

Chapter 9:

The Ideologies of the Stoneleigh Group and its Partners

Introduction

As a pilot programme of informal education outdoors for young people the Stoneleigh Project set out to provide a programme that supported marginalised young people in becoming agents of social change with the intention of challenging the established social order. The Stoneleigh Group explicitly described the programme as spiritual development. This analysis of the Stoneleigh Project begins with a close look at the way in which the ideas for a radical and transformative project emerged and were variously understood by the Stoneleigh Group partners.

As described in Chapter 2 the Stoneleigh Project set out to be a radical intervention in the lives of marginalised young people. Its purpose was to support them in transforming their circumstances and in becoming agents of change tackling the social issues that the Stoneleigh Group partners thought were some of the causes of their marginalisation. To do this the Stoneleigh Project was designed to work with the young participants to develop their values in order to transform their emerging adult identities. Lastly, the Stoneleigh Project was designed to create opportunities for young people to engage with their worlds in ways that expressed their identities by tackling the issues that they thought were important.

It was not always clear what the Stoneleigh Group meant by a radical programme. At times the term was used in the context of the claims for transformative outcomes for the young people and the communities of which they were a part. At other times it was applied to the approach to informal education taken by the Stoneleigh Project, especially the retreats. This would sometimes refer to the content, particularly the idea of spiritual development, whereas at other times it would refer to the process, especially the way in which it was thought power and control were facilitated on the programme. It was also not clear what the different organisations in the Stoneleigh Group, or the Stoneleigh Group itself, meant

by transformation. The concept was variously applied by the partners in the Stoneleigh Group to the transformation of the young people's identities, the young people's circumstances, the social world of the young people, or the institutional world of youth work.

The purpose of this chapter is to clarify the ideologies and philosophies of the Stoneleigh Group and its partners. This will help with the understanding in later chapters of how these beliefs interacted; both between the partners in the Stoneleigh Group and with other youth work institutions. The retreats form a central focus in this research. This analysis will also provide a framework from which to consider the practice of the retreats. Did the Stoneleigh Group 'walk the talk' and in what way, if at all, can it be considered radical or transformative?

To help clarify the thinking of the Stoneleigh Group partner organisations and how these compared with the Stoneleigh Group itself, I have arranged the discussion in this chapter into three themes. These were central to the discussions held by the Stoneleigh Group as the Stoneleigh Project was being developed.

The first examines the Stoneleigh Group partners' concepts of youth and transition and how these developed to form the Stoneleigh Group's own concept of this process. This leads to a discussion of the Stoneleigh Project in the context of wider views concerning youth transition discussed in Chapter 3 and, in particular, the cultural and historical approaches taken by youth work outlined in Chapter 4.

Secondly, one particular issue dominated the developments within the Stoneleigh Group; the issue of marginalisation. I will consider the way that the Stoneleigh Group thought of marginalisation. In one sense the role of youth work was understood as to help young people transform themselves so that they could escape their marginalised circumstances. It was also discussed as a situation the Stoneleigh Group sought to transform through the efforts of the young people. Marginalisation was also considered by some partners in the

Stoneleigh Group to be a situation that motivated young people to become agents of change.

All the partners used work as a core context for their interventions with the 18 plus age group. The meaning of work is the third theme that I discuss. It is in relation to work that the Stoneleigh Project sought to support the transformation of the young people involved. It was seen as a device that would facilitate the transformation of the young people's personal circumstances as well as encouraging them to act as agents of social change.

In order to explore these themes I use evidence from early conversations, meetings, and papers. The approach I have taken to this evidence is historical. I have examined the evidence retrospectively, already knowing the themes that have emerged through this research. Important relationships, intentions, concepts, values and beliefs underlying the Stoneleigh Group stem from this early development work that will inform the later struggles that are discussed in Chapter 13.

For the Stoneleigh Project to be radical in approach, as defined by Bernstein (see Chapter 8.), it needed to address the inequity that the young people who participated had experienced in their personal, social, and public lives and not 'paper over the actual distributions of power' (Singh and Luke, 1996, p. xiii). Chapter 4 outlines the historical and cultural influences that have led to youth work seeking to address the inequities in the development of young people in all three of these aspects of their lives. Any claims made by the Stoneleigh Group for radical approaches and transformative outcomes could have an impact in any combination of these three areas; the personal, social, and public worlds of the young people involved. These are the subjects of Chapters 10 (in which I will explore in what ways the Stoneleigh Project's retreat programme could be understood as radical), and 12 (in which the degree to which young people were transformed, in what context, and if this had radical elements within it, will be discussed).

Youth and Transition

Evidence concerning the beginning of the Stoneleigh Group is patchy. My involvement as a researcher and evaluator did not begin until the first Stoneleigh Project was underway. However, during 1998 and 1999 I met regularly with one of the founders of the Group, Colin of the Rank Foundation, to discuss his work. During some of these meetings he discussed with me his emerging ideas about what was to become the Stoneleigh Group and I made contemporaneous notes of two of these meetings. Other evidence comes from minutes and papers from early meetings and the recollections of those involved and noted at the time or documented later in interviews.

The following indented text is a summary of my notes from meetings held with Colin in 1998 and 1999. The purpose of these meetings was to help Colin think through his ideas. My role was to help him critique and develop his thoughts including providing him with a theoretical and empirical underpinning for the ideas he was trying to articulate for his trustees.

Colin did not understand the period of youth as a time of transition but as a time of life with its own merit. My notes describe his position.

He was passionate about the potential of young people. He saw them as a source of critical reflection on society and he felt they were a major opportunity for the development of new values. He claimed these views were largely based on an experience he had had with ‘a group of young Rank ‘gappers’ on a weekend retreat’ at his invitation. What he saw as ‘their passion and vision for a better world’ impressed him... Further, he thought that it could be a time of action of benefit to the young person and to society. He believed the critique of the young was something the adult world should value rather than tolerate or ignore.

