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### **Abstract**

This article examines tensions and developments in youth work following the Albemarle Report in 1960 which sought to revive the flagging youth service. It uses oral history interviews with former youth workers and club members in London and Liverpool, archival research looking at the documents of voluntary youth clubs and associations in London and Liverpool, and national policy documents to uncover ideas about the professional youth worker between 1958 and 1985. It examines three main areas of tension: between older and newer methods in youth work, between volunteers and those with a sense of themselves as professional workers, and the conflict between those in voluntary youth association management, allied professions (e.g. teaching and social work) and the youth worker. Ultimately it shows youth work was professionalising at this time but that its status remained unclear. This article aids our understanding of professionalisation, informal education, and youth in post-war Britain.
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# **Introduction**

In 1939 the Ministry of Education sent out Circular 1486 which formally brought 14 national voluntary youth organisations under the umbrella of the Youth Service to supervise the young during the war amid concerns about rising levels of delinquency.[[1]](#footnote-2) These organisations collectively provided a range of services to train, educate and entertain youth under the leadership of a mixture of full- and part-time leaders, and assisted by a vast array of volunteers. After the Second World War, thoughts turned to reconstruction and in education, the need for new schools and to implement the 1944 Education Act. This left the Youth Service in a precarious situation. Some assumed that new state welfare would supersede the need for voluntary youth organisations, yet those working in these organisations saw a continuing need to guide young people to adulthood by the provision of recreational facilities, leaving them feeling ‘caught both ways’.[[2]](#footnote-3)

While the inception of the Youth Service was concerned with rising levels of wartime delinquency, the state and voluntary organisations have long intervened to prevent and tackle youth crime.[[3]](#footnote-4) Anxiety about young people has also stemmed from and been expressed in other ways such as concern about their engagement with mass culture and involvement in subcultures and gangs.[[4]](#footnote-5) Such discourses have been shaped by class, gender and race and have been framed by the way in which young people were imbued with significance as the future of society.[[5]](#footnote-6) The work of youth clubs were just one way that social, educational and welfare workers sought to tackle anxieties about helping young people grow up in twentieth century England. The work of residential institutions, schools, probation, social work, local authorities and the police have all formed important responses to the problems of youth.[[6]](#footnote-7)

This article considers how youth work has changed in England from the late 1950s onwards, focusing on voluntary youth clubs and associations in Liverpool and South London between 1958 and 1985. It takes as its starting point, the formation of a committee to examine the Youth Service in England and Wales in 1958 under Lady (later Countess) Albemarle. Lady Albemarle had a strong background in voluntary work and public service, giving the report and its recommendations a certain weight and importance.[[7]](#footnote-8) The article ends its analysis after *The Thompson Report* (1982)*,* which in many ways failed to make much impact at a time when the Youth Service was hit by wider welfare changes and the introduction of a neoliberal agenda.[[8]](#footnote-9) In this way, it covers a crucial period in the post-war Youth Service deserving a fuller academic analysis.

In line with a longer running theme in the history of education, what follows looks at the trend of professionalisation.[[9]](#footnote-10) Sarah Mills in her work on the historical and moral geographies of youth has begun to examine how secular full-time youth leaders negotiated their role in the 1960s with her example of a Jewish Lads Brigade Club.[[10]](#footnote-11) However, what is needed is a more comprehensive examination of the changes in youth leadership since  *Albemarle Report* which consider the training and professional status of youth leaders. It is important too to examine youth work within the context of broader shifts in various welfare and education professions, and at a time when young people were the subjects of moral panics about subcultures, criminal activities and unemployment to name but a few. The international context is worth a brief mention too, for while Albemarle examined only the English and Welsh Youth Service, she did so within a wider set of concerns about juvenile delinquency in twentieth century Europe and America.[[11]](#footnote-12)

What follows explores a shift between older and emerging ideas of how society helped young people grow up in twentieth-century England and Wales and the workers who did this on behalf of the Youth Service. Voluntary Youth Clubs existed at an intersection whereby the state, church, voluntary action and private endeavour all contributed to shaping the definitions of youth work. This makes them a particularly good prism through which to view changes in youth leadership at this time. Using archival research conducted in London, Liverpool and at national level, together with oral histories, this paper explores three sets of professional tensions in post-war youth work and the discourses surrounding them.[[12]](#footnote-13) In particular interviews with former youth workers allow an exploration of the relationships between national policy, local agendas and the lived experiences of youth workers – between ‘professionalisation’ as a process of training youth workers, and arming them with contemporary expertise and the practice of youth work in the case study locations. London and Liverpool have been chosen for this due to their prominent positions in national youth work discourse since 1960, in addition to their well-preserved youth work archives, lack of which pose a particular challenge when doing research in this area.

Firstly, the article looks at how efforts to professionalise youth work existed alongside continuities in youth leadership, especially from the pre-war boys’ club movement. Secondly, it examines how the emerging sense of the professional ‘youth worker’ came up against the volunteers and part-time workers who still provided the bulk of work in youth clubs, as well as other educational and welfare professionals. Thirdly, it explores how progressive and radical youth work faced a post-Albemarle backlash. These three areas of tension link the politics and practice of youth work to show how professionalisation of youth work was hindered by the lack of a common definition of the nature and purpose of youth work. Ultimately this article charts the ways in which youth workers struggled to find a clear professional identity and status among other social and educational workers between 1958 and 1985 and therefore argues that youth work could be seen as professionalising, but not yet a profession. This article aids our understanding of the limits of professionalisation in informal education which in turn aids our understanding of expertise in education, welfare, leisure and citizenship in contemporary Britain.

### Creating the professional youth worker

Before 1958 attempts to professionalise youth work were already underway in England and Wales. Simon Bradford has looked at wartime efforts to create the leaders needed to help young people to navigate the disruption of war.[[13]](#footnote-14) In this sense, while for young people youth clubs were often somewhere to spend time, for the state and voluntary youth workers there were a set of aims for the Youth Service, which required trained and paid workers. Youth work was seen to offer answers to the fears about young people, alongside a rise in the number and variety of a range of other state and welfare professionals tackling the problems of youth.[[14]](#footnote-15)

In seeking to define the boundaries of knowledge and professional practice, discussion of the Youth Service also sought to examine how it related to allied fields. With governmental oversight coming from the Ministry of Education, it was at face value an educational service. However, it was also strongly linked to social work in terms of methods, and by often having a focus on working-class teenagers. In many ways, youth work after the 1960s continued to be a hybrid of social and educational work, with informal education, group work and case work used in varying ways, sometimes with identified groups of young people, to suit workers’ skills, local resources and local needs. This fluidity was a key characteristic of post-war non-uniformed youth work, yet one which overall contributed to its uncertain professional status, a theme that recurs in the rest of this article.

