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Abstract and Keywords
This chapter considers the indirect influence of Sen's body of work on social policy in relation to youth policy in post-industrial Wales. The devolved Welsh government's policy is influenced by the principle of progressive universalism, and its core document on youth (which happens to have the title 'Extending Entitlement') is suggested to have positive outcomes for young people precisely because it reflects aspects of Sen's capabilities approach by arguing for supporting troubled or troublesome young people into a repertoire of opportunities and experiences. Anti-poverty measures which emphasize control under non-devolved policy (and are particularly punitive to young people who are labelled 'disorderly' when in public spaces), have been delivered differently by the partnerships in post-industrial Wales to those in similar regions of England. An alternative approach to adult-youth relations, explaining these in terms of a cooperative conflict, is used to examine adult complaints about youth in public spaces.
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I. A Personal Note
THE invitation to write a chapter for Amartya Sen's festschrift is a delight and an honor. I was lucky enough to be Amartya's research assistant in the 1980s, when he was developing his conceptualizations of famines, poverty and gender (Kynch and Sen 1983), and he has remained a key influence, his writings occupying a shelf below Marx, and consulted more often. He also encouraged me to carry out fieldwork on nutrition in Palanpur (Lanjouw and Stern 1998: 409–28) and agricultural wages in West Bengal (an influence on Pal and Kynch 2000), and I was privileged to meet his colleagues there.

I have also benefited from his interest in research beyond economics, including research into areas of natural science such as nutrition and medicine. Crossing disciplines has served me well over the years, most recently when seconded as a government social researcher, negotiating between policy-makers in health, social policy and social justice. This was in our devolved Welsh Assembly, where a report about supporting youth bore the title Extending Entitlement. This report sounds (and sometimes reads) like Sen, but why? For this chapter, I set out to discover if (p.101) the commissioners or authors had been influenced by Sen, and, following denials of direct influence, my search expanded into a question of how theory might be reflected in policy, albeit with mutated concepts.
II. Introduction

In this chapter, I shall consider how the devolved government of Wales has formed a distinctive approach to policy within the United Kingdom, in particular with respect to young people, and will consider to what extent it echoes Sen's body of work on entitlements and capabilities, or how Sen's framework might apply to it.

A major principle on which all devolved Welsh policy is based has been articulated by the First Minister as **progressive universalism** (Morgan 2006). According to Drakeford (2007: 175), progressive universalism in Wales is the provision of services universally in preference to means-tested or targeted services, and the “progressive part of universalism comes in providing ... additional help for those who need it most”, so that “Universal services, with a progressive twist, combine the advantages of the classic welfare state with some of the benefits which can be claimed for targeting. What the approach provides, however, is a universal obligation, as well as a set of universal rights. In this model, social justice is everybody's business.”

The argument I wish to make is that social policies aimed at young people in Wales, building on politically nurtured historical roots in which collective responsibility played a major part, have had a positive influence, as evidenced by outcomes for young people. Nevertheless, I shall suggest that there are some conceptual gaps, which can be addressed by Sen's work. For example, social relations involving young people could usefully be interpreted as *cooperative conflicts*, requiring attention to bargaining in place of appeals to cooperation or sympathy, if Welsh policy is genuinely to encompass its aims for social justice.

Section III briefly introduces devolved Wales, a minority interest even within UK academia. Section IV describes the evolution of social policies towards young people, and their emphasis on including young people's voices. The origins of the influential Welsh document *Extending Entitlement* are explored, and ways in which it mirrors Sen's framework of *entitlements, realized functionings and capabilities*. The fifth section concerns bi-national policy, and how it has been adapted for the Welsh policy context.¹ In section VI, drawing on my own empirical research, adult-youth (p.102) relations
in public spaces are examined as cooperative conflicts. The seventh and final section draws some conclusions.

