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Abstract

This study developed a model of youth work practice based on a philosophy of nonviolence. Youth work in Australia is in the process of creating a clear self-consciousness and idea of its role, and a philosophy of nonviolence provides a strong foundation for further development. The study was based on the first three phases of intervention research (problem analysis and project planning, information gathering and synthesis, and design) within a heuristic paradigm. It involved a literature review, a telephone survey of 60 youth workers, in-depth interviews with 20 young people and 15 youth workers, and focus groups with 16 youth workers. Literature on youth work in Australia and Britain, and youth care in Canada and South Africa helped identify key features of youth work. Ten principles of nonviolence were developed based on principled nonviolence literature. The telephone survey provided a broad overview of current practice in New South Wales, and identified issues for further exploration in the interviews. The in-depth interviews with youth workers and young people explored their perceptions of violence and discrimination within their services; ways in which youth workers prevent and respond to disruptive, violent and unsafe behaviour; and ways in which youth work practice can be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence. Based on the research, a model of nonviolent practice was developed, and then refined following focus groups with youth workers. The model encourages youth workers to be committed to nonviolence in all they do; to develop a reflective work practice; to build professional, caring relationships; to focus on power-with; to be committed to social change; to apply principles of social justice; to ensure there are adequate, appropriate staff and resources; to negotiate clear expectations and boundaries; to create a positive environment; to respond to behaviour nonviolently; and to facilitate informal education.
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SECTION I

BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK FOR STUDY
Chapter 1

Introduction

Nonviolence as a philosophy has a significant impact on many social change movements but there has been little consideration given to its implications for youth work practice. Youth workers have probably heard of nonviolence activists such as Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King but are unlikely to be aware of the philosophy underpinning the nonviolence they, and many other women and men, practised. This research addressed this oversight by considering the implications of nonviolence for youth workers, and developing a model of nonviolent youth work practice.

A philosophy of nonviolence stands in stark contrast to the coercion and violence that underpins many aspects of society. Threat, coercion and violence protect the interests of dominant groups within society at many levels. The traditional, conservative view is that there are those who have the right to govern and those who have a duty to obey. Where obedience is not forthcoming, those in authority have the right to enforce compliance (Burton 1997; Sharp 1973b) and numerous agencies, such as the police force, courts of law, prisons and the military, have been sanctioned by society to do so. Some individuals, including teachers and parents, also have the right to use socially accepted coercion or violence. Discrimination, exploitative economic structures, and the unequal distribution of resources are other means used to help protect the interests of dominant groups (Moses 1997). The forms of violence underpinning forced compliance are many and varied:

- Aboriginal people were removed from their families, and continue to face inequality, discrimination and poverty (Haebich & Delroy 1999; Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1997; Neill 2002; Read 1998).
- People, mainly from disadvantaged groups, are imprisoned and subjected to physical violence, psychological deprivation, and the loss of liberty and autonomy (Newell 2000).
- The social position of men is protected by domestic violence, pornography, unequal access to economic resources and social norms (Atkinson, Indermaur & Blagg 1998; McAllister 1982; Starhawk 1990).
• Homophobia and “poofta bashing” not only physically and emotionally harm gays and lesbians, but also deny them many rights taken for granted by other sections of the community (Healey 2002; Mason 2002; Tomsen 2002).

• Refugees are prevented from entering Australia by force or are detained in harsh conditions (Four Corners, 15 April 2002 and 13 August 2001).

• Parents have the right to physically “punish” their children (Saunders & Goddard 1998). While corporal punishment is no longer used in schools, a range of other means of control are available to teachers and principals including detention, suspension and expulsion as well as other institutionalised practices which adversely affect students (Epp 1996).

• Economic injustice leads to unemployment, poverty, ill health and starvation both nationally and internationally (Bittman 1997; Saunders 1996; Yeros & Vandersluis 1999).

Youth work occurs within this context of violence. In addition, young people who use youth services are frequently both the victims of violence (direct, physical violence and the violence of unjust social structures), and perpetrators of violence (Alder 1991; Crime Prevention Division 1999; Halstead 1992). Nonviolence offers youth workers a framework from which they can help create a more peaceful, just society, and develop work practices that do not rely on coercion and control. Although Walz and Ritchie (2000) suggest there is significant overlap between social work values and Gandhian principles, there has been no systematic investigation of the implications of nonviolence for youth workers. Shachter and Seinfeld (1994) argue that the time has come for social workers “to rediscover the transcending wisdom” (p. 349) of advocates of nonviolence such as Gandhi and King. The following study drew upon this wisdom in the context of youth work.

The research

This study is part of broader research into ways in which community-based, government-funded youth services can create cultures of nonviolence. The aim of this part of the research was to develop a model of nonviolent youth work practice. In order to meet this aim, it asked the following questions:
1. What are the key principles of a philosophy of nonviolence?
2. How violent or nonviolent do youth workers believe their youth services are?
3. What aspects of current youth work practice are consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence?
4. What are the implications for youth work of a philosophy of nonviolence?
5. What might a model of nonviolent youth work practice look like?

The research was conducted within a heuristic paradigm (Tyson 1995) using intervention research (Rothman & Thomas 1994), both of which focus on building a close relationship between research and practice, recognise the insights and wisdom of practitioners, and allow for a range of methodologies to be adopted. The research involved six steps:

1. A review of literature on youth work and nonviolence.
2. A statewide telephone survey of 60 youth workers in New South Wales to obtain a broad overview of current practice and issues needing further exploration.
3. In-depth interviews with 15 youth workers and 20 young people to explore their perceptions of violence and discrimination within their services; ways in which youth workers prevent and respond to disruptive, violent and unsafe behaviour; and ways in which youth work practice can be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence.
4. The development of a model of nonviolent youth work practice.
5. Two focus groups with youth workers to obtain feedback about the results and the draft model.
6. Refinement of the model based on feedback from the focus groups.

THE RESEARCHER

In some traditions, social research is perceived as being a value free process of discovering natural laws that govern human behaviour, and the role of the researcher is to be detached, neutral and objective (Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997). The heuristic paradigm and much social work research, reject this role for researchers and argue it is important that researchers acknowledge the subjective aspects of their research and identify their own values and biases (McDermott 1996; Plath 2000;
Sadique 1996; Tyson 1995). McDermott (1996) argues, “a quest for the objectivity promised by positivist epistemology, with its perspective derived from natural science research models and methods, clearly contradicts social work’s continuing involvement in debating the profession’s value base” (p. 7).

Consistent with these arguments, the following is a brief discussion of my background and value stance. I came to the research with an existing, strong commitment to nonviolence. I am a Quaker (a group with a long history of pacifism), have been involved in nonviolence and peace issues since the early 1980s, and became a youth worker in 1991. In the past I have been involved in social action aimed at a variety of issues including nuclear disarmament, the arms trade, the environment and social justice. Since 1994, I have been a facilitator with the Alternatives to Violence Project, facilitating workshops on nonviolence with youth workers, young people, prisoners, teachers, parents and many other people. Over the years, my interest in nonviolence has influenced my youth work, and my youth work practice has deepened my understanding of, and commitment to, nonviolence. I have become convinced that there is a close relationship between the two and, through this research, I explored the implication for youth workers of a philosophy of nonviolence.

Although I am committed to social justice, I come from a socially privileged background. I am a white, middle class, well-educated, middle-aged, heterosexual male from a Christian background. My position of social privilege necessarily shaped the research, the relationships I had with research participants, and how I made sense of the experiences of others and myself. It is probable that a researcher from a different social background would have interpreted results differently and developed a different model but this does not mean the research is invalid. The heuristic paradigm acknowledges the impact the researcher has on the research, and assists researchers to address the impact they may have (see Chapter 5).

**Thesis Structure**

This thesis is divided into four sections. The first section provides the context for the research. Chapter 2 discusses youth work from an international perspective and briefly discusses the British Youth Service, and youth care in Canada and South Africa.
Chapter 3 explores youth work in Australia in greater detail. Chapter 4 examines literature on nonviolence, identifies ten principles of a philosophy of nonviolence and discusses literature on the relevance of Gandhian thought for social work.

The second section outlines the methodology used in the study. Chapter 5 provides an introduction to the heuristic paradigm and intervention research, presents the way in which intervention research was implemented, and discusses some of the ethical issues involved in research with young people. Chapter 6 presents the methodology involved in the first phase of intervention research, problem analysis and project planning, specifically the background to the research, and the way in which the literature review and telephone survey were conducted. Chapter 7 presents the methodology involved in the in-depth interviews that formed the basis of the second phase of intervention research, information gathering and synthesis. Chapter 8 discusses the design phase of intervention research during which the model of nonviolent youth work practice was developed, and focus groups were held with youth workers. Chapter 8 also outlines steps taken to protect the quality of the research.

The third section provides the findings of the telephone survey (Chapter 9) and the in-depth interviews (Chapter 10).