### *The Albemarle Report*

In 1958 the Ministry of Education set up a committee to look at the Youth Service after it had been left to wither after the Second World War due to a lack of investment and political attention.[[15]](#footnote-16) The committee included social researcher Pearl Jephcott who had been writing about young people since before the war, and Richard Hoggart whose 1957 book, *The Uses of Literacy* had shown concern for young people amidst emerging mass culture and who later went on to establish the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.[[16]](#footnote-17) It was named after its chair, Lady Albemarle.

When the Albemarle Report was published in 1960 it painted quite a sorry picture of the largely voluntary Youth Service. While recognising the ongoing need for such a service, the Report pointed to weaknesses which stemmed ‘from the prolonged financial stringency and consequent lack of drive’.[[17]](#footnote-18) It pointed to problems such as low political priority, an inconsistent and underdeveloped grant-making machinery, ‘haphazard’ local development, a tired method of youth work, ‘dingy drab premises’, lack of equipment, insufficient leadership, poor support and training for leadership, little co-ordination between local authorities and voluntary bodies, and a failure to reach many young people.[[18]](#footnote-19) In some ways this low priority was understandable in the context of prioritising formal education in the immediate post-war period and limited resources. However, by the time of the Report, public expenditure could now include a consideration of how young people spent time outside of school. The committee produced a two-phase development plan for the Youth Service initiated by an emergency five-year development phase and the establishment of the Youth Service Development Council to oversee further endeavours.[[19]](#footnote-20) A key recommendation was that 1,300 new full-time professional youth workers were needed, to be trained in new and fast-developing fields including; ‘adolescent psychology, problems of personal relationships, the transition from school to work, the youth employment service, adolescent physiology and health and sex education’ and specialisms such as ‘behaviour of groups and principles of group work.’[[20]](#footnote-21) In so doing they extended prior attempts to develop a theoretical, academic and methodological underpinning equipping youth workers to respond to the changing circumstances of youth. This in many ways reflected the training other educational and social workers were also receiving at this time.[[21]](#footnote-22)

The emergency training course established at the National College for the Training of Youth Leaders at Leicester immediately following the Report sought to fast track the qualification of would-be youth workers after one year of full-time study. It was designed to supplement the four existing ways of training for youth work in order to meet anticipated needs. Existing routes were; as part of teacher training, as part of training for social work, three month supplementary courses for those with ‘suitable’ existing qualifications and one to two year courses for mature students.[[22]](#footnote-23) In particular, teachers were thought to be ideally placed to give time to the Youth Service, alongside or in a break from formal teaching.

Not only did the potential pool of recruits for youth work show that it drew on both educational and social work expertise, it also indicated an assumption from some quarters that youth work might form only a small part of a wider professional career in either field. Indeed there was evidence that some assumed youth work was something someone might do only for a few years.[[23]](#footnote-24) In spite of this, the Albemarle Report discussed establishing a committee to look at salary scales and superannuation for youth workers along the lines of that for teachers, showing the inherent contradictions at the heart of the idea of the professional youth worker in the early 1960s.[[24]](#footnote-25)

It is arguable whether the impact of the Albemarle Report lived up to the lofty expectations of voluntary youth associations. The Liverpool Union of Girls’ and Mixed Clubs noted in their 1960 Annual Report that, ‘the year in review will no doubt be remembered as a most significant one in the history of the Youth Service’.[[25]](#footnote-26) It has been widely perceived as a watershed in the history of the Youth Service, not least by Bernard Davies who refers to it heavily in his account of the Youth Service. [[26]](#footnote-27) Tony Jeffs, evaluating the impact of the Report in 1979, saw its impact as largely symbolic and there is some merit to this view when its failings are considered alongside its successes.[[27]](#footnote-28) Yet, it is clear that Albemarle provided a boost to youth services, and set new standards for training youth leaders. However, in order to not over-state its impact, it is important to establish that there were strong continuities in youth work from earlier in the twentieth century.

# Continuities in Youth Leadership

Scholarship on youth organizations has established the way provision for young people was structured by gender and class, as well as the religious roots of much youth work.[[28]](#footnote-29) Religion continues to play an important role throughout this period with many youth clubs meeting in church halls under the leadership of church members, though a full examination of the role of the church in youth work is beyond the scope of this article. In a wider twentieth century historiography focussing on secularisation, this is an important continuity.[[29]](#footnote-30)

In the late 1950s and 1960s the same currents of class, gender and religion ran through the work of youth clubs in London and Liverpool, in line with the founding aims of the associations in the 1880s.[[30]](#footnote-31) Boys’ Club Associations in London and Liverpool in particular, as founding members of the Boys’ Club movement, sought to emphasise the role of discipline and calibre in youth leadership in line with longer running trends, echoing Freeman’s work on ‘Muscular Quakerism’.[[31]](#footnote-32) In 1958 the London Federation of Boys’ Clubs saw themselves as offering young people ‘the chance to share their leisure with men of high calibre.’[[32]](#footnote-33) A year later they repeated the term in an effort to recruit more leaders, this time including women in their call for staff saying they needed ‘men and women of the right calibre who will not only be able to initiate new activities but who can win the confidence and friendship of the more unstable boy.’[[33]](#footnote-34) The Liverpool Boys’ Association agreed with much of this, and by 1962 were using very similar language to their brother organization in London saying that the ‘task of recruiting sufficient people of the right calibre and temperament is becoming more difficult’.[[34]](#footnote-35) In visits to clubs in the 1960s the Liverpool Boys’ Association recorded positively ‘firm friendly’ relations between the leader and members in one club, and in correspondence with another the chair of a management committee noted approvingly to the General Secretary that ‘Mr. Robinson [leader], like myself is a keen disciplinarian. He is an ideal leader, strict yet kind and together we strive, not only to win honours, but to turn out good healthy citizens.’[[35]](#footnote-36)

The idea that youth leaders were training their young charges for citizenship is a further continuity in post-Albemarle youth work and in literature on youth movements, such as Mills’ work on post-war scouting and John Springhall’s examination of youth movements.[[36]](#footnote-37) The way youth workers articulated citizenship did change though, from early twentieth-century notions of imperial citizenship, to one which linked much more strongly with emerging notions of social citizenship. One former worker described it in exactly these terms, as ‘for them to participate in it, in a democratic society’ via dialogue and using ‘every opportunity to widen their experience, make them think’.[[37]](#footnote-38) However, the idea persisted that the role of youth leaders was to enable young people, especially those from working-class backgrounds, to develop citizenship skills, however defined, specifically outside of formal educational structures.