III. A Brief Note about Devolved Wales
Wales is a small nation of about 3 million people, of whom nearly half are concentrated in the south-east, where the post-industrial Valleys cut southwards through the hills towards the capital Cardiff (once the largest coal port in the world). Arguably, Wales was the cradle of the Industrial Revolution, and also first to move away from the heavy industries associated with it (Morgan 1995; see CWM n.d. for a comprehensive bibliography). This history has helped shape attitudes to social justice: for example Drakeford suggests as influences on these attitudes a flatter class structure (fewer middle-class, more working-class people), economic structure (the lack of a major financial sector), and political structure. He claims that “Wales is the only part of the UK to have a genuinely long-term commitment to left of centre redistributive politics, stretching for more than 150 years, from 19th-century Liberalism through 20th-century Labourism and on to the present day” (Drakeford 2007: 174).

Devolution in the United Kingdom was taken forward by the Labour government elected in 1997, following 18 years of Conservative rule. A referendum in Wales produced only a slim majority in favor of the Assembly, which was set up in 1999 initially as a corporate body without any tax-raising or primary legislative powers. The Government of Wales Act 2006 separated the powers of the executive and Assembly Members and now provides for limited law-making powers on devolved matters, but not tax-raising.

The lack of economic levers may have benefited social policy, in that imaginative leverage has gone into the devolved areas, such as education, health, housing and local government, and has even seeped over into the implementation of economic, criminal justice and other policies decided bi-nationally by the UK government. However, a problem for any distinct devolved social policy can be that rhetoric does not stop at the border even when the powers do.

IV. Extending Entitlement: An Example of Devolved Policy
In the late twentieth century, prospects in South Wales were distressingly poor outside the prosperous parts of the capital city, Cardiff, and the Vale of Glamorgan: (p.103) the region's
poverty was recognized by European Union Objective 1 special funding to most of the Valleys. Debates in Wales about poverty, as in other parts of the UK, were strongly influenced by the concept of social exclusion (Room 1995: 4–9), with an Anglo-American empiricist twist. While the welfare state was being criticized, and dismantled, solutions—best practice—were being trialed in regeneration areas, often on the council housing estates built in the 1960s. Along with regeneration came a wave of global mantras of consultation and participation (Cooke and Kothari 2001) and later, emphasis on partnerships, service-level agreements with the voluntary sector, and the relating of public finances to actual activity.

The scale of the new Welsh Assembly’s flagship program for regeneration, Communities First, was ambitious—initially the 100 most deprived communities (compared with only 39 communities under the equivalent program in England). Concern was widespread, not only about area-based poverty, but also about children and young people, especially the high proportion in low-income households (36% of Welsh children in 1996/7), and especially after a report showed that in the Valleys about a fifth of young people leaving school went off the official radar: they were not in employment, training or further education, and qualitative research described their situation as status zero (Istance and Williamson 1996; Williamson 1997). Indeed, Communities First has often delivered child and youth provision because that has been identified as the communities’ own main priority.

A combination of research and activist interests and events drove forward an agenda on children and young people, one result of which was Extending Entitlement: Supporting Young People in Wales (NAW 2000). A selection of the main actors has told me that they drew directly on the social exclusion literature and either the rights-based literature or their skilled observations.

Interestingly, the early debates about youth, about the running down of youth services, which had not been protected from spending cuts in the late twentieth century, and about problems of young people whose access to state benefits had been removed, involved future Assembly Members and ministers as well as UK ministers, who shared strong views on equality and rights. Many of these were women. (The remarkable achievement in the 2003 elections of returning
50% women Assembly Members in a nation dominated by elderly white male councilors followed the Welsh Labour Party's affirmative action in 1999: see Beddoe 2004 and the literature cited there.) It is possible that women's achieving their political potential has been another lever on policy.

Politicians are also moved by events, and the coinciding of these debates with the uncovering of child sexual abuse in children’s homes (resulting in the Waterhouse Tribunal's report *Lost in Care*, DOH 2000), facilitated the appointment of an independent Children’s Commissioner in 2001. Furthermore, special provision for Wales was made in the UK Learning and Skills Bill 2000 (NAW 2000: annex 2), which expressed a need for study by an Expert Reference Group to recommend how best to support young people in Wales, especially the marginalized. In Wales, *p.104* a young person is defined as aged up to 25 years, which has enabled support to young people who leave care at 18 to be extended into their twenties, including contributions to expenses and accommodation.