The final section presents a model of nonviolent youth work practice. Chapter 11 discusses the model in some depth and explains the process by which the model was developed. Chapter 12 concludes the thesis by discussing implications for practice, proposes further research and outlines the next steps to be taken in the broader intervention research project.
Chapter 2
Youth Work in an International Context

Youth work is shaped by a combination of social, political, economic and historical factors (Ferguson, Pence & Denholm 1993b, p. 3) and there are significant differences in the nature, structure and focus of youth work in different countries (Sherraden 1992). This chapter identifies main traditions of youth work internationally, and provides two examples of youth work overseas: youth work in England, and youth care in Canada and South Africa.

There have been a number of attempts to classify the various traditions of youth work. Banks (1994) identifies four broad categories:

1. Leisure-based work where any workers involved do not encourage or draw out learning, for example, a village football team.
2. Personal and social development work which may use leisure activities as a focus for informal education and learning aimed at a broad range of young people, for example, youth club activities.
3. Preventive work perhaps targeted at particular communities or groups aimed at reducing drug use or crime through informal educational methods.
4. Youth social work working with young people to control or treat individual problems such as non-school attendance or offending, or offering counselling and advice on a range of problems such as sexual abuse (p. 3).

King (n.d., pp. 1-4) suggests five youth work traditions, some of which are similar to Banks’ categories:

1. Youth work in families and communities – young people are cared for, supported and educated within existing family and community networks or structures.
2. Youth work as social and leisure provision – programs or activities are provided which help young people develop characteristics such as loyalty, fair play and responsibility, while also giving them something to do.
3. Pastoral work and informal education – while the programs and activities may be similar to the social and leisure tradition, the motivation is different, usually involving spiritual, religious or other social education.
4. **Youth work for development** – young people are helped to develop skills, attitudes or behaviours that are considered important to the nation’s growth. The focus can range from national fitness and military training to political awareness and youth movements. It should be noted that youth development officers in New South Wales (Winch & Hewlett 1990), who undertake community work with a youth focus, are a form of youth welfare work and are not part of this tradition.

5. **Youth welfare work** – a range of welfare services, such as housing, advocacy, or skill development are provided to disadvantaged, at risk or marginalised young people.

Smith (1988, pp. 51-57) suggests six categories of working with young people:

1. **Social and leisure provision** focuses on social interaction in a non-structured environment, or leisure activities in a more structured environment, with sympathetic adults being available to listen or to provide basic support. The emphasis is on enjoyment in the present rather than preparing young people for future roles.

2. **Character building** focuses on building the personal character of young people through structured activities, often within a clear hierarchical structure; collective performance; and/or exercise and sport. There is often an emphasis on leadership, obedience to authority and preparation for future life.

3. **Personal and social development** assists young people to develop skills and attitudes that will be of use to them as they take on more “adult” roles.

4. **Politicising** promotes young people’s political awareness and involvement within either a narrow understanding of politics as being essentially about government or a broader view of politics as being about power relationships.

5. **Youth welfare** provides professional support to young people with special needs and draws upon the disciplines of psychology and sociology. It can involve therapy, advice, information and referral, and material help including food, clothing, money and accommodation.

6. **Rescuing** has similarities to youth welfare but is largely non-professional and invariably assumes the form of a moral crusade often religious in nature. Young people are seen as being in need of saving and problems are seen as personal rather than structural.
Smith (1988, pp. 57-61) groups the six categories into three broader categories:

1. **Organic youth work** which is largely initiated and undertaken by people who have not undertaken professional training, and use methods based on commonsense and everyday experience.

2. **Movement-based youth work** which has strong and explicit links with various social movement (e.g. Scouts and Guides, churches and political movements).

3. **Professionalised youth work** “expounded and practised by occupational groups who have attained a dominant position within their particular division of labour” (p. 58).

Based on Smith’s typology and drawing on King (n.d.) and Banks (1994), Figure 2 - 1 illustrates seven traditions within youth work. Family and community networks are seen as part of organic youth work and informal education as part of personal and social development. In addition, it is important to note that the term professional youth work refers to the nature of the professional relationship between young people and youth workers rather than inferring that youth work is necessarily a formal profession.

![Figure 2 - 1: Traditions of working with young people](image-url)

The main focus of this study is professional youth work as the research is based on, and addresses, youth workers within these traditions. The following discusses two examples of professional youth work in different contexts:
• The British Youth Service, which provides personal and social development through informal education
• Youth care in Canada and South Africa, which is cast within a welfare mould.

THE BRITISH YOUTH SERVICE

Established by the Education Act in 1944 (Banks 1994), the British Youth Service refers to a range of service provision for young people developed through a partnership between local government authorities, voluntary youth organisations and independent groups (National Youth Agency 2001c, p. 5). Its origins lie in voluntary organisations which began at least 150 years earlier (Milson 1970), particularly the clubs and projects established in the nineteenth century (National Youth Agency 2001c). According to the National Youth Agency (2001c):

Youth work helps young people learn about themselves, others and society, through informal educational activities which combine enjoyment, challenge and learning. Youth workers work with young people aged between 11 and 25, particularly those aged between 13 and 19, in order to promote their personal and social development and enable them to have a voice, influence and place in their communities and society as a whole (p. 4).

The Agency proposes that youth work can be recognised by the following qualities:

• It offers its services in places where young people can choose to participate;
• It encourages young people to be critical in their responses to their own experiences and to the world around them;
• It works with young people to help them make informed choices about their personal responsibilities within their communities;
• It works alongside school and college-based education to encourage young people to achieve and fulfil their potential; and
• It works with other agencies to encourage society to be responsive to young people’s needs (National Youth Agency 2001b, p. 1).

British youth work is an example of personal and social development involving a) voluntary participation by young people, particularly through youth groups or clubs and
b) informal education (Jeffs & Smith 1997; Smith 2002). Each of these is briefly discussed below.

**Voluntary participation**

The British Youth Service relies on the voluntary participation of young people during their leisure time (Davies 2000; Hall, Williamson & Coffey 2000). Unlike school, there is no compulsion to attend the Youth Service, thus the process of engagement is crucial and needs to be carefully managed (Murphy 1999). Davies (2000) argues that the voluntary nature of the relationship has been confirmed and defended by the Youth Service for over a century. Jeffs and Smith (1997) agree, drawing attention to youth workers’ consistent questioning of “whether or not they can in good faith operate in settings where attendance is compulsory” (p. 49). They propose that in such settings, youth workers are stepping outside their traditionally defined roles. Given the historical emphasis on voluntary participation, there is ongoing debate about whether or not it is appropriate for youth workers to be involved in crime prevention programs, or other programs which could undermine young people’s ability to choose the level of their involvement in the Youth Service (Davies 2000; Smith & Paylor 1997; Smith 2001c).

The Youth Service provides services to all young people, not just those who are disadvantaged or marginalised (Davies 1999, 2000; National Youth Agency 2001c; Robertson 2000; Smith 2002). Between 60% and 90% of young people have contact with the Youth Service at some time between the ages of 11 and 25 (Davies 2000; National Youth Agency 2001c). As Davies (1999) demonstrates, the universal approach means that young people are less likely to be given stigmatising labels such as “offender’, ‘truant’, ‘slow learner’, ‘unemployed’, ‘abuse survivor’, ‘homeless’” (p. 52). A number of writers express concern about pressures on the Youth Service to move towards targeting disadvantaged young people and a social control orientation, rather than being open to all young people as a preventative force (see for example Robertson 2000; Smith 2002).
Informal education

The educative focus of youth work is emphasised by the incorporation of the Youth Service as a component of the overall British education system (National Youth Agency 2001c; Sherraden 1992). According to Rosseter (1987), “first and foremost, youth workers are educators” because youth work is about bringing about change and the development of “knowledge, skills and feelings” within young people (p. 52). Banks (1999b) argues, “education is both the process and the purpose of youth work” (p. 7). Likewise, Davies (1999) states that youth work is “unapologetically an educational practice” (p. 52). It is not, however, the formal education offered in schools and other traditional education institutions. Education occurs informally: the emphasis is on “discovering and learning things by experiencing them” (Rosseter 1987, p. 54). According to Jeffs and Smith (1992), informal education is at the heart of youth work (see also Banks 1994, 1996, 1999b; Davies 2000; Jeffs & Smith 1992; McCulloch & Tett 1999; National Youth Agency 2001c; Rosseter 1987; Smith 1988; Young 1999). As Banks (1996) suggests:

The concept of informal education incorporate the key processes and values of youth work and is premised upon the fact that practitioners may work with a variety of client groups in a variety of settings. It not only encapsulates what has been valued as the core process of youth work, but also allows for the fragmentation and specialisation that is currently happening in the world of work (pp. 20-21).

Smith (1998, pp. 127-132; see also Jeffs and Smith 1990, pp. 6-13) identifies seven characteristics of informal education in youth work. First, “it can take place in a variety of settings, many of which are used for other, non-educational, purposes” (Smith 1988, p. 131). Informal education is not limited to traditional education sites, such as schools, but can take place in shopping centres, people’s homes, work places, youth centres, pubs, pool halls or other informal settings. Often the focus of young people is the primary task at hand, such as organising a social event or playing pool, whereas the youth worker’s main focus is on what can be learnt through the process. These differing priorities create tension and require skilled intervention so that tasks contribute to informal education while not being hijacked by youth workers (Jeffs & Smith 1990b, p. 7).
Second, “the process is deliberate and purposeful in that the people concerned are seeking to acquire some knowledge, skills and/or attitudes. However, such purpose and intent may not always be marked by closely specified goals” (Smith 1988, p. 131). People may know that they “need to sort something out – to put information and feelings in order” (p. 128) but they may not know exactly what knowledge, skills or attitudes they need to learn. Youth workers allow learning to occur by creating contexts and conditions that promote reflection and exploration (Jeffs & Smith 1990b, p. 7).

