Goldsmiths
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Battle Front: An Estate Based Analysis of the Impact of Professionalism on the Ability to Provide Localised Neighbourhood Based Social Controls.

James Gregory Alexander

Goldsmiths College, University of London

Declaration

Declaration of Authorship I James Gregory Alexander hereby declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is entirely my own. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is always clearly stated.

Signed: _███████████████__ Date: 13 /07/18

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to everyone who has helped me through the past 6 years.

Firstly, I would like to thank all the people who have taken part in the project, who for anonymity sake cannot be named. There were so many people on the estate whom I owe so much to, not just in helping this project, but in life generally, providing advice, meals, fun and most importantly friendship.

It would be a miss not to thank Mum, Brian, Claire, Amy, and Katie; it has been so comforting to know you have been there for me, listening to my ideas and offering their support, wherever possible.

Again, I would like to express my appreciation to Dad and Hillary who have provided my needed advice when called upon.

This thesis would not have been finished without Dr. Brian Alleyne who has guided me through the process from start to finish, helping to bring clarity, focus and a critical eye on my work, which without I may never have finished.

I would like to show my undying gratitude to Renee, DeAndre, and Mone who always seem to give me the space to finish my thesis and the much needed distractions and happiness to keep me going. Lastly, I would like to thank Renee once again for giving me the perfect motivation to finish soon so I can hold our little Sapphire without having to type as well.

Abstract

This thesis is the culmination of nearly four years' worth of ethnographic research on a south London housing estate which discusses a complex battle for control on many fronts. The estate has always had a chequered reputation. Squatting, petty crime and anti social behaviour meant that during the 80 and early 90s it was on the council's hard to let list. Accounts from the estate suggest that historically a network of committed residents had led action to keep the deviant side of the estate under control. However, over time, local commitment waned, resident friendship networks shrank and the criminal behaviour started to become more serious.

Some more recent high profile violent incidents involving young people meant the council looked to provide added support in the form of commissioning professional services to address the perceived increase in serious youth crime. Unfortunately, these interventions largely disempowered residents, who saw the embers of their relational ways of working criticised and ignored. Previous resident run youth projects attempted to develop relationships with the young people and their families, aiming to develop social controls based on intergenerational obligations. However, very few residents were committed enough to spend their own personal time to support young people, and those who were still engaged saw their influence decreasing. By contrast, the commissioned services ran

for only a couple of hours a day and attracted young people from further afield than just the estate.

However, despite its popularity with young people, the professional youth delivery failed to improve the situation and was accused of making matters worse. The introduction of professionals made the residents take a step back, ending a long established norm of residents working together to tackle youth deviance through informal friendship building activities. This, coupled with the increase in young people on the estate, meant that it has become almost impossible for informal networks to develop social control mechanisms. The generational disconnect, amplified by the arrival of professional help, contributed to the development of a street based culture among the young people. This is as much an account of the battles between the residents and professionals, to prove the legitimacy of their differing approaches, as it is a battle against the increasingly deviant behaviour of particular groups of young people.

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis is the culmination of nearly four years' worth of ethnographic research on a south London housing estate which discusses a complex battle for control on many fronts. The estate has always had a chequered reputation. Squatting, petty crime and anti social behaviour meant that during the 80s and early 90s it was on the council's hard to let list. Accounts from the estate suggest that historically a network of committed residents had led action to keep the deviant side of the estate under control. However, over time local commitment waned, resident friendship networks shrank and the criminal behaviour started to become more serious.

Some more recent high profile violent incidents involving young people meant the council looked to provide added support in the form of commissioning professional services to address the perceived increase in serious youth crime. Unfortunately, these interventions largely disempowered residents, who saw the embers of their relational ways of working criticised and ignored.

However, despite its popularity with young people, the professional youth delivery failed to improve the situation and was accused of making matters worse. The introduction of professionals made the residents take a step back, ending a long established norm of residents working together to tackle youth deviance through informal friendship building activities. This, coupled with the increase in young people on the estate, meant that it has become almost impossible for informal networks to develop social control mechanisms. The generational disconnect, amplified by the arrival of professional help, contributed to the development of a street based culture

among the young people. This is as much an account of the battles between the residents and professionals, to prove the legitimacy of their differing approaches as it is a battle against the increasingly deviant behaviour of particular groups of young people on the estate.

In describing the struggles on the estate, the research considers the impact that different types of relationships and networks have on what takes place on the estate. It then assesses how these connections are influenced by interactions between the residents' committee, the local authority and other organisations in shaping life on the estate.

The project seeks to understand the impacts of shifting from a resident led informal way of addressing social issues to a more formal professional approach that is governed by contractual arrangements. The project primarily focuses on the struggles between residents and professionals for legitimacy and control of the use of space. In doing so it analyses the way in which these conflicts have shaped wider life on the estate. These battles were prominent in attempts to deal with youth antisocial behaviour, and as such, much of this research focus is on young people and attempts to address their actions.

The research starts by showing how past projects were resident led, motivated by care and governed by a relational based structure. This allowed the activities to be catalysts for friendship making across the estate, which is a major influence on the actions of younger residents. The data then details how, as local engagement waned, the more informal approach

to estate activities shifted to a more professional approach initiated by the local authority.

The residents who were still active initially resisted this change. However, over a short space of time, this professional way of interacting and providing services started to spread across various elements of social life on the estate. The residents' committee soon realised that if they were to be seen as a key decision maker, they had to embrace this change and the shift in power dynamics that came with it. Consequently, the care and concern that was once the driving force behind the residents' actions were often relegated to an afterthought. The project considers the wider impact of this shift on how young people feel supported, and in turn how their connections with others are influencing their behaviour.

Bourdieu's concept of field was employed to explain the different relationship types that dominated the interaction on the estate. As such, field within this research did not refer to locations or settings, rather the various ways of interacting and working that dominated the different projects and spaces. Habitus and capital were used alongside field to explore how different relationship types have their own sets of rules that shape how they operate and, consequently what they achieve. Bourdieu's theory of praxis was combined with theories on professionalism to show how preferencing particular ways of doing things was used to control areas of work and subordinate residents.

As the council intervened to try and improve the situation on the estate, those who knew the rules of the game of the local authority's professionalised field, dominated those who interacted informally.

The emergence of this new hierarchy led to two eventual reactions by the residents. One was an acceptance of their inferior position and then an attempt to adopt the rules of the professional field to gain acceptance and recognition. The other was for residents to try and use the rules of the professional field against staff from professional organisations to seek to wrestle back some control. In both instances, the residents resigned themselves to accepting the superiority of a professional ethos over the informal relational field. This new way of conceiving how services and activities should operate effectively shut down the possibility of young people once again being supported in a relational manner, motivated by care.

This shift has influenced the support experienced by different generations of young people. A relational and intergenerational approach to supporting young people once contributed to young people feeling obligated to behave in ways that those supporting them and their parents' friendship network would approve. Devoid of these informal intergenerational relationships, current young people on the estate feel isolated from adult residents. As a result, young people see peer associations as the primary influence on their behaviour. This has resulted in the uninhibited development of a youth street culture among the young people who hang out on the estate.

The project ends by considering some areas of resistance shown by the residents to the professional approach and the hierarchical position they found themselves in. As the residents found their feet in this new era, the research ends by considering whether a hybrid field is developing that enables residents to interact relationally and embrace key elements of the professional field in their service delivery.

The research is of importance for a number of reasons. Firstly, with the continuing stresses on public funds and the 2011 Localism Act, councils are at pains to find new ways for services to be delivered, often resulting in outsourcing under the guise of collaboration between the council, professional organisations, and residents. Although such processes are designed to empower local people to tackle social issues, this thesis considers how the hierarchical structure involved in these relationships means the opposite can often occur.

Secondly, as the research site has an issue with youth crime and deviance, the project shows the impact that the different ways of interacting can have on young people's behaviour. The project shows that trying to fill the gap left by diminishing informal relational networks with professional services alone can weaken the more localised resident led action that is also needed to bring about change. In studying life on an estate where such issues and preventative interventions have taken place, the research can consider the wider impact of such initiatives outside of their immediate delivery, and help to inform interested parties on the overall effectiveness of different types of support to young people who are vulnerable to getting involved in deviant behaviour.

Lastly, the project helps to identify localised factors effecting the development of friendship networks on the housing estate and considers their effectiveness in addressing localised social issues.

I have lived on the estate for over ten years and wanted to give a voice to my friends who since moving to the area have given me so much support and inspiration. Initially, I moved onto the estate in 2005 to help start a new volunteer led local church and had planned to get the church to run initiatives to support local people. It was not long before I realised two significant things; the other church members had no affinity with the area and were not interested in engaging locally. Secondly, there were a fair few residents who were far more passionate about the estate and far more capable than I was at working out how to deal with local issues. Over a relatively short space of time, I felt far more affinity with the residents I volunteered alongside and who had become my friends than I did with the church. By the time the research started in 2011 I was struggling to see the value that the church was adding to the local area and had left before the researched ended.

During my time as a resident, I have seen people on the estate needing to fight for the little recognition they have received from outsiders. People with less experience but attached to 'professional organisations' have been paid to do something that residents had been doing on a voluntary basis for years. Added to the frustrations caused by the above, many residents have experienced pain and suffering caused by serious criminal and anti-social behaviour; and the successive failures of initiatives to address resident's concerns.

In late 2011, as the research was just getting underway, the estate was chosen by the local authority as a test bed for its new cooperative council model, leading to a significant increase in professionals operating there. Promoted as a capacity building initiative to help empower residents, the process had the opposite effect, with professional organisations sidelining the existing active and committed residents.

The estate becoming a test bed and the experience of residents during this process means that the project is inherently political. The thesis aims to: give a voice to residents who have been marginalised over the years; to understand the hierarchical structure that developed due to professional intervention and show the impact of this structure on how people interact with each other and feel supported. It does this by providing an estate based analysis of the impact of professionalism on the ability to provide localised neighbourhood based social controls.

The research unashamedly takes sides (Becker 1967); it seeks to illuminate both obvious and more hidden power relations, deliberately giving preference to the often silenced residents' voices and experiences.

The focus outlined above led to the following research questions:

- What social fields dominate interaction on the estate and why?

- How has a more professionalised field influenced interactions on the estate?

- What has been the impact of the domination of certain fields on the development of effective neighbourhood social controls on the estate?

An ethnographic approach enabled the research to move from the what, to the how before explaining the why (Fine 2003; Maxwell 2013) and uncover how marginalised groups are positioned within both power and political structures (Molland 2013).

The project was an opportunistic Complete Member Research (CMR) as the fieldwork was an extension of my everyday life (Adler and Adler 1987; Anderson 2006; Charmaz 2004, Denshire 2014, Murphy 1987). Before undergoing the field work I was already a leader in the local church, trustee, and coach of a local football project, a member of the residents' committee and had been involved in the resident action to support local young people. However, as my Ph.D. progressed, I took on several additional roles that allowed me greater access to information. These positions included becoming: the secretary of the residents' committee, chair of trustees for the football project, co-chair of the community hall management group and a member of the local area forum. My paid work during this time firstly as the head of an alternative education centre and then of managing a youth construction training programme both supported by the council also gave me greater access to local officials.

Limitations

The project provides in depth focused analysis of a housing estate that had experienced a gradual decline in informal friendship networks over several

decades. These relationships, which had provided support to residents and a degree of social control, were often the result of residents getting involved in activities. However wider socioeconomic factors (Bauman 2000, 2007; Beck 2002; Standing 2011) combined with personal situational changes have meant that residents are less likely to engage locally, leading to a reduction of estate based friendship networks. The project tracks several attempts to engage residents in a controlled professionalised way, shedding light on the effectiveness and limitations of such initiatives, and discusses why they failed to improve the social situations they were designed to address.

However, the project is limited in scope. Firstly, this is a detailed study of one estate, and although the issues discussed may be comparable to other neighbourhoods, further research will need to be undertaken to understand how the results of this study relate to situations elsewhere.

Secondly, the research concentrates on localised issues impacting how people interact on the estate. These exist within a wider socioeconomic framework that was out of scope for this investigation but influences the relationships discussed in the study. As the macro situation has been the focus of various other studies, some of which are discussed in the literature review, I decided to focus on micro estate based interactions and how they impact how people engage with each other.

Lastly, the limits of focusing on estate based phenomena are apparent when considering the impacts on the young people. Young people are influenced by far more than the relationships that they either have or do not have with

the people around them. However as wider issues such as education, housing, and employment opportunities are discussed at length in other studies, it again was felt that the research should not try to go over areas that have already been researched; instead, it should contribute something new. In taking this approach, the study is limited to only being able to comment on the impact that localised relationships had on the behaviour of young people.

Introduction to the Area

The estate consists of 882 flats in 32 low rise blocks, four communal buildings and is home to nearly 3000 people. Although the estate is under local authority control 25% of the properties are privately owned. No real roads go through the estate, once you enter from one of the six entrances you come to a series of car park areas. Over the years, various sets of barriers have added to prevent cars from using the estate as a short cut between the main roads that straddle the blocks of flats. Due to the local geography, the estate itself naturally divides into four discernible areas. There is a large concentration of 26 blocks, which is divided in two by the nearest thing to a road, a dead end loop serviced by one entrance that gives vehicle access to several parts of the estate. The estate sits opposite a large local authority park, the land for which was acquired by the London County Council between 1891 and 1903. When work on the flats started in 1937 the local authority used the removal of the detached houses and their gardens to open up a pathway to the park, with the dead end looped roadway slicing through the blocks acting as a walkway for the surrounding area to access the park.

Locally this loop is known by a few different names; some call it 'Dog Shit Lane' owing to the amount of poo on the grassed area in the middle of the loop, others simply call it the 'Middle Bit'. Most of the young people on the estate have named it 'Frontline', a common term locally for areas where young people hang out. In 2014 a local councillor held a consultation process to formally name the loop which was seen as a waste of time by most residents. After a name had been chosen, by the ten people that took part in the process, the councillor had to admit that she had not gone through the proper channels and it was not possible to name the road.

The third area, to the south of this site, has three more blocks, separated from the main estate by a primary school. The fourth area consists of three blocks on the other side of a main road leading some council officials to feel that it should be considered an independent estate.

Despite several resurfacing projects the roadways are littered with potholes, partly caused by a stream that runs under the estate, and partly by leaking water pipes. Around once a year at least one pothole caves in and water from a gushing pipe spills out into the street.

The estate has many green areas, however, access many of them is limited as they fenced off behind the blocks. There were requests to encourage residents to use the areas by opening them up and adding picnic benches. However, the council have been reluctant to do so in case this led to young people congregating around the benches at night. Most of the accessible grassed areas are littered with dog poo, with many residents blaming dog owners of nearby houses for coming onto the estate and letting their dogs

foul on the grass. Despite this, the estate still has many useable outdoor spaces including four gardens maintained by residents, a football/basketball pen, outdoor gym equipment, two table tennis tables and two children's playgrounds

In the late 70s and into the 80s the estate had a bad reputation and was known as a place to dump stolen cars leading to some referring to it as the 'Wild West of the South'. By the late 80s and into the early 90s, the area had an issue with drugs. Stories about the row of shops just off the estate give an image of how the estate would have been perceived during this period. A sign in the local chemist warned '*Heroin sold in this area is cut with brick dust and can kill instantly'*. Drug dealing was so rife that the police set up CCTV across the road from the shops to deter dealing, and the bookies were requested to remove its seating to stop people using it as a hangout. In response to this, the newsagent parked two transit vans outside the shop to hide patrons from the CCTV, and the bookies simply replaced the seating with milk crates (provided by the newsagent). Both shop managers realised that although the dealing was a nuisance, those who were the target of the police deterrent were also their main customers.

In the early 80s, the estate was put on the council's hard to let list and squatting was quite common. One respondent commented that they bought their first flat on the estate for £20. Their mum who also got her first flat on the estate from squatting qualified the statement by explaining that buying a set of keys to an empty flat and moving in didn't quite make it his. To try and turn things around the council advertised properties to university students who could move into flats and take on any needed repairs

themselves. Dave, the only one of these students left, recalled how the flat he moved into had no door leading to his balcony.

Although there were complaints that during this period the local authority had left the estate to deteriorate and the staff saw the residents as '*scum*', the estate was also a hive of resident activity, and the view from inside the estate was less bleak and critical.

Many residents spoke of having rotas within their blocks for cleaning the communal areas, and when the community centre flooded, the hall committee was inundated with offers from residents willing to help with the cleanup job and get the place usable again. Several commented that residents would generally know at least one person in every block creating a loose network that made them feel safe.

Historically, the estate had three main communal buildings. John's Hut, a part council part resident run youth club providing arts and craft activities, homework clubs, table tennis and football as well as a resident organised camping trip every year. Centenary Hall, the resident, run community centre that housed older people's lunches, as well as acting as the local social club with reggae and jazz nights and domino competitions. And, a council run adventure playground (APG). These activities were supported by a resident organised legal surgery that ran out of an empty flat; two children's holiday clubs; and an informal youth advice and guidance centre that ran out of one of the mum's flats. This summary does hide some of the complexities that will be discussed below, for example, there were two holiday clubs because black children were not welcome in John's Hut.

In 2008, the council set up an arm's length management organisation (ALMO) to manage the estate, despite widespread objection from residents. This transition was one of the requirements stipulated by Whitehall for councils to qualify for a housing improvement grant. Due to the poor rating for their housing services, the council only qualified for the money in the last year of the scheme by which point the £450m investment had been turned into a loan to be paid back through rents and service charges. In the years up leading up to the transfer to an ALMO, the estate suffered from a lack of investment, possibly to increase resident support for an ALMO. Only emergency repairs were carried out, and broken windows on residential and communal properties were simply boarded up rather than replaced.

After seven years of mixed performance, and concerns over how effectively these vast sums of money were being spent, the council dissolved the ALMO and took back control of the estate.

The communal buildings have changed over time. After a resident led fundraising drive in the 80s, John's Hut was replaced by a permanent building complete with hall, kitchen, and office space, and renamed St Mary's Youth Club. The club could have easily been closed down in the mid-90s when the council decided to pull out their youth workers and relocate the council run youth activities to the adventure playground. However, Billy from one of the families running the club, went into the housing office to get the keys and decided to keep the building open. The building is now run by two families who live on the estate but is now solely rented out to outside organisations including Mencap and a Chinese church. The fencing now

surrounding the building is a symbolic reminder that this space is now unavailable to residents.

Centenary Hall, with its computer suite, large hall, commercial kitchen and smaller hall, had been shut for 26 years before reopening in 2013. Two of the original management committee gave differing accounts for its closure; one commented that it had to close due to mounting debts, while another commented on the loud late night parties and people hiring it out to run night club like events made its continuation unworkable.

When Centenary Hall closed a new space, Our Place, opened up. Our Place, also known as the Community Flat, was made by joining together three flats on the ground floor of Turner House, the largest block on the estate. It was initially a social services office, however, when they moved out, it was turned into a communal space.

Our Place has been home to two churches and internet café, and several children's and youth activities, making the Turner block the home of most of the activities on the estate for a number of years. Today the community flat houses the residents' committee meetings, a church bible study and a training organisation offering adult education, but the council has plans to turn it back into flats by the end of 2017.

The youth activities have taken many guises until they eventually stopped in 2014. Initially, the activities were run by residents, then, in 2011, a Council commissioned national organisation ran an anti-gang service that lasted three months. After this, the council directly delivered youth activities for a couple of months, and finally, a local education charity called Saplings ran

the youth activities for around 18 months. When Saplings ran the activities, they boasted of having 170 young people on their books. Instead of only serving those from the estate their provision acted as a magnet for a wider group of young people. The increased numbers of youth who did not live on the estate, but who hung out there, led to a rise in low-level anti-social behaviour such as weed smoking, urinating in the stairwells and talking loudly outside residents' homes, as well as more serious crimes such as drug dealing, fraud, and violent acts.

The adventure playground, which was run by the council until 2013, was popular with the under eights, however, unpopular with older age group which was one of the reasons youth activities were based in Our Place. When Saplings were commissioned to run the building from spring 2013, they did not respect the local dynamics and lost the interest of the older young people by trying to move their provision from Our Place to the APG. At the same time, their failure to employ suitably qualified play workers meant that activities for the younger age had to stop for nearly two years. As a result, the building continues to struggle to attract young people with only 6 attending the twice weekly activities.

The borough has a mixed population in ethnicity, culture and wealth. Presently, the unemployment rate for the estate stands at roughly 15%, double the national average. The estate has 42% of residents under the age of 25 which has resulted in issues relating to young people occupying a lot of the political and public life of the estate. The local authority's housing strategy states that there is an annual churn rate of 10%, which means the makeup of the estate is often in flux. An indication of this change can be

seen in the attendees of St Mary's Football Project. When the project started in 2004 nearly 60% of the participants were children of Caribbean decent, however now this same demographic makes up around 35%, with 40% of the participants being first or second generation Africans (mainly from the West or Horn of Africa). Historically, the estate has had a mixed demographic, with the older participants taking part in this research mainly moving on to the estate in their 20s from various parts of the UK including Newcastle, the Midlands, Essex as well as other parts of London, or from the Caribbean. Although you would not detect any racial issues from their contemporary interactions, many from a Caribbean background did comment on the racial tensions that existed on the estate when they were younger.

A 2012 local authority survey of estate residents shows that just over 48% of the adult residents have lived on the estate for more than 10 years, 27% have lived on the estate less than five years and 10% less than a year. 57% of the residents are female with females making up two thirds of the main tenancy or lease holder. This may help to explain why mainly women feature in this ethnography. In terms of ethnicity, 27% are of Black African origin, 18% are of Black Caribbean origin, 18% are White British, 7% were Portuguese and 6% of other White backgounds.

The young people today seem not to concern themselves with ethnic difference when on the estate, mixing freely with one another. The only overt sign of any recognition is on the odd occasion when the young people decide to have 'play' group fights. The rules of which seem to be that you can inflict as much pain on someone else as you like until they tell you to

stop. During these occasions, the young people often decide teams on whether they are African or Caribbean. Those from the UK, other parts of Europe or South America have the freedom to choose their side.

The borough is the fifth most deprived borough in the capital. However, the average house price is £402,000 (Source Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, 26.10.13). According to the local authority's housing strategy, of the 130,000 households, 67% of the occupants are renting, with a fifth of renters having a social landlord. Nine thousand households were renting privately but on housing benefit and there is a housing waiting list 22,000 long against a council housing stock of 27,000. The local authority's housing strategy states that 32% of residents are earning less than £20,000 a year, which would rule them out of being able to afford the average £288 per week rent for a two bedroom flat. The estate has started to be somewhat of an Island of social housing in an increasingly gentrified area. The local secondary school that once stood opposite the estate, is now a gated development of 'luxury apartments' and the local authority's State of the Borough Report states that the average house price in the borough in 2001 was £172,000 whereas in 2015 it reached almost £500,000 with an expectation that prices would continue to increase.

However, compared to the surrounding areas, flats on the estate remain fairly affordable. A one bedroom flat on the estate costs around £280,000 and a three bedroom flat is typically on the market for around £350,000. Similar sized properties on one of the side roads near the estate can go for several hundred thousand more. Ten years ago, the local shops serving the estate had: two Caribbean take aways; a chicken and chip shop; a kebab

shop; bookies; a pharmacist; a white barber; black barbers; female hair dressers; dry cleaners; three newsagent/convenience stores; two cafes; one English and one Portuguese and five empty commercial properties. One of those empty properties turned into a Portuguese restaurant, which stayed open for about five years. Now only the two of the newsagents, the white barber, female hairdresser, dry cleaners and chemist remain and have been joined by a vegan bar, second hand shop, tea and cake shop and hipster coffee shop. These additions reflect the new cliental that has started moving into the side roads and privately rented flats on the estate.

Historically the borough has been known for its high crime rates and police statistics show that from 2010 to 2015 it was second behind Westminster for both the overall number of crimes committed and potentially more concerningly violent crime. The same period saw the borough have the fourth highest drug arrests in the capital. The borough's youth crime scrutiny report (2017) shows that although serious youth violence (often associated with drug offences) has not reached its 2011 peak, since 2014 there has been a significant increase in report serious youth violence. The latest three year trend (2014-17) incidents have risen from an average of 16 a month to 27 a month. However, within this period the ward the estate is located in has reported a 9% decrease in reported crime, including an 11% drop in reported violent crime. Although crime statistics can often be problematic and are often considered not a true picture of criminal activity it does suggest that although crime locally is falling there is still a concern around the prevalence of violent crime especially among young people.

The local crime rate is relatively low, with the local authority ward, ranking 66th out of 139 council wards within a five-mile radius, (Local Authority Estate Plan Document 2013) with a 2% reduction in overall crime from 2014-2015 (Ward Crime Data 2015). However, it has been plagued with incidents of more violent crimes over the past eight years, including muggings, stabbings, shootings including a fatal drive by murder. In the early 2000s, the young people on the estate started to get a reputation for getting into trouble. Initially, this trouble was localised to the estate and resembled low-level anti-social behaviour, which was largely dealt with by the residents themselves. However, over the years, this has progressed to drug dealing and violent confrontations with young people from other areas. In 2007 two people in their mid 20s were shot on the estate, but none fatally. There were incidents of young people from the estate going to other parts of the borough and attacking young people. By the end of 2011, two young people had been murdered and several others were in prison for drug or violent offences. In early March 2012, one young person who hung around on the estate was stabbed over 10 times on a bus but thankfully managed to survive. However, later that day two of his friends, one of whom also hung around on the estate, stabbed to death a teenager who they thought was involved in the original attack. As a result, the estate has continued to have a bad reputation and is considered by the authorities as having a gang problem.

On the positive side, the estate has a very active residents' committee who, over the past few years, have fought to be recognised as an important voice in the local area. Their most significant victory came in securing £167,000

of Section 105 capital from the sale of estate garages for the renovation of the local community hall. However, the impact this group can have on what happens on the estate is limited by its size. Of the around 3,000 people living on the estate, only 15 or so attend the monthly residents' committee meetings and of them, only seven or so can be counted on to try and make things happen. A tension has emerged over the legitimacy of this group to run activities, leading them to be often overlooked by the local authority in favour of more established organisations.

The local authority budget cuts have had a dramatic impact on the council's ability to continue to run its services. The council's website states that the 2010 coalition government had imposed a 50% cut in its core funding, which amounts to a £200m reduction in its spending by 2018. At the same time, the Localism Act (2011) has given the local authority greater ability to delegate responsibility to local people for the running of services. The local authority's take on the Act and the cuts were obvious; they were going to stop running as many services as possible and hand the responsibility to other organisations. The devolving of responsibility saw local and national charities, ex-council staff mutuals and in rare instances, resident groups take part in a competitive tendering process, designed to promote professionalism when awarding service contracts.

As part of this process, the council set up two structures that were to become independent organisations and take over the remnants of local council commissioning. The first and more influential on the estate was the forum network and its member St Mary's forum in particular. The second

was the youth co-op, which effectively replaced the youth service, but with a purely commissioning remit.

The local forum was one of seven in the borough set up to help bring local organisations, businesses, tenants groups and residents together and allocate small amounts of council funding to projects that met the local authority's strategic priorities.

At the start of the research project, there were two main controllers of economic and physical capital on the estate, the local authority and the ALMO. Despite the local authority cuts, the council remained the largest owner and distributor of financial resources on the estate during the initial stages of the project. However, the Localism Act 2011 made councils ring fence their Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for housing issues only, which was now in the hand of n the ALMO. Before this, the housing income went to the council who then set an agreed budget for the ALMO. By 2013 the ALMO had significantly more financial resources than the local authority. Tensions started to emerge between the holders of political power and the ALMO, the new owner of economic capital, about how HRA should be spent. The council believed that this should include estate based and resident engagement activities and services, which are not direct housing costs. This included youth services and support for vulnerable people, which were previously funded via the council's General Fund. Mid way through the research, the tensions were resolved by the local authority dissolving the ALMO, taking back housing management responsibilities and control of the HRA. For the purposes of this project, the ALMO staff and activities have been referred to as council staff.

Throughout the study, the outside organisation with second highest influence was Saplings, mainly because they were the chosen recipient of economic capital that originated in the council's hands. The Saplings board contained two local councillors, one of which was also a director of another local charity and a director of a housing association; its patron was the local MP, and many its staff used to work for the council and vice versa. Part the way through the research one of the Saplings board members became the director of Community Regeneration at the Council. Over the course of the study, 30 organisations had a presence on the estate including 14 local charities, five government departments, three constituted groups, three churches, two national charities, two companies, and one children's development consortium.

Nine of these organisations were there to support young people, by far the most common reason for organisations seeking to work on the estate. Five organisations including the three churches simply rented space and featured very little in the life of the estate. Four organisations were generic community development specialists. Of the organisations engaged in youth support, four came to meetings proposing to work, but did no delivery due to funding constraints and a further three ended their involvement fairly quickly due to contracts ending. Of all 30 organisations, only seven had any significant long term presence.

It is against this backdrop and within this context that this research takes place.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The project considers the intersection between professional and informal life on a South London housing estate; especially taking note of how the forming and maintenance of hierarchies influence social interactions. I have employed a critical theory approach drawing heavily on Bourdieu's theory of praxis to form a framework through which to understand the data.

Although this project focuses on the everyday interactions of a housing estate, these do not happen in a vacuum, as such there needs to be some consideration for the macro socioeconomic situation in which these interactions take place. This research is, therefore, a specific snapshot of a much wider ongoing continuum. Although it is not within the scope of this project to explore the wider structural factors that are shaping life in the estate, I will draw on some underpinning theories to help place this project in a broader context.

This chapter will, therefore, start by acknowledging theories relating to wider socioeconomic factors, precariousness, and risk associated with advanced capitalism, specifically focusing on the connection between the social structure and relationships within these texts.

I then outline the Bourdieusian framework which has been used to understand the interactions on the estate. In doing so, I have employed the concepts of habitus, field, and capital to uncover the hierarchical dynamics within the relationships discussed.

I explore the concept of social capital, drawing on the work of Coleman and Putnam alongside Bourdieu in considering the value of different types of relationships and how these valuations go on to impact both the activities on the estate and who is considered capable of carrying them out.

Through this process, I will consider the role that professional organisations and professional social networks have played in establishing new hierarchies by introducing alternative sets of rules and habitus on the estate. The themes displayed in chapters' four to seven are discussed using Bourdieu's concept of field to draw out the different rules and habitus governing the informal and professional ways of operating. In so doing I will explore how authors such as Beverley Skeggs have shown how those living on estates internalise the belief that their culture is inferior and take subordinate positions in relation to others on the estate. I will then turn to studies considering the role that professionalisation plays in controlling market access and creating notions of expertise.

The chapter then considers the work of Lefebvre, Minton, Wacquant, and others to explore the causes and impacts of changes in the management and use of space.

Within the research, the impacts of relational changes were most evident in the activities of young people and the activities that help shape their lives. As such I will have a specific focus on theories relating to neighbourhood and youth crime such as social disorganisation and collective efficacy theory. I then return to a Bourdieusian framework and refer to theorists such as Fraser (2013), Harding (2014), and Sandberg (2008) to explore how

Bourdieu's theory of practice has been used to understand the relational and structural dynamics impacting the actions of young people.

Wider Socio-Economic Considerations

The broader socioeconomic conditions in which this research takes place can be understood as one in which market forces have that increased the risk of an uncertain future for individuals. Routines, structures, and institutions are dissolving faster than the time it takes for them to form (Bauman 2007). More and more services are contracted out and subject to ever increasing market flexibility, transferring risk from the state to workers and their families (Bauman 2007; Beck 2002). This transference has led to greater economic insecurity (Bauman 2007; Standing 2011). The rise of insecure or temporary work and decreased wages means that the opportunities for those on the lower rungs of the ladder always remains just out of reach.

Governments, who are devoid of the willingness or ability to offer stability or security, play on the concept of the other to invoke a common enemy such as migrants and benefit scroungers (Bauman 2000; Standing 2011). Our thoughts are being reordered to at best believe that good will is rare, with the common perception that most people will be hostile. Trust between people has broken down, and urban life is now ruled by fear (Bauman 2000; Standing 2011). These concerns stem from living in a de-regularised, individualised world where tight bonds of family and neighbourliness have been broken. It is considered better to keep your distance rather than

integrate. People willingly exchange freedom for a sense of safety manufactured through isolation (Bauman 2000b).

The labour market, for Beck, has the effect of physically destroying communities by increasing mobility through opening up opportunities and at the same time compelling mobility through the threat of financial ruin (Beck 2002; Hass and Olsson 2014). Our strive for freedom and individuality, to be in control of our lives, starts to have the opposite effect. The freer we think we are becoming, the closer we are to danger forcing us to focus primarily on our own survival.

Increased financial uncertainty makes it difficult for people to participate in supportive networks due to the expectation of reciprocity which they may not be able to fulfil (Offer 2012). Offer comments that, whereas there used to be lots of solidarity among poor income networks, current research would suggest that low-income families receive no or at most insufficient support from their networks and that they are far less networked than previously thought. Offer also points out that social deprivation increases the chance of imbalances and mistrust. As a result, people tend to be less willing to help others. Therefore, those from deprived backgrounds have to trust strangers in professional roles to access the support they need, rather than relying on less formal relationships (Sáez and Sanchez 2006).

Bourdieu's Theory of Practice (Conceptual Framework)

Some of the consequences of these macro changes can be seen in changes in relationships at a local level. I have used a Bourdieusian

framework throughout the research to explain the dynamics and hierarchical structures of these local connections.

Bourdieu proposed a three concept reflexive framework for understanding both the way that social structures shape human action and how this human action reflects back on and changes the structures that formed them. Actions are socially shaped but individually constituted through personal practice which then forms common trends. Bourdieu saw himself as both a constructivist and a structuralist who wanted to break from the tradition of objective versus subjective knowledge and understand the underlying drivers of action (Bourdieu 1990). His theory of practice (1972) looks at the relationships between people and structures and can be considered a relational theory.

For Bourdieu (1990) there are structures within the social world, outside of the thoughts and motivations of individuals that both guide and constrain action, which he designates as fields. Fields set the rules for engagement in a reflexive relationship with habitus (preferences and distinctions) and capital (Grenfell 2014; Steinmetz 2011). To consider the interplay between the concepts, Bourdieu develops a theory that identifies processes as both structured and structuring. Everything we know about the world comes from our perceptions; however, this takes place within pre-existing but always evolving value laden structures which serve to reinforce the status quo. These structures offer a guide to how we should think and act; they tell us the established way of doing things.

In developing the concept of habitus, Bourdieu (1990) wanted to bring idealist practical knowledge and the materialist tradition together. Habitus is both a structured and a structuring structure; shaped by one's family and educational upbringing as well as other past and present circumstances, and structuring as it helps define our practices now and in the future. This structure is made up of durable dispositions that shape our preferences and practices. It generates the perceptions we have of ourselves and others. In turn, others consider themselves and others through their habitus.

People acquire habitus over time, but habitus is also shaped by immediate social and physical relations found in neighbourhoods, work places, as well as friendship and kinship networks. However, this historical element of our actions is not recognised, hidden by what are thought to be objective structures. Habitus is, therefore, the internalised form of a group condition. Habitus thus is a 'system of acquired dispositions that act practically as categories of perception and assessment, acting as 'organising principles of action' that help define an individual's role. The structures found in particular social and physical environments produce durable, similar and transferable dispositions or preferences within humans. These dispositions allow some practices to become regular and others irregular without there ever being a set of rules. Although we feel like free agents, people's everyday actions are predictable, and we base our decisions on what we predict about others (Grenfell 2014).

Habitus is largely a class issue as those of the same class will have more similar experiences to each other, creating similar embodied habitus (Bourdieu 1984). Those with similar attributes or habitus usually find

themselves together both socially and physically. Habitus gives the holder a sense of their position and the place of others and forms the basis for all forms of friendships and connections (Bourdieu 1990). For Bourdieu (1984) it is when we study field that we start to understand the interests attached to different positions. People who occupy positions within fields are individuals; however shared habitus allows them to act as a group, resulting in the domination of one group over another. Those with the most economically valued habitus, often operate well in fields where they can acquire larger amounts of capital. This economic capital then allows them to purchase cultural capital acquiring and habitus developing experiences. As habitus is largely a produced through family relations and school experiences, this process ensures the reproduction of inequality within society.

The choices we have in life depend on our positions within particular fields; however, our past experiences help shape which of these options we can see. In this sense, the way we respond to situations is structured by our journey and unique to us. However, habitus is also shared, based on characteristics, experiences, and identities people hold in common with others of the same social class, gender, ethnicity, nationality, and other demographic traits. Thus, habitus makes people both unique and standard at the same time.

Habitus operates within a field leading Bourdieu to develop the following equation [(habitus)(capital)] + field = practice (Bourdieu 1984). Our practices are the result of the relationships between our habitus, our capital, and position within a particular field (Grenfell 2014). However, this relationship

is reflexive, *"if the habitat shapes the habitus, the habitus also shapes the habitat"* (Bourdieu 1990: 128)

For Bourdieu (2003), fields are constructed social space governed by their own rules and logic of practice. Within this research, the field was not necessarily the estate itself, but standards and norms that governed interactions on the estate. The research considered the decreasing influence of an informal relational field and the increasing impact of a professional field on the estate. The changing nature of social space or field, in Bourdieusian analysis, needs to be considered in terms of its history, place within wider economic structures, power relationships and cultural significance to understand events and transactions fully (Oliver et al. 2010).

Fields are competitive with people strategizing on how to get into the best positions. Those that progress often have the benefit of a long-term submersion in the field allowing them to have a 'feel for the game', an intuitive understanding of the rules of the field. This feel for the game becomes Doxa, convention that 'goes without saying', determining the thinkable and doable which is then internalised creating habitus (Bottero 2010; Decoteau 2015; Oliver and O'Reilly 2010; Steinmetz 2011). Doxa is a shared unquestioned intuition that causes people to misrecognise the rules and procedures of a field as natural. Those without this intuition can feel and be seen to be out of place within a social space. An individual's position is partly determined by how they can internalise the rules of engagement and be able to accumulate the capital needed to operate fully in their field(s). This internalisation and accumulation both shapes how they feel about the way they fit into particular social space while also indicating

how others should judge them. All social spaces are therefore places of domination (Steinmetz 2011) with those who operate within a particular field having a self-interest in ensuring its ideology remains dominant. Part of this process is the creation of symbolic reference points that enable those outside of the field as well as those in it to recognise this 'legitimate' domination (Susan 2014).

Capital, although commonly understood as an economic term, has a wider usage by Bourdieu and refers to different things that can be accumulated and exchanged within and between social spaces or fields. Within Bourdieu's work, there were four main forms of capital, economic cultural, social and symbolic. Economic capital relates to someone's financial resources. Cultural capital refers to a person's awareness and embodiment of culture which acts as a distinguisher due to different cultural traits having different perceived values. Social capital is the connections and relationships that someone can draw upon within social fields. Whereas symbolic capital refers to the representation of other forms of capital, for example, a degree certification from a prestigious university can symbolise family background, economic status, and cultural capital as well as indicate academic ability. These various forms of capital are actually "transubstantiated" forms of economic capital, with a transactional value within different fields. Power relations based on capital, for Bourdieu (1990), are imposed on all people within a field but are brutal for new entrants. This process initiates competitive struggles with the field for status, control, and recognition of symbolic capital.

Cultural capital is both inherited through family relations and acquired through education. For Bourdieu people possess capital in different amounts and therefore the deck is stacked in favour of some more than others (Grenfell 2014; Oliver and O'Reilly 2010; Swartz 1997). Cultural competence is a symbolic expression which has meaning and value placed upon it by those who both do this act and by those who see it. Knowing the symbols suitable for a field endows the holder with self-certainty and cultural legitimacy; while those who do not possess it are left with a sense of vulnerability and feeling out of place. Economic and particular forms of cultural capital ensure access to and status within the most powerful fields (Grenfell 2014; Oliver and O'Reilly 2010; Reeves 2014; Swartz 1997).

Bourdieu understands that people operate within fields by maintaining practical relationships with useful family members (practical kinship) and other practical relationships that can be called upon when needed (Bourdieu 1972). People seek to acquire the practical relationships and the symbolic capital, which will lead to approval greater standing within desired fields. Social capital can, for Bourdieu, look altruistic, however, this is a misrecognition of the relationship dynamics involved. Transfers in social capital are simply transactional with all those involved simply seeking to progress themselves.

These forces combined cause domination to occur, through what Bourdieu terms symbolic violence. This maintains social hierarchy through both the dominated and the dominator internalising the belief that the habitus, capital, and actions of the dominating are naturally superior (Bourdieu 2000; von Holdt 2012; Wacquant 2013). Dominance is therefore maintained not

by physical force but symbolically. In struggles to define what is legitimate those with symbolic capital such as titles, educational qualifications, and particular affiliations are likely to come out on top. Symbolic power is based on symbolic capital that gives people the social authority to both impose and implant a vision or direction into the minds of others. Those with higher status within a field have a greater ability to influence others' understanding of this reality. Status is therefore based on misrecognition (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2013)

One such symbolic form of domination for Bourdieu (1972) exists in the bureaucratic process of professionalism which seeks to establish particular practices and interests as intrinsically legitimate. These strategies are then used by individuals and groups to dominate and legitimise domination within particular fields. As habitus shapes what we see as sensible and reasonable, we will commonly recognise and share these value judgements about symbolic capital with others and at the same time commonly recognise and subordinate, with others, those who do not share the same value judgements as ourselves. Those who are on the receiving end of this subordination in like manner misrecognise the value of this symbolic capital and accept their position as intrinsic. In this sense, the arbitrary appears natural.

Those who want to succeed need to acquire as much dominant capital as possible. The struggles for this acquisition help people to recognise internalised boundaries that need to be removed to move up in the field. Certain groups get recognised as having a more legitimate right to positions of authority and influence than others. The status field dynamics confer onto

specific groups lead to others feeling and being treated as inferior despite them not realising it (Mckenzie 2015; Sanli 2011). Skeggs (2004; 2005) has commented that this internalisation of your own subordination and another's superiority is often due to class experiences. When lower class people from estates find themselves alongside those from middle class backgrounds they automatically assume a position of inferiority.

This project considers how different fields intersect on the estate, how particular groups create the field they want to operate in and how this determines the habitus and capital needed to feel confident. As the state has the monopoly on symbolic violence (Guzmán 2015), much of the research focuses on the interplay between residents and local authority discussing who sets the agendas through the implementation of particular fields, ultimately establishing what habitus and cultural capital has the most influence.

Despite its dominating character, there are often signs of resistance against symbolic violence. Cvetičanin et al. (2014) develop Bourdieu's theory further considering how those in less powerful positions fight back. They comment that strategies are the domain of the powerful who have a more bird's eye view of the field which enables them to manipulate situations and plan for the future. In contrast, tactics are calculated actions of the less powerful who do not have the privilege of a macro view. Tactics are often in the moment decisions to gain some ground against the strategic. (Cvetičanin et al. 2014; Kärrholm 2007). Part of this investigation looks at ways in which the

dominant forces develop strategies for the estate and surrounding area and how residents employ tactics of resistance against this domination.

Relationships and Social Capital

In the initial stages of the project, I considered whether to operationalise community as a concept to discuss the relationships that presented themselves. However, I found the concept un-useful for two main reasons. Firstly, the concept has such a diverse usage that it is impossible to find a definition that would be workable for this project (Alleyne 2002; Henderson 2005; Mulligan 2014; Sennett 1986). Secondly, it seems that, despite the myriad of ways the concept is deployed, there is often an artificial connection made between new forms of relations badged community and the community benefits outlined by classical scholars such as Tönnies (1887), despite these benefits never really materialising within contemporary uses of the concept. To this end Delantly (2003) comments that historically community was often understood as the key component of society, however Bauman (2000) comments the relatively recent rise in the use of the term and the search for community is largely a testament to the fact strong relationships are increasingly allusive, and community has become aspirational rather than attainable. The use of the word community in the contemporary sense somewhat devalues the more traditional understanding of the word where community grows out of sustained and strong relationships built over a lengthy period. It gives license for people to define almost any form of association as 'community' and associate it with the positive connotations that come with the word. With this in mind, I have chosen not to use community as a sociological concept within this project.

Instead, I will concentrate on the role of different forms of relationships, why these relationships develop and what they influence.

The effectiveness of the flow of capital and the development of relationships rests upon high levels of trust within the networks. Without trust Fukuyama (1995) believes that communities cannot develop. Field (2004) sees trust as the lubricant that speeds otherwise time-consuming processes up. Trust can be either particularised or generalised. Particularised trust is developed through an individual's observations and experiences which determine their confidence in another person or group. Generalised on the other hand is the trust developed from long term involvement or membership of a group. Trust in this situation is not between individuals but given to a broader set of people. For example, with particularised trust I may trust my neighbour because I have an individual relationship with them, however with generalised trust, I chose to trust everyone in my neighbourhood, because the norms of where I live lead me to believe that no one will rob me. Generalised trust, therefore, operates on a broader level. Trust allows capital to flow and to grow including relational and network based social capital.

Putnam (1993b) outlined two forms of social capital, bridging, and bonding that operate in a similar way to trust. Bonding social capital is the force that works within existing social networks. It causes the solidarity between people, maintaining loyalty and reinforcing its identity. Bonding social capital is what causes people within a group to confidently act believing others in the group will back them up, make good on promises and not do anything

to harm them. Bridging capital allows people to relate to those outside of their group and form new alliances.

Putnam discovered that weaker ties with those who may be outsiders but whom someone has associated themselves with for a specific purpose are more important for climbing the professional ladder than the bonding ties of family that may at times be stronger, but less useful. Putnam explains the two as 'vertical' ties and 'horizontal' ties. The vertical bonding ties that exist in a family are in many ways hierarchical and controlling, thus often limiting members to what those above them know and understand. Horizontal ties are more exploratory with people forging networks and allegiances with others whom they feel will benefit them in their life desires. It, for Putman, provides individuals with far more scope to succeed. Bridging capital is common within the professional field, while bonding capital is common in the informal networks of family and friends.

Despite Putman's assertion that bridging capital is most useful for people's career development; the social capital developed through close relationships, for Coleman (1988) has the biggest impact on people's personal and social development. Family networks and relationships that develop organically over time are the most influential network in someone's life. Coleman talks about the family as a 'primordial' social organisation that is best placed to support the social development of a child. He contrasts this benefit with that of what he terms 'constructed' forms of social networks, which tend to come together for a shorter period with weaker ties and have less influence on a child and young person's development.

For Coleman, the power of primordial organisations rests in what he calls closure. Closure can be simply defined as a network that provides the care and supervision that its members need through a close relational structure. Closure's strength is in the way the network can provide for its members; which then produces tacit control through the implied threat or ostracism and loss of benefits. Closure can feel oppressive at times. Indeed, one of the complaints levelled at this type of social structure is that those who do not agree with its working are often forced into submission by its overbearing existence or feel compelled to leave. However, these closed networks exist for the benefit of all its members and the benefits of being 'in', for many, far outweigh the negatives.

Bonding social capital, of the type that is found in closed networks, is often found in the survival tactics of those from more disadvantaged backgrounds that lack the economic and cultural capital to take advantage of mainstream employment opportunities (Burnet 2006; Gowan 2011; Woodward 2013). However, this reliance on bonding social capital, even though it helps them survive, reinforces their exclusion (Burnet 2006; Wyness 2009). Gowan (2011) and Woodward (2013) both considered the role of social capital in both the lives and support that unemployed black young men from deprived US neighbourhoods receive. Gowan (2011) suggested that unemployed young men's bonding social capital enables them to survive on the streets by being able to fit in and allowing them to utilise the support their networks could offer. However, this often led them to pursue criminal activities to provide for themselves as this activity is a normalised way to provide within the network, and membership ensures the skills and knowhow to carry out

criminal acts successfully. Despite strong bonding capital to call upon, the bridging capital needed for personal development was missing. Woodward (2013) suggests that programmes supporting the unemployed should be analysed through their effectiveness of providing welfare recipients with additional economic, social and cultural capital. Programmes that are most effective allow welfare recipients to understand the capital they have and how to use it to secure employment. Woodward uses this approach to show how simply focusing on improving the skills of clients' neglects more valuable social capital developing approaches. Using a wider lens of capital, Woodward shows how the social capital transference from welfare workers to recipients is vital in improving employment chances, and this transference is more likely when welfare workers acknowledge and value the different capital that the welfare recipients also possess. Burnett (2006), also considering social capital transference, found that programmes designed to increase participants' bridging social capital predominately built bonding social capital instead. For Burnett (2006) relationships of trust and reciprocation are developed with other programme participants with similar social and cultural capital to them, not with coaches or staff members who were the holders of bridging social capital. The shift from relational to professional approaches to service delivery, as discussed within this project, can be understood as a move from relying on bonding capital to a preference towards bridging capital.

In considering the role of relationships within societies, Sahlins (1972) proposed a theory of generalised reciprocity, suggesting that in settings with strong personal relationships there is a high degree of trust and desire to

support leading to a system of reciprocity. However, within relationships with weaker ties, stricter rules around reciprocation are needed to prevent unbalanced exchanges which can lead to resentment and exploitation. In short, the closer the relationship the greater the obligation to support or reciprocate support received; the more distant the relationship, the weaker the duty to help or reciprocate any support. This sense of obligation is often unconscious (Bourdieu 2013). Support and reciprocation act like an adhesive that kept social networks together and functioning tying people together and strengthening bonds similar to Mauss' (1967) analysis of gift exchanges. The reciprocal giving cycle is a powerful cohesive force (Sykes 2014) which both unites people and regulates people's actions. Putnam (2000) in his seminal work 'Bowling Alone' comments that the bonds between people are breaking down and people are living increasingly individualised lives. Murty (2012) outlines a number of factors that have contributed to the decrease in obligations because of shrinking local interaction, these include: financial pressures, which have resulted in two career families, frequent residential mobility, longer commutes, the increase of electronic personalised entertainment and the emergence of youth cultures that are at odds with the values of older generations. The above have contributed to the reduction in civic involvement of successive generations leading to decreasing levels of generalised reciprocity and localised obligations.

Rationalisation and Professionalisation

Public services have been increasingly influenced by neoliberal economics over the past 30 to 40 years. The belief that market economics can deliver

more efficient and effective services has been at the heart of this new movement (Fores et al. 1991, Pusey 1996). This change is one that has enhanced exclusion rather than inclusion (Fores 1991). A succession of reforms throughout the western world has moved more and more welfare and social service delivery from the state to private organisations and charities that are compelled to operate in a more market driven, professional, environment (Bauman 2007; Marwell 2004; Noordegraaf 2011; Standing 2011). Combined with the discourse of professionalism the neo-liberal approach has enabled the spread of rampant individualism to community services (Evetts 2013).

These developments have led to a change in field resulting in cultural capital relating to business and commerce being preferred over that produced from on the ground social welfare based experience (Özbilgin and Tatli 2011; Woolford and Curran 2012). Özbilgin and Tatli (2011) employ the concept of field to show how struggles between frontline and managerial staff have emerged over the preferencing of business and financial decision making protocols over of concerns regarding the quality of front line delivery. Draus and Carlson (2009) suggest the emergence of neoliberal thinking within the charity sector is moving service delivery away from a welfare model to a greater emphasis on recipients' personal risk management. More emphasis is being put on service users to take responsibility for their own care at the expense of focusing on more needed changes in the structure of the welfare/support social space. They found that service managers were starting to see the neoliberal imperative as taken for granted, in the way that experts in a field get a feel for the game. Operating as a business was

becoming essential, not optional. Draus and Carlson see this reflected in the recruitment of board members with business professionals preferred over those from a particular community or those with experience with service users. They argue that successful management rests on being able to secure government contracts and deliver them in a way that is financially beneficial to the charity. The change in focus has, for Woolford and Curran (2012), led to the restructuring of the charity field and changed the capital and habitus needed to succeed. Business management, data analysis, and financial risk management skills are replacing, albeit with some struggle, traditional skills and dispositions found within the service welfare sector. Despite the neo liberal motivated drive to professionalise, governments now see community involvement as essential to tackling social issues such as crime, poor education and health concerns (Marinetto 2003). In the UK this was highlighted with the establishment of the Department for Communities and Local Government inside the cabinet office in 2001 (becoming a department in its own right in 2006). There has been a greater emphasis on neighbourhood participation and resident empowerment on the one hand, and self-reliance and self-responsibility on the other. This new welfare environment has a dual focus, providing material welfare at a lower cost and developing a self-empowerment mindset within welfare recipients through building lasting relationships and reciprocity, yet the latter has proven hard to realise (Marwell 2004).