Alongside citizenship training, youth leaders in the 1960s and 1970s also articulated the idea of character and the character training of youth as part of the conceptual tool box of the Youth Service. This was particularly the case in boys-only clubs which continued to exist throughout this period.[[38]](#footnote-39) Sir Basil Henriques, Juvenile Court Magistrate in East London, was also President of the London Federation of Boys’ Clubs.[[39]](#footnote-40) In 1959 he prefaced their Annual Report with a reminder that ‘[T]he years between early puberty and manhood are still the most critical in the formation of a boy’s character’ and that the boys’ club was still vital in shaping adolescent boys.[[40]](#footnote-41) The idea that boys needed help to form the right character remained an important discourse in youth work. While this approach received less attention in youth clubs after 1960, it would be misguided to think of it purely as a pre-1945 phenomenon in youth leadership. The shift away from ‘character’ is similar to that described by Freeman in his article on developments in Outward Bound, an organisation providing outdoor adventure holidays for young people.[[41]](#footnote-42) In the intervening period, youth workers’ roles and identities did change and it is these changes to which this paper now turns.

# Emerging progressive and professional identities

Changes to voluntary youth services in the 1960s and 1970s challenged some of these traditional understandings of youth work. The Albemarle Report was one of the key drivers of change. It expanded the notion of expertise and specialism in youth work and promoted the idea that youth clubs should be led by full-time, paid, and fully-trained leaders. In fact, with so much emphasis on the full-time qualified leader, by 1970, responses to a follow up policy report criticised that no part-time or volunteer-led clubs were visited while drafting the new policy (despite these still forming the majority of local youth clubs in some cases).[[42]](#footnote-43)

In addition to recommendations on the training of youth workers, Albemarle advocated experimental work with young people presently outside the Youth Service - known as the ‘unattached’ - as a specialist form of youth work. [[43]](#footnote-44) Experimental youth work was undertaken between 1960 and 1985 in both London and Liverpool and demanded a different type of youth worker. It looked to target particularly vulnerable working-class youth, or use special projects (such as on anti-racist, anti-sexist and girls’ work), and grassroots or informal clubs to offer a new way of interacting with young people.[[44]](#footnote-45) This type of work was often characterised by its lack of traditional structure and formality. The ‘emphasis on informality’[[45]](#footnote-46) has been noted by former youth club attendees and workers alike in both Liverpool and South London, with one attendee saying ‘we weren’t a very structurable group of young people, is the politest you could be about it.’ [[46]](#footnote-47)

The Bronte Street Youth Centre was set up in three empty shops in a central area of Liverpool with little alternative youth provision in 1963. In the early days of planning this venture the documents record the aim to have a more informal type of club.[[47]](#footnote-48) The management committee decided that their ‘unorthodox’ approach would result in two actions.[[48]](#footnote-49) Firstly, in refurbishing the empty shops, they only commissioned basic structural and cosmetic work and the completion of a coffee bar.[[49]](#footnote-50) Secondly, the club was set to open with no formal programme and activities were to be planned based on interests indicated by the potential members.[[50]](#footnote-51) With this lack of formal structure, the management committee felt that a specific type of youth leader was required, with the skills and expertise to cope with the anticipated lack of structure. They turned to the training colleges to aid their search, initially recruiting someone with a solid academic grounding in youth work, but relatively little practical experience.[[51]](#footnote-52) They sought expertise over experience. This project has similarities to the Hoxton Café Project examined by Bradley in a recent work on ‘rational recreation’ which too stressed the informal nature of the youth work in the experimental setting and the importance of coffee bars in attracting new young members.[[52]](#footnote-53)

Similarly, detached youth work began in Liverpool inspired by the progressive and pioneering methods for youth work laid out in Mary Morse’s *The Unattached* in 1965.[[53]](#footnote-54) This book explained an experimental project undertaken by the National Association of Youth Clubs following the Albemarle Report’s call for innovative methods in youth work to reach those not currently attached to a youth organization. The hallmarks of the project were, once again, an informal way of communicating with young people, and a lack of structure, including the most traditional structure of them all - there was to be no youth club building. The workers relied on a genuine interest in young people, acknowledging young people’s ‘reluctance to abide by the formalities of club membership’ and ‘response to a sympathetic adult who is prepared to talk to them’.[[54]](#footnote-55) This is evident throughout the workers’ reports, where antisocial and criminal behaviour was discussed and discouraged, but trust was maintained by not reporting such behaviour to the police. In fact, workers often went to court with the young people they knew and arranged family visits for those who were given custodial sentences.[[55]](#footnote-56) Their sense of themselves as professional youth workers was rooted in the advanced youth work qualifications these workers had, their commitment to their local area, political views and profound sense of social justice.

The initial experiments of the 1960s faced further challenges as a new policy report published in 1969 *Youth and Community Work in the 70s* sought to further shape the professional identities of youth workers, reframing them as ‘youth and community workers’.[[56]](#footnote-57) This Report published the work of two committees, one looking at the relationship between schools and the Youth Service, the other looking at integrating youth work with community development approaches. This linked the work done as part of the Youth Service with the use of schools and community centres which the Youth Service could make greater use of. The emergency training course established by Albemarle was closed and new accredited courses established. These courses continued to promote the idea of expertise and specialist skills and the idea of developing them via reflective practice. They also stressed the bureaucratic and technocratic elements of the role of youth and community workers, as this side of the role expanded alongside the expansion of other welfare and social bureaucracy.[[57]](#footnote-58) The 1971 *Year Book of the Youth Service* listed these new courses, intakes, requirements and planned programmes.[[58]](#footnote-59) Most required a handful of O-Level passes or ‘equivalent’ experience and many had a minimum age varying from eighteen to twenty-three years old for applicants, in contrast to the A-Levels required for many undergraduate courses.[[59]](#footnote-60) The City of Leicester College’s two year, full-time course had four components: professional studies, educational studies, personal interest studies and field practice. [[60]](#footnote-61) Professional studies included principles and methods of youth and community work, management, organization, administration and methods of social investigation.[[61]](#footnote-62) Educational studies examined social and educational policy, psychology, sociology and social history, while the third module enabled trainees to develop interests and specialisms in arts, crafts, drama and physical education.[[62]](#footnote-63) Field practice involved placements and provided a space for trainee workers to reflect on their practice.[[63]](#footnote-64) Manchester Polytechnic’s two year course had similar elements - youth and community work, developmental psychology, sociology, physical education, and ‘activity skills’, though for reasons that are not clear, they added English and maths as a separate standalone module.[[64]](#footnote-65) The National Association of Boys’ Clubs course with Liverpool University Department of Extra Mural Studies similarly considered expert forms of knowledge related to youth and community work, the information and skills required to navigate the mixed economy of welfare and practical ‘applied study’, again over two years.[[65]](#footnote-66) Several conversion courses or additional modules for those with, or doing, other social science or teaching qualifications were also listed separately as being available in many education colleges and institutes – showing the intention to recruit teachers into youth work.[[66]](#footnote-67) This pushed further previous attempts to shape the professional status of workers via training requirements.