Waterhouse highlighted the serious results of children not having a voice in care and of children and young people’s voices being ignored or sidelined in schools or the community. This evidence contributed to persuading politicians in Wales (unlike those in England) that children and young people should not be dealt with as recipients of services but instead were to be heard, and could have expectations about the delivery of a system for them. In Sen's terms, we could say they were to have *agency*.

**IV.1 A Different and Principled Youth Policy for Wales**

The Expert Group on what such a system should be was chaired by a prominent voluntary youth project worker from the Rhondda Valley, Margaret Jervis. (She exemplifies commitment: her project had begun small, with one wage paying two people to work round the clock to get disaffected young people involved.) The group report was launched by the Education and Lifelong Learning Minister, Jane Davidson, and the Health Minister, Jane Hutt, in 2001, and adopted unanimously by the Welsh Assembly.

The politicians did not decide the title *Extending Entitlement*. One of the group, Howard Williamson, an academic, is agreed to have coined the term, but he admits
that he has never read Sen, or other learned authors on the entitlement approach and capabilities. However, Williamson, like some other members of the group, did contribute on youth issues within UK and European working groups, for whom the relational rather than the distributional notion of poverty was being taken forward by operationalizing social exclusion as the framework for policy. It is no accident that Sen’s concepts and their interactive development are widely referred to within the social exclusion literature (Gaudier 1993; also Gore 1993; Rodgers et al. 1995: 8–9, ch. 3). I think it is fair to say that the overlap between those interested in youth services, and academics researching poverty and deprivation, was not very great, but there is an obvious coincidence of interests, for example in health and education, that promoted cross-fertilization through debate rather than published work.

More interesting than the Welsh group’s reading matter was the explicit principled stance they adopted. Clearly contrasting the Welsh approach from that taken by the UK government for England, Williamson argued in his weekly magazine diary for December 2003 that:

Deliberations in Wales started at a different point—not the delinquents, druggies and dropouts ... but “sorted” young adults who are well equipped for participation in the labour market and civil society. We considered their past experience. It had comprised at its heart a decent education but it was likely to have been much more than this. There had also been strong family support, away-from-home experiences, access to sport and leisure opportunities, contact with other cultures, and the availability of information services and new technologies. We maintained that young people in difficulty and causing difficulty had had little of this; it should be no surprise that they were parochial, introspective, often alienated and sometimes racist and homophobic: both troubled and troublesome. The public policy challenge, therefore, was to extend a broad “entitlement” to this range of opportunities and experiences to those who were unlikely to access them by “private” or other means. (Williamson 2007)

Within Extending Entitlement itself, the contrast with UK government policy for England is similarly explicit:
But government policies have tended to focus on only one manifestation—the offender, the homeless young person, the school refuser and so on, and that particular policy context defines the problem rather than listening to the young person to see things more in the round and address the underlying causes. Effective responses depend critically on understanding the different priorities which young people may attach to problems in their lives. Thus a drug user may well not see drug dependency as the central problem—the problem is destitution, unemployment, family rejection or lack of future prospects—for them drug or alcohol use is the solution or means of escape. So without attending to these issues intervention around drug use is unlikely to help. Changing this compartmentalised response to young people is not easy to achieve[]{2.32–2.33}

In addition, the report argues for society’s responsibility to young people (rather than the young person’s responsibility as a recipient of targeted support) and against stigmatized support to individuals:

[Where this support [by home, family, friends and school] is lacking society has a responsibility to fill the gap—if it does not it will both fail the young person and lead to much higher costs on public services later. ... Young people who need extra support should not be stigmatised—many young people from stable families encounter problems and all young people need access to challenges and opportunities beyond their home and community.

(NAW 2000: §1.5)

The differences between England and Wales—at both the theoretical and policy level—are probably overstated. Indeed, policy reports have been important bi-nationally (e.g. SEU 1999, 2000). England has already imitated Wales by appointing a Children’s Commissioner, and more convergence is likely (for example, policy on child poverty: see Balls 2007). Extending Entitlement is also well known and admired in Europe, and sits within Council of Europe guidelines. This could be because the Welsh Minister, Jane Davidson, has for several years been the UK’s political representative in Europe.
on youth issues, and advocates youth policy from a distinctly Welsh position. It could, however, be argued that the context of Wales favors different implementation: as we shall see, non-devolved issues may have some better outcomes for Wales, which supports this possibility.