[N-C01(0198), N-C01(0299)]

‘Gappers’ is a term used to describe the young people on long term volunteer placements of up to nine months in voluntary organisations that the Rank Foundation supports (Rank

Foundation, 2006). The retreat mentioned was held to explore concerns Colin had with the trajectory of these young people after their gap schemes had concluded. He felt they were not building on their gap experience in ways that he had hoped. He described in one meeting how he had hoped their energy would carry them beyond the gap scheme into values-based environmental or community projects but this was not turning out to be the case. From Colin's perspective the development of the privately held beliefs of young people should not be retained within the social world of youth but should have an expression within the public adult world. This he thought could take place through meaningful work that challenges the social values regarded by young people as in need of change.

The organisations that came to comprise the early Stoneleigh Group held different views to Colin concerning the period of youth. Instead of a time during which young people are tolerated or ignored, they thought of it as a problematic time of risk as well as a time of opportunity and possibility. They understood young people to be the victims of the ills of society rather than the potential to address those ills. This is reflected in their statements of purpose (see Appendix 4). For example Eden Community Outdoors state that the 'community does not know how to support young people...' (Civic Trust, 2006). The period of 'youth' is also understood by them to be partially lacking in forms of institutional support and increasingly negotiated by young people for and between themselves. Weston Spirit claim there is a 'lack of opportunity and poverty of aspiration' (Weston Spirit, 2006) and the Prince's Trust believe 'the difficulties many young people face are complex and interconnected' (Prince's Trust, 2006).

For all the Stoneleigh Group partners, youth work is understood as a means to support those that are marginalised or vulnerable during this time. For example Endeavour Training state they work for 'young people especially hard to reach groups, those 'at risk' of exclusion, and those already on the edges of society' (Endeavour Training, 2006). These shared ideas were reflected in the first collective expression of the Stoneleigh Group's beliefs:

A rich 'youth' culture occupies these transitional years and, in part, attempts to compensate for this extended youth role. Identity is built around music, fashion, transient relationships, consumption, education and leisure. Purpose can be provided by travel, studying, relationships and social action. However, the complexity of the modern world coupled with the reduction in the strength of many communities can leave some young people abandoned, vulnerable and open to exploitation. In these circumstances youth work provides a handrail and a safety net. Also, in order to discover their role within their community, they need an engagement with adult role models both during this phase and in transition from it.

[R-SG(1100)]

The partners in the Stoneleigh Group held a shared view that the duration of the time of youth has recently been extended and is a time of transition. In part, there is a correlation between the views of the Stoneleigh Group partners and Furlong and Cartmel (1997) that social institutions have yet to identify and provide for the needs of young people post-18. The notion of 'compensation' in the quotation above is interesting. It implies a lack of something resulting from the emergence of an extended period of youth. Although several potentially enriching aspects of culture are identified as a result of this new stage in life, unlike Colin, these are not always seen as a gain for young people or society. Rather, they are thought of as preparing, marking time, or compensating, for something else that is understood as more significant; the world of work and adulthood.

The Stoneleigh Group's early views echo the time of transition from youth to adult as being like Furlong and Cartmel's (1997) metaphor of a car journey discussed in Chapter 4. They also claim, in contradiction to their ideas of youth culture as partly a compensation for a delayed adulthood, that the extended period of youth has an essential purpose. This, in their view, involves the exploration of several trunk routes, by-roads and blind alleys in order to find a place for themselves away from the view of adults.

During this time young people need to explore and experiment, reject the norms of society and the oppression of adults and seek out spaces and roles in which they can express their individual talents and beliefs.

Nevertheless the first quotation above from this report infers that the Stoneleigh Group think that young people find some adults less oppressive than others. They are seen as having a significant role in helping young people address issues of abandonment and vulnerability, overcome the violence of rejection, and avoid exploitation by providing 'a handrail and a safety net'.

The journey, despite its unpredictable and variously valued paths, has, in the minds of the Stoneleigh Group, a clear destination. In a statement in their paper that introduced the Stoneleigh Project to new participants and organisations the Stoneleigh Group described the needs of young people as they saw them.

Making the transition from youth to adult has always been difficult. Some of the milestones - to worker, parent and homemaker, for example - have been delayed. Others have been marginalised. Those that remain are often entered into without the intergenerational guidance they require to be effective.

[R-C05(1000)]

However, as research conducted by one of the Stoneleigh Group (Prince's Trust, 2004) indicated, despite the 'rich youth culture' there is no doubt that in the view of the members of the Stoneleigh Group, for some young people, this is a difficult time. It is a time understood by young people as well as by their communities, youth work professionals, and social policymakers, as a time with the potential for serious negative consequences.

Several interesting differences of view were present from the foundation of the Stoneleigh Group. Whilst the period of extended youth was understood by all of the organisations as sometimes problematic there were different views about exactly what the problem was (see Appendix 4). For some it was centred on the way in which young people and the time of youth were understood. Another perspective held that families, schools, and communities

had variously let young people down in their earlier development. For others the problem was the duration of the time of youth or the nature of the opportunities within this period. For yet others it was the lack of adult involvement during this period, especially the lack of an informal education service to provide a handrail, in particular for those experiencing problems.

Nevertheless, all the organisations forming the Stoneleigh Group also saw the extended period of youth as an opportunity (see Appendix 4). This opportunity was understood by some to be a chance to discover individual potential. Others thought of it as a time to explore possible identities through a range of social networks and projects. For others it was an opportunity to develop a critique of aspects of current social norms.

As the Stoneleigh Group established itself the vision was wavering between three approaches. The first was an approach that understood young people as Colin's motivated young people of 'passion and vision' 'of benefit...to society' [N-C01(0299)] and the time of youth as a period during which young people could use this energy and commitment to address the problems of society. The second, held by the voluntary youth work organisations, understood the target group to be those finding the transition to adulthood difficult. For them the aim of the programme was to help young people address these problems and to support them in realising their potential in their personal, social and public lives. A third view can be seen emerging from within this discussion in which Colin adapted his initial position in order to work with the voluntary youth organisations attracted to exploring their idea of spiritual development within youth work. This view understood youth as a time of transition during which young people could tackle both the problems they were encountering in this process of transition and the causes of the problems that they faced.