However, courses were not at degree level which meant they failed to live up to the ideal set out in 1960. Yet, in this training, the mix of the social and educational is clearly continued, and so is the intention to create a professional workforce. At this time the London Federation of Boys’ Clubs remarked in their Annual Report that ‘the professional approach is to be welcomed and encouraged’ and that youth workers are ‘trained and are properly recognised as important social workers’.[[67]](#footnote-68) In some sense formality and structure were being replaced by notions of expertise in a service which sought to place itself ever more firmly between other social and educational professionals.

It is also important to consider how changes elsewhere in formal education and welfare provision affected the potential pool of youth workers at this time. The abolition of the tripartite system, the opening of new comprehensive schools and the expansion of higher education centred around the Robbins Report in 1963 changed educational opportunities for young people, particularly women, in the 1960s and 1970s.[[68]](#footnote-69) Many of the youth workers interviewed came via the route of senior club membership and were marked out for mentoring and youth leadership. Several remained in the area, and indeed two in the same club, where they had spent their time as adolescents.[[69]](#footnote-70) Indeed it is also worth noting that three interviewees found youth work via, or later moved into formal teaching.[[70]](#footnote-71) There were new avenues for working class youth and community workers to gain expertise in working with their own communities, often alongside other forms of community activism. Relevant here is that educational opportunities expanded for both men and women, offering women more routes into a role that had long been male dominated.

Oral histories of youth workers who had this training and went on to work in South London and Liverpool at this time reveal strong links to trade unions, the New Left, other forms of activism and a grounding in social theory received in new training.[[71]](#footnote-72) They saw young people as, to some extent, products of their circumstances. Raised in the new welfare state, from which many had benefited socially and educationally, with increased understanding of social welfare and inequality, they felt young people had been excluded by the state and polity. Responses to this varied, with some harnessing their activism on behalf of young people, and others hoping to use critical dialogue to get young people to organize themselves. Youth workers in Lewisham and Liverpool working with black and unemployed young people were particularly prominent in this regard. In response to talking about older methods in youth work, discussed previously, one worker in Lewisham said:

I know of no educational or developmental approach that is predicated on getting the best out of people by making them feel shit…solidarity and collectivity were the only way you would get anything [out of young people]. [[72]](#footnote-73)

For this worker the essence of youth work was to ‘help young people to work out what they think about the world and what they want to do about it’ rather than any sense of winning honours or maintaining high standards of discipline.[[73]](#footnote-74) His professional identity was rooted in his training, community activism, left-wing politics and a genuine wish to give young people in Lewisham a voice. His use of words like ‘solidarity’ connected his trade union and youth work, seeing them both as expressions of his political activism.

Another worker interviewed was a former member of the club he now led. He linked the older style of boys’ club leadership to the military backgrounds of some former leaders. He said ‘some people respond to the sergeant-major-ish type person. I think that’s good’ but that his approach was about building ‘trust with young people’, being ‘non-judgemental’ and having a ‘sense of being *with* young people [original emphasis]’.[[74]](#footnote-75) His comment evokes the stereotype of the boys’ club leader and seeks to distance his professional identity as a youth worker from this older image. Interestingly his opinion emphasises the value of what gets a response out of young people rather than supporting any single ideological standpoint on the fundamentals of youth work. It shows that training enabled a more adaptable and progressive style of youth work which was more centred on the demands of young members, and contrasts this with the stereotype of the ex-army boys’ club leader set on maintaining strict order.[[75]](#footnote-76)

 There were key changes in youth workers professional identities after the Albemarle Report and linked to wider changes in the structure of the mixed economies of welfare and education. There were new routes into youth work for working class, female and later, black and Asian youth workers and opportunities for people to build a career working with young people in their local communities. New training helped youth workers to develop new methods in working with young people that continued to mix group work, case work and informal education in a way which further highlighted that youth work was an unclear mix of educational and social work. These drives to experiment saw youth work take on an increasingly progressive, or perhaps in the terminology of the time, ‘permissive’, flavour. Training and practice also emphasised the managerial and bureaucratic elements of youth work, something considered important to Perkin in professionalisation[[76]](#footnote-77) However, uncertainties remained which undermined the emergence of a fully professionalised Youth Service, such as the failure to obtain degree-level status for training and the lack of a clear career path for the trained youth worker. Important to consider as part of this picture too, is the continued reliance of the largely non-statutory Youth Service on part-time untrained and voluntary workers.

### The professional status of youth workers among volunteers and other professionals

As new training was offered to full-time leaders, efforts to raise the standard of leadership extended to other adults in the youth club. In March 1961 the Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs advertised a Youth Service Training Centre refresher course called ‘The Club Programme – New Angles’ which covered ‘Traditional Patterns, comparative values, and new features for club programmes’ over three afternoons.[[77]](#footnote-78) Courses were aimed at helpers too, and were not free, although management committees may have subsidised the costs of attendance. For 2/6d., voluntary helpers could attend an introductory course over four evenings covering ‘The Youth Club Movement, the Youth Club Method, Finding Your Feet and a Visit to a Club’.[[78]](#footnote-79) Annual Reports from the youth associations frequently record the numbers attending and passing primary leadership courses which ran internally in preparation for taking on more responsibility within member clubs.[[79]](#footnote-80) The efforts made by youth associations to offer training to part-time workers and volunteers shows another facet to wider attempts to professionalise youth work and this fits in with wider developments in volunteering.[[80]](#footnote-81) This created a complex mix of personal and professional identities, but did provide an important bridge for the senior member, volunteer, or part-time worker which allowed some to move to professional training while enabling others to feel more equipped for their voluntary or part-time roles. These courses show that it would be misleading to think of professionalism solely in terms of full-time workers, though this assumption prevailed at the time.

Even in full-time led clubs, part-time workers and volunteers were vital. Some were in training themselves, provided instruction in specific activities, or senior members employed or volunteering on a sessional basis. These workers were a vital part of provision and turned the full-time worker into a manager of staff and volunteers as well as a youth worker and building manager. Yet the status of part-time and voluntary workers in full-time clubs, was a matter of debate. This can be seen, in part, as one of the ways that fully trained workers sought to protect their hard-won professional positions, but it devalued the contributions of other adults in the youth club. Former worker Tony said:

I always say professional youth worker now. Because anyone who does any work with young people is seen as a youth worker, whether it is one night a week or two nights a week doing a bit of activity. I’ve got nothing against that. I emphasise that they are add-ons. It’s not youth work, professional youth work.[[81]](#footnote-82)

This articulates the differences between trained workers perceptions of what they did and the more functional role of the volunteer or sessional worker. Michael remarked that when he was volunteering in a club during his training he never had a conversation with the full-time youth worker.[[82]](#footnote-83) He said volunteers and part-time paid workers were hard to tell apart, in this case indicating that it was the full-time youth worker who had a different status within the club, showing that perhaps he saw himself in a managerial role.[[83]](#footnote-84) Some of this affected his own work where he stressed the ‘planned interactions’ he had with young people over volunteers or part-time staff running activities, echoing Tony.[[84]](#footnote-85) However, he pressed for his part-time staff and volunteers to undertake training and expected them to be reliable and to understand the job in a way that suggests he wanted them to be as professional as possible.[[85]](#footnote-86) This is another example of the kinds of tensions that emerged during a period of professionalisation in a service that was still dependent on volunteers.