(p.106) IV.2 Form versus Reality

It is useful to distinguish form and reality in any development policy. In particular, the structure of twenty-first century policy and its funding and implementation through partnerships of voluntary and statutory agencies can result in forests of documentation (strategy, plans, service-level agreements, bids for funding, targets and so on) and a related ongoing information problem. This problem, also known as muletry, involves ceaseless collection and collation of data and information for measuring professional activity, competence or outcomes, and for baselines (to assist future evaluation, quality assurance or performance measures). A tendency for micro-management, fueled by internal markets and a managerial model based on mistrust, has exacerbated these unintended consequences bi-nationally. A virtual world can be created with little real benefit, sometimes perverse incentives, and serious barriers to functionally illiterate or form-averse citizens. Drakeford (2007: 177) argues that a high-trust cooperative approach in Wales protects against this, though I am not convinced.

The excesses of over-documentation, especially from restructuring, were initially damped in Extending Entitlement by the argument that “new structures are not needed—rather a local network of quality services guided by a clear vision of how young people’s needs will be met” (NAW 2000). This argument for cementing quality was overlooked, however, and new forms were introduced, with the perverse effect of increasing access for socially included young people rather than the excluded (Haines et al. 2004).

The avoidance of such unintended consequences, and the sustaining of a focus on supporting real young people, will depend in part on practices in partnerships. Early evaluation of partnerships with a central role in delivering Extending Entitlement seems to bode well. Basically, this central role in each of the 22 local authorities falls to a Strategic Unit and a Young People's Partnership. Haines et al. (2004) found that, in
general, the Young People’s Partnerships have found the
document and later guidelines very clear, and the results
positive.

IV.3 Grounds for Guarded Optimism
I asked some politicians and advisers for specific examples of
their principled strategy in action for children and young
people, and they highlighted the incorporation of young people
into civil and school government (providing the delivery of a
system, and making sure that their views are heard and acted
on), free swimming for all children up to 16 years in the school
holidays, and the free breakfast scheme.

The last of these is held up as a good example of progressive
universalism and collective commitment (see WAG 2004). It is
voluntary in that the primary schools (p.107) have to sign up
for it—about half have done so—but it is universal in its
delivery. Breakfasts are free to all children, which sends out a
powerful anti-stigma message. The social benefits are seen as
giving all children, without stigma, a good breakfast (some
were arriving unfed and early), and new opportunities for
socializing and play.

The new forms of incorporation in schools and civil society can
usefully be understood as relating to agency (a theme in Sen’s
work which will be taken up in the next section). The Welsh
school system remains robustly state comprehensive, without
performance rankings in league tables, which Wales scrapped,
and with less testing. The rate of school exclusion is lower in
Wales—and much lower in five of the six Valleys authorities—
than in England, though it is higher than in Scotland (Kenway
et al. 2005).

Young people’s agency in schools is mainly developed through
systematic inclusion in youth councils, whose budget and
views must be considered by school governors. There are
statutory powers for students to have transitional support
from primary into secondary education. Young people are
included in the Schools Inspectorate as Peer Inspectors. To
carry out these functions young people receive skills training
in putting forward their views, and this has spin-off benefits,
especially if—and it is a big if—the most disadvantaged,
troubled or troublesome are recruited into the structure.
The agency of young people within civil society is taken forward through local area youth forums which feed into the local authority forum, and there is also a Children and Young People's Assembly for Wales online (Funky Dragon n.d.). One aim is that young people will allocate a proportion of the youth services budget. The Children's Commissioner has been actively involved, for example in the evolution of an advocacy service (Pithouse 2006; WAG 2007). These examples also implicitly relate to the protective provision of a social wage for the benefit of young people, and to social capital—a measure of collective responsibility to ensure the development of the whole child.

There are some grounds for optimism about the long-term impact of the framework and operation of the above policies, although evaluations of their reach to the disaffected or status-zero children and young people are, at best, only tentative (Haines et al. 2004: 23, 101; Lynch and Murphy 2007). The framework for developing the whole child has been put in place, and undoubtedly benefits from the abiding strength of the statutory sector, especially education, in Wales.