Third, “timescales are likely to be highly variable and often structured by the dynamics of the particular institution(s) in which exchanges are set. Most of those institutions will not primarily be concerned with education” (Smith 1988, p. 131). Informal education can consist of one-off events or it can occur over a long period of time. The time structure alters according to the specific learning project, the personal and social characteristics of the young people, and a variety of other external factors (Jeffs & Smith 1990b; Smith 1988). Because of the scale, nature and time frames of informal education, progress often appears to be quite slow (Jeffs & Smith 1990b, pp. 7-8).

Fourth, “participation is voluntary and is often self-generated” (Smith 1988, p. 131). Jeffs and Smith (1990b, p. 8) argue that even in services where attendance is compulsory, participation in specific activities can still be voluntary. Because participation in informal education is by choice there is sometimes an assumption that youth workers do not need to devote the large amounts of time that school teachers do to behaviour management (Smith 1988, p. 129). This assumption is incorrect and, as this study will show, despite the dearth of literature on managing behaviour in youth work, youth workers frequently face issues of behaviour management and control.

Fifth, “the process is dialogical and marked by mutual respect” (Smith 1988, p. 131). Dialogue in informal education goes beyond discussion by promoting reflection, critical analysis, the development of alternatives, and action (Jeffs & Smith 1990b, p. 9). Dialogue is entered into through conversation characterised by concern, trust, respect, appreciation, affection and hope (Smith 2001a; Young 1999).

Through conversation, testing out prejudices (prejudgments), searching out meaning, we become more critical.... We become better able to name our feelings and thoughts,
and place ourselves in the world. We can develop a language of critique and possibility which allows us to act (Smith 2001a, para. 54).

Drawing upon Freire (1973, 1994), Jeffs and Smith (1990b) argue that such dialogue is not value free and “involves a certain view of the world and of women’s and men’s place within it” (p. 10). The role of an informal educator is to ask questions and make comments that allow other people to clarify their own thinking, to make sense of their experiences and to build theory for themselves.

A respect for truth and for justice, a commitment to collaborative working and a belief in reflectiveness and theory making are all necessary. Crucially, this last belief must connect with action: there has to be some promise of the dialogue resulting in changed or better informed behaviour (Jeffs & Smith 1990c, p. 10).

Sixth, “there will be an active appreciation of, and engagement with, the social systems through which participants operate, and the cultural forms they utilize” (Smith 1988, p. 131). Rather than creating separate institutions for education, informal educators attempt to “work within or along side forms and structures familiar to, and owned by, participants. This requires an active appreciation of local social systems and the culture of the engaged” (p. 130). Informal education in youth work involves constantly looking for learning that can arise from everyday life. As Jeffs and Smith (1990b) argue, “the whole purpose of informal education is to develop forms of thinking and acting that fit the situations that people find themselves in” and as this can only be done by the people themselves, informal education must make “their analysis and view of the world a central reference point” (p. 11).

Seventh, “it may use both experiential and assimilated information patterns of learning” (Smith 1988, p. 132). Experiential learning starts with people doing things (a concrete experience) followed by reflection and theory making, and then testing out any new understanding in more concrete experiences. Information assimilation starts with the educator passing on information, ideas or theory that can then be put into practice or tested by the learner (Smith 1988). Both forms of learning are used in informal education depending on the nature of the learning experience, and youth workers are not restricted to the use of one style of learning (Jeffs & Smith 1990b, p. 12).
Other characteristics

Given the focus on Australian youth work in this study, there are three other characteristics of British youth work that differentiate it from the Australian context:

- Voluntary organisations such as Scouts, Guides and Young Farmers’ Clubs are an important part of the Youth Service (National Youth Agency 2001c; Sherraden 1992). In Australia, the role of such groups is strongly debated.
- The Youth Service relies heavily on volunteer workers (Jeffs & Smith 1992; National Youth Agency 2001c; Sherraden 1992) with as many as half a million volunteers being directly involved in youth work (National Youth Agency 2001c, p. 5). In Australia, there has been a move away from volunteers in many areas of youth work.
- Residential services are not considered part of the British Youth Service. In Australia, youth accommodation services were a major base for the growth of professional youth work.

Youth care

Youth care in South Africa and Canada are examples of professional youth welfare work. Since South Africa turned to Canada for models of youth care, similarities in practice exist across these diverse contexts and a growing body of literature is available. Youth care as a field of practice developed in response to the need for alternative care for children not cared for by their biological parents (Beukes & Gannon 1999). From the eighteenth century various institutions were established to care for children or young people identified as being in need of care (Beukes & Gannon 1999; Charles & Gabor n.d.). Initially confined to residential care professionals (Charles & Gabor n.d.; Ferguson, Pence & Denholm 1993b), child and youth care has broadened its focus to include:

- Infants, children, and adolescents, including those with special needs, within the context of the family the community, and the life span... Professional practitioners promote the optimal development of children, youth, and their families in a variety of settings, such as early care and education, community-based child and youth development programs, parent education and family support, school-based programs, community mental health, group homes, residential centers, day and residential
treatment, early intervention, home-based care and treatment, psychiatric centers, rehabilitation programs, pediatric health care and juvenile justice programs (Mattingly & Stuart 2001, p. 3, see also Ferguson, Pence & Denholm 1993, National Association of Child Care Workers n.d.).

Ferguson and Anglin (in Denholm 1990, pp. 51-52) suggest that the key elements of child and youth care are as follows:

- It focuses on the growth and development of children and young people within a variety of contexts
- It is multifaceted and cares for the totality of developmental function rather than focusing on one facet
- It adheres to a model of social competence rather than a pathology-based orientation
- It is based on, but not restricted to, direct, day to day work with children and youth in their environment (see also Child and Youth Care Online 2000; Ferguson, Pence & Denholm 1993b).

Anglin (1996, 2000) identifies a number of tasks performed by child and youth care workers (see Figure 2 - 2). However, it is the day to day to day tasks – *The other 23 hours* (Trieschman, Whittaker & Brendtro 1969) – that are emphasised in child and youth care (Child and Youth Care Online 2000; Gabor & Kuehne 1993; Gerber & Slavin 2000; Gray & Gannon 1998; Krueger 2000). Gabor and Kuehne (1993) argue that the context of practice for youth care workers is a young person’s “everyday living environment” (p. 196) and that youth care workers are involved in the events and activities of young person’s day for several hours at a time. Young people need:

> Care givers who they can count on, who are on hand to talk when they are ready, to support them when they are motivated to learn, to encourage them to try again when they fail ... and to also be there when they are neither ready, motivated, nor interested in a helping hand (Krueger 2000, para. 32).
Direct Service to Clients

1. Individual interventions, counselling or therapy
2. Group intervention, counselling or therapy
3. In-home family intervention, counselling or therapy
4. Office-based family intervention, counselling or therapy
5. Assessment of child
6. Assessment of family
7. Child management
8. Child abuse interventions
9. Employment counselling or assistance
10. Life skills training
11. Health management
12. Education remediation
13. Recreational leadership
14. Arts and crafts leadership
15. Counselling on death and dying
16. Therapeutic play
17. Parenting skill training
18. Sexuality counselling
19. Marriage counselling
20. Stress management
21. Lifestyle modification

Organisational Activities

1. Case management
2. Client contracting
3. Report writing and formal recording
4. Court appearances/legal documentation
5. Program planning and development
6. Use and interpretation of policy
7. Individual consultation with other professionals
8. Participation in professional teams
9. Co-ordination of professional teams
10. Contracting for services
11. Supervision of staff, students or volunteers
12. Staff training and development
13. Public relations/community education
14. Organizational analysis and development
15. Policy analysis and development

(Source: Anglin 2000)

Figure 2 - 2: The role of the child and youth care worker

Building relationships

Closely connected to “being there” (Krueger 2000), the importance of relationships to youth care is frequently emphasised (Anglin et al. 1990; Brendtro 1990; Fewster 1990; Krueger 1983, 2000; Maier 1990, 1991; Richardson 2001). Drawing on research into attachment formation, Maier (1990, 1991) argues that attachment to another person is essential for human growth and development. “Close and dependable attachment enhances learning, risk-taking, and openness to change” (Maier 1991, p. 395). According to Krueger (2000), young people who have been “psychologically and or physically abandoned throughout their lives” are afraid that they will be abandoned again and so “to trust and grow, they need dependable and predictable connections” (para. 32). In less formal language, Bronfenbrenner (in Krueger 2000) suggests that every child needs a connection with “at least one person who is crazy about him or her” (para. 24).
Fewster (1990) suggests that it is only through relationships that “we come to know our qualities, potentials, vulnerabilities and, ultimately, our humanness and our mortality” (p. 25). He goes on to argue that, in youth care, relationships should not be just another intervention technique but rather they are an opportunity for both the young person and the practitioner to learn and grow as equal partners (p. 39). Brendtro (1990) discusses the dangers for child and youth care workers when relationships become too shallow or distant, and advocates that relationships be based on love, acceptance and genuine concern. Quoting Janusz Korczak, killed in the Nazi death camp Treblinka, Brendtro reminds readers, “your authority as a child care worker is based on the strength of your status as a beloved and admired model person. This cannot be acquired by tools and technology” (p. 82).