In a similar way, youth workers sometimes found themselves with an uncertain status among other social and educational professionals. Teachers and headteachers sometimes showed a sceptical attitude to youth workers and reluctance to work with the Youth Service on issues, such as in Liverpool on truancy where one local school simply denied that there was a problem for the youth workers to help with.[[86]](#footnote-87) While *Youth and Community Work in the 70s* heavily promoted the idea of extending the use of schools to the Youth Service and the building of new ‘youth wings’ on school premises, this met with mixed success. In Liverpool in the 1970s one of the detached youth workers felt there was a ‘clash between formal teaching and youth work’ and that ‘teachers were very conservative with a small ‘c’’.[[87]](#footnote-88)

Yet, this sense that whatever a youth worker was, they were not part of formal education or welfare provision sometimes conferred an advantage. Former teacher turned detached youth worker Katherine recalled visiting a man in Liverpool with seven children whose wife had left him. He was scared that if he let the social workers into his house the children would be taken away from him. She said ‘a lot of people would invite me into their house but wouldn’t invite a social worker. They were fearful of social workers…of authorities really, with due cause sometimes.’ [[88]](#footnote-89) Katherine was able to arrange to take two of the children away for a few days. She felt that her role as a youth worker meant she was accepted by the community in a way in which a social worker would not have been. While youth workers sometimes sat uneasily with their lack of clear professional identity alongside other education or welfare workers, they could exploit this ambiguity to gain the trust of the families and young people they worked with. The same could also apply to how they managed the relationship between young people and the police at times, such as above, when they refused to report criminal activity. Yet, even among their management and fellow workers, the expert role of the worker continued to come under scrutiny throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s.

# Contested identities and radical youth work

As described in the founding of the Bronte Street Youth Centre above, it took a certain kind of professional worker to take on the experimental work demanded by the Albemarle Report. What is described below could be seen as a backlash against these workers. Experimental youth work was seen as novel and against the grain of traditional youth work. Indeed experiments aimed to tackle normative methods which were failing to attract those who might be most in need of the Youth Service and because Albemarle had perceived that there was ‘less willingness than we should have hoped to break new ground’.[[89]](#footnote-90) Reactions to innovative techniques from some youth voluntary association managers and executive committee members illuminated that not everybody thought that youth work methods needed a radical overhaul in the 1960s and 1970s. Interestingly, concerns were most often voiced by those from a background in Boys’ Clubs, perhaps still the most traditional youth club setting of them all. The Liverpool Boy’s Association said in their 1966 Annual Report:

The fashion today in any work with young people, is to re-examine, re-state and re-title, with the object of holding and more important, attracting new entrants. This inwards and outward looking practice, classed as progress, but perhaps more aptly in the language of the day described as being ‘with it’, whilst commendable in many ways, does involve much theorising and speculation.[[90]](#footnote-91)

This very public statement draws attention to the reservations the Association had about progressive youth work at the time, seeing it as little more than a fad. Similarly, in 1969, the Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs commented rather negatively on their perception of detached youth work (in a letter to the committee being asked to further support it), saying ‘[O]n the one hand, the number of young people with whom contact is made and who benefit (original emphasis) is extremely small. Also the ‘detached workers’ are apt to be rather curious types who seem to spend much of their time pub-crawling’.[[91]](#footnote-92) Comments such as these show the scepticism from the older traditions of youth work about some of the post-Albemarle trends, and a feeling that good old-fashioned club work was being maligned. A detached worker who encountered this criticism responded by saying:

There were a few older youth workers, male, who thought as detached youth workers we were taking them [*young people*] into the pubs, getting drunk with them…a real antithesis towards it…I had to fight, in that sense, for detached youth work…there was resistance to its development particularly from the male, older, I’d call them boys’ club even if they weren’t boys’ club, they had a sort of mentality…I think they thought I was a bad influence.[[92]](#footnote-93)

Katherine’s quote suggests a gendered element to her experience, reflecting her feminist activism at the time, and the way in which she felt that patriarchal influences sought to marginalise her viewpoint. This is something Spence also points to in her examination of feminist youth work at this time.[[93]](#footnote-94) The feeling that detached work was viewed with scepticism is evident in records Katherine and her co-worker wrote at the time. In 1977, the report of their conference stated:

There was also some difference apparent in those who still worked in face to face situations with young people and those whose roles were of a more policy-making or administrative ilk. The planners and the doers need to educate each other much more about what they are about.[[94]](#footnote-95)

She felt that she constantly had to justify her work in a way that club-based workers did not and that she wrote ‘more reports than any youth club worker,’ a sentiment reflected in the fact that so many of this projects’ reports have survived in the archives.[[95]](#footnote-96) She says she was ‘always swimming upstream’ and was not even welcome in the local youth club.[[96]](#footnote-97) This antagonism suggests just how experimental this work continued to be, even as detached youth work gained ground as a specialism.

This resistance to experimentation by the trained worker was also found in London nearly 15 years after the Albemarle Report.[[97]](#footnote-98) In 1974, the London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report noted the wider financial pressures on youth work, and added:

Alongside these pressures are those from the enthusiastic experimentalists who are happy to put at risk or reject worthwhile work, often in over-publicised or ill-judged attempts to reach the many unattached young people. Youth Service, like many other areas of Social and Educational work is suffering from a surfeit of experts, consultants and observers and a dearth of men and women who will get on with the job. [[98]](#footnote-99)

In this quote they take an actively anti-professional stance, strongly criticising the standpoint of those seeking to push the boundaries of youth work. For the London Federation of Boys’ Clubs, innovations since 1960 had detracted from the use of and proper emphasis on established methods in an attempt to attract new teenagers to the Youth Service. In this scenario, the role of the expert had been to prevent youth leaders from working effectively with those already in (presumably their own) well-run clubs. Yet, they show that even where they disagreed with the methods of youth work, they too position it between formal educational and social work roles.