This change has progressed the thought that non state actors are an essential part of the welfare system with both private and voluntary sector organisations being contracted to run more and more services. As a result,

Andreassen et al. (2014) state that the not for profit sector is becoming professionalised, so their operations fit particular criteria. A dual process is taking place, firstly movements that were once run by volunteers are becoming run by paid employees, pushing organisations away from the grassroots; secondly, service deliverers are conforming more and more to professional codes of conducts and practices. Managers are recruited based increasingly on managerial experience and qualifications rather than on the ground experience, with senior staff more readily swapping between sectors. The public, private and voluntary sectors are increasingly looking the same (Andreassen et al. 2014).

With the election of the coalition government in 2010 and initiation of an austerity budget the landscape changed further. Local authority funding started to up, and two new Acts of Parliament signalled a further development in local provision. Firstly, the Localism Act (2011) opened up local authority services to be delivered by national and local organisations, staff mutuals and newly formed partnerships. To win tenders within this new landscape organisations must show how they will be competitive, demonstrate how they can cut costs and generate their own income. Parallel to this, a community budget facility was encouraged to give local people control over funding with the idea that locals should be able to commission, design and provide the services they want and need (Dowling and Harvie 2014). For Dowling and Harvie this placed communities at the heart of a new privatisation process.

The austerity government's agenda had three fundamental social aims, which have been further entrenched since the 2015 general election: to

provide less costly but better social services, devolve decision making power and administrative responsibility to local communities and stimulate economic growth through innovation (Dowling and Harvie 2014).

The 'community' within this context is a professionalised locally active third sector, which is being asked to fill the void caused by state retrenchment and disappearance of more informal connections. Much of this study focuses on the increase of third sector organisation activity on the estate and the impact this is having on the life of the estate.

Traditionally professionalism has been associated with roles that require highly specialised training and specific ethical codes such as law and medicine (Andreassen et al. 2014; Begun 1986, Evetts 2011). In recent years the term has had a wider catchment and covers a plethora of occupations including those related to community development and youth work. This professionalisation has been used to close markets by discriminating against those trying to enter the field or carry out similar work, thus ensuring market control (Begun 1996, Evetts 2003, 2006, 2011, 2013). Often symbolic mechanisms such as rites of passage, licensing, state backed endorsements and jargon are used to endear loyalty within the professional groups, respect amongst lay people and the acceptance of any status given as an institutional fact (Evetts 2013, Lyons 2011, Noordegraaf 2011). In a localised inner city setting the notion of professionalism places those who can carry the tag above residents, partly because of the perceived expertise and partly because, unlike residents who act as individuals or a group of residents, the professionals are acting on behalf of

a recognised organisation of power. Professionalism therefore often serves as a method of social control (Evetts 2006, Waring and Waring 2009).

However, as Pfadenhauer (2006) has commented there has been somewhat of a crisis with the concept of professionalism in recent years. People are no longer always inclined to see professionals as experts, and there has been an erosion of their perceived cognitive superiority. It is now acceptable for less trained people to operate in perceived professional roles as '*professional amateurs*' (Andreassen et al. 2014; Pfadenhauer 2006). Users of services delivered by professionals can prefer to develop and act on their knowledge and experience rather than trusting professionals. Added to this, self-regulation is being replaced by standardisation and outside regulation resulting in increasing lower skilled roles (Pfadenhauer 2006), which could, in theory, make it easier for 'lay' people to get involved in previously closed off activities. As such, a central theme of chapters' four to seven is the relationship between professionalisation and a resident engagement in service delivery.

Spatial Control

The changing of fields and increased professionalism on the estate is explored further in the management of physical space. Lefebvre (2009) comments that space is often considered a neutral element of social relations, yet all space is political. Political silence regarding a particular space simply means that its future has already been decided. For Lefebvre (2003) public areas have traditionally been a space for interaction and relationship building. However, the bourgeoisification of the city has led the

street to lose its meeting place function and is now merely a passageway to assist consumption. Occupied streets once protected against criminal violence, however when street busyness disappears, crime increases. Urban space is now primarily seen in terms of commercial value has become abstract space (Hass and Olsson 2014; Horkheimer and Adorno 2002; Lefebvre 2003; Wilson 2013), which has limited its relationship building potential.

Short termism is increasingly apparent in the use and development of urban space, which is motivated by commercial gain and preferencing space over place. These areas are being remade using a middle class individual lifestyle blueprint rather than one based on more working class community orientated living (Çelik and Gough 2014; Hass and Olsson 2014). For Habermas (1962), the public sphere is a place where private people come together as a public. Bourgeois sensibilities govern the rules of such interactions. A middle class way of operating is influencing deprived areas which have seen public space increasingly regulated and controlled. The privatisation of public space has increased social and spatial segregation (Britton 2008; Lloyd 2013), resulting in less contact with other groups despite physical closeness. Because of the proximity but lack of interaction, Britton comments that a group threat situation occurs reinforcing prejudices resulting in residents spending most of their time in their homes (Britton 2008; Fenton 2010). Some neighbourhoods and therefore certain residents get labelled as dangerous, by the media, local authorities and residents of other areas (Fyte in Lees 2004; Tickner 1993). The depiction of certain

estates as problematic helps to construct a representation which supports the political-economic rationale for place (re) construction.

Lived experience now tends to take place, not in public but in homes and other private places. More and more 'communal' spaces are controlled by outsiders, including the state, as they get vacated by residents and other groups (Ilan 2012). The public sphere is now 'the socialised expression of individuals' reciprocally constituted autonomy' (Susen 2011), rooted in the coordination of normative public behaviour and excluding what is not acceptable (Lloyd 2013). Local authorities and other bodies use controls to try and impose their form of order onto areas (Lefebvre 2003; Tonkiss 2013; Wilson 2013). The construction and reconstruction of space and who should occupy it sits alongside notions of territoriality with different groups laying claim to areas in an attempt to shape it to their liking (Fenton 2010; Kärrholm 2007). These actions can be carried out by different groups simultaneously which can result in conflict around who has a legitimate right to control a geographic area. Territory making is never static and is continually made and remade through control mechanisms and the shaping of socialised behaviour. Although this is not always intentional or planned, the results tend to remain long after these actions end. On the estate, there are visible signs of the tension between the more sterile professional space making and the more territorial place making by young people who consider many of the communal areas of the estate as their home. Situations where groups of young people are hanging around, as is noticeable in many inner city housing estates, are more likely to be seen as problematic by local leaders as they fail to conform to a particular public image (Hatiprokopiou 2009; Ilan

2012; Wacquant 2007). Policy makers often make decisions that further dispossess those who, by way of their social, cultural and economic capital, already feel dispossessed. Decisions made from afar can leave those living in deprived neighbourhoods seeing what is culturally familiar and gives them a sense of home, disappearing (Wacquant 2007). The research, therefore, seeks to understand how what is considered the right or acceptable way to behave in different spaces is shaped by the dominant field and by social relations. As these change over time so does what is deemed acceptable behaviour.

Field, Social Control, and Young People

Many of the issues outlined above are brought into focus when they are discussed in relation to young people. Young people are currently experiencing a fragmented and prolonged transition from youth to adulthood (Bradley 2008; Brannen and Nilsen 2002; Juvonen 2014; MacDonald et al. 2005; Silva 2012; Russell and O'Connell 2001). For some, this protracted move into adulthood is a period of supported self-exploration and development. However, for young people from deprived backgrounds, this time represents a period of chaotic and unplanned housing options (MacDonald et al. 2005), educational frustrations (Reynolds &. Baird 2010), long term unemployment; and a lack of inter generational and capital building networks (Tubergen 2014; Watkins 2007). The relationships young people do form often help entrench particular life patterns and their exclusion from others. Unbalanced connections impact on their perceptions of their future opportunities, all of which increase the risk of being involved

in criminal activity (Bradley 2008; Kingston 2009; Kupchik and Catlaw 2015; Holligan 2014; MacDonald et al. 2005; Smith & Riach 2014).

As a result, youths from estates are spending longer in a state where they are conceptualised as either at risk of danger or are dangerous themselves (Hughes 2011). Kelly (2003) comments that young people today are alienated; people view them as the other, delinquent and ungovernable. Due to the tendency for young people to hang around in groups, authorities often view their criminal activities through the gang lens, despite there often being little evidence to substantiate this claim (Hobbs 2013). Hobbs comments that the category of organised crime is regularly overly hyped, with the police's understanding failing to capture the fluidity of membership of such groups or the realities of their social structure. Many young people are therefore labelled by the authorities wrongly as gang members (Fraser and Hagedon 2016).

Hatiprokopiou (2009) comments that minority groups can suffer from a not having their own space and as such have to play out more of their lives in public areas. The visibility of these groups often leads to tensions and confrontations with others who object to the practices displayed causing tensions. Local leaders' normal response is to try to limit the behaviour that is seen as problematic through enforcement.

Concerns caused by the actions and visibility of young people have increased the attempts to regulate their behaviour. Anxiety and mistrust about young people have resulted in increased calls for professional intervention (Fraser and Hagedon 2016). This process has created a body

of professionals who claim to have a better understanding of how to ensure young people transition out of their deviancy.

In many respects, this project details a battle between the informal friendship field and the professional field; however, alongside these two fields another youth social space had been developing on the estate. Bourdieu's theory of practice has been employed by various researchers of street and youth culture. Sandberg (2008) comments that Bourdieu's framework allows for the analysis of activities within social spaces as systems with their own rules, regulations, and values without the black and white, good and bad moralistic dichotomies that can be seen in the work of other commentators of street culture such as Anderson (1999). Using Bourdieu's theory of practice in this way highlights the struggle, domination, contextuality, skillful action and transformative effects of street based social space (Shammas and Sandberg 2016).

Theorists such as Bourgios (2003), Fleetwood (2014), Fraser and Atkinson (2014). Harding (2013), Ilan (2013), Shammas and Sandberg (2016), Sandberg (2008, 2012) and Wacquant (2000), have all developed understandings of street habitus and capital. Sandberg (2008) outlines the struggle for status and symbolic capital within street cultures, highlighting the strategies that marginalised groups develop to accumulate symbolic capital, which over time become embodied street capital.

Bourgois (2003), studying crack selling in El Barrio, New York, showed how particular networks and an understanding of street culture was a form of street cultural capital, helping the possessor excel in drug dealing. Moyle

and Coomber (2017) use habitus, field and capital to understand user-dealer practices to show how particular habitus and capital lends itself to drug dealing rather than other forms of income generation. Sandberg and Fleetwood (2016) look how street talk is embedded in street habitus, highlighting role narratives play in the creation and accumulation of street capital. For Sandberg and Fleetwood, street narratives allow people to bond and develop with others in their network. Knowing and telling stories of street exploits is an important factor in successful street based bonding and displays competence and knowledge of the field. Recalling such events then reinforces the cultural values of the street.

For Sandberg (2008) street capital that gives status to violence and criminality develops when groups become isolated from the mainstream. As this new culture emerges the norms and values become embodied habitus developing a new subculture (Sandberg 2008; 2012). Street habitus develops when the economic and social structures of society isolate particular groups who then find their immediate prospects bound up in illegal activity such as drug dealing.

Within street fields, violence or the appearance of violence act as a symbolic capital maintaining its hierarchical structure (Akers 1977, 1979; Alexander 2000; Bourgois 2003 Harding 2014; Sandberg 2008, 2012, Sandberg and Pederson 2011 Sutherland 1974; Winfree et al. 1994). Those who are most successful have the greatest feel for this violent game (Shammas and Sandberg 2016).

Isolation and exclusion from mainstream education and employment opportunities experienced by young people contribute to the development of street capital (Gowan 2011; Harding 2014; Holligan 2015; Young 1999). Young people are making life choices based on the internalisation of the limitations that their cultural capital and habitus bears upon them (Bhat and Rather 2013; Bottrell 2009; France and Haddon 2008; Threadgold and Nilan 2009). Teachers and youth professionals also judge the habitus of young people living in deprived conditions (Dean 2016; Farrugia 2011; Wallace 2016), which guides what capital developing activities are offered to them (Dean 2016). This exclusion has led many to see street life as their best option, turning to crime to secure an income.

The resources needed to survive and excel in this field leads to habitual patterns that further isolate people from mainstream fields (Gowan 2011; Harding 2014; Holligan 2015; Rimmer 2010; Young 1999). Young people's responses to the mismatch between particular fields and their habitus become capital in other constructed fields but cause further exclusion (Gilbert et al. 2013). Pih et al. (2008) in their study of gangs found that gang members with the socioeconomic backgrounds to access the capital needed to secure legitimate work stay gang members for a shorter period than those who do not have access to this form capital. As such, they found that gang members with legitimate jobs often get involved in drug dealing and other gang associated activities to supplement other forms of income. Their connection to and knowledge of gang life meant that they had the right links to make a bit of extra money when they needed. However, gang members without connections to the mainstream world of work could not do

the reverse. However young people who do have the cultural and social capital and habitus to operate in more than one field often struggle with a sense of not fitting into any field and can feel personally isolated (Franceschelli and O'Brien 2015; Ingram 2011; Lehmann 2009 and Reay et al. 2009).

Warner and Rountree (1997) found that the wrong strong ties can lead to an increase in crimes such as burglary. These ties, Putnam (1993) argued, can lead to cynicism towards the authorities and established modes of personal and social development such as mainstream educational and employment opportunities. Neighbourhood relations, therefore, can constrain young people limiting their perceptions of economic and social opportunities and increase their tolerance of deviant activities (Ilan 2012; MacDonald et al. 2005). Weak social ties outside of young people's immediate peer group lead to the increase of violence and the development of gang culture (Harding 2014; Pih et al. 2008; Sampson and Groves 1989 Winfree et al. 1994).

Where there is little outside supervision, the dynamics of particular groups can support offending behaviour (Ilan 2012). Mehlkop and Graeff (2010) built upon Becker (1968) and developed the Theory of Subjective Utility (SEU) commenting that people's understanding of the pros and cons of committing a crime are influenced by the standards of those around them.

The project combines a Bourdieusian analysis of the youth street field with Shaw and McKay's (1942) Social Disorganisation Theory and Sampson and

Grove's (1997) Collective Efficacy Theory to place field analysis within a wider context of neighbourhood crime.

Shaw and McKay (1942) followed the work of Park and Burgess (1925) in researching inner city crime and developed a theory of Social Disorganisation. For Shaw and McKay crime is caused by structural issues such as such as population turnover, deprivation and racial and ethnic heterogeneity (Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Cantillon et al. 2003; Kingston et al. 2009; Sampson 1997; Shaw and Mckay 1942). Shaw and McKay found that even when rapid changes in populations occur crime rates stayed stable and that delinquency decreased the further people lived from the inner city. They concluded that delinquency is caused by macro level structural issues rather than individuals. The social structure and social networks of an area can determine whether or not it will be a high crime neighbourhood.

Social Disorganisation theory draws on a systemic model of community organisation which views neighbourhoods as a complex system of friendship and kinship connections that operate alongside more formal networks that support the socialisation process (Bellair 1997, Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Carr 2003; Cantillon et al. 2003; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974). Frequent interaction with family members and neighbours are considered vital in preventing localised crime and developing effective social control mechanisms. The closer these connections, the more likely people are to intervene if someone is starting to show signs of deviancy (Bellair 1997). Neighbourhoods, where large numbers of residents know and interact with each other, are more likely to develop surveillance

mechanisms, rules and intervene in disturbances (Bellair 1997; Bursik 1998). Weak ties largely associated with the networks developed by community organisations, have a role to play but are not enough to produce collective social control by themselves (Bursik 1999; Kingston et al. 2009).

However, strong neighbourhood ties are becoming rarer, leading to concerns about the effectiveness of residents' connections in dealing with youth deviance (Fischer 1982; Sampson 2009; Wellman 1979). Bellair (1997) found that only 15% of residents in urban neighbourhoods get together with other neighbours every day, and only 21% get together several times a week. This lack of connection means that, for Bellair, there was little evidence that a resident would intervene if they saw a young person doing wrong.

Hunter (1985) suggests that even where there are strong ties between residents, they can lack the capacity to achieve social control. Hunter suggests there are three types of connections needed for localised social control. The first is the informal or private control akin to Coleman's (1988) primordial socialisation. Young people with strong ties with those with robust morals are less likely to contravene these values due to the impact it will have on these relationships. Parochial connections to local organisations such as schools, churches, and youth centres add a second layer of control. For Hunter, these organisations provide additional adult supervision and the reinforcement of pro social norms. Hunter's third level is connections that those within the neighbourhood have with institutions such as the police, social services, and other agencies which they can draw upon for support.

Hunter suggests that all three levels are needed for effective social control. However, one or more are often missing in deprived neighbourhoods.

Sampson and Groves (1989) built upon this understanding and developed collective efficacy theory to explain how the relationships that residents have with relatives, friends, and co-workers establish reciprocal ties which when coupled with the connections with local organisations such as schools, local charities and work places, influence neighbourhood behaviour.

Collective efficacy theory considers how interactions produce trust and mutual expectations, which are utilised to address local social issues. Collective efficacy differs from other relational based concepts such as social capital as it refers to activity focused on addressing specific social control issues, rather than general relational benefits (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Sampson 2009). Sampson highlights the importance of intergenerational closure resulting from parents knowing the parents of their children's friends as a key to developing supervision systems that help prevent youth crime. Adult networks are also a vital source of role models, advice, and opportunities for young people (Oberwitter 2004). Although relationships are an important component of collective efficacy, Sampson (1997; 1999) suggests that disadvantage and racial exclusion produces economic dependency, alienation, fear, and distrust weakening collective efficacy enough to overpower the influence of strong personal relationships to administer social control. This neighbourhood instability leads to weaker social ties and less control over crime (Bursik and Grasmik 1993; Carr 2003).

Bursik and Grasmick (1993) see the capacity for neighbourhoods to ensure effective social control rests on their ability to draw upon the resources of local organisations and institutions such as the police, social services, and local charities. However, in considering the role that relationships to wider sources of support play in neighbourhood social control, Sampson, and Graif (2009) found that residents with connections to local organisations often have less connection to their neighbours. Resident involvement in activities with local leaders did very little for social capital development within neighbourhoods and leadership social capital has a negative relationship with collective efficacy as it can act to separate those who are actively involved in the neighbourhood from other residents (Sampson and Graif 2009). In this sense, social disorganisation can leave residents isolated from one another and from institutions that a2re supposed to support them (Cantillon et al. 2003). A dual process occurs where residents disengage and their relationships weaken, and local leaders engage more but have little connection with those who live in the area.

Areas with low levels of social connections with professional organisations and little collective efficacy often lack the resources, social support and informal social controls that are needed to support the positive development of young people. Young people in these neighbourhoods are more likely to be influenced by deviant peer groups (Kingston et al. 2009).

Carr (2003) observed that anti-crime initiatives involving residents and professionals focused on promoting formal control mechanisms rather than developing informal relationships. Carr found that involvement in local committees gave residents the chance to engage in issues as a group,

preventing them from having to act as individuals. However, because residents do not have close relationships with each other, formal mechanisms of control are initiated rather than the relational interventions such as the collective supervision of children. Activities included getting bars, off licences and shops closed down and giving statements in court against perpetrators. The impersonal character of these interventions causes an "us and them" situation to occur with identified enemies. However, Carr did observe that there is often still an unconscious supervision of children, but when they become teenagers, there is more reluctance for adults to intervene. This supervision tends to mainly take place at functions and such as BBQs and parties as adults tend not to standout on the street to observe their neighbourhood as they once did. With residents no longer supervising young people in the way they once did, formal institutions such as the police and local authority are increasingly seen as those to rely on to prevent youth criminality.

Summary

Chapters four to seven tie together the themes discussed above with the data collected during the research. Drawing on Bourdieu's theory of practice and utilising the concepts of field, habitus, and capital, the project explores the hierarchical dynamics of life on the estate. Specifically, it focuses on how the interventions of the local authority have helped to usher in a new professional ethos and, as a result, changed the dominant habitus. The increased status of professionalism brings into play methods of market control and hierarchy that will be explored through Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence. The emphasis on professionalism has influenced the

way people use communal space, how services are delivered and how people interact with each other.

The change in the dominant way people interact with one another can be most clearly seen in the support and actions of young people. As such a large proportion of the data below considers how changes in field, habitus, and expectations influence the actions of young people hanging around on the estate. In so doing the project explores how wider relational theories such as collective efficacy and social disorganisation theory relate to the data collected.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research problem

The research took place on what is considered a deprived 882 unit housing estate in South London. The estate itself dates back to the late 1930s - 1940s, and as such it is more structurally sound than other nearby estates which were built in the 1970s. Its physical robustness means that, unlike many other local estates, it has not undergone nor is not earmarked for redevelopment. Instead, it was chosen to be the trial estate for local authority's new collaborative approach to service delivery as part of the council's shift to becoming a cooperative council. During the life of the research, the site was the place of many new initiatives aimed to test out new devolved approaches to service delivery.

My motivation for undergoing this research is that from 2005 onwards I had been living on the estate. Initially, I moved on to the estate as part of my commitment to helping to start a new volunteer led church on the estate, believing that to support residents I should live locally. It was not long before I realised two significant things. The other church members had no affinity to the local area and were not interested in developing community initiatives. Secondly, there were a good number of residents who were far more passionate about the estate and far more capable than I was in working out how to deal with local issues.

During my time on the estate, residents have had to fight to gain even the smallest recognition from outsiders. People with less experience but attached to a 'professional organisation' have been paid to run similar

activities to that which residents have done to a better quality, and for free, for years. Added to the frustrations caused by the above, many residents have experienced pain and suffering caused by anti-social behaviour and serious criminal violence as well as the successive failures of initiatives to address resident's concerns. Although I had no intention of doing research when I first moved on to the estate, what I witnessed over several years caught my interest and after five or six years of living alongside and experiencing what other residents did, I felt that there was a story to tell.

The experiences described above means that this project is inherently political; aiming to give voice to those residents who have been marginalised or simply appeased over the years, to understand the hierarchical structures that people on the estate operate within, and how these structures shape life on the estate. The research takes sides (Becker 1967) deliberately giving preference to the residents' voices and experiences to illuminate both the obvious and more hidden power relations that place residents lower down a hierarchical structure than others. Ethnography was the ideal method to collect the data needed as it is best placed to uncover the position of the marginalised within various power and political structures (Molland 2013). The research looked to move from the what, to the how, before explaining the why (Fine 2003; Maxwell 2013) of what was observed. As such, the research started with a wide lens, observing many aspects of estate life, before narrowing its focus onto specific elements.

The research project was opportunistic Complete Member Research (CMR) as my involvement in the field preceded the research (Adler and Adler 1987;

Anderson 2006; Charmaz 2004, Denshire 2014, Murphy 1987). I had already lived in the area for a number of years, was a leader in the local church, trustee, and coach of a local football project, member of the residents' committee and had been involved in resident activities to support local young people. As my Ph.D. progressed, I took on several additional roles that allowed me greater access to information. These positions included becoming the secretary of the residents' committee, chair of trustees for the football project, co-chair of the community hall management group and a member of the local area forum, which has a wider remit than just the estate of interest to me. My paid work during this time of running a youth construction training programme, supported by the local housing ALMO (now dissolved) and council, helped give me greater access to local officials. The fieldwork was, therefore, an extension of my everyday life.

Main Protagonists

Out of an estate of about 3000 residents, one of the starkest observations from anyone who tries to do anything on the estate is the fact that there only a dozen or so people who are actively involved in estate activities, and from this group, only a handful or so who can really be relied upon.

This study, in many respects, is their story with a focus on those who were most active on the estate. There was a group of main protagonists throughout the ethnography, with others dropping off and others entering as the research progressed. There were a number of different groupings on the estate. On the surface there were the adult residents, professionals, and young people, however, a closer look suggests a more interesting picture. The frontline professionals engaging with the estate were mainly women of

either White British or Caribbean background, with a few white male managers and black women managers in the background. The older adult residents tended to be first generation migrants from the Caribbean or White British residents, with both groups moving on to the estate in the late 70s or early 80s. A few West Africans who moved on the estate in the 90s joined these groups also becoming active on the estate. The fact that the remnants of these groups sit around tables and work together for the betterment of the estate today somewhat hides the fact that in the past there were some real palpable ethnic divides, with activities sometimes operating along racial lines. The strength of diversity on the estate, alongside changes in what is socially acceptable, has muted any racist sentiment that remains (Back 1996).

Adults of a generation or so ago seemed to have none of these antagonisms with different ethnicities mixing more freely. Many friendship groups included both men and women of different ethnic backgrounds. Often these relationships are solidified by inter racial relationships or the presence of mixed race children. This seemed to allow a mainly black friendship group to accept white parents of mixed race children as one of them.

For the young people on the estate, ethnicity seems to be less of an issue among themselves. Despite the fact that they speak of racial discrimination, especially in relation to the way they are treated by the police, amongst themselves the youth culture seems more syncretic (Back 1996). Youth friendships groups are made up of mainly second and third generation West African and Caribbean young people, and some White British and other Europeans, all interacting as equals. Although there is an awareness

amongst the young people of their various backgrounds, Nigerian, Ghanaian, Congolese, Jamaican, Portuguese, White British, Turkish, comments about the differences were generally jovial. On the estate, the young people seem to portray a common culture that supersedes any ethnic or racial dichotomy.

One of the main constants throughout was Dorothy, now in her late seventies, who came to the UK from Jamaica in her 20s to study nursing. After a short time in Essex and then Manchester, whilst her then husband who had moved to the UK from Nigeria studied law, the young couple settled on the estate in the early 70s. Dorothy commented on how her friends did not understand why they had decided to start a family on the estate and got even more questions when she decided to buy her flat in the 80s. Dorothy's reasoning was that it seemed as good a place as any.

Dorothy mentions several reasons why she started to take an active role on the estate. She first took an interest after a few kids started lighting fires in the bin shelters in her block. Her response was to go try and get to know the boys in question, and what she found out moved her to go across the road to the local school and see if she could help out. Her thoughts were that there were probably others that she could support too. Her eagerness to help those around her led her to take some community development classes at the local adult education centre and then retrain as a social worker.

In listening to her talk about her involvement on the estate, her one regret seemed to be that she may have spent too much time supporting others at

the expense of her own three children. The strength of her character is seen in her willingness to work alongside others of her generation who, 20-30 years ago used to openly object to black people being involved in particular estate activities and obstructed some of her efforts in the 80s. Although Dorothy would sometimes speak of the hurt endured during this period, she would never say a bad word against any of those involved.

Over the past 40 or so years, Dorothy has got involved in most estate based initiatives and as the current treasurer of the resident's committee, she holds significant sway. However, it is not necessarily her positions that are the source of her considerable influence, but how she has used her various positions to help others.

Her desire to see others and the estate prosper means she is seen by those who associate with her as a grandmother figure, with many of those who have got involved recently, motivated to stay involved due to some personal support from Dorothy. As the project drew to a close there were seven residents whose initial participation or continued participation could be linked to Dorothy's actions.

Another key figure is Charis. Now in her late 40s, Charis lived in Birmingham when she first moved over from Jamaica. She moved to the estate in the mid 90s as a young mother and soon got a reputation as being short tempered and loud mouthed. She shares a two bedroom flat with her two daughters, Miche aged 26 and Stephanie aged 12, and Miche's two daughters. In around 2012, she was also joined by her brother who moved down from Birmingham for a fresh start. When Miche got pregnant with her

first daughter in 2006, Charis thought that something needed to change. Stephanie was just a few years younger than Miche was when she started hanging around with the boys from the estate, and Charis was worried that Stephanie might soon go the same way. This was the start of something of a transformation for Charis. After deciding to try and help the young people on the estate, in just a few years Charis moved from being a problem mother to a well respected member of the residents' committee, who was considered by the residents as a vital asset in their support of young people. From 2006-2009 Charis helped to run the resident led youth project and she became a popular figure among the young people and their parents. By the end of 2012, she had qualified as a play worker and had a part time job at an after school club at a nearby school. She could still rub people up the wrong way when she wanted, but by her own account, she was a lot calmer than before. Many of the ideas for the residents' support for young people came from Charis, often via someone else who she asked to suggest them as she didn't feel confident enough to speak up herself.

Miche, Charis eldest daughter, lives out her life on the estate. In many ways, her development mirrors that of her mother. From about the age of 15-19, she was the only female in the group of what became known as the original elders on the estate, hanging out until late and being rude to those who complained about the noise she was making. When Hawk, a local Eritrean boy got her pregnant, Miche came under Charis' wing once more and got involved in estate activities. Whilst most were concentrating on activities for the boys, Miche developed a small girls group and a t-shirt printing business.

Elizabeth, originally from the midlands, moved on into the area in the 80s as a squatter, before securing a council tenancy. Her new age disposition is still on show for all who enter her home, beads have replaced the internal, doors and ornate crystals and books on meridian points are almost everywhere you look. Before retiring in 2012, Elizabeth spent a couple of years working for a community health project, however up until this point she had objected to working, saying that the estate was her job. This commitment to the estate was initially seen by her running and informal home school from outside her flat, and offering advice and guidance to all who asked. After a short time away from the estate, Elizabeth got involved with the residents' committee, becoming its secretary a few years later in 2004. She stayed in this position until early 2012, when she decided to take a step back. As secretary, Elizabeth really set the agenda for the residents' committee, and not just in terms of the meetings. During her early years as secretary almost nothing got done if Elizabeth didn't approve. Some saw this as her using her position to only ensure that what she was interested in getting any attention, however, the reality was somewhat different. Once Elizabeth was made aware of an issue she would research and network tirelessly, talking to residents as well as contacting relevant councillors and local authority staff, before putting it on the committee's agenda. It was only after this initial investigation was complete that Elizabeth raised the issue publicly.

Lino started St Mary's Football Project in 2004 when he decided to take a few boys from his block to the local park one summer to play football. Shortly after, he ended up as a parent governor at the local primary school after his

wife put him forward for election as a joke and, as the only candidate, he was elected. However, struck by the lack of local representation, he decided to get stuck in. This was a bit of a turning point for Lino, who had grown up just down the road to an Irish mum and Italian Dad. Lino had spent most of his youth and early adulthood involved in various criminal activities. However, a combination of seeing many of his friends' lives ruined by drugs and meeting the right woman, he started to turn his life around. Lino, in the space of just a couple of years, had gone from selling knock off clothes outside the school gate to becoming a governor. Lino and his family moved to just down the road some years ago, however he is there so often that many either don't realise this or regularly forget.

Kwame, in his late 50s, came over to the UK from Ghana in the 80s and settled on the estate soon after. He, like many other long term residents, is a leaseholder, however, his outlook was not as community orientated as other leaseholders such as Dorothy. Kwame, another longstanding member of the residents' committee, became chair of the group in 2012 after the reshuffle triggered by Elizabeth's departure. Apart from coming to the meetings, Kwame does very little on the estate often speaking quite negatively about other residents, especially young people. In one committee meeting, Kwame even suggested that the best thing to do would be to knock the estate down so that he and other leaseholders who are trapped can take the money and move somewhere else.

Marie, now in her 40s, moved to the estate at the age of two when her parents relocated from Essex where they were born and brought up. Marie's parents were part of the original group of residents who ran both Centenary

Hall and John's Hut. As she got older, clashes of personality with other members of the residents' committee meant that her mum took a step back, and she took up the mantle of estate engagement. After leaving school Marie trained and worked as a hairdresser before a problem with her leg and back left her unable to work. Marie was one of the last people on the estate to take advantage of a once common housing scheme where children of council tenants could be housed near their parents. As such living on the estate is almost all she has known. After Centenary Hall reopened, tensions started to appear between residents who were worried about the impact that parties in the hall would have on the estate and the residents' committee. The most vocal of the former was Antoinette, Marie's mum, which seemed to leave Marie in the middle of two arguing groups. After a short time volunteering with her mum on a 50s+ meal project based in the hall, Marie left the residents committee and now concentrates her time supporting her mum run the old St Mary's Youth Club building.

Antoinette and another long standing resident Billy, a proud Geordie, were heavily involved in the youth activities and the original incarnation of Centenary Hall, however, both are in their 70s and concentrate their time keeping the old youth club building open. Both will occasionally get involved in residents committee activity, Antoinette, in support of her daughter and Bill, because his wife Margerie was still a member of the residents' committee until very recently.

As the project came to a close, a new group of volunteers started to emerge under the tutelage of Dorothy. Most of them originally got involved due to a summer play scheme run by the residents' committee. Kate, a Jamaican

mother of three who has been on the estate for nearly 10 years, seemed to be the catalyst, recruiting some of her fellow parents from the local primary school. Some of these volunteers lived on the estate, some lived further afield and were attracted due to the opportunity to do something positive locally, to help their children and their children's friends and get paid for doing so. As with the estate volunteers before them, they have a mixed heritage. One is a white British woman who grew up locally, another, alongside Kate, grew up in Jamaica, another is Black British of Jamaican decent and another is from Congo. What they all have in common is that they have children of a similar age and the encouragement of Dorothy seems to have motivated them into action.

Theoretical underpinning

I took the approach of Baiocchi and Conner (2008) and focused mainly on the official public life of the estate since almost all the activities that took place in the public arena was some form of official activity. Outside of the activities of young people, seldom did anything that did not start in a meeting somewhere take place in the open or communal spaces of the estate. Concentrating predominantly on public activities defined my research significantly, and led to a focus on the activities of particular groups, especially the residents' committee, and its members. I wanted to understand how the official life of the estate has changed over time, what caused these developments and what their effects were. As such, the research sought to unearth the cogs and wheels of the causal process within particular areas of estate life (Hedström and Swedberg 2010).

The consideration of time was an important factor in my understanding of variation. Although this is often used in the sense of shadowing or following research subjects outside of the initial research field (Trouille and Tavory 2016), I wanted to employ the concept to consider how different issues were addressed and resources used over time. Despite this breaking with the standard pragmatist approach of inter situational variation, I felt that it was important to employ a historical qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) approach (Fortun 2012, Small 2013). Therefore, the difference in the situations became a variation over time. As it was not plausible to gain this data through an ethnographic study, I used qualitative interviews to support the research. This approach enabled me to track the development and impacts of different fields (see chapter two) on the estate.

My original thought was to apply a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss 1999 [1967]) as a way of looking at the research field afresh. However, in the early stages of the research, a pragmatist approach was taken and I looked to other studies to draw comparisons and as a way of seeing things from different perspectives (Fine 2003, Tavory and Timmermans 2013). However, I did borrow Glaser and Strauss' notion of a 'theory in process' and developed my ideas as I identified the key issues and causalities from the data.

The ethnography highlighted the causal relationships at a micro level, which were often the result of abstract macro contexts (Machamer, Darden and Craver 2000; Tavory and Timmermans 2013). This ethnographic approach helped to find the chains of action that caused problems to occur and chains of actions that created meaning. I have considered the sociological themes

discussed in the literature review within a number of settings and situations and with different actors to ascertain whether what I observed was the result of reactive or reflective responses and whether the data captured represented a habit or more systematic way of dealing with things. In so doing I was interested in the variations (Tavory and Timmermans 2013) or gaps (Fortun 2012) within the dataset to uncover the causal relationship between phenomena. For example, in considering why less adult residents actively support the younger residents when compared to a generation ago, I needed to consider what the support was like a generation ago and looked at the chains of events leading up to the contemporary situation. The research, therefore, has a historical element (Steinmetz 2011). In this sense, the research attempted to make "*an inherently "invisible" causal explanation visible"* (Tavory and Timmermans 2013).

Research Questions

The overall objective of the research was to provide an estate based analysis of the impact of professionalism on the ability to provide localised neighbourhood based social controls.

The focus outlined above led to the following research questions:

- What social fields dominate interaction on the estate and why?

- How has a more professionalised field influenced interactions on the estate?

- What has been the impact of the domination of certain fields on the development of effective neighbourhood social controls on the estate?

Defining My Research Site and Research Participants

The project had a larger potential. However, I was acutely aware of the danger of causing the research project to become too vast and unmanageable (Silverman 2006). I, therefore, opted to be in the position to say a lot about something specific rather than gain a more general understanding of something wider in scope.   In defining the specific geographic area, I was careful not to allow the geographic confines of the estate to define my research completely and allowed the boundaries to be porous and blurred. My research population included residents and those who associated themselves with the estate, as it was apparent that many young people who do not live on the estate saw it as their home. Similarly, the ethnography enveloped organisations that worked on the estate but were based elsewhere.

During the research three main dichotomies appeared, adult residents, young people, and paid workers/professionals. Professional was used as a category to identify those who associated with the estate because it was part of some paid role, without which they would not be involved in the area.

Research Design

Ethnography is a method classically utilised by social anthropologists. However, there is also a long history of ethnography being used within urban sociology. The Chicago School under Robert Park developed a

reputation for neighbourhood based ethnographies that sought to understand why social issues such as deviant behaviour happened in particular areas.

William Foots Whyte's seminal work Street Corner Society (2009 [1943]) followed this tradition with Whyte moving into Cornerville and observing the 'urban slum' over a three year period. Whyte's research sought to dispel the myth that inner city poor neighbourhoods are disorganised, showing the intricate networks and structures that make street life possible. Whyte's work highlighted the need for research to understand actions on the respondents' terms rather than trying to interpret actions through the researcher's own mindset.

This outlook was developed further by Howard Becker through his work on deviance, most notably in Outsiders (1963), who used ethnography to understand the impact of being labelled deviant on various social groups within urban Chicago.

Back (1996) continued this tradition in his research of two housing estates in South London, unearthing a bricolage culture among the young people who drew on a range of ethnic backgrounds to produce their own culture.

In considering neighbourhoods with issues of noticeable criminal activity ethnographies by Anderson (1999), Bourgois (2003), Carr (2004) and Goffman (2014) have proven good reference points for the project. This study aims to continue in the tradition of ethnographical research within urban sociology, exploring a situation through the use of thick description.

Below I have outlined the specific reasons why I chose to employ my principle research method, participant observation. I also address some of the documented inefficiencies tabled at ethnography by including complimentary methods such as interviews, historical analysis, and the analysis of policy documents and email data. Added to this, I employed a reflexive approach to my fieldwork and subsequent writing, taking into account the impact of the research on myself and also the estate (Roberts and Sanders 2005).

Most of the data from the participant observation came from my time administering one of the roles I played on the estate, or through the related informal activities that made carrying out these roles possible. The observations were recorded in a fieldwork diary which was updated at least three to four times a week.

The interviews were mostly of an informal nature and were with adult residents, young people and staff from stakeholders including council and local organisation staff.

The secondary data comprised of the following: previous research done in the area, national government datasets; local and national government policy; local authority and local organisations' plans, minutes from meetings and emails passed on to me by respondents who wanted the information contained in them included in my research.

Ethnography

I have used the collective definition of ethnography provided by Martyn Hammersley in Ethnography: Principles in Practice, in which he states:

"Ethnography usually involves the researcher participating, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions through informal and formal interviews, collecting documents and artefacts – in fact, gathering whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the emerging focus of inquiry." (Hammersley 2007 Kindle location 214).

I participated in both the public and the private life of the estate including going to meetings, taking part in activities and also just being around to observe what is going on, whether this is in communal areas or residents' flats.

My aim was to research people in as close to their real life situation as possible. To do this I operated within overt and covert conditions, meaning that all parties knew that I was conducting a Ph.D. and collecting data, however, in making my data collection non intrusive, my role of a researcher was often overlooked. The naturalness of my position did bring up some ethical considerations which are explored below.

I used ethnography to understand what Fortun (2012) calls the discursive gaps in our current ways of explaining phenomena that cannot be described through current idioms. The research, instead of looking to illuminate what people already know, was designed to explore what cannot already be explained. For example, when considering ways to deal with social issues on the estate, instead of looking to existing community development ideas

to identify potential interventions, I have started from a more explorative approach based on the data produced through the ethnographic research.

I took Seeger's lead (in Rose 1990) and stopped collecting data when I knew enough about the areas of interested and the additional data was duplicating what was already collected. At no point did I reach the point where I thought I had captured everything, however after narrowing down my area of interest I did get to the point where new information was simply reinforcing my existing data.

The study is, in many respects, classical 'insider research' (Bucerius 2013, Hammersley 2007). Like many recent ethnographers, I have chosen my area of research out of a personal connection to the subject matter. I was very much what Anderson (2007) calls an Analytic Auto-Ethnographer, paying more attention to the way the subject matter related to theory and wider social phenomena than evocative descriptions (Charmaz 2004). Taking an analytic approach allowed observations to be guided by theory rather than a personal curiosity (Aguilar 1981, O'Reilly 2009).

My involvement in the research field allowed me to bypass many of the issues associated with entering the field and building a report as an outsider. It also enabled me to easily gather more data than if I was entering the field solely for research purposes.

For Becker (1998) and others, the art of good ethnography is to be constantly refining an image that we construct about our research subject. Conducting the ethnography allowed me to develop a picture of the changing nature of social life on the estate at a time where there was

immense pressure to tackle some key social problems with scarce resources. This first-hand experience and vastness of the data I collected over more than three years of writing filed notes, helped address Bulmer's (1982 [1969]) critique that researchers often make sense of their limited research data with their own beliefs and images. I am acutely aware that I still brought my own ideas to the research; the only difference being is that this imagery had been developed through time within the research field prior to the project starting.

I made a conscious decision not to be a silent author and wrote myself into the project as one of the research respondents (Bourdieu 1992, Blackman 2007, Denzin and Lincoln 1998, 2003). I aimed at democratising voice within the study by placing my voice alongside others. I hoped to lessen the documentary style narration and develop more of a collaborative feel to the work (Gobo 2008) ensuring that my research did not reproduce the current system of domination (Richardson 1994; Fortun 2012). I decided to write in the third person to ensure there was less attachment to my position than if I were to write in the first person (Denshire and Sturt 2014). This approach also helped to avoid 'author saturated texts' (Geertz 1998).

Rose (1990) recalls his frustration of having to conduct his covert research as a mechanic with no recording devices or opportunities to ask questions or conduct interviews. Although I conducted overt observation, these same frustrations existed. As an active participant, there were times when I was participating in an activity wishing that I could write down what was taking place, however it was not practical. Also, the discipline of regularly writing up field notes had an impact on how I experienced meetings, conversations,

and events on the estate. On an almost weekly basis, I found myself feeling overwhelmed by the fact that what I had heard, witnessed or experienced would result in several hours of writing. Despite the familiarity of the research field, the isolation of the research process caused a great deal of loneliness, both due to hours shut away writing and also because I started to understand the estate in a way that separated my views from other people I associated with (Benson and O'Neil 2008).

Interviews

Silverman (2006) points out that ethnographic research can only take our understanding of events so far. The data collected from observation was supported by qualitative interviews, which helped clarify the imagery the ethnographic study produced. Interview data was used to place the ethnographic data within its historical context through interviewing participants about their past experiences. However, I was aware that people might romanticise about the good old days (Back 1997) and collected as many historical accounts as possible to help substantiate different viewpoints.

The interviews were unstructured and non-directive, however, guidance was given as to which of the responses I wanted to explore further. The interview data and memos from the interviews were treated as a resource providing insight into how the interviewee understands the social relationships that they experience as part of their life on the estate.

Theoretical sampling (Emmel 2013, Goulding 2002) was used to identify interview respondents who would have information on specific theoretical

concepts or themes that the coding of the initial ethnographic data identified as important. In total, 41 interviews were conducted, 17 adult residents or ex-residents, 19 young people and five staff members from the council or organisations working on the estate. The interview data was deliberately comparative, with the data from the older residents used to understand how their experiences of growing up or parenting on the estate differed from that of contemporary parents and young people.

Ethical considerations

There were a number of ethical considerations and issues relating to how the research may impact participants and the wider neighbourhood that needed to be addressed with particular care. I took a pragmatic ethical stance (Liamputtong 2007) throughout the research as there were often instances where the rule did not fit the situation (Gobo 2008). Although I set out a strong ethical framework, there were situations where instead of following a rigid set of guidelines I had to ask myself, '*ethically, what is the right thing to do here?*' Gobo comments that sticking to ethical policies too tightly may itself be unethical, as it would stop some voices being heard. In many respects, it was impossible to make the research 100% ethical. Instead, it was a case of understanding what was the more ethical decision in particular situations (Mohatt and Thomas 2006). For Gobo, the underlying principle should be that no individual was harmed by the research or its publication.

The ethical issues I had to be aware of during the project were as follows:

Researcher Position

Due to my closeness to the research field and many of the respondents, it was impossible not to be emotionally involved in the research. I, therefore, took heart at Blackman's (2007) work on hidden ethnography which spoke of the merits of being honest about the emotional impact that the research has on the researcher. Unlike other researchers who had obvious entry and exit points to and from the field, the field in my case was my home, and although this gave me open access to data, it was emotionally draining. At times I felt like there was no way out. When I stepped down from some of my roles on the estate to give myself additional time analyse my data and write my thesis, I felt as though I was abandoning the people that I continued to live alongside. My discontent was amplified when people would comment about things that they thought were going wrong on the estate and I realised that, if I was to give myself enough time to finish my thesis, I could not do anything to help resolve the issue.

Due to my position, I was inextricably woven into the research both as a researcher and a source of data (Charmaz 2004). However, there were some distinct differences between myself and the other participants. Firstly, I was not only a resident, but I was also a researcher that has access to an academic society of peers through which I processed my data, hoping to produce a piece of work that would be accepted by the academy (Rose 1990). My situation also made residents whom I had known for many years start to question my motives again. One Tuesday lunch time two residents were talking in the kitchen of a communal building. As I walked into the kitchen, the conversation went quiet, and then Dorothy, one of the women,

commented: *"it is okay we can trust James."* Liz then replied, *"Well I guess, he has been around us for a while now, he is like family"*. Then the conversation continued. This 'for a while' was nine years which included teaching Liz's older son on a construction course and coaching her younger son football. Dorothy admitted sometime later that after I had told her I was going to start some research on the estate, she wondered whether to trust me still as she felt previous researchers had betrayed the residents.

Secondly, I found that throughout the research it was hard for me to enjoy social activities on the estate due to the time it will then take to write up the accounts. Not only did this experience change how I integrated with residents, the fact that I had to take time out to write up field notes meant that I was not always available to observe phenomena.

Lastly, due to my data collection, I had an interest in more areas of estate life than other residents (Anderson 2007). The research, therefore, drove me to get more involved than I would otherwise have been. My role as estate residents' committee secretary is a key example. At several times during the research, I voiced my concerns regarding the workload and my desire to step down to concentrate on more specific areas of estate action. However, when it came to the crunch, I always remained the secretary. I did so for three main reasons; firstly no one else wanted to do the role, secondly, I liked having a position of influence and service to other residents on the estate, and thirdly it gave me access to so much information through meetings, emails, and conversations that I would not otherwise have access to. However, it did lock me into a pattern of being responsible for organising, setting the agenda and writing up the minutes of around six public meetings

a month, fundraising for estate activities and line managing the only committee member of staff. These additional roles were on top of my other voluntary commitments of helping to run a church, being a trustee and coach of a local youth project and holding down a full time job. My week was often taken up by rushing to meetings or activities for at least three nights a week, coaching on Tuesday evenings and Saturday mornings and setting up the local community hall and attending church on Sunday mornings. In addition to this, there were countless phone calls and informal meetings around people's houses and on the street over the course of the month. However, this schedule gave me unprecedented access to the political and general resident activity. It also gave me a perfect reason for making connections with people without coming across as trying too hard. I, like Hennigh (1981 in O' Reilly 2009), found myself in a pivotal role within the local area with even the local housing office directing people to me to find out information or get things done.

In some senses I straddled different participant types within the research; on the one hand, I was a resident, who was heavily involved in the life of the estate, as a member of the residents' committee also helping to lead a church and various youth projects. However, I was also part of the professional group who was employed as the head of a £1.7m youth training project which carried out some training on the estate.

At the beginning of the research, I was seen by the professional players as a resident and, as such, grouped as unskilled. However, when they understood my credentials, I was perceived as a professional by some and taken more seriously. However, I found out to my detriment that playing the

professional card in the wrong situation, or in the wrong way, can very quickly make me the enemy of the other active residents. In one instance, I used these credentials to set up a meeting with the local authority's deputy director of youth services, which resulted in some of the residents' committee accusing me of trying to betray them.

Although I was very much an insider, as Hodkinson (2005) pointed out this term can be misleading and 'deceptively simple'. Notably, there are several groups on the estate, including, council officers, various groups of young people and two over 50s groups with whom I could at best be a trusted outsider. My differing status did not necessarily pose a problem, Bucerius (2013) comments that trusted outsider status can give a different perspective than that gained from insider status. Bucerius suggests that respondents involved in deviant or criminal behaviour can open up more easily to an outsider as they feel the risk of exposure or reprisal will be less. Similarly, Thornton (1995) has commented that some respondents may feel more inclined to react more in line with the dominant accepted group perspective when around insiders. In this situation outsider status allowed me to glean information and viewpoints that would otherwise be inaccessible to me.

Some local authority workers prefixed their conversations with me by stating 'I am only saying this because I talk to you different to the others'. The other's they were referring to were their staff colleagues and other residents. Often the information they divulged during these moments would compromise their position back in the office or with residents if it became widely known.

My status as an ethnographer was one of flux. As Mercer (1990); Hall (1994) and Anderson (2007) point out, people's lives and the roles they play are often changing and multifaceted. This movement of identity was visible during the research. There were times when my various roles meant that I had to be involved in decision making that upset other residents and as such, for certain groups, I was seen as a traitor. For example, one morning I was walking down to the tube station when a police car pulled over, and two police officers got out to talk to me. They used their mobile phone to show me a YouTube video of music track was recorded in the studio on the estate. The video itself featured a clip of a drunk near naked girlfriend of a young person from another area. As a result of the video, the girl had to leave London for fear for her own safety. On seeing the clip, I felt I had no option but to close the studio. To studio users, I very quickly moved from being a trusted outsider to being an enemy, if only for a short while. The transition to an outsider was always only an action away.

In my research, some young people saw me as a trusted outsider, whereas with other groups rapport was harder to forge. It was also evident that some of the young people I had been close with over the course of ten years through my various roles were sometimes the most distant towards me. Those who fell into this category were young people whose journey into school exclusions, using cannabis, dealing drugs and committing petty crime had left respect, but also a feeling of disillusionment on both sides. There are also a number of young people who were more transient and used the estate as an occasional hangout, and so it was not plausible to build a strong rapport with these young people.

Likewise, adults on the estate also have various identities that they can draw upon depending on their circumstance (Hayano 1979). The reality is that, although there were recognised groups of actors situated and operating on the estate, they were made up of individuals who like me had identities of flux, and so there were not always consistent identities to be insiders with.

For example, Dorothy, one of the oldest and most long serving members of the tenant's committee, could at times act as the estate grandmother, or a professional social worker, while at the same time she could be seen as, and admits herself that she is, a tiring older person. Occasionally she would also privately comment that she acts in certain ways to show outsiders that estate residents are not push overs or that she had to still let people know that black people can achieve good things. In some of these situations, I could be both an insider and outsider at the same time.

It was important for me not to try too hard to fit in, either when my status changed or when being faced with outsider status. Hodkinson (2002) has discussed the fact that researchers who accept their outsider status can glean more data than those who are adjudged to be insincere in the actions to gain insider status.