Building relationships is particularly important because participation by young people in youth care is frequently involuntary. Youth care workers do not work with all young people but focus on young people who have been removed, or are at risk of removal, from their parents (Anglin 1996). While the focus of youth care is increasingly on prevention and early intervention (Anglin 1996; Gray & Gannon 1998), there is still a large focus on care and control (Beukes & Gannon 1999; Denholm 1990; Ferguson, Pence & Denholm 1993b; Krueger 1991) which often involves involuntary clients.

Professionalisation of youth care

Following long campaigns, child and youth care has achieved professional status in both Canada and South Africa (Anglin et al. 1990; Denholm 1990; du Toit 2000). Du Toit (2000) argues that there are three fundamental reasons why child and youth care workers have “begged, pleaded and fought” (p. 20) to be recognised as professionals:

- Firstly, we believe in what we are doing, we do it well, we receive specific training, and we want to be recognised both professionally and with respect to salaries. We want to earn what social workers earn for example, and want to take our place within a professional multi-disciplinary team without being patronised or disregarded.
- Secondly, (and most important of all) we believe that the children and youth whom we service deserve the best – always. They deserve ethical and effective practice. They deserve to know that the people working with them are equipped to do so, have
committed themselves to an ethical code of conduct and are prepared to be held accountable to it.

• Thirdly, we believe this is a very special profession, with very specific knowledge and skill, very special attitudes toward vulnerable children and youth, and a very specific philosophy. “Not just anybody,” simply because they work with children and youth, can call themselves a “child and youth care worker.” We have always seen our work as different from, yet complementary to social work, psychology and education. We have not wanted to be seen as some kind of assistant to social workers, neither do we in any way presume to do social work. When we were offered the opportunity to be social auxiliary workers, we said no thanks! (p. 1).

CONCLUSION

Figure 2 - 3 summarises some of the key characteristics of youth work in Britain and youth care in Canada and South Africa. It needs to be emphasised that this discussion of two significant contexts of youth work internationally has not captured the full breadth of practice within each country, nor has it addressed many of the current debates. In Britain, for example, there is debate about the role of youth workers in crime prevention and control (Jeffs & Banks 1999; Moir 1999; Smith & Paylor 1997; Tucker 1994), youth work and social change or action (Bamber 2000; Barry 1996; Barry, Davies & Williamson 1997; Davies 1999; Fleming, Harrison & Ward 1998; Green 2001; Williamson 1995), the training of youth workers (Jeffs & Smith 1993; Tucker 1994), ethics in youth work (Banks 1999a; National Youth Agency 1999, 2001b), and a government plan to transform youth work through the Connexions Service (Davies 2000; Department for Education and Employment 2001; National Youth Agency 2001a; Smith 2002).

In child and youth care there is a strong focus on developing the theoretical base for youth care (Anglin et al. 1990; Ferguson, Pence & Denholm 1993a; Krueger 1991), and there is debate about the relationship between child and youth carers and social work (Gerber & Slavin 2000; Gray & Gannon 1998), behaviour management (Krueger 1983; St Germaine & Kessell 1989; The International Child and Youth Care Network 2000), competencies involved in youth care (Mattingly & Stuart 2001) and ethical practice (Mattingly & Stuart 2001; National Association of Child Care Workers n.d.; The
International Child and Youth Care Network 2002). It is worth noting that in South Africa there is also a very strong tradition of youth movements involved in social and political change (Maunders 1984).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The British Youth Service</strong></th>
<th><strong>Youth Care</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Youth work helps young people learn about themselves, others and society, through informal educational activities which combine enjoyment, challenge and learning. Youth workers work with young people aged between 11 and 25, particularly those aged between 13 and 19, in order to promote their personal and social development and enable them to have a voice, influence and place in their communities and society as a whole (National Youth Agency 2001c, p. 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tradition of working with young people</strong></td>
<td>Personal social development, Informal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical roots</strong></td>
<td>Youth clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical base</strong></td>
<td>Informal education, Developmental psychology, Ecological perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Education, Care, control and prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth participation</strong></td>
<td>Voluntary, Involuntary (with a control function)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group</strong></td>
<td>Universal, Young people who have been removed, or are at risk of removal, from their parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteers</strong></td>
<td>Includes voluntary organisation (e.g. Scouts, Guides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close association</strong></td>
<td>Other educators (especially informal educators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional recognition</strong></td>
<td>No, Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2-3: Comparison of British Youth Service and youth care**

In sketching a brief overview of The British Youth Service and Canadian and South African youth care, this chapter provides a useful starting point for the discussion on youth work in Australia.
Chapter 3
Youth Work in Australia

Australia has examples of organic, movement-based and professional work with young people but, compared to the examples discussed in the previous chapter, Australian youth work is underdeveloped as a specific area of practice (Sercombe et al. 2002, p. 103). Rather than attempting to address the full range of groups and organisations working with young people, this study concentrates on youth workers within professional traditions of youth work. This chapter provides a brief history of youth work in Australia before discussing its current social and political context, the way in which the concept of youth is socially constructed, definitions of youth work, the relationship between youth work and social justice, and the debate concerning youth work obtaining official status as a profession.

A HISTORY OF YOUTH WORK IN AUSTRALIA

Beginning in the mid 19th century, youth work in Australia has developed on an *ad hoc* basis (Australian National Commission for UNESCO Youth Research Project Sub-Committee 1976; Sercombe et al. 2002). Starting as a volunteer movement, it was initially associated with church-based, charitable and uniformed organisations (Bessant 1997; Maunders 1984, 1990; White 1990a) and involved three major strands:

- Attempts to control working class young people, particularly young males (Higgins 1991; Mason 1987; Maunders 1984; O'Connor, Wilson & Setterlund 1998; White 1990a).
- Rescuing young people from “a life of idleness or immorality and poverty,” and showing the “labouring poor” how to think and feel like the middle-class” (Bessant 1997, pp. 34-35; see also Denholm & Ling 1990; Maunders 1984; Quixley 1992; Westhorp 1990).
- Providing recreation activities, frequently associated with attempts to control or rescue young people (Mason 1987; NSW Youth Workers' Association 1982; Quixley 1992; Westhorp 1990; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991).
With Government funding for the establishment of National Fitness Councils in the lead up to, and following, the Second World War, the focus of youth work moved to physical wellbeing (Bessant 1997; Maunders 1984). Some of these Councils, however, focused on more than just physical fitness. For example, the Victorian Council Committee noted, “fitness depends not so much on the development of physique as on education of the whole man [sic]” (Maunders 1984, p. 80).

Until the early 1970s, youth work was largely left to non-government, voluntary organisations with unpaid workers (Bessant 1997; Ewen 1981; Mason 1987) but during the 70s there was a significant growth in government involvement in youth policy, increased government funding of youth services and a rise in the number of professional youth workers (Australian National Commission for UNESCO Youth Research Project Sub-Committee 1976; Ewen 1981; Mason 1987; Maunders 1984; Sherington & Irving 1989; Westhorp 1990). A major impetus for change came when the Whitlam federal government attempted to establish a community-based system of welfare provision with a network of services, based on a philosophy of community participation involving clients and volunteers in the provision of service (Mendelsohn 1982, p. 192). This period saw the emergence of local, community-based youth services, with voluntary community management committees. People with a basic qualification or without a welfare or related qualification (there was no tertiary youth work training in most states) generally staffed these services because it was believed that “friendly casual workers and volunteers” (Healy 1998, p. 85) could do most youth work tasks.

The Community Youth Support Scheme (CYSS), established in 1976, helped further the expansion of youth services by establishing:

- Small community-based projects to provide support for unemployed young people.
- CYSS projects frequently ran drop-in style projects where unemployed young people could meet, talk, share a cup of coffee, and get involved in a range of activities including recreation and employment-oriented programs (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 313).

Many bent, or ignored, funding guidelines in order to develop services that met the local needs of young people (Maunders 1984, p. 102). In New South Wales and Victoria, CYSS tended to adopt “a broad social welfare approach” whereas other states tended to
be more “single-minded in the employment preparation approach” (Ewen 1981, p. 17). While a Committee of Inquiry into Labour Market Programs (1985) recommended that CYSS be expanded to form the basis of an Australian Youth Service, the Government appointed Australian Youth Service Consultation Team (1985) investigating the proposal did not support the recommendation. While the consultation team recognised the need for a “more comprehensive and integrated approach to delivering services to young people” (p. 8), they recommended that “CYSS should remain as a labour market program under the aegis of the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations and should not be developed into an Australian Youth Service” (p. 13). The proposed separate Australian Youth Service did not eventuate. Federal governments, both Liberal and Labour, had already commenced placing restrictions on the type of programs CYSS projects could run and, following the report, the focus moved from a youth support program to employment training.

