Academic Achievement                           |
| Aggressive Behaviour                               |
| Running Away                                       |
| Truancy                                            |
| Risky Sexual Behaviour                             |
| School Exclusion                                   |
| Mixing With Offending Peers                        |
| Alienation and Lack of Social Commitment           |
| Problem Behaviour                                  |

| Other Child/Young Person’s Behaviours Put Child/Young Person at Risk |
| Anti-Social Behaviour                                   |
| Substance Misuse                                       |
| Edge of Crime                                           |
| Non Violent Crime                                      |
| Violent Crime                                          |

| Bullying |
| Aggression |
| Sibling involved in criminal activity |
| Victim of Crime |
| Witness to Crime |

P3

‘3.3 The work of the unit is to:

- **Receive** the initial information, usually from a single agency
· **Build** upon that by checking with other agencies’ databases and workers for additional relevant information
· **Develop** a practitioner’s view of the family and possible family needs using agreed risk assessment tools.
· **Determine** whether this is information that can be usefully passed to a single worker, whether it needs to lead to a comprehensive intervention or whether it needs to be archived to await further activity.
· **Allocate** the information to the appropriate person and/or agency designated to act as lead.

*N.B. It is important to note that it is very likely that a number of agencies will be working with a single child and/or that a range of agencies will be working with that family. The Lead Agency will be responsible for coordinating all of those activities and ensuring that there is an overview.*

3.4 Once the information is passed to the relevant agency, their responsibility is to:
· **Involve** the family and workers from all other appropriate agencies including those in universal and targeted services.
· **Assess** the child/young person, family and environment using the appropriate process (e.g. CAF, Inset, Onset))
· **Plan** how best to intervene to promote positive outcomes
· **Monitor** the success of the plan against agreed outcomes

The process is illustrated in Appendixes 3 and 4.

3.5 The unit will also use the compiled information to proactively identify children, young people and families for early intervention. *P4*

4.0 **LINKAGES**

4.1 The establishment of this unit would link to, and have implications for, the following:
· Access and Assessment Team
· Youth Support Teams
· Tier 2 Social Work
· YOT
· MAPS-PYP
· Contact Point
· Common Assessment Framework and eCAF *P4*

5.1 *The unit would need to be managed by someone with knowledge and experience of child protection issues, risk and resiliency factors.*

5.2 *This unit will need to be staffed by highly skilled practitioners who:*

· Have an understanding of risk and resilience factors
· Have the ability to take a whole system approach to working with children and families
· Have an understanding of evidence based practice and the social learning theory based methodologies used in Hackney
· Know what services are available in Hackney and from whom as well as how to match child, young person and family needs to the appropriate service
• Have the ability to work with professionals from different backgrounds, who bring with them different assumptions, languages, concepts and experiences.
• Understand the legislative framework relating to children including relevant portions of:
  o The Children Act (1989)
  o The Crime and Disorder Act (1998)
  o Every Child Matters Guidance
  o SEN Codes of Practice
  o Disability Discrimination Act
  o NSF for Children, Young People and Maternity Services
  o Data Protection Act (1998)
  o Youth Crime Action Plan (2008)’ P4-5

‘5.6 There would be additional costs for integrating the IT systems in one location and building a database to track all incoming referrals and the actions taken on them (e.g. whether they were allocated, to whom, when, whether a CAF is undertaken and the date a report is expected and received).

The system would also need to archive old referrals so that incoming ones could be easily checked against key fields (e.g. DOB, addresses, names) to get a cumulative picture of need.’ P5

‘6.1 The aim of the Triage Unit is to use effective analysis and whole system information sharing to gain a balanced perspective on the risks facing children, young people and their families and to use that perspective to choose the most appropriate service to do further assessment and intervention.

That assessment and intervention, if done using evidence based methodologies, should in turn lead to an increase in protective factors in the child/young person’s system, better family support, engagement in education or training and a decrease in risk factors.

As previously stated, the service which provides the response is less important than the quality and appropriateness of the response.’ P6

‘Work of the Triage Unit (which primarily deals with information) is shown in blue.