Despite the fluctuating nature of my status, I strived to keep my insider status as much as possible (Deegan 2001, O'Reilly 2009); I wanted to draw a richer picture of the landscape instead of simply concentrating on the main distinguishing features, which can be a flaw of outsider research (O'Reilly 2009).

The other factor that had an impact on my status as a researcher was my background. I am a white male in my mid-30s with a vast amount of professional experience and on the estate by choice. These factors played out in a different fashion depending on the respondents. My ethnicity, for example, was both a help and a hindrance. For some research participants, particularly older first and second generation Jamaicans with Rastafarian leanings, my ethnicity made me someone that was not to be treated as an insider. In one situation a woman commented that she felt like starting 'arms house' with me and I should remember that she knows where I live. However, in other instances, my ethnicity worryingly brought me more status. For example, when coaching football, often new parents of every nationality, would bypass black coaches and come to me to get information about the project; information that any of the coaches could have given. In addition, the fact that I could move off the estate with relative ease also made my position very different from most of the other respondents. For example, the night time anti-social behaviour experienced by some led to a feeling of being trapped, something that I did not feel.

Rapport and Reflexivity

The fact that I was doing research changed the nature of my interaction with (potential) respondents. I was mindful that those I was engaging with could have a wealth of information that may prove interesting. I, therefore, looked to consciously navigate my way through sometimes very political relationships to ensure that I was in good enough standing with everyone to gain information. At times I had to 'fake rapport' with those whom I do not agree with (Mauthner 2002). There were numerous occasions when I felt I

was deceitful in building strong rapports with members of staff of organisations just to gain their trust and greater access to data. My intention was not to expose them or use the data in a way that would have negative implications for them personally or for their role, nor was I trying to get hold of data that would be protected under the data protection act; however, my false friendliness did weigh on my conscience at times.

I also had to be reflexive and consider the impact of myself on the research field. Davies (2012) believes that the researcher's involvement with the groups being researched is less important than their ability to be reflexive in their approach. As such throughout the project, I asked myself the following questions:

- How was my presence impacting on the situation?

- How has my prior involvement with the subject field shaped my research and data collection?

- How am I using the information that I have gained throughout my research to shape activities on the estate? Moreover, how is this shaping guided by my desire to uncover an interesting research subject?

- How is my involvement on the estate changing me and how is any change impacting the research?

- How is the research changing my relationships with other research participants?

As an auto ethnographer, I was acutely aware that I was helping to create the phenomena I was trying to study. There was often a thought running

through my head of *'would I be doing this if I was not doing a PhD.'* as my research progressed this moved on to, *'would I be encouraging others to act in particular ways if I did not have the data from my research.'* Unlike other researchers who sit on the sidelines and record what is taking place, it was my connection with other residents and my desire help improve the estate that drove my involvement as much as wanting to record and explain phenomena.

Despite my closeness, it was important to be able to withdraw from the subject matter. Stepping back was harder than if I was researching phenomena previously alien to me (O'Reilly 2009). Familiarity can make a researcher consider something normal which an outsider would want to explore further. Using a Bourdieusian field analysis helped me to counter this by locating actions within particular fields and then analysing them in relation to the rules of these social spaces.

The normality effect (Fielding 2004) posed another danger. While out talking to a group of young people one Saturday afternoon, I decided to walk to the local shop a few minutes down the road. By the time I came back three young people had been shot (none fatally) right where I had been chatting with them. I was oblivious to the danger of the fieldwork. As Fielding (2004) points out, a culture had developed around me that made my sense of danger subside. My obliviousness was drummed home about an hour later when I was observing the aftermath and the police investigation. A young person came up to me and said that he did not think I should be hanging around the area as someone who does not know me may think I was a

policeman and cause me problems in the future. It took a young person to point out a danger that I had not foreseen.

I also needed to address some key questions, most of which derive from a primary concern of the research, namely improving residents' lives. The part of me which had been angered by bad decisions and miss spent funding wanted to prove a point and make an example of those who had been clearly operating on the estate for reasons more than simply supporting local people. However, acting on this feeling would not only bring into question the validity of the research but could also inflame already deep rooted ill feeling amongst various groups. Ethically, I had a responsibility to ensure an honest account of estate life and even if my final thesis seemed to side with a particular view point, it would at the very least have a neutral effect on existing relationships and hopefully serve to improve them.

Consent

Although all key subjects knew that I was doing ethnographic research, there were concerns about informed consent. Aside from the desire to comply with ethical codes and produce a piece of work that, when peer reviewed, would stand up to scrutiny, I also still wanted to be welcome in my neighbourhood after my thesis was made public. In short, I wanted to keep my friends. The concept of informed consent posed one of my biggest ethical dilemmas. Before starting the research, I already had friendships with or was at least known by many of the key respondents. My situation meant that there were always blurred lines between residents interacting with me as research respondents and as friends and neighbours. It was also true that although it was widely known that I was conducting research, there

were people I observed who would not have known what I was doing. Liamputtong (2007) draws on the work of Emanuel (2000) to define informed consent as:

> *'the provision of information to participants, about the purpose of the research, its procedures, potential risks, benefits, and alternatives, so that the individual understands this information and can make a voluntary decision whether to enrol and continue to participate'* (Liamputtong 2007:33).

Much of the participant observation data has not been collected under these conditions. Although this did ensure a greater authenticity to the data, it did pose the problem of not always having informed consent. To mitigate against any ethical concerns that this arises, I took the following steps:

- Informed as many people as possible about the research including having a write up in the estate newsletter

- Continued to remind people about my research

- Wrote in general terms so as not to identify anyone when recalling data where someone may not have known fully about the research (e.g. writing a resident, or a group of young people, rather than using a specific pseudonym)

The consent for the interviews was less complicated in most instances as I got all adult interviewees to sign a consent form, however with the younger respondents, it was not so simple. Some refused to sign consent forms as to them it resembled the process of signing paperwork used within the

criminal justice system. In these instances, I felt that it was important to ensure that their voices were heard as in many cases it was their views that were too often neglected. I decided to follow the Social Research Association 2003 guidelines and accepted verbal consent if written consent was not a suitable option. The less formal approach seemed to suit many of the young people who were involved in or suspected to be engaged in criminal activities (Coomber 2002; Wiles 2013). Despite several attempts to explain how I would use pseudonyms a number of young people indicated that they were keen to talk to me but did not want to sign anything that could be linked back to them as some thought that the council or police may be able to use the research to link them with deviant activity. Also, a few of the young people were worried that some of their friends would object to them taking part for fear of what they may be saying. If no consent form was signed, they could easily shrug off any accusations by stating that they were just chatting to me. The notion of informed consent which could be proven by a signed document seemed unworkable, and so I adopted more of an ethics of care approach (Heath et al. 2009).

I took Miller and Bell's (2002) approach that as long as respondent had full knowledge of my research project, verbally consented to the interview, and could request that certain elements of the conversation were not included, then I would proceed as if written consent had been given (Miller and Bell 2002). This stance was vividly highlighted as an appropriate response on an occasion when the police came on to the estate with sniffer dogs and lined a group of young people up to search them for drugs and weapons. As I was walking past, a young person called out

> *'James are you seeing this, make sure you stay and watch for*
>
> *your Ph.D.,'* then shouted to the police – '*see he is doing a Ph.D.*
>
> *so what you gonna do now.'*
>
> (FNJ 17.07.14)

The same respondent a few weeks earlier had taken part in an interview but asked not to sign a consent form.

There was also an issue of what respondents were consenting to. As with many ethnographic based research projects I took an open approach to the research structure (Benson and O'Neil 2008) and the direction did not start to become apparent until a considerable amount of data was collected and analysed. The emerging focus meant that the explanation given to the respondents at the outset of the project was not as clear on what the aims of the research were as later explanations. I, therefore, adopted a 'process consent' approach (Heath et al. 2009), continually updating respondents about the direction the research was taking, giving them the chance to object to taking part in the future or withdraw any previous interview data (Wiles et al. 2007). This stance also allowed me to continually negotiate with the research participants, knowing that their situation and therefore their views may also have changed (Birch and Miller 2002).

Confidentiality

I was also concerned about how to handle potential disclosures of abuse, criminal activities, and issues of conflict. In dealing with the former, despite the desire to ensure confidentiality in research, I was duty bound to report any disclosure or concerns that arise. I, therefore, informed respondents of

the parameters of when I would have to disclose information (Wiles 2013).

I was fortunate enough to be involved in a number of groups on the estate that had defined safeguarding policies, and so I had nominated safeguarding officers that I could report concerns too. The support on offer somewhat eased the burden of having to deal with such concerns myself.

There was one incident during the research that could have represented safeguarding concern. As the residents' committee were preparing to run a children's holiday club, there was a concern over how to get project staff and volunteers Disclosure and Baring Service (DBS) checks done in time for the start of the project. The process would normally involve an organisation registering with a checking authority who can verify that they have sufficient processes in place to collect the required information to facilitate the checks on behalf of the authority they have registered with. Once the organisation has been approved, the checking of individuals can start. The initial process alone could take several weeks, before the up to six week process of checking individuals could start. Anne from the local authority supported by agreeing for the council to process the checks on behalf of the committee, however, this was only confirmed three weeks before the start of the project. As a result, it seemed very likely that the project would start without DBS checks being completed. As five of the nine people involved already had DBS checks through where they currently worked, it was decided that their certificates should be produced and certificate numbers stored as evidence of their DBS check. The committee then agreed that as long as the other staff and volunteers had started the process with the council and were paired up with someone who had an

existing DBS, then sufficient safeguarding measures had been put in place. This worked fine for everyone apart from David, who some of the residents had asked to be involved to help him get some work experience. There was a concern that the council would object to him being involved due to his conviction for drug dealing, despite the fact that this would not ordinarily prevent him from doing so. The process would normally be to carry out a DBS and as long as they were not barred from working with children, meet with the applicant and discuss their convictions to see if they posed a risk or not. The main concern was not over David's suitability but in the committee's confidence in standing up to any council objection. I was part of a group of four residents who had to make a decision as to how to handle this situation. Everyone involved agreed that they wanted David to be employed by the summer project, partly due to the fact that they had all known him since he was in primary school, but were concerned about how the council would view his record. David himself was keen to work, but due to the concerns of the committee was apprehensive about getting a check done. It was decided to let David to be involved under the following circumstances and due to following reasons: David would know most of the children that the project would be engaging anyway due to his presence on the estate; as David was showing willingness to do something positive, he should be encouraged rather than hindered to do so; he had indicated that he had an expired DBS check from his previous involvement with the St Mary's Football Project and if his conversations regarding his criminal behaviour matched what has been disclosed on this then we will accept this check as a temporary measure and if David took part again he would need

104

to be DBS checked; David was to be supervised by Charis or Dorothy at all times. Although this was not a by the book response to was seen as an acceptable compromise as David's criminal convictions were not deemed to signify that David was a threat to the children and if David was not left alone with those he was supervising, any risk that may exist would have been mitigated against.

I, like Paillet (2013), took the stance that the actions of those I was observing should be understood in terms of the 'ethics as it stands' rather than how it should be to avoid passing a similar judgement common in the practices of bodies such as local authority or police. The 'should be' approach has often been the reason why residents were not seen as capable of taking responsibility for certain activities. As part of the democratising of the research, it was important to depart from this viewpoint.

My default standpoint was that information (including non safeguarding criminal information) gathered as part of the research process should remain confidential, regardless of whether it has been gained through an interview or from participant observation (Liamputtong 2007). There were times when residents disclosed that they expected others of dealing crack, or acting-aggressively towards others, much of which I also saw first-hand. There seemed to be a general acceptance that particular groups of residents were involved in unlawful behaviour, particularly fraud and drug dealing**,** and so there was not the expectation by any of the other participants that this type of activity should be reported. With this in mind, I took the decision that I would only act if I felt that there was a threat to someone's immediate well-being. The conditions of confidentiality were

communicated to respondents before the interviews, and also countless times to the young people I met out and about on the estate.

At no stage did I feel pressured to inform the authorities of information that was disclosed to me. I did, however, receive an email from a police detective after I had run a focus group with the young people on the estate who asked if any of the young people had disclosed criminal activity during the session. I ignored this email, and it was never followed up.

Anonymity

Anonymising responses was a complicated issue. Although it was easy to give pseudonyms to the local area, organisations and individuals; respondents' positions, roles, and statuses posed a problem in relation to anonymity (Goodwin in Pope and Mays 2006). The fact that the local council was becoming a cooperative council made it evidently recognisable as it was the only one in the area doing so. Similarly, the fact that there was only one ALMO in the borough meant that this was recognisable to those who knew the area. As such the research site, local authority and housing association could only ever be partially obscured. Tiittula and Ruusuvuori, (2005) in Vainio (2012) believe that public bodies and public figures do not have the right to anonymity due to their public role. Although Tiittula and Ruusuvuori's stance would have made my write up easier to manage, I was aware that this could be seen as a naming and shaming exercise which would have changed how the research came across. I, therefore, chose against this approach, and although it was impossible for the research to assure complete anonymity, I looked to obscure identities as much as possible. (Van Den Hoonaard 2003, Nespor 2000).

Like other locational ethnographies, many respondents were well known to each other (Van Den Hoonaard 2003) and held recognisable positions on the estate so changing their names would not hide their identities from other participants or other local people. However, if their identities were disguised enough to ensure anonymity, the nature of data attached to them would be compromised (Vainio 2012). Scheper-Hughes (2000) uses her work on the troubles in Ireland to highlight the need to be sensitive when dealing with people who will be able to recognise other respondents. Although not necessarily on the same scale, I did have to be sensitive to local relationships and politics. I wanted to make sure I conformed to the British Sociological Association Statement of Ethical Practice (2002), and therefore I had no option but to take a multi staged approach to avoid any distress to the research participants. Firstly, if attributing the data to a single person would have compromised their position, it was attributed to an identifiable group, such as residents or council official (Vainio 2012) rather than specific people. Secondly, I often sense checked the way I portrayed the data with the respondents themselves to ensure that they were happy with some of the more antagonistic elements. The process of checking often led to a negotiation to make sure that the essence of the data was not compromised by its portrayal (Birch and Miller 2002). I also utilised the option of using composites, especially in some of the accounts relating to young people.

Professional Separation

Gobo (2008) has commented how researchers often just simply *'fill their bags and leave'*. In my situation, this was not the case however the scars of previous studies and actions of professionals were clear. One older resident

stopped speaking to me for a few months when I informed them about the research because past researchers had portrayed the residents in a bad light. To ensure that I was not seen simply as a researcher out to get what I wanted, it was important to maintain relationships with those involved in the research, but outside of my immediate contact group (Mauthner 2002). Although this was geographically easy to do, it was often very physically and emotionally draining.

Eglinton (2013) has commented that researchers and commentators' perspectives of others are underpinned by theories that are distant from the lives of those who are being theorised about. I was keen to ensure that the perspectives portrayed in the research were a close representation of the lives of those living on the estate. The importance of this was magnified early in the field research when it was clear that the professional's perception of the estate residents was overwhelmingly negative. I adopted a stance of being emotionally involved in the research. As I was already friends with many of the respondents to take a distanced stance would seem unnatural. Like Eglinton (2013) and Amit (2000), I agree that this approach allows respondents to feel comfortable and share more of their views, resulting in more representative data. To do this effectively, I ensured that I positioned myself as someone who led through collaboration, keen to learn from others. Residents often came to me and started our conversation with, *"I thought I would tell you this so you can learn for next time."* After telling an anecdote of what they had experienced, many respondents commented, *"Stick that in your Ph.D."* In this sense, respondents acted as if they could help decide what should be included in the Ph.D. thesis. As the research

progressed, participants started to help shape and therefore share the research goals. Throughout the research, there was a sense of reciprocity and mutual learning between myself and the respondents (Eglinton 2013).

The intensity of my involvement on the estate meant that internal conflicts did emerge during the research, especially when respondents would talk to me about their views of other residents or colleagues. There were times when I was used by respondents to sound off about others. In these situations, it was hard to know what to do, and my normal stance was to appear neutral or supportive. However, this was challenging when I agreed with a particular viewpoint, however, doing so whether publicly or privately would impact on my relationships with other respondents and potentially impact my data collection. The expression of my opinions was often curtailed due to the information I wanted to collect (Eglinton 2013).

Liamputtong (2007) draws on the work of Smith (2005) commenting that there is a tendency to focus more on professional regulations and codes of conducts around ethical practice, rather than the views and aspirations of the vulnerable. Although I have paid due attention to ethical codes of conduct throughout the research, a key ethical principle has been to give a voice to those who are not usually listened to. Wanting to hear those who are often silenced meant that it was critical to preference residents' voices.

Throughout the research, I had often reflected on my different roles on the estate and being a researcher undoubtedly impacted my thoughts and decisions. I had moved on to the estate due to a somewhat naive belief that I could help provide the type of support that the estate needed but was

lacking. Six years later as I started the research I was volunteering alongside residents who were far more capable than myself and who had been doing their bit to help the estate for years. However, I was not just acting as a resident, but at times as a representative of various organisations. The first of which was the church, which in many respects was the reason why I moved on to the estate in the first place. By the time the research started in late 2011, I had largely given up on trying to get the church engaged in activities to support the estate. Soon after I stopped inviting residents to the church as those who did come would generally stay for a couple of weeks and then feedback to me that it was not for them. By then the church was six years old and barely managed to attract people beyond the pastor's family network and we were lucky if 12 people came each week. The issue seemed to be that the church service mainly followed that of a typical charismatic Ghanaian church and although the number of Ghanaians on the estate had grown in recent years, those who were interested in Christianity were already attending another church. Those who were not from this background found the church service, complete with songs in Twi, preaching that lasted over an hour and Ghanaian cultural etiquette somewhat alien to them. Due to a potential conflict of interest with my voluntary roles in the church and the Centenary Hall management committee, I was asked not to represent the church in matters relating to its use of the hall. Just before the fieldwork finished I left the church which in many ways was an acceptance of personal failure in not being able to influence the church to be more involved in the life of the estate. The pastor in charge could see that bar 5-6 people, only his family members were

attending and wanted to focus on what he had seen work elsewhere. This was understandable, however, it meant that I no longer belonged in a place that I had worked hard to try and establish.

After having several jobs unrelated to the estate, in 2011 I found myself heading up a nearby alternative education centre where young people from the estate would sometime end up going. Although this role did not have any direct bearing on the estate itself, it did help me build relationships with key council staff members. In 2013 I secured a new job developing a youth construction programme in the borough, which I was able to initially base on the estate itself.

As with the church, this project featured very little in the data, largely because the funding requirements meant that it mainly acted as a maintenance contractor involving groups of young people from across the borough and tradesmen, carrying out minor repairs. The large project targets meant that four teams were set up working across the borough, which led to the project leaving the estate. As the project developed I again became conflicted over the impact of something that I had helped initiate. The sheer volume that the project was meant to reach (1500 young people in two years) meant that to run a project that provided the best level of support to young people was not going to be possible. After the initial funding ended I secured the backing of the organisation I worked for to support a smaller scale project, with the compromise of having to secure commercial contracts to help fund its cost base. The locally based project that engaged young and old from a particular area in a supportive environment never materialised. In its place developed a fairly well

respected construction training programme that helped housing associations and the local council to carry out simple maintenance and refurbishment work and support young people to become more work ready. However, the need to be commercially sustainable led the project to take on work across South London.

The church and this employment experience in many ways reflect some of the frustrations felt when carrying out the research project. In all situations there appeared to be the potential to achieve the kinds of support that would have a major positive impact in a localised area, however conflicts of opinion, operational targets and at times, sheer disinterest meant that what was initially strived for by all involved never materialised. This was not without people trying, it would be difficult to find someone represented in the research or who worked with me on the construction project to argue against the need to develop stronger relationships with adult residents and young people. Groups and individuals may differ in how to achieve this and what the relationships should look like, however, the overall concept would be agreed upon. This had led me to consider whether a situation whereby residents, professional organisations, volunteer groups and statutory bodies working together to provide the types of support needed in areas like the estate, is actually achievable.

Publication

A final consideration was how the research would be viewed and potentially used by the local media and politicians. A 2011 report published by the local authority stated that 33% of those living on the estate wanted to move. The publication was picked up by the local MP who wrote an article for the local

newspaper commenting that drastic action was needed as the estate was an undesirable place to live. He called for urgent action to be taken to tackle the anti-social behaviour that was making residents lives a misery. The MP failed to mention that the main reason people wanted to move was overcrowding and the need for a bigger property. With this in mind, I needed to ensure that the research could not be construed in the wrong way to further someone else's agenda. The finished project was, therefore, a reconstruction which was put together with the audience in mind (Benson and O'Neil 2008).

I undertook the research due to an acute desire to help bring about a positive change in both St Mary's estate and similar areas. My hope is that this research starts to address some of the injustices that have been documented below, both in terms of influencing future policy but also helping to change situations on the estate practically. In that sense, I am seeking to utilise what Fortun (2012) calls the creative force of ethnography in order to produce something new. I want to use the emotion felt by myself and the respondents to make a more powerful call for change (Charmaz 2004, Denzin 1997)

As well as looking to publish in academic journals and publish a monograph, I will also look to influence the local authority through being involved in public consultations and debates to hopefully improve working relationships and approaches to tackling localised issues.

Managing Data in NVIVO

NVIVO was used to both code and analyse the data. Initially, the data was coded openly to identify and formulate the ideas and themes that emerged from the project, before being recoded using a defined coding structure. During the open coding stage, the main thematic and deductive codes were established and as such the process of discovery was both inductive and deductive (retroductive) (Katz 1988a). Focused coding was used to go through the data line by line until no new themes or issues arose. This secondary coding enabled seemingly unrelated events to be grouped thematically, and potential topics started to emerge.

Once the coding was completed a decision was made on what codes were most relevant to the project, which codes should be dropped and which codes could be merged. A coding hierarchy of different thematic and deductive codes and sub codes were then developed for the project.

The case nodes and their definitions for the project were as follows:

Adult Residents –Respondents who lived on the estate and primary role on the estate was a resident. Contained in this node were members of the resident committee and people who simply lived on the estate.

Young People - Those under 25 who hang around on the estate and those slightly older who still hang around on the estate and talk about themselves or are seen by others as a young person.

Paid Employees – Those who act on the estate due to some form of contractual paid role, without which they would not interact on the estate.

Volunteers - Those who act on the estate due to a contractual or voluntary role, without which they would not associate on the estate.

Politicians – Local politicians.

Location – Various areas on and off the estate that are recognisable from the data as a specifically identifiable space.

Organisation – Organisations that operated on the estate.

(Full details of the Case Node Classifications can be found in Appendix 1).

The parent thematic nodes were:

Control and use of space - Data relating to either the control or use of space on the estate.

Motivations – Data relating to people or organisation's motivations for their presence or actions on the estate.

Narrative control - Data relating to narratives about the estate and it residents.

Relationships – Data relating to the connections between different actors and organisations on the estate.

Types of activities – Data relating to activities taking place on the estate that was observed or spoken about during the research.

Young people - Data relating to young people, including their actions, what people said about young people, meetings about young people and activities put on by young people were included in this node.

(A full account of the thematic coding structure can be found in Appendix 2).

The parent deductive codes are as follows:

Apparatus of Influence – Data relating to influences identified as either ideological or repressive with Althusser's analysis of state apparatus.

Missing Apparatus – Data where there is a clear lack of influence from the ideological state apparatus.

Capital – Data relating to the presence of economic, social, educational or cultural capital.

Withheld Capital - Data relating to the withholding of economic, social, educational or cultural capital.

Type of Relationship –Data indicating whether the connection between different parties is paid for and therefore coded as transactional or more informal.

Professionalism as Control – Data that shows how the professionalism is controlling actions on the estate.

Repressive Action – Data that shows a deliberate action to repress others on the estate

Receiving repressive action – Data relating to actions taken when being on the receiving end of repressive action

Rejection of Repressive action – Data relating to the rejection conscious or otherwise of repressive action

These code definitions were developed in direct relationship to my research questions as a method to tag the data so that it can be easily retrieved, analysed, contextualised and theorised (Bazeley and Jackson 2014). The coding allowed me to analyse the data with regard to various themes and concepts so that the data was not just understood in its own time specific context but also in relation to other themes and concepts that materialised during the data collection.

Once the data was coded, word frequency and matrix queries were undertaken. The word frequency analysis was used to identify what were the main topics within the data; while matrix queries established the relationship between the main themes and concepts within the data. Thematic and deductive cross tabulating queries were used to understand what key relationships should be explored further.

Representing the Data

In presenting the data, I wanted to find a balance between representing the data within a scholarly framework and allowing the text to flow in a way that captured the essence of the field notes. I wanted the text to read like a narrative tale (Emerson 2011) telling the story of the estate as much as I wanted to explore the sociological relevance of particular issues.

A decision was made to present the data around themes rather than concepts and to have a chronological flow within these themes. The analytic commentary was then inserted into the writing. Topics for the data chapters were centred on themes that were identified within the data. As 914 individual data sources were collected including 401 emails, 290 field note

entries, minutes and documents from over 150 meetings, 40 interview transcripts and 32 government documents, there was not enough scope to include all of the narratives or themes that emerged from them. Accounts that exemplified the main themes and resident concerns were prioritised as the most important to ensure that the project supported their empowerment.

This thematic approach meant that the data sources were largely used as the basis and text for the chapters rather than excerpts that illustrate key analytical points. The narrative for the chapters was often constructed through the rewriting of events combining the interview, field note, and meeting document data together into one coherent discursive commentary (Atkinson 1990). At other times excerpts from the data were included to allow the reader the opportunity to understand the processes that were taking place, to further highlight points that came out of the thematic discourse, or to allow the data displaying particularly pertinent points to speak for itself. Sometimes edited versions of the data, particularly field notes, seemed to capture the essence of an event or series of events better than a composited narration. When this was the case, the fieldnote was included as part of the narrative flow.

Although the presentation of the actual data was kept as true to its original form as possible, the excerpts were edited to ensure anonymity, to make sections easier to read and to correct any spelling or grammatical errors that may have existed.

Chapter 4: They are not their children: From Relational to Professional Engagement and Support

> "*You know what is starting to annoy me, all this talk of 'our children' by Elizabeth and Charis, it is gonna cause problems. They are not their children they did not birth them.*"
> (FNJ 21.04.12)

In 2011 the local authority earmarked St Mary's estate to be the test bed for its new cooperative council approach, and after the murders of two teenagers in successive years, the delivery of youth services seemed the obvious place to start. Although this new way of working was promoted as encouraging local people to get involved in the provision of services, it in fact ushered in a new professional way of operating which served to side line the few residents who were active.

This chapter outlines the transition from an informal to a professional ethos as the dominant mindset on the estate. It does this by comparing interview accounts of historical and pre 2011 activities with that of data collected from observations and interviews relating to post autumn 2011 estate life and service delivery.

The accounts relating to the historic service delivery were gathered through interviews with those who were young people or parents on the estate at the time in question. The data relating to the post Autumn 2011 events was generated from observations at meetings and other activities on the estate and supported by interviews with active residents and prominent young people.

Autumn 2011 is a pivotal moment as it is when the local authority started to try and embed professional services as the dominant long term method for dealing with youth deviance, setting the tone for future activity on the estate.

The chapter starts by detailing the way that the older generation (45+) recalled how social events and service delivery used to be organised, before moving on to briefly describing resident led youth activities that took place between 2005 and 2011.

The latter part of the chapter considers the development of professional youth services and the emergence of a professional field on the estate. Shifts in the social space will firstly be described through the analysis of the commissioning of a new youth provision; before considering how these events changed how people interacted on the estate.

I have employed the Bourdieusian concept of field (see page 28) to help differentiate between different modes of operation. Field here refers to sets of rules, hierarchies, standards, and relationships that govern the way people act and perceive how others should act. In so doing, I have distinguished between an informal field, usually the domain of residents and the professional field of service deliverers and council officers. Within this chapter and throughout the project, I have used the term informal to refer to activities that are not motivated or governed by a contract or funding arrangement, or relationships that are not a consequence of one or more party being in a paid or voluntary contracted position. The informal field is contrasted to the professional field which refers to activities that are motivated or governed by a contractual or funding arrangement, or

relationships where the connection is because at least one party is in a contracted position.

The changes outlined above are discussed in relation theories of professionalism described by Evetts (2006; 2011; 2013), Andreassen (2014) and others who have shown how professional standards are used to close off markets and establish hierarchies that place those who have professional recognition above those who do not. Combining their work with that of Bourdieu's theory of practice, the chapter will show how the council's desire to improve the standards by funding a professionalised youth provision on the estate established a field with a new habitus and doxa, where professional know how and connections were more important than the local knowledge and relationships. Outsiders with professional qualifications and social capital were seen by the council as the experts on how to deal with social issues on the estate.

I explore how economic capital and particular narratives were employed to ensure relational approaches were sidelined and professional interventions were portrayed as the best approach to tackling social issues. The chapter goes on to shows how professional connections and bridging social capital of the sort described by Putnam (1993) were more advantageous in these settings than local friendships and informal networks.

In summary, the chapter helps to explain how an informal relational field which was once accepted as the way through which issues were resolved gave way to a professional field that relied on transactional relationships to address problems. The chapter shows how the habitus and capital

associated with the professional field established a new set of rules which left the residents feeling out of place and side lined on their own estate. The cooperative experiment that was billed as giving residents a greater say in local services actually left them feeling disenfranchised in their own neighbourhood.

Historical and Past Service Delivery

From the late 1970s to the early 1990s the social life of the estate centred around four key spaces; Centenary Hall, John's Hut (which became St Mary's Youth Club), the adventure playground and the nameless car park/road area that surround the blocks of flats.

Centenary Hall

Centenary Hall opened in 1977, shutting about 15 years later before reopening in 2013. The building has a large hall complete with a staged area which can seat 200, a smaller hall, kitchen and computer room. During the 1980s a young people's project painted the main hall with a rain forest theme. All four walls were covered in trees, monkeys, parrots and other rain forest animals. Two Grecian pillars lined the stage, a black angel was set between the pillars and the names of those who took part in the project inscribed below the angel. When the hall reopened the paintwork caused some debate, the older residents who remembered the mural being painted wanted to keep it, however, others believed it made the hall too dark and unattractive. In the end, a compromise was reached with the angel, Grecian pillars and one side of the mural staying, and the rest was painted light beige.

During its first incarnation the hall, run by a group of residents, was a licensed social club and had weekly activities such as dominoes nights, discos and music events that were open to all ages. The hall was an informal space where different generations came together. Cynthia, a mum of six in her 50s of Jamaican decent who moved onto the estate when she was 12, often spoke of the importance of this space. Cynthia's mum was somewhat of a local activist and was the secretary of the residents' committee, active in the running of Centenary Hall and ran an informal youth club from her flat. The youth club was partly as a response to Cynthia always bringing friends around who needed something to eat or their clothes washed, and her mum felt obligated to help. She recalls the intergenerational nature of activities in Centenary Hall as she was growing up;

> *"…I helped my mum out there, and I used to help tidy up and interact with the older people there…that is where the elderly, the older ones, the youth and the babies, little ones that is where everyone used to congregate, and it was a family that brought out everybody…. because we used to have Jazz night in the hall, dominos and other things always going on so people could socialise … You know how the boys would cotch along there [indicating to the wall where the young people now sit] we did the same thing outside jubilee hall when it was open. As much as we could go inside we were doing our thing outside at the same time we had respect for people. Well, what it is it was not even a feeling it was how it is."*

(Interview with Cynthia 21.11.14)

Primarily the hall was open from Thursday to Sunday as a social club and was funded through the sale of alcohol, which also helped to pay for a weekly lunch for older people on the estate. The informal character of the hall's management brought residents together both in the running of the

building and the activities that the hall housed. This could be seen in residents' accounts of a flood that threatened to cancel the weekly elderly lunch that took place in the space in the early 80s, which is summed up in a comment made by Dorothy, whom we will hear more about shortly.

> *"And I did not know that there were so many skilled people on the estate until there was a massive flood and the committee put a call out for help, and there was not enough room in the hall for everyone, you could see barristers, teachers, nurses… I was shocked as I did not think we had that calibre of people on the estate and they were willing to help where they can."*

(Interview with Dorothy 17.06.14)

John's Hut

Next to Centenary Hall was John's Hut, an old tin building, dedicated to youth work. In the mid-1980s a group of residents led by Billy a residents' committee member and treasurer of Centenary Hall and, Antoinette who lived opposite the site, raised enough money to build a permanent building on the same spot which became known as St Mary's Youth Club. Both Antoinette and Billy had children who went to the club and were, along with a number of other parents, actively involved in its management. The activities were coordinated by John, a council youth worker, from which the original building took its name. The hut was a hive of activity with table tennis, pool, art projects, homework clubs, football sessions, and summer camping trips to Gloucestershire. It is not the activities themselves which are of interest, but who ran them. The only staff member mentioned by the seven residents who spoke extensively about St Mary's Youth Club was John; all other references to adults were of parents running the activities and managing the building.

Parental involvement here and elsewhere on the estate proved pivotal in the development of adult friendships and in turn the support younger residents received. Parental involvement was only possible because of how the spaces were managed. Activities in the communal buildings seemed to be open for all who wanted to come in and get involved, making them places where parents made friends as well as places of support for young people. Margerie, a resident in her seventies who's children who used to attend John's hut, reveals the club's role in her making friends.

> *"When the club was over the road, I used to get in involved in that with Billy when I was younger, and I made a lot of friends there."*

(Interview with Margerie 10.07.14)

Margerie went on to explain that her neighbours and friends on the estate would often come and tell her and Billy when her children were up to no good.

This space for making friends was in part due to the way the activities in the buildings were run, Marie who still lives in the block where she grew up commented on the ethos of John's hut.

> *"… we used to enjoy it, and the parents knew where we were, and John was very good at knowing who the parents were if they knew where they were, he was like that, he was like an uncle, well like a granddad, he was very supportive of what you wanted to do… If it wasn't for him and the community the neighbours in the blocks, we knew at least a family and their parents in all the blocks all of the blocks; it was really nice. Then with John, if one of us didn't turn up then we would send out a search party if you know what I mean. It is that kind of thing, so there was a community and that kind of support…If your mum had to go out, then she would say can I leave my child with you and they knew you were safe. Like my dad used to do*

homework with the kid next door or if they didn't understand the work or like the parent didn't understand the homework the parents could ask for it to be explained, that kind of thing."

(Interview with Marie 01/08/14)

Summer Activities

However, there was a more sinister side to the youth delivery in John's Hut. Dorothy, the current resident committee treasurer, decided to set up a holiday play scheme in the late 1980s because black young people were not welcome in the building. Initially, the scheme had to run off the estate in an open green space, with the young people using trees for shelter when it rained as no one would let Dorothy use their building. However, when social services moved out an office space made up of three flats joined together in Turner House, Our Space was made and Dorothy was allowed to run the project from there.

Dorothy explains the struggle;

> *"It was very hard as sometimes we didn't have a place. At first, we had to start under the trees on Oakley Park, and we had to fight like mad to get a place, and no one wanted to know. We had to fight like mad because most of the children were black children about 20 and it was only black women in charge of them, so they look at us and say they don't want to know. Finally, we were allowed in a building off the estate.*
>
> *But one morning when we went up there because I always went up there early. Two dogs came out, and they were vicious, and if any of the children had put their hand out, they would have eaten it, and the kids were crying. So I went up to knock on the door to find out what is going on who was going to open for us and sort the dogs out. So I said to the community worker they don't want us around there too many black faces, so they don't want us. She didn't say anything. So we were literally thrown out*

and never went back in there. And when they rain comes and it becomes very difficult, and we had to keep running into people's houses and thing, so I decided to come down, and then the community worker got Turner House, so she started saying I should come there."

(Interview with Dorothy 17.06.14)

Other Activities

Alongside these structured and long term activities, there were short term and ad hoc activities initiated by residents, many of which took place in the open communal areas of the estate. For example, many of the older residents recalled a time when there were no contracted cleaners and residents from each block set up cleaning rotas. Dorothy and Cynthia's mum used an empty flat to set up a free legal advice surgery. Another resident spoke of her embarrassment as a young girl to see her father organising cricket matches with other residents on the estate.

One of the most talked about social activities were Lianne's BBQs along the central road area of the estate, jerking chicken in a big drum, with other residents chipping in to buy the meat and drink. By the late 2000s, the BBQs had become less frequent. Some residents kept the BBQ's going once Lianne was moved out of London in 2011 due to one of her sons receiving death threats; however, they became more ad hoc and smaller in attendance.

This resident ownership leading to the development of supportive relationships is possibly best exemplified by the actions of Elizabeth, a

former formidable residents' committee secretary, who had a reputation for making things happen.

> *"I never sent the kids to school so we had four young children who were always at home all day every day so we kind of extended the flat - had a big piece of carpet outside and other people would bring their kids and people came for marriage guidance and the like; they came to us because we were always there basically. You give people marriage guidance, babysitting parenting education, anything they need it really, helping find some places to live and even drugs."*

(Interview with Elizabeth 13.09.13)

The open and communal spaces were seen as the residents' domain and they were free to use the spaces as they saw fit. Elizabeth's ad-hoc home school come advice surgery would not have met any of the professional guidelines, but it served a purpose. People on the estate knew where to go to get some informal support, and there was trust. A trust that was built up due to continuity, location, and care and concern that was developed through getting to know other people.

The accounts above point to an estate where residents felt it was their place to establish activities that addressed the local need. That is not to say that the estate was an ideal place to live. Indeed many interviews recalled the social issues that were present on the estate, however at the same time they spoke of resident led initiatives or actions in their everyday lives that sought to make the estate a better place.

Worried about the prejudice that some of the young people were experiencing; Dorothy felt compelled and empowered to start a holiday club for the black children on the estate. Although it was not easy and it was

fraught with obstacles, Dorothy's project engaged local people and was backed by the local authority.

This pattern was seen in the other accounts also. John's hut could only function due to the trust that the few council staff involved had in the resident volunteers.

The council trusted the resident's committee to run the community hall, who ran it in an inclusive family like intergenerational way. Young people, often the children of those involved in its management and their friends mixed with the adult patrons of the building.

The care and concern that led residents to engage in the social life on the estate were no better exemplified than by Cynthia's mum. Her desire to positively influence the lives of those growing up on the estate led to her home becoming an informal youth club. Others accepted what she was doing because her involvement in other activities led to trusted relationships being formed. Her actions along with those of other residents like Billy, Margerie, Dorothy, and Antoinette meant that Marie and other young people on the estate felt both connected to and supported by adult residents.

The status enjoyed by the active residents was open to abuse with Dorothy and Cynthia mentioning the racial discrimination present at John's hut, Elizabeth used her visibility and popularity to help solve people's problems but also deal drugs. These negatives although mitigated by other resident activities are a reminder that however positive the residents spoke of the past, there were still considerable issues caused by the residents themselves.

A strong sense of responsibility, friendship and care for one another, especially for young people, came across in all the interviews that discussed past activities. It was clear that many adults felt compelled to support other residents, and could act on this compulsion due to their ownership of social space of the estate.

The activities above took place within a distinct field, which had its own habitus and capital (Bourdieu 1972). It was a field where residents were in control and could determine the rules of the game. In this space caring about fellow residents was a key habitus and local friendships were the most effective source of social capital. Even those in professional positions were reliant on friendships with residents to operate effectively.

The lack of professional control of space and services gave room for resident led activities to develop, allowing communal spaces to be places where different generations could informally come together.

The fact that adults were out in the open and communal areas of the estate meant that these spaces were not given over to one demographic group as is now the case. Instead, they were shared spaces. Young people had to act alongside adults, many of whom they or their parents knew well. This, as we will discuss in later chapters, had an impact on how the young people behaved.

The activities undertaken in the communal spaces were catalysts for friendship forming, without which many friendships would not have developed. Those interviewed all indicated that their friendships, and the care emanating from them, came from involvement in resident led activities.

These relationships were valued by professionals. John, the council youth worker embedded himself within the friendship networks of the estate, which helped him effectively deliver youth activities. Similarly, the resident participation officer who supported Dorothy and others to set up the legal surgery, alternative summer play scheme and other events played a facilitation role for residents who were far more connected, trusted and generally in a better place to get things done.

The dominant field on the estate was one that was owned and controlled by residents, with their values and dispositions setting what habitus and cultural capital prevailed (Swartz 1997). Those at the top of the hierarchy were those with the most favourable dispositions regardless of their qualifications of professional skill level. For example, Billy, who was an integral part of the running of the Youth Club, eventually taking over the management of the building, as well as sitting on the management board of Centenary Hall, and a well-respected member of the residents' committee, drove a school bus for disabled children as a day job. The residents' status was earnt from what they did to support people, which meant those with fewer qualifications such as Billy were seen in equal stature to other figures such as Dorothy who had both nursing and social work qualifications.

This hierarchy of practical value, similar to Bourdieu's notion of social capital being based on practical relationships (Bourdieu 1972), allowed people such as Cynthia's mum, a part time administrator, and Elizabeth an unemployed fixer and networker, to gain prominent positions on the estate. They both knew lots of people and could get things done through their networks simply because they went out of their way to support people.

Getting things done in an informal friendship based way became the doxa on the estate with social capital and status increased by actively helping others. There was minimal bridging social capital with most of the connections being bonding in character (Putnam 1993b). The effects of this bonding capital helped to develop closure (Coleman 1988) (which will be explored further in chapter six) producing unconscious obligations (Bourdieu 2013) within the wider resident population in a way similar to what Sahlins (1972) describes in his theory of generalised reciprocity. Young and old felt supported by each other which, as will be discussed later, produced obligations to behave in socially acceptable ways. The openness of this field enabled a relational network of care to develop similar to Tönnies' (1887) notion of community.

The accounts of the activities at this time all recalled a close knit feel to the estate, with the centenary hall acting a social hub; and the dominant habitus was one that was aligned to working class communal culture (Bourdieu 1984).

The dynamics of this field were endorsed by the local authority who handed over the management of three of the four communal spaces on the estate to the residents. There was an acceptance that the resident's informal processes were capable of effectively running buildings and local services.

However, the informality of this field did allow members to prioritise their own preferences which led to racial discrimination to take place. This resulted in a dual youth support structure to exist, with the council endorsed service that was known for not welcoming black children operating

alongside a black resident managed service.

This dualism between a resident managed and council managed service continued as a key theme throughout the project with racial differences being replaced by a more professional field versus informal resident dichotomy.

St Mary's Estate Youth Project

In the summer of 2006 Charis, a single mother who shared a two bedroom flat with her brother, two daughters and two granddaughters, asked Elizabeth who lived below her what they could do to calm the young people down over the summer. Charis was motivated to take action as she had seen Miche, her eldest, go bad and didn't want her youngest to follow suit. Apart from the fact that Miche had got pregnant at 18, Miche's only noticeable deviant behaviour was that she used to hang out and make noise in the evening. However, this was enough for Charis to spring into action.

Elizabeth and Charis approached James to see if the church he belonged to wanted to be involved; however, only James was interested. Throughout that summer Charis and James, supported in the background by Elizabeth, spent their evenings out supervising the children and young people as they played on the estate.

By the autumn the three residents had raised £10k, and with the help of Miche, Charis' daughter and volunteers from two churches located near the estate (but not from the churches that met in the buildings on the estate) they ran a twice weekly youth club in Our Place. Activities ranged from; homework support, arts and crafts, music sessions and a Friday movie night

using a borrowed projector and illegally downloaded movies. There was no great planning, just a desire from Charis for her youngest daughter not to go the way of her eldest.

The three also helped a group of young people set up a music studio, arranged work experience placements and took young people away on residentials. Soon Charis and James became the go to people if an adult was worried about the actions of a young person or if a young person needed support. Charis comments;

> "*It worked because we knew them all if there was any trouble we would go round their parent's house and people used to call us to check on their children.*"

> (Interview with Charis 13.6.13)

The project stopped in September 2009 when a 15 year old boy was shot at while on his way to Our Place. The police advised against having lots of young people congregating in one place as it made them an easier target. Tom, the young man in question, got stabbed to death outside his school the following June. The day of Tom's killing proved a turning point for the estate. That evening more and more young people started congregating on the estate, many looked visibly distraught. Charis and Elizabeth decided something needed to be done and organised an impromptu BBQ, knocking on other residents' doors asking for donations of food.

However, that was not enough to stop the police descending on the estate in full riot gear and marching down the central roadway towards the young people, throwing a couple of cans of CS gas in the process to disburse the

gathering crowd. The police response set the tone for policing on the estate that summer with the local officers replaced by the Territorial Support Group. Throughout that summer grey 'bully' vans roamed the estate on a daily basis. Young people were subject to searches, which were, at times, forceful. On one occasion, Emre a young resident was taken into one of the vans and beaten up. On another occasion, the police had Darren, Adal, and Kojo, three older young people, face down on the ground outside Our Place each with two officers over the top of them with their knees in their backs. A friend of the three walked on to the estate, saw what was happening and immediately got to the ground saying, *'I've done nothing, I'm innocent'*. There were a number of young and old residents shouting at the police from walkways of the blocks surrounding the area. Gerald a 25 year old Ghanaian, who had been instrumental in setting up the music studio and was respected by the young people and the residents' committee alike, was feeling a bit braver and went downstairs and started filming what was going on. All five young people ended up getting arrested for assault on an officer. Emre and Gerald's parents' flats got raided, and all digital storage devices including sky boxes and laptops were taken. Emre's elderly, deaf, mum needed hospital treatment because she was forced to the floor and held there by an officer kneeing her back, while the raid was going on.

When the case went to court, the young people were tried together and the first jury had to be dismissed due to the police constantly referring to the young men as a gang despite presenting no evidence of this. The case finally collapsed as three officers gave different locations for the assault and a fourth admitted he was not sure the assault actually happened.

By the end of the summer, the police action had fostered enough resistance from parents and other residents for the local MP to coordinate a meeting between the police and those affected. About 20 residents and young people went down to a community centre opposite the police station and were met by two local councillors, the MP, Police Borough Commander and some officers who had been policing the estate. The discussions were mildly amicable; a noticeable disagreement occurred when the number of stop and search slips collected by residents before the meeting out stripped the police figures for the same. By the end of the meeting the borough commander stated he would stop using the TSG to police the estate and the council agreed to invest in youth provision on the estate. However, the only money available was from the targeted gang prevention budget. So, in February 2011, the local authority commissioned two borough wide gang intervention programmes to run from Our Place. The residents' committee objected to the idea of bringing outside young people onto the estate. However, as the plan had widespread council support, and, as the councillor for community safety reminded the residents, Our Place was technically a council building, the services went ahead. The interest from the council was the start of the end of resident involvement in the running of youth activities. No residents were invited to help run any of these sessions as the local authority believed that the young people would be better served by professional, trained workers. During the three months that the funding lasted the young people who saw the estate as their home had doubled from around 15 to 30. The additional young people had no intrinsic link to the estate outside of the service delivery itself. Seeing the need to continue

some form of provision the council agreed to move two of their youth workers to the estate to run a three hour session once a week.

Although sessions only ran on Fridays, the 30 or so young people who now saw the estate as their home had the run of the building because the fire escape was broken and the council refused to recognise building maintenance was their responsibility. Young people came and went as they pleased. Various residents used to go in and ask them to leave every night knowing that they would just reinter again. One Thursday evening in June 2011, Kwaku, a 17 year old who lived above Our Place was shot dead in a drive by shooting outside his block after hanging out in the building. Immediately after the shooting, the council boarded up Our Place, and the MP called for it to be shut permanently. The official line was that the residents were allowing the young people to use the building unsupervised. Despite this being hotly disputed the line was used by the MP as a sign of resident irresponsibility.

The increased council attention brought with it new people and signaled the start of a new field emerging on the estate. During this early transitional period, the professional's involvement was limited to providing time bound services within Our Place. However, their participation brought with it a new dynamic. The decision by the council to commission an outside service and side step the residents who already informally worked with the young people was the first indication that the council believed the resident's skills and capital could not adequately support those on the estate. These new paid for services were run under a new professional ethos that dismissed the value of the resident's capital.

In the same way, there was a hierarchical dichotomy emerging that placed the council and professionals above the residents. The new hierarchy could be seen in the local authority's decision to discount the resident's concerns about running a gang prevention service from the estate and then in ignoring the resident's requests for the fire door in Our Place to be fixed. In essence, the council officials were using their political, economic and social capital to insert on to the estate those whom they felt were more capable and qualified. In so doing, the professionals, paid to work with the young people, were given a higher status, with their opinion and work considered superior and the residents subordinate.

The youth project set up by Charis, James, and Elizabeth tried to fill the space between the relational and professional service delivery. It was developed and governed in an informal way; however, the project itself is a sign that the old order of relational control was breaking down. The young people were starting to act in an anti-social manner as the previously close networks that existed on the estate were disappearing. The closure (Coleman 1988) of previous years was starting to wane.

There had been a retrenchment by adults into their homes, and localised relational ties were disappearing. Macro-economic factors, which are out of the scope of this project (Beck 2002; Bellair 1997; Fenton 2010; Offer 2012), coupled with local factors discussed throughout this project acted together to make people less likely to engage. Trust between people started to disappear, and the relationships that once allowed social capital and neighbourhood controls to flourish (Field 2004; Fukuyama 1995) weakened or were none existent. The young people were benefiting less and less from

close relational ties, and they were starting to be seen as a risk (Kelly 2003). Fear and the expectation of hostility from the young people became many adults' default position as people's physical proximity remained, but relationally they became more distant (Bauman 2000; Standing 2011). The council's solution was for residents to trust strangers to provide the support and interventions needed to make their lives better, as they were seen as not having the skills, experience or networks to resolve the issues themselves (Sáez and Sanchez 2006).

Despite the lack of relational support, the space and activities on the estate were still largely governed by an informal mentality. Although the outside areas of the estate had generally started to lose their meeting place function (Lefebvre 2003) and segregation between the young people and adults was visible in the communal areas (Perry 2012); the estate had not yet become controlled by outsiders (Ilan 2012). Charis, Elizabeth, and James saw an opportunity to try and rebuild the relational networks that would bring the type of results resembling Coleman's closure (1988). The idea was simple enough, help residents get to know and understand the young people by interacting with them and hopefully influence their behaviour along the way.

Their vision did not totally materialise, apart from a handful of residents, and volunteers from a church based off the estate, no one really got involved, and a supportive network did not develop. The connections that were established were largely between Charis, James and individual parents and although obligations between the volunteers and young people were created, a wider system of generalised reciprocity as discussed in Sahlins' (1972) or Coleman's (1988) work, was missing.

By the end of this period, a new direction under instruction from the local authority was emerging. The solution to the 'young person issue' was not to be found in developing relationships but by introducing professional services delivered by trained experts (Evetts 2003; 2006; 2011). In seeking to try and redress some of the ill feeling caused by the TSG, the local authority did not want to work with and empower the engaged residents; rather they opted to bring in professionals from off the estate to take over from them.

A New Interest in the Estate and New Ways of Working

By the autumn of 2011, the political landscape had changed further; the local authority budget cuts were starting to kick in, and the 2011 Localism Act gave local people greater scope to deliver council services. The local authority responded by promoting the cooperative council model stating that it wanted to hand decision making over to the people. However, despite the stark economic reality forcing the local authority to abandon direct delivery, they still wanted to control how services were delivered and by whom.

In September 2011, the local authority asked representatives from a newly formed local area forum, which covered five local estates, street properties, local business, and organisations, to meet the commissioner of youth services to discuss potential new youth activities on St Mary's estate. The council were willing to put £25,000 towards activities designed to impose order on to what they were increasingly conceiving of as an unruly location. This was to be achieved through specialist intervention to address the now

rampant criminal behaviour. However, for the residents' committee, the process looked like an outside force coming to take control of their space.