Their criticism continued to reveal a feeling of general frustration and an understanding of good youth leadership as focussed on management, administration and having an appropriate activity programme. They commented that there was:

[n]o room for the evident sloppiness in simple administrative and managerial skills which befront and frustrate voluntary management. Nor the generally poor level of relationships, behaviour, programming and organisation …in some situations.[[99]](#footnote-100)

This conflicted with their idea of ‘the job’ which was grounded in their belief that traditional approaches, as outlined earlier, were still valuable to the boy of 1974. By 1981, when resources for experimental work were becoming scarcer due to welfare reform, they remark that ‘there has been a gradual and marked reversal back to the essentials of good club-work, where challenging leadership, discipline, self-respect and a sense of responsibility are being upheld’.[[100]](#footnote-101) Such statements demonstrated that continuities with pre-war and wartime youth work existed into the 1980s, and that a discourse emphasising the personal qualities of leaders was still embedded in the Youth Service. No matter what the level of qualifications were, or the types of expert knowledge that workers had access to, there was still a perception that there were an innate and unteachable set of qualities possessed by the ideal youth leader. Tensions about the role, status and professional identity of the youth worker were left unresolved, in some cases, persisting to this day.[[101]](#footnote-102)

# Conclusions

This paper has charted three ways in which the professional identities of youth workers were contested between 1958 and 1985. Firstly, the traditions of boys’ club leadership came up against progressive youth workers armed with a new sense of their status and training. The trend towards mixing was important in bringing these tensions into youth associations but there were also continuities in how boys’ clubs personnel had a sense of exceptionalism and purpose.[[102]](#footnote-103) Secondly, these new workers, emboldened by the sense that they were in the vanguard of youth work, sometimes side-lined the volunteers and sessional workers who still provided the bulk of voluntary youth services and were in turn side-lined by other welfare professionals. Thirdly, progressive youth workers, galvanised by the experience of doing experimental work were aligned with radical social and youth work, the new left and new social movements. These workers found themselves up against the higher echelons of management in associations, some of whom had cut their teeth in the boys’ club movement who thought that continuity in youth work was important, and radicalism, dangerous. This resulted in a backlash which saw competing ideals of the trained youth worker at odds into the 1980s. The Youth Service at this time was professionalising, but in comparison with other educational and welfare workers, youth workers struggled to claim professional parity. They also occupied an uncertain space on the spectrum of social and educational work which contributed to their flexibility but sometimes meant an uneasy relationship with other workers.

Examining the youth service at this time helps historians to nuance arguments such as those identified by Perkin and Hilton et al of a widespread advance of expertise and professionalisation in state and voluntary welfare in the 1960s.[[103]](#footnote-104) It helps us to understand the ways in which youth clubs serve as focal point around which to examine wider twentieth century changes in welfare, politics, youth, voluntarism and religion. Much more research is needed, particularly on the way in which gender, race, religion and activism were expressed through youth work and by young people in youth clubs.

By the 1980s, newer ideas about professionalisation had crossed currents with a more traditional Youth Service reliant on older traditions and volunteerism to create contested but coexisting ideas of leadership. By 1985 newer, more existential conflicts challenged the Youth Service as funding and the role of the service came under the remit of a new Tory government - a further shift requiring historians’ attention. This was facilitated by the way in which the idea of the ‘youth worker’ was open to a wide and diverse interpretation within the more fluid setting of the youth club. This was especially the case when clubs are compared to organizations like the Scouts with a uniform, handbook and promise giving them a more fixed sense of identity and purpose. A simultaneous strength and weakness of youth work was its flexibility. It could shape itself to local needs and the ideals of its leaders, but this left a lack of clarity about the nature and purpose of youth work.[[104]](#footnote-105) Despite the tensions highlighted by attempts to further professionalise youth work after 1960, those in voluntary youth clubs and projects were all, in some ways, Lady Albemarle’s youth workers, spurred on by her call to reinvigorate the Youth Service, united in the aim to help post-1960 youth navigate their way to adulthood, and seeking to make it more than a ‘hastily applied medicament’ for the needs of post-war youth.[[105]](#footnote-106)

## Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Kate Bradley, Georgina Brewis and Mark Freeman for providing feedback on an earlier version of this article. Material in this paper was presented to the 25th Anniversary Conference of the Voluntary Action History Society (VAHS) and to the International Centre for Historical Research in Education (ICHRE) IHR seminar. I am grateful to the attendees of both for their thoughtful feedback. This paper built on my ESRC funded PhD which was completed at the University of Kent in 2016. I am thankful for the support of my supervisors and funders which enabled the early research for this article. I am also most grateful to the individuals who gave me their time and testimony in the form of oral history interviews.

## Notes on Contributor

Charlotte Clements completed her PhD in the School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research, University of Kent, in 2016. She is now Lecturer in History and Course Director for the BA (Hons) in History at London South Bank University.