In all three cases, whether in the context of 'motivated' or 'marginalised' young people, the time of youth was understood as problematic in all three of the areas of concern of their personal, social, and public lives. In addition, young people were thought of as experiencing problems in these areas rather than causing them. Also, in all three cases, young people were understood as the agents of the change believed necessary to tackle

these problems, whichever they were. It was around these understandings that the potential partners in the Stoneleigh Group developed their common ground.

Marginalisation

The young people that became the participants in the Stoneleigh Project were understood by the organisations working with them as marginalised. From Colin's original position all young people are marginalised to some degree; tolerated or ignored but not supported or listened to until they adopt an adult identity and so engage with the adult world. Colin thought these issues had root causes in the nature of modern society. He had set out to enable young people to tackle these issues that he felt he and they intuitively grasped. Colin's early vision was of 'a process that would support young people with a passion for change in identifying their strengths and values and supporting these into action in the world' [N-C01(0299)].

Colin offered an optimistic view of the capabilities of young people to transform their worlds. This view has some similarities with Bernstein's (1996) definition of personal enhancement.

I see 'enhancement' as a condition for experiencing boundaries, be they social, intellectual or personal, not as prisons, or stereotypes, but as tension points condensing the past *and* opening possible futures. Enhancement entails a discipline. It is not so much about creativity, although that may be an outcome; enhancement has to do with boundaries and experiencing boundaries as tension points between the past and possible futures. Enhancement is not simply the right to be *more* personally, *more* intellectually, *more* socially, *more* materially, it is the right to the means of critical understanding of new possibilities. I want to suggest that this right is the condition for *confidence*. Where the right is not met then neither students nor teachers will have confidence, and without confidence it is difficult to act.

(p. 6–7)

Bernstein held that it is possible to provide experiences that create critical understanding of the situation a person is in from a structural point of view and that these can be transformational. However, he argues that this transformation should not be understood as to do with the pursuit of 'more' but of an awareness of the possibility of difference. Bernstein argued that such an understanding would create new possibilities even though it would create an awareness of the structural constraints on the developing identity of the young person.

Colin's vision can also be compared with Bernstein's (1996) third right for participation in society. For Bernstein this was '... not only about discourse, about discussion, it is about practice, and a practice that must have *outcomes*. It is the right to participate in the construction, maintenance and transformation of order' (p. 7). For Colin the young people he spoke with held values that he understood as transformative if only they could get beyond the stage of 'discussion'. Colin thought that young people were resonating with a time of change in UK culture that he also perceived, and he believed in them as more than a conscience for the culture but as potential agents of change. His frustration was that society did not provide a means by which young people could readily build identities around such values.

Colin was aware of the problems young people were encountering in constructing meaningful identities. However, in his view, the problem lay in the incongruence between the emerging values of the young people he was working with in the gap scheme and the values of the society with which they were attempting to engage. He wanted young people to hold on to their values and to find or construct meaningful spaces in the adult world for them to be expressed. He thought of this as a good for society. Whereas Bernstein thought that education, at best, currently develops a 'conforming but flexible man' (p. 225), Colin, like Bernstein, believed ideologically in an education that would create a radical and flexible person.

Colin's support for the introduction of a more radical education can be understood as a response to some of the recent changes that he believed should have an influence on adult identity. For him this identity is not constructed solely around family and work. It should

have a wider relationship with society and its social and environmental values that are partly met through social and working life but in Colin's vision, should also be met through an engagement with a wider civil society. However, he also thought that the ways in which young people can match their emerging values with the adult world they are entering are poorly developed. Work is often thought of as meaningful only in that it creates a means to access resources to support family and private life; a false transformation through 'more' of things as Bernstein described it. This other life is not, in his view, a useful context for expressing values with political or social implications. Desires for changes are in this way, he believed, thwarted. What he believed was needed in order to support young people in the expression of their values was a new attitude to work or a wider engagement with the public world through civil life.

Colin's views of the significance and potential of young people as agents of social change were shared by two of the partners in the Stoneleigh Group, Eden Community Outdoors ['... reconnects the community with the energy of young people and the value of meaningful work' (Appendix 4)] and the Wrekin Trust ['...to develop as conscious instruments for creative change' (Appendix 4)]. However, the idea of 'marginalisation' was understood differently by most of the other members. For them it referred to those young people at risk or actually encountering considerable problems in preparing for or building an adult identity. The causes of marginalisation were variously cited by the members of the Group (see Appendix 4) as inappropriate parenting, education, or work opportunities (Arthur Rank Centre, Endeavour Training, The Prince's Trust), failing communities (Eden Community Outdoors, Mobex) or risky distractions such as substance abuse (Endeavour Training, The Prince's Trust).

Whatever the social influences on their pathways to adulthood, the Stoneleigh Group partners thought of the young people they worked for as disempowered or marginalised by their failures at school and in the work place (The Arthur Rank Centre, Endeavour Training, Mobex, The Prince's Trust and Weston Spirit). For example Endeavour Training describes their target young people as 'disaffected or excluded' and the Prince's Trust as 'struggling' or 'in trouble'. This sense of failure was also understood to extend to family and social situations (Endeavour Training, The Prince's Trust, Weston Spirit). However,

the responsibility for these failures is largely placed on society for an inadequate education or inappropriate work opportunities. The Stoneleigh Group partners thought of modern society as providing a range of benefits that are the milestones of adulthood - work, parenting, and home, from which marginalised young people were excluded and to which they could be helped back. Whilst Colin's vision of transition can be described as an alternative path the other members of the Stoneleigh Group held an idea of transition more in keeping with Bois-Reymond and Blasco's (2003) yo-yo transition.

Bernstein (1996) described the process by which a student is able or not to respond to the knowledge that is being offered by society through pedagogic systems as 'recognition rules' (p. 31–33). He quoted research by Holland (1981) and Whitty, Rowe and Aggleton (1994) that highlights the way in which these rules function to maintain the established distribution of power in society by excluding young people from certain social backgrounds and from the privileges of knowledge. This was understood by the Stoneleigh Group partners as a significant factor behind the marginalisation of some young people. For example the Prince's Trust seek to support 'those who've struggled at school' (see Appendix 4). Eden Community Outdoors also wish 'to support young people who fail at mainstream education' (see Appendix 4). The Arthur Rank Centre are also specific about what they think is the cause of the marginalisation of the young people they support by identifying 'the shift from vocational to academic education for practically inclined young people' (see Appendix 4).