Intervention Work done by the agencies (which primarily deal with people) is shown in red.’ P10-11
Is new information significant enough to trigger a CAF Part 2? If 'NO', note and use to inform future actions. If 'YES', continue below.
Allocate

Is new information significant enough to trigger a CAF Part 2?
If ‘NO’, note and use to inform future actions.
If ‘YES’, continue below.
Review and, if necessary, reassess needs

Report
Appendix Two (referenced @ Information is the Key - ‘Partnership Triage Unit’ - in Chapter Eight)

Partnership Triage Schematic

Specific objectives

- To provide comprehensive, appropriate, evidence based, outcomes focused interventions commensurate with need to promote positive outcomes for children and young people in Hackney.

- To use effective analysis and whole system information sharing to gain a balanced perspective on the risks facing children, young people and their families and to use that perspective to choose the most appropriate service to do further assessment and intervention.

- That assessment and intervention, if done using evidence based methodologies, should in turn lead to an increase in protective factors in the child/young person’s system, better family support, engagement in education or training and a decrease in risk factors.
The service which provides the response is less important than the quality and appropriateness of the response.

To build the appropriate IT infrastructure required for the new Triage Unit to access information systems from the various Hackney Agencies.

To meet children’s needs through sharing information legally and professionally (Common Assessment Framework) using the appropriate technology choices.

Create an interface to enable staff to look up information on a contact through agency information systems.

The system would also need to archive old referrals so that incoming ones could be easily checked against key fields (e.g. DOB, addresses, names) to get a cumulative picture of need.

To provide a method of data sharing between the children’s services in the NHS, Hackney Hackney Children & Young People’s Services, the Learning Trust, YOT and the MPS that will reside in the Triage Unit and to their relevant networks.

To develop common data sharing protocols.

To develop any training needs including materials and protocols that are required for the staff to be able to use the systems from its inception until throughout its lifecycle.

To provide a safe and secure email system to be used by all Triage Unit.

**Project Implementation approach:**

**Management approach**
Hold regular ICT board meetings for the purpose of driving the project. Implement project in line with the agreed project plan with providing regular highlight reports to the board at agreed intervals.

**General project Implementation approach**
Access will be provided to all existing agency systems via a central interface and a secure method of transfer of information between agencies will be provided. The organisation and management of all aspects on the project will be organised and coordinated through the project manager.

**Change Management**
A training programme and information communication plan will be developed to ensure all staff are aware of the protocols and policies they need to adhere to and how to use the systems appropriately.

The approach for each deliverable is outlined below:

**Information Systems**
All agency information systems will be delivered through a user interface enabling the user to switch between systems. The user interface has not been identified however processes will be developed to ensure the dataset is maintained in each agency specific information systems.

**Email System**
Staff will all be provided with a London Borough of Hackney email address and network logon. Protocols/Policies will be created to inform staff of all rules in terms of sending client sensitive and confidential information between each other. A message sent outside of the network will have to follow the policies set by the employee’s respective agency.

**Common information areas and the intranet**
Access to any of the partner agencies intranets will be provided from the Triage Unit.

**File and Print Services**
All staff will be setup on the London Borough of Hackney network regardless of the agency. Staff will use the current systems for filing ranging from the NHS filing being electronic and paper based with Hackney Children & Young People’s Services being completely electronically. Staff will be able to electronically file on their own agencies network and through some of the systems that sit on these networks e.g. Capita One/Comino systems.’ P27

---

**Appendix Three**
(referenced @ Information is the Key - ‘Partnership Triage Unit’ in Chapter Eight)
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London Borough of Hackney

Partnership Triage Unit

Information leading to interventions

275 Mare Street London
E8 1GR

Phone: 0208 356 1108
triage@hackney.gov.uk
General Information

Hackney’s Partnership Triage Unit was launched in June 2009 as a response to the need for police to meet their responsibilities under Sections 10 and 11 of the Children Act 2004 and for the delivery of frontline services to be integrated in order to improve outcomes for children and young people.