This section has traced the emergence of the seminal youth policy framework Extending Entitlement and shown clearly that the term entitlement bears little direct relation to Sen's definition of an individual's command over goods and services. However, Extending Entitlement does address young people's realized functioning and capabilities—what young people can do and be—and can be interpreted within Sen's theorization (Sen 1992, 1999), beginning with its solid description of the complex issues around troubled and troublesome youth.

In the following sections, I shall look further at reality; first, through the adaptation of a bi-national policy which has particularly affected deprived areas, and then through adult-youth relations in public space, of which both young people and poor people tend to be high users. Some advantages in the Wales policy context emerge, but also a gap in understanding social relations which undermines young people's capabilities.

V. Young People in South Wales: Adaptation of Bi-National Policy
Progressive universalism, as practiced by the Welsh Assembly, intends that people should be beneficiaries on the basis of living in Wales, and not on the basis of good behavior. Furthermore, the ethos of youth policy is encouragement and collective responsibility (NAW 2000: §§10.3–10.11). We might expect, then, that the treatment of troublesome or criminal behavior of young people might differ in Wales from that in England, where much of the criminal justice rhetoric has been punitive and exclusionary in character. This applies also to anti-social behavior, which has become a UK government concern, and has prompted legislation that is particularly judgemental towards youth. However, policy in this area is bi-national, and the Welsh government can influence it only indirectly. Despite this, it has been suggested that Wales has more positive outcomes with respect to youth offending.

In section V.1, I shall ask to what extent the devolved Welsh social policy context can have an impact on the results of a bi-national policy; in section V.2 I shall examine some empirical research about the social relations of adults and youth in public places when adults complain about young people's behavior.
V.1 Area Deprivation, Anti-Social Behavior and Control

The argument that something needed to be done about non-criminal but disruptive behavior emerged in part from debates about regeneration (e.g. in Hills 1998). In fact, it is possible to draw up a typology of regeneration areas, reflecting the lead agency's (or their funder's) predominant interests and perception of the primary cause of social exclusion. One such typology distinguishes between a control- or crime-reduction-led model, a welfare-led model, and a community-enterprise-led model of regeneration (Kynch et al. 1999). The leading player in control-led (p.109) regeneration was the Home Office, which oversaw a program in 20 cities and boroughs between 1988 and 1995. The central objectives were the reduction of crime and the fear of crime. In this model the creation of community safety is seen as the necessary prerequisite to the re-establishment of a sense of community, and to other forms of development.

Control-led regeneration practices drew on the notion that taking minor nuisance seriously will prevent more serious crime (Wilson and Kelling's 1982 broken windows argument). Tactics included surveillance by residents or CCTV, zero-tolerance policing, and the targeting and disruption of troublesome groups. Moreover, a tendency to focus upon perceived threats (in addition to crime itself), such as groups of young people hanging about the streets or aggressive or noisy neighbors, was argued to be the community's expressed priorities, and this was cited as the justification for the UK government focus on behavior. Indeed, this appeal to community (Crawford 1997) could become an excuse for seeing control as an end in itself.

Anti-social behavior legislation was introduced through the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, among others. Importantly, the former Act introduced Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships to all local authority areas and an obligation on authorities to consider the impact on crime and fear of crime across policy, introducing leverage even into the welfare- and enterprise-led regeneration areas. In Wales, it was argued that safety was a universal issue and addressed social insecurity, and the partnerships were renamed Community Safety Partnerships. This relabeling also reflected a resistance to the growing
tendency noted by criminologists for social problems to be reconfigured into crime problems, or the criminalization of social policy (see Simon 2007).
V.2 Is Wales more Cooperative than Coercive?

The former chair of the Youth Justice Board, Rod Morgan, observes in a lecture (Morgan 2007) that there have been two worrying trends in recent years. First, over 15 years, the number of children and young people being held in custody in England and Wales has doubled (despite an existing target to reduce the number in custody), and secondly, although crime has been falling, over the last three years there has been an increase of about 25% in the criminalization of young people (see also Allen 2006). However, Morgan holds up the treatment of young offenders in South Wales as an example that has bucked this trend, and contrasts South Wales with West Yorkshire, a similar post-industrial part of North England.