Bernstein also identified that knowledge may be acquired but that rules also exist that control the expression of this knowledge, for example in examinations or in pathways of further and higher education to work roles. These he called 'realization rules' (p. 31–33) and he also considered them to be constructed in such a way as to maintain the established distribution of power. As will be discussed later, many of the young people who were participants in the Stoneleigh Project 'succeeded' at school and even entered university. They then struggled with various issues including the dislocation they felt from their family and social roots. Hess (1995) highlights the role of dislocation as a factor in the development of psychosocial disorders in young people. In particular she identifies moving, divorcing, remarrying and leaving or entering work as significant stress factors. In

these cases social mobility, perhaps in part encouraged by some of the family factors identified by Hess, led them to drop out of work or higher education, accept work that did not match with their educational achievements or aspirations, or stay unemployed. This may be an example of Henderson, Holland, McGrellis, Sharpe and Thomson's (2007) concept of downward mobility discussed in Chapter 4. However, the situations described above suggest that the causes of this mobility are not a lack of educational opportunity but rather a feeling that the newly acquired 'recognition codes' created a social and, sometimes, geographical distance between the young person and their traditional social context giving them a sense of dislocation and alienation. Using Bernstein's analysis discussed above this can be interpreted as instilling a lack of confidence. However, it has been brought about by an undesirable outcome rather than an unattainable one.

Colin proposed another interpretation of this problem. In his view some of these young people had developed radical value systems through their educational and life experiences. Pathways to adulthood available in the wider world did not, in his view, reflect the knowledge they sought to realise. In other words it was not, in Colin's view, the education that was unattainable but appropriate work opportunities post-education. If this is so it is not a failure of pedagogic systems to make knowledge available. It suggests a weaker framing of a curriculum for which the young people do possess the recognition rules.

Goffman's (1968) concept of stigma may also be a factor in the response of these socially mobile young people to their situation. He discusses the way in which stigma, which he understands as a disempowering aspect of the social process of identity construction, can be attached to a person who is perceived as different. Young people in the process of socially mobile transitions run the risk of being stigmatised by the family and community that they are leaving behind, a situation that may well describe the experience being discussed here. In these cases the young people are alienated from the social context of their adolescence. Whilst this can be understood as creating the potential for more fluid forms of social capital at the same time they also lose a significant aspect of this capital so weakening their situations. They could also feel alienated by those in education responsible for enabling the social mobility. As a consequence the pathway before them

may become unattainable or undesirable and so it could be argued these young people become part of the 40% 'going nowhere' (Bynner et al., 2002).

For some young people, education, in its widest sense, has been capable of providing knowledge with the potential to be transformative in a political sense. Colin thought that gap years and social projects for 'gappers' might provide an additional educational pathway to facilitate the process of realising these radical values in action. However, he claimed to be disheartened by the lack of transfer of these values by the young people from their gap schemes into the next steps in their lives. It was as though the schemes acted as a safety valve with no real impact on the established culture, a 'papering over the cracks' as Singh and Luke (1996) would suggest.

Re-engaging young people who have been marginalised by the educational system and so understand it, and the adults who represent it, as harmful and to be avoided has been a long-standing challenge for the informal education approach of the youth services. Bernstein claimed that the impact of recognition and realisation rules would result in marginalised young people who would then reject the adult world. Young people in this situation, he thought, would reject parents and other adults seeking to help them. Trust in adults, especially those representing established institutions such as education, is widely regarded as a central problem for youth workers operating in this field (Prince's Trust, 2004). The analysis of thinking about youth culture that was discussed in Chapter 4 argued that this then emphasises the importance of youth culture in helping young people find an identity. This, it is suggested, will sometimes be an identity that is not only marginalised but also dysfunctional from the perspective of an adult society and potentially deviant and harmful to the young person, or criminal.

The majority of the voluntary youth organisations involved in the Stoneleigh Group worked to redress these problems by restoring the trust of young people in certain adults who can then work with them to rebuild their identities and find the skills that can return them to a path that leads to work and a healthy engagement with mainstream society (see Appendix 4). However, their approaches did not set out to foster critical awareness of the social and economic factors that were thought of as the causes of the problems faced by

young people. It could be argued that their approaches can be summed up as attempts, often they would claim successful, to provide alternative recognition and realisation rules for an education that restored young people to a conventional situation that re-asserted the established distribution of power. The concepts of work held by the Stoneleigh Group partners and their meanings in society are discussed further below.

Neither did the Stoneleigh Group partners deliberately set out to support young people holding more radical views of society to find meaningful roles within it. Transformation achieved by fostering critical awareness that, as Bernstein would have described it, goes beyond a discourse and leads to ‘a practice’ emerged as a distinctive element of the Stoneleigh Group championed by Colin and two of the partners. This is also discussed further below.

Marginalisation as a Structural or Network Problem

The issue of marginalisation is thought of by the Stoneleigh Group members as partly structural in origin. For example in The Prince’s Trust report (2004) class, gender, age, ethnicity, and ability in particular are identified as potential barriers to educational, housing, and work goals. However, the Stoneleigh Group members also interpret these issues from the position of social networks. From this perspective they claim that the weak, chaotic and strong networks, as outlined in Chapter 4, can work to inhibit or restrain young people from new and transformative trajectories. These networks can be, for example, educational institutions, faith institutions, youth clubs, families, peer groups, or communities.

Whilst Bernstein claims that his theories can apply to a range of pedagogic relationships his analysis views the state and its institutions as the dominant source of established and potentially oppressive order. Bernstein claimed that this works to a large degree to maintain the structural inequities in society (Bernstein, 1996). From the perspective of young people who are post compulsory schooling the knowledge that helps or hinders them in acquiring identity comes from several sources. They are involved in several pedagogic relationships other than formal education; families, communities, religious institutions and peer groups can all have an influence. Some of these are, or can be,

established institutions such as the church. Others are separate from institutions and the mainstream values of society such as peer groups.