The council's proposal document (see appendix four) set the tone for future service delivery on the estate. Point one of the proposal placed the estate in a much wider service provision context and made the involvement of groups from off the estate seem normal and even preferred. Although the point mentioned that there was a whole range of organisations in the local area, it is telling that only Saplings and the residents' committee, out of these organisations, were invited to submit a bid to run the activities.

Saplings was set up in 1995 as part of an agreement between the local authority and a housing association after the council transferred an estate five mins walk from St Mary's over to their control. Saplings' main focus was adult education, however, by 2011 they had started to deliver youth work activities, despite this not being their expertise. Saplings had a mixed reputation locally. Their patron was the local MP, two of their trustees were local councillors, one was a director of the housing association, and another was a CEO of a local charity. Many of their staff used to work for the council and vice versa. In this regard Saplings were very well networked and, as such, was the go to organisation for the local authority in terms of local service delivery.

Conversely, some local people and staff from other organisations regularly criticised Saplings stating that they focused more on appearance, dominated partnerships, took the credit for other's successes, whilst often not delivering on their own agreed project activities. Whether or not this

criticism is well founded remains up for debate, however much of it mirrored the main accusations levelled at them by the residents over the next few years.

The second point in the proposal highlighted how economic capital was used by the council to ensure their narrative about the estate was dominant. The council stipulated that there was £25k available for targeted programmes, yet the money was only available if the residents accepted that there were youth crime and gang issues on the estate. This point would force the engaged adult residents to concede that the young people on the estate were essentially bad. Up until this point Elizabeth, Charis and James along with support from other residents defended the young people and portrayed them more as victims than perpetrators. During the TSG policing the summer before, an older couple had taken to walking around the estate at night to observe the police and Elizabeth, Charis and James had consciously made themselves more visible in the evening. This point would force the residents to accept the council and police narrative that there was a problem with crime or gang activities that needed dealing with. The recognition of this narrative would give the council greater leverage to push through their agenda.

Although it was evident at the initial meeting that the council did not want to fund the residents, they did permit them to submit a proposal alongside the one requested from Saplings. However, the residents' proposal played into the council's hands and justified the viewpoint that professionals, and not residents, should tackle the issue.

The battle of Narratives

The local authority used their position as commissioner to address narrative differences that existed in the residents' and professionals' views of the young people. The residents' committee did not believe that the young people were as entrenched in serious criminal activity, as the police and the council were making out. Even though the introduction of new young people through the gang intervention activities had increased the prominence of criminal behaviour, the active residents still thought the young people should be nurtured rather than controlled. As such, they saw themselves as best placed re-establish the supportive relational network that would guide the young people back on the right path.

In contrast, the local authority conceptualised the young people through a gang lens and as a risk that needed to be governed and controlled by professional interventions (Armstrong 2004; Hughes 2011; Hobbs 2013; Kelly 2003).

The council narrative had four key goals: depict the young people as so entrenched in criminal behaviour that they need to be supported by specialist professionals; stress that the resident group did not have the skills to provide this support; show how the resident group did not have the infrastructure capability to up skill and deliver the project successfully, and lastly, establish Saplings as the natural deliverer of the services that the estate required.

The document opens with a summary of what had happened over recent years, which according to the residents was inaccurate. Elizabeth felt that

there was a deliberate fudging of the details, which purposefully denied the work that she and other residents had been successfully doing before the council started their more recent delivery. The account also hid the fact that the council had been running the adventure playground for years, but had failed to engage with the older teenagers in the way that the residents had. Finally, it failed to acknowledge that the council youth delivery was a poor compromise, designed to provide some investment on the estate, after a summer of policing by the TSG.

The account also moved the end of the council delivery from June 2011 to September 2011, a few weeks before this meeting took place. The fudging of dates suggested that the local authority was more committed to providing a continuous youth provision than they actually were. This image was backed up with point four of the document which implied the council had provided some fairly long term support, when in fact it was two youth workers, for three hours a week for six weeks. Again conveniently missing from this background point was the fact that the council youth delivery ended when Kwaku an 18 year old who lived in a flat above Our Place, was murdered on the estate.

The document failed to mention that the residents' committee were actually against targeted programmes as they felt that it would attract the wrong young people to the estate, which would result in the issues getting worse; something that bore out to be true.

The process sought to establish the local authority as the main past provider of youth activities on the estate, making it seem logical that what followed

should continue along the same lines. It failed to acknowledge the formal and informal youth work by residents that had been and still was taking place on the estate. Including this fact would have muddied the water somewhat and given the residents more of a foothold in the proceedings.

The document's discussions on local involvement referenced the 'community', meaning people, organisations, and businesses from a wider area than the estate itself. The wording made the residents one stakeholder amongst many, who, therefore, could be over ruled. This was despite the fact that they were the only people who, up to this point, knew any of the young people.

Point five of the document mentions Saplings surprise at the type of young person that hung around on the estate, which was cited as a contributory factor in Saplings not being able to run a project on the estate over the previous summer period. However, Elizabeth recalls that Saplings had approached the residents' committee to run a joint programme, but had been unsuccessful in securing the funding, so the project did not go ahead. The inclusion of the inaccuracies of this point had a dual impact. Firstly, it reinforced the narrative that the young people needed specialist support. Secondly, it placed Saplings as a clear successor to the local authority's work.

Darren, the local authority's deputy director of youth services, had not been to the estate, nor consulted any residents or young people before he wrote the document. Equally the meeting in Turner House to discuss a potential youth project was the first time the majority of those in attendance had been

on the estate. However, this did not seem to be of importance. The council's key point was that the young people needed professional intervention, and the residents' committee were not professional.

There was minimal direction about what type of youth activities should take place. The document and the proceeding discussions focused on how to ensure a professional service. As such there was a preferencing of managerialism, over on the ground experience (Andreassen et al. 2014). The special status of the professional (Begun 1996, Evetts 2003, 2006, 2011, 2013) was being used as a method of control (Evetts 2006, Waring and Waring 2009). This control prevented the democratisation of decision making that the Localism Act was purported to bring. The local authority used its status and economic capital to shape the future of a localised delivery, it was about to vacate. Despite this passing of responsibility from the local authority to other organisations, the use of professionalism as a control mechanism meant that the handing over was to organisations that operated within a professional field, rather than groups of residents who may have operated under a different ethos.

The two submitted proposals (Appendix 5 and 6) show the contrast in approaches, with the residents emphasising a local knowledge based relational approach and Saplings highlighting a professional methodology.

The residents' proposal included the desire to split the under and over 15s up due to Elizabeth and Charis' concern that the younger group were being influenced negatively by the older teenagers. Having two separate groups

in separate locations would help to negate any negative implications of the youth activities.

The activities planned for the older group reflected the old resident youth delivery, which used to be a mix of activities chosen by the young people, combined with what the residents can provide through their own skills, resources, and networks. There was no real expectation to bring in any paid outside support.

Local knowledge was also seen in the explanation of the activities for the 8-15 year old activities, both regarding support and usage of Our Place. A reference to this group needing the most support stood in contradistinction to the police and council evidence, who believed that the older group were the most problematic. However, Elizabeth's issue was not the current deviance, but concern that the younger group were behaving worse at their age than the older group was at the same age. Therefore the focus should be in the younger group, to stop them turning out even worse. (A point that proved to be an accurate assessment in terms of the types of crime this group went on to commit in later years).

The relational approach was most evident in two paragraphs relating to Charis, expressing care for Charis and Charis' own care for the young people.

Rather than focusing on hiring qualified staff, Elizabeth focused on the merits of a more localised approach. Her proposal centred on Charis who, Elizabeth commented, deserved the job as she had been doing a lot of work for free and should to get some recompense. The proposal continued to

state that the project will be good for Charis as '*The fact is Charis needs to change her life.'* She even included a comment about her mother being ill and the wages could help Charis to go and visit her more often.

Charis' commitment was further commented upon by of her apparent willingness to change her Christmas plans for the sake of the young people and that she used to 'go the extra mile' by taking the young people home after sessions in the past.

Elizabeth continued to explain the value of Charis by stating that Martha Carr (Saplings CEO) was also aware of Charis' worth and that without Charis there would be no project. The budget stretched out the funding over several years because Charis would do additional work off her own back and supplement her income through other part time work.

The Saplings proposal was weighted in the opposite direction, setting out a structure for the weekly sessions, which was not too dissimilar to that which was being proposed by Elizabeth, yet the jargon and presentation were far more professional.

There was a cursory mention of incorporating feedback from residents and young people, despite the only feedback that was taken into consideration was the views expressed at the initial meeting. As local consultation was a cornerstone of the new council ethos, the proposal was written to emphasise its collaborative focus.

Its budget looked far more thought through and professionally presented than the residents' version. The proposed activities, although most didn't

happen, included preparation for work and re-entry to education programmes, and enrolment on to 'accredited' courses that Saplings were already running.

In a meeting at the council's diminishing youth service office, Darren explained to James that there was no way that he could accept Elizabeth's proposal. He did not elaborate on the reasons why but stated *'Well you have read it, James, you can see why it can't be accepted, I mean it just can't be."* It is worth noting here that James came to meet Darren in a capacity as a manager of a local alternative education centre, rather than a resident. As the meeting continued Darren expressed his annoyance with the cooperative agenda stating that he was appointed due to his experience in public sector outsourcing and had no previous youth experience at all; he was simply an outsourcing specialist brought in to make people including himself redundant.

Despite the fact that Darren made the final decision about who should get the funding, it was to be administered through the new local forum. The process of awarding Saplings the contract was made somewhat easier, as at the time the forum was using Saplings' bank account.

The council's response to the Localism Act sent out almost contradictory messages. On the one hand, the Act was meant to give local people a greater say in how services were managed and delivered in their area (Dowling and Harvie 2014). However, the council used its economic and social capital to ensure what happened fitted a professional mold. The council operated within a professionalised field, and it seemed natural to the

council staff that any service they funded would operate under the same rules. In doing what seemed logical, the council staff were in fact, establishing a new way of interacting on the estate. They were bringing their own field, complete with its valuation of different forms of capital and habitus, to the estate with the belief that their perspective was the best one. For example, Darren talking to James as a professional colleague, believed he would have a 'feel for the game' and it would 'go without saying' that Elizabeth's proposal could not be chosen (Bourdieu 1984; Bottero 2010; Decoteau 2015; Oliver and O'Reilly 2010; Steinmetz 2011). This field saw professional market oriented skills, professional connections, and knowledge, as vital for effective delivery. It preferred this over the capital and relationships developed from the frontline work of residents similar to that which was discussed by Draus and Carlson (2009), Özbilgin and Tatli (2011) and Woolford and Curran (2012) and explored further in the literature review. The local people that the council wanted to engage and hand responsibility over to, were not ordinary residents, but like-minded professionals. Due to the rules Darren and others operated within, it just didn't seem possible that the residents' proposal could address the issues at hand, or be treated seriously.

As a result, a new field started to become dominant, one with new rules and ways of working. Close networks, based on local knowledge and relationships, gave way to a professional bridging social capital (Putnam 1993a). Within this professional field, the informal character of the residents' way of working was not deemed appropriate. For the council to be satisfied that what they were commissioning would be effective, the

service had to be delivered by those with specialist training and expertise (Andreassen et al. 2014; Begun 1986, Evetts 2011). The desire for professionalism gave the council a legitimate reason for shutting the residents out of running the activities on the estate. Even though Saplings themselves did not have a qualified staff team in place to deliver the service they proposed, they were networked in with the council, and importantly knew the 'rules of the game of the professional field (Bourdieu 2003). Sapling's capital was enough to pre-assure the council that, despite their lack of youth service experience and almost no knowledge of the estate, their service delivery would meet the council requirements.

Networks Matter

The emergence of the professional field led to a revaluing of what types of networks and social capital were of importance on the estate. The residents, involved in the process above, were all operating in a non-work capacity which impacted the resources they could draw upon. Some individual members of the committee had connections within the youth sector on a professional basis. However, their professional networks could only be utilised using economic capital, which the residents did not have. The separation between James' role as a resident and also the manager of a youth training project highlights this fact. His work networks were ones of a professionally reciprocal nature; however, as a resident, there was nothing that James could professionally offer this network, and so he could not draw upon it for support. Both Elizabeth and Charis also had extensive networks, yet they were made up largely of parents and other residents and were of no value within the professional field. Within this new social space, the

friendships that once enabled Elizabeth, Charis, and others to get things done, were not only of little value. Their reliance on this network was an indication to professionals that the residents did not have the understanding, experience or connections to operate successfully.

On the other hand, Saplings were acting in what was their standard work arena and therefore could more readily utilise their professional network. Indeed, their invitation to the meeting, and then to apply for the funding, was a sign of their networking in operation. Even though they had only recently started delivering programmes for young people they were clearly the council's preferred, if not only, option for the funding. Their status as the organisation of choice in local matters was substantiated later in the project, with council staff members almost coercing the residents to work with Saplings over the running of Centenary Hall (discussed later) and Anne, a council resident engagement officer, commenting;

> *"Supporting the residents' committee is really getting me into trouble Matt [her manager], and Peter [area housing manager] both keep asking me what am I planning with Saplings on the estate if I do not start inviting them to things I will get into trouble."*
>
> (FNJ 27/07/14)

Saplings' connectivity meant the council had already earmarked them to receive the funding before the meeting with the residents and other potential stake holders took place. The resident group were in the contrasting position of being included in the meeting, not because they were considered important, but because the new council strategy made their involvement necessary. It was evident from the meeting that the council did not believe

that the residents were a possible option as a youth service deliverer. Instead, the resident involvement was a tokenistic gesture to conform to a new cooperative direction.

Changing Field

This process not only opened the door for Saplings to run youth activities on the estate, but it also signalled a shift in the dominant field. Field in this context is drawing on Bourdieu's concept discussed in the literature review and refers in this research to sets of structures, relationships, rules and ways of working. The council's interest in the estate, along with their economic and social capital meant that over a relatively short space of time a new field became dominant. The commissioning process, under the auspicious of cooperation and co-production, was indeed putting local people at the heart of government outsourcing (Dowling and Harvie 2014). Local people in this sense were not ordinary residents but well-connected representatives of organisations.

Professionalism became symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1990) which legitimised Saplings' position and precluded the residents from getting involved. The use of buzz words and phrases in Saplings' proposal was a sign of their competency when operating within the professional field (Evetts 2013, Lyons 2011, Noordegraaf 2011). Professionalism was used to close off the opportunity to some, and legitimise the preselection of Saplings as the preferred organisation to receive the funding (Begun 1996, Evetts 2003, 2006, 2011, 2013).

Up to this point an informal field, developed out of residents' everyday interactions, was dominant. In it the more care and support someone offered, the more respected they were. In this field, people such as Dorothy, Charis, and Elizabeth had top status simply because of a number of people they knew and the amount of care and concern they had shown over a long period of time. It was widely known that if someone, including the council, wanted to get the residents' committee to approve something they needed the approval of Dorothy and Elizabeth first. The status of these two women often meant that the other active residents would simply trust their judgement. We will discuss the importance of such relationships throughout later chapters, however, it suffices here to summarise that there was an emphasis on residents supporting one another and it was this action that served as symbolic capital and gave status to particular residents.

The professional field, that very quickly became the dominant field, had completely different norms and values. Status was based on connections with professional organisations and knowledge of how to act in a professional way, which included sourcing and managing funding. This new field was not governed by relationships, but by contractual arrangements. Involvement in and the connections within this field were and still are initiated through self-interested transactions. Without adequate transactional recompense for their time, efforts and skills, Saplings were not going to act.

New Values, Relationships and Statuses

The council's involvement on the estate precipitated a rather rapid change in the dominant field. The informal field had evolved over time, and although

it was noticeable that the impact of this field had somewhat diminished over the years, its predominance, up until this point, had remained.

In the space of just a few months, the old way of resolving local issues was replaced with the new. This resulted in numerous clashes in both method and motivation as proponents of the new field used professionalism to assert their status and wishes on the estate. The interplay between habitus, field and social status can be understood by looking at four key residents on the estate, Elizabeth, Charis, James, and Dorothy.

Elizabeth's introductory email to the residents' committee about Saplings was upbeat and included asking for permission to send individual's contact details to Martha, the director of Saplings who was keen to work together. Elizabeth's spirit of cooperation was also seen in an email to Darren Wood after the initial meeting at Our Place that highlighted the merits of the forum despite its fledgling character. However, after Saplings received the funding it seemed Elizabeth's belief in partnership working was not universally held. Notwithstanding the disappointment of the council dismissing their proposal, Elizabeth and Charis went to a meeting at Saplings' office to hopefully secure some concessions for the residents.

Elizabeth ended up walking out of the meeting crying feeling that Martha and other Saplings staff were belittling her to such a high degree that it was offensive. A week later Elizabeth emailed the residents' committee stating that she would be stepping down as the secretary but hoped to stay involved in some more informal way. Elizabeth had often commented that she needed to do less so that she could spend more time with her children who

were starting families of their own and this snub was the last straw for Elizabeth who could feel herself being squeezed out.

Elizabeth had spent most of the past 25 years or so supporting estate residents, either simply as a resident or later as a committee member. She was extremely effective at bridging the gap between residents and the council due to longstanding relationships with Adam, the housing manager, and some local councillors. Both Adam and the councillors' acceptance and understanding of the benefits of Elizabeth's ways meant that others did not question her methods. She would even comment that she can walk into the housing office use their photocopier and have a chat with Adam whenever she liked. However, with staff changes and other departments starting to be responsible for what happened on the estate Elizabeth's value, experience and methods were not held in such high esteem. Her social capital was losing its value, and her habitus was not appreciated in the new field. Instead of learning the rules and trying to adapt Elizabeth decided to opt out and take more of a back seat.

However, initially, Elizabeth did not realise that because she did not have the backing of a respected organisation, her views would not be considered equal to those of the Saplings staff. Elizabeth, still utilising the habitus that made her so effective in the informal field, failed to internalise the subordinate position as a nonprofessional that she held in the new field. This resulted in the Saplings' staff putting her in her place. Elizabeth considered her reaction as unprofessional, which was for her a sign that she needed to walk away, and for Martha it confirmation that Samplings rightly saw themselves as professionally superior.

Dorothy now in her late 70s spent her working life, after she moved to the UK from Jamaica, first as a nurse and then as a social worker for the local authority. As such she had been submerged in a professional protocol and doxa. Yet at the same time, she was a champion of residents getting involved and running activities. Due to her retirement, Dorothy's professional habitus was fast running out of date. Her inability to use a computer effectively and adherence to past processes showed her up as someone whom time and progress was passing by. During meetings, her views were often placated by the professionals. In response, Dorothy would very often try and maintain her past status by agreeing with their suggestions only to regret it later. The desire for recognition from those who were all too ready to dismiss Dorothy influenced what she supported and consented to. Some residents viewed Dorothy as someone whom organisations targeted to get on their side as a way on to the estate. In return during residents' committee conflicts with Saplings, Community Learning Trust and Oak Training (the latter two will be discussed in later chapters), Dorothy would often mention that she feels responsible for letting these organisations on to the estate in the first place.

James' position in the field was also somewhat contradictory. Professionally James was well respected by the council officers, if not by Saplings staff. His status with the council officers largely came from his paid roles where he had successfully delivered projects for them. The local authority understood that James could utilise the habitus needed to operate in the field and as such was considered a reliable and trustworthy operator. His status like other professionals was tied to his access to resources which

could support the council's agenda. On the estate, James was operating not as a professional, but someone committed to resident empowerment. The mutual respect emanating from his professional position still extended to his work on the estate, even if the council found his commitment to resident empowerment frustrating at times. The fragmentation can be further seen in his interactions with Saplings staff, who regularly saw James as a confrontational character who was opposed to their presence on the estate. Therefore James, to Saplings and many other organisations, was simply a resident lacking professional habitus who had unrealistic ideas about how services should operate.

Charis was possibly the hardest hit by the changing field. A single parent, who had only been positively engaging on the estate for 5 or so years and still very rough around the edges, Charis had very little suitable habitus for the new field. With support and mentoring from Elizabeth, Charis had become a key resident, building up a lot of respect with young people and parents alike. However, with the emergence of the new professional field Charis' rugged relational way of operating and willingness to be out on the estate almost every day to keep an eye on what is going on meant nothing to the council or Saplings.

Charis' loss of status was solidified in her two attempts to apply for jobs with Saplings. The Saplings proposal included employing local people to work with the young people and Charis thought she was the perfect candidate so got Elizabeth to help fill out the application form. Charis failed to secure an interview and Martha fed back to Elizabeth her disappointment with the standard of the application. Charis had wrongly assumed that her efforts on

the estate would help her stand out from the other candidates, however, they were considered irrelevant. This knocked her confidence, and for a while, she spoke about not getting involved on the estate anymore. She had the job centre on her case and was fed up of seeing people coming on to the estate and getting paid for doing less than she was doing for free.

However, eighteen months later, Charis had become a qualified play worker and was working part time at an after school club. Saplings were once again hiring, but this time for a play worker at the adventure playground. Buoyed with the confidence that now she was now qualified Charis thought that Saplings may now take her more seriously. Initially, she wandered up to the adventure playground to ask about the role and was directed to speak to Martha at the main office. After phoning three times and walking up to the office twice, every time being told Martha would contact her, Charis decided she would not go through the anguish of another failed application.

Charis had none of the options, status or tactics that Elizabeth, James or Dorothy could turn too. Her habitus which allowed her to fit in with the young people and parents now caused her to be discarded as unimportant.

Another casualty in this process was the informal way the active residents were used to operating within. Previously residents could run youth projects, those who wanted to get involved simply had a trial to see if they liked it. There were no contracts, minimal policies and procedures, just an understanding that people should ensure that others are not let down, and if they want to discipline a child they should try and contact the parent first. Interventions included marching particularly bad children back to their

homes and explaining to their parent what had happened. The informality was also seen in who attended the activities. Although there was a rule that attendees had to be eight or over so that the project did not need to be Ofsted registered, young people often came with their younger brothers and sisters, some who were still in nappies. The rationale for letting the smaller children stay was based on concern; the older child would be left looking after them with no adult supervision if they were sent away.

The Saplings project operated under a different ethos. The two recruited staff members had no previous connection with the estate; Saplings did suggest that they would recruit resident volunteers to ensure a local connection. However, this did not materialise. Saplings insisted that any resident wanting to volunteer had to complete their volunteer training programme first which included explaining the importance of keeping clear boundaries between themselves, the young people and their families; something that was alien to the potentially interested residents. The recruitment process proved a stumbling block and Saplings failed to recruit any residents to be volunteers.

Saplings' adherence to the rules of the professional field served to reinforce their apparent status as a specialised professional organisation (Andreassen et al. 2014; Begun 1986, Evetts 2011) and ensure their control of the local service delivery market (Begun 1996, Evetts 2003, 2006, 2011, 2013). Their volunteer training programme would have been a rite of passage ensuring that those who worked on the project had the right training to work with young people, further reinforcing the idea of specialist skills needed to deliver services effectively (Andreassen et al. 2014; Begun

1986, Evetts 2011). To ensure the superiority of their method, Saplings had to ignore the value of the residents' skills and relationships. Any recognition shown to the habitus and capital displayed by the residents would detract from the merits of their professional ethos.

In shoring up their position Saplings reinforced the belief that professional boundaries should be kept between the workers and the young people. One of the clearest signs of the change in ethos from how the residents acted came when James and Dwight (the Saplings youth coordinator) were walking from the estate to Saplings office with Dwight commenting;

> "*You know what is starting to annoy me, all this talk of 'our children' by Elizabeth and Charis, it's gonna cause problems. They are not their children they didn't birth them.*"
>
> (FNJ 21.04.12)

Dwight objected to the ownership and care that certain residents were showing towards the young people on the estate. This care compelled Elizabeth, Charis and others to get intimately involved in the lives of the young people, yet it was a care that over stepped the boundaries laid out in the rules of the professional field.

The need for separation between the young people and workers was further reinforced at a committee meeting when Martha commented on Gerald's involvement as a volunteer. Saplings had encouraged Gerald (a twenty five year old who had recently moved off the estate) to start volunteering for Saplings as a way to combine the popularity of his music studio with the Saplings project. Martha commented that;

161

> *"It is important that the workers keep their professional distance from the young people otherwise it becomes very hard for them to do their job. Gerald is finding this out right now. He knows most of them as friends and is used to joking around with them and is finding it hard to move into a place of authority where they will listen to him."*

(FNJ 24.10.12)

However right Martha's comments may have been, they need to be understood in the context of Gerald being a 25 year old who grew up on the estate and at the time of him becoming a volunteer still hung out with the local young people. Gerald's issue was not whether he could influence the young people as his management of the music studio proved he could but in his ability to apply the rules of the professional field. Young people were not used to Gerald acting in a different way towards them so didn't take him seriously when he tried to enforce professional boundaries. His involvement lasted around six months after which he realised the promised training and paid opportunities were not forth coming. At which point he left and became a Tesco delivery driver.

The domination of the professional field continued throughout the youth project. Steph Thompson, a council officer, and ex Saplings staff member, facilitated a steering group made up of Saplings staff, members of the residents' committee and forum members. The resident committee was asked to draft the group's terms of reference, in which they included a clause that tried to block Saplings staff being able to vote on any proposal that they put forward. This clause reflected the fact that Julie, who was the Saplings' lead youth worker, had recently voted in favour of supporting

Saplings bid to run the APG as a forum member, despite the fact that she was also worked for Saplings. There was sufficient distrust to believe that she could do this again and propose something as a forum member that was beneficial to Saplings and then vote on it. The residents also asked that the young people be split up into groups to ensure the older ones were not a bad influence on the younger ones; be consulted on any proposals that Saplings wanted to put forward ahead of steering group meetings and for monthly attendance, demographic and financial data to be shared. Despite the terms of reference being emailed around the group, it was never discussed at a meeting, and the points above were routinely ignored.

There was an increasing annoyance about the way Saplings were running the project and of the tokenistic nature of the steering group. Residents plotted to expose Saplings over discrepancies in the now £30k budget submitted to the council and what was actually being spent. Much of the concern was around an identified over £8,500 budgeted for project activities that were not taking place and a further £11,419 that was budgeted to go straight to Saplings to cover operational costs including £5200 of venue hire for activities that didn't take place. James emailed Steph Thompson to put budget issues on the agenda, however, despite many requests it only appeared once and then Martha responded by offering to send through a reforecasted budget after the meeting, the document never materialised.

The disregarding of the resident's requests was symptomatic of the hierarchical relationship that had been established during the commissioning and continued during the delivery. Saplings staff saw themselves as superior and as such did not need to take the residents'

concerns seriously. The hierarchal privilege also led the Saplings staff to act in a demanding manner which can be seen in an email exchange between Dwight from Saplings and Elizabeth and James. The analysis below shows the typically demanding tone of the Saplings' staff and the retaliatory character of James' and conciliatory character of Elizabeth, who at this point had tendered her resignation. The two different types of responses indicate the various status positions of Elizabeth and James. James, who operated in both the professional and informal field, wanted to try and assert his status on the situation; whereas Elizabeth was giving up on her formal involvement in the residents' committee and was happy to concede ground. The full email interaction can be found in Appendix 7 however below is an excerpt from the conversation which highlights both the status positions and the priorities of those involved;

> **Dwight:** *I hope you are all good and well, sorry I was unable to attend the meeting yesterday. I am emailing you today because I have a couple of points which I would like to raise as a matter of urgency.*
> *Turner house: I need the building work to be completed or to a safe standard by Monday morning. I need to ensure that all electrical/gas equipment is tested before use - can I have a progress report Monday morning.*

> **James:** *the gas is tested yearly, and the main circuits are tested according to health and safety guidelines - labels on the gas meter and fuse box indicate when they were last tested - it is up to individual groups to ensure their own equipment is PAT tested.*

> **Elizabeth:** *Turner house - what you need may not happen although I am sure everyone involved is doing their best. I spoke to the man about an hour ago, and the electrician will go in there on Monday, so................................ Work to be finished by Monday morning - won't happen. You can either ask Yolanda* [the council's resident engagement officer] *for a progress report*

> *or - the man is called Stuart and his number is 0780 xxx xxx, I'm sure it will be OK for you to call him - in fact, as I write, I have just received another call from him and apparently he told you all this BEFORE you sent this email so - you already know that it won't be done by Monday morning!! As with yesterday, I write this with the intention of being friendly, polite, etc. but - it's very hard as time goes by. Please don't think I am being sarcastic but - seeing as it all comes out wrong - I hand over to Yolanda. She knows as much if not more than me.*

(email between Dwight, James and Elizabeth 30.03.2012)

Dwight's comments about Turner House shows his view that now Saplings had been given the contract he could tell the resident's committee what he needed rather than ask for help. The email itself contains a list of instructions rather than anything thing that resembles a productive relationship. Both James and Elizabeth responded in a way that continued the animosity with James, out of annoyance deliberately placed responsibility back on to Dwight. Elizabeth was less subtle in showing her frustrations highlighting the fact that Dwight had already been told by Stuart, the City Maintenance LTD operative, that the works were not going to be finished before Monday. Dwight's inclusion of this need was simply to put pressure on the resident's committee by placing any initial delays or problems with the project in their hands by not completing work to his time table. Dwight could only act in a demanding way as he believed he was in a position of authority to do so. Secondly, Dwight believed that this position of power would be recognised enough for it to cause action by James and Elizabeth. Thirdly, he did not expect Elizabeth or James to know Stuart who was another professional on the estate. Elizabeth's general mode of operation was to be friendly to everyone and get things done through

relationships. This is how she came to know Stuart and his boss, both of whom would routinely do odd jobs for people at Elizabeth's request.

Dwight believed that his position as a paid, experienced and qualified worker from the organisation chosen by the council to run a professional service had earnt him a special status (Andreassen et al. 2014; Begun 1986, Evetts 2011). However, Elizabeth and James' response showed that neither was going to recognise Dwight's status and Elizabeth was keen to highlight Dwight's deceit and her frustration over it.

Within the same email, Dwight sent confirmation of the hours the project would run, which again highlighted the power relationships. In the initial discussions, Elizabeth, Charis, and James all wanted the activities to go on until later in the evening and for Saplings to 'walk' the young people home afterwards. Martha had already cited '*health and safety*' for her staff not walking the young people home and had commented that her staff felt that the sessions should finish in the early evening, which Dwight confirmed in the email.

James' response showed that he was not about to let this lie using terms like 'bad planning', 'good practice' and 'successful youth projects' in an attempt to use a professionalised language and play Saplings at their own game'. James' comments were not considered significant as he was responding as a resident, so his agitated concerns were ignored.

The antagonisms within this email showed a further power relationship that existed within resident and paid for staff connections. The rebuffs or rebukes that were directed towards Dwight in the email did not have enough weight

behind them in his eyes to warrant a response. Disregarding was one two ways that these types of communication were dealt with, the other was to accuse the residents of being confrontational and complain about the way in which they were reacting rather than addressing the issue at hand. For example, during an update meeting, James suggested that the resident training element of the Saplings contract had not yet been done. Twenty minutes later when several agenda points had passed Martha responded;

> *"I just have to say this, I found what James said earlier, very rude and unfair and I feel that it is not really the place to raise something like this. It puts me off coming to these meetings if I am going to get attacked like this."*
>
> *(FNJ 23.10.13)*

A trend emerged in the communication between residents and professionals. Criticism of professional delivery was often rebranded as personal attacks on the professionals themselves, which then made what was said seem unprofessional and not warranting consideration other than complaining about its offensive nature.

As the service progressed, it kept attracting more young people with Saplings' own estimates stating that only around 30% of the young people using the building were from the estate. The service's popularity was evidence to Saplings and the local authority that the activities were working and were value for money. The sheer volume of young people who now hung around the building and consequently the estate meant that many adult residents felt wary of going into the space for the meetings and birthday parties that were held there when the club was not running. Unlike

the previous resident led youth activities, the Saplings provision was considerably motivated about proving its worth. The rhetoric of supporting young people and delivering activities that would help their personal and social development soon gave way to demonstrating value for money through reporting on the numbers of young people who attended. At the residents' committee meeting, Julie gave monthly updates stating once that over 150 different young people had signed consent forms or taken them to be filled out. Despite everyone believing the number Julie reported was wildly exaggerated, the numbers reported were used as evidence that the service was providing what the young people needed and should continue. As a consequence of the Saplings delivery, Our Place that when under resident control was focused on serving residents, was simply becoming a venue that outside organisations used for their own benefit.

Complaints from residents from across the estate about anti-social behaviour such as drug dealing, smoking weed on stairwells, making noise and generally causing a nuisance went up. One of the residents' key concerns was the fact that they no longer recognised the majority of young people they saw causing problems and therefore felt worried about asking them to stop. Many residents reported intimidatory behaviour by the young people when they did try and talk to them. In return, many of the young people cited the rudeness of adult residents as the reason for their behaviour during the interactions between themselves and adults. This will be explored further in chapter six.

Summary

The data above starts to show how the professional field became the predominant field when dealing with social issues on the estate. The chapter initially outlined accounts of historical service delivery on the estate that was predominantly run by resident volunteers in an informal manner. The chapter went on to discuss how interest from the local authority caused a quite rapid shift in the dominant field. Although fields change and evolve over time (Bourdieu 2003), the estate experienced an almost overnight shift from one field to another, complete with a new set of rules, hierarchies, and processes. This change in what field was superior set a new standard for future operations on the estate. Understanding this shift within its historical context makes visible the extent of the field change. The proceeding chapters discuss much of the fallout of this abrupt change and explore how active residents both battled against and at the same time actively sought to embody the new rules and processes of the professional field in an attempt to acquire status and recognition.

The professional field on the estate was a space of domination (Steinmetz 2011). The move towards a cooperative council and the use of St Mary's Estate to pilot new ways of working meant that the council could and felt the need to extend their field further. The professional doxa that the council subscribed to was seen as the only effective way to operate, and the staff felt that it was their duty to ensure that others conformed to this ethos. Their economic capital allowed the council to enforce their values on to the estate residents firstly by defining the rules of the field and narrative attached to funding, and secondly by using their social capital to bring in organisations

whose habitus was similar to theirs. In this sense, a person's or organisation's habitus became a marker of those who could be trusted to operate professionally and those who could not. There was a sense that both the council and Saplings wanted to close off the delivery and were using the notion of professionalism as a way to do this in the face of opposition from the residents (Begun 1996, Evetts 2003, 2006, 2011, 2013). Allowing residents who did not conform to or agree with the professional doxa would damage the narrative that only the professionalism of Saplings could deliver what the estate needed.

With this field came and increased competitive spirit. Within the previous field, there were arguments and tensions between different personalities; however, this was something else. Previously on the estate people were relatively equal in stature with people earning the right to have a greater influence through their commitment. Disagreements were generally between two people with equal dedication and passion disagreeing on particular activities. However, with a new dominant field came a new hierarchy (Swartz 1997). Those who knew the rules of the professional field, had the habitus to act appropriately (Bourdieu 2013) and the social capital to advance their status, were placed in a superior position by those who had the economic capital to make things happen.

Knowing the rules of the game and having the right habitus made Saplings seem like the natural choice to run the youth services as they ticked the professional boxes. It was easy to see that they were at home within this field (Grenfell 2014; Oliver and O'Reilly 2010; Reeves 2014; Swartz 1997).

The lack of the residents' knowledge and appropriate habitus was starkly apparent in the proposal and actions of the residents. When Elizabeth wrote the proposal, she was basing it on the rules of the informal field. However, what carried weight in that field was worthless in the new, and the residents now found themselves in an inferior position. The proposal confirmed to those well versed in the professional field just why they were superior and the residents inferior. For the Saplings staff, their superiority in relation to the residents seemed normal (Bourdieu 2000; von Holdt 2012; Evetts 2003). However. for the residents involved this was something they were not used to. Charis, Elizabeth, and James were used to giving and receiving a degree of respect on the estate and were used to collaboratively making decisions together. Suddenly they found themselves and their views dismissed as inferior and not needed (McKenzie 2015).

The antagonisms between key residents and Saplings meant that Saplings were keen to show that their activities were popular and well used. Saplings' targets justified allowing young people from further afield to attend the project, which in turn, increased the argument for the need for a professional service while decreasing the likelihood of any potential informal connection between adult residents and young people. The need for the service to be professionalised to satisfy commissioners (Andreassen et al. 2014) took the service out of the hands of local people with both delivery and decision making given over to those who were removed from life on the estate. The changes outlined above made resident involvement in activities on the estate even harder to cultivate. Already affected by more macro factors that theorists such as Bauman (2000; 2000b; 2007), Beck (2002) and Standing

(2011) have commented upon, resident involvement took another blow. Activities and spaces that were once a catalyst for resident informal network building were shut off from fulfilling this function.

In the early stages of this change in field, some of the residents tried to resist and fight their subordination, partly through trying to prove their methods were superior and partly by trying to use the professional rules against Saplings. These protests were met by Saplings and the council in two ways. Firstly, there was a constant reinforcing of the superiority of professional field, both by Dwight and Martha, with Dwight stating that residents' talk of the young people as theirs was not helpful and then Martha commenting that Gerrard's closeness with the young people made it hard for him to operate effectively. However, the hierarchy was most strongly reinforced when the residents tried to appeal to the rules of the professional field in an attempt to gain more influence. They were simply ignored, seemingly the residents' status did not warrant the issues raised by them to be taken seriously.

Chapter 5: "They Do Not Feel Comfortable in There:" How Professional Interaction Started to Dominate

This chapter explores the impact the new professional field has on both the role residents play in the delivery of services and how they believe services should be delivered. The chapter spends some time exploring the interaction between the residents and professional organisations, discussing the hierarchical statuses involved in these interactions and how the residents adapted to the realities of the professional field. The chapter explores the interplay between the field and status, how this impacts on who gets involved in activities as well as what their involvement looks like.

The data shows how despite the residents initially being at odds with the new field, over a relatively short space of time they started to accept the professional approach and in some cases encouraged it. In considering this phenomenon, we will track how the usage of Our Place changed to become more professional and how the residents helped to perpetuate this change, resulting in them having less power over what happened there. This account highlighted how the acceptance of a professional ethos was also an acceptance of their own inferiority and subordination. The chapter ends by looking how the residents' battle for legitimacy in wanting to manage Centenary Hall led them to adopt a more formal approach to service delivery to try to prove to themselves and the council that they could be professional.

Using ethnographic data from meetings and other formal settings, email data, notes from meetings and proposal documents, this chapter considers the wider and more long lasting impact of changes on the estate. I examine how professional status and transactional rather than relational connections

changed the use of space and the types of activities that took place on the estate. Included in this analysis is a discussion of the motivations and ideas of trust that exist within and between different relationships. The chapter helps us understand how the professional approach became accepted by the residents as the predominant way of working; and how this changed the way residents dealt with social issues and delivered services.

Within the chapter, Bourdieu's concepts of field, habitus, and capital are utilised to explain the process whereby residents accept their subordination. The chapter will also consider the work of Özbilgin and Tatli (2012) and Woolford and Curran (2012) to explore how the field changes described in this and the previous chapter suit a particular habitus and ways of operating which was at odds with how the residents usually interacted on the estate.

The chapter progresses on to a discussion of how the acceptance of the superiority of the professional field turned communal spaces such as Our Place and Centenary Hall turning into abstract space (Hass and Olsson 2014; Horkheimer and Adorno 2002; Lefebvre 2003; Wilson 2013). The chapter will discuss how this approach was more akin to middle class rather than working class lifestyles (Çelik and Gough 2014; Hass and Olsson 2014) contributing to exclusion and segregation on the estate (Britton 2008; Lloyd 2013) rather than relationship building as experienced by previous generations.

Opening the Doors to Professionalism

The Saplings youth delivery was just the start of a series of 'cooperative' processes initiated to engage residents and get them to take more

responsibility locally. Ironically, just as in the Saplings delivery they were at best disengaging.

Two of the standout initiatives were a community asset mapping project and the development of a poly tunnel growing project.

Community Mapping

The local authority commissioned Making Places, *'a social design company'*, that had worked on many *'neighbourhood making'* projects across Europe to conduct an asset mapping exercise which would involve developing resident run projects.

Making Places' plan was simple, engage key residents who would carry out a prescribed outreach programme; then organise a public meeting where Making Places would run a series of activities to motivate residents to get on board with some of their ideas. The outreach consisted of erecting a notice board on the estate with the words how can we make the estate better boldly displayed. Next to the board were blank plastic ideas labels that residents were encouraged to fill out and tie to the notice board. After three weeks the board and the 12 or so filled out labels were taken down. This idea was sold to the residents' committee as a way of finding out what residents wanted which would form the basis of the next stage of the project. The truth is that the labels were taken down discarded and thrown away a couple of years later, long after Making Places had disappeared. About ten residents came to the public meeting, half were from the residents' committee, and some were mums and children that James invited. The two projects presented that had some interest (one resident for each project)

were Pot Luck, a community big lunch idea, and Trade School, skill sharing barter proposal. Despite the lack of real enthusiasm Making Places were keen to carry on with the projects. There seemed to be two main reasons for their fervour; a possible contract extension if their work on the estate went well; and both pot luck and trade school both had existing digital *'global networks'* that Making Places were already a part of.

The pot luck idea never got off the ground as the resident who put themselves forward to explore it had to spend some time outside London to take care of her sick mother.

Making Places supported the Trade School idea by getting the council to administer the back end of the supporting website. However, this seemed like more of a ploy to put pressure on the residents' committee to find people to run the classes. There followed a series of emails asking for more classes to be uploaded on to the website, especially as the project was now linked to the wider global trade school network. Instead of acting as motivation this seemed to weigh the project down with unwanted expectations. After much effort, one resident agreed to do a quilt making class, another a knitting class and another a session on public speaking, less than the eight to ten that Tracey the Making Places CEO had asked for. In admitting that their project targets were likely to be missed, Making Places and James decided to launch Trade School project at the forthcoming reopening of Centenary Hall in an attempt to raise its popularity.

To add to Making Places' growing frustration, the hall opening got delayed twice, firstly because the building works were not completed on time and

secondly when the area housing manager had a heart attack and could not sign off on the expenditure. Tracey's annoyance came through in an email to Yolanda, (the council's resident engagement officer) in which Tracey stated that she needed to know the plan to get the project back on track to minimise further delay, showing no real concern for Adam's health.

The urgency showed by Making Places was added to by the local authority organising a visit by Jeremy Heywood the Cabinet Secretary to showcase its cooperative approach. Part of the secretary's trip included a visit to St Mary's Estate to see the good work that Making Places had been doing to engage and empower local people.

As the visit came closer, there was nothing to show for Making Places' activity, apart from a couple of meeting and some instructional emails. However, on the day James, the only resident present, played ball and talked up how much the Making Places projects were progressing. After the event, Tracey thanked James for keeping to the un-agreed but presumed script.

Poly Tunnel

Another local authority initiated project was the erection of a poly tunnel. Despite the lack of interest, the council were keen to press ahead with the idea in the belief that once started residents would get behind the project. Like the Saplings' and Making Places' work, the intention was to establish the project, then train interested residents to take over once the initial funding had finished. Saplings were commissioned to run a 'Growing in a Poly Tunnel' qualification to help make the volunteering more worthwhile.

The vision never came to pass. After a month or so of Val (the council employed project coordinator) unsuccessfully trying to and get residents to help her pick a suitable spot for the poly tunnel, she had to decide it on her own. A handful of residents did come out to assist Val, and her existing volunteers erect the structure in spring 2012, and two continued to support the work for a while afterwards. Tina, the most committed of these dropped out after a year as the job that she believed would follow the completion of the qualification never materialised. After the council's initial 18 month funding ended, Val moved on, and the poly tunnel was left unsupported until early 2015.

The poly tunnel's failure to attract residents stemmed from the professional way that it was set up. Val's initial engagement with the residents' committee entailed attending one meeting with all other communication done via email. When the residents' committee invited Val back to another meeting, she replied that there was no need to go to any more meetings as the residents had all the information already. There was no acknowledgement of the informal nature of estate life and the fact that the residents invited Val back so they could get to know her better.

When the tunnel stopped producing food, it became home to a crack smoking rough sleeper, who had moved there from the bin shelters which he inadvertently got locked in from time to time. After a couple of years, the council commissioned another organisation New Leaf to kick start the project once again. Roger, who ran New Leaf, grew up on the estate, moving off as an adult and was enthusiastic about making the tunnel work. When Roger's PowerPoint explaining his fresh vision was presented to the

residents' committee, it caused some laughter after he left the room. Unfortunately for him, it mirrored the exact ideas of the original poly tunnel project: resident engagement; training; motivating residents to grow their own food to save money; and bringing generations together; all of which would create social cohesion and earn money for the estate. There was one catch with Roger's proposal; the council was willing to put £10k into the project if the residents' committee found another £10k to pay for Roger's and his staff's time. Needless to say, this did not go down to well, however, after a series of phone calls and private discussions between Kofi (the committee's chair), Roger and Dorothy, the committee agreed to invest £5k of the money they had been earning from the hiring of Centenary Hall. Despite Roger's efforts, he failed to engage anyone from the estate in his vision. Currently, New Leaf staff still water the plants on a regular basis, but the poly tunnel is padlocked shut when the New Leaf workers are not present.

The poly tunnel project further highlights the disconnect between the decision makers and life on the estate. Residents had been gardening and food growing in three separate areas long before the poly tunnel idea was pitched. Two were designed gardening spaces built by the council and solely managed by groups of residents who had just unofficially adopted the areas. A further place had been created by residents behind one of the blocks and had developed over several years. Although there was no official council approval, consent was shown in the local authority asking a contractor to erect a picket fence to help protect the space.

The introduction of the poly tunnel nearly ended the very thing it was designed to initiate. Once the original funding for the tunnel ended, Anne, the new resident engagement officer, decided to harness the wider gardening interest to save the tunnel and put some structure around the wider gardening activities. Anne proceeded to set up a gardening group that would have terms of reference, monthly minuted meetings, and the kudos of being recognised by the council as an official residents group. The project lasted three meetings before everyone involved rejected the idea, threatening to stop their gardening efforts if things carried on as Anne had planned. Anne did not realise that the resident involved liked the informality of what they did, they liked to be able to come up with ideas and run with them, doing things in their own way when they felt like doing them. They did not want to have to plan together and report to the council via Anne on what they had achieved.

These are two further examples of how the council used a professional approach on the estate, however, unlike the youth project they had hoped residents would fully engage. The local authority believed resident engagement could help address social issues (Marinetto 2003) if the council could control the terms of said engagement. The council used its social and economic capital to help shape the service delivery to promote professionalism (Evetts 2006, Waring and Waring 2009) in an attempt to shape the way the residents engaged with activities on the estate and with each other. Due to the local government cuts and the 2011 Localism Act, the council was going to lose more and more of its influence (Brannen and Nilsen 2002). If it was going to hand decision making power and delivery

responsibility to local people (Dowling and Harvie 2014); it was going to establish mechanisms to ensure that what emerged was cast in its own image.

The local authority commissioned organisations who possessed the same habitus and symbolic capital as them, which then gave those organisations the belief that they and their way of working were superior to the residents' (Andreassen et al. 2014; Begun 1986; Bourdieu 2003; Evetts 2011). However, this belief caused the professionals to fail to connect with the residents who generally operated within a different field with different rules. Professionals such as Val did not understand the norms of the informal field, which preferenced relationships over process; in solely operating within the confines of their field Val, Robert and Tracey, just like Saplings, failed to connect effectively with residents.

Despite the desire to get more residents involved in activities, the council's efforts had the opposite effect. The new initiatives did not inspire local people to get involved and trying to organise existing resident engagement in a structured and professional manner ended with residents walking away. An understanding of the origins of these new projects and their protagonists sheds some light on why this could be. The new activities were imagined and designed by people from off the estate who had been submerged into a doxa that prefers structure and process to informality and relational working. The professionalising process had moved decision making power away from those with frontline experience (Woolford and Curran 2012) into the hands of strangers (Ilan 2012) who were planning the resident engagement within the confines of an alien professional field.

Those living on the estate responded badly to this approach for a number of reasons. The residents had been used to dealing with issues in an informal friendship based way. Even where committee members did understand the rules of the professional field, their activities on the estate were done with friends away from work and often involved going around each other's homes for chats; or bumping into each other on the street and discussing how they can help a friend in need. Placing a professional structure onto these activities just did not make sense. The council officers and the organisation's managers understood the habitus required to operate effectively in the professional field as if it was second nature to them (Bottero 2010; Bourdieu 1992; Decoteau 2015; Oliver and O'Reilly 2010; Steinmetz 2011). Field dynamics served to reinforce the social hierarchy that placed residents lower than professionals precisely because the residents did not understand or were not expected to understand these rules. Although the local authority clearly did not trust residents to run key services, they did want their involvement in general as long as it conformed to a particular professional structure (Andreassen et al. 2014). The professional ethos signified a lack of trust in and disempowerment of residents by the local authority and organisations who only seemed interested in introducing their processes and showing residents a better way of doing things.

A rather dismissive hierarchy was developing. Making Places pre-set ideas and forcing the poly tunnel on to the estate, shows that the local authority and their commissioned partners felt that they knew more about what was needed than the residents. Embedded within these projects was the intention to build the residents' capacity in the professional field. In the

Making Places projects this took the form of being part of a wider international online network, and with the poly tunnel, it took the form of accredited training. Neither of these projects or forms of capacity building was of interest. However, it was not necessarily the activities that were the problem, but the way they were presented. At the time the Poly Tunnel was proposed, there were groups of residents already engaged in estate gardening and growing projects that developed organically and were informal and self-regulated. The Poly Tunnel project was to be almost the complete opposite, imposed from above, with processes, targets and an expectation for residents who wanted to get involved to embody a new way of thinking and working.

The usual resident interaction of chats on the street and around people's houses could not be utilised by professionals who lacked the necessary relationships. Instead, the posters, emails and training specifications were sent out, none of which resonated with residents. Val did not realise that the committee wanting her to come to another meeting was not about getting more information, but about wanting to get to know her more. In so doing she had misrecognised her habitus as superior and the residents as inferior (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2013).

The failure of these projects was in many respects down to the inflexibility of those responsible who could not adapt to a different field to gain support. The fallibility of such an approach was most evident in Anne's attempt to bring some structure to the ad hoc gardening that was taking place on the estate.

However, although these projects did not take off, they did have the desired effect of promoting professional approach on the estate. It became apparent that those who operated within the rules of the professional field had greater access to economic and political capital and although residents initially rejected the field they soon understood its dominating character (Bourdieu 2000; von Holdt 2012; Wacquant 2013). As a result, the residents' committee started to see its value.

A New Vision for Our Place

After the Saplings youth delivery ended in the summer of 2013, the residents' committee did not see the value of either running or commissioning another youth club in the building. The numbers of young people on the estate had grown exponentially, and the committee felt while the youth club was the main reason for the increase there was also little evidence that it had actually benefitted the young people. While some like Charis would have liked to start up a youth project in a similar vein to one that she used to run, even she admitted that the *'kids dem are far too gone now'*.

In the summer of 2013, a teacher from the local primary school contacted Dorothy, the new unofficial committee gate keeper since Elizabeth stepped away, and introduced her to Adama who was looking for a new home for Oak Training, her adult education organisation.

Dorothy invited Adama to a committee meeting who proposed a partnership that included a below commercial rate for parts of Our Place in return for the following;

- *Oak Training will develop the centre so that other users will be able to benefit from it*
- *Oak Training will give priority to parents that use Centenary school and parents from the estate.*
- *The community can have access to the equipment to use on days Oak Training is not the premises*
- *Families will have access to the IT suite that Oak Training plan to develop allowing them to access the internet for free. Also this will be very useful with the welfare reform when the universal credit system begins*
- *Oak Training plan to provide a crèche facility over time to make the courses for everyone more accessible as this is a barrier for many who want to get into training*

(Taken from the Oak Training proposal to the residents' committee on the 03/07/13)

Having seen what Oak Training was offering, the committee agreed to a partnership and Dorothy met with Adama to flesh out the details. Adama got use of certain rooms in Our Place from 9am to 5pm Monday to Thursday at a reduced rent, and in return, Oak Training was to install and pay for an IT room and internet which was residents would be able to access outside of Oak Training's building use.