Morgan notes similarities between the areas as formerly heavily industrial mining areas with “significant social problems; poverty, unemployment. But the criminalization trend is very different in those two areas.” West Yorkshire has increased (p.110) the number of children and young people criminalized by 61% in three years; South Wales has reduced it by 3%. It is possible, he suggests, that South Wales, and the Chief Constable, take a different strategic line in partnerships on estates. He observes that Chief Constable Barbara Wilding “has made various public statements saying that she regards the use of certain tools in the antisocial behaviour toolbox as very much a last resort and an indication of failure if they have to be resorted to. ... [S]he doesn't think that arresting young people, for certain sorts of behaviour, is necessarily the most constructive way of dealing with antisocial behaviour.” Wilding has also worked closely with the Children’s Commissioner, Expert Group member Keith Towler, and has involved young people in designing diversionary activities for youth at risk (South Wales Police 2006).

More evidence that Wales is acting a little tangentially to the bi-national line can be found in the UK government’s curt response to the Welsh Affairs Committee’s endorsement of Wilding’s approach. The Committee wrote: “We agree that ASBOs [anti-social behavior orders] should be issued as a last resort and welcome the Welsh forces’ proportionate and appropriate approach to anti-social behaviour.” To which the government retorted, “We do not agree that ASBOs should be used as a last resort” (House of Commons Welsh Affairs Committee 2005 App. 1, §15). (The ASBO is a civil order based
on levels of evidence lower than in a criminal case; a breach of an ASBO is an imprisonable offence, although the behavior in question is not a crime.)

What South Wales was doing was to negotiate creatively, using warnings or contracts, with young people and parents, in schools or the community, or providing activities to gain young people's cooperation in changing behavior. Importantly, the Community Safety Partnerships often work closely with Children and Young People's Partnerships, the latter being central for delivery within the Extending Entitlement ethos.

Whether this can be sustained is another matter, for the rhetoric and media portrayal of young people as very troublesome also crosses national boundaries.

VI. Youth Annoyance: Social Relations in Public Spaces
Although I have argued that devolution may work positively for young people in Wales, an important aspect of being a young person may have been overlooked, and that is the dynamics of incidents involving adult and young people in shared public space. As Sen has argued (and as we argued in Kynch and Sen 1983), social relations are often characterized by both cooperation and conflict, and bargaining (p.111) power over who gets or does what is affected by a person's fallback if the relationship is absent or breaks down (e.g. a young person is ejected from home by parents, or not tolerated in public space). Sen's approach also emphasizes how the perception of needs and perceptions of contributions affect bargaining outcomes. Agarwal (1994: 54–60) draws out aspects of bargaining, such as the possibility and forms of resistance used by the powerless to discomfort the powerful, which are relevant here.

This section will draw on research about young people's behavior in public spaces in order to investigate adult-youth relations as cooperative conflicts. Although little attention has been paid to relations in the unstructured setting of public space as opposed to the household, public space is a good place to discover how adults and young people rub along. Indeed, public space provides social and outdoor experiences in line with a recommended entitlement—or realized functioning—in the policy framework of Extending Entitlement. However, this view might be thought a little controversial, because the Home Office's British Crime Survey
regards the presence of teenagers hanging out as an indicator of disorder, and a third of respondents in South Wales thought it problematic (Aitchison and Kynch 2004).

The concept of youth is emotive and young people have always been seen as rebellious and challenging. One issue is whether they are over- or under-controlled, over- or under-protected (Loader 1996). The media play a powerful part in constructing and sustaining negative images of children and young people as engaged in disorder and types of behavior which threaten society—a continuous moral panic (Cohen 1972; McRobbie 1994: 199). Social constructions of youth tend to divert attention away from, or misconstrue, the mundane nature of their regular activities in public spaces.

VI.1 Youth Annoyance in Swansea: Some Research Findings

In 2002, I led a collaborative team of researchers from the Welsh Assembly, a Community Safety Partnership and Children and Young People’s Strategy Unit in researching the perceptions and experiences of youth annoyance in Swansea, a non-metropolitan city of South Wales (Kynch et al. 2004). Swansea has a strong reputation for positive work with young people.