The Stoneleigh Group partners thought that, from the perspective of young people, these other influences on their senses of themselves are significant and powerful, offering an alternative and potentially different source of knowledge about themselves and the world they are in. This relates back to the idea of youth being a time of compensation noted above. These other sources from which to construct an identity were thought of by the members of the Stoneleigh Group as often being either diversions on the trajectory to adulthood or dysfunctional alternative pathways. Less often were they thought of as a healthy alternative path of transition or a source of alternative values.

The rhetoric of the partners in the Stoneleigh Group suggest that their strategies for challenging the marginalisation of the young people in their programmes are based on those concepts that interpret the world of the young person as a series of networks open to influence, development, and change. For example these strategies can be interpreted to include developing weak social networks or breaking away from strong or chaotic networks to build more fluid ones. Residential outdoor experiences are often described by the partner organisations in this light. For example Camas describe the intention of their outdoor retreats as to provide ‘visits both memorable and meaningful through discovery and recreation, laughter and conversation, peace and activity coming together in this beautiful place’ (see Appendix 4). Claims are made for the way in which the broadening of personal and social horizons allow young people to see themselves in a new light, break with dysfunctional or sterile networks, build new networks of support with adults and other young people, and plan new trajectories. For example, and of special relevance to the Stoneleigh Project, Stoddart (2004) supports these claims in relation to the social capital of marginalised young people and experiences of outdoor education. Eden Community Outdoors, Endeavour Training, Mobex, The Prince’s Trust, and Weston Spirit all offer such justifications for their outdoor residential programmes. For example Mobex state that they provide ‘training and development programmes of outdoors, arts and environmental education (that) build confidence, awareness and teamwork skills and explore personal and social issues’ (see Appendix 4).

In this context, support from the potential members of the Stoneleigh Group for an outdoor residential programme was relatively easy to establish. It would appear relatively normal to the voluntary youth organisations that were approached by the founders to offer a programme that set out to transform the social networks and self-images of young people. Designing a project that sought to transform the structural inequities that might be the cause of their marginalisation would, in most cases, be breaking new ground. However, for Camas, the host of the early retreats, this was typical of their approach to youth work. This is described by Camas as to do with ‘issues of sustainability, peace and justice ... , both in the choice of groups that are encouraged to visit and in the everyday life of the centre’ (Loynes, 2001).

Marginalisation and Bernstein’s Criteria For a Just Education

The responses of the members of the Stoneleigh Group to marginalisation (see Appendix 4) can be considered using Bernstein’s three educational rights for a young citizen (Bernstein, 1996, p. 6-7). The language of modern youth work presented in Chapter 4, and echoed by many of the Stoneleigh Group partners, talks about building personal capacity through personal development programmes. Brahma Kumaris, Eden Community Outdoors, Endeavour Training, Mobex, The Prince’s Trust, and Weston Spirit all provide programmes described in this way (see Appendix 4). On the surface this could be understood as Bernstein’s ‘enhancement’ which he thought of as focussed on the individual (Bernstein, 1996, p. 6). Bernstein argued that a critical understanding by the young person of the context in which the transition was occurring was a central aspect of the educational goal of enhancement. It would, he claimed, help young people to gain some control over their pasts, challenge the pathways their trajectories were following and, at the same time, be realistic about the possibilities ahead.

The members of the Stoneleigh Group understood enhancement to involve compensating for learning difficulties or preferences (see The Arthur Rank Centre, Appendix 4), offering a second chance to acquire educational skills, knowledge and qualifications (all the organisations, Appendix 4) and building confidence and awareness (all the organisations, Appendix 4). The intention is that this would enhance a young person’s potential leading to rediscovery (see Brahma Kumaris, Appendix 4), reconnection (see Eden Community

Outdoors, Appendix 4), reaching potential (see Endeavour Training, Mobex, The Prince's Trust, Appendix 4) and gaining aspiration (see Weston Spirit, Appendix 4). The Stoneleigh Group partners thought of their role as providing young people with a critical awareness of themselves rather than of their situations. Providing knowledge and skills then supports this process of building and sustaining the emerging identities of the young people. This was thought to help them to recover self-respect and so reconsider their value in society and thus restore a trajectory to their transitions.

The goal of this aspect of the work of voluntary youth organisations is described by the Stoneleigh Group partners as gaining or restoring confidence (for example see Mobex and The Prince's Trust, Appendix 4). Bernstein (1996, p. 6-7) also thought that confidence was important. However, he understood it as an essential consequence of the right of enhancement being met rather than as a condition that could be restored on its own. All the partners in the Stoneleigh Group are aware that restoring confidence in young people, and the possibility of success in achieving a healthy adult identity in a risk society, is a challenging task. As Joas (2000) proposes and as has been discussed in Chapter 8, individuals forming identities in circumstances where they are rejected by the established norms of society and have a poverty of experience will feel that their underdeveloped identities are under attack. This violent definition, as Joas describes it, defines rejected young people as who they are not and he claims will lead them to be distrustful and defensive. They will, Joas states, avoid contact with the social world that has denied them an identity.

Addressing this exclusion from support is a central concern of all of the partners in the Stoneleigh Group. They all offer programmes that seek to address this consequence of marginalisation. They, therefore, also include elements in their programmes that address Bernstein's second principle of inclusion. Experiences are designed to 'engage young people in education, work and community life' (Endeavour Training, Appendix 4). The purpose of this is variously described as to 'feel valued' (The Arthur Rank Centre, Appendix 4), 'to rediscover ... goodness' (Brahma Kumaris, Appendix 4) and find 'meaningful work' (Eden Community Outdoors, Appendix 4). The partners provide one or more of the following interventions. They seek to support the social inclusion of young

people by challenging the violent rejection they have experienced and by listening to their life stories and respecting them. In addition they provide opportunities for education and voluntary or paid work and, through association within and beyond the voluntary organisation, build social networks that will help them develop their leisure, social and working lives.

Bernstein's (1996) third right for a just education '... is the right to participate in the construction, maintenance and transformation of order. Participation, Bernstein claimed, 'is the condition for *civic practice* and operates at the level of politics' (p. 7). Bernstein places '*civic practice*' in italics to emphasise that, for this right to be met, the young person should be engaged in more than a discourse. This echoes his concern for an education that 'papered over the cracks' by giving the impression of something happening within the boundaries of education, that, due to strong classification, remained within those boundaries. It did not become a 'civic practice' within the community.