1. Bernard Davies, *A History of the Youth Service in England* (Leicester: NAYC, 1999), 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. London Metropolitan Archive (LMA), LMA/4232/D/01/001/12, London Union of Mixed Clubs and Girls’ Clubs Annual Report 1959-60, 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Heather Ellis ed., *Juvenile Delinquency and the limits of Western Influence, 1850-2000,*  (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Melanie Tebbutt, *Making Youth – A History of Youth in Modern Britain* (London: Palgrave, 2016), ch. 2 and Pamela Cox, *Bad Girls in Britain – Gender Justice and Welfare 1900-1950* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Richard Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957); Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson (eds), *Resistance through Rituals – Youth Subcultures in post-war Britain*, 2nd ed*.,* (London: Routledge, 2006), Geoffrey Pearson, *Hooligan – A History of Respectable Fears* (London: Macmillan, 1983). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Laura King, ‘Future Citizens: Cultural and Political Conceptions of Children in Britain, 1930s-1950s’ *Twentieth Century British History*, 27, No. 3 (2016): 389-411. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Melanie Tebbutt, *Making Youth,* ch 2 and Cox, *Bad Girls,* Louise Jackson, ‘The ‘Coffee Club Menace’: Policing Youth, Leisure and Sexuality in post-war Manchester*, Cultural and Social History* 5, no. 3 (2008): 289–308; Kate Bradley, Juvenile Delinquency, the Juvenile Courts and the Settlement Movement 1908-1950: Basil Henriques and Toynbee Hall’, *Twentieth Century British History* 19, no.2 (2008): 133-155. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. See for example her obituary in *The Times* July 15, 2013 (paywalled) available at: <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/diana-countess-of-albemarle-z03mm5mwjxb> [accessed 26th October 2018]. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. DES, *Experience and Participation (Thompson Report),* London, HMSO, 1982. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. See for example Peter Cunningham and Philip Gardner, *Becoming Teachers – Texts and* Testimonies (London: Woburn Press, 2004; Keith Williams, ‘Re-shaping Teacher Identity – The Liverpool Teachers’ Centre 1973-76’, *History of Education*, no. 43 (2014); on the wider trend see Harold Perkin, *The Third Revolution: Professional Elites in the Modern World* (London: Routledge, 1996). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Sarah Mills, ‘‘Geographies of youth work, volunteering and employment: the Jewish Lads’ Brigade and Club in post-war Manchester’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 40, no. 4 (2015): 523–535. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. For a wider context on this see Heather Ellis *Juvenile Delinquency and the limits of Western Influence, 1850-2000*  (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). Kate Bradley demonstrates the international influence of ideas from the Chicago school to British Settlement work in ‘‘Growing up with a City’: Exploring Settlement Youth Work in London and Chicago, c. 1880-1940’, *The London Journal* 34, No. (2009), 285-298. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. To maintain confidentiality all interviewees have been assigned a first name pseudonym which will be used throughout the article. Permission to use all quotes has been obtained from interviewees. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Simon Bradford, ‘The ‘Good Youth Leader’: Constructions of Professionalism in English Youth Work, 1939-45’, *Ethics and Social Welfare* 1, no. 3 (2007): 293-309 and, ‘Practices, policies and professionals: emerging discourses of expertise in English Youth Work, 1939-1951’, *Youth and Policy* 97/98 (2007): 13-28. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. On welfare professionals around children see Harry Hendrick, *Child Welfare: Historical Dimensions, Contemporary Debate* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2003) and *Child Welfare and Social Policy: an essential reader* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2005). On changes in social work see David Burnham, *The Social Worker Speaks* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Ministry of Education, *Report of the Committee Appointed by the Minister of Education on The Youth Service in England and Wales (hereafter Albemarle Report)*, Cmnd. 929, (London: HMSO, 1960). Note that this framework applied only in England and Wales. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Pearl Jephcott, *Girls Growing Up* (London: Faber and Faber, 1942); C*lubs for Girls: Notes for new helpers at clubs* (London: Faber and Faber, 1943)*; Rising Twenty. Notes on ordinary girls* (London: Faber and Faber, 1948)*; Some Young People* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1954); *Time of One’s Own – Leisure and Young People* (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1967); Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy.* [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. *Albemarle Report*, 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. *Albemarle Report*,11-12. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. *Albemarle Report*, 108. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. *Albemarle Report*, 75. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. This training had similarities to developments in the training of social workers and probation officers, Brian Sheldon, ‘Theory and Practice in Social Work: A Re-examination of a Tenuous Relationship’, *British Journal of Social Work* 8, no. 1 (1978): 1-22; Rosaline S. Barbour, ‘Social Work Education: Tackling the Theory-Practice Dilemma’, *British Journal of Social Work* 14, no. 1 (1984): 557-578; Robert J Harris, ‘The Probation Officer as Social Worker’, *British Journal of Social Work* 7, no.4 (1977): 433-442. See also David Burnham, *The Social Worker Speaks.* [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. *Albemarle Report*, 109. It was also possible to be considered qualified by having five years’ experience as a full-time club leader. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. *Albemarle Report*, 70-84. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. *Albemarle Report*, 110. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Liverpool Record Office (LRO), M367/MYA/G/3/40, Liverpool Union of Girls’ and Mixed Clubs Annual Report 1959-60, 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Davies, *A History of the Youth Service.* [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Tony Jeffs, *Young People and the Youth Service* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Tammy Proctor, “*On My Honour”: Guides and Scouts in Interwar Britain* (Philadelphia: APS, 2002); Tammy Proctor and Nelson Block (eds), *Scouting Frontiers: Youth and the Scout Movement’s First Century* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009); Sarah Mills, ‘Geographies of youth work, volunteering and employment’; ‘‘An instruction in good citizenship’: scouting and the historical geographies of citizenship education,’ *Transactions of the British Institute of Geographers* 38, no. 1 (2013): 120-134; ‘Scouting for Girls? Gender and the Scout Movement in Britain’, *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 18, no. 4 (2011): 537-556; Melanie Tebbutt, *Being Boys - Youth, Leisure and Identity in the Inter-war years,* (Manchester: MUP, 2012); Kate Bradley, ‘Rational Recreation in the Age of Affluence’ in Rappaport, Erika, Trudgen Dawson, Sandra and Crowley, Mark J. (eds), *Consuming Behaviours: Identity, Politics and pleasure in Twentieth Century Britain,* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); Bradley, ‘‘Growing up with a City’; *Poverty, Philanthropy and the State: the University Settlements and the Urban Working Classes, 1918 – 1979,*(Manchester: MUP, 2009). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. See for example Callum Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800-2000,* (London: Routledge, 2001) and Hugh McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s* (Oxford: OUP, 2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Terry Powley, *Getting on with it: the History of London Youth,* (London: London Youth, 2014), 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Mark Freeman ‘Muscular Quakerism? The Society of Friends and Youth Organisations in Britain, c.1900-1950’, *English Historical Review*  CXXV, No. 514 (2010), 642-669. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. London Metropolitan Archive (LMA), LMA/4283/A/2/4, London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report 1957-58, 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. LMA, LMA/4283/A/2/4, London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report 1958-59, 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. LRO, M367/MYA/B/6/1-6/12, Liverpool Boys’ Association Annual Report 1961-62, 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. LRO, M367/MYA/B/9/1, Report of a Club Visit to Belle Vale Boys’ Club, 20th May 1960, letter to General Secretary of Liverpool Boys’ Association from the Chair of Richmond Boys’ Club Management Committee, 29th September 1966. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Mills, ‘‘An Instruction in Good Citizenship’, John Springhall, *Youth Empire and Society* (London: Croom Helm, 1977). [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. Interview with Katherine (former youth worker in Liverpool), Liverpool: September 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. While Marcus Collins has described a trend toward mixed clubs in the interwar period in chapter three of *Modern Love* (London: Atlantic Books, 2003), there remained demand for boys-only clubs after the war. The London Federation of Boys’ Club looked after 150-200 boys’ clubs throughout this period. See Charlotte Clements, ‘Youth Cultures in the Mixed Economy of Welfare: Youth Clubs and Youth Voluntary Associations in London and Liverpool 1958-1985’*,* PhD thesis, University of Kent (2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. See Bradley, ‘Juvenile Delinquency’ for more on Basil Henriques. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. LMA, LMA/4283/A/2/4, London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report 1958-59, 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. Mark Freeman, ‘From ‘character-training’ to ‘personal growth’: the early history of Outward Bound 1941-1965’, *History of Education* 40, no.1 (2011): 21-43. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. For example in Liverpool, LRO, M367 MYA/M/7/2, 'Last but not least - essentials for a creative Community Youth Service in Liverpool', September 1973, p. 5 states that 34 out of 44 full-time clubs were managed by voluntary agencies. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. *Albemarle Report,* 108-113. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. Clements, ‘Youth Cultures in the Mixed Economy of Welfare’, ch 4-6. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. Interview with Michael (former youth worker in South London and Liverpool), September 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. Interview with Dennis (youth worker in South London, South London), September 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. LRO, M367/MYA/B/10/4/1, Minutes of the Meeting of the Policy Groups from the Liverpool Boys’ Association and the Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs, 15th February 1962, states the leader is to have ‘freedom to see what develops’ without a ‘set pattern’. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. LRO, M367/MYA/B/10/4/1, letter to the Liverpool University Guild of Undergraduates asking for a donation, 5th March 1962. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. LRO, M367/MYA/B/10/4/1, Minutes of the Meeting of the Policy Groups from the Liverpool Boys’ Association and the Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs, 15th February 1962. On coffee and milk bars see Louise Jackson, ‘The ‘Coffee Club Menace’; Joe Moran, ‘Milk Bars, Starbucks and the Uses of Literacy’, *Cultural Studies* 20 (2006), 552-573. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. LRO, M367/MYA/B/10/4/1, Minutes of the Meeting of the Policy Groups from the Liverpool Boys’ Association and the Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs, 15th February 1962. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. LRO, M367/MYA/B/10/4/1, Minutes of the Meeting of the Policy Groups from the Liverpool Boys’ Association and the Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs, 15th February 1962 and Warden’s Report 9th October 1963 outlining contained plans for club opening and describes equipment for early activities ‘bought at the request of those potential members’ contacted. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
52. Kate Bradley, ‘Rational Recreation’. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. Mary Morse, *The Unattached* (Leicester: National Association of Youth Clubs, 1965); LRO, M367 MYA/M/6/1/1, Memo titled ‘The Unattached’ to the Liverpool Youth Organisations Committee dated 31st May 1965 from The Great George Youth Welfare Association (central Liverpool), directly recommended the appointment of ‘street workers such as those used in the research project recorded in the book “The Unattached” by Mary Morse. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. LRO, M367 MYA/M/6/1/1, Memo titled ‘The Unattached’ to the Liverpool Youth Organisations Committee dated 31st May 1965. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. For example, LRO, M367/MYA/M/6/1/2, September 1979 Workers Report notes ‘three days spent at Birkenhead Crown Court. Two young men I know were accused of GBH…they were both given a three year jail sentence. What a waste.’ [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
56. Ministry of Education, *Youth and Community Work in the 70s* (London: HMSO, 1969). [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
57. Burnham, *The Social Worker Speaks,* Perkin, *The Third Revolution.* [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. *Year Book of the Youth Service in England and Wales 1970/71* (Leicester: National Association of Youth Clubs, 1971). [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
59. *Year Book 1970/71,* 625-632. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
60. *Year Book 1970/71*, 625. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
61. *Year Book 1970/71,* 625. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
62. *Year Book 1970/71,* 625-626. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
63. *Year Book 1970/71,* 625-626. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
64. *Year Book 1970/71,* 627. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
65. *Year Book 1970/71,* 628-629. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
66. *Year Book 1970/71,* 632-668. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
67. LMA, LMA/4283/A/2/7, London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report 1970-71, 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
68. Carol Dyhouse, *Students – A Gendered History* (London: Routledge, 2006), ch. 4-5. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
69. Interview with Steve (youth worker in South London), London: July 2014 and Lee (former youth worker in South London), London: September 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
70. Interviews with Michael, Katherine and Wendy (teacher, former youth club member and volunteer in South London), London: July 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
71. Interview with Dennis (who was involved with the Youth and Community Workers Union, local anti-cuts and anti-racist activism); interview with Katherine (a worker from Liverpool with links to trade union and feminist activism). Dennis and Lee both specifically mention theory and emerging literature on subcultures such as Dick Hebdige, *Subculture – The Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen & Co., 1979 Hall and Jefferson eds, *Resistance through Rituals.* [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
72. Interview with Dennis. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
73. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
74. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
75. This can be seen as allied with approaches emerging in teaching too, for example those encouraged by Alec Clegg in the West Riding of Yorkshire. See Alec Clegg, *A Revolution in British Primary Schools* (Washington, 1971). [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
76. Harold Perkin, *The Third Revolution*, xi-xv. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
77. LRO, M367/MYA/G/4/15, Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs Circular Letters, March 1961. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
78. LRO, M367/MYA/G/4/15, Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs Circular Letters, March 1961 . [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
79. See for example M367 MYA/M/4/1-22, Liverpool Union of Youth Clubs Annual Reports 1958-1969. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
80. For example the Aves Report in 1969. See Hilton et al, *The Politics of Expertise,* 32; Geraldine Aves, *The Voluntary Worker in the Social Services: Report of a Committee Jointly Set up by the National Council of Social Service and the National Institute of Social Work Training* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1969); Georgina Brewis, *A Social History of Student Volunteering: Britain and Beyond 1880-1980* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 163-4. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
81. Interview with Tony (former youth club member and youth worker in Liverpool), Liverpool: September 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
82. Interview with Michael. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
83. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
84. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
85. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
86. LRO, M367/MYA/M/6/1/4-6/6, Merseyside Youth Association Report on ‘Contact’ Detached Youth Work Team, April 1972-March 1975, 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
87. Interview with Katherine. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
88. Interview with Katherine. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
89. *Albemarle Report,* 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
90. LRO, M367/MYA/B/6/1-6/12, Liverpool Boys’ Association Annual Report 1965-66, 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
91. LRO, M367/MYA/M/6/1/6, Letter from Donald Crawford to the Merseyside Youth Association Honorary Officers about the next phase of the detached youth work project, 17th July 1969; this comment was echoed by the detached youth workers, LRO, M367/MYA/M/6/1/5, Detached Youth Work Report, 27th November 1971. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
92. Interview with Katherine. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
93. Jean Spence in Tony Jeffs, Ruth Gilchrist, Jean Spence, Naomi Stanton, Aylssa Cowell, Joyce Walker and Tom Wylie eds., *Reappraisals: Essays in the history of youth and community work* (Dorset: Russell House Publishing, 2013). [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
94. LRO, M367/MYA/M/6/1/4, Report of the Detached Youth Work “SHARE” conference, March 1977, part 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
95. Interview with Katherine. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
96. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
97. *Albemarle Report*, 11-12. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
98. LMA, LMA/4283/A/2/8, London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report 1973-74, 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
99. LMA, LMA/4283/A/2/8, London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report 1973-74, 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
100. LMA, LMA/4283/A/2/8, London Federation of Boys’ Clubs Annual Report 1980-81, 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
101. Bradford, ‘Practices, policies and professionals’, 24. [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
102. Collins, *Modern Love*, ch. 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
103. Perkin, *The Third Revolution,* Hilton et al, *The Politics of Expertise.* [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
104. Bradford, ‘Practices, Policies and Professionals’, 23. [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
105. *Albemarle Report,* 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-106)