“Youth annoyance” was a local police and council term for the activities of young people in public locations and spaces which cause offense to others. It encompasses crime, disorder, anti-social behavior, incivilities and simply “hanging around”. An incident of youth annoyance involves an adult-youth relationship in which age is the defining social symbol of power, and adult perceptions are given credence.

(p.112) The Research Samples

We looked at three different viewpoints: young people (young people interviewed face to face: 113 on the street and 77 in schools), expert practitioners (31 interviews) and adult residents (924 postal responses from a representative panel).

The street sample was a broad cross-section of young people who spend time on the streets and are likely to become involved in intergenerational incidents. They were sought out and approached where they hung out (with help from detached youth workers or Youth Offending Team (YOT) staff), or in drop-in facilities. We went out on the streets in the wind, the wet and the cold, and no doubt interviewees huddling in
these weathers included vulnerable young people who felt unable to be at home, in both affluent and deprived areas. We also observed at first hand the excellent relationships of detached youth workers with young people in bleak and deprived areas.

All young people were likely to be high users of public space, with nine out of ten saying they had hung out on the streets in the previous month. Many were out on most days, for several hours a day and at all hours of the day and night, and this constant presence attracted frequent complaints. Public space, and how space is shared, mattered to them, as drop-in center staff recognized. The street sample was usually socially engaged, more so, if anything, than the school sample, being marginally more likely to play in teams or have structured activities. More of them also had some paid employment.

Types of Youth Annoyance: Criminal, Anti-Social, Disputed and Negotiable

As I noted in section V, legislation on anti-social behavior rests on what are said to be communities' shared perceptions and priorities. However, our research suggests that this gives too much weight to the minority of adults who are offended or upset by young people's mere presence, especially in groups.

What do we classify as anti-social behavior? The opinions of adults, experts and young people are summarized in Figure 6.1. We found a strong consensus on what was criminal, and on what was not criminal but justified a complaint. However, there was considerable disagreement about two other types: disputed behavior, perceived as annoying or troublesome depending on the situation or context, or property rights, and negotiable behavior, activities which were usually tolerable or sometimes even pro-social.

With regard to the examples of disputed and negotiable types of behavior, a substantial minority of adults thought them annoying, but nearly all the young people said they were all right and did not justify a complaint. The potential for conflicts was high, and we shall look later at how complaints worked out.

(p.113)
For example, skateboarding was popular in Swansea as a street activity, and figured frequently in complaints. Yet it is intrinsically quite healthy, skillful and sociable. The key difference between skateboarding incidents that were negotiated successfully, those that included resistance, and those that left the young person aggrieved, was the adult-youth relations—not the behavior.

**Perceptions of Young People's Behavior**

The perception of a person as having low value can undermine their bargaining in social relations. As already noted, teenagers are not greatly valued in public space; in fact they are officially labeled a *disorder*. The young people in our study were aware that adults perceived them as a problem, and the street sample tended to overestimate greatly how much of a problem they were perceived to be.

Some of the experts gave examples of misconstrued behavior, and a few showed awareness that young people do like to wind up authority. By establishing the facts in place of misconstrued adult opinion, or maintaining a little humor in the face of provocation, the police, YOT and Youth Service workers could make themselves available as arbitrators when incidents blew up.

**Complaints against Young People**

Asked about their experiences during the most recent complaint against them, the young people brought out the different ways in which they resolved, or failed to resolve, an incident. The great majority of complaints involved disputed or
negotiable behavior, and such incidents are the main concern here.

The young people had a strong sense of justice and showed awareness of how their age was used to manipulate them into relative powerlessness in the community. They also used active and passive resistance in order to persist with their activities and presence in public space.

(p.114) Cooperation: Compliance and Justice
A substantial group of around half the young people thought there had been a good reason for the adult to complain, and 41% claimed that they had complied with what was asked, occasionally apologizing. They appreciated explanation.

Fair complaints included when neighbors of footballers in the street were “scared in case there was a car crash, or we get run over”. A skateboarder said that when skating in the University, “security guards complained. Yes, fair—people trying to work. [We were] moved on—[but it] should be OK at weekends.”
Conflict: Resistance and Persistence

Resistance was common, and parents occasionally had to back up the young people when an adult was unreasonable, or called the police. Access to an advocate like a parent was an important part of the young person’s fallback. There was little evidence in the narratives that young people intended to stop their activities permanently. Instead they looked for another location or time—for example, skateboarders networked information about where to skate without contestation.