Mobex claim to help young people 'become active participants in their communities' and The Prince's Trust hope that the projects they offer will 'make a positive contribution to their communities and society'. Eden Community Outdoors, as well as The Prince's Trust, go further by claiming to help young people in the creation of new leisure, social, educational, or work opportunities. For example Eden Community Outdoors are described by the Civic Trust (2006) as working with young people to create a youth club, a circus skills training programme, an annual community street festival, a mobile youth service, an organic café, and a recycling co-op. Both organisations claim to support young people in the creation of new opportunities on their own behalf and on behalf of their communities. ECO describe this as social entrepreneurship and use measures developed by the New Economics Foundation (Sanfilippo, 2006) to monitor their success. These include social indicators such as crime rates, vandalism, and truancy but also economic indicators such as conditions of employment, salaries, and tracking the turnover of money within the community, all enhanced by the activities of the young people involved in the ECO projects.

Some of these opportunities support young people in acquiring identities in a way that maintain, as I have described Bernstein calling it, the social order. Others, such as Eden Community Outdoors, set out to help young people transform their leisure, social and work opportunities, both for themselves and for other people in the community. The various ways that the members of the Stoneleigh Group understand work in relation to young identities is explored further below.

In Chapter 8 I used Bernstein's theoretical frameworks to interpret the assertions made by the Stoneleigh Group for the Stoneleigh Project as a radical intervention. However, the Stoneleigh Project was more complex than this suggests. The Stoneleigh Group developed the retreats in a way that was intended to be radical as understood by the Stoneleigh Group's ideology. Meanwhile each partner in the Stoneleigh Group offered voluntary leadership roles in line with their normal practices. Claims made for this part of the Stoneleigh Project as a radical outcome were made in the context of the ideology of the youth work organisation and not the Stoneleigh Group. The partners in the Stoneleigh Group expressed the radicalism of the breadth of intention and provision in two different ways.

Firstly, it can be argued that the claims made by some of the voluntary youth organisations were that their work was transformative because it helped young people find a new trajectory on the road map of youth transition. From the perspective of the social world and the world of work the claim is that young people can build new and healthy social networks and develop constructive identities. From the perspective of Bernstein's social theory, whilst the young people involved may be understood to have transformed their situations and opportunities, they can be thought of as having maintained the social order through their actions.

Secondly, other partners in the Stoneleigh Group, such as Eden Community Outdoors, The Prince's Trust, and the Wrekin Trust, claimed that their programmes supported young people in becoming agents of change within the community, constructing and transforming their social worlds as well as themselves. Both of these actions are an equivalent to 'civic practice' as Bernstein would have termed it (Bernstein, 1996, p. 7). Chapter 12 will

examine in what way the Stoneleigh Project and the work of the voluntary youth organisations were thought of as radical or otherwise by the young people who participated in the programme.

Not all the partners in the Stoneleigh Group claimed to be radical in relation to all three of Bernstein's rights of a just education; enhancement, inclusion, and participation. However, they all claimed that the Stoneleigh Project offered a distinctive approach to one or more of them. Breaking their claims down into these three areas will be useful when discussing the claims made for the Stoneleigh Project by the young people, and by the partner organisations, for a programme that was thought of by each member of the Stoneleigh Group as enhancing the radicalism of their provision.

The Concept of Marginalisation and the Stoneleigh Project

The Stoneleigh Group partners understood growing up as problematic. The nature and location of the problems of marginalisation and the ways the partners sought to address them continued to be understood in different ways. For some of the members, their roles were to address the problems young people are experiencing because of earlier difficulties in their lives. For others it was to address the problems young people were currently experiencing whilst trying to recover what the partners understood as a healthy trajectory. This may have been a set of problems located in the young people, for example poor literacy, lack of confidence, drug use and so on. Or, alternatively, it may have been problems located in the world with which the young person was attempting to relate; no work opportunities or housing, poor social or medical support and so on. Lastly, Colin, supported by Eden Community Outdoors and the Iona Community especially, continued to advocate for the importance of tackling the causes of the problems on behalf of these and other young people.

Despite the variety of ways in which young people, their social worlds, and their problems were understood, phrases in the Stoneleigh Group literature such as 'empowering young people to transform their own circumstances' [CD-SG(5103)] could be interpreted by all the partners as supporting their way of seeing things. Such ambiguous phrases enabled all the partners to give their support to the developing Stoneleigh Project.

The Stoneleigh Group and the Meaning of Work

For the age group that was the focus for the Stoneleigh Group, preparing for work, being in voluntary or paid work, or creating new work opportunities were thought of by the partner organisations in two ways. In one sense they were part of the informal educational intervention they were providing. Work was used as the main vehicle through which young people in need of help were supported in their transition to adulthood. They were also understood as one outcome of a successful project. Obtaining work was seen as the most significant achievement of each organisation's intervention with a young person and, as discussed in Chapter 3 and enlarged upon below, 'sorting yourself out' was seen as the best way to go about getting work. As voluntary work became a central aspect of the Stoneleigh Project it is worth exploring further the various understandings of work held by the members of the Stoneleigh Group.

The critical difference between the ideas held by the members of the Stoneleigh Group lies in the meaning and nature of the work rather than the idea of work as such. Eden Community Outdoors (ECO) state that their programme 'reconnects the community with the energy of young people and the value of meaningful work' (see Appendix 4). The Arthur Rank Centre was founded to provide young people of a practical bent with training in order to gain work in traditional agricultural and horticultural roles (Arthur Rank Centre, 2007). The Prince's Trust, among other things, help train and finance young people to set up their own businesses, seeing marginalised young people as a creative resource in job creation (Prince's Trust, 2006).

Whilst the Arthur Rank Centre might be seen as conservative in their approach compared with ECO and The Prince's Trust it can be argued that, in some respects, ECO has more in common with the Arthur Rank Centre than The Prince's Trust. Whilst The Prince's Trust would consider most vocational training, employment, or entrepreneurial activity as a successful outcome the other two organisations hold particular and related values about the nature of work.