With the replacement of CYSS by Skillshare in 1988 (Westhorp 1990), the target group was expanded to include all long-term unemployed, and tenders were sought from non-profit organisations. Most tenders were awarded to large charities with existing administrative infrastructure and professional management, and there was an emphasis on outcomes in terms of employment, education or training (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998). Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998) described the process of change as follows:

Somewhere in the middle of all that, unemployed young people stopped going to Skillshare. Although young people remain a “target” population, it is easier to guarantee outcomes for women re-entering the workforce and recently arrived migrants, and they have less problems with the structured program. Most Skillshares no longer do youth work (p. 313).

Another impetus for the growth of professional youth work was the establishment of the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) in 1980 with a specific youth component (Westhorp 1990, p. 12). The findings of the Burdekin Report Our Homeless Children (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1989) also brought greater attention to the needs of homeless young people and led to an increase in funding for youth accommodation services (Westhorp 1990, p. 12).
From the initial base of employment and accommodation services, youth workers now operate in a wide range of areas. Bessant and Webber (1999, pp. 47-48) identified three broad categories of youth work and suggested that many youth workers operate at one or more level simultaneously:

- **Face-to-face youth work** involving a variety of roles in direct service provision.
- **Organisational and administrative youth work** that centers on organising other staff and activities and generally involves little or no face-to-face work with young people.
- **Policy development and implementation, writing and research** that also do not include significant face-to-face contact with young people.

While these broad categories could also apply to the English Youth Service or Canadian and South African youth care, there appears to be a broader range of direct service provision in Australia. The main areas of direct service delivery in Australia include accommodation services, employment assistance, training programs, alternative education programs, counselling, recreation services, community development, case management, street work, health services, drug and alcohol services, legal or court support, crime prevention, and services for specific groups of young people, such as indigenous young people or young people from a non-English speaking background (Bessant & Webber 1999; Ewen 1981; Grierson 1992). Although volunteers have played a large role in youth work, the specialisation of services and the increasing demand placed on workers means that there is a decreasing role for volunteers.

The groups targeted by youth workers vary, and include both voluntary and involuntary clients, although the focus is mostly on voluntary clients or participants. Community-based youth services usually target disadvantaged or marginalised young people and many have a specific target group, such as homeless young people, early school leavers, or drug users. In New South Wales, even services which do not have such a specific target group, such as youth centres, are often funded through the Community Services Grants Project which funds them to focus on disadvantaged groups and communities (Ayres 1998).
Unlike the contexts discussed in the previous chapter, there is not a clearly articulated philosophical or theoretical framework for Australian youth work (Brown 1991; Conference of Australian Youth Organisations 1985; Flowers 1998; Maunders 1984; White 1990b). While there have been a number of attempts to address this gap, during the late 1980s and early 1990s Australian literature focused on models of youth work (Cooper & White 1994; Knight 1991; White 1990a) or the importance of ideology for youth work (Brown 1991; Davey 1991; Manning 1992a; Turley 1994; White 1990a).

Knight (1991) suggested that there were two main models of youth work: pioneering and settling. Pioneering referred to activities breaking new ground and bringing about change in people and situations. They were not “guided or constrained by traditions” and were not afraid to “break away from bureaucratic practices within an organisational framework” (p. 51). Pioneering activities were at the “frontiers” (p. 55) of youth work and included innovative approaches to youth work. Settling activities included maintaining and managing existing programs and providing traditional youth work activities. Knight (1991) went on to suggest that a balance had to be achieved between pioneering and settling activities to avoid new projects which failed to become properly established or the unquestioning acceptance of existing forms of youth work. He also suggested that it was important to match youth workers effectively and appropriately with the type of roles they needed to undertake.

White (1990a) suggested that there were two “political divisions” (p. 175) among youth workers – liberals and radicals – and argued that in youth work liberal views were more popular than radical ones (p. 176).

[Liberals] tend to engage in the more conservative “softer practice”, which bears some similarity to the “child saver” movements that first emerged in the nineteenth century. [Radicals] base their work on political objectives, objectives which are tied into wider class, gender, and ethnic struggles, rather than being defined in terms of “young people” themselves (White 1990a, p. 175).

Cooper and White (1994) extended White’s (1990a) categories into six models of youth work practice:

1. Treatment model
2. Reform model
3. Advocacy model (non-radical)
4. Advocacy model (radical)
5. Empowerment model (non-radical)
6. Empowerment model (radical).

They argued that youth workers’ political or ideological understanding of the social order had “a major impact on the direction and quality of their youth work practice and the methods they adopt in daily routines” (p. 30). The “principles and politics of the practitioner, the service agency and the social milieu” (p. 34) in which youth work occurred determined the specific methods used by youth workers. Figure 3 - 1 summarises the six models that, despite their limitations, provide a good overview of major approaches to youth work in Australia. In general, due to a variety of historical, social and political influences, youth services have been relatively insular and have not built close relationships with other professions. Although the issues facing young people, such as homelessness, unemployment and exclusion impact on other sections of the community, youth workers generally have not built alliances with other sections of the welfare industry, membership by youth workers in unions is low and there has frequently been mistrust between youth services and other professions, such as teachers and social workers (Maunders & Broadbent 1995; Sercombe 2000; Wyn & White 1997, 1998).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How “problems” involving young people are defined</th>
<th>Treatment Model</th>
<th>Reform Model</th>
<th>Advocacy Model (non-radical)</th>
<th>Advocacy Model (radical)</th>
<th>Empowerment Model (non-radical)</th>
<th>Empowerment Model (radical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• YP a social problem &amp; threaten social stability so anti-social YP should be brought into line</td>
<td>• Some YP disadvantaged by their social environment or upbringing &amp; thus act in ways harmful to themselves &amp; society</td>
<td>YP have problems because: • they don’t know their rights • they lack skills in using bureaucratic systems to ensure their rights are protected</td>
<td>YP have problems because: • they don’t know their rights &amp; their basic rights are not protected • they are unable to use existing systems to protect their rights</td>
<td>• Major problem facing YP is that they don’t have enough power or control over their own lives</td>
<td>• YP like many other groups in society are systematically disempowered by the institutional arrangements which operate to protect the privileged position of the powerful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• YP who do not fit into society are deviant, mad or deficient</td>
<td>Disadvantage makes it difficult for some YP to fit into society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some YP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YP have problems because: • they don’t know their rights • they lack skills in using bureaucratic systems to ensure their rights are protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• YP who do not fit into society are deviant, mad or deficient</td>
<td>Disadvantage makes it difficult for some YP to fit into society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some YP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some YP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of equality</td>
<td>Equality dependent on choices individuals make</td>
<td>Equality defined as equality of opportunity</td>
<td>Equality defined as equality of opportunity</td>
<td>Equality defined in terms of equality of opportunity</td>
<td>Equality defined as equality of opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values underpinning model</td>
<td>Conformity to socially defined norms</td>
<td>Socio-environmental conditions affect YP in different ways &amp; some YP are better able to overcome adversity than others</td>
<td>Bureaucracies should act in an open &amp; equitable way when distributing benefits</td>
<td>Role of YW includes helping YP to transform society &amp; to remove biases which protect the interests of the powerful</td>
<td>YP need more control over their lives and are capable of independent decisions about their best interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social justice less important than other values</td>
<td>• Discrimination (including affirmative action) unacceptable</td>
<td>• YP deserve to get whatever they are entitled to under existing regulations</td>
<td>• YW’s role includes assisting YP to protect their rights</td>
<td>• There are situations where YP need assistance to achieve this</td>
<td>Empowerment achieved by helping individuals become more powerful within whatever framework of values they choose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competition &amp; differential status provide incentives to self-improvement</td>
<td>&quot;Help those who help themselves&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are situations where YP need assistance to achieve this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of interventions</td>
<td>Structured programs with clear expectations of behaviour which limit anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Skills training &amp; remedial education</td>
<td>Welfare rights advice &amp; support</td>
<td>Campaigning for political &amp; legal change</td>
<td>Laissez faire: let YP do what they want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparing YP for conventional adulthood</td>
<td>Special services to help YP overcome disadvantages</td>
<td>Legal aid</td>
<td>Information &amp; referral</td>
<td>Advocacy for individual cases &amp; challenging underlying causes of injustice</td>
<td>Encourage YP to take action on their own behalf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal development courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are situations where YP need assistance to achieve this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are situations where YP need assistance to achieve this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-1: Models of youth work YP = young people YW = youth worker
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills required by youth worker</th>
<th>Treatment Model</th>
<th>Reform Model</th>
<th>Advocacy Model (non-radical)</th>
<th>Advocacy Model (radical)</th>
<th>Empowerment Model (non-radical)</th>
<th>Empowerment Model (radical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Controlling YP</td>
<td>• Helping YP to identify how they can change themselves</td>
<td>• Understanding of welfare &amp; legal rights</td>
<td>• Campaigning skills</td>
<td>• Supporting YP</td>
<td>• Ability to help YP believe in themselves &amp; their own abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to set a good example by exhibiting high standards of personal conduct</td>
<td>• Forming trusting relationships with YP, in order to offer encouragement</td>
<td>• Knowledge of how to ensure YP receive rights due to them</td>
<td>• Media skills</td>
<td>• Standing back &amp; watching YP</td>
<td>• Supporting YP in identifying how they can act to overcome their oppression without oppressing others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to provide “wholesome” recreational activities for YP</td>
<td>• Case work skills</td>
<td>• Informal networking skills &amp; contacts within bureaucracy to smooth the process</td>
<td>• Motivational skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representational skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplines which inform practice</td>
<td>• Behavioural psychology</td>
<td>• Consensus, sociological perspective</td>
<td>• Legal &amp; para-legal professions</td>
<td>• Human rights</td>
<td>• Misunderstanding of progressive education which translated it as permissive educational theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Functionalist sociology</td>
<td>• Social psychology</td>
<td>• Social Welfare</td>
<td>• Critical legal studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Radical psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Heroic tales” (folk heroes who succeed despite adversity)</td>
<td>• Personal development</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Elements of liberation theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the professional</td>
<td>• Expert</td>
<td>• Expert who assists people to make the most of opportunities available to them</td>
<td>• Maximise YP’s ability to benefit under existing legal-bureaucratic framework, by advocating on behalf of individual YP &amp; groups</td>
<td>• Advocate</td>
<td>• Educator &amp; learner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program organiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Campaigner for radical social change</td>
<td>• Carries a remnant of oppressor consciousness unless he/she shares the life experience of the client group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Role model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• May, or may not, have been a member of the client group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unlikely to have shared the life experience of client group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Friend &amp; supporter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Laissez faire leader who avoids imposing values or limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Educator &amp; learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Carries a remnant of oppressor consciousness unless he/she shares the life experience of the client group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>• Conservative – focus on societal good, functionalist sociology &amp; the preference for competition rather than social justice</td>
<td>• Liberal – focus on individual adaptation, consensus view of society &amp; concept of equality of opportunity</td>
<td>• State liberal to social democratic - recognition of value of state intervention but no demand for radical societal change</td>
<td>• Social democratic to socialist – focus on radical social change while attempting to maximise the benefits for clients under the existing system</td>
<td>• Classical liberalism – non-interventionist with a focus on helping individuals become more powerful rather than collective action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social to anarchist – focus on changing the balances of power in society, avoiding oppression &amp; social change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Cooper & White 1994)