Before Oak Training started their delivery they requested a clear out of the Turner House space and asked if they could redecorate the rooms they were going to use. To support the residents' committee Adama organised two people she knew to help with the clearing. The redecorating was nothing short of a substantial make over. Blinds were installed on all the windows, a new curved reception counter was built for the building's entranceway, keypad locks were put on all the internal doors to rooms Oak Training wanted to use, and health and safety signs were staple gunned to the walls.

Old furniture was replaced with 16 school desks and chairs; however, Adama made it clear that they were hers not the committee's.

The first sign of things to come came a few weeks after the redecorating had finished when the residents' committee received an invoice from Oak Training for all the work that had taken place in the building including the clear out help. While the transformation was taking place, the committee members were pleased to see the initial care that was being paid to their building. Local councillors were even complimentary and praised the residents for finally getting Our Place up to a decent standard. There were concerns over the signs being staple gunned to the walls, and there was reticence over the key pad locks although this somewhat abated when Adama agreed to share the codes with the committee. However, the committee's thoughts on the transformation soon changed when they realised that they were asked foot the bill which Dorothy had agreed to pay.

It seemed that Adama got what she wanted out of the deal and gave very little in return. Kofi did unsuccessfully try and challenge Adama regarding the locking of internal doors, especially when she later refused to hand over the key codes due to 'insurance reasons'.

There were clashes between residents and Adama over how the building should be used. Miche, Charis' daughter, was backed by the committee to start a printing project with girls from the estate, given a room in Our Place and £600 worth of computer and printing equipment. Shortly after the project started, Miche complained that she could no longer get into the room. An initial compromise was struck which left Miche having to move her

equipment out of the room every day so that the space could be used as a prayer room for a few of Adama's students in the day time. However, the agreement was short lived as Adama soon stated that she was unable to share a space with Miche in case anything went wrong. For a while, the music studio in Our Place run by the original group of young people who were now in their mid-20s, stayed open, however after several run ins with Adama and concern over one particular video that accompanied a track made in the studio this closed down. Our Place, in the space of 18 months had gone from a home for young people who were using it so much that others were put off from going there to a space where Ashley, a youth worker who had worked with the young people in various guises for a number of years, commented;

> *"The young people do not even consider Turner House to be theirs anymore, with all the changes to it, they do not feel comfortable in there."*
> *(FNJ 04.04.14)*

Adama also took the same exclusive view with the internet that at the proposal stage was going to be available for all to use. When the router was installed the sticker with the Wi-Fi password on it was removed. Adama's reluctance to let the residents access to the Wi-Fi was cemented after Dorothy had organised some safeguarding training for local parents who were going to help run a play scheme in the summer of 2014. The trainer had contacted the committee ahead of time and asked if there was internet access to watch a YouTube video as part of the training. The request was

passed on to Adama to see if she would allow access to the internet in the building. However, she refused.

Although Adama had promoted the benefits of Oak Training by stating that residents will be targeted as one of the main group of learners, the reality was much different. Almost all of Oak Training's learners were from off the estate. As Adama struggled to attract learners, she started partnering with a security guard and social care agencies and offered training for their new recruits.

Despite broken promises, the committee was reluctant to challenge Adama, and there was the feeling that as she had a contract to use the building, there was nothing the committee could do. Adama's professional status coupled with her contract made the committee feel like she was untouchable.

Over the space of the year, Oak Training took more and more control of the building to the point where they used building seven days a week, had a permanent sign on the wall by the building and even had the google maps listing for the building change from Our Space to Oak Training.

This space had been recreated to fit a different mold. The locks on the door, the signs and the designating of space for specific activities signalled an end to the freer communal, trusting space that was based on respect for other users and their equipment. Almost unwittingly the residents' committee had all but lost control of the building and handed it over to those who used a professional ethos to shape the space and its interactions according to their desires. The focus shifted more to control through

physical barriers and contractual agreements than on building meaningful relationships that produced respect, trust, and reciprocity.

The account above is the first sign that the emergence of the professional field was having a longer term impact on the estate and was becoming the established field beyond those who were paid to be on the estate.

The professionalised youth service run by Saplings, instead of supporting the limited numbers of young residents involved in anti-social and criminal behaviour ended up magnifying the problem by attracting more young people to the estate. The relational approach to support that Charis, Elizabeth, James and later Dorothy wanted to foster seemed almost impossible to achieve. The local authority narrative that the young people were ungovernable and needed specialist intervention (Armstrong 2004; Hughes 2011; Kelly 2003) started to ring true. However, instead of blaming the young people, the residents saw this as a consequence of the Saplings project. The new professional interventions that were meant to help empower residents and build collective efficacy (Sampson and Groves 1989) had done the opposite.

The decision to use the building for something else was not a simple neutral decision (Lefebvre 2009). It was a clear political decision to take something away from the young people. Although during the early stages of the space being used by Oak Training, the young people still had access to their self-managed music studio, this was fraught with problems and short lived, it was not long before the studio was shut down.

The committee's management of Our Place signified a shift in the residents'

relationships with the professional field. Up to this point, the residents had

either tried to resist the emergence of the professional field or simply

disengaged themselves from it. However, the renting of Our Place to Oak

Training was a sign that the residents were starting to accept its merits.

The partnership was also a sign that the committee had started to internalise

their inferiority (Bourdieu 1972, 2000; McKenzie 2014), misrecognising the

rules of the professional field and those who embodied its habitus as

superior (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2013).

In embracing the professional field, the residents accepted an inferior

position in relation to professionals such as Adama who was confident that

she could commandeer rooms, add locks to doors, not give door codes,

shut off empty spaces to other users and adamantly not fulfil her side of the

agreement. The internalised nature of this status differential (Bourdieu

2000, von Holdt 2012; Wacquant 2013) was again seen in the committee's

reluctance to challenge Adama on her failure to stick with the terms of the

agreement and their acceptance of her right to make un-agreed changes to

the building. The committee members were not used to operating within

professional relationships and automatically believed that others knew

better than them. Adama's use of professional policy reasoning regarding

the door codes, even though unfounded, was enough to enforce her

domination (Guzmán 2015; Steinmetz 2011). The residents' acceptance of

the professional field in this instance led them to be complicit in their own

domination (Bourdieu 1972).

Centenary Hall

The residents' transition from solely operating in an informal way to accepting the superiority of and utilising a professional ethos is most clearly seen in the residents' committee struggles to gain the right to manage Centenary Hall and their eventual running of the building. The committee had argued for a long time that the council should refurbish the hall and reopen it. After some resistance, in 2010, the council agreed to invest £170k of Section 105 money into the hall refurbishment. In the pre professional field domination of the estate, the residents' committee benefited from a strong link with the local authority. Clara (the then Community Engagement Team Leader) had worked with the residents for a number of years and had been a strong champion for their empowerment, and later that year the council offered the tenants association a ten year lease on the building.

However, by the time the refurbishment work started in 2012 the council staff working with the residents changed and as discussed above so did the dominant field. Yolanda, the new resident participation officer, was tasked with ensuring the building was managed well once it was open. In so doing she felt obliged to help the residents' committee realise that they did not have the skills needed to manage the space and ensure that Saplings were chosen to do so in their place. Yolanda's assessment soon became the council's standard viewpoint for the hall management and over the course of an 18 month period several steps were taken to try and ensure that the residents' committee accepted this position.

Yolanda proposed widening the membership of a resident group responsible for the hall, promoting non-resident involvement. In her first

meeting with the hall committee, held on the 13/06/12 there were 17 people in attendance. Those at the meeting included 13 residents, and staff from Saplings, Urban Actors and Arts Space (two groups who had been using the hall for storage but wanted to have access to it as a work space) and one representative of another estate's residents' committee who also volunteered with Saplings. This wider involvement could in other circumstances be seen as positive, however, after the disempowering experience of the youth delivery, the residents were opposed to others being involved.

This objection could be seen in one of the first tasks on the agenda: formalising the group. Dorothy, James, Charis, Kofi, Gloria, Margerie, Antoinette, Marie, Irene, and Simon, (all residents) wanted the group to be constituted in a way that gave the residents overall control of the decision making. However, Yolanda was more in favour of one person one vote. In its current form, this would not have been a problem for the residents, yet Yolanda was keen for more organisations involved and for the group to be limited to 12 or 13 members. It was evident to the residents that if Yolanda's plan went ahead, they risked losing control of what was historically their hall. After no consensus could be found, formalising the group was put off to a later date. Yolanda suggested that they take on the name 'Interim Management Group' in the recognition that the structure had yet to be agreed.

The minutes of several subsequent meetings reveal numerous discussions about inviting others to join all of which were prompted by Yolanda. The first suggestion simply called for a list of local organisations that could be asked

to join the group. No list was forth coming even after several attempts by Yolanda to get the residents to pull one together. James in what was partly a stalling tactic and partly an exercise to prove the skill level of the residents suggested that instead of simply asking others to join the group, a skills audit should be done of the existing members to highlight missing skill areas. James suggested that job descriptions should then be drawn up to help recruit people with the skills that would complement those of the existing members. Again, the residents stalled at producing the descriptions, so no additional recruitment took place.

Over the subsequent months the involvement of non residents became less and less, and within six months only Julie (Saplings' lead youth worker) was involved. The strategic importance of the hall was diminishing as organisations realised it was unlikely that they would get sole control of the space. When Arts Space and Urban Actors recognised they were not going to get priority over the use of the hall, they disappeared, and the council had to hire a skip to get rid of the junk they left behind.

The residents did not have the luxury of being able to walk away. An email from Irene (a long standing committee member of 30 years) sending her apologies for not being able to make a meeting sums up the residents' commitment;

> *Hi James*
> *Sorry, I can't make the meeting tonight. I would like to put myself forward to be on the committee for the Centenary hall. Having lived on the Estate for 37 years I am keen to see that it is a success and of benefit to the Estate and the Local community. Please tender my apologies.*
> *Thanks.*

(E-mail between Irene and James sent on the 4th December 2014)

Organisations involved in the early stages of planning the hall's management were doing so to position themselves to gain control over the hall. However, when things did not turn out as the organisations had hoped, it was rational for them to withdraw. However, the residents who were involved were in a different position. Their involvement in the project was not due to trying to gain a strategic advantage for their organisation but out of care and concern for the estate.

As it became more and more apparent that the residents were not going to be proactive in recruiting people from off the estate to support the hall management and that organisations were not going to offer assistance unless they got something in return, a new approach was offered. After stating in the summer of 2012 that there was no money available to help run the hall, towards the end of the year the council were offering £20k to help pay for a part time hall coordinator.

Matt Worth, the Resident Participation Manager, along with Yolanda suggested the money be given to Saplings to run the hall on behalf of the council and the residents. The suggestion was met with disdain by the residents who strongly objected to the idea. However, despite the resistance, Yolanda continued to push for the residents to accept that they were not capable to run the hall, hoping they would back down and go with the Saplings plan. In the January 2013 hall management group meeting, Yolanda bluntly stated;

> *"The residents' committee are not capable of running the hall, and despite the issues that have gone on in the past, Saplings are a good local organisation and would do a good job running the hall on behalf of the residents. The council are prepared to fund a part time post if the residents agree to work with Saplings".*

> *(FNJ 15/01/13)*

This reoccurring discourse caused increasing animosity between her and the active residents. In the build up to the hall opening Yolanda's frustration was displayed in a phone call to James recorded in the field notes;

> *"You all are making some really bad mistakes you may want to take control of the hall and feel you can but you are not able to do the job and don't know what you are getting into, everyone will be left with egg on their face."*

> (FNJ 13.02.15)

Yolanda's stance was backed up nine days later with another call.

> *"Yolanda called James to report back on a recent St Mary's officer's meeting commenting that there is real pressure on the residents' committee around Centenary Hall as the council and some councillors do not feel the residents' committee are capable of running Centenary Hall."*

> *(FNJ 22.03.13)*

As the date for the hall opening approached Kofi, Dorothy and James, the executive members of the residents' committee were invited into Adam's (the Area Manager) office to discuss the management options for the hall. Both Yolanda and Matt were also there from the council along with Martha from Saplings, despite the residents not being informed of Martha's invite

until seeing her at the meeting. The following is an extract from the field note journal of the meeting;

> *The meeting started extremely awkwardly with Dorothy asking why Martha was present. Yolanda explained that she was the one that invited Martha so that everyone could discuss the different options on the table. Earlier in the week, Yolanda had a go at Kofi for neglecting his duty as the committee chair by not approaching Saplings to discuss them running the hall. However, Laud pointed out that there was nothing to discuss. This was Yolanda's way of making this discussion happen. Adam expressed his surprise that Dorothy and the others did not know that Martha had been invited at which point Martha offered to leave…*
>
> *As part of the introduction, Adam mentioned that the council are fully committed to making Centenary Hall work, and as part of the commitment Matt Worth is proposing a part time member of staff that will be funded by the council. Yolanda had already told the committee members that this money was going to be made available but stated the committee would not be allowed to have it. After Adam's introduction, James asked if one of the options would be for the residents' committee to have the money – Matt Worth replied yes, but this wasn't the council's preferred option. He then outlined the following options.*
>
> *The first option mentioned was for the council to employ a worker; however, they would rather not do this due to their lack of experience in running community halls.*
>
> *The second option would be for the residents' committee to employ the worker; however, Matt commented that he and others at the council have concerns that they will not be able to handle the running of the hall or the responsibility for employing someone.*
>
> *The third option was for Saplings to employ the worker, which Matt admitted was the council's preferred option….*
>
> *Dorothy was a little hesitant about the residents employing someone and openly said that she prefers the first option, but Kofi and James were bullish and preferred option two. Matt commented that they would really need to prove that they were*

capable before this would be seriously considered. However, Matt said that he was equally hearing that the residents were currently uncomfortable with Saplings running the building and would not force this on them, even though he feels it is the most sensible option.

(FNJ 09.02.13a)

After the meeting, the resident representatives met in the office area to review what was just discussed. The excerpt from the field note journal sums up their views of not just the meeting, but how the residents' committee was feeling about the whole process.

After the meeting James, Dorothy and Kofi congregated in the main office area to discuss the meeting. All three expressed their distrust of Yolanda who they thought was not telling the truth before in saying that the residents could not have the money. Kofi commented that Yolanda was going behind their back trying to undermine the residents by telling other people that they cannot cope with the responsibility and lining up her friend Martha to come in and take over. Dorothy commented…
"I don't know where people from the council are getting a bad impression us from unless Yolanda is telling people at meetings that we cannot cope, and that is not true, and it's not right, how can someone who is meant to be supporting us be doing this."

(FNJ 09.02.13b)

As the residents were walking out still discussing the different options, they passed Adam's office and saw Martha and Matt chatting with each other. Immediately Kofi commented that it is obvious that Martha and Matt are doing a deal behind their backs.

However, after the meeting, Matt seemed to concede to Dorothy's wishes and started to explore the option of the council employing a worker for the hall. However, it was not long before things changed. Matt emailed James

197

on the 27th of March 2013 asking for the committee to discuss the proposal or Saplings running the hall again at their next meeting stating;

> *My original intention had been to get someone in post ideally before the Hall formally opened. Obviously, that hasn't happened. If we go to recruitment agencies for an interim manager we may be able to get someone in post within 6 to 8 weeks. I'm concerned such a delay will impact on getting the hall off to the start everyone wanted. I appreciate some resident's committee members do not support Saplings being involved but I would ask whether that can be reviewed because they would be able to offer management support straight away as they have a part time manager for the adventure playground already in post. This could be an interim arrangement while we get the post advertised.*

(email sent to James on 27th March 2013)

The discussion at the committee meeting lasted all of one minute with Margerie reacting sharply to the agenda item stating that James should stop bringing it up, questioning whether James was siding with Saplings. On James' agreeing to discuss the role of Saplings one more time, Matt E-mailed Adam to start putting in place a strategy to get a job description written. However, on feedback from the meeting, Matt did honour his word and agreed on a rethink. Finally, in April 2013 a month after the hall opened, the council decided to hire the person directly cutting Saplings out of the loop and sent round a proposed manager job description. Again, this was met with some resistance from the residents who were concerned that the role as described would effectively place the hall in the council's hand and so pushed for a change to a more administrative post.

The council seemed set on finding a way to stop the residents from running the hall, despite residents staffing the building voluntarily after it had opened

whilst the issue was resolved. The residents' saw this as a ploy from the council to hold out until the residents' committee agreed to work with Saplings. In May 2013 Matt once again emailed the residents' committee and came to their monthly meeting to apologise for mistakes in the interpretation of the hall worker's JD and to explain that the hall worker job description would have to go through the local authority grading process. He stated that the grading would take several weeks so it may be better to revisit the initial idea of Saplings or a 'third party' to administer the post as the residents' committee did not have the capacity to take on the role themselves. Again, the residents refused to consider working with Saplings.

After the grading process was complete Matt found out that the proposed position was graded as being in a higher salary band than he had budgeted for and so he put working with Saplings back on the table. It was only after Dorothy and several other older members of the committee threatened to resign that Matt reluctantly agreed to allow the residents' committee to employ the staff member directly.

Unlike the youth delivery, the residents had won their battle for control. The continued drip feeding of the *'residents are incapable'* message made the residents' committee determined to prove the opposite, to show that they could operate in a professional way.

Many committee members thought that managing the hall would give them a chance to run activities that would both give people an opportunity to get to know one another and foster a sense of common purpose. In the face of

increasing numbers of transactional services, many wanted the chance to turn a space into a place and help build friendships.

However, the rejection of council or 'third party' management turned out to be just that, a rejection of the organisations rather than the approach. As the committee established themselves in the role, they settled into the professional rather than a relational way of working. The hall management started to mirror the 'outsider's service delivery and the vision of the hall being a catalyst for developing relationships somewhat disappeared.

The first sign of this was in discussions of how much to charge for the hall hire. Some on the committee wanted the hire costs to be kept low to ensure that residents were not put off from using the hall. However, Yolanda and Kofi felt that the cost should be benchmarked against other halls. Despite some arguing that this would make Centenary Hall simply a hall for hire and negate its purpose, the price was set at £40 an hour for residents and £50 an hour for others.

When hiring the coordinator, many residents wanted an informal hiring process and had in mind whom they wanted to offer the position to. However, the council insisted on a process that involved advertising the position and having a formal application and interview process that they would help facilitate. As a result, a non-resident was hired much to the annoyance of many. Natalie, the person in question, turned out not to be suitable for the role and after four months was asked to leave and Francesca, a resident, and a previous applicant was offered the role.

However, Natalie's lack of ability was beneficial in some ways at it allowed James and Dorothy to run the hall in a more relational manner. For example, even with Natalie in post James and Dorothy still made the decisions on how much to charge groups. Although they charged the set hourly rate, they often gave residents a couple of extra hours for free.

Dorothy would also give cheap deals to people that she thought could not afford the full price and whom she wanted to help. Initially, hire agreements were signed by hirers Dorothy did not know but not by those she did. The hall was managed according to the rules of the informal field with relationships building paramount in the thoughts of Dorothy and the other residents involved. However, those who hired the hall were not of the same mind set. For example, the two churches whom Dorothy gave significant discounts to due to their connection to the estate, only had one family from the estate attend between them and made no observable effort to do anything other than be a hall hirer. The similar was true of individual hirers whom Dorothy wanted to help, more often than not they left the hall in a mess and were never seen again.

The hall hirers were engaging with Dorothy due to a transaction they wanted to make. Conversely, Dorothy saw the transaction as an opportunity to build a relationship based on the reciprocation of the favour she was giving them. However, the agreements only produced the transactions stipulated in contractual agreements. With hirers who signed agreements this meant leaving the hall tidy or risk losing their deposit, for those without agreements, it meant very little. In fact, often the reverse of what Dorothy wanted happened. Community Learning Trust (discussed further in chapter 7) and

both churches that used the building under preferential agreements often over stayed their allotted time and made complaints about issues relating to the hall and offered nothing in return. Those engaging in a transactional manner, even when treated in an informal relational way, did not foster a sense of obligation that is often unconsciously produced in long relational exchanges (Bourdieu 2013). After the discounted rate had been agreed, Dorothy's and the committee's capital had run out. These unbalanced relationships (Sahlins 1972) led to resentment, with Dorothy often taking things personally and wondering why people are treating her so badly.

With the appointment of Francesca, this all changed. Francesca had an MBA and entered the job with the desire of running the hall more professionally. Francesca ended the process of giving people free time for both one off hires and regular users. The ad-hoc arrangements that saw particular groups paying more than others and some hirers getting the hall for free or next to nothing ended. However, a work around was built in, and activities where the committee was a partner, could hire the hall for free. All hirers were given a contract, which they were expected to abide by. Francesca increased the hall's usage and income significantly, yet this was achieved largely through private hire that had little to do with developing relationships among residents.

The change in mentality was exemplified in two resident hall hire cases. After Aton, Gerald's younger brother died in a car crash; the family hired Centenary Hall for the wake. The night before the funeral Simon, a hall key holder let Miche and some friends in the building to decorate the hall, without informing Francesca. The next morning when Francesca found out, she

asked for the keys back from Simon and warned Miche and Charis that they should not have trespassed. Simon responded to Francesca that as it was clear that she was only interested in a business relationship with him and the other residents, so he and others would simply relate to her in that way from now on.

Another was in the hall hire for Kate's wedding reception. Kate had been getting involved in the residents' committee for about a year and had become a vital member of the team that delivered a holiday play scheme (which we will discuss in chapter seven) and regularly helped Dorothy out with different projects. To help keep the cost of their marriage down Kate and her boyfriend already planned to get married on a Thursday afternoon and Dorothy wanting to support offered the hall for free. When Kate approached Francesca to arrange the details Francesca responded that the hall would not be free and that Dorothy had no right to give such concessions. Francesca's point was that other people volunteer on the estate and the hall could not be free for all of them as well. In the end, a compromise was struck where Kate was allowed to book the smaller hall, which could then be upgraded for free if the main hall was available on the day of the wedding. What Francesca did not know about this arrangement was that Dorothy only conceded to it after she gave Kate the money for the small hall hire.

As Francesca settled into her role, the vast majority of the activities in the hall became focused on income generation rather than building relationships. Even Matt Worth commented that the income generation

since Francesca got on board had been impressive however he would much rather see a greater emphasis on activities with a local benefit.

Despite some initial resistance and falling outs between Francesca, James, and Dorothy, Francesca got the hall running in a more organised and consistent way. In so doing the committee were proving that they were competent enough to run the hall. However, their fears of the hall becoming simply a space for hire started to be realised, and the hall management ended up resembling what they were so eager to avoid.

The residents' experience of controlling the hall was not one of liberation and self-determination; instead, they seemed to reproduce what they were hoping to avoid. The local authority as the main holders of symbolic power (Guzmán 2015) had set the agenda and used its economic and social capital as well as its status to establish a preferred way of doing things. Through funding those with professional habitus they had created a symbolic reference point (Susen 2014) based upon the benefit of professional rather than relational operations (Sanli 2011) making the inferior place of the residents seem logical. In return, the residents looked to improve their status by consenting to and adopting the rules of those they saw as superior (McKenzie 2015). This feeling was backed by the majority of the residents' committee who saw the benefit of copying a culture in order to get ahead. By the time the field work had come to an end the majority of the residents' committee were in support of the economically driven professional approach to running the buildings on the estate, and it was their dominant mode of operation. The residents had proved themselves to such a degree that when the council moved out of their offices on the estate, they

handed responsibility for the building over to the residents' committee and trusted them to turn the space into a hub for the wider local area.

Summary

The chapter outlines how the residents internalised the superiority of the professional ethos which, despite their initial protests, became the main stay of how the committee members started to govern their activities. The continual drip feeding of the 'residents are incapable' narrative, and the council using their control of capital to promote a particular habitus (Grenfell 2014; Steinmetz 2011) was internalised by the residents. This internalisation was to such a high degree (Mckenzie 2015) that when the residents successfully wrestled back some control, they ended up copying the actions of professional organisations on the estate.

Once the committee had secured use of the building, the informal nature of Dorothy and James' practice soon disappeared. At first, this caused some conflicts between Francesca and Dorothy. Dorothy wanted to use the hall as a tool to engage local people in local activity, and although as treasurer she knew the importance of securing enough income to keep the building going, her actions were far more relationship than money motivated.

This adoption of the merits of the professional field resulted in a shift in focus from relationship building to activity sustainability. As a result, there was no real concern for whether or not positive relationships were being developed through the buildings' usage.

The professional field was so powerful that even though the residents' committee were in control of two buildings on the estate they were unable

to stop them being subsumed into the professional field. As a result, these spaces now have extremely limited ability to support the development of friendship networks across the estate; something which the residents' committee were hoping for and what the building's once excelled at.

The shift from the informal to the professional field brought with it a revaluation of habitus and capital. The rules of the professional field acted as a method of assurance that what was taking place was of a particular quality and had enough financial oversight to give the council the confidence that the right things were happening.

The council used their existing economic and social capital to offset the potential loss of control, though not running services themselves and shape the delivery of the services they were commissioning. The most logical approach to achieve this was to reach out to organisations in their social network that could run services in the manner the council was accustomed to. In the case of the youth activities, they were successful in achieving this. With Centenary hall the situation changed somewhat. The fact that the council were not initially offering any economic incentives to those within their social network, coupled with local ill feeling meant that the risks to the professional organisations of being associated with the hall outweighed the benefits. The actions of the professional organisations suggest that relationships within professional social networks are only of value when there are economic benefits to be had from the relationship. The local charitable organisations operated within a market environment and therefore had to weigh up the economic costs of any such involvement

(Andreassen et al. 2014; Bauman 2007; Marwell 2004; Noordegraaf 2011; Standing 2011). Operationally it would not make sense to be involved on the estate without financial remuneration. The social capital of the council could only be utilised if it was supported by the prospect of economic capital being transferred along the connections.

The chapter draws together some key themes within the project showing how the professional field was, within a short space of time, accepted by the residents' committee as superior to their regular informal way of working. This shift resulted in the relinquishing of attempts to run activities in an informal manner which they had hoped would support the development of resident friendship networks.

The chapter outlined how the council's efforts to ensure services were run to a particular standard and engage residents established a professional field on the estate. However, this process alienated even the already committed residents. The professional character of the attempts to promote activities did not connect with the more relational way that the engaged residents interacted. As a result, the council and other organisations failed in their attempts to kick start new activities. However, embedded in these attempts was the assumption that the residents' current ways of working and they themselves were not adequate, and a new approach provided by outside help was needed.

Although the resident declined to get involved the underlying message started to hit home, and the committee members began to internalise the notion that the professionals and their way were superior. When Saplings

stopped delivering in Our Place, the committee believed that they were not capable of supporting the young people anymore and actively consented to handing over the use of the building to an outside organisation.

In so doing the committee members assumed an inferior position within their new field allowing Oak Training to do as they saw fit. Committee members did not feel they were not in a position to effectively challenge what they did not agree with.

By the time the residents' committee had settled into running Centenary Hall this belief had been internalised to such a high degree that their delivery conformed to the rules of the professional field. As a consequence, the committee's desire to use the space as a catalyst for developing relationships was not fulfilled.

Chapter 6: "*You Have To Say It's Everyone For Themself":* Disappearing Support for Young People and the Recognition of Isolation

This chapter uses the data regarding both historical and contemporary activities to identify how the shift from relational to professional as the dominant mode of operation has changed the expectations of people's interactions with others. The chapter correlates past and present experiences of care and support on the estate that are a direct consequence of the types of relationships that were and are being fostered.

As in chapter four, this chapter compares the experiences of past young people with the experiences of the current generation. However, instead of considering service delivery, it focuses on the shape and impact of the relationships between young people and older generations. The chapter considers how past young people were part of an intergenerational network of friendships and how this support shaped their attitude and actions. This data was collected through interviews with the parents of past young people or past young people themselves and focused on the types of support that residents used to give each other and how this shaped what happened on the estate.

The chapter then considers interview and observational data relating to the current young people to gain an understanding of their experiences of support from local adults and how these experiences shape their actions. In doing so, I consider how the disappearance of intergenerational relationships impacts on the field that the young people operate within. The account concludes that with the demise of the informal field where young

and old interacted together, a new street based field has developed (Bourgios 2003, Fleetwood 2014, Fraser and Atkinson 2014; Harding 2013, Ilan 2013, Shammas and Sandberg 2016, Sandberg 2008, 2012) which is shaping young people's behaviour. In short, this chapter discusses how the professionalising of adult interaction has contributed to the domination of a street field along with its particular street habitus (Wacquant 2000) and street capital (Sandberg 2008) among groups of young people who hung out on the estate.

We have seen in previous chapters how the rules and habitus of the professional field disempowered residents who preferred an informal relational form of interaction and changed the expectation of how and why people should engage. When considering support for young people, the professional field resulted in exclusion (Begun 1996, Evetts 2003, 2006, 2011, 2013; Fores et al. 1991) through preferencing policy, processes and control (Evetts 2006, Waring and Waring 2009) over inclusion and friendship building. Through considering Social Disorganisation and Collective Efficacy theories (Bellair 1997, Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Carr 2003; Cantillon et al 2003; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Sampson 2009) the chapter considers how changes in the way people interacted with young people has impacted on the ability of the estate to develop neighbourhood social control mechanisms.

The chapter identifies how the dominant way of interacting influenced expectations that people have on the estate. Previously, it was commonplace for residents, young and old, to feel supported by the informal relationships they had with other residents and this support produced

obligations within the young people to conduct themselves in a socially acceptable manner. As the informal field was replaced by the professional field, and the numbers of young people who hung out on the estate increased and relationships and obligations declined, resulting in an observable change in the way young people behaved.

In taking this approach, I explore how the lack of estate based intergenerational relationships has contributed to the development of a youth only street field with its own habitus and rules, resulting in increased anti-social and criminal behaviour (Harding 2014; Sutherland 1974; Winfree et al. 1994). The chapter considers how this new field is continually developing with different ages of young people recognising changes in the rules and doxa within other groups.

To conclude I discuss how the isolation experienced by young people impacts on the effectiveness of those still trying to support them. As such, I consider how the development of a youth dominated street field effects the young people's ability to access resources to operate sufficiently in other fields.

The chapter starts to evaluate the impact of the professional field on the choices and actions of young people and assesses whether this approach put forward by the council helped improve the situation of the young people on the estate.

Historical and Contemporary Generalised Reciprocity

This section outlines how a change in who offered the different types of support was directly linked to the type of underlying ethos that shaped

interactions on the estate. It shows that previous generations of young people experienced a far more supportive environment than those of the current generation and links this to the social space in which the adult residents interacted.

All of the interview respondents, who were in at least in their mid-30s and had grown up on the estate, or were parents of the same, commented on how past generations of children were widely supported. The past generation of young people grew up in a network of supportive relationships that helped shape their actions through the production of generalised reciprocal obligations similar to that discussed by Sahlins (1972).

Although this chapter seeks to highlight the positive relationships of previous generations, it does have to be noted here that the estate's bad reputation dates back to the early 80s when it was known as a high drug use area and a place that stolen cars were dumped. However, many talked of the estate having a different vibe, Dave, a carpenter who moved onto the estate in the early 80s explains;

> *"It wasn't so much what people did; it was more about loose networks all over the place. You would be able to walk through the estate and know people everywhere and be able to nod to people, and you would know people in every block, and they would know their neighbours, so it was like people knew each other… It wasn't as if it was really friendly, but you could walk through the estate and feel safe because you know people in each block."*
>
> *(Interview with Dave 03.07.14)*

Elizabeth further comments on the impact of the informal network on solving issues on the estate;

"Because they didn't have to go to an official place, filling forms and answering questions they just bumped into us and were able to talk freely with no criticism with no judgement, say what the problem was and nine times out of we will answer the problems; we even got stolen goods back from people."

(Interview with Elizabeth 13.09.13)

Cynthia even spoke of how her mum used to run an informal youth club from her flat;

"My mum is the complete opposite of me, but a beautiful lady. She started the Oasis Youth Club from her house 32 Turner. When my mum first moved on here, mum kept herself to herself but I used to bring people to my house all the time, so my mum used to get to know people either through me being friends with their children or me having fights with other people's children and them coming to the front door. Even when children went missing someone would say to the parent try 32 and their child would be there. When my mum came in, she would see loads of faces, and I had cooked for them."

(Interview with Cynthia 21/11/14)

Barb, Cynthia's mum's efforts were recognised by others on the estate as having a significant impact, as Dorothy commented;

"Barb, she used to help with the youth on the estate. She was a shoulder to cry on, and they would go round her house. At first, I didn't understand it and thought what is she doing, but when I came to realise that the young people some of them didn't have any food to eat, their parents were at work maybe like 2-3 jobs. They were making a nuisance of themselves on the estate so she would give them food, cook for them, she had a washing machine and say to some of them your clothes are not looking so good throw them in there. So when I understood, I didn't listen to what the other people were saying. She was a mother or a protective grandmother and that even strengthened me to say that there was a need for me."

The informal networked approach to life on the estate influenced young people's behaviour, either through direct involvement as Irene (whose children grew up on the estate) mentions or through a self-governmentalizing process as Donna, a 37 year mum on the estate mentions;

> *"everyone knew everyone, you couldn't do anything, even with a policeman, if you got into trouble with the policeman he will clip you round the ear and tell you, wait till I see your father. So it might be three weeks later you were getting punished for something you couldn't even remember coz you had forgotten about it but that's when he saw your mother or father, and he said I caught this one doing this or that whatever you been doing"*

> (Interview with Irene 16/07/14)

> *"Now I'm an adult I can see it was beneficial, when I was younger, it was a bloody burden… but like my dad was quite influential, a lot of people knew him, so I had a lot of adults influencing my life whether that be they see me out on the road at a certain time of night, or I might be with certain friends, and a lot of people knew my parents, so I had to conduct myself in a certain order I couldn't behave a certain way on the road."*

> (Interview with Donna 27/04/15)

Cynthia also recounted a similar experience when asked about who told her off when she was young;

> *"Oh if we got caught it would be our parents, neighbours and adults, anybody who saw us doing something that was wrong an adult would scold you there and then. People back then they were close, there was caring in the air, I don't find a lot of caring in the air, I find anger and selfishness. Back then there was*

more caring, you know my child down the road doing something wrong, and you tell him off and then when you see me you tell me what happened and I say ok thanks."

(Interview with Cynthia 21/11/14)

The sentiment expressed by the adult residents who grew up on the estate, suggests that there was a strong network of relationships in which residents found themselves having to act within. The older residents described how adult friendship networks, that for the most part were formed through engagement in resident initiated activities (see chapter 4), both supported the young people and also shaped their actions. The older resident's influence on past generations of young people could only happen due to the close adult to adult and intergenerational relationships.

The type of connections and support described above is similar to the concept that Tönnies (1887) described as community spirit; people were connected through experiencing life together (Parson 1951; Tickner 1994; Tönnies 1887), leading to a sense of mutual care and responsibility. People's closeness produced obligations to reciprocally support one another and to behave in socially acceptable ways (Bourdieu 2013, Sahlins 1972).

This relational care could only exist because adults had an active estate based social life. For example, Donna's dad was involved in the local music scene including putting on the reggae nights at Centenary Hall, Irene and her husband helped run the youth club and Centenary Hall, and Cynthia's mum ran her own youth project and was a key figure the running of Centenary Hall. Resident involvement was only possible because of the

more informal management of space and activities that meant residents could get involved on their terms. The belief that activities should be run by those with professional status (Andreassen et al. 2014; Begun 1986, Evetts 2011) had not embedded itself in the local psyche, and so the rules of professionalism were not controlling what took place (Evetts 2006, Waring and Waring 2009). The informality allowed residents to interact freely in these spaces forming friendships in the process. It was within these friendships that young people found themselves growing up.

As a result, the young people grew up within a network of support and supervision. This type of interaction allowed the relationships vital in localised neighbourhood control (Hunter 1985; Portes and Sensenbrenner; 1993 Sampson 1997, 1999, 2009; Sampson and Groves 1989) to thrive. Young people saw older residents as a source of support (Oberwitter 2004) developing reciprocal obligations around the types of behaviour that was acceptable.

As much of adult life happened in the communal areas friendships were formed which led to adults feeling obligated to support the young people they interacted with and because they knew their parents.

The care showed to the young people coupled with the fact that they knew that if they misbehaved someone that showed them care was either likely to tell them off or tell their parents caused the young people to curtail their behaviour and act in socially acceptable ways. The informal field that allowed people to build relationships led to effective neighbourhood social control.

Relational changes on the estate

> *After the local Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) had given his update about crime on the estate, Dorothy, a 78 year old asked;*
>
> *"In your professional opinion as a PCSO, what can we as residents do for the young people to stop them getting into trouble?"*
>
> *For the next twenty minutes, a discussion ensued which progressed into a consensus of blaming 'the parents'. Then I interjected;*
>
> *"When you guys were growing up how many of you were supported or disciplined by your neighbours or those who lived locally?"*
>
> *All 14 people at the meeting put up their hands; I followed up by asking…*
>
> *"How many of you even know the names of the young people who you see hanging around outside?"*
>
> *No one could put up their hand.*
>
> (FNJ 10.01.14 taken at a residents' committee meeting)

The decline in intergenerational connection has coincided with an increased feeling of disempowerment in regard to what was happening on the estate. People's sense of safety once came from their interactions with other residents and a general awareness that communal areas were shared spaces (Lefebvre 2003). As relationships and the informal use of communal space disappeared, protection from others became seen as a service that needed to be provided. Young people were increasingly characterised as dangerous and as a risk (Fyte in Lees 2004; Hughes 2011; Kelly 2013; Tickner 1993), helping to justify the promotion of professional services. With fewer people engaging locally (Murty 2012; Putnam 2000) and with the

actions of young people increasingly at odds with the values of other generations on the estate (Murty 2012), people's sense of obligation towards one another decreased.

There had always been low level anti-social behaviour on the estate with children playing knock down ginger and being loud in the evenings. Once Our Place was used to house youth activities, these problems had become more concentrated around Turner House. Although this caused some criticism when the residents ran the activities. the concern was manageable due to the small numbers of young people and the resident volunteers engaging with the parents and those who aired their views. The complaints usually took the form of residents knocking on the doors of Charis, James, and Elizabeth who then spoke to the young people individually.

However, by the time the Saplings' activities were in full swing the numbers of young people using their service regularly hit 35-40 a week with only 30% of those young people being from the estate (Saplings' estimate). The stairwells of Turner House started to be used by the young people as a toilet, a rubbish bin for their chicken and chips boxes and a place for them to gather to deal drugs and smoke weed. Over the course of the project, the drug dealing progressed from weed to selling crack and heroin with some of their customers using the stairwells as a location to smoke crack complete with the often accompanying emptying of their bowels.

Residents, who regularly complained of being scared to walk up the stairs, were getting fed up of the smell of urine and cannabis smoke as well as being kept awake at night by young people making noise into the early hours

of the morning. The residents' frustrations were amplified because they did not recognise those who were causing the concern and felt they could not approach them in a constructive way. Kate a young mum who became active on the estate in 2013 explains the contrast between when she moved in in 2006 to 2014:

> *"Well, when I used to visit my partner it was alright to be honest because it was quiet and I liked the estate because it was really quiet so I didn't really see any problem, to be honest… Last summer we had a lot of boys hanging around in our area um it's not even a problem with them hanging around in the blocks. I had one of my neighbours she was mentioning an incident in the middle of the night when she had to go out to ask them to be quiet because she was trying to sleep as it was about 1-2am and she was told to just go back to sleep, and I felt that was very disrespectful and out of order. And it is very intimidating as well as sometimes when I am coming down the stairs with my kids they will all be sitting there on the step like smoking and drinking and they will be breaking the bottles and leaving it on the step like and sometimes my youngest son will be asking mummy what are they doing, and I know what they are doing, but I don't really want to be explaining all of that to him as he is too young."*

(Interview with Kate 13/04/15)

There were regular complaints of this nature throughout the summer months of 2013–2015, Kate's comments here were rather reserved in nature, other residents were not so polite when airing their views about the young people. When the police and staff from the local authority were invited to discuss solutions at residents' meetings, the most popular solution mentioned was to install CCTV across the estate, which was only hampered by the cost of such a solution. Surveillance has replaced supervision in the minds of the disengaged residents and council staff as a means of shaping the behaviour of young people hanging out on the estate.

The increased numbers of young people hanging around the communal areas coincided with a substantial decrease in the numbers of adults out and about on the estate. Apart from the occasional summer BBQ that were becoming fewer and farther between and smaller in attendance, the only real time residents can be seen on the estate was when they are walking to and from the nearby bus stops.

The issues described in this chapter started before the pervasiveness of the professional field, and the chapter does not try to attribute the starting of these issues to the acceptance of this field as the standard way of working. The chapter does, however, seek it explain how rather than finding solutions to the issues they were deigned to address, professional interventions both contributed to the problems and shut down other ways of working that may have been more effective at tackling them.

For some time the open spaces on the estate had become increasingly vacant of adult activity and were now mainly populated by young people; initially by young residents and then also by those who attended the professional youth delivery. Without their use as an adult social setting, the open and communal spaces were susceptible to increased anti-social and criminal activity (Lefebvre 2003; Murty 2012). Increasing numbers of young people were behaving in ways that caused concern among residents who felt unable to interact with them to address their concerns.

A conflict emerged over who had legitimate use of the space (Fenton 2010; Kärrholm 2007), leading to further mistrust between adult residents and young people (Hatiprokopiou 2009). Without a means of constructively

engaging with the large numbers of young people who now hung out on the estate, the adult residents response was to largely disengage, further problematizing the issue of the lack of neighbourhood social controls. This absence of intergenerational interaction and obligations has, as we will discuss below, played a significant role in the increased criminal behaviour of young people.

Missing Generalised Reciprocity among Young People

Young people are now growing up with parents who lack the support of a local friendship network to help guide their children. Where interactions between generations do exist, they are generally individualised and not part of a wider supportive network and often confrontational. Marjorie, who was once a volunteer at John's Hut with her husband, showed a resigned attitude towards the young people today that goes some way to explaining her lack of engagement with young people on the estate;

> "I *don't really know them [the young people], you can't tell them to be quiet or anything as they will give you cheek or swear at you, they never used to, it's the way the population is going I suppose."*

> (Interview with Marjorie 10.07.14)

Cynthia also commented on the lack of adult interaction and communication regarding the behaviour of young people and the confrontational nature that current dealings so often take;

> *"And now what I find is adults don't go to the adults when they see a child doing something wrong they want to scold the child themselves. They want to talk to the child like it's an adult and then don't want the child to answer back like and adult, but they*

have opened the door for it. That's the other thing that is very alarming, adults directly going to the child instead of going to the parent. They should be going to the parent and scolding the child in front of the parent. I had it here the other day someone called and asked to speak to my son, so I thought she was gonna ask him something but she was telling him off. I had to take the phone off him and say "hold on what you doing"; I am his mum how can you call me and tell me to speak to my son and tell him off without talking to me. Adults my age have lost the plot."

(Interview with Cynthia 21.11.14)

These comments were symptomatic of the general feeling expressed by adults on the estate. There was a sense that the young people were too unruly to effectively engage with. Most residents were too concerned about the reaction of young people to intervene. It, therefore, seemed more sensible not to try and address any anti-social behaviour that they encountered. Cynthia's observations highlighted the lack of connection between parents and other residents and the subsequent lack of engagement between residents regarding young people's behaviour. Cynthia's comments show a general attitude among residents of confrontation towards both young people and their parent when and if a resident did decide to address an issue with someone. Where there was once a sense of togetherness and support between adults when dealing with young people, now there is a feeling of isolation and antagonism.

The lack of connectedness has resulted in a breakdown in obligations to look out for one another (Fischer 1982; Sampson 2009; Wellman 1979). Relationally oriented living has given way to more individualised lifestyles (Çelik and Gough 2014; Hass and Olsson 2014). As a result, there is a clear

contrast between past accounts of adult disciplinary intervention and what happens currently. Past accounts recalled how adults would know the parents of the young people on the estate and talk to them about their child's behaviour. Now the situation has changed somewhat, due to the majority of the young people hanging around on the estate but not living on the estate and the lack of adult interaction; adult residents do not know the majority of the young people or their parents. Where parents are known the relationships are not strong enough for other adults to engage them when wanting to intervene regarding a child's behaviour. There is no longer an understanding of obligation, no cohesive force (Bourdieu 2013; Mauss 1967; Sykes 2014), and no opportunity for closure (Coleman 1988). Instead, young people are now conceived of by the residents as posing a risk (Hughes 2013) and ungovernable (Kelly 2003). Relationships that were once so key in systems of neighbourhood control were disappearing (Belliar 1997) and the process aimed at addressing the anti-social behaviour among young people caused the few relationships that remained to be weakened further. The lack of localised intergenerational relationships meant that it was impossible to secure the levels of neighbourhood crime control identified by Hunter (1985) and Sampson and Groves (1989) that would result in a reduction in criminal activity on the estate.

Separation and young people's experiences

The negativity towards young people was clearly felt by them and became seen as normal. Miche commented about the growing antagonisms between adult residents and young people;

"You have a lot of rude people, rude adults who don't want the kids to do nothing, like when I was growing up there were a lot of adults who didn't want us to do nothing. They knew us they knew our families even next door neighbours, but they didn't want us… to play football was a problem for the boys… To stand up outside making noise was a problem, everything we did was a problem for them."

(Interview with Miche 31.07.15)

Miche expressed the sentiment of many young people who simply saw the adults on the estate as people who moaned at every opportunity about their behaviour, rather than taking the time to get to know and understand them.

The lack of networked connection meant that many interactions that focused on young people's behaviour became confrontational rather than supportive. Even when young people did feel that there was a link between them and other residents, it was admittedly fairly shallow as Cece a 22 year old mother who had recently moved off the estate and into a hostel explained;

"You know everyone on the estate, where they live, but it's like hi, hello. If they have kids the same age, you will probably be at their house. However, you don't really know much about anyone."

(Interview with Cece 17.09.14)

Amongst the young people, there is a general feeling of isolation and being left to fend for themselves. Cece's account of life on the estate as teenage girl highlights the immediate lack of support when out and about on the estate;

"Uhhh it was horrible growing up on the estate as a girl, it was sick, as a good looking girl as well. No seriously, I remember

224

moving on to the estate and walking past and going down to the shops, for example, you would have guys throwing out dirty words – let's do this or like running me into the block. I had to be like Commando FBI agent, around the estate, hiding on the estate, it was that terrible. Adults were never out on the estate they were at home; us girls were on our own."

(Interview with Cece 17.09.14)

Her experience of not feeling supported by the adult residents on the estate was echoed by other young people also as Tyler and Anton, both of whom grew up on the estate comment;

"You have to say it's everyone for them self, you don't see anyone, so if you don't see anyone then no help can be given… Coz you don't know the help I need. It makes me feel…like… It still makes me feel like I am doing something wrong because I am not seeking help then I can't get it, so it's like I am doing something wrong even though I don't know them to ask for the help…it's just fucking shit."

(Interview with Tyler 23.08.14)

"I wouldn't say any other residents would help, I would say that people's individual parents would try and put sense into their head and guide them the right way, but I wouldn't say any other people's parents would try and help."

(Interview with Anton 15.04.15)

Within these accounts, there was an obvious sense of disconnection expressed by the young people who felt that they could not rely on older generations for help or guidance. Some internalised this lack of interest to such a high degree that they started to feel that they were doing something wrong by not seeking help from those around them. This is despite not knowing those whom they felt they should approach for support.

This sense of isolation and separation led to a lack of reciprocal obligation

that had previously helped to shape young people's actions. The young people themselves realised that something is missing. Kojo, a 24 year old who grew up on the estate and was considered by the police as a potential leader of the criminal activities seemingly by virtue of where he lives and his age, commented on how he sees the impact of the separation of young people and other residents on the estate.

> *"I missed out on all those things, and even with all the help we can get for free we kinda don't use it. Even the people who are trying to help us we don't take it, it takes time I suppose, it takes a relationship between the people who are trying to help and the people who are reaching out, but it is not there."*

(Interview with Kojo 03.05.14)

Without close networked relationships, young people were reluctant to take up the limited support that was on offer. Kojo's comments sum up the thoughts of the young people as they opened up about how supported they felt. They understood quite clearly that something was missing. This feeling would sometimes be brushed off, other times the feeling is expressed in resentment to older residents.

Apart from familial relationships, there is little other positive connection with adults. The parents themselves are a lot less locally networked than previous generations of parents. Outside of their immediate family, nearly all other connections between young people and adults are transactional, meaning the adult is getting paid to interact with the young person.

The lack of connection apparent in the adult residents' accounts was also displayed in the data captured from the young people. It is clear that the young people felt the confrontational nature of residents who did intervene.

Without any real relationship with adult residents, young people for the most part simply felt the frustrations of adult residents. The past interventions of a disciplinary nature were done within an environment of support, which fostered a sense of obligation. Without this care and concern, even if interventions were polite there was no sense of reciprocal obligation to back them up.

Young people felt a sense of isolation on the estate. Whether it be from young women, who felt alone and had to defend themselves from the advances of the young men, or young men realising that the adults around them were not interested enough to give them the support they need.

Strong neighbourly relationships akin to primordial socialisation (Coleman 1988), supported by effective organisations and ties to statutory services, were the back bone of Hunter's (1985) analysis of neighbourhood crime control. Yet the council's efforts to improve the estate by increasing the presence of outside organisations and had a negative impact on local relationships. The way that these organisations operated led to the much needed local relationships becoming unobtainable. The very process that was meant to strengthen the neighbourhood's ability to self govern actually weakened the main element needed to achieve effective social control. As Sampson and Graif (2009) commented when they looked at local leadership connections to residents, those the council were connected to and trusted to run the youth club and empower local people, actually had no connection with residents. The way the services were run meant that the strong relationships between local people and such organisations also never materialised.

A professional youth service that was meant to educate the residents and help them understand how to deal with the young people on the estate had a different effect; it led to residents deciding not to provide any youth provision when they had the chance. The potential for the informal supervision that is so important in shaping positive behaviour (Bellair 1997, Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Carr 2003; Cantillon et al. 2003; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974) disappeared.

The local authority and the organisations they introduced failed to acknowledge the importance of informal networks in establishing neighbourhood social control mechanisms (Bellair 1997, Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Carr 2003; Cantillon et al. 2003; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974). Without the close relationships, residents were unlikely to engage with each other or young people in an effective way (Bellair 1997). Moreover, the lack of these neighbourhood controls contributed to an increase in deviant behaviour by young people.

The professionalising of the youth activities was meant to provide more specialist intervention for the young people. However, the transactional model of paying people to provide support actually had the adverse impact. The few residents who were previously engaged, disengaged and those paid to engage did so only when their contract stipulated. The transactional arrangements did not produce a network of care or increase the informal relationships of support that past generations of young people experienced. Young people have been forced to rely on and trust relative professional strangers for support (Sáez and Sanchez 2006), who only stay in their lives as long as money allows. Within this environment, young people were

reluctant to take up offers of support as the relationships that would have enabled them to trust what was being offered did not exist. The constructed form of support (Coleman 1988) didn't have the same level of influence over the young people as the previous informal relational network did.

Critical Mass

The lack of adult friendship networks meant that any adult engaging positively with young people did so in relative in isolation. Whereas previous adult relationships with young people were a result of adult networks that extended to young people; contemporary relationships were comprised of a young person and an adult with no wider supportive network. This more isolated support generally came from the direct provision of services to young people rather than any informal relationship. However, this un-networked support has been largely ineffective in curbing young people's behaviour. There seems to be a need for a critical mass type network for generalised reciprocity and neighbourhood social control to occur. The limited impact of this direct young person to adult relationship was displayed in several instances throughout the research.