In this comparison of the three organisations The Prince's Trust holds the most traditional set of values in relation to the meaning of work. The Prince's Trust (Prince's Trust, 2006)

understand work as an important milestone in the transition to adulthood providing identity, meaning, status, engagement with the adult world, and the financial means to participate in a modern society. The Prince's Trust's business partners, who support their work with marginalised young people and young entrepreneurs, are large employers. The mentors who work voluntarily are young people themselves employed by these business partners and The Prince's Trust celebrates vocational training and employment, as well as business start-ups, as successful and worthwhile outcomes.

The Arthur Rank Centre (2007) believes that the nature of work and education in a modern society alienates and excludes certain young people who are more suited to practical and manual tasks. They understand the world of work as one in which knowledge and intellectual skills are the main route to employment and so privileging those people who are intellectually capable. They seek to restore the opportunities for traditional forms of rural work. They also seek to restore a value to this kind of work in order that it is understood as dignified and worthwhile [R-SG(1100)].

ECO, on the other hand, set out to support marginalised young people in developing what they considered to be new and meaningful work [I-S01(4403)]. The Stoneleigh Group came to regard ECO as the most radical organisation [R-C05(7404)]. This claim was founded on the Stoneleigh Group's understanding of radicalism as supporting young people as change agents in the community. Radical, from this perspective, meant a programme that transformed the individual, the social networks within which the individual lived, and the community, through the actions of the individual. From the perspective of Bernstein, this would be a claim that the pedagogic rights of enhancement, inclusion and participation discussed above were being met in such a way that all three were transformative experiences.

In this regard it is interesting that ECO claims it has the least reliance on public funding to carry out its work.

Public funding involves demonstrating the achievement of success criteria such as reductions in health or behavioural issues or increases in educational or employment take up. We do not want to be tied in to funding that defines the length of our programmes, what we can do, who we can do it for and what should be the outcome. We want people who fund our work to ask the young people we work with what they need and for them to be happy to support these. We would also prefer that this funding comes from local benefactors. We think a community should invest in the development of its own young people in a way that works for this community and this bioregion.

[I-S01(4403)]

Their view resonates with the criteria Bernstein offered for an integrated curriculum. Liz, a youth worker with Eco, described it as important that the control [“framing” in Bernstein’s terms (Bernstein, 1996, p. 26-28)] of the programme was in the hands of the young people involved and the power [“classification” (Bernstein, 1996, p. 19-21)] over what knowledge and skills should be developed in order to achieve which projects was also determined by the young people. The youth workers’ roles were to accompany the young people in achieving these aims. I would argue that Bernstein would describe this as weak classification and framing and so he would call it an integrated curriculum (Bernstein, 1996, p. 28-29). As Bernstein suggested that weak classification and framing are necessary for the boundaries between an educational project and the social world to be weak, this suggests one explanation for the claims made by ECO to be effective in working with young people to transform their community.

When ECO was founded the leaders did have their own visions for the organisation. They imagined and hoped it would develop projects such as organic farming [I-S01(4403)]. When young people were consulted, what emerged were projects rooted in environmental values but that also had much stronger social dimensions; a recycling project, a summer outdoor adventure play scheme, an organic café, a backpacker’s hostel with a housing scheme attached, an annual seasonal festival, a market stall selling wood carving, and an eco-bus providing youth services to isolated rural communities [I-S01(4403)].

One difference in the approach taken by the young people of ECO is that they were directing their working lives whilst the young people from the Arthur Rank Centre were employed labour. Perhaps the key distinction from the point of view of this thesis is that the Arthur Rank Centre wished their young people to be valued whereas ECO, whilst also wanting their young people to be valued, understood their young people as valuing. ECO also believed that the latter had the power to be transforming for both the young people involved and the community within which the work was undertaken.

What ECO and the Arthur Rank Centre have in common is a value placed on work in relation to the land and to a community. Spretnak (1997) an advocate for the values of the Craft Movement and, in particular, what she claims to be that movement's environmental ethics, would concur with this 'resurgence of the real'. She understood approaches that were in step with the values of the Craft Movement as countering all that she saw as wrong with work in the context of modernity; a set of values she describes as 'hypermodern' (p. 222). She argues for a restoration of work that values the body, a sense of place in the landscape and a place in the community; a set of values she describes as 'non-modern' (p. 27). However, she does not promote a return to a 19th century agricultural society. Like ECO and unlike the Arthur Rank Centre, she is seeking a new solution to finding relationship in an individualised world, a resolution that retains as many of the gains of modernity - democracy, education, longevity, leisure time, etc.; a resolution she describes as 'truly post-modern' (p. 223). This, Spretnak believes, could draw on the non-modern values of the Craft Movement although she claims that these values need a new interpretation of the nature of people, community, and the meaning of work. The values of ECO could readily be understood as one such re-interpretation.

The Prince's Trust, on the other hand, value work in its 'hyper-modern' context and do not question the underlying values of the current form of capitalism or the systems of production and consumption that support it. Transformation for them concerns the changes in the personal circumstances and opportunities available to the young people and not changes in the world of work with which they are engaging. 'Persuading you he isn't just a useless troublesome waster isn't the problem. It's how do we persuade him?' (Prince's Trust, 2006) However, they do acknowledge that patterns of work are changing and that

young people can become entrepreneurs able to create new types of work, are part of the way in which the work of the future will be constructed [R-SG(1100)].

Clearly, within the Stoneleigh Group member organisations, there were significantly different understandings of society and the relationship of young people and voluntary organisations to that society. The Prince's Trust represented a philanthropic approach committed to tackling marginalisation, with a strong belief in the capabilities of young people to transform their own circumstances. It acknowledged the changing nature of society and yet was uncritical of the society in which this occurs. The Arthur Rank Centre was critical of the way in which modern society marginalises certain groups of young people and sought to restore traditional forms of work and social life that countered these alienating trends. ECO was critical of the alienation of modernity and the consequent exploitation of people and nature. It sought to transform society through the work of young people who had become critically aware of the society in which they lived. All three organisations mediated, on behalf of their young people and according to their own ideology, the spaces in the adult working world with which the young people engaged. They sought congruence between the values they espoused about the social world and the adult world they were acting for as a gatekeeper.