Up until that time, Come to Notice reports either went to Children’s Social Care or the Youth Offending Team. In many cases, there was not sufficient information about the child in the context of the school and family to make a fully informed decision. Many were simply read and marked ‘NFA’ (no further action) because the threshold for statutory intervention had not been reached. It was obvious that valuable intelligence as well as the opportunity for earlier intervention was being lost. It was also at odds with Hackney’s commitment to family interventions. A new approach was considered and the Partnership Triage Unit was developed.

Co-located with the police in London Borough of Hackney premises, a multi agency team researches information on children and young people who have come to the notice of the police. Accessing a range of sources, the team determines which agencies (if any) are already involved with the child, young person and/or his family and gathers additional relevant information.

Using INSIGHT, the unique IT platform that was built to support the work of the Unit, team members have identified ‘drills’ that allow them to record information. Different levels of ‘permission to view’ mean that information is only shared when it is determined to be relevant.

During its first full year of operation, the Unit processed 5,467 police referrals. Each of these referrals has a full audit trail showing exactly what information was received, when it was received, what information each agency shared, the manager's decision and when and to whom is was ‘handed off’.

How the Partnership Triage Unit Works

The police record their concerns when they have contact with a child or young person who is at risk of not achieving one of the five outcomes. If there is an indication that the child is at risk of immediate harm, that goes directly to Children’s Social Care. Where the risk is not imminent the Merlin is passed to the Partnership Triage Unit and dealt with as indicated in the flow chart on the following page.
Contributing to Positive Outcomes – a link in the chain of good practice

Partnership Triage is a support unit; not an operational unit. Its role is to provide proportionate and accurate information to enable practitioners to deliver effective and focused interventions.

It has, however, contributed to the development of agreed pathways and procedures. For example, in order to ensure that decision making about hand-offs in cases of domestic violence was robust and consistent, it was necessary to clarify the roles and remit of the different agencies involved in investigating and offering support; an area that was opaque to many practitioners. This led to a ‘matrix of support’ agreed by all Children’s Services partners.

During the past year its role has also been broadened to take in more that police referrals. Regular ‘matching’ reports show the number of times a young person has come to the attention of the police. This may be an indication that existing interventions are not effective. Since April 2010, the Unit has been linked to the Youth Partnership Resource and Review Panel a group of senior managers who review the most complex cases.

In addition, the Unit now does checks for the Anti Social Behaviour Panels where children and young people are involved, either as perpetrators or as the children of parents, whose behaviour causes concern.

Focusing on all the information available on a family has revealed gaps and duplications. Details about children and families are held in a variety of places and systems and often never shared; in part because practitioners may not be aware of what exists.

As a result of this, Hackney is introducing a Common Support Framework where, with the explicit consent of the families, a range of documents from all the partners can form the basis of the assessment and be electronically shared and stored.

The end product will be similar to Contactpoint with three key differences:

- Records will only be brought together and stored with explicit consent
- There will be no effort to make it universal – it will focus on those most in need
- It will hold actual records; not just contacts

The planned system in outlined in the flowchart on the following page
Statistics for Year 1

01 July 2009 – 30 June 2010

Age of Subject

- Unborn - 2.8%
- < 1 Year - 5.7%
- Age 1 - 5 - 16.9%
- Age 6 - 10 - 10.5%
- Age 11 - 15 - 43.6%
- Age 16 - 18 - 20.5%

Key Agencies for Hand Offs

- 1845 incidents were handed off to The Learning Trust
- 1659 incidents involved families where there was existing involvement from Children’s Social Care
- 836 incidents were handed off to the Youth Support Team
- 790 incidents were handed off to Tier 3 Social Care as new cases
- 615 cases were handed off to the Youth Offending Team
- 312 incidents were handed off to the City and Hackney Community Health Services (partial year)

Incidents by Type

The manager assigns an ‘incident type;’ using a pre-agreed list and definitions to allow the Unit to compile statistics. The principal incident types used in were:

- 1442 incidents related to either domestic violence or domestic disputes
- 1171 incidents involved youth crime (either as a victim or perpetrator)
- 892 incidents related to missing children
- 652 incidents were categorised as ‘child behaviour’

Some of the most interesting statistics were in areas where the numbers were small, but did identify what appeared to be growing areas of concern e.g. young women at risk of sexual exploitation.