An example of such weakness can be understood by looking at individual cases, such a Kwame a 16 year old who grew up on the estate. He had gone to St Mary's football project since he was six, attended the church on the estate with James, and also the Saplings youth project. Through the football and church, he had built up a good relationship with James whom he respected. He had also built up a good but adversary relationship with Lino (the founder of the St Mary's Football Project) who, if James could be

described as the kind uncle, was the stern dad that would often have a go at Kwame and say that he is washing his hands of him only to accept him back at football the next week. In one instance Lino was looking for young people to put on a coaching course and James wanted Kwame to attend, but Lino refused to sign him up. However, after some persuading, James convinced Lino to meet Kwame to assess his seriousness. After a brief chat in the local café, Lino signed Kwame up, but as Lino had expected Kwame did not show up.

Kwame's behaviour showed the limits of the obligations that isolated relationships produce. Kwame's respect towards James and Lino was shown not in him trying to do the right thing but in him trying to hide what he was doing from them, sometimes with comical results. On one occasion Kwame was smoking weed with some friends on the estate when James walked past. After seeing James, he tried to hide but only managed to lay lengthways behind a wall leading up to a stairway leaving his legs sticking out. James walked over to him and spoke to him but Kwame pulled his hoodie over his head and simply said was sorry he was not Kwame.

On another occasion, James was called out to Our Place at 2am after being told that there were some young people in the building. As James walked over he could see young people running out, one of which was Kwame, who as he saw James put his hands in front of his face as he ran past.

The next morning at football training in the park, James spoke to Kwame who denied the incident. For the most part, this was the level of respect that those who had some form of relationship with adults on the estate showed.

Instead of feeling obligated to behave, the young people with a connection to adults rather sought to hide or deny what they were up to.

By the time he was halfway through year 10, Kwame had started to get a bit of a reputation, and James sat him down to talk to him during a football training session. Kwame denied that he was doing anything wrong and ended the conversation by stating;

> *"And in any case even if I was doing anything, I am too smart to get caught."*
>
> (FNJ 09.04.13)

Two weeks later Kwame was permanently excluded from school after being caught with a knife. Just over a year, later Kwame's parents sent him to Ghana to after he had been arrested for possession of class A drugs.

Often it was only when a young person had got arrested and needed some support to try and get out of trouble that they opened up. James would be asked to write a reference and find them a course to go on to improve their chances at court; and Lino talked to them about their case, advising them on what solicitors to use and what might happen if they were found guilty. Lino's past experience with the law meant that the young people felt freer to open up to him and his opinion was respected, even if that respect only occasionally resulted in them following his advice.

During one of the cage football sessions run by St Mary's Football Project on the estate, Tyreece a 16 year old resident was discussing with Lino what he does for money explaining that he is 'calm';

> **Tyreece:** *But it's all about making the P's, man's gotta do what a man's gotta do, you know how it is Lino.*
>
> **Lino:** *Nothing has changed from my day, we were like you, but all my friends ended up inside. Do you really think the man above you cares?*
>
> **Tyreece:** *Well look I am making my money, and that's how people show me care, I just get my Ps so I can take care of myself, that's all the care I need.*
>
> **Lino:** *So what are you handling now?*
>
> **Tyreece:** *You know just the usual (said rather cockily) a bit of brown and a bit of white*
>
> **Lino:** *You do realise that you are taking all the risks if you get picked up; your supplier isn't going to do anything*
>
> **Tyreece:** *It's a risk a man's gotta take it's all about that paper, but seriously Lino, if you have something for me I am listening.*
>
> (FNJ 03.08.15)

For Tyreece, Lino was a good sounding board and source of advice, but Lino's presence and influence were not going to stop Tyreece from drug dealing. Tyreece's last comment about the 'paper' is an indication of one of the biggest drivers for young people on the estate.

The data above shows that even when there is support on offer, the transference of habitus and capital that are for Özbilgin and Tatli (2011) and Woolford and Curran (2012) so important for disadvantaged people to successfully enter and navigate through more mainstream fields never materialised. When professionals offered support, Kojo indicated that the necessary closeness and trust needed for young people to take up the offer was missing resulting in young people rejecting the little help that was made available through these channels. Those, such as Lino, who offered support more informally often had the trust and support of the young people but were

not part of a wider network that could have provided the type of primordial socialisation that a network of closure (Coleman 1988) could offer. As a result, the individual adult to young person relationships of support had limited impact on the behaviour of young people and was more focused on offering young people help and advice on legal matters and other issues that would help them in their immediate predicament. As such these relationships helped young people meet their immediate needs (Gowan 2011) rather than helping to positively influencing young people's actions or future.

Results of Missing Generalised Reciprocity: New Influences, New Activities

The lack of guidance contributed to young people establishing their own behavioural standards described by Wacquant (2000) as street habitus and others (Bourgios 2003, Fleetwood 2014, Fraser and Atkinson 2014; Harding 2013, Ilan 2013, Shammas and Sandberg 2016, Sandberg 2008, 2012) as street capital. Within this street based field, the influence of adults has been replaced by that of peers leading to an increased emphasis on making quick money through illegal means, and group violence.

Impressing other peers and those slightly older than themselves has played a major part in motivating the actions of the younger people. Tyler, Miche, and Fatima, three young people from the estate, explain the risks involved in the young people looking to peers and those slightly older than them as role model figures;

Tyler: "It's like they have no role model or someone to look up to. But it's not just like that coz you may look up to someone, but they may not be good and… So they may thin that they are doing the right thing for them and that's why they do what they do. They all think they are a grown ass man and they want to do grown ass man things like smoking, drinking, driving without a licence, having sex or having kids at a young age, going prison or going to secure unit and getting on tag but it's not a good thing."

(Interview with Tyler 23.08.14)

Fatima: "The olders are telling the youngers to do it, the olders like Kojo and that told Joe to go and get a moped, so they nicked it and brought it back, and they started changing the licence plates, and Joe was there saying can I have my money now I want my money."

(Interview with Fatima 21.01.15)

Miche: "It's like you see little Mark and Raheem hanging around the olders, well that's how it starts, they see them do it and think they can copy, they think that is how life is, Sometimes an older one will ask one of them to go and do something for them and it just starts from there.
I don't even know how Kwaku and that lot, I can't stand them, got into dealing the harder stuff it was such a shock but they are dumb. They see the olders in Louis Viton shoes and nice clothes - they see that and want it now but don't realise it's taken him a long time to get it they want quick money, but it's not like that."

(Interview with Miche 31.07.15)

The accounts above show the results of young person to young person interaction without adult influence. Fatima's recalls a common theme of older young people paying their youngers to do tasks for them. Their ability to do so comes partly from their status as a source of income for the youngers but also due to the image they portray as having enviable material possessions. The influence of the older ones led those younger than them

to understand deviant behaviour as normalised. Even Tyler, who deals drugs on the estate, understood that the lack of positive influence has resulted in young people to develop unhealthy understandings of maturity. His comments of having sex, being sent to a pupil referral unit or prison, among other things, being seen as positive markers for young people, indicate the problems that young people face when trying to navigate through their lives.

The local authority's attempts to address these issues through strengthening local organisations' involvement on the estate didn't have the desired results. This not only contributed to the disappearance of intergenerational interactions but also enhanced the adverse impacts of peer influence through attracting new young people on to the estate as Kojo comments:

> *"When I was growing up basically there was no need to impress anyone, mainly because we were all friends from young. But now there are some new ones who come out of nowhere and come onto the estate and the ones on the estate want to impress the new ones."*

> *(Interview with Kojo 03.05.14)*

Kojo' comments highlight two key issue relating to young people's experiences on the estate. Firstly Kojo could recognise a difference in the experiences he had growing up with that of those a few years younger than him. Although he was part of the original group of young people who had been responsible for the anti social behaviour that had kicked people like Elizabeth and Charis into action, his experience and actions were vastly different from those 6-10 years his junior. The changes he and others

recognised were amplified by increased numbers of young people who were now socialising on the estate. For each new young person that appeared, young people felt the need to impress and prove themselves. As a result, Kojo and other members of the original group of young people felt that their youngers were being negatively influenced by the arrival of new peers onto the estate.

The domination of a formal approach to service delivery, leading to the development of a professional field, has a further problematic impact on the emergence and scale of a youth street based field. The Saplings provision followed in the footsteps of other local authority commissioned services in targeting young people from off the estate as well as those on it. As a result, the provision run by professional organisations attracted new young people to the estate; every new young person on the estate meant new young people that needed to be impressed.

The sheer numbers of young people that had started to hang out on the estate increased the influence of peer and further normalised certain activities. This normalisation is especially true in the choice to deal drugs and commit fraud to make money. Within this environment drug dealing and bank fraud became standard employment option for so many people on the estate as can be seen in Tyler's explanation of how he and others got into drug dealing;

> *"I see it as everyone doing what they got to do. So if they have to make their money somehow be that a newspaper boy, selling milk, selling carpet, cracking cards with fraud or selling drugs, they got to do it whatever you got to do."*

Miche, in her role of part young person, part responsible mother who had separated herself from a lot of what was taking place on the estate, was still close enough to the young people to know what was going on even commented that it was easier to point out which young person wasn't dealing drugs rather than who was.

David a 22 year old youngest member of the original 'olders' and one of the last to remain on the estate indicated how normalised drug dealing had become and why in his mind trying to get the younger teenagers to change was pointless;

> "You might as well forget about them lot [pointing over to a group of 16-18 year olds hanging out by the football cage]. At their age they are not serious, they don't have any cares at the moment. It's only when you get to 22 and up that you realise you got to sort something else out. These lot aren't serious…When I was their age there were certain things I wanted, the clothes, the trainers, money and I knew my parents couldn't afford to provide it for me, so I had to go and get the money from somewhere else. Other people had it, and so I wanted it. And it's easy, but now the feds won't leave me alone. They think I am stupid, coming to harass me while I'm just sitting in my slippers. I am not that stupid; I don't have anything on me while out here."

(FNJ 06.07.15)

Ten months later David was convicted of possession with intent to supply Class A drugs.

Not only did some of the older young people express their surprise at the activities that their young peers were engaged in, but they also told of the inability to positively influence their behaviour. In this case, David was giving

advice to an adult who worked with the young people, however as we will see below attempts by 'olders' to curb the behaviour of those younger than them also fell on deaf ears.

On the surface, it could seem that there was one group of youth with shared norms governing their behaviour. However, on closer inspection, it seemed that there were, in fact, several age orientated friendship based mini street fields. Each such field had its own tolerances of what was acceptable, with the general view of each older group that the younger was more criminally orientated than theirs.

The olders could sometimes be seen haplessly warning members of the younger group not to do certain things on the estate. On one occasion a few of the year 11s had broken into a black cab on the estate stealing the float inside, Kojo warned the group about turning residents against them, but from his expression, you could tell he knew they were not paying attention. On another occasion, Yoshua, a 14 year old estate resident, was seen carrying a bike with the back wheel still D-locked to the frame. As he walked past David called out to him;

> **David:** *"How many times do I have to tell you, you don't do these sort of things around here."*
>
> Without stopping Yoshua answered back
>
> **Yoshua:** *"It was from round the corner so what does it matter to you."*
>
> (FNJ: 28:06:15)

This concern is crystallised in Tyler's observations about the young people who were coming up after him;

I thought my generation was worse growing up like, my generation was more like… They were hype like I could say gang related stuff would happen a lot of stabbing would happen it was crazy people dying but it wasn't nice. But this generation is so lost even like smoking, they are smoking at 13 hardcore. But like at the age of 14 was the first time that I tried weed and didn't start smoking it a lot till like 17- 18. The younger generation are chain smoking… Young stabbing each other, not thinking about what's gonna happen. It's kinda loose; it's different, it's crazy."

(Interview with Tyler 23.08.14)

The changing environment on the estate, including the lack of positive guidance, has resulted in a recognisable move towards increased deviancy in the actions of young people. Older young people themselves were shocked at what they were seeing their younger peers doing. It appears that the isolation young people have experienced on the estate has contributed to negative peer influences, which has led to an escalation of deviant behaviour.

Being associated with street based activity became symbolic capital, those who were not involved in a certain incident often feel that they are missing out; even if it is just missing out on the capital associated with being able to talk about it (Shammas and Sandberg 2016). On this issue Gerald comments;

It is not like if you are from this area you don't like people from that area, but then people fall out and then that gets escalated, and it becomes a group thing but it is not like a gang thing where you know, well people may watch TV and say let's do that, but we are not in America despite what people think, we are not in America. It's more like if I know someone has beef with someone and people are talking about it, I feel the need to get involved too so I can be part of what everyone is talking about.

The desire to be associated with such symbolic capital could also be seen in the conversation of the young people on the estate, with even primary school children asking one another if they saw shootings or car chase incidents. On one occasion you could see the disappointment in a group of children's faces after they heard that someone had been shot five minutes' walk up the road and they were not there to see it.

The professionalising of services, spatial management (Lefebvre 2003; Lloyd 2011; Susen 2011; Tonkiss 2013; Wilson 2013) and interactions has left most young people isolated from anyone other than their own peer group. As such, the estate has become another place where young people are shut out of what was considered the mainstream field. In such places of exclusion street habitus (Wacquant 2000) and street capital thrives (Bourgios 2003; Fleetwood 2014; Fraser and Atkinson 2014; Harding 2013; Ilan 2013; Shammas and Sandberg 2016; Sandberg 2008, 2012). The young people's friendship networks have become the strongest local influencer on what young people do on the estate.

The new normal

By the end of the research, the impact of the young people operating within their own fields was there for all to see. Deviant behaviour had become normalised (Ilan 2012) becoming both habitus and symbolic capital with its own field. This new normal is most evident in the summer months when the young people are more visible, hanging around in larger numbers for longer. Although more severe incidents were not a daily occurrence, during the

research there were a number of stabbings and shootings, none of which were fatal. Most of these incidents went unnoticed by the majority of the residents unless they were associated with a party on the estate. By the summer of 2015, many of the original middle group of young people were looking to find a way to combine making money and having fun and had started to host BBQs on the estate. Below is an account of one such BBQ that took place in the summer of 2015 and the first of many to follow;

In the afternoon while James was at work Gerald called to ask who Ashley (a young person from the estate) needed to talk to so he could get a couple of tables for a BBQ. James said that he should talk to Francesca or Simon at Centenary Hall who should be able to help.

By around 6pm a BBQ was in full swing with about 30-40 young black men and a few year 10 and 11 girls in the Turner House Park. By all accounts, the BBQ started off highly organised. A DJ was situated behind the swings playing a mixture of Afrobeat, Hip hop and Grime with a generator powering his laptop and Mackie powered speakers that sat either side of a table borrowed from Centenary Hall. The food was cooked by Ola who was fresh back from Uni and wearing a t-shirt that said Ola's Kitchen.

Ashley saw James and seemed really grateful that he was there and mentioned that the police had been circulating in a car few times and would appreciate him staying around to deal with them if they came back. Ashley tried to get James some food for free but Ola wanted to charge him, saying rather apologetically that he would give it for free but he needed to pay the DJ and wasn't making enough money from the event to cover his costs.

Within about 30 minutes the park was filling up, and soon around 100 people were there. Safi an 11 year old boy, whom James knew from football, came over to look at what was going on. James said that he could either go home or if he stayed he had to stay in James' sight and wasn't allowed out of it. He

explained that he was going home to get some money and go to the Centenary Hall disco anyway and then walked off.

About five or six adult residents were standing on the balconies of Stokes and Turner House watching what was going on, but none of them came down. By now the music was getting louder. When a track made by the young people themselves came on they would pull their hoodies over their head, making shooting symbols with their hands, mouth the words, and film each other. As the night wore on more and more people showed up, around 150 in total. At about 11pm quite a few of the young people started filming themselves for YouTube, and there seemed to be an official cameraman that was using a digital SLR to film.

Ashely and a few others could be seen every now and then walking over to some bushes looking for their stash of weed and coke wrapped tightly in a black plastic so they could make a deal. At one point Ashley was frantically searching the ground by a bush looking for the drugs and was visibly panicking before realising he was at the wrong place, and he had already moved the drugs somewhere else.

Most of the guys there were between 17 and 22, and the girls were generally between the ages of 15-18. As the night wore on some of the original 'olders' drove up and got out of their cars in designer clothes, mainly to make an appearance. Miche commented, "look at these guys, all the younger lot want to be like them, but they don't realise what they need to go through to get like it, and it's all drugs and fraud nothing will last." At one stage James asked Miche who on the estate was dealing. Miche sniggered and answered "it would be easier to say who isn't dealing than who is, and don't think these boys who have gone off to uni aren't doing it, they are just the smarter ones, most of them are dealing where they go uni too… James everyone is doing it, and I mean everyone."

The night rolled on, and the girls were getting drunker and were becoming pray for the boys. Girls could be seen walking off with young guys every now and then and coming back 15 or so minutes later. Some could be seen walking off with another guy shortly after the first. James saw Fabio, whom he had had runs ins with in the past walking off with one girl and James told him to check her age first. It wasn't long before Fabio and a couple

of other 18 year old guys could be seen stumbling around the estate suffering from drinking too much.

One girl was so drunk she couldn't stand up. Her friend tried to carry her to a bench, but she couldn't sit down. One guy poured a little water on her head to try and sober her up after she fell into a bush. At this point, she got irate and started to try and chase after him but kept falling down hardly being able to stand let alone walk or run. By now there were quite a few guys around her. Some tried to film her while others offered to look after her but really wanted to try and sleep with her.

James helped one of her friends take her off the estate, and her friend called a cab that never came. James met Miche coming back from Kate's with her eldest daughter and asked her to help look after the girl who was trying to fight some girls who were walking past. One such girl walking past said that she didn't want to touch her as the drunk girl had chlamydia to which the drunk girl replied: "Well you have it too as we are sleeping with the same man."

Two police cars pulled up after about ten mins and asked the girl, who was no more than 16 years old (as she kept mumbling about the video better not be online otherwise it will be hell at school) where she had just come from. All four police got into their two cars after a couple of minutes saying that there was nothing they can do to help her. Miche and James asked if they could at least try and take her home to make sure she was safe. The police responded saying that it wasn't really their concern.

By now Miche and James told her to get on a bus and go home. As they were all walking to the bus stop about six guys followed her. A guy who was about 19 told one of his friends to get the car. Two of them turned back while he carried on walking after the girl. As the car went past the driver stopped to let one of his friends in and James went over and said to him that he was not to let the girl in his car as it will lead to him going to prison for rape, the driver sarcastically replied "thanks" and then drove off. Miche and James accompanied the girl to the bus stop. The driver pulled up a bit away from the bus stop got out and started walking to the bus stop but then got back into the car saying "Nah man that guy is there" so shouted to the two girls to come to the car. Miche followed the two girls and convinced them not to get in. Shortly after, the bus arrived, and the girls got on.

Miche and James walked back over towards the park and stood watching the BBQ from the walkway outside Miche's flat on the first floor of Turner House.

About midnight a large bang could be heard, and there was some confusion about whether it was a gun or firework, but after about 10 seconds no one really paid any attention. Miche had let her 11 year old daughter go and check the BBQ out for a bit and ran down when she heard the bang. However, by then, her daughter was already standing outside a neighbour's flat on the ground floor not wanting to get too close to the action.

About 30 minutes afterwards about 40 or so young people could be seen rushing to the edge of the park. Yoshua had got into an argument with someone from a nearby estate, and the two had to be separated. As Yoshua walked back to the main BBQ area the other young man was led off the estate by his friends. As he was walking off, he turned and drew a gun waved it around a few times shouting "you don't know about me" and then fired the gun above people's heads and left the estate. There was some panic with people ducking and running for cover, however, within 2 minutes, people seemed to be back to normal. Within 10 minutes an armed police unit turned up in two SUVs circled the park a few times followed by another two SUVs and then an unmarked police car and a bully van. The police stayed on the estate for about 45 mins without getting out of their cars.

As the first police car turned up, most people ran off the estate, and many people got into their cars and drove off. Within ten mins of the police arriving there was only about 25 people left – some young people who lived on the estate and those who had driven to the estate but didn't want the police to link them with the car they were driving.

By now some of the guys who were left were cuddling girls and talking to them as cover to try and indicate to the police that they were there for the girls and nothing else.

(FNJ 31.07.15)

Despite the scale, this incident alone didn't cause significant attention, James, Miche, and Charis were criticised for their involvement in the BBQ

with many of the committee believing that James and Charis had helped organise the event despite them having no knowledge of what was going on until the request for some tables. Charis believed that this criticism had been started by Francesca who was trying to cover her back as the tables came from the hall that she was responsible for. However, by the third BBQ which involved another shooting and a car crash between the shooting suspect and a police car, Dorothy wanted something done. The council agreed to set up a meeting and again got a number of professional organisations together who were funded to help provide employability skills to local people and a jobs fair was planned. However, two weeks before the event was meant to take place, the organisers realised that the young people were not interested and it was cancelled. This engagement with the local authority was the first sign of residents proactively connecting with professionals in a more formal approach to dealing with anti-social behaviour. Their actions were similar to Carr's (2003) ethnographic observations of resident engagement in addressing anti-social behaviour where local people became an additional resource within professional processes rather than leading initiatives themselves. Despite the plans not going ahead, it was an indication that in regards to the teenage young people, even the most invested residents were now relying on the professional approaches to deal with them.

The incident exemplifies a number of issues that were prevalent throughout the research. Several years of young people being left without the types of relationships that produce generalised reciprocity contributed to the development of the street field. The youth street field largely had three

motivations, making money, fitting in with peers and having fun. Although these motivations may not be that different from those of the past the young people's actions; the ways in which these motivations were acted upon were no longer tempered by obligations to behave forged through growing up in a networked relational environment where the different generations integrated with each other.

Just as the adult residents largely withdrew from interacting with the young people, the young people were oblivious to how their actions may impact others. Ashley and the others who organised the BBQs had no concern for the disturbance it would bring to other residents; the music was played as loud as the speakers could go and there was no thought of how having 150 young people attending the BBQ would look to adult residents. It was for Ashley and the other organisers, however, a great chance to make money through added customers. The habitus Ashley and the others were displaying in organising the BBQ allowed them to excel in the street field that they were used to. However, this same habitus made it almost impossible for them to successfully engage in other fields.

As the BBQ unfolded the norms and values and symbolic capital of the street field were on view. Knowing the lyrics to the tracks of peers, drinking the right alcohol, smoking weed, drug dealing and taking advantage of women were all present in abundance. The relative normalcy to those at the BBQ of the gun firing shows how even such extreme actions were both habitus and capital in a field of the like discussed by Frazer and Hagedon (2016); Harding (2014); Frazer and Hagedon (2016) and Wacquant (2008). In this environment risky and violent behaviour associated with hyper

masculinity and increased female vulnerability have been normalised and are commonplace.

The isolating structure of the different fields was also on view. While the BBQ was taking place about 25 or so adults could be seen watching the events from the walkways of Turner and Stokes House. Their willingness to look on but not get involved even when the BBQ started to get out of hand but could have been calmed down was due to their lack of connection with young people who hung around on the estate. The emergence of different social spaces has led to weak social ties among the various groups that occupy the estate. These weak social ties allow young people to act unchallenged (Harding 2014; Pih et al. 2008; Sampson and Groves 1989 Winfree et al. 1994). The adult residents looking on looking from the balcony showed both the disconnect and relative powerlessness of their position. The sheer numbers of young people, the majority of whom had not grown up on the estate and had no relationship with adults from the estate meant that there was no opportunity for neighbourhood social control (Bursik 1999; Kingston et al. 2009). In turn, without any connection, the young people attending the BBQ felt under no obligation to act in a way that the adults would have considered socially acceptable.

The BBQ, in many ways, symbolised the loss of adult territorial control of the open spaces of the estate to young people. BBQs had once been relatively frequent on the estate but organised by adult friendship groups who included young people in their activities. As more and more of adult estate life is being spent behind closed doors (Britton 2008; Fenton 2010; Ilan 2012), ownership of the open space has passed to young people

(Hatiprokopiou 2009; Ilan 2012), who are missing the relationships that would show them how to behave in more socially acceptable ways (Lloyd 2013). The young people were occupying the space vacated by the adults, and with no intergenerational interaction, there was no way to shape their behaviour in this space.

With the controls associated with collective efficacy missing, young people were left with the more deviant influence of each other. The chapter above outlines how the behaviour of the young and the development of a street field have been influenced by the disappearance of intergenerational relationships and the role that the expansion of a professional field has played in this.

Previous generations of young people grew up in a supportive network of adult resident friendships, relationships that were often formed through adult involvement in informal social activities on the estate. These connections led to young people feeling supported by their parents' friends and other adults whom they knew which resulted in them feeling obliged to behave in ways that the adults would see as acceptable.

As adult social life started to disappear from the communal areas so did the intergenerational influence on the young people. The council's attempt to bring some order to the situation through commissioning professional youth provision and supporting the development of professionalised behaviour on the estate simply increased this estrangement. The services led to an increased number of young people hanging out on the estate and at the same time decreased the opportunity for localised adult friendships forming.

As a result, the young people exist in a space devoid of meaningful adult influence, and their actions are being shaped by peer groups, leading to increased deviancy.

Chapter 7: Resistance, and a Sign of the Future?

This chapter outlines accounts that show seeds of resistance against the dominating professional ethos. There are two types of resistance recalled here, those either designed to obstruct or hold professional bodies to account and activities run by residents who still operate in the old informal way and that have the capacity to become catalysts for relationship building.

This chapter considers data captured through interviews, observations, and emails relating to three instances of resident empowerment. The first, an informal estate gardening project linked to a BBQ that provided support to a young person who had been arrested for drug dealing. The second, a residents' committee dispute with Community Learning Trust (CLT) a onetime partner of the committee. Lastly, summer play scheme set up by the residents that tried to straddle both the informal and professional approaches to service delivery.

The first account is an unofficial garden area set up by residents and shows how the informality of this space opened up the opportunity for caring relationships to emerge; relationships that led to residents receiving tangible support from other residents. This act of resistance was not an attempt by residents to stop something happening; instead, the garden area itself was a sign that the professional ethos had not covered all communal areas of the estate. The case study outlines how those involved in the gardening project built relationships with other residents who offered support in times of need. The account goes on to recall how the garden was used by a resident to informally mentor a friend's son who had been arrested. The

case study shows how networks that positively impact people's lives can still develop if the right activities, culture, and capital are available.

The example of the dispute with Community Learning Trust showed the committee actively using the rules of the professional field to gain the upper hand against CLT in a dispute over funding and control over the future of an older people's lunch project. The account of the dispute showed how the residents' committee's initial instinct was still to deal with things informally, however as they became more confident with professional processes, they tactically used them to gain a positional advantage. The account considers how the subordination process can lead to supposedly inferior groups turning their internalised knowledge of a particular field into a tactic to gain the upper hand (Cvetičanin et al. 2014).

The play scheme can be understood as an act of defiance by the committee who, in the face of ineffective professional youth delivery wanted to re-establish a more relational approach to support, albeit through targeting young children rather than teenagers. At the same time, the project highlights the contradiction within residents who tried to manage the project having internalised elements of both the informal and professional field and considers whether a new hybrid field is emerging. The account discusses what is possible when residents have access to capital in the form of buildings and money. However, the project also shows the limitations of trying to straddle two fields in that although relationships between summer scheme workers were strengthened, this did not translate into a supportive friendship network forming between workers, other parents, and young people. Although the project was successful in that it met its aims of

employing residents to run children's activities, the project failed to develop relationships that allowed obligations to develop or cultural and social capital to be transferred.

The accounts of the gardening and play scheme projects shed light on what is possible when communal areas are kept from becoming abstract space (Hass and Olsson 2014; Horkheimer and Adorno 2002; Lefebvre 2003; Wilson 2013). It also shows how relationships developed within the informal field can still lead to obligations as commented on by Bourdieu (2013), Sahlins (1972) and Sykes (2014). The connection between physical space, social space, and personal relationships is explored further in relation to the activities' ability to support the development of neighbourhood social controls as discussed by Hunter (1985), Oberwitter (2004), Sampson (1997,1999) and others.

The chapter helps to develop an understanding of what the future may look like and whether a new hybrid field will emerge to fully replace the professional field as the dominant field. Developments in the way people engage are of further interest considering that none of the professionals mentioned in this project are still active on the estate. It is interesting to consider whether intense professional involvement over a relatively short space of time has a lasting impact on how residents interact with each other.

Estate Gardening and a BBQ: Ingredients for Support

Separated by a main road stands three blocks in isolation from the rest of the estate. At the back of one of the blocks Mary, a resident in her 50s has commandeered a small piece of land to grow some vegetables. Mary loved

gardening and wanted to use it as a way to bring people together by getting residents to grow food which they could cook and eat together. Over the space of about eight years the garden area got bigger and bigger and although some children came down and helped with the planting and watering most of the work in the initial years was done by Mary, who often complained that the work was too much for her to do alone. The residents' committee showed their support to Mary by buying her some tools and equipment and the council sanctioned her unofficial efforts by getting one of their contractors to erect a picket fence around the now 15m by 15m space. Slowly other residents started getting involved, and the space became a mini allotment area complete with a water butt, apple tree, pathways made out of paving slabs and vegetable patches. In the evening frogs could be heard croaking from the small pond that Mary and co had made. For Mary, the garden was an escape from the constant pressures of the DWP trying to make her get a job by moving her from disability benefit to JSA. The continual pressure and regular sanctioning meant that Mary was often left destitute and on the verge of mental illness. Her predicament prompted both Dorothy and Elizabeth into separate actions. Elizabeth supported Mary to lodge an appeal with the DWP and also stave off potential eviction proceedings when her housing benefit was stopped. Elizabeth also put together a plan for the residents' committee to employ Mary as the estate gardener to take care of the garden spaces that she tended on a voluntary basis. James and Dorothy were in support, despite the fact that Dorothy objected to Elizabeth proposing the committee do something, an objection that had its roots in a long history of disagreements. Despite their approval,

they both knew that unless Kofi (the committee' chair) agreed, the idea was dead in the water. James, Dorothy, and Elizabeth all tried to phone Kofi before a committee meeting to get his backing, but they could not reach him. As with previous meetings where paying residents was discussed Kofi was against the idea, and the proposal never gained approval.

However, this did not stop the residents' committee supporting Mary. Despite losing the vote, Dorothy thought that it was only right to give Mary a little every week to help pay for her gas and electric and get a little bit of food. Dorothy was quite open with James and Margerie about what she was doing as, for Dorothy, this was a way to ensure what she was doing was not dishonest.

Mary's effort with the garden, although not reaching her aim of bringing masses of people together, did play an important role in the life of one young person; Duarte. Duarte had grown up on the estate and was the son of Marcia who had taken over the unofficial BBQ duty when the previous organiser had moved off. This position led to Marcia being loved and respected by many people who enjoyed her cooking and company. In time it was common for residents to be around Marcia's house every day helping her out with things or because Marcia offered to look after their kids. Her reputation for good food also enabled her to run a takeaway food service from her flat during a time of unemployment. In late 2014 Duarte started to hang around with a group of young people on the estate and although he was never seen doing anything wrong Marcia was getting concerned about what he was up to. Her fears were realised when the police came to her flat with a search warrant seizing £200 and a big bag of cannabis from Duarte's

room. Marcia was at a loss as to what to do. However, Honour who had made friends with Marcia through the BBQs mentioned it to her partner Ray who wanted to do something. Ray was quite committed to the unofficial garden, becoming a keen gardener as well as taking on handyman projects. Ray invited Duarte to help him every day in the garden, and soon Duarte was spending more time helping Ray with the garden and handyman work than he was with his friends. When he was not with Ray, he was helping his mum at her evening cleaning job where he earnt a little money for himself.

The garden project set up by Mary simply because she liked growing vegetables did not get any outside funding, had no targets attached nor did it have a plan to become self-sustaining. Over the course of many years, her vision started to come to fruition. Other residents saw the potential and began to get involved taking on their own patch and making sure it was well watered in the summer months. The BBQs that Marcia organised allowed people to socialise and build friendships, friendships that ultimately supported Duarte at a time when he could have become engrossed in criminal activity.

Marcia's BBQs started off in the central roadway attracting a relatively large crowd of residents and ex-residents alike. They would start around 4pm and go onto about midnight with the mainstay of Honour and her family, Stacy, another ex-resident who got a home swap to a bigger place, and a group of Stacy's school friends. A transient group of younger people would come over for food and then leave again to sit on the wall 20 or so metres away. The BBQs were one of the only times adults and young people shared an open or communal space on the estate. Marcia paid for most of the food

with her friends chipping in with the drink. She always looked to make her money back by selling to those who were not part of the main BBQ group. As the evenings wore on Trevor, a resident who seemed to have everything practical one could ever need would come out with his fishing floodlights to light up the area. One Saturday in July 2014, during a time of unemployment, Marcia was visibly upset towards the end of the BBQ. One of the young people had twice paid for his chicken with fake £20 notes, which after she had given him his change back meant that she had lost money on the day. When this was made known, Kojo came over and gave Marcia £40 to cover her losses. After each BBQ Stacy and her friends cleaned up, using litter pickers provided by Trevor, and you would barely know that something had taken place.

For her efforts Marcia got a letter from the council after a BBQ organised by the young people and that Marcia had nothing to do with, threatening her with action over anti-social behaviour. By the end of the research, the BBQs had got a lot smaller in number with only seven or eight adults attending, moved over to where the unofficial garden was with Honour taking up the mantle after Marcia downsized and moved off the estate to avoid the bedroom tax.

The reciprocal obligation that Marwell (2004) commented was so hard to foster in professional initiatives was in abundance here. In the first instance, Mary's involvement in the garden led to her developing relationships with both Dorothy and Elizabeth, two people who were inclined to support those they knew. Mary's hard work in creating the garden created obligations within both Dorothy and Elizabeth (Bourdieu 2013; Sahlins 1972), who

informally rewarded Mary with support when she hit hard times. Dorothy's actions show the importance of informality when giving this support. Dorothy was only able to find a way to financially support Mary because of the relaxed relational way that the committee operated. If strict processes were adhered to the money would not have been released.

As the garden was not an official space on the estate, it escaped the clutches of the professional field, and its informal character allowed interested residents to engage on their own terms. For Mary this enabled her to get out of the house and work on a project without having to worry about policies or processes, there were no short term goals or funding targets, just a desire to do some gardening and help others who were like minded. The way the garden was run allowed Ray to get involved and use the space to learn about gardening.

Similarly, Marcia benefited from the friendship networks that she developed through her engagement in the social activities that she contributed in and ended up taking over the running of on the estate. Through the BBQs, she met Honour and Ray. When Marcia's son got into trouble with the police, it was these relationships that gave the support to Marcia with Ray spending time supporting Duarte in the garden. The way the garden was governed allowed for a place making ethos to continue, and it was through this place making that reciprocal relationships were able to emerge in a way that was absent from services and spaces that were run by professional organisations. Stacy likened one of the BBQs to friends deciding to have dinner outside together. The professionalising of the services and the management of estate space in an attempt to improve the standard of

services had almost sanitised the estate from such activities. The garden and BBQs were two small enclaves of resistance that functioned outside of the parameters of the professional field.

However, there were real pressures on both activities. Ellison (2013) has commented that engagement of this kind needs thick time, which is becoming an increasingly precious commodity. Mary would regularly comment that she was worried that if her personal situation changes she may no longer have the time to look after the garden. The time commitment needed and the apparent lack of time that people have also helps to explain why very few residents have actually got involved in the upkeep of the area. The concept of thin time could help explain the dwindling numbers attending Marcia's impromptu BBQs which used to attract 30-40 adults, however in the last year of the research they were only attended by around 7-10 people.

The informal field of the garden and the BBQs allowed long term friendship networks and obligations to develop unconsciously (Bourdieu 2013). When Marcia needed some support with her son, it was a member of this informal friendship network that used the informal space of the garden to draw Duarte away from further criminal activity. It was the informal field that allowed the intergenerational relationships and interventions to exist. Possibly the most effective form of neighbourhood control through collective efficacy (Sampson and Groves 1989) was as a result of the existence of informal rather than professional activities.

Turning the Tables: Dispute with Community Learning Trust

There were times when the residents' committee attempted to utilise the rules of the professional field when interacting with outside organisations, often in matters of dispute. At first, this had little effect, but over time things changed. The use of professional rules can be seen in the residents' committee dealings and CLT who had come onto the estate to run an over fifties lunch club. CLT first appeared on the estate at the Centenary Hall opening in March 2013 after being invited by Yolanda. That summer Rosemary, its CEO and founder, contacted Dorothy to ask about running a lunch club in the hall. Dorothy explained that she already ran an over 50s project but would be keen to develop a partnership. Dorothy then invited Rosemary to present her idea at a committee meeting who subsequently agreed to allow Rosemary to write a funding application in partnership with them. The idea pitched to the committee was for CLT to work with Dorothy's existing over 50s group and help set up twice weekly lunch sessions while training resident volunteers up to take over the project after two years. As a sign of partnership, the committee agreed that the lunches could happen in Centenary Hall for free. Once the application was written Dorothy signed it on behalf of the committee who believed that Rosemary was going to work with her group and enhance what was already happening on the estate.

Towards the end of the year, Rosemary reported back to the committee that the funding application had been successful but not for the whole amount. This meant that the project would only run for one day a week not two and that she would need to oversee it as the funding would not stretch to pay someone to manage the project. She also explained that the project also

needed to be something new and therefore had to be separate from Dorothy's group. Rosemary then stated that her next task would be to recruit some volunteers and set up a team who will eventually take over the running of the project. Kofi, as chair of the committee, asked how much funding was received to which Rosemary said that she did not have the final exact figure to hand, but it was about half of what was originally asked for. When asked for the original amount was, Rosemary was equally as evasive however did say that she would send the details over email. These details were never received by the committee.

The project started in January 2014 with only Marie and her mum, Antoinette, volunteering. Over time, Connie, another resident from their block came and helped. After the initial meeting, Rosemary hardly spoke to the committee preferring to go through Marie to give updates, which annoyed the committee as Marie was never able to give the information they wanted. Once a week on a Wednesday Rosemary, Marie and Antoinette provided lunches for between 6-10 older people.

Initially, the committee let CLT use the hall without any formal agreement, however, after some disagreements over storage space and a double booking, a contract was drawn up. The contract stipulated the length of time that the committee should give if they need to cancel the hall hire and that they would help to develop a project continuation plan. CLT's obligations included providing project management accounts, and for a member of CLT's staff to act as a main point of contact. However, although the contract was issued, neither party actually signed it.

As the second year of the project started, Rosemary came to the committee for the first time in over six months to give a project update. During the update, Rosemary explained that she had done a lot of outreach on the estate, despite the low volunteer and participant numbers, but again failed to give any details of the project finances. As Rosemary's update came to an end, an argument broke out between her and Dorothy over Rosemary stating that she had both tried to engage Dorothy's group and had shown Dorothy the original funding paperwork. On hearing this Dorothy, for the only time that anyone could remember, shouted calling Rosemary a liar. After about a minute things settled down, and it was agreed that James would send some dates for a few members of the committee to meet Rosemary and discuss the future of the project. After months of going back and forth on email without being able to agree on a date largely because of Rosemary tended to give dates and times that James had already indicated committee members could not do Kofi, Jessica and Dorothy agreed a time to meet Rosemary.

The meeting took place in the Centenary Hall computer room towards the end of one of the lunch club meals, and Rosemary invited five of those who attended the meals to come to the meeting also. Despite the committee calling for the meeting, and despite knowing that James would not be there, Rosemary sent James an agenda via email a couple of hours before the meeting was due to start. Subsequently, the committee members had no knowledge of Rosemary's proposed agenda, which ignored the fact that committee members wanted to discuss the lack of transparency and partnership in the way that CLT was running the project. Instead,

Rosemary's agenda focused on getting acceptance that Dorothy had signed an agreement with Rosemary after the funding had been received, discussing the achievements of the project and finding out what the committee was going to do to continue the project after the CLT funding came to an end. The meeting itself was very heated with accusations on both sides. Rosemary accused Jessica of acting unprofessionally and shouting, whereas the committee members felt that Rosemary was dismissive and domineering, firstly through feeling it was her place to set the agenda, then by not being willing to discuss the committee's concerns during the meeting.

Rosemary's actions show a degree of assumed superiority due to having the professional field's habitus internalised. Due to her position as a professional working on the estate, Rosemary expected three things:

Firstly Rosemary felt that she could set the agenda, despite being invited rather than initiating the meeting. Rosemary's understanding of her status in relation to the residents was as someone in a more powerful position than them. When the committee members refused to follow her agenda, Rosemary saw their behaviour as unprofessional, rather than understanding that they felt her attempt to set the agenda was wrong.

Secondly, she believed that the residents who were acting in a voluntary capacity and in their spare time should still conform to professional rules when meeting with her. Therefore Rosemary expected to have an agenda that would be followed. Their failure to do so was considered unacceptable behaviour. However, the residents were used to meeting to discuss issues

without having a preset agenda, preferring to outline issues to be discussed at the start to ensure that those in attendance had their points covered. Even in the main monthly committee meetings where an agenda is emailed around in advance, residents would normally still bring their agenda items on the day. As the reasons why the meeting was called were well established, the committee thought that knowing a general purpose was enough to facilitate the meeting. In acting in this way, Rosemary had identified her way of working as superior. Rosemary's response below focused on the nonconformity to the rules of a professional field rather than the content of what was discussed.

Lastly, Rosemary's accusation of the committee members acting unprofessionally signalled her belief that a set protocol should have been followed and in not following it her and those of the lunch club whom she invited had their times wasted. She did not believe that insisting the residents follow her rules and her agenda was antagonistic or that her inviting lunch club goers to the meeting without prior notice was the cause of their wasted time.

After the meeting, both sides reverted to a very professionalised and non-relational approach to their partnership. The following evening the committee met to discuss what to do and asked James to send an email stating the committee's stance, which resulted in a flurry of email exchanges between him and Rosemary.

The residents' stance was that because no signed paperwork could be produced and that the committee was not involved in the project's

management, there were two possible ways forward as outlined in an email to CLT below:

> *We would like to develop a stronger partnership approach with you in relation to running the lunch club and feel that any partnership would need to be based on transparency and would therefore like to offer you the following options:*
>
> *The lunch club can sign an agreement with the committee and continue using the hall for free as part of a partnership initiative. This would include you sharing your initial funding agreements with the committee and have an open book approach to the accounts. We would also like to discuss your plans on how you will be training up residents to take over the project when the funding ends as we understand that this was part of the funding bid. The committee would like to support your plans in making this a reality.*
>
> *The second option is for you to hire the hall as a community user at a reduced rate and run the lunch club as your own initiative. In this case we wouldn't see the project as a partnership and there would be no need to share any funding or accounting information.*
>
> *The committee would very much like the first option to be taken, however feel that as you initiated the project you should be free to choose which option you would like to take.*
>
> (E-mail from James on behalf of the residents' committee to Rosemary CEO of CLT on 23.06.15)

This email above is one of the few examples the residents' committee employing the rules of the professional field successfully. Successful not because it strengthened relationships and brought about a positive working relationship, but successful because the committee achieved what they wanted as a result of using professional rules as a tactic to challenge a hierarchical position and gain some control. By the time they employed this tactic, the committee was not interested in rebuilding some form of amicable

working relationship but asserting its power. This stance was not surprising considering the use of the rules of the professional field in other situations can clearly be linked with the domination of professional organisations over the residents. The residents' committee was simply mirroring the behaviour that they had been the victims of. Unlike other situations where the residents' committee had been accused of acting in an unprofessional manner and therefore treated as inferior; here they displayed that they had learnt their lesson. The residents felt that Rosemary was not being transparent about the project's funding and wanted to employ a professional approach to either get Rosemary to submit to the committee's management through providing the project's financial data or secure some of the project's funding through charging to use the hall. The committee giving CLT options, despite the fact that they believed that CLT would not like any of them, gave the appearance of an olive branch while at the same time asserting the group dominance over the situation. This approach had been used against the committee in the past by both the council and Saplings by offering the committee various options all of which stripped the committee of the chance to gain the status they wanted.

Rosemary's initial response continued her belief in her professional superiority and accused the committee of behaving unacceptably in not following the 'rules of the game'. The email below clearly shows Rosemary's hierarchical stance.

> *Hello James*
> *Thank you for your message. I am sorry you were not able to attend.*

Unfortunately the meeting was inconclusive and most unsatisfactory.

In order to facilitate productive discussions and for lunch club members and volunteer to share their views on developing the club from 2016 and learn the committee's plans regarding the same I accordingly prepared a suitable agenda guided by the various previous emails as below. Disappointingly and unaccountably the committee officers present completely refused to follow this agenda claiming to have come to discuss other things.

When asked if they had brought an alternative agenda covering the topics that they thought they had come to discuss it transpired they had not done so.

It is astonishing that if the committee officers did indeed have particular topics to discuss they should have totally failed to prepare or bring any agenda of their own to offer the meeting attendees. Furthermore, it is inexplicable why in the absence of any agenda of their own these same officers also refused to follow the perfectly legitimate agenda which had been provided.

This behaviour was, to say the very least, highly unprofessional and in addition was very disrespectful towards the lunch club members and volunteers who had given their time to participate in a process that should have led to a shared consensus on the future of their club from 2016.

In the event the lunch club users' time had been completely wasted through the unwillingness of the committee officers to engage in constructive and sensible engagement with them or even to follow appropriate meeting protocol.

The lunch club members and volunteers will no doubt have their own observations on yesterday's display.
Best regards

Rosemary

(Email sent to James from Rosemary on 24.06.15)

Several other emails were sent back and forth with Rosemary sending six or so emails asking for clarification immediately after each time the committee's responded. The committee saw this as a stalling tactic

believing that Rosemary was trying to get the committee to not respond to an email, which could then be used as a reason for her not making a decision before the next lunch club was scheduled to take place. After the 6th such back and forth James replied that Rosemary should respect the fact that the residents are volunteers and put all her questions into one email so that they can respond once. After this, the questions stopped, and Rosemary informed the committee that CLT would like to enter a commercial relationship with the committee and pay for the hall.

The CLT confrontation was one of only a few occasions when the residents' committee adopted a professional approach and ended up achieving their desired outcome. It is worth having a closer look at this example and to find out why.

The partnership started with the committee taking a very relaxed relational approach to their work with CLT. Rosemary was invited to a meeting because Dorothy liked her and thought the committee and Rosemary would get on well together. Despite the initial niceties Rosemary's main motivation for being on the estate was the revenue that running a project would bring to her organisation; which had several implications for the partnership. Rosemary was solely on the estate in a professional capacity operating within the confines of a professional ethos in order to secure her desired outcome. Her position as a professional with the ability to set up and run a service made Rosemary associate herself with a position of superiority in relation to the residents. This thinking was reinforced by her proposal to train residents to be able to take over the project, assuming the residents did not

have these skills already.

The residents continued to operate within their preferred informal way when dealing with CLT occasionally adopting a professional stance without too much seriousness, for example issuing a contract without following it up to make sure it was signed. However, over time the residents realised that they had to operate more professionally to achieve their desired result. Their almost immediate switch to this approach was supported by two factors. Firstly, the committee no longer wanted an informal relationship with CLT and so felt under no obligation to be consolatory. Secondly, they had the upper hand in terms of resource capital. The committee had a lease on the hall and was responsible for who uses it and how much they should pay. The hard fought battle for the control of the hall had given the committee some leverage at last.

This account highlights power dynamics on the estate. The residents' committee, although starting to operate within the professional field, still were not proficient in its doxa and their default field was still informality. The residents' actions gave Rosemary the upper hand to install a professional process on the proceedings and shape things how she wanted. However, instead of the residents taking the subordinate position, they hit back. Initially, the residents' actions were unprofessional, which allowed Rosemary to claim that she was in the right. However, after the meeting, the residents responded to Rosemary using professional rules. The initial informal relational manner in which the committee related to Rosemary became one governed by contractual agreements. Realising Rosemary had

not signed a hall agreement gave the residents leverage, and they tactically used the rules of the professional field against her (Cvetičanin et al. 2014). This use of professionalism against Rosemary was not necessary a sign that this way of acting was going to be the committee's new default way of working. Instead, it was a tactical short term use of professional rules to get the upper hand (Cvetičanin et all 2014; Kärrholm 2007).

Summer Play Scheme

In early 2014 Dorothy approached James asking for help to apply for funding to set up a summer play scheme. There were two immediate options available. To seek up to £4000 from the council which involved a lengthy funding application that asked for the CVs and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) numbers of all staff and volunteers as well as to see a number of organisational policies. The second option was to apply for £10,000 from the lottery which had a much simpler application process. Given the fact that the residents' committee did not have any DBS checked volunteers nor did they know who would be working on the scheme, James opted to apply to the lottery. In June 2014 the committee heard back that they had been awarded £9600 for the play scheme. James sent around an email to the committee and Matt Worth, Peter the housing manager and two local counsellors sharing the good news. Despite their later admittance of surprise at the news, all the professionals emailed back their congratulations, all that is apart from Cllr Jacquie a staunch supporter of Saplings who just responded;

> *"I didn't think the residents' committee wanted to run youth activities on the estate."*

Jacquie's comment was a reference to the fact that the committee decided that after the experience of the Sapling's youth delivery they did not want a youth club on the estate as it was more negative to the young people than positive.

However, the play scheme was part of a wider residents' youth plan that the residents' committee had agreed a few months earlier that emphasised that their priority was to support residents getting to know the young people better rather than having youth activities that just worked with young people. When the idea was presented to the committee earlier on in the year, Cllr Jacquie called the plan mad, and both she and the resident participation officer commented that even the simple idea of ide encouraging residents to say hi to young people as they walked past each other would breach health and safety guidelines.

Once the funding was secured Dorothy and James went about putting a team together. Both wanted only residents to work and volunteer on the project as the whole idea behind the initiative was to help build relationships between different generations on the estate. James designed a job advert which he posted on the doors of all the blocks, from which he got one inquiry, and that was from someone he already knew. The most fruitful recruitment tool was the WhatsApp message James sent to a few mums on the estate telling them of a meeting taking place the next Tuesday evening.

At the first meeting, Dorothy and James were joined by Anne the participation officer and eight residents including Camille, Kate, Charis, Cecilia, Irene, Miche, Adalina, and Emre. Kate also brought along three of her friends, who lived off the estate. Within the space of a few days, the staff recruitment had been completed. At the meeting, a wage of £10 was suggested, which in subsequent weeks became £9 to allow for Kim's friends to move from being volunteers to paid staff. Some in the committee argued against paying the workers or simply paying minimum wage. However, Dorothy argued that people need paying and paying properly.

Dorothy's insistence on paying people for the work, despite Kofi's and other's resistance, was not just altruistic. It also signalled a conceding to the reality of the time. Kofi, Margerie, Grace and even Dorothy herself all recalled a time when residents would spend their time volunteering on the estate with no recompense. However, Dorothy who was the most active of that generation could see that times had changed. She often commented that people now could not be expected to help out for free as they have too many pressures on them. Dorothy's comments mirrored conclusions made by Ellison (2013) regarding thin time, but also Offer's (2012) analysis that highlighted that people from deprived areas struggle to afford to participate in these types of activities and often withdraw due to economic pressures (Offer 2012).

Dorothy's desire to pay residents to engage was the result of the culmination of a number of factors. Firstly, Dorothy spent more time than most with people on the estate listening to their problems and concerns. Dorothy's experience led her to understand the need that people had to earn some

271

money and as treasurer of the committee she saw a way to help them out. Even if it was a nominal amount, she felt that the committee should use their funds to help local people. This motivation in many respects aligns itself largely with the informal field with Dorothy's motivations being based on relational care and concern. However, Dorothy also recognised that people's attitude toward local life had changed and that the committee could no longer count on people giving their time for free. Dorothy's last motivation was more directly a result of the emergence of professionals on the estate. Dorothy was very vocal in arguing that if others were getting paid for their work on the estate, then residents should as well.