Resistance could deflect conflict when adults seemed to be deliberately targeting young people. The young person might hold their ground, like another skateboarder who told us he was “on a cycle path and had a board set up at the side—a cyclist deliberately knocked it down—obvious what he meant. Didn’t even slow down. Attitude really. Not very fair.” Passive resistance was also employed, for example a 16-year-old was “standing there; asked by people driving past ‘Have you smoked a spliff … this and that’. I stayed standing. Completely unfair—they drove away and said sorry to bother me.”

However, conflicts could leave the young person expressing aggrieved powerlessness. This is another skateboarder: “Just skateboarding—not my own street—on a road near my house. This woman aged about 40 complained. Not very fair: we weren’t really doing much—we left. Next time we went there she rang the police without coming out. The police booked us for skateboarding on the road. They took our names, and wrote to our parents—saying ‘they could have been doing drugs and alcohol’—but we were just skateboarding.”

Breakdown and Adult Force

Many adults may be unaware of how young people see them behaving and their role in escalation and breakdown—for example, a hanger-out on a pavement found a complaint “Not very fair—shopkeeper told me to fuck off”. Rudeness and adult force permeated breakdown as everyday experiences for some: “This old man came out: ‘stop kicking the can’. I shouted back to ‘shut up’. ” As one 11-year old put it, “adults shouldn’t go round to a person and give them the violence. [We] shout violence back at adults. Adults start it.”

(p.115) In summary, young people in Swansea, as elsewhere in the UK, often annoy adults. Conflicts in adult-youth relations in public spaces reflect adult perceptions and low
adult valuations of young people outside the home, and often
the young people exhibit forms of overt and covert resistance
to the apparently arbitrary exercise of power. It should not be
forgotten that these young people will be tomorrow's adults,
and inclusion of a capability to be present and active or
sociable in public space is encouraged by positive relations
there, and the collective responsibility for bringing these
about.

VII. Conclusions
I have argued that the history and context of post-industrial
Wales has been conducive to devolved policies dependent on
collective responsibility for the well-being of its residents, on a
universal basis, with extra support for the most disadvantaged.
Furthermore, devolution in Wales has arguably encouraged
imaginative use of social policy, even though other important
policies concerned with the economy and crime and disorder
have not been devolved.

Welsh youth policy, as encapsulated in Extending Entitlement,
captured a moment when the policy-makers made their
expectations clear, and youth researchers communicated in a
meaningful way as a contribution to a policy agenda. This
policy can be interpreted in terms of realized functionings of
young people and capabilities, with an emphasis on
cooperation and encouragement. In particular, the Welsh
Assembly has shown a commitment to deliver a system which
effectively addresses the agency of young people.

Shortcomings may lie in the availability of resources, in form
versus reality, and in under-theorization. Most importantly,
there are doubts about the extent of support to disadvantaged
young people, although socially included youth have gained.

Regeneration of deprived post-industrial areas has been
affected by a bi-national policy on crime and disorder, and the
Wales policy context appears to have resulted in more positive
outcomes for young people in terms of criminalization. I have
suggested that this could be because partnerships under bi-
national policy and devolved Welsh policy work closely
together and are affected by the ethos of Extending
Entitlement.
Although the Welsh policy looks promising, its conceptualization of adult-youth relations is weak, and is prey to the rhetoric of moral panic. I examined incidents of adults becoming annoyed by young people in public space as social relations characterized by both cooperation and conflict. This conceptualization facilitates attention to both adult and young people’s bargaining and weaknesses when relations break down, and could help policy to deliver more substantial freedom for young people to achieve their potential.

This reinterpretation of policy and support for young people in South Wales has been an opportunity to demonstrate the breadth of Amartya Sen's contribution to understanding development, and his indirect beneficial influence on social policy and its wider potential.
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Notes:
(1) In this chapter *national* refers to Wales and *bi-national* to England and Wales. “The UK” refers to all of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.