The Unit identified a small group of young women aged 13 to 15 who were truanting and going missing until very late a night. Individually there were not significant concerns; collectively it could be seen that there were patterns of friendships developing and all were at risk of sexual exploitation. The manager brought the information to the Youth Partnership resource and Review Panel where coordinated plans of support were developed and implemented.
Documents

The following additional support documents are available.

Operational:

- Triage Unit: Incident Collation Assessment and Handoff Procedures
- INSIGHT Administration System – User Manual
- Researcher Systems Manual
- Agreed Data Relevance Scales
- Definition of Incident Types
- List of Acronyms and Abbreviations Used in Partnership Triage Hand Off Reports
- Job Descriptions and Person Specifications:
  - Manager
  - Unit Coordinator
  - Forensic Researchers

Information Sharing Agreements:

- SSISA including PCT linked to North East London Protocol v 0.3 (Draft)
- ISA between Partnership Triage Unit and Other Agencies (Draft)
- ISA between Metropolitan Police and Partnership Triage Unit (Draft)

Reviews:

- Triage Unit – Phase One Project Completion Document – October 2009
- Strategic Review: Hackney Triage Unit by WM Enterprise - November 2009

Key Legislation and guidance that informs the work of Triage:

Ø Children Act 2004
Ø Every Child Matters 2006 www.education.gov.uk
Ø Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 www.yjb.gov.uk
Ø Framework Code of Practice for Sharing Personal Information (ICO) www.ico.gov.uk
Ø Information sharing: Guidance for managers and practitioners (DCSF) www.education.gov.uk
Ø Sharing personal and sensitive information in respect of children and young people at risk of offending (YJB) www.yjb.gov.uk

Ø Safeguarding Children Missing from Care and Home
Ø Safeguarding Children Abused through Domestic Violence
Ø Hackney Council: The Learning Trust and Children’s Social Care, Protocol: Electively Home Educated Children and Safeguarding
Reviews:

- Triage Unit – Phase One Project Completion Document – October 2009
- Strategic Review: Hackney Triage Unit by WM Enterprise - November 2009
Appendix Four - Connecting Young Hackney
Appendix Five - Hackney Child Wellbeing Framework
Bibliography


Barlow J. & Scott J. (2010) - ‘Safeguarding in the 21st Century - Where to Know’ - Research in Practice / University of Sheffield - Devon


Bateman T. & Melrose M. & Brodie I. (2013) - ‘Nothing’s really that hard, you can do it’ - University of Bedfordshire

Berg L. (1968) - ‘Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School’ - Penguin - Middlesex


Cotterell J. 2007) - ‘Social Networks in Youth & Adolescence’ - Routledge - Sussex


240

Haralambos and Holborn (2000) Sociology – Themes and Perspectives – Collins


Lea J. & Young J. (1984) - ‘What is to be done about Law and Order?’ - Penguin - Middlesex
Mack J. & Lansley S. (1985) - ‘Poor Britain’
Management’ - Report No 03/2010 - The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research
Murray C. (1990) - 'The Underclass' - The IEA Health and Welfare Unit - West Sussex
Orr D. (October 1992) - Environmental Literacy: Education as if the Earth Mattered - Twelfth Annual EF Schumacher Lectures - Great Barrington, MA


Pitts J. (2012a) - ‘Definitive reluctant Gangsters’ - Forthcoming

Pitts J. (2012b) - ‘The Third Time as Farce: Whatever Happened to the Penal State?’ - Forthcoming

Pitts J. (2012c) - ‘Too Bland, Grand and Abstract’ - Forthcoming


Rose D. (1990) - Living the Ethnographic Life - Sage - California, USA


Stephenson M. Et al (2007) - ‘Effective Practice in Youth Justice’ - Willan Publishing - Devon


Vanstone M. (2007) - ‘Supervising Offenders in the Community’ – Ashgate

Office for National Statistics - Population Trends No 121 - Autumn 2005

Website Links


http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/Targeted%20youth%20support%20integrated%20services.pdf - Targeted Youth Support Guide and the fit with IYSS