At the initial meeting Anne, the council's resident participation officer, raised the issue of how people should apply for the job, Dorothy and James had assumed that the group that came to the meeting would automatically be employed. However, to appease Anne, James suggested that people should to submit CVs and write a cover letter which would be assessed. Anne liked the idea however it was met with widespread rejection by the prospective staff members with Adelina raising the issue that she and some of the others around the table had been volunteering on the estate for years and it would be a kick in the teeth if they would then have to prove their worth to people. Kate and Camille, good friends with Adelina, backed this claim up saying that a more formal recruitment process could lead to people who have nothing to do with the residents' committee getting paid and those who are already engaged missing out. Despite being concerned with how Anne would take it, James agreed with Adelina, and a process was dropped.

On the way out Adelina thanked James for backing her point and criticised Anne for suggesting something different.

The informality of the recruitment process allowed the residents' committee and namely Dorothy to side step some legal and process motivated barriers to certain people getting involved. All the way through the first meeting one of the residents continually said that she is not worried about the pay or the recruitment process as she only wants to volunteer. After the meeting had formally finished James asked her why she does not want to get paid, to which she replied;

> *"You know my situation, man that is why I have to volunteer everywhere; I don't have my papers you know that."*
>
> (FNJ 24.06.14)

When James spoke with Dorothy about the issue as they were walking back to Dorothy's flat, she responded;

> *"People are really struggling, James, it's so tough for some people but tell her we don't worry about those things, we just need to do what we can to help people you know. People don't know what others are going through."*
>
> (FNJ 24.06.14)

Dorothy's position and caring nature mixed with the flexibility afforded to her in her position of committee treasurer meant that she was able to financially support those on the estate with whom she had a relationship with. In many respects, Dorothy was able to care for and provide opportunities for those that professional services couldn't or failed to.

One of the concerns for the project was around how people were to get their DBS check to allow them to work with the children. People were worried that unless checks were done quickly, no one would be able to be employed. Four of the group already had their checks through volunteering at a local children's centre, and Anne offered to get the council to DBS check those who needed one done, which unfortunately never happened. As a quick fix, the group agreed that those without DBS checks would be paired with those with them if the ones done by the council were not back in time.

The leniency around DBS checks was to prove crucial in the employment of one of the young people on the estate. Elizabeth and Charis both spoke to James about including David a 22 year old resident as one of the paid staff. David had grown up on the estate and had spent a short time in prison for dealing class A drugs. Due to their closeness with David, Charis and Elizabeth wanted to help David get his foot on the job ladder and not have to rely on dealing to get money. They were concerned that if he got a DBS check done by the council, his criminal record would mean that he would not be able to be involved, not because of his convictions but because of how it may look to the council. James agreed to chat with David, whom he knew well from David's days as a football player and then trainee coach to work out a way forward. After talking with David and recognising his convictions would not pose any threat but also seeing David's apprehension, James agreed that he should not be DBS'd and said that we could make some excuse up about his ID if anyone asked. David turned out to be a hit with the staff and the young people running football and dodgeball sessions in the caged pitch area of the estate. However, his involvement

was not without its issues. Dorothy, who supported the idea of helping David, had to tell him off a bit in the first week of the project as he was on his phone a lot and his friends came to chill out with him while he was working. Dorothy did raise concerns that she thought he was still up to something. However, she appreciated that things changed after the first week.

In the build up to the summer holidays, the group met weekly discussing the rules and the structure of the programme, most of which were decided fairly quickly. Once the Tuesday to Friday from 3pm to 7pm timing was set, staff were asked to go away and plan activities that they could run complete with a list of materials that they would need. The ideas were then turned into a timetable, and staff allocated to activities and the spaces where the sessions would run. The activities included photography ran by Emre, T-shirt design ran by Miche, and a number and sports and arts and craft activities. There was a plan to have a BBQ every Friday which parents would be invited to, however after it was raining much of the first week the 'ladies', as the staff became known, decided to change this to oven pizza which set the standard for the whole project and a BBQ never materialised.

There were calls for the project to start and finish later as one of the major reasons for running the scheme was to keep the young people engaged late into the evening. However, Kate led the calls to finish earlier as her and the other mums needed to get home to make dinner so running the activities too late into the evening would preclude them from helping out.

The group got paid cash every Friday which meant Dorothy had to go to the bank in the morning to withdraw the wage that each person was due. Dorothy knew that the paying of cash was not necessarily the right thing to do however she was happy to go along with the cash payments as all but one of the women were either unemployed or had term time only contracts as play assistants in local primary schools so had to go through the summer without a wage.

Holding that much cash in the building did cause concern, and on the Friday of the third week, £200 was stolen. Dorothy decided to keep the issue quiet. Although she felt very let down, she put the incident down to the fact that some of the ladies needed support to understand how to conduct themselves properly, and accusing people would not help anyone.

Working in such a semi-formal did have its difficulties. As eight of the group were mums it was agreed that they could bring their children to the meetings, however, after the second meeting, even the mums were complaining that the kids were slowing their progress down. This issue was never really resolved, and it remained an accepted annoyance throughout the planning stage.

Trisha and Nicole, two of Kate's friends, fell out one weekend and continued their argument at one of the meetings and had to be held apart to stop them from coming to blows. However, by the next week, they both had apologised to each other and the group and things were back to its friendly nature. Trisha and Nicole's behaviour seemed to be the norm throughout the project with staff members more than the children, falling out with each other for a

couple of days before things blew over. To help resolve these matters Dorothy seemed to use her wisdom and had quiet words with people more like a caring grandmother than a boss.

This informal manner of the project did get questioned from within a few times. One such instance was around the plan of having estate wardens who would be attached to the project but not be responsible for any activities. These wardens would be located in the areas where young people tended to gather in the school holidays, such as Turner Park and the football pitch just to add an adult presence and be on hand if anything untoward happened. Irene, a retired accountant in her late 60s, was concerned that the group would need to get parental consent for everyone in the park or pitch to do that. Charis argued that this would not be the case because the idea was not to run activities with them or not to take responsibility for the young people but to just be around. Charis commented that this was how Elizabeth and she started the original youth project years ago. After listening to Irene's concerns, some of the other staff members asked not to be a warden over concern that a parent might see a warden talking to their child and 'kick off'. In the end, only Charis opted to be a warden stationing herself in Turner Park for the four weeks of the project. As many of the young people attending the scheme knew her already through her children and grandchildren, a large number opted to go to the park with Charis, and this became an official space of the project.

On the first day of the project, 38 children signed up leaving Dorothy and Irene the two coordinators concerned that they would end up being overrun by children, particularly since promotion had only been through word of

mouth. Dorothy in wanting to do things properly insisted that signed consent was received for all young people, including consent that they could go home on their own. The latter led to many young people being kept in after the activities finished while Dorothy and Charis tried to get hold of parents, who had not picked up their child.

By all accounts, the first week went well from a participants' point of view. However, there were complaints about the way Dorothy was running the project. Irene, after the first couple of days, had conceded that she could not work alongside Dorothy as Dorothy wanted to do things her own way. However, despite openly stating such continued to support the project over the next few years. Dorothy under pressure from the sheer busyness and keen to ensure that the council thought the project went well, started to see suggestions from others as criticism.

Much of the concern was channelled through Elizabeth via Charis, with Elizabeth calling for a meeting to take place on the Monday before the start of the second week's activities. Dorothy objected to Elizabeth's involvement which she saw as interference and refused to go to the meeting. Elizabeth then emailed James a potential agenda and asked him to chair the meeting, despite James not being involved in the day to day running of the project. James called Dorothy to ask her to come to a meeting however she refused and inferred that any meeting would be undermining her leadership. James, therefore, decided to meet Charis, Miche, Kate and Camille in the park to have an informal discussion to try and keep both Elizabeth and Dorothy happy.

Despite the urgency in the tone of Elizabeth's email, the actual detail was not that concerning to an outsider looking in. Most of the points related to needing a system for ensuring all staff pull their weight and that there were contingencies in place in case it rains. The issue of fairness of workload and pay became an increasing issue throughout the life of the project. Nicole, one of Kate's friends, was regularly accused of spending her time looking after her own children and not helping others out. Dorothy saw the issue and was concerned but was reluctant to discipline her. Instead, Dorothy commented that she would rather take Nicole under her wing so that in a couple of years Nicole would be able to function as a proper employee. Kate and Miche, who cooked the pizzas on the first Friday wanted to be paid more for taking on the cooking responsibility, their rationale being that as the project was saving money by not having a BBQ, this should be passed on to them.

The project ran under budget during the first year, mainly due to the staff working harder for less, and Dorothy decided that the remaining budget should be used to subsidise a day trip to Butlins and gave Kate and Miche the responsibility of organising this.

As part of the process, Dorothy agreed to meet with Kate and Miche every Monday evening for progress updates and to troubleshoot issues. For years Dorothy had organised the estate summer trip to the seaside and so had lots of experience and knew exactly what to do. However, as she explains;

> *"I cannot go on doing this all my life so now I have to think about the future, so if I can train up Kate and Miche to do this, then they can take on other things in the future. Hopefully, Charis can*

start to take on more so she can take over the play schemes in a few years. I just want them to do well for themselves and the estate, that's why I do this."

(FNJ 15.09.14)

The Monday evening catch ups normally involved Kate getting to Dorothy's on time and Dorothy listening to Kate's worries about her personal life and plans for the future and Dorothy giving advice and support where she could. Miche would join them 30 to 45 minutes late. Once Miche got there they would go through who had signed up, who had paid their £10 (the fee Dorothy had placed on attending the trip), and what needed to be in place before the day of the trip. However, the informality of the meetings gave room for new ideas to come up.

Dorothy kept the Monday evening meetings going looking to impart her knowledge and ethos to new people while at the same time supporting them to progress in their own life. During their time together, Kate started talking about her experience of volunteering at a children's centre that her son used to go to. With Dorothy's mindset, a new project was born. Kate and Miche were to set up a stay and play project for parents with toddlers in Centenary Hall. Before long Kate and Miche had the contact details of 40 mums who were interested in attending and Dorothy used her influence to get the residents' committee to back the idea. Kate contacted the primary school where she used to volunteer to see if they could help in any way. Initially, they were interested in working in partnership with Kate and co however as the talks progressed the partnership became a loaning of toys for the scheme. Dorothy felt annoyed by the school as after a few meetings the

school mentioned that they were changing their stay and play to a Thursday, the day that Kate had originally planned for her group. Dorothy felt that the school was trying to go in direct competition with what was planned on the estate. The school's reason was far more innocent; their volunteer coordinator was no longer available on a Wednesday. Despite this, Dorothy still felt aggrieved.

To bring the small hall where the stay and play would be located up to the standard that the school felt comfortable with Dorothy asked James to get his youth construction training programme to do some minor repairs on the floor and paint the room to freshen it up. Dorothy ideally wanted an extension built on the building so that there could be a staff area and some additional storage, however, settled for a garden shed to store the group's equipment.

In a similar way to the BBQs and Mary's garden, the play scheme acted as a catalyst for the development of friendships between Dorothy, Kate, and Miche. Their friendship combined with Dorothy's mentoring led to a new project. Dorothy's belief in and commitment to Kate and Miche resulted in obligations between them that meant Miche and Kate wanted to develop the project for free.

In January 2015 Kate and Miche started their project. The stay and play was slow in taking off with three or four parents coming each week. However, by 2016, this number had grown, and the project was widely known to new mums in the area.

Two years on and the play scheme is also still going, with many of the same women still involved and the project is funded by the income from the hall hire. The numbers had reduced by the third year owing to Saplings running a programme at the same time at the APG a hundred yards away that included days out to go-karting tracks and other activities that children found more exciting. Saplings had contacted the committee to find out when their scheme would run to try and ensure that they ran at different times, however, neither group was willing to change their scheduled times, so both ran simultaneously.

The motivations and desired outcomes from the play scheme and the Saplings Project outlined in chapter four highlights the difference between the professional and informal field. Both saw popularity, albeit quantified differently, as a measure of success. Whereas adherence to restrictive recruitment processes was an essential component of the Samplings' project, the play scheme was deliberately used to strengthen adult friendship networks, financially reward residents with a track record of getting involved in estate activities and support friends who needed help with employment. Within the informal field, rules and regulation are secondary to people's needs.

However, this support only happened because the residents had gained control of vital capital in the form of the funding and the management of Centenary Hall. Control of this capital allowed the activities not to be totally governed by the notion of abstract space (Lefebvre 2003; Steinmetz 2011) of the professional field, giving the committee the power to decide the direction for the project. This power was seen when Anne enquired about

the recruitment process. Initially, the previous power dynamics could be seen in James' response with him willing to implement something that Anne would consider professional. However, ownership of the capital and space needed for the project to take place meant that such concessions were not required.

The delivery was not without its problems. The most common response to Dorothy's commitment and generosity was a reciprocal care where those involved in the project went over and above and did more hours than they were paid for, all except Nicole. Nicole was regularly criticised for not pulling her weight with arguments ensuing. There was a sense that Nicole was not reciprocating to the degree that is required of her and the exchange was unbalanced (Sahlins 1972) leading to other staff members complaining and believing that they should receive more pay than her.

However, the field of operation was not solely informal; there were various characteristics of the professional field embedded in the play scheme' practice. Firstly, the fact that the staff were being paid influenced the dynamics of the role. The earlier Charis and Elizabeth run youth project was run voluntarily and designed to give the young people supervision when they most needed it, whereas the times of the current service delivery incarnation were set to suit the staff that simply saw the project as work that needed to fit around their own schedule. As such although the staff were interested in supporting the young people, this interest only stretched to the extent that their paid role demanded, there was no wider interaction with the young people or their parents. As a result, the project failed to develop any long lasting estate based networks that would improve collective efficacy

and neighbourhood social control that could lead young people away from anti-social and criminal activities. The possibility of this occurring was further reduced by the fact that by the second project, during the following Easter holiday, five of the staff members were friends of Kate and Miche, but from off the estate, and the only reason for them to come onto the estate was to go to work.

The formality of the sign up process may have impacted on the engagement with parents also. Previous resident run youth delivery often relied on phone conversations and bumping into parents to pass on messages or get consent; the current delivery relied on young people collecting a form for their parents to fill out and bring back. Although the latter was more risk adverse in terms of providing the right legal requirements, it did nothing to support interaction between residents and staff.

The project supported young people up to year seven as the committee wanted to bring some positive influence in their lives in the knowledge that this group could be easily influenced by older groups over the summer. The residents chose not to engage with the older group as they felt that what they could offer would not interest them. Carr (2003) in his ethnographic study of Chicago's Beltway recalled something similar in that it was commonplace for younger children to be supervised by adults in the neighbourhood, whereas when they got to their teenager years, people tended to leave them to their own devices.

This configuration thus left the teenagers on the estate without any adult supervision while they were out over the summer months. At the same time,

the younger children were being let out of the summer play scheme at a time when the estate was mostly populated with the older groups. In this sense, although the project did give some supervision to certain young people, the straddling of the informal and formal fields did not meet its goal of wanting to ensure the younger age group were kept from the influence of the older young people during the holidays.

Although the project helped develop friendships among staff resulting in new projects, the residents' committee's new ideas for supporting young people have, so far, failed to develop the type of neighbourhood control and collective efficacy that it has set out to achieve.

Summary

This chapter helps to understand how the surviving aspects of the informal field with its more relational approach to tackling issues can and do achieve what the introduction of the professional field was meant to accomplish. The importance of the informal field is apparent in the garden project and the support that was given to Mary and Duarte. However, it is very apparent that this and other such examples are very individual in character.

When the residents tried to employ the same relational approach on a larger scale, with the summer play scheme, the results were mixed. The ownership of their own capital in the form of funding and the management of Centenary Hall allowed them to continue to act within the informal field and rebuff some attempts to adopt professional rules. However, although this did allow relationships and obligatory support to form, the fact that the relational network from which staff members were drawn was geographically sparse

meant that the project could not develop any of the long term neighbourhood social controls that it initially sought to do.

However, the data also showed how the adoption of the rules of the professional field is not always a disempowering experience, and we see how the residents' committee can utilise them to change hierarchical relationships to regain control in certain situations.

The accounts above indicate that a new hybrid field may be developing in regard to the resident's committee's actions. In the case of the disagreement with CLT, the committee used the rules of the professional field as a tactic to control a particular situation. However, with the play scheme, there was a clear mixing of the rules of both the professional and informal fields. Field hybridisation could only be achieved because the residents' committee had access to the financial and material capital needed to control their activities. This power enabled them the freedom to operate in the way that allowed them to both support residents and friends in a manner that they saw fit and run a successful play scheme. Although this process also successfully led to additional projects developing that engaged some residents, the projects have failed to protect younger children from the negative influence of older young people hanging around on the estate. There is, at present, also little evidence that this hybrid way of working will help create the types of friendship networks that will help develop neighbourhood social controls. However, it may be too early to say whether this will develop in the future.

Chapter 8: Discussion

Throughout the project, I have considered the development and the influence that different ways of interacting have played on the activities that take place on the estate. The research identified three fields, which instead of being separate and self-standing had an impact on each other. Although it was beyond the scope of this project, it is worth noting that the fields discussed, as well as being influenced by local events and political decisions, were also shaped by wider socio-economic circumstances. As such the fields identified were both structured and structuring, as well as being a structuring structure themselves (Bourdieu 1990). For example, the informal field, which had governed activities on the estate for decades had become weaker due to wider social and economic structures (Bauman 2000, 2000b, 2007; Beck 2002; Standing 2011). This change influenced how people behaved on the estate, which in turn influenced the development of new fields.

The weakening influence of this field had led to the slow emergence of a youth field that had its own rules on what was considered acceptable behaviour. A group of committed residents worked to gain back some influence over the young people by running a youth club based on the rules of the informal field. They were attempting to strengthen the existing friendships between people which they understood were previously a major influence on young people. The club helped forge relationships between young people in attendance and the few residents who got involved, however, no wider supportive network emerged. The adult residents who volunteered did so in relative isolation and their influence and actions,

although appreciated by the young people and their parents, were not enough to abate the negativity surrounding the young people and their activities.

As the issues surrounding the young people became more serious the local authority sought to address the issue, initially through moving an existing commissioned gang intervention service on to the estate and then by commissioning an estate specific service. The council were committed to channeling their resources into addressing the developing youth issue.

The professional commissioned services brought with them rules of engagement, in essence, a new field of operation. The hope was that more skilled support would better divert the young people away from criminal activity.

The addition of professional youth workers was not taken as positively as the council had hoped. The residents who were currently supporting the young people saw it as somewhat of an imposition. One of the council's aims was to use the injection of trained workers to capacity build the residents, who would eventually be able to run their own services in a more professional manner than before. However, a mixture of trying to force the residents to accept an inferior position and the reinforcing of this stance by service delivers such as Saplings, led to even the most committed residents disengaging from the process. There was little or no room for the residents' informal way of working and therefore, the residents involved felt there was little room for them.

The youth activities were the first of several council initiated activities aimed at providing professional support to the estate. However, like the youth activities before them, they largely failed to engage with residents.

Although this process did not get the desired response from those on the estate that the council wanted, the economic capital behind the projects positioned a professionalised approach as superior. Residents' committee members found themselves becoming less and less in control of what happened on their estate as paid workers started to make more of the decisions. In an attempt to reassert some of their authority the residents sought to assimilate elements of the professional field into their own practices.

As such the spaces and services delivered on the estate became increasingly governed by professional rules and procedures, either being controlled by professionals directly or through the hybridising of the informal and the professional by the residents' committee. As a consequence, the relationship building aspects of activities were considered less important than more procedural and process elements of service delivery.

However, instead of effectively addressing issues such as the deviant behaviour of young people the problems continued to get worse. The popularity of the services increased the numbers of young people, whist disengaging the already active residents. This resulted in the further isolation of both adult residents and youths. The commissioned services were structured, budgeted and ran in a more professional way that assured the council that their money was being spent appropriately and effectively.

However, the way they were implemented and positioned as the sole way of dealing with issues on the estate, unfortunately, shut down any alternative measure.

The three components of strong informal relationships, robust and engaged local organisations and good links with statutory services as outlined in the work of Hunter (1985) and then developed by others such as, Bursik and Grasmick (1993) and Sampson and Groves (1989), all seemed to work against rather than complement each other in this situation. The positioning of professional services as the best way to deal with issues on the estate weakened rather than strengthened the informal activity on the estate. Whilst the residents' resistance to and disengagement from this intervention, in reality, saw the vital elements needed for effective neighbourhood social control battling against each other. The rejection of the resident's approach and their rejection of this more formal approach led to a further separation between the adults and young people. The failure to connect with local people meant that the professional services, by and large, withdrew from the estate within a couple of years of first engaging.

The chance for a more integrated support structure where the residents and professionals appreciated the benefits of different approaches was lost. Despite the residents taking on some of the characteristics of the professional field there was never a sense that the different groups were willing to work together or even admit that they needed each other to be successful.

However, despite the failure of the multiple initiatives and long after all the professionals and professional groups in this study have left the estate, there is still a group of residents volunteering on the estate. They have negotiated a hybrid position that has tried to merge the formal and informal. In developing this new approach, the residents' committee took the decision to focus its efforts in supporting primary school children, rather than once again attempting to tackle the issues relating to the behaviour of young people on the estate. As a consequence, the young people hanging around on the estate are still left largely isolated.

The continuing separation between young people and adult residents has seen the youth field developing into a street field (Bourgios 2003, Fleetwood 2014, Fraser and Atkinson 2014; Harding 2013, Ilan 2013, Shammas and Sandberg 2016, Sandberg 2008, 2012). Hyper masculine activities such as street violence, drug dealing and t advantage of women not only increased but became habitus (Wacquant 2000) and capital (Sandberg 2008).

With a more collaborative approach, an alternative scenario for young people may have been possible. However, the forceful and disempowering way that the council's strategy was introduced on to the estate and the resulting battle for control meant that too much effort and resources were spent on each side trying to prove their way of operating posed the best opportunity to resolve the issues of youth deviance at the expense of the young people themselves. What is left is a residents committee that is in the process of developing a hybrid culture that has tried to combine elements of a professional approach, with elements of an informal way of working. However, as the more formal side takes hold, more and more of their

previous relational approach is being lost. The residents are operating in this way largely without the support of outside organisations who have disengaged. Potentially a more effective approach could have been a greater acknowledgement of the benefits of both approaches and a recognition that both resident and professional efforts were needed to develop the social control mechanisms that were evidently needed.

In describing the processes above, the research project tracked the localised decisions and events that influenced social dynamics that led to three distinct fields emerging. Chapter four initially took a historical approach to understand public life on the estate and outlined how the public activities and supportive interaction of the 1980s and 1990s all took place within an informal relational field. The structured activities consisted of a youth club, various social and welfare activities, a volunteer run advice centre and two summer play schemes. Some of these activities had paid staff from the council, while others were less structured and solely involved residents, usually parents, extending the support they offered to their family out to their neighbours. For example, Barb's support of her daughter and her daughter's friends and Elizabeth's alternative school come advice centre, both running out of their respective homes. In these instances, the main driving force behind the activities was residents' care for each other.

These activities could get considerable numbers of residents engaged because they could take part on their terms. Relationships rather than professional expertise were the qualifying marker for engagement. These activities took place outside of people's working life and as such engaging in an informal socialising way seemed normal. This way of interacting led to

friendship networks developing across the estate, which had a big influence on the behaviour of young people.

These relationships produced reciprocity akin to what was described by Sahlins (1972) in his theory of generalised reciprocity. Connectedness produced an unconscious obligation (Bourdieu 2013); for the adults, this led them to support the young people and intervene regarding their behaviour if they thought it was unacceptable. For the young people, this meant behaving in ways that were respectful of the values of the adults around them. As these informal relationships broke down and the friendship networks across the estate wore thin, nothing replaced them. In the gap that emerged young people started to find the freedom to develop their own social norms.

Charis, Elizabeth, and James attempted to deal with the growing deviant behaviour through running a project with the aim of re-establishing the supportive networks that were previously present on the estate. Although their project, was led by residents in a largely informal way it failed to attract significant numbers of parents and so support was limited. As a result, young people's behaviour continued along its deviant path.

The actions of the young people gained increased interest from the local authority, who in 2011 used their capital to place additional resources on the estate in an attempt to tackle the young people's behaviour more effectively. Local people's involvement to address social issues was still seen as crucial (Marinetto 2003), yet the council were keen to control what this participation looked like.

The council's involvement on the estate changed the dominant field from the informal to the professional over a significantly short space of time. The council believed that their professional approach to project delivery and finding solutions to issues was preferable and that those who operated professionally were better placed than the residents to deliver what the estate needed. The chapter then tracked how the way in which services on the estate changed from an informal relationship style to a more professional transactional contract based approach.

There was an attempt to bring some order to the estate by reconstructing support activities using a professional blueprint, which brought with it new rules, procedures, and hierarchies (Bourdieu 2003). Due to the differences in how the council, Saplings, and residents saw the issues relating to young people, there seemed to be little space for negotiation. The commissioners and Saplings believed that the best way forward was for the youth work to be taken on by trained professionals and if residents wanted to get involved they had to under conditions agreed by Saplings. This new field meant that the habitus and networks of the engaged residents that once was so dominant lost most of their value. In response, instead of seeing the council's involvement as a welcomed support, it was largely received as unwelcomed attention. Both these stances made it clear early on that there was to be no collaboration or merging of ideas. However, the power dynamic meant that public life on the estate became an arena of domination creating a new hierarchical order in the process (Swartz 1997). A new set of rules was introduced by people that operated with a different habitus which determined what was considered the most effective way of getting things

done (Bottero 2010; Decoteau 2015; Oliver and O'Reilly 2010; Steinmetz 2011).

These new rules and procedures included a preferencing of qualifications and professional experience over local relationships. At a managerial level, this meant those with bridging social capital connecting them with local politicians and holders of economic capital became more important than decision makers with on the ground connections.

This change brought with it different expectations on what was acceptable. Charis, Elizabeth and James' care towards the young people; their desire to connect personally and build relationships with them and their families was considered outdated. Commitment, longevity and the willingness to shape your personal life to support young people meant nothing in the face of the rules of the professional game. Residents who were once the go to people on the estate for organising new initiatives and for dealing with youth issues now found themselves sidelined in both. The ways of the informal field that made residents talk of the young people on the estate as 'theirs' was problematic as they stood in contradistinction to what the professional field required.

A new hierarchy emerged with professionally connected managers on top and those who arguably had the most invested through their emotional and social relationship with the estate, at the bottom. In the middle were the staff members whom the management placed on the estate to do what was contractually agreed to carry out. In this sense, the new professional field acted to shape what activities took place and who carried them out. The

desire to assert professional solutions as the way to address the social issues on the estate closed off any alternative. There seemed to be a reluctance to accept any part of the residents' way of doing things on behalf of the professionals and the residents had no desire to learn from and be a part of something they saw as disempowering.

The successive professional youth provision, culminating in the Saplings' delivery were measured against different delivery targets than the previous resident run projects. Numbers rather than relationships or behavioural change became the measure of success. However, with every new young person attracted to the estate, which was evidence that the professional service was successful, the chance for meaningful relationships between young people and adult residents moved further and further away.

As delivering services were an integral part of resident relationship building in the past, their exclusion precluded the development of friendships and informal support for young people.   This distance between the adult residents and young people resulted in the residents seeing the young people through the lens that was given to them by the council and other professionals rather than from direct personal experience.

Field was a useful concept in considering the change that occurred on the estate for the following reasons. Firstly, it allowed for a historical perspective to be taken. What happened on the estate both in the changing of the fields and within the fields themselves have a historical dimension that needed to be considered if we were to fully understand what happened (Bourdieu 2013; Oliver et al. 2010). Secondly, field as concept uncovered the

hierarchy that emerged when the dominant habitus changed. The new players on the scene established a new field and with it a new superior habitus that governed what professionals should prioritise and how people were to act towards each other. The professional field's domination also meant the acceptance of the field's narrative of the young people as a risk to be managed. As a consequence, a process that was meant to provide additional support to the estate and establish some form of localised social control further dampened the embers of a care based relational approach that had already been struggling to stay alight.

Chapter five started by discussing two council initiatives aimed at engaging residents in activities that would develop their professional acumen. The idea was to initiate new projects that would attract and train new volunteers who would add to the estate's capacity as well as build their own human capital. There was a recognition that residents could and should play a role in improving the estate. However, to be an effective force there needed to be more residents active on the estate, and crucially for the council, they needed to be adequately trained (Andreassen et al. 2014; Evetts 2011, 2013).

However, these initiatives failed to attract new resident volunteers and their approach did not connect with existing active residents either. Those initiating the new activities were doing so as part of a paid position and had to meet targets, deadlines and stay within agreed processes. Resident activities, although taken seriously, were often of a social nature and once again, although the antagonisms of the youth delivery were not present, the two styles were at odds with one another. For example, Val failed to

recognise that the resident's committee desire for her to come to more meetings was an attempt to build a relationship with her. In the professional field that Val was operating in, the residents' committee's only purpose was to approve the poly tunnel proposal using the information she had already provided. From a professional perspective, it did not make sense for Val to once again speak to a group when they already had the necessary information.

However, although the council commissioned projects failed to engage residents, the aim of developing the residents' professional acumen started to be realised. Largely due to the residents feeling that they had been made to feel inferior leading to a desire to prove their worth, the committee started to copy some of the actions of the paid organisations (Mckenzie 2015; Sanli 2011). After Saplings stopped running the youth activities from Our Place the committee had the chance to use the building and run youth activities themselves again. However, they declined the opportunity, this time agreeing with the council assessment that they were not able to deal with the young people on the estate. Instead, they hired out the building to Oak Training, a professional educational organisation. The agreement was the residents' first forays into trying to initiate and manage professional activities themselves. However, they did so seeing themselves as the inferior party. Despite the committee being the landlord in this situation, they assumed a subordinate role in the relationship. Oak Training received a reduced rent for hiring particular rooms during week days, which soon became the whole building seven days a week due to their complaints about others using the building alongside them. In return, the committee got none of the benefits

included in Oak Training's proposal which was meant to be part of the reciprocal partnership for receiving the reduced hire fee.

New to the professional ways of working, the residents' committee felt unable to challenge Oak Training as they were unsure of their standing or how to apply the rules of the game. Adama from Oak Training's insistence that she could not give out the key codes to the locks that she had put on the doors due to her insurance requirements was met a muted response. No one was willing to challenge Adama for effectively locking the committee out of rooms in its own building without permission.

Despite some initial opposition, the constant reinforcement of the message that professionals and their way of doing things were superior was internalised by the residents, and their subordinate position seemed natural (Bourdieu 2000; von Holdt 2012; Wacquant 2013). Even when in positions where the residents should have had the upper hand, this was not realised often leading to those in professional positions disregarding the requests of, or agreements made with residents.

However, the residents did take a far firmer stance in their battle to manage Centenary Hall. The resident committee was adamant that they and not a professional organisation should run the hall otherwise there would be no opportunity for the space to be used to cultivate relationships on the estate. After a relentless battle for control over the building, that included the council constantly stating that Saplings should run the building and only when all other options failed, the residents' committee were given the chance to manage the hall.

However, the internalisation of the inferiority of their methods coupled with the desire to be respected led to the residents adopting a more professional approach to managing the building, than many of the committee members had originally envisioned. In the initial months of their control when a hall coordinator was yet to be appointed, Dorothy offered favourable hall hire deals with people she wanted to help. However, it was apparent that although Dorothy was trying to operate in the informal field and use the building to develop relationships through reciprocally obligatory exchange, those who benefited from Dorothy's generosity were only interested in a contractually transactional exchange. None of the extremely generous agreements with local organisations including; the local church that moved from Our Space, CLT who used the hall for free, or the young people whom she let use the building for next to nothing for children's parties and christenings, produced the type of reciprocal relationship that Dorothy had hoped. Dorothy was trying to make deals out of her care for others and was taken advantage of by those wanting to operate with a professional transactional ethos; resulting in negative reciprocity.

The dynamic changed when Francesca, a resident with a business background, was hired as the building's coordinator. All hirers were given contracts to sign, and the reduction in hirer's fees was phased out. Francesca managed to improve the hall's income by increasing the numbers of private hire functions and regular user bookings, none of which did anything to build relationships on the estate. In so doing, the residents' committee's management of the hall ended up largely reflecting what they had fought so hard to resist.

Chapter six discussed how the isolation felt by the young people on the estate due to changing social interaction influenced their behaviour. It does this through contrasting the experiences of the support that different generations growing up on the estate received. The chapter started by outlining the impact that informal relationships, especially parental friendships had on past generations of young people. The estate was a system of friendship and kinship networks that were able to support the social development of the young people (Bellair 1997, Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Carr 2003; Cantillon et al. 2003; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974).

The closeness of these relationships and the obligations that stemmed from them (Bourdieu 2003) produced a form of closure (Coleman 1988), with the adult's networks being one of the biggest influences on the young people's behaviour (Oberwitter 2004b).

As these networked relationships dwindled and the residents' attempts to reignite them by running a youth project failed to curb the young people's behaviour, the council sought for new initiatives to address the youth deviance. However, the local authority's plan overlooked the role that informal connections once played. Instead of meaningfully engaging with the residents to find a solution, the council staff opted to commission an organisation from off the estate to work with the young people. By the end of the provision's funding, the numbers of non-resident young people hanging around on the estate had increased dramatically, and even the most supportive of residents had given up hope of developing relationships that could once again shape young people's behaviour.

There was an offer for residents to become volunteers within the new service, but the devaluing nature of the process meant the offer was never taken up. As a result, resident engagement with the young people all but ended. The additional young people who were attracted to the estate due to the project made developing obligatory relationships all the more difficult. If informal resident relational networks, involvement of good local organisations and close ties to the authorities such as the police and local council are all needed to provide effective neighbourhood social controls (Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Hunter 1985; Sampson and Groves 1989), this study would suggest that, when done in the wrong way, increasing the presence of local organisations can damage informal relationships. Despite the best efforts of a few committed residents and then the council and professional youth workers, the young people became more isolated. After the ending of the commissioned youth provision, young people were left with nearly no positive interaction with adult residents.

Only two people continued to have any significant contact with young people on the estate, James, and Lino due to their involvement in the St Mary's Football project. However, as these connections were not part of a wider network of informal support, their support was not enough to shape young people's behaviour away from criminal activity.

Depending on the closeness of their relationship with Lino and James, some young people tried with limited success to hide their behaviour, while others asked for advice and help from Lino and James when they got into trouble. Without the networked support that was once present but had been disappearing for some time (Bellair 1997; Fischer 1982; Sampson 2009;

Wellman 1979), the existing relationships were not robust enough to provide effective neighbourhood social control (Bursik 1999; Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Carr 2003 Kingston et al. 2009).

Devoid of the influence of adult relationships, young people have become increasingly influenced by their peers (Warner and Rountree 1997). As a result, a street field (Bourgios 2003, Fleetwood 2014, Fraser and Atkinson 2014; Harding 2013, Ilan 2013, Shammas and Sandberg 2016, Sandberg 2008, 2012) has taken a hold in the lives of the young people who hung around on the estate. Within this environment, criminal behaviour has become normalised with young people seeing it as a legitimate way to earn money, pass the time and fit in with friends.

This culture led to successive groups of young people seemingly increase their deviance as they each became accustomed to antisocial behaviour due to hanging around with those slightly older than them. The young people's choices about criminal activities were influenced by those immediately around them, and as such the greater the connection that young people had with other deviant young people the more normalised deviant behaviour became (Becker 1968; Mehlkop and Graeff 2010).

Those who were classed by the adults as the original group of olders were content with dealing weed and getting involved in low-level anti-social behaviour. However, they were an influence on those a few years their younger who wanted to imitate their actions. As each new group emerged, they became accustomed to deviant behaviour at a younger age than those whom they followed. The earlier criminal activity became normalised in

youth peer groups; the more serious their criminal activity became as they got older. By the end of the research, the estate had seen three groups of olders with a 4th transitioning to take over this position. Whereas the first set of elders were known to deal weed, commit fraud and become violent on occasion, the fourth group were dealing crack and heroin and were both victims and perpetrators of gun and knife crime. As young people were attracted to the estate, initially by the various incarnations of professional youth activities, this peer influence increased. Different groups of olders noticed this criminal progression and commented on how the behaviour of their youngers shocked them.

The data discussed in chapter six shows a considerable difference in the experiences of support and the associated feeling of obligation among the different generations of young people. Whereas past generations growing up on the estate felt supported by and obligated to adult residents, often because these same residents were either friends with their parents or volunteered on the estate with their parents, the current groups of young people have grown up without any such network of care. As a result, there is a distinct lack of collective efficacy (Sampson and Groves 1989) and primordial socialisation (Coleman 1988) that would have helped to steer young people away from criminal activity. When reflecting on this, young people realised that something was missing and even commented that they felt they must be doing something wrong if adults living locally could help were not doing so. Some of the respondents also felt that they missed out on the support that was on offer because the lack of trust between themselves and those offering the support meant they were reluctant to take

up the offers. The introduction of professional youth workers was meant to improve the support young people received, firstly by ensuring qualified practitioners rather than nonprofessionals were working with the young people and secondly by capacity building interested residents so they can run a professionalised service themselves in the future. Instead, this process further isolated young people and residents and arguably had a negative rather than a positive impact on their behaviour.

Chapter seven outlined the signs of the residents' resistance against but also coexistence with a more professionalised way of working. The activities that resisted the professionalisation process were often organised by those who were either on the periphery of the residents' committee or not engaged with them at all. Mary's work on the garden could only continue as it did because she and others involved in the various gardening projects decided to reject calls to embrace the professional field. They could do this as they were operating effectively already and didn't need anything that being more professional may have to offer. Marcia's BBQs, although attended by committee members, were always organised without the involvement of the committee. The informality of the BBQs meant that they were initially a place for relationships to form. The BBQs allowed Marcia to meet Honour and her husband Ray, who in turn met and supported Marcia's son.

The BBQs and gardening project also show the limitations of the contemporary informal field as although they did support the development of relationships which saw residents help one another, these instances were isolated and not widespread enough to bring about neighbourhood social control. These activities relied on individual residents organising and taking

part in them, and as with other past informal activities, the numbers of those who participated were dwindling. With the right support, informal relationships that influence the behaviour of people in the way that Sampson (1997; 1999) and others have previously commented about can develop. However, as these relationships are decreasing, their influence should be understood as operating on the individual, not the neighbourhood level. Even during the life of this project, it was clear that informal friendship networks on the estate were decreasing (Bellair 1997). Although the relationships that did still exist were able to provide positive influences, it is hard to see how this method of support can be anything other than the exception.

The resident managed play scheme showed how the residents' committee had embraced elements of the professional field which brought with it both advantages and limitations. The play scheme's staff recruitment was done almost entirely through word of mouth and existing friendship networks. The informality of the recruitment process allowed those who would have been put off with traditional application forms and those who would not have met the professional qualification requirements to work on the project. It also allowed those who legally couldn't participate in paid employment due to their immigration status to be compensated for their efforts. The group of residents involved in the project were a mixture of previously engaged residents who had been shunned by Saplings and friends new to estate activity that came together and got paid to run a summer play scheme. The funding was used by the committee to both reward those who deserved to get something in return for years of commitment, similar to the motivation of

307

Elizabeth's initial proposal to the council, and to bring their friends into the fold.

There were two priorities for the project, connecting adult residents and supporting young people in a way that builds relationships between the generations. The control of both the economic capital to run the play scheme and Centenary Hall where the scheme took place was vital for the above happening. The informality of the project allowed Dorothy to play the role of an older family member as well as the project's manager. Her desire to see the other staff members develop the skills to be able to act as employees should in the future, could to outsiders be evidence that this way of operating provided an inferior service. However, it is also a sign that within this field, relationships are more important than qualifications and experience. The relational dynamic of this field allowed Dorothy to train the women working on the project and also to support them personally. These relationships birthed a parent's play project with a similar goal of developing parental relationships. However, unlike their involvement in the play scheme, the workers here gave up their time voluntarily. Having its own economic capital gave the residents' committee the confidence to challenge calls from council staff to do things more fitting with the professional field. The fact that nine residents got involved in the summer play scheme as compared to three-four in the previous resident run youth project shows the importance of controlling capital and being able to pay people. However, this also changed the dynamics of the project, traditionally the residents led initiatives have relied on people acting in a friendship like capacity when taking part in activities. However, throughout the research, estate activities

that relied on voluntary involvement from residents either struggled to get support or were seeing their numbers dwindle. If paying people to engage is a solution it does pose some significant problems. Although the informality of the play scheme's management did lead to lasting supportive relationships to develop, most notably between Dorothy and the women she supported to set up a parent and toddlers group, the majority of residents were acting in a transactional capacity.

Although the staff interactions were largely informal, there was a strict paperwork trail, consent and medical forms were collected for all the children participating and all activities were risk assessed. The willingness for the council to support in the DBS checking showed that the committee were going to be treated as a recognised service provider. However, this new hybrid field of the residents taking on some professional characteristics has been limited in its effectiveness. In the first instance, the focus has been on the younger children with the residents still deciding not to engage with the older young people. The project's delivery structure meant that there is little sign of a wider supportive network emanating from it. The young people of most concern have been left to shape their own futures and are now devoid of both the informal relational and more professionalised support that may have helped redirect their path.

In many respects, this research leaves a sense of what could have been if there was mutual recognition of the merits of both the relational and the professional ways of working in the initial stages of council's interest on the estate a more collaborative approach could have been taken. The hybrid field that developed could have been a joint space where residents and

professionals worked alongside each other, utilising their strengths to provide more effective support.

Further research

The study touches on several different areas of estate life that can be explored further. In addition to the further research outlined below, it would be useful to do a comparative study of similar estates to see if the findings identified above are localised to the estate in this study or part of wider phenomena. Any such study should include a historical comparison to understand whether the localised relational dynamics identified here are present elsewhere. Further study will enable any recommendations to address wider community development and estate management practices in general rather than be specifically focused on the circumstances of the estate researched here.

Any additional research should extend the focus on areas that this project touched upon but could not cover in detail. Further projects would include the following:

Research into the role that the young people's perception of their education and employment opportunities has in the shaping of their likelihood to get involved in criminal behaviour. Again, this would be a comparative study of the experiences of different generations focusing on their views on education and employment opportunities and how this influenced or is influencing their chances of taking part in sustained deviant behaviour. This study would draw on an Althusian framework understanding education and employment as parts of the ideological state

apparatus that help to shape people's behaviour. A comprehensive study of young people with different educational and employment expectations would further support any conclusions as to the role this plays. In many respects, this would build on existing research that looks at the link between job opportunities and desistance from offending, in considering perceived future chances and its connection to future or fledgling criminal careers.

The impact of wider social and economic factors in relationship development. The research touched on a number of wider macro social and economic factors that are understood to impact the lives and relationships of those living on estates. However, most of these are quantitative studies that do not show qualitatively the impact that these wider circumstances have on the day to day experiences of estate residents. The study above attempted to do a potted historically comparative study of public life on the estate. There is the need for in depth research into the personal life histories of people living on this and other estates so that the impact of the well documented social and economic changes as well as the localised developments outlined in this study on individuals and local neighbourhoods can be better understood.

Appendix 1: Case Node Classifications

Case Node	
Location	
	Name
	Current managers
	Building landlords
	Current main occupiers
	Past managers
	Current main activities
	current additional activities
	current additional activities (2)
	Type of location
	Current managers since
	Past Main activities
	Past secondary activities
Organisati ons	
	Name
	Type of organisation
	Primary role on the estate
	Resident involvement
	Income size
	No staff living on the estate
	No of volunteers living on the estate
	No of ex resident staff
	No of ex resident volunteers
	Length of time on the estate
	Main source of funding
	date started on the estate

	Date ended involvement on the estate
	Primary motivation for being on the estate
	Reason for pulling off the estate
Paid employees	
	Name
	Company or organisation
	Active on the estate prior to paid involvement
	Active on the estate after paid employment ended
	Gender
	Age
	Race
	date started on the estate
	Date ended involvement on the estate
	Active involvement on the estate during paid employment but not as part of their employment
	Live on the estate
	Involvement on the estate
	education level
	Professional Training
Resident	
	Name
	Age
	Race
	Length of time on the estate
	Tenancy
	Parent
	Role on the Estate
	Gender
	Current employment status
	Previous work status
	Current Job

	Role on the Estate 2
	Professional Training
	education level
	Criminal record
	Informal estate activities
Volunteers	
	Name
	Company or organisation
	Active on the estate prior to volunteering
	Active on the estate after volunteering ended
	Gender
	Age
	Race
	date started on the estate
	Date ended involvement on the estate
	Active involvement on the estate during volunteering but not as part of their volunteering
	Live on the estate
	Involvement on the estate
	education level
	Professional Training
Young Person	
	Name
	Name
	Gender
	Age Group
	Ethnicity
	Criminal record
	Been to prison
	Parent
	Living arrangements

| Live on the estate |
| Current Criminal Activity |
| Current formal activity |
| education level |
| Attended Purser house |
| Visibility on the estate |
| Part of SMP |

Appendix 2: Thematic Coding Structure

Thematic Nodes			
Parent Node			
Young People	Name	Sources	References
	Outlook	58	319
	Future Outlook - education	30	48
	Future Outlook - housing	33	59
	Future Outlook - jobs	30	56
	Future Outlook plans	15	29
	Past outlook education	15	26
	Past outlook housing	26	50
	Past outlook jobs	12	23
	Thoughts about the area	13	28
	youth activities	140	514
	Current Crime and trouble	129	450
	Current Crime and trouble - reasons	46	94
	Current Crime and trouble - type	113	267
	Current Crime and trouble Consequences	47	87
	Current youth activities	33	53
	Historic Crime and Trouble	1	1
	Historic crime and trouble - consequences	8	14
	Historic Crime and trouble - reasons	9	17
	Historic crime and trouble - type	17	36
	Historic youth activities	6	10
	Youth support	189	878
	Reasons for supporting young people	15	43
	Reasons for not supporting young people	18	31
	views of resident intervention	8	18
	What support is needed	80	137
	Professional support	61	84
	relational support	34	52
	Youth support - historic youth support	22	103
	Youth support current youth support	143	545
Type of Activity	Name	Sources	References
	Co-op ideas	126	170
	APG delivery	23	29

	Community Wi-Fi	1	1
	financial inclusion	3	3
	Funding	5	5
	Saplings youth delivery	66	84
	Hubs training for Centenary hall	6	9
	poly tunnel	19	19
	Social spaces ideas	16	20
Formal meetings		125	149
	APG stake holder meeting	1	1
	Council meeting	2	2
	gardening group	0	0
	Hall committee meeting	12	12
	Saplings and Council meetings	2	2
	Meeting between the Council and Resident Committee	9	11
	Forum meeting	11	14
	Resident Committee and forum meetings	3	3
	Resident Committee led public meeting	12	12
	Resident Committee meeting	67	72
	Youth sub group meeting	14	20
Historic delivery		6	32
	garden development	1	1
	Old APG	1	3
	old John's Hut	4	5
	Old play scheme	2	4
	Past Centenary hall running	4	12
	Past other youth support	3	7
informal activities		12	12
	BBQs	12	12
Informal meetings		70	111
	Chats between paid workers	1	1
	Chats between paid workers and Resident Committee members	18	22
	Chats between residents	11	17
	Chats between Resident Committee members	40	63
	conversation with young people	8	8
Negative activities on the estate		75	163
	being rude	4	4
	Breaking in to Turner House	7	9

	Crack Smoking	5	8
	Dog fouling	2	2
	drug dealing	11	11
	Fights	14	14
	Hanging around	30	33
	Making noise	15	16
	Robberies	14	16
	Shooting	12	14
	Stabbings	11	11
	Stealing cars	4	4
	underage sex	3	4
	Weed smoking	16	16
Organised social activities		37	42
	film club	8	8
	Parties	8	9
	Resident Committee social event	22	25
Resident formal activities		7	8
Resident informal action		50	57
Resident Led service delivery		211	283
	Café	4	4
	Gardening	5	5
	Happy Hours	8	11
	Running of Centenary Hall	134	176
	Studio	19	22
	summer project	17	19
	Resident Committee Youth plan	42	46
Service delivery		80	120
	Build-it	7	8
	Church	6	11
	Council anti-crime initiative	15	17
	Oak training	6	15
	estate pride	2	2
	Hire of Turner house	6	8
	HLS	4	4
	jcp job fair	8	8
	Lunch club	17	25
	martial arts	2	2
	SMP football	16	18

	Name	Sources	References
	SGT	2	2
Relationships	Name	Sources	References
	Current formal relationships	212	343
	Council and service providers	33	37
	councillors and service providers	25	25
	Resident Committee and councillors	14	19
	Resident Committee and service providers	177	260
	Current Informal relationships	143	262
	Current friendship care	76	119
	current friendship formation	7	10
	Current resident dislike	10	10
	Resident Networks	102	123
	Past formal relationships	4	7
	Historic formal relationships	3	3
	Historic youth and workers	2	4
	Past Informal relationships	13	43
	councillors and workers	1	1
	Historic friendship formation	7	12
	Historic informal relationships	6	8
	Historic racism	4	10
	Historic resident care	6	11
Narrative Control	Name	Sources	References
	Estate Narrative Control	164	331
	Gentrification	5	5
	Narrative about the past	5	16
	Past crime narrative	4	6
	police narrative	9	9
	political narrative	14	16
	pre move on narrative	9	14
	resident narrative	83	119
	TSG	1	1
	Worker Narrative	84	117
	worker vision	5	5
	young person narrative	16	24
	young person narrative of police	4	4
Motivations	Name	Sources	References
	Antagonisms	122	165
	Care	157	227

	Control	94	131
	Employing residents	43	58
	Isolation	1	1
	Keeping myself to myself	7	8
	Keeping up with peers	3	3
	Money	113	154
	Opportunity	32	37
	Ownership	77	118
	Positioning	86	117
	Professional integrity	174	247
	Publicity	50	54
	Work Obligation	26	48

Appendix 3: Deductive Coding Structure

Parent Node	Deductive Nodes		
Apparatus of Influence	Name	Sources	References
	ISA		
	Education	30	56
	Employment	29	48
	Generalised Reciprocity	78	127
	Housing	43	86
	RSA		
	Council	20	27
	Police	50	64
Capital	Name	Sources	References
	Cultural Capital	2	2
	Economic Capital	30	32
	Educational Capital	1	1
	Social & Human Capital	25	29
Missing Apparatus	Name	Sources	References
	Missing employment options	20	33
	Missing generalised reciprocity	128	294
	Missing Housing options	11	18
Professionalism as Control	Name	Sources	References
	Councillor influence	38	52
	Need for professional service	135	169
	professional unprofessionalism	79	92
	Talk of the residents' lack of ability	38	45
	The committee acting unprofessionally	35	41
	Committee need to be professional	125	161
Receiving repressive action	Name	Sources	References
	Receiving symbolic violence	18	31
	Receiving Technical Rationality	2	2
	Receiving a rejection of relational approaches	1	1
	Receiving professionalism	34	42
Rejection of Repressive action	Name	Sources	References
	Rebellion against professionalism	85	113

	Standing up against symbolic violence	100	133
Repressive Action	**Name**	**Sources**	**References**
	Distrust	161	241
	distrust of paid for organisations	92	122
	distrust of residents	39	49
	distrust of young people	53	69
	Symbolic Violence	126	169
	Technocratic rationality	260	429
	Professionalism	245	390
	Rejection of relational approaches	30	36
Type of Relationship	**Name**	**Sources**	**References**
	Organic Relationships	274	550
	Transactional Relationships	346	603
Withheld Capital	**Name**	**Sources**	**References**
	withheld cultural capital	0	0
	Withheld economic capital	4	5
	Withheld educational capital	6	6
	Withheld social capital	1	2

322

Appendix 4: Local Authority St Marys Estate Youth Commissioning Document

Background

1. *The council's youth team have delivered targeted programmes for Lower Valley in the community flat in Turner House between May 2010 and September 2011.*
2. *These sessions tended to attract young people who police intelligence show are involved in youth crime and who the police believe to be members of a gang.*
3. *The youth team do not feel these programmes are sustainable, that they are what the community want or that the community flat is a suitable venue.*
4. *In spring 2011 the youth service provided workers for more general sessions but these tended to attract the same young people and this is not something the youth service has the capacity to deliver in the long term.*
5. *Over the summer the youth service commissioned Saplings to deliver a summer programme from Turner House but Saplings were slightly taken aback by the nature of the young people and as a result were not able to deliver the activities that were originally planned.*
6. *More recently Valley Estate Residents' committee has approached the youth service with a request to "quality assure" some volunteers they had identified in order for them to open and run Our Place but this is not something the youth service are able to do and does not address the issue of the suitability of the venue.*

(Taken from a council community commissioning document – the original document was bulleted not numbered)

Proposal

- *St Marys is a priority for the Police and Community Safety. There are a whole range of organisations based or potentially working in the area and it covers a number of separate but inter-linked estates.*
- *Young & Safe have put aside £25K for youth activities in the area but this funding will need to target the programmes client group and this will require an acceptance that there is a youth crime / gangs issue to be addressed in parts of the estate.*
- *There is the opportunity to apply to the Home Office Crime Innovation Fund for additional funding and it is possible that the St Marys Forum is already developing something.*

- *There is also the possibility that there is additional funding available from other partners.*
- *It is therefore proposed that a meeting is held in the first instance with St Marys Forum and Council partners – Young & Safe, Active Communities, and Youth Service.*
- *That this meeting looks at:*
  - *What is in place and what the community might want in place in terms of universal and targeted services*
  - *What funding streams or support are available*
  - *What venues can be used, for what activities and for what age / target group (this needs to build on the community audit that has been completed / is being completed by Saplings).*
- *The meeting should also consider who else could or should be involved in further development with initial suggestions being; local Living, Valley Youth Partnership, local primary and secondary schools, Police, local young people.*

(Taken from a council community commissioning document)

Appendix 5: Saplings Youth Commissioning Proposal

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR YOUTH ACTIVITIES ON TULSE HILL ESTATE –

Prepared by Martha Karr, Saplings Community Development Trust

Taking into account feedback and the needs of the young people on Valley Estate and the feedback from residents regarding local people working as youth workers and mentors, I have pulled together the programme below. This is to be discussed further with Elizabeth More and other representatives from Residents' committee and Haley Belgrade from the youth service.