The Arthur Rank Centre can be thought of as seeking to provide a pathway to an adult working identity based on what I would argue Bernstein would call the recognition and expression codes that it thought were appropriate for the young people they worked for (Bernstein, 1996, p. 31-33). From the perspective of the Arthur Rank Centre it was not seeking to transform the young people. Rather, a curriculum was offered that it believed young people would find relevant and achievable. Nor was it seeking to transform work. The world of work was, in its view, in need of reform to suit the capabilities of the young people rather than transformation.

The Prince's Trust tackled the educational problems they perceived the young people they worked for as having. They sought to transform the young people they worked for by approaching them with educational programmes that the young people recognised as of value. They changed the pedagogic approach that would be familiar in a school so that the

missed/failed curriculum of numeracy, literacy and other core and vocational skills were offered with recognition rules that they claimed worked for the young people. This, they believed, would provide a second chance for the young people to express themselves in finding work but within the traditional parameters of society. Once an education was acquired they believed that young people would have learned the expression rules necessary to restore them to a conventional transition to work and an adult identity.

ECO was working with both personal and social transformation. It developed new forms of work that were based on the values of social entrepreneurship with the environment in mind. These were inspired by the young people who were holding values that challenged the norms of work in their community as well as being concerned with issues of social and environmental justice. Like The Prince's Trust, they also offered an alternative education that held recognition codes that were accessible to the young people. However, rather than understanding the outcome as the transformation of the young person, they sought to work with young people in order to transform the social and working world they were entering. ECO claimed that the young people were transformed not only by the educational programme but by the new opportunities then available in the wider community. As Liz put it

The young people in ECO want to challenge the situation that the only jobs they can aspire to if they remain here are to drive tractors or work supermarket checkouts. They did not drop out of school because they can't cope. They dropped out because they don't want to follow a path that leads to work like this.

[I-S01(4403)]

Most of the young people in ECO were truants from school or engaged in some form of home schooling or alternative education. Liz's remarks suggest that the young people understood the trajectory they were on and that, rather than failing at school, they resisted schooling because they did not want to follow such paths. They might have had the recognition codes but they had a critical capacity that the strong collection curriculum of school could not tolerate or that led them to be intolerant of school [I-S01(4403)]. Willis (1977) noted a similar rejection of authority and the formal process of learning to work

amongst working class boys in school in the 1970's. He comments that their behaviours do, in fact, prepare them to cope with the kinds of work they are likely to get helping them to find meaning in and out of work through their resistance. Liz may have identified a similar trend but, in this case, amongst the middle classes as well as the working classes and amongst girls as well as boys.

Conclusion

In his thinking about what was to become the Stoneleigh Group Colin was building on a set of implicit beliefs about young people, their social world, and youth work. He believed youth is an expanded time of partial dependency and a relatively new phenomenon. Support for young people during this time was, he believed, inadequate. He thought growing up is more complex in a modern world and increasingly managed by the young person in a plural and more socially mobile world. In his experience young people held strong values but did not feel listened to. They felt impotent.

The emerging assertions of the Stoneleigh Group built on the beliefs of Colin. The Stoneleigh Group believed that the time of youth is increasingly problematic and that a growing number of young people are marginalised. They thought the problem was partly about being valued as much as it was about having values. Whilst, in the partners' view, the problems were not of the making of young people they believed young people had the potential to tackle and even transform these problems for their own benefit and the benefit of their communities. However, they understood the public world as offering a narrow set of opportunities with limited potential for expressing a wider set of personal or social values.

In this respect, the Stoneleigh Group partners were particularly critical of the work available to young people seeing the knowledge society of late modernity as offering too few meaningful work opportunities for those not intellectually gifted or socially mobile. However, the partners took different approaches to tackle this issue, some more critical of society than others. This was significant because, for the target population of the Stoneleigh Group, supporting the transition to work involved creating volunteer work opportunities within the youth work of the members of the Stoneleigh Group.

All the members of the Stoneleigh Group understood themselves as working for the benefit of young people. However, under the influence of Colin, the Stoneleigh Group itself, through its emerging concept for the Stoneleigh Project, acquired a different intention that was considered by it to be more radical politically than the typical youth work of most of the partners. It became more than the sum of its parts. It set out to support or develop young people as agents of change who were capable of transforming both their own circumstances and those of their social situations.

Typically, in the hierarchical context of a collection type curriculum, young people are assessed for the identities that will best suit them (Bernstein, 1996, p. 28-29). However, the members of the Stoneleigh Group claimed that the young people were evaluating the educational programmes of the partners for their capacity to set them on pathways to adulthood that they, the young people, valued. In other words the young people were thought of by the partners as choosing their identities for themselves rather than allowing them to be determined by mainstream society. It is possible that, in some cases, this impression of agency was a significant motivating factor in the development of a young person. However, in practice, the claims made for most of the programmes of the Stoneleigh Group partners described them as restoring the young people to conventional pathways from which the young people had been marginalised earlier in life. In many other cases it is probable that the personal and social worlds of the young people were transformed by the youth work of the Stoneleigh Group partners and that this enabled them to access pathways to adulthood previously unavailable to them. In both these situations the practices of the Stoneleigh Group partners, whilst restoring or transforming the young people, maintained rather than transformed the social order. In a few cases, notably ECO and, to some degree The Prince's Trust, claims were made that the social order was also transformed and by the efforts of the young people involved in the programmes.

The Stoneleigh Group set out to create a programme, the Stoneleigh Project, which specifically intended to support the development of young people as agents of social change. All the Stoneleigh Group partners subscribed to this purpose. However, the ideology on which this purpose was based, and that was applied by the Stoneleigh Group to the retreats, will be seen to interact variously with the ideologies on which the general

programmes of each Stoneleigh Group partner were based, and which formed the other significant part of the Stoneleigh Project. This interaction will be an important theme of the remaining chapters as the meanings of transformation and radical practice are explored in the dialogue and practice of the Stoneleigh Group and its partners.