Figure 3 - 1 (continued)
THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXT OF YOUTH WORK

The contemporary social and political environment has a significant impact on youth work. As Ife (1997) suggests in relation to social work, social workers find themselves:

In an unfriendly, if not downright hostile, practice environment which is problematic for someone who genuinely believes that the role of social work is to make the world a better place, and to further the cause of social justice by seeking to empower the disadvantaged (p. 1).

The same can be said for youth workers. Since the 1980s, the dominance of the economic rationalist argument that it is better to allocate economic resources through market forces rather than through government intervention (Bryson 1996; Stilwell 1993a) has led to major changes to the political and social context of welfare provision within Australia (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Bryson 1996; O'Connor, Wilson & Setterlund 1998; Valentine 1999). In particular, there has been increased market-oriented and competition-based welfare reform (Ife 1997; Valentine 1999; Wearing 1998), which has led to a decreasing emphasis on provision of services by government, and a greater reliance on market forces, the private sector, families, and the resources of individuals (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Healy 1998; O'Connor, Wilson & Setterlund 1998; Wearing 1998).

The dominance of economic rationalism means that economic issues are considered more important than concerns about social justice (Bryson 1996; Mendes 2000) and economic policy takes priority over social policy (Ife 1997; Rees 1994). According to economic rationalists, good social policy must make economic sense because all benefit when the economy is strong (Ife 1997, ch. 1) and, rather than considering ways in which economic goals serve or hinder the pursuit of social justice, social policy should be used to further economic goals (Ife 1997; Rees 1991, 1993). Equity has been redefined from a liberal ideological perspective as “giving everyone the right to pursue their own goals in life without being penalised and brought back to the lowest common denominator if they succeed” (Stilwell 1993b, p. 190), and it is argued that economic improvement will eventually benefit everyone (Ife 1997; Stilwell 1993a). Despite its promise of a trickle-down effect (Jackson & Donovan 1999, p. 4), there has been a growing gap between the rich and poor (Australian Council of Social Service 1999; Wheelwright 1993). Rees
(1994) argues that in order to allow state budgets to be pruned and traditional values to be restored:

Families were exhorted to look after their own, the elderly, the disabled, the unemployed. Psychiatric hospitals were closed but the promised community care resources were seriously underfunded and understaffed. A two-tier society of winners and losers was encouraged and justified (p. 183).

The emphasis on economic rationalism has resulted in a number of major shifts in social policy and practice that have major implications for youth services. First, the privatisation of a wide range of social services has led to the transfer of service provision from the government to the market and private sector (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Healy 1998; Ife 1997; Wearing 1998). Examples include Centrelink, the Job Network and, in the youth sector, the use of private not-for-profit or for-profit organisations to support state wards. It is argued that there is a need to “roll back the state” because “big government creates high taxes and unfavourable interest rates, destroys initiative, and redirects capital from the private to the ‘unproductive’ public sector of the economy” (Davis et al. 1993, p. 114). Privatising services is justified by the belief that private enterprises will be more efficient than public providers will (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998). There has also been support for a greater reliance on private charitable agencies (only partly government funded) and philanthropic organisations (Mendes 2000; Rees 1994).

Second, there has been increasing emphasis on competitive tendering of social services (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Ife 1997; O'Connor, Wilson & Setterlund 1998; Valentine 1999). One of the outcomes of privatisation is that social services are less likely to obtain state funding unless they win tenders or receive some other private source of funding (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 306). The emphasis on competitive tendering is supported on a number of grounds including that:

- It promotes cost saving through lower overheads, greater commitment of welfare sector workers and the use of volunteers.
- It is seen to promote efficiency, choice and innovation.
- It is encouraging the public sector and community-based organisations to operate in a more business-like manner.
• It promotes a focus on outcomes (Baldock 1991; Ernst 1996; Jackson & Donovan 1999; Ryan 1995).

There are others who argue, however, that there are major concerns with the trend towards competitive tendering in the community sector and that some of the arguments for competitive tendering can be summed up as “competitive tendering is about competition and hence it is intrinsically good” (Ernst 1996, p. 30). Some of the concerns include that:

• The actual cost savings may not be as significant as advocates suggest.
• It focuses on the cost of services rather than service quality.
• Competition might deliver efficient, but not necessarily equitable, outcomes.
• The process of tendering can be complicated and time consuming, thereby favouring larger organisations.
• Competition is changing the culture of government and community-based services by making services compete with one another thereby decreasing cooperation and increasing division and fragmentation.
• There is heightened uncertainty about funding, which is increasingly for a limited time and then subject to competitive re-tendering. With uncertainty of funding, there has been greater job insecurity as services cannot be confident of continued funding (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Ernst 1996; Jackson & Donovan 1999; Ryan 1995; Travers 1995).

Third, the emphasis on economic rationalism has resulted in managerialism being imported from the private sector into the public and voluntary sector (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Ife 1997; Rees & Rodley 1995). Nabben (2001) argues:

The philosophy of managerialism applies private sector models to the public sector. The public sector is re-conceptualised as a business, with customers, competitors, products, throughput and efficiencies. Because business decisions are fundamentally guided by clear, quantifiable, short-term profit measures, the same types of measures are given to public sector programs. In order to cut through the public sector’s perceived failures ... the managerialist approach places a priority on reform and action. One necessary component of such reform is top down control (p. 43).
From the perspective of managerialism, the skills of management are the same regardless of the organisation, so capable managers are able to move from industry to industry. The ideal manager “is no longer a long-serving senior worker with an intimate knowledge of particular products and services” (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 308) and, as happened in New Zealand, a manager can move from managing a large brewery to managing a large hospital (Easton 1995, p. 39). Rather than identifying as social service practitioners, managers of social services increasingly have a background in, and identify with, the discipline of management (Ife 1997, ch. 5). In addition, because the science of management is seen as being morally neutral and scientifically objective (Ife 1997; Rees 1995), ethical considerations are given a low priority, if not removed altogether (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 308).

The emphasis placed on efficiency by managerialism means there is a continual drive to do more with less (Rees 1995). In addition, activities which are difficult to quantify, including preventative work and “talking with young people to establish rapport and relationships or affirming young people” receive less emphasis and have to be “squashed between other activities like submission writing, tendering, administration, and the actual delivery of services” (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 310). A youth worker suggested that the new social and political context meant:

> Your aspirations to help young people need to be reconciled with new ways of thinking and operating. You have to re-align yourself and work in a new framework...

Helping disadvantaged young people or working to empower young people now is harder to do especially in a context based on principles that conflict with what I think human services is really about. The rhetoric has also changed. It used to be based on ideas about social justice and social change, but now it is focused very much on market principles (quoted in Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 309).

Another aspect of the social and political context that is creating challenges for Australian youth workers is the current resurgence of a social control agenda (Delaney 2002; Loughman & Sanders 2002; NSW Council of Social Service 2002; Sercombe et al. 2002). Sercombe et al. (2002) argue, “state responses to the youth problem in Australia have swung between welfare and justice, control and care, treatment and punishment” (p. 86) and, at present, the emphasis is returning to control and punishment. In particular, youth workers are being urged to accept more controlling or
punitive roles, such as crime prevention, curfews and street clearing exercises, breaching young people who fail to meet the expectations of Centrelink, and controlling young people’s use of public space and shopping centres (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Ford 2002; Henson 2002; Sercombe 2000; Sercombe et al. 2002; Turner 2002).

In Britain, which is also experiencing the return of a control agenda (Banks 1994; Jeffs & Smith 1997), Jeffs and Banks (1999) identify three ways in which youth workers might be involved in controlling young people. “Practice for control” (p. 94) includes two approaches: diverting or preventing young people from activities considered harmful to themselves or other people, and controlling young people by socialising them to fit into society and accept its norms. “Control in practice” involves using some degree of control in order to “create an appropriate learning environment, promote equality of opportunity and ensure the safety and well-being of young people” (p. 94).

Some youth workers argue that practice for control is consistent with the aims of youth work. For example, Smith and Paylor (1997) believe that youth services should “welcome opportunities to become involved more explicitly in preventing youth crime” (p. 17). While recognising there are ethical dilemmas involved, they support the change in focus. In discussing a crime prevention program at a youth service, they suggest it presented the youth service with a number of challenges.

Most obviously, it was being asked to adopt crime reduction as a specific aim of its work in projects supported by the [crime prevention] scheme, which meant a move towards a more overtly controlling role than the service had traditionally wished to play. Perhaps as importantly, the stress on monitoring and evaluation challenged the service to develop less intuitive ways of justifying its work than it had used in the past; measures of success could not simply be those which supported what the service had been doing anyway (p. 18).

Jeffs and Banks (1999), however, argue that practice for control should not be the main focus of youth work and that “work with young people which sets out specifically to tackle offending and delinquency, to control rather than to educate, swiftly ceases to be youth work” (p. 107). Although some forms of control are appropriate, Jeffs and Banks (1999) argue that control in practice, while frequently raising ethical dilemmas, is essential for good practice. It is part of a youth workers responsibility to ensure:
An appropriate learning environment is created. To this end workers and their managers or agencies make rules and plan programmes and activities (often in conjunction with young people). This is essentially about setting the scene for the work. During the course of the work occasions may also arise when workers may have to control or “restrain” the young people they work with (Jeffs & Banks 1999, p. 97).

As the in-depth interviews demonstrated (discussed in Chapter 10), control in practice or managing behaviour is an important issue for youth workers, and requires greater attention by youth work literature (see for example, Community Service Commission 2001). Reasons youth workers may need to control the context of the work or the behaviour of particular young people include:

• Preventing young people victimising, bullying or harassing other young people or groups of young people
• Ensuring that issues relating to access and equity are maintained
• Maintaining balance within a program
• Ensuring that the young people are safe and protected from harm (Jeffs & Banks 1999, p. 98).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON YOUTH

While a young person’s age is a biological reality and involves biological processes, particularly puberty, the meaning and experience of being young is socially constructed. What it means to be a young person varies from one historical period to another, from one culture to another, and from one social context to another (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Bessant & Watts 2002; Sercombe et al. 2002; Turley 1994; Wyn & White 1997). It is thus important to consider ways in which young people can be perceived.

From individualistic, liberal and developmental perspectives, adolescence is conceptualised as a developmental life stage during which certain biological and psychological changes occur which assist young people in the transition from childhood to adulthood (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Maier 1990; National Collaboration for Youth 2002). Development is said to involve progression through predictable life stages, and deviations from the norm constitute developmental delays or problems in
development from one stage to the next. From such a perspective, problems experienced by young people are individualised and locate the origin of the “problems” within young people (Wyn & White 1997, p. 56). Wyn and White (1998) argue, “doing something about particular social problems is by and large equated with doing something for or to particular categories of young people” (p. 35, their emphasis). They also argue that seeing youth as a state of “becoming” infers that adulthood is the “arrival” (Wyn & White 1997, p. 11) and that young people are incomplete adults (see Figure 3 - 2). Such a perspective promotes deficit-based approaches that see young people as social problems, or approaches that see young people as being the future rather than active citizens or constituents now (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, pp. 77-78).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Adolescent/not adult</td>
<td>• Grown up/adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Becoming</td>
<td>• Arrived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presocial self that will emerge under the right conditions</td>
<td>• Identity is fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Powerless and vulnerable</td>
<td>• Powerful and strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less responsible</td>
<td>• Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dependent</td>
<td>• Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ignorant</td>
<td>• Knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risky behaviours</td>
<td>• Consider behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rebellious</td>
<td>• Conformist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reliant</td>
<td>• Autonomous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Figure 3 - 2: Notions of youth and adult**

A structuralist perspective recognises that the transition to adulthood is subject to wider social divisions and complex social, economic, political, and cultural influences (Bessant & Watts 2002; Sercombe et al. 2002; Stewart 1998; Wyn & White 1997, 1998). As a group, young people are neither homogenous nor static and many social structures and processes shape the experience of being young and the transition to adulthood. For example, the experience of being young is likely to be different for males and females, and for indigenous and non-indigenous young people. Achieving recognition as an adult is “shaped by the relations of power inherent in the social divisions of society” (Wyn & White 1997, p. 3) and these relations of power often
prevent young people from being able to shape their lives as they might have otherwise done (p. 120).

Sercombe et al. (2002) argue that youth is a “socially constructed category, in which biologically adult members of a society, on the basis of their low relative age, are deemed to have inadequately assimilated the dominant social codes, and are excluded from full participation accordingly” (p. 15). They argue that research evidence indicates that, post puberty, young people are biologically adult and their inherent capacities are similar to those of adults. Despite having the same capacities as adults, they are excluded from full participation in adult life because they are identified as being “too young” and having not yet “assimilated the dominant social codes, and are therefore deemed to be ‘unsafe’” (p.14).

Our society deems young people to be unsafe drivers, drinkers, tenants, financial managers, voters and marriage partners. This is not because of any inherent lack of capacity.... Young people are excluded from engaging in these roles or practices because it is assumed that they don’t yet have the right “attitudes” on these things (p. 14).

Although young people are over represented in some areas such as driving accidents and some crimes, particularly property offences (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Crime Prevention Division 1999), it does not necessarily justify excluding young people from driving, associating with friends in groups, or making use of public space. Rather than assuming young people are too young, it is important to consider factors other than age, such as social exclusion, that could contribute to these behaviours.

Exclusion is not necessarily experienced as oppressive. Some young people may be frustrated by their exclusion from voting; others may be quite happy not to vote. Most young people are unlikely to object to being excluded from adult prisons or military service (Sercombe et al. 2002, p. 15). The exclusion of young people from full participation in society is justified on the grounds that young people are incomplete adults and are in a period of transition. Young people’s rights as citizens are frequently considered unimportant and they are denied a say on many issues affecting them (Wyn & White 1997, p. 12).
Age is not the only factor contributing to social exclusion: other social divisions such as race, class, gender and sexuality also play a crucial role in social exclusion (Jeffs & Smith 1997; Sercombe et al. 2002). The various forms of social exclusion can lead to varying levels of social exclusion, and exclusion can have greater impact on some young people than on others.

Exclusion from employment for young people from upper-middle class families, for example, may mean enforced retention in education through to university level. For young people from poor families, it may mean extended periods of unemployment, accompanied maybe by spending a lot of time of the street and frequent contacts with the police (Sercombe et al. 2002, p. 15).

The strengths perspective encourages recognising young people as contributors to society, as having strengths, resources, capacities, and abilities to learn, grow, develop, mature, and change (Benard 2002; Early & GlenMaye 2000; Poertner & Ronnau 1992; Saleebey 1992a; Weick 1992). From a strength perspective young people can be understood as “citizens in their own right rather than... ‘incomplete’ adults whose rights can be ignored” (Wyn & White 1997, p. 3). It is important to acknowledge that young people are actively involved in negotiating “their own futures, lives and meanings, but do so in the context of specific social, political and economic circumstances and processes” (Wyn & White 1998, p. 25). A strengths perspective fosters the involvement of young people in decisions affecting their lives and in challenging social structures and practices that impact negatively on their lives and the lives of others.

Theoretical perspectives inform youth work practice and influence the way in which youth workers respond to young people. Individualistic, liberalist and developmental perspectives are likely to lead to a focus on the individual and his or her immediate social context or environment (e.g. family, friends, and school). Structuralist perspectives are more likely to lead to responses that address broader social (or structural) issues, such as race, gender, sexuality, and class. While these different perspectives result in different models of youth work (Cooper & White 1994), ideally youth workers should adopt a holistic approach, address the many and varied influences on the lives of young people, and recognise the way in which young people can be active participants in shaping their own destinies.
DEFINING YOUTH WORK

There is no widely accepted definition of youth work in Australia, and boundaries to what constitutes youth work are unclear (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Brown 1991; Sercombe 1998; White 1990a; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991). Westhorp (1990, p. 2) suggests that the only thing youth workers in diverse settings have in common is that they work with, or to the benefit of, young people. Youth work is thus frequently defined in relation to its target group despite the fact that many other occupational groups also work with young people (Grierson 1992; White 1990a). For example, the 1991 South Australian Ethics and Standards Conference defined a youth worker as:

A person whose primary paid or unpaid role is to deliver services… to young people, and who is not employed within any other existing professional category (e.g. teacher, social worker). Within this, work with or for young people must be a primary focus, a defined target and a significant proportion of their work (NSW Youth Sector Training Council 1992, p. 45).

Two definitions, adopted in this study, provide a clearer understanding of the nature of Australian youth work. First, according to White, Omelczuk and Underwood (1991):

Youth work is perhaps best defined in terms of

• target group (young people);
• specific ways of working with young people (content of practice); and

Second, Sercombe (1997b) suggests:

We can perhaps define youth work as the practice of engaging with young people in a professional relationship in which:

• the young person(s) are the primary constituency, and the mandate given by them has priority
• the young person(s) are understood as social beings whose lives are shaped in negotiation with their social context
• the young person is dealt with holistically (p. 21; see also Bessant, Sercombe and Watts 1998, p. 239).
Although both definitions identify young people as the focus of youth work, neither specifies the actual age range. Some youth services only work within a narrow age range but generally in Australia the United Nations’ definition of youth as being 12-25 is accepted (Sercombe et al. 2002; Westhorp 1990). Current social, political and economic trends, however, suggest that it is likely that this age range will expand in both directions (Sercombe et al. 2002; Wyn & White 1997).

White, Omelczuk and Underwood (1991) propose that one of the defining characteristics of youth work relates to specific ways of working with young people. This content of practice has “shifted over the years, reflecting changes in the circumstances of young people, and changes in the relationship between the welfare state and those individuals and groups working with these young people” (p. 47). They suggest that youth work now concentrates on issues that fall under the “broad welfare umbrella” (p. 47).

Sercombe’s (1997b) definition provides greater clarity about the practice of youth work. First, they establish professional relationships with young people. A professional relationship is not dependent on formal accreditation or training: it describes the nature of the relationship between youth workers and young people. Sercombe (1997b) suggests a professional relationship is “intentionally limited” so that young people can safely tell secrets, expose “less savoury aspects of their character or behaviour,” or reveal their “ignorance or insecurities” (pp. 19-20). The professional relationship “is deeply ethical in nature” (p. 21) and youth workers need to act with integrity and establish clear boundaries so that young people can safely place their trust in them. In order to be worthy of that trust, youth workers should:

- Have the interests of young people at heart
- Be willing to act on the behalf of young people on an ongoing basis or until it is inappropriate to continue
- Be competent
- Expect some level of accountability from the young people with whom they work
- Revise commitments and time spent with individual young people in order to provide better service to all the young people with whom they work
- Monitor their own behaviour (Koehn 1994, ch. 4).
Second, young people are the primary constituency of youth workers, and the mandate given by young people has priority. Youth workers enter into contracts, whether formal or informal, with numerous constituents (individuals and/or organisations). As well as a formal job contract with their employers, youth workers may also have contracts (spoken or unspoken) with their funding body, members of their management committee, co-workers, colleagues in other youth services, people in the local neighbourhood, parents of young people who use the service, the police, local businesses, and young people themselves (Sercombe 1997b, p. 18). The mandates youth workers receive from each of these individuals or groups may be in conflict. Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998) argue that, in accepting mandates, youth workers:

Should not agree to do things that are against the interest of the young people they are working with; they should not act in contravention of the young person’s rights; they should not take on roles that compromise their professional relationship with the young person (p. 314).

According to Sercombe (1997b, p. 19) and Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998, p. 314) activities that could be inappropriate include removing young people from public space, punishment processes such as supervision of community service orders, processes that involve reporting breaches or potentially incriminating information to authorities, and mediation (because mediators are objective and impartial and youth workers have a prior obligation to the young person). In practice, as the focus groups showed (Chapter 11), youth workers do undertake activities such as these (see also Bessant & Webber 1999; Grierson 1992). Although youth workers usually claim to give priority to the interests of young people (Flowers 1998), they are also constrained by other expectations and interests, and make decisions about how to prioritise their various mandates (Chapter 11 discusses the concept of mandate in greater detail).

Third, young people are understood as social beings whose lives are shaped in negotiation with their social context. Youth workers need to consider the social contexts in which young people find themselves, recognise the way in which young people are shaped by their social contexts, and promote ways in which young people can influence their own lives (Bowie n.d.-b; NSW Technical and Further Education Commission 2001). In youth work, young people are seen as having the capability of making
decisions for themselves, and youth workers should actively support the participation of young people in all aspects of their own and community life (Mapstone 1999; NSW Commission for Children and Young People 2001; Slattery 2001).

Fourth, young people are dealt with holistically. Youth workers address the whole young person rather than focusing on one aspect of young people’s lives such as their education or their medical needs (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; Kuiters 1980; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991). According to White, Omelczuk and Underwood (1991) youth work:

Attempts to consider the multiple needs of the young person rather than concentrating on any one aspect of their experience. This is the case even where a particular service may be organised around a specific function (such as accommodation or drop-in centres), since the notion of service provision usually extends beyond the immediate purpose of a particular agency (p. 47).

White, Omelczuk and Underwood (1991) suggest that the self-identity of practitioners is also important in defining youth work and that youth workers see themselves as youth workers rather than belonging to some other occupational group such as social workers or teachers. In Australia, the self-identity of youth workers is particularly important because, unlike England, Canada and South Africa where there are bodies responsible for registering services or workers, there is no accreditation process (Sercombe et al. 2002, p. 103). There are, however, a number of bodies which have “helped solidify a distinct youth work identity” (White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991, p. 47) including Youth Action and Policy Associations, Youth Affairs Councils and Youth Work Training Councils.

The role of uniformed organisations (such as Scouts, Guides and the Boys’ Brigade) and church youth groups in Australian youth work has been debated for over 20 years (Irving, Sherington & Mauanders 1995; Mauanders 1984). Although these groups were important in the origins of youth work (Mauanders 1984; Westhorp 1990; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991) and continue to provide valuable services for young people, they are increasingly seen as falling outside the specific field of youth work (Bessant & Webber 1999; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991). Taken together, the nature of the professional relationship between youth workers and young people, the
position of youth work within the field of welfare, the priority given to mandates from young people, and the holistic approach to practice preclude most people working in uniformed organisations and church youth groups from the definition of youth workers used in this study.

**SOCIAL JUSTICE**

Despite the conservative nature of the voluntary organisations from which youth work grew (Australian National Commission for UNESCO Youth Research Project Sub-Committee 1976; Maunders 1984) and the different emphases on social justice given by different models of youth work (Cooper & White 1994; White 1990a), social justice is a major theme of Australian youth work. Social justice is one of the three principles on which the youth work courses offered by the New South Wales TAFE are based (NSW Technical and Further Education Commission 2001). White (1987, 1990b) believes that social justice is an important feature of youth work and that youth workers should actively seek improvements in the position of “the least powerful and most disadvantaged groups of young people” (White 1987, p. 25). *Mosaics*, an introduction to youth work produced by the New South Wales Youth Action and Policy Association (Manning 1992a, 1992b), is based on the proposition that even direct youth workers “have a role to play in addressing the structural and policy issues which often bring about the need for their programs in the first place” (p. 3). Pisarski (1992) argues that youth workers need to address structural issues that lead to inequality. Sercombe et al. (2002) suggest that youth services can be evaluated by how effectively they reduce the exclusion of young people.

In practice, however, youth workers often focus on individual rather than social or structural change (Conference of Australian Youth Organisations 1985; Pisarski 1992; Quixley 1992; White 1989, 1990b). There are a number of reasons why youth workers are more likely to focus on individual change:

- They are working in a political context that places little emphasis on social justice.
- They focus on addressing the immediate needs of young people and, due to increasing workloads and pressures involved in meeting individual needs, have little time or energy for social change.
• They are concerned that their funding may be at risk if their funding sources disagree with an involvement in social change activities.
• They may not feel that they have the knowledge or skills needed for social and structural change (Bessant 1997; Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998; White 1987, 1990a).

White (1987) suggests that there is a significant difference between youth workers who “actively and consciously situate” their work within “a framework of broad political and social objectives,” and “workers who concentrate on the provision of services without reflecting too much on the social or political significance of their day-to-day practices” (p. 25). Rather than abandoning a commitment to social justice, youth workers need to be assisted in developing practices which meet the needs of individual young people while also meeting broader social objectives of improving the position of marginalised young people (Crooks 1992; Sercombe et al. 2002; White 1987).

**PROFESSIONALISATION**

As the focus of this study is on youth work within a professional tradition, it is important to consider the implications of professionalisation. The professionalisation of youth work has been debated in Australia for over 20 years (Denholm & Ling 1990; Ewen 1981; Sercombe 2000; Study Group on