REGULAR WEEKLY ACTIVITIES

2 weekly sessions for 8 to 13 year olds – Youth club-type activities and music, media, art, sport based activities with personal development embedded.

2 weekly sessions for 14 to 19 year olds -- Youth club-type activities and music, media, art, sport based activities with personal development embedded.

The majority of these sessions to be delivered by locally based youth workers. However a budget would be held to 'buy-in' special stand-alone sessions.

EMPLOYABILITY PROGRAMME

PREPARATION FOR WORK – for 16 to 25 year olds. 2 x 12 week courses designed to get young people ready for the world of work. Once young people have received training we will work with them on CV's, interview preparation and job search either through Saplings Employment & training Support Service and/or working in partnership with Fairbridge. Young people will receive one to one support and coaching, advice and guidance on employment and training and be offered opportunities for volunteering, work placements, paid apprentice schemes and employment.   Young people would also have access to Apps for Good programme which teaches young people how to create and develop applications for mobile phones and for Facebook. They gain teambuilding, presentation, problem solving skills etc. and develop their confidence. They are also networked with organizations and companies which give opportunities for apprenticeships or employment.

Residential at the end of the course to consolidate learning and preparation.

RE-ENTRY TO EDUCATION -- for 13 to 16 year olds. We will use the nationally accredited 'Arts Awards' as a way into a series of accredited Residents training provision in key skills, IT and personal development.

We will also offer our family support service to parents of young people that are struggling to deal with day to day issues, e.g. liaising with schools regarding exclusions, housing issues, parenting skills etc.

LOCAL YOUTH WORKERS

Recruit 2 local residents to work with young people. This would initially be managed by having a Lead Youth worker on site who would train and coach resident youth workers for approximately 6 months. These youth workers could assist in running the evening drop-in sessions. Accredited Residents training to be provided, including, safeguarding, first aid, health & safety. Once local residents are trained and accredited they would manage youth sessions.

VOLUNTEERING & MENTORING PROGRAMME

Recruit local people to volunteer to work with young people during youth sessions and/or to become one to one mentors for young people. Training to be provided.

HOLIDAY ACTIVITIES

The two main holidays for the year are Summer and Easter. Programmes should be in place for:

Easter holidays: Monday 2 to Friday 13 April 2012

Summer holidays: Monday 23 July 2012 to Friday 31st August 2012

EQUIPMENT:

15 pc's or laptops

Printer

If no broadband/WI FI available then dongles needed for internet access

SAPLINGS BUDGET

Activity	Cost

Regular Weekly Activities (Community Flat & Centenary Hall)	
1x Youth Worker (£15* 6hrs* 30wks)	£2,700.00
2x Youth Workers (£10* 6hrs* 30wks)	£1,800.00
2x Tuck Shop (£30 food/drink & £5 Float)	£70.00
adventure playground venue hire (subject to negotiations after March)	£4,350.00
Contribution to Community Flat (Cleaning etc)	£200.00
Contribution to Centenary Hall (Cleaning etc)	£200.00
Total	**£9,320.00**
Employability Programme ages 16-25 (Centenary Hall)	
Fairbridge + Residential (Funded)	£ -
Residential (Funded)	£ -
Total	**£ -**
Re- entry to Education primary & secondary school (Centenary Hall)	
Tutor (£25* 6hrs* 4wks)	£600.00
Total	**£600.00**
Volunteering & Mentoring Programme (Saplings)	
Tutor £25* 6hrs* 6wks	£900.00
Room Hire £25 per hr (day rate £160)	£960.00
Total	**£1,860.00**
Local Youth Workers (Training)	
Volunteer Expenses	£300.00
2x ABC Level 2 Youth Work Practice (£498 per)	£996.00
2x First Aid (St Johns Ambulance £315 per)	£630.00

2x ISOH Working Safely (£160)	£320.00
4x Safeguarding	£ -
Total	**£2,246.00**
Community Flat Equipment	
2x desktop PC's (inc 1 yr warranty)	£250.00
12 Month Internet Broadband (TA?)	£ -
Printer (wifi)	£70.00
Table Tennis Table	£120.00
Table tennis Equipment	£50.00
Pool Equipment	£60.00
Tv (32")	£270.00
Portable Tv stand	£100.00
Game Console (inc games)	£200.00
Security Cable (Tv/Game console)	£50.00
Board Games	£40.00
Fuseball Table Screws	£5.00
footballs indoor/outdoor	£30.00
Football Equipment (cones, bibs etc)	£40.00
Seating Furniture	£650.00
Craft Materials (inc Ink carts & paper)	£200.00
Total	**£2,135.00**
Summer & Easter Holidays (Programmes)	
Easter Holiday Worker £15* 20hr* 2wks	£600.00
2x Easter Holiday Workers £10* 20hr* 2wks	£400.00
Summer Holiday Worker £15* 20hr* 4wks	£1,200.00
2x Summer Holiday Workers £10* 20hr* 4wks	£1,600.00
Workshops / Activities	£1,000.00
Summer & Easter Outings	£2,000.00
Trophy/medals	£100.00

Prizes	£500.00
Total	**£7,400.00**
Budget for Additional Activities	£330.00
Project Coordinator @ 1 day per week x 9 months (Inc. Youth work)	£3,609.00
Management & Operational Costs (10%)	£2,500.00
Grand total	**£30,000.00**

Appendix 6: Residents' committee Youth Commissioning Proposal

OVERALL VISION

What we would like to see/create is: Two venues functioning three times a week.

The long term plan involves Centenary Hall being finished and in use and therefore making the use of Turner House almost irrelevant (although it may still be useful for small specific groups, or one-to-one sessions)

The shorter term plan involves two venues which are: -

The adventure playground which would be suitable for the Over 15 age group. This would have less structure – certainly to begin with but the intention would be to provide specific sessions according to a) what the young people would like and b) what we are able to provide (guest speakers/film night/pamper sessions/tournaments)

13 Turner House would be used for more structured sessions for the 8 – 15 year olds. We are very aware that this age group is most in need of direction and guidance and therefore would use our most suitable members of staff here. In fact, the layout of the building is very conducive to smaller sessions with individuals or small groups which is great. We do understand the issues around use of this building – one 'problem' relates to the building being "very different to purpose built youth centres." This is of course true but even so, we have used this building successfully for many years and the young people – as is mentioned in the THF minutes - are very familiar with the space. It is just essential (and we agree with this of course) that any sessions are led by qualified, experienced workers and are also well structured. Security of the building is also of paramount importance. There was a suggestion at the THF meeting that "This venue at Turner House is not best placed to attract other funding". Well, two things come into play here – firstly that this is not necessarily the case as we received large amounts of funding in the past (from Children in Need. Awards for All, O2 and others) with no trouble at all. But – more importantly - the other fact is that use of 13 Turner House may well be very short term either way because local Living is working with Residents'

committee to bring Centenary Hall back into use before the end of 2012.

Velocity Studios will function at different times to the other groups. Gerald (who runs the studio) is aware that both sessions cannot run at the same time but consequently he is very willing to be one of our youth workers. He does already have a CRB check.

Fairbridge Trust is offering to run sessions for some of our young people who may benefit from their services. Some sessions will be held in Turner House while some sessions will be run from the base in Kennington

At the moment we have two members of staff who have strong qualifications who we would use as Team Leaders. We also have two ladies who are very experienced who would be support workers. Everyone concerned has current CRB certification (except me!). We have contacted LVAC so as to advertise for more volunteers (current CRB being one of the requirements).

The very short term plan is to make sure that something is in place for the Christmas holidays. Therefore on 17th December (the day after the schools break up and the holidays begin) we will hold an event which will be specifically to attract Dads and male role models – as well as anyone else in the community who would like to help. Then we will run sessions beginning on the following Monday (19th December). Up to this point we will have spent no money so I will mention the most important part of the plan and our biggest need.

Wages for Charis: When CYPS were very first involved we met with Sandy Cotton who understood the situation and said that she would investigate and do what she could. Charis was doing a huge amount of work and although she had started the group on the understanding that she would never be paid, the responsibility and the time taken to do a good job had grown. The fact is that Charis needs to change her life. Her mother is ill and needs care and attention. If Charis is working she will be in a position to visit her mum on a fortnightly basis and therefore stay in London. If Valley Youth Group functions over the Christmas period, she will bring her mum down to London to stay here for two weeks. However, if she is not paid to work here (particularly as there is also a safety/risk factor involved) she will go to Birmingham for the holiday and even consider staying there for good.

I do believe that everyone concerned – Residents' committee, Martha Carr

(THF) and anyone who has had anything to do with Valley young people – is aware of just how valuable Charis is. Without Charis there is no project. Her position as the person who knows all the young people individually as well as many of their parents is incredibly important. She is the only one who is able to work on the level that she does – as an example; she has already said that she will personally visit the parents of any young person who becomes part of the group. She automatically 'goes the extra mile'. She is totally dedicated to the young people of the area (even though sometimes it goes against her own wishes). As another example, when we ran the group before, she (and another worker) would take the young people home at the end of each session – which was why it was troublesome when CYPS (or other organisations) were not in a position to do this. It makes a difference and Charis was (and is) prepared to do this.

I suggest: - 16 hours a week x £10 an hour = £160 a week x 52 = £8,320 But – for that we have the best worker – she would function pretty much full time. She could do 3 sessions a week of 5.30 – 9.30 and then one four hour session a week with Gerald in the studio (or two sessions of 2 hours each) Although 16 hours a week would not provide a 'living wage' Charis would be able to sign up for agency work as an additional source of income.

Other immediate expenses would be - child minding expenses for three of the volunteers

Long term we would also like the potential to do our own CRB checks although having spoken to Martha Carr and (just now) seen a letter from Haley Belgrade, I believe we would be able to do this under the umbrella of Saplings or Valley Forum. We would like training for all concerned in Child Protection, First Aid and Health and Safety.

Appendix 7: Saplings Youth Project Set Up E-mail and Responses

Dwight's email	James' response	Elizabeth's response
I hope you are all good and well, sorry I was unable to attend the meeting yesterday. I am emailing you today because I have a couple of points which I would like to raise as a matter of urgency. Turner house: I need the building work to be completed or to a safe standard by Monday morning. I need to ensure that all electrical/gas equipment is tested before use - can I have a progress report Monday morning.	the gas is tested yearly and the main circuits are tested according to health and safety guidelines - labels on the gas meter and fuse box indicate when they were last tested - it is up to individual groups to ensure their own equipment is PAT tested.	Turner house - what you need may not happen although I am sure everyone involved is doing their best. I spoke to the man about an hour ago and the electrician will go in there on Monday, so................................ Work to be finished by Monday morning - won't happen. You can either ask Yolanda for a progress report or - the man is called Stuart and his number is 0780 257 9487, I'm sure it will be OK for you to call him - in fact, as I write, I have just received another call from him and apparently he told you all this BEFORE you sent this email so - you already know that it won't be done by Monday morning!! As with yesterday, I write this with the intention of being friendly, polite etc. but - it's very hard as time goes by. Please don't think I am being sarcastic but - seeing as it all comes out wrong - I hand over to Yolanda. She knows as much if not more than me.

Easter Project: My apologies for not putting times and dates in writing, I briefly informed times and dates of the Easter project with members of the TA, as it was not set in stone at the time and members was not present at the St Marys forum I am not sure if fellow members of the TA are aware of the times and dates. TA avoids double bookings. The dates and times follow: First week Monday 02nd March – Thursday 5th March 1:00pm – 6:00pm Second week Tuesday 10th March – Friday 13th March 1:00pm – 6:00pm can we have the rooms booked from 12:30 – 6:30pm to avoid overlapping?	Please can you let me know as a matter of urgency your plans for after 6 pm- it is not beneficial to have a youth project that draws all the young people on the estate together only to leave them at 6pm - this is very bad planning and is completely against the good practice that successful youth projects have done before - in fact other youth projects that have finished around this time in the past have always contributed to more trouble on the estate not less. If you are going to finish at 6m then we need to know what is your plan for after 6pm.	Easter Project: The fact that we have not had regular communications is the bottom line of what we needed to discuss yesterday. What we needed to discuss did not happen and instead our visit (and the request for a meeting - not my suggestion at all) was seen (I think - I may be wrong) as an attack. Defences (reasons for whatever and 'updates') were given but our main 'issue' (me and Charis) was relating to lack of communication - we needed more and did feel left out/ignored - whether it was deliberate or accepted or not, that was and is how we felt/feel. In fact, because we were not kept up to date, I for one am no longer part of the overall plan. You are doing (hopefully) a brilliant job but basically, a job that does not include talking to us or letting us know what is going on. The conclusion at the end of yesterday's meeting was to 'go ahead'. So - good. I wish you all well - and I do mean that sincerely. (And at this point I feel that I must apologise for the long email. What can you do - this is me. But - hopefully you won't have to put up with me any longer). I will mention though - I think the dates you mean are relating to April - not March. You don't need to book rooms - it's all yours. Yolanda will confirm which rooms you have already decided to use.

Keys: As a matter of urgency I would need to be issued with a full set of keys in order to open up and lock areas of the building for youth sessions by Monday.	this is not possible only residents' committee members are to have keys you will need to arrange to pick them up and drop them off every day.	See Yolanda
Room storage & equipment: Staff will require an office space to put belongings, paperwork, log books, apply first aid and to successfully separate young people, calm down and negotiate in incidences of conflict etc. The best room for this is the room in between the main room and back area (workshop area). From this room staff can see both areas though the looking glasses. Elizabeth agreed to tidy the room up as there was a lot of clutter and it was very messy. Has this been done? Can this area be cleared or tidied? If so can we have this done ASAP please?	you can have the MPs room for the time that you are using the building - however please be aware that it is the residents' committee's policy not to give any group their own room so if you are keeping items in their overnight etc please make sure you have them in a lockable storage facility like a filing cabinet that you will need to provide. This is especially true of any confidential information - this should not be left out at all.	Room storage & equipment: See Yolanda (although, yes, Elizabeth did tidy the office) up to a point - there is certainly enough space to use for storage of staff belongings although it is DEFINITELY NOT suitable for use by young people. When we walked around yesterday we agreed that it would be good for you to have what is known is the MP's room but - it's up to you to discuss with Yolanda - keeping in mind that other people also use the building and the office is usually totally out of bounds for outsiders (meaning young people). Therefore the MP's room could be all yours - for storage as well as for calming down/one-to-one.

I noticed there is some unstable furniture and other items which seem to be unused and unusable - the contractors have agreed to remove stuff which is no longer required. As none of these items belong to Saplings I have spoke to Members of the TA in regards to labelling the furniture for removal, has this be done?	No furniture should be removed unless all residents' committee members are notified and agree to this as no one member of the residents' committee will know what is needed and what is not - so this hasn't been done and won't be done - any items you do not want out should be stored away by yourselves and put back afterwards - all other groups do this and I expect you to also	The furniture has been labelled
Fire policy: Is there a fire policy? Is it displayed in the building? If yes can I have a copy ready by Monday? I have completed a temporary Fire Policy for the Youth sessions, but I will require an official Fire Policy from the TA.	this will not be done in time - any requirements like this should have been asked for months ago as you haven't asked for it until now you will not get it. - remember everyone in the residents' committee are volunteers - many are very experienced and highly qualified - but volunteers non the less and so all request take longer to get done	

Visiting: Can Saplings Team leaders be informed before any visitors visit the project whilst the programme is on. Can these matters be dealt with as a matter of urgency	Just to let you know as a member of the residents' committee was meant to be overseeing this project I will may pop in at any time throughout the two weeks just to see what is going on. As I am meant to be using the Easter period to study, I may set myself up in the residents' committee office to study whilst keeping an eye on things. Dwight - please remember that you are using a residents' committee run building and the project is being funded by money that is meant to be designated by the residents' committee and all your requests should be understood by yourself as requests and not demands. We will do our best to accommodate you but if we can't we can't. Please ensure that you get agreement of more than a couple of residents' committee members before doing anything.	Funny you ask that - we sked that and nobody responded. As I say - it's now all yours.

Bibliography

Adler, P. & Adler, P. 1987. *Membership Roles in Field Research*, London: Sage.

Adorno, T. W. & Horkheimer, M. 2016. *Dialectic of enlightenment*, London: Verso Classics.

Akers, R. L. & Jennings, W. G. 2009. The Social Learning Theory of Crime and Deviance. *In:* Krohn, M. D., Lizotte, A. J. & Hall, G. P. (eds.) *Handbook on Crime and Deviance.* New York: Springer.

Akers, R. L., Krohn, M. D., Lanza-Kaduce, L. & Radosevich, M. 1995. Social Learning and Deviant Behavior: A Specific Test of a General Theory. *In:* McCord, J. & Laub, J. H. (eds.) *Contemporary Masters in Criminology.* Boston, MA: Springer.

Alleyne, B. 2002. An idea of community and its discontents: towards a more reflexive sense of belonging in multicultural Britain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 25**,** 607-627.

Althusser, L., Balibar, E., Bidet, J. & Goshgarian, G. M. 2014. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,* London: Verso.

Amit, V. 2004. *Constructing the field: ethnographic fieldwork in the contemporary world,* London: Routledge.

Anderson, E. 2000. *Code of the street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City.* New York: W.W Norton

Anderson, L. 2006. Analytic Autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 35**,** 373-395.

Andreassen, T. A., Breit, E. & Legard, S. 2014. The making of 'professional amateurs'. *Acta Sociologica,* 57**,** 325-340.

Armstrong, D. 2004. A Risky Business? Research, Policy, Governmentality and Youth Offending. *Youth Justice,* 4**,** 100-116.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. 2014. *Handbook of ethnography,* London: Sage.

Back, L 1996 *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture: Racisms And Multiculture In Young Lives,* London: Routledge.

Baiocchi, G. & Connor, B. T. 2008. The Ethnos in the Polis: Political Ethnography as a Mode of Inquiry. *Sociology Compass,* 2**,** 139-155.

Bauman, Z. 2013. *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty,* Oxford:

Wiley.

Bauman, Z. 2015. *Liquid modernity,* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. 2013. *Community: seeking safety in an insecure world,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bazeley, P., and Jackson, K. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis with NVIVO*, Los Angeles: Sage.

Beck, U. & Beck-Gernsheim, E. 2002. *Individualization: Institutionalised Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences,* London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi, Sage Publications.

Becker, G. S. 1968. Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach. *Journal of Political Economy,* 76**,** 169-217.

Becker, H. S. 1967. Whose Side Are We On? *Social Problems,* 14**,** 239-247.

Becker, H. S. 2011. *Tricks of the trade: How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It,* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Begun, J. W. 1986. Economic and Sociological Approaches to Professionalism. *Work and Occupations,* 13**,** 113-129.

Bellair, P. E. 1997. Social Interaction and Community Crime: Examining the Importance of Neighbour Networks. *Criminology,* 35**,** 677-704.

Benson, M. & Jackson, E. 2013. Place-making and Place Maintenance: Performativity, Place and Belonging among the Middle Classes. *Sociology,* 47**,** 793-809.

Bhat, M. A. & Rather, T. A. 2013. Youth Transitions in Kashmir. *South Asia Research,* 33**,** 185-204.

Birch, M. & Miller, T. 2002. Ethics in Qualitative Research, London: Sage.

Bird, J., Curtis, B., Putnam, T. & Tickner, L. 2012. Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change, London: Routledge

Blackman, S. J. 2007. `Hidden Ethnography': Crossing Emotional Borders in Qualitative Accounts of Young People's Lives. *Sociology,* 41**,** 699-716.

Booth, C. & Pfautz, H. W. 1967. *On the city: Physical pattern and social structure: Selected writings,* London: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Bottero, W. 2010. Intersubjectivity and Bourdieusian Approaches to 'Identity'. *Cultural Sociology,* 4**,** 3-22.

Bottrell, D. 2009. Dealing With Disadvantage. *Youth & Society,* 40**,** 476-

501.

Bourdieu, P. 2007. *Masculine domination,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Nice, R. 1972. *Outline of a theory of practice,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. 2013. Symbolic capital and social classes. *Journal of Classical Sociology,* 13**,** 292-302.

Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L. J. D. & Polity, P. 2013. *An invitation to reflexive sociology,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourgois, P. 2010. *In search of respect selling crack in El Barrio,* Cambridge: University Press.

Bradley, H. & Devadason, R. 2008. Fractured Transitions: Young Adults' Pathways into Contemporary Labour Markets. *Sociology,* 42**,** 119-136.

Brannen, J. & Nilsen, A. 2002. Young People's Time Perspectives: From Youth to Adulthood. *Sociology,* 36**,** 513-537.

Brewer, J. D. 2011. *Ethnography,* Buckingham: Open University Press

Britton, M. 2008. "My Regular Spot". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 37**,** 442-468.

Bryman, A. 2015. *Analysing Qualitative Data*, London: Routledge

Bucerius, S. M. 2013. Becoming a "Trusted Outsider". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 42**,** 690-721.

Bulmer, M. 1982. *Social Research Ethics: An Examination of the Merits Of Covert Participant Observation,* London: Macmillan.

Burnett, C. 2006. Building Social Capital through an `Active Community Club'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,* 41**,** 283-294.

Bursik, R. & Grasmick, H. G. 2001. Neighbourhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control, New York: Lexington Books

Bursik, R. J. 1988. Social Disorganization and Theories of Crime and Delinquency: Problems and Prospects. *Criminology,* 26**,** 519-552.

Bursik, R. J. 1999. The Informal Control of Crime through Neighbourhood Networks. *Sociological Focus,* 32**,** 85-97.

Cantillon, D., Davidson I, W. S. & Schweitzer, J. H. 2003. Measuring Community Social Organization: Sense of Community as a Mediator in Social Disorganization Theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 31**,** 321-339.

Carr, P., Xa and J 2003. The New Parochialism: The Implications of the

Beltway Case for Arguments Concerning Informal Social Control. *American Journal of Sociology,* 108**,** 1249-1291.

Çelik, Ö. and Gough, J. 2014. Introduction to the special section: Urban neoliberalism, strategies for urban struggles, and 'the right to the city'. *Capital & Class,* 38**,** 414-451.

Charmaz, K. 2004. Premises, Principles, and Practices in Qualitative Research: Revisiting the Foundations. *Qualitative Health Research,* 14**,** 976-993.

Chase, E. & Walker, R. 2013. The Co-construction of Shame in the Context of Poverty: Beyond a Threat to the Social Bond. *Sociology,* 47**,** 739-754.

Cohen, S. 2011. *Folk devils and moral panics,* London: Routledge.

Coleman, J. S. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94**,** S95-S120.

Cordero, R. 2014. Crisis and Critique in Jürgen Habermas's Social Theory. *European Journal of Social Theory,* 17**,** 497-515.

Craig, G. & Mayo, M. (Eds) 1995. *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*, London: Zed Books

Crookes, L., 2014. Habitus of the Hood. *Housing Studies* 29, 566–568. doi:10.1080/02673037.2013.834720

Cronin, C. 1996. Bourdieu and Foucault on Power and Modernity. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* 22**,** 55-85.

Cvetičanin, P., Spasic', I. & Gavrilovic', D. 2014. Strategies and Tactics in Social Space: The Case of Serbia. *Social Science Information,* 53**,** 213-239.

Davies, C. 2012. Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Dean, J. 2016. Class Diversity and Youth Volunteering in the United Kingdom. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 45**,** 95S-113S.

Decoteau, C. L. 2016. The Reflexive Habitus. *European Journal of Social Theory,* 19**,** 303-321.

Deegan, M. J. 2001. The Chicago School of Ethnography in Atkinson. P., et al. (Eds) *Handbook of ethnography Handbook of ethnography,* Sage

Delanty, G. 2003. *Community,* New York: Routledge.

Denshire, S. 2014. On Auto-Ethnography. *Current Sociology,* 62**,** 831-850.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. 2012. *The landscape of qualitative research: theories and issues,* Los Angeles: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. 2018. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.

Devisch, I. 2014. *Jean-Luc Nancy and the Question of Community*, London Bloomsbury Academic

Donald, S. H. 2009. Branding cities cosmopolitanism, parochialism, and social change, London: Routledge

Dowling, E. & Harvie, D. 2014. Harnessing the Social: State, Crisis and (Big) Society. *Sociology,* 48**,** 869-886.

Draus, P. J. & Carlson, R. G. 2009. "The Game Turns on You". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 38**,** 384-408.

Durkheim, É. & Simpson, G. 2012. *Suicide: a Study in Sociology,* [Place of publication not identified], Snowball Press.

Eglinton, K. A. 2013. Between the Personal and the Professional: Ethical Challenges When Using Visual Ethnography to Understand Young People's Use of Popular Visual Material Culture. *Young,* 21**,** 253-271.

Ellison, N. R. 2013. Citizenship, Space and Time. *Thesis Eleven,* 118**,** 48-63.

Emmel, N. 2013. Sampling and Choosing Cases in Qualitative Research: A Realist Approach. London: Sage

Erel, U. 2010. Migrating Cultural Capital: Bourdieu in Migration Studies. *Sociology,* 44**,** 642-660.

Evetts, J. 2006. Trust and Professionalism: Challenges and Occupational Changes *Current Sociology,* 54**,** 515-531.

Evetts, J. 2011. A new professionalism? Challenges and Opportunities. *Current Sociology,* 59**,** 406-422.

Evetts, J. 2013. Professionalism: Value and Ideology. *Current Sociology,* 61**,** 778-796.

Fahmy, E. 2006. Social Capital and Civic Action. *Young,* 14**,** 101-118.

Farrugia, D. 2011. The Symbolic Burden of Homelessness. *Journal of Sociology,* 47**,** 71-87.

Fenton, S. 2010. *Ethnicity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Field, J. 2008. *Social Capital*. London: Routledge

Fielding, N. 2004. Qualitative Research Practice. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Fine, G. A. 1979. Small Groups and Culture Creation: The Idioculture of Little League Baseball Teams. *American Sociological Review,* 44**,** 733-745.

Fine, G. A. 2003. Towards a Peopled Ethnography. *Ethnography,* 4**,** 41-60.

Finlayson, G. 2005. *Habermas: a Very Short Introduction,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Fischer, C. S. 1991. *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City,* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Fores, M., Glover, I. & Lawrence, P. 1991. Professionalism and Rationality: A Study in Misapprehension. *Sociology,* 25**,** 79-100.

Fortun, K. I. M. 2012. Ethnography in Late Industrialism. *Cultural Anthropology,* 27**,** 446-464.

France, A. & Haddon, E. 2014. Exploring the Epistemological Fallacy. *Young,* 22**,** 305-321.

Franceschelli, M. & O'Brien, M. 2015. 'Being Modern and Modest': South Asian Young British Muslims Negotiating Multiple Influences in Their Identity. *Ethnicities,* 15**,** 696-714.

Fraser, A., 2013. Street Habitus: Gangs, Territorialism and Social Change in Glasgow. *Journal of Youth Studies* 16, 970–985. doi:10.1080/13676261.2013.793791

Fraser, A., Atkinson, C., 2014. Making Up Gangs: Looping, Labelling and the New Politics of Intelligence-led Policing. Youth Justice 14, 154–170. doi:10.1177/1473225414529047

Fraser, A., Hagedorn, J.M., 2016. Gangs and a Global Sociological Imagination. *Theoretical Criminology* 0, 1362480616659129. doi:10.1177/1362480616659129

Freie, J. F. 1998. *Counterfeit Community: The Exploitation of Our Longings for Connectedness,* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Garland, P. 2014. *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*, University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, C. 2007. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gelman, A. 2011. Causality and Statistical Learning. *American Journal of Sociology,* 117**,** 955-966.

Gilbert, T., Farrand, P. & Lankshear, G. 2013. "I Don't Want to Live Like This Anymore". *Youth & Society,* 45**,** 347-364.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. 2012. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research,* New Brunswick: Aldine.

Gobo, G. 2008. Doing Ethnography. London: Sage

Goffman, A. 2015. *On the run : Fugitive Life in an American City.* New York: Picador

Goodwin, D. 2007. Ethical Issues. *Qualitative Research in Health Care.* Blackwell   Publishing Ltd.

Gowan, T. 2011. What's Social Capital Got to Do with It? The Ambiguous (and Overstated) Relationship between Social Capital and Ghetto Underemployment. *Critical Sociology,* 37**,** 47-66.

Grenfell, M. 2014. *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts,* London: Routledge.

Gross, N. 2009. A Pragmatist Theory of Social Mechanisms. *American Sociological Review,* 74**,** 358-379.

Guzmán, S. G. 2015. Substantive-Rational Authority: The Missing Fourth Pure Type in Weber's Typology of Legitimate Domination. *Journal of Classical Sociology,* 15**,** 73-95.

Haas, T. & Olsson, K. 2014. Transmutation and Reinvention of Public Spaces Through Ideals of Urban Planning and Design. *Space and Culture,* 17**,** 59-68.

Habermas, J. 2014. *Toward a Rational Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Habermas, J. 2015. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society,* Cambridge: Polity Press

 Hall, S. 1994. *The Polity Reader in Cultural Theory,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall, T., and Barrett, H. 2012. *Urban Geography*, Oxon Routledge.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. 2010. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice,* London: Routledge.

Hayano, D. 1979. Auto-Ethnography: Paradigms, Problems, and Prospects. *Human Organization,* 38**,** 99-104.

Heath, S., Brooks, R., Cleaver, E. & Ireland, E. 2009. *Researching Young People's Lives.* London: Sage.

Hedström, P. & Ylikoski, P. 2010. Causal Mechanisms in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 36**,** 49-67.

Heiskala, R. 2007. Economy and Society: From Parsons through Habermas to Semiotic Institutionalism. *Social Science Information,* 46**,** 243-272.

Henderson, P. 2005. *Including the Excluded: From Practice to Policy in European Community Development,* Bristol: Policy Press.

Hobbs, D. 2013. *Lush life: Constructing Organized Crime in the UK*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hodkinson, P. 2005. 'Insider Research' in the Study of Youth Cultures. *Journal of Youth Studies,* 8**,** 131-149.

Hodkinson, P. 2013. Family and Parenthood in an Ageing 'Youth' Culture: A Collective Embrace of Dominant Adulthood? *Sociology,* 47**,** 1072-1087.

Holdt, K. V. 2013. The Violence of Order, Orders of Violence: Between Fanon and Bourdieu. *Current Sociology,* 61**,** 112-131.

Holligan, C. 2015. Disenfranchised Violent Young Offenders in Scotland: Using Actor-Network Theory to Explore an Aetiology of Knife Crime. *Sociology,* 49**,** 123-138.

Horkheimer, M. 2013. *Eclipse of Reason,* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

How, A. R. 2001. Habermas, History and Social Evolution: Moral Learning and the Trial of Louis XVI. *Sociology,* 35**,** 177-194.

Hughes, N. 2011. Young people 'As Risk' or Young People 'At Risk': Comparing Discourses of Anti-Social Behaviour in England and Victoria. *Critical Social Policy,* 31**,** 388-409.

Hunter, A. 1982. *Symbolic Communities: The Persistence and Change of Chicago's Local Communities,* Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press.

Ilan, J. 2013. Street Social Capital in the Liquid City. *Ethnography,* 14**,** 3-24.

Ingram, N. 2011. Within School and Beyond the Gate: The Complexities of Being Educationally Successful and Working Class. *Sociology,* 45**,** 287-302.

Jayne, M. & Bell, D. 2017. City of Quarters: Urban Villages in the Contemporary City. Farnham: Ashgate.

Jensen, S. Q. 2006. Rethinking Subcultural Capital. *Young,* 14**,** 257-276.

Jerolmack, C. & Khan, S. 2014. Talk Is Cheap. *Sociological Methods & Research,* 43**,** 178-209.

Julien, C. 2015. Bourdieu, Social Capital and Online Interaction. *Sociology,* 49**,** 356-373.

Juvonen, T. 2014. Fragile Agencies in the Making. *Young,* 22**,** 253-269.

Kärrholm, M. 2007. The Materiality of Territorial Production. *Space and Culture,* 10**,** 437-453.

Kelly, P. 2003. Growing Up as Risky Business? Risks, Surveillance and the Institutionalized Mistrust of Youth. *Journal of Youth Studies,* 6**,** 165-180.

King, A. 2013. Recognising Adulthood? Young Adults' Accomplishment of their Age Identities. *Sociology,* 47**,** 109-125.

Kingston, B., Huizinga, D. & Elliott, D. S. 2009. A Test of Social Disorganization Theory in High-Risk Urban Neighbourhoods. *Youth & Society,* 41**,** 53-79.

Kirk, A. 2007. Karl Polanyi, Marshall Sahlins, and the Study of Ancient Social Relations. *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 126**,** 182-191.

Kupchik, A. & Catlaw, T. J. 2015. Discipline and Participation. *Youth & Society,* 47**,** 95-124.

L. Thomas Winfree, J., Bäckström, T. V. & Mays, G. L. 1994. Social Learning Theory, Self-Reported Delinquency, and Youth Gangs. *Youth & Society,* 26**,** 147-177.

Latour, B. 2008. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory,* Oxford: Oxford University. Press.

Lees, L. (Ed) 2004. *The Emancipatory City?: Paradoxes and Possibilities,* London, Sage.

Lefebvre, H. 2014. The Urban Revolution, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H., Brenner, N., Elden, S. & Moore, G. 2010. *State, Space, World: Selected Essays,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lehmann, W. 2009. Becoming Middle Class: How Working-class University Students Draw and Transgress Moral Class Boundaries. *Sociology,* 43**,** 631-647.

Li, J. 2013. Observation Methods, London: Sage.

Liamputtong, P. 2007. Researching the Vulnerable, London: Sage

Lloyd, J. 2013. Trouble Comes to Me. *Space and Culture,* 16**,** 306-322.

Lombard, N. 2013. Young People's Temporal and Spatial Accounts of

Gendered Violence. *Sociology,* 47**,** 1136-1151.

Lyons, M. 2012. The Professionalization of Children's Services in Australia. *Journal of Sociology,* 48**,** 115-131.

Macdonald, R., Shildrick, T., Webster, C. & Simpson, D. 2005. Growing Up in Poor Neighbourhoods. *Sociology,* 39**,** 873-891.

Machamer, P., Darden, L. & Craver, C. F. 2000. Thinking about Mechanisms. *Philosophy of Science,* 67**,** 1-25.

Marcuse, H. 2010. *Philosophy, Psychoanalysis and Emancipation: Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse, Volume Five*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Marinetto, M. 2003. Who Wants to be an Active Citizen? *Sociology,* 37**,** 103-120.

Marwell, N. P. 2004. Privatizing the Welfare State: Non-profit Community-Based Organizations as Political Actors. *American Sociological Review,* 69**,** 265-291.

Mauss, M. 2014. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange In Archaic Societies,* Miami: Hard Press Publishing.

Maxwell, J. A. 2013. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach,* Los Angeles, Sage.

Mckenzie, L. 2015. *Getting By: Estates, Class and Culture in Austerity Britain*, Bristol: Polity Press.

Mehlkop, G. & Graeff, P. 2010. Modelling a Rational Choice Theory of Criminal Action: Subjective Expected Utilities, Norms, and Interactions, *Rationality and Society,* 22**,** 189-222.

Meier, R. F., Kennedy, L. W. & Sacco, V. 2001. *The process and structure of crime: criminal events and crime analysis,* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Mercer, K. 2013. *Welcome to the Jungle: New Positions in Black Cultural Studies*, London: Routledge.

Messerschmidt, D. A. 1981. *Anthropologists at Home in North America: Methods and Issues in The Study of One's Own Society,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, T. 2012. *Ethics in Qualitative Research,* London, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.

Minton, A. 2012. *Ground Control: Fear And Happiness in the Twenty-First-Century City,* London: Penguin Books.

Mohatt, G. V. & Thomas, L. R. 2006. The Handbook of Ethical Research with Ethnocultural Populations & Communities, London: Sage.

Moyle, L., Coomber, R., 2017. Bourdieu on Supply: Utilizing the "Theory Of Practice" to Understand Complexity and Culpability in Heroin and Crack Cocaine User-Dealing. *European Journal of Criminology 14, 309–328.*

Mulligan, M. 2015. On Ambivalence and Hope in the Restless Search for Community: How to Work with the Idea of Community in the Global Age. *Sociology,* 49**,** 340-355.

Murty, K. R., Bowling Alone: Urban Tribes in Concrete Jungles. *Social Change,* 2(2) 157–164.

Murphy, R. F. 1990. *The Body Silent,* New York, Norton.

Nespor, J. 2000. Anonymity and Place in Qualitative Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 6**,** 546-569.

Noordegraaf, M. 2011. Remaking Professionals? How Associations and Professional Education Connect Professionalism and Organizations. *Current Sociology,* 59**,** 465-488.

Offer, S. 2012. The Burden of Reciprocity: Processes of Exclusion and Withdrawal from Personal Networks Among Low-income Families. *Current Sociology,* 60**,** 788-805.

Oliver, C. & O'Reilly, K. 2010. A Bourdieusian Analysis of Class and Migration. *Sociology,* 44**,** 49-66.

O'Reilly, K. 2009. *Key Concepts in Ethnography.* London: Sage

Özbilgin, M. & Tatli, A. 2011. Mapping Out the Field of Equality and Diversity: Rise of Individualism and Voluntarism. *Human Relations,* 64**,** 1229-1253.

Paillet, A. 2013. The ethnography of 'Particularly Sensitive' Activities: How 'Social Expectations of Ethnography' May Reduce Sociological and Anthropological Scope. *Ethnography,* 14**,** 126-142.

Park, R. E., Burgess, E. W., Mckenzie, R. D. & Janowitz, M. 2010. *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Però, D. 2014. Class Politics and Migrants: Collective Action among New Migrant Workers in Britain. *Sociology,* 48**,** 1156-1172.

Perry, S. L. 2013. Urban Hybrid Space and the Homeless. *Ethnography,* 14**,** 431-451.

Pfadenhauer, M. 2006. Crisis or Decline? *Current Sociology,* 54**,** 565-

578.

Pih, K. K.-H., Rosa, M. D. L., Rugh, D. & Mao, K. 2008. Different Strokes for Different Gangs? An Analysis of Capital Among Latino and Asian Gang Members. *Sociological Perspectives,* 51**,** 473-494.

Portes, A. 1998. Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 24**,** 1-24.

Pusey, M. 1996. Economic Rationalism and the Contest for Civil Society. *Thesis Eleven,* 44**,** 69-86.

Putnam, R. D. 1993. The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *The American Prospect***,** 35-42.

Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R. & Nanetti, R. Y. 2013. Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy. Princeton: University of Princeton Press.

Putnam, R. D. 2000 *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Reay, D., Crozier, G. & Clayton, J. 2009. 'Strangers in Paradise'? *Sociology,* 43**,** 1103-1121.

Reeves, A. 2015. Neither Class nor Status: Arts Participation and the Social Strata. *Sociology,* 49**,** 624-642.

Reynolds, J. R. & Baird, C. L. 2010. Is There a Downside to Shooting for the Stars? Unrealized Educational Expectations and Symptoms of Depression. *American Sociological Review,* 75**,** 151-172.

Rimmer, M. 2010. Listening to the Monkey: Class, Youth and the Formation of a Musical Habitus. *Ethnography,* 11**,** 255-283.

Roberts, J. M. & Sanders, T. 2005. Before, During and After: Realism, Reflexivity and Ethnography. *The Sociological Review,* 53**,** 294-313.

Ronai, C. R. 1995. Multiple Reflections of Child Sex Abuse. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 23**,** 395-426.

Rose, D. 1990. Living the Ethnographic Life, London: Sage

Rousseau, J.-J.1984. *Of the Social Contract, or, Principles of Political Right and Discourse on Political Economy,* New York: Harper & Row.

Russell, H. & O'Connell, P. J. 2001. Getting a Job in Europe: The Transition from Unemployment to Work among Young People in Nine European Countries. *Work, employment and society,* 15**,** 1-24.

Sáez, J. & Sánchez, M. 2006. Trust and Professionalism in Social Professions. *Current Sociology,* 54**,** 595-606.

Sahlins, M. 1973. *Stone Age Economics*, New York: Adeline

Sampson, R. J. 1988. Local Friendship Ties and Community Attachment in Mass Society: A Multilevel Systemic Model. *American Sociological Review,* 53**,** 766-779.

Sampson, R. J. & Graif, C. 2009. Neighbourhood Social Capital as Differential Social Organization. *American Behavioural Scientist,* 52**,** 1579-1605.

Sampson, R. J. & Groves, W. B. 1989. Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social-Disorganization Theory. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94**,** 774-802.

Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D. & Gannon-Rowley, T. 2002. Assessing "Neighbourhood Effects": Social Processes and New Directions in Research. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 28**,** 443-478.

Sampson, R. J. & Raudenbush, S. W. 1999. Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighbourhoods. *American Journal of Sociology,* 105**,** 603-651.

Sandberg, S., 2013. Cannabis culture: A Stable Subculture in a Changing World. *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 13, 63–79. doi:10.1177/1748895812445620

Sandberg, S., 2008. Street Capital. Theoretical Criminology 12, 153–171. doi:10.1177/1362480608089238

Sandberg, S., Copes, H., 2013. Speaking with Ethnographers. *Journal of Drug Issues* 43, 176–197. doi:10.1177/0022042612465275

Sandberg, S., Fleetwood, J., 0. Street talk and Bourdieusian criminology: Bringing Narrative to Field Theory. Criminology & Criminal Justice 0, 1748895816672909. doi:10.1177/1748895816672909

Sanli, S. 2011. Public Sphere and Symbolic Power: 'Woman's Voice' as a Case of Cultural Citizenship. *Cultural Sociology,* 5**,** 281-299.

Scharff, C. 2012. Umut Erel Migrant Women Transforming Citizenship: Life-stories from Britain and Germany. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009. 220 pp. *Feminist Theory,* 13**,** 107-108.

Scheper-Hughes, N. 2000. Ire in Ireland. *Ethnography,* 1**,** 117-140.

Scheyvens, R. & Storey, D. 2003. (Eds) *Development Fieldwork: A Practical Guide*, London: Sage

Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J. & Silverman, D. 2004. *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage

Shammas, V.L., Sandberg, S., 2016. Habitus, Capital, and Conflict:

Bringing Bourdieusian Field Theory to Criminology. *Criminology & Criminal Justice 16, 195*–213. doi:10.1177/1748895815603774

Shaw, C. R., Mckay, H. D. & Beirne, P. 2006. *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas a study of rates of delinquents in relation to differential characteristics of local communities in American cities,* London: Routledge.

Silva, J. M. 2012. Constructing Adulthood in an Age of Uncertainty. *American Sociological Review,* 77**,** 505-522.

Silverman, D. 2015. Interpreting Qualitative Data, London: Sage

Simmel, G. 2001. How is society possible? *The American Journal of Sociology.* DOI: 10.2307/2763090

Skeggs, B. 2004. Context and Background: Pierre Bourdieu's Analysis of Class, Gender and Sexuality. *The Sociological Review,* 52**,** 19-33.

Skeggs, B. 2005. The Making of Class and Gender Through Visualizing Moral Subject Formation. *Sociology,* 39**,** 965-982.

Small, M. L. 2013. Causal Thinking and Ethnographic Research. *American Journal of Sociology,* 119**,** 597-601.

Smith, C. & Riach, K. 2016. Drug Taking and Employment: Exploring the Employable Citizen in UK Policy. *Sociology,* 50**,** 24-42.

Standing, G. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class.* London, Bloomsbury Academic.

Steinmetz, G. 2011. Bourdieu, Historicity, and Historical Sociology. *Cultural Sociology,* 5**,** 45-66.

Sullivan, A., Ketende, S. & Joshi, H. 2013. Social Class and Inequalities in Early Cognitive Scores. *Sociology,* 47**,** 1187-1206.

Susen, S. 2011. Critical Notes on Habermas's Theory of the Public Sphere. *Sociological Analysis,* 5**,** 37-62.

Susen, S. 2014. Reflections on ideology. *Thesis Eleven,* 124**,** 90-113.

Sutherland, E. H. & Cressey, D. R. 1974. *Criminology,* Philadelphia; Lippincott.

Swartz, D. L. 2013. *Symbolic Power, Politics, and Intellectuals: The Political Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*, London: University of Chicago Press

Sykes, K. 2014. 'Adopting an Obligation': Innovative Forms of Inter-Clan Democracy in the Islands Region of Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Classical Sociology,* 14**,** 110-121.

Tavory, I. & Timmermans, S. 2013. A Pragmatist Approach to Causality in Ethnography. *American Journal of Sociology,* 119**,** 682-714.

Tavory, I. & Timmermans, S. 2013. A Pragmatist Approach to Causality in Ethnography. *American Journal of Sociology,* 119**,** 682-714.

Teddlie, C. & Tashakkori, A. 2014. Foundations of Mixed Methods Research Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioural Sciences. Johannesburg: MTM.

Thornton, S. 2013*. Club Cultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital*, Cambridge: Policy Press.

Threadgold, S. & Nilan, P. 2009. Reflexivity of Contemporary Youth, Risk and Cultural Capital. *Current Sociology,* 57**,** 47-68.

Tonkiss, F. 2015. *Cities by Design: The Social Life of Urban Form,* Cambridge: Policy Press.

Tönnies, F. & Harris, J. 2005. *Community and Civil Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trimble, J. & Fisher, C. 2006. *The Handbook of Ethical Research with Ethnocultural Populations and Communities*, London: Sage

Trouille, D. & Tavory, I. 2016. Shadowing: *Warrants for Intersituational Variation in Ethnography, Sociological Methods & Research DOI:* 0049124115626171.

Tubergen, F. V. & Volker, B. 2015. Inequality in Access to Social Capital in the Netherlands. *Sociology,* 49**,** 521-538.

Vainio, A. 2013. Beyond Research Ethics: Anonymity as 'Ontology', 'Analysis' and 'Independence'. *Qualitative Research,* 13**,** 685-698.

Van Den Hoonaard, W. C. 2003. Is Anonymity an Artifact in Ethnographic Research? *Journal of Academic Ethics,* 1**,** 141-151.

Wacquant, L. 2007. Territorial Stigmatization in the Age of Advanced Marginality. *Thesis Eleven,* 91**,** 66-77.

Wacquant, L. 2013. Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality, Cambridge: Polity Press

Wallace, D. Reading 'Race' in Bourdieu? Examining Black Cultural Capital Among Black Caribbean Youth in South London. *Sociology,* Vol 51, Issue 5, pp. 907 - 923

Waring, A. & Waring, J. 2009. Looking the Part. *Current Sociology,* 57**,** 344-364.

Watkins, N. D., Larson, R. W. & Sullivan, P. J. 2007. Bridging Intergroup

Difference in a Community Youth Program. *American Behavioural Scientist,* 51**,** 380-402.

Weber, M., Parsons, T. & Henderson, A. M. 1969. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation,* London: The Free Press; Collier-Macmillan.

Whyte, W. F. 2009. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum,* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Wiles, R. 2013. *What are Qualitative Research Ethics?,* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Williamson, T. 2011. *Sprawl, Justice, And Citizenship: The Civic Costs of the American Way of Life,* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, J. 2013. The Devastating Conquest of the Lived by the Conceived. *Space and Culture,* 16**,** 364-380.

Woodward, K. 2014. "Pimping the System". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 43**,** 3-37.

Woolford, A. & Curran, A. 2013. Community Positions, Neoliberal Dispositions: Managing Non-profit Social Services Within the Bureaucratic Field. *Critical Sociology,* 39**,** 45-63.

Wyness, M. 2009. Children Representing Children. *Childhood,* 16**,** 535-552.

Young, A. A. 1999. The (Non) Accumulation of Capital: Explicating the Relationship of Structure and Agency in the Lives of Poor Black Men. *Sociological Theory,* 17**,** 201-227.

Secondary sources

State of the Borough (2016)

Local Council (2013) Local Tenancy Policy February 2013

Local Council (2013) Local Housing Allocation Scheme 2013

Local Council (2012) Local Tenancy Strategy 2012

Local Council (2012) Local Housing Strategy 2012-16

Local Council 2011 The Co-operative Council: Sharing power: A New Settlement Between Citizens and the State

Local Council 2010 Homelessness Discharge of Duty into the Private Rented Sector

Local Council 2010 The Co-operative Council: Putting You in Charge

Local Council 2009 Taking Pride in Your Home

Local Council 2009 Housing Placement Policy

Local Government Association 2004 Community Cohesion – An Action Guide

Local Government Association 2006 Leading Cohesive Communities

HM Government 2008 National Indicators for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships: Handbook of Definitions

HM Government 2009 Cohesion Delivery Framework Overview

HM Government 2009 Guidance on meaningful interaction How encouraging positive relationships between people can help build community cohesion

HM Government 2013 Households Statistical Release   Social Housing Lettings: April 2012 to March 2013

Online Sources

British Sociological Association 2002 Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association. Available at: http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/Statement+Ethical+Practice.htm (accessed 03 August 2012)

Social Research Association 2003 Ethical Guidelines. Available at: http://www.the-sra.org.uk/documents/pdfs/ethics03.pdf (accessed 03 August 2012)

http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/1/coomber.html (accessed 02 September 2013)

http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/2/wiles.html   (accessed   12 November2013)

https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm (accessed 14 May 2015)

https://www.met.police.uk/sd/stats-and-data/met/crime-data-dashboard/ (accessed 07 June 2018)

https://www.met.police.uk/sd/stats-and-data/met/year-end-crime-statistics/ (accessed 07 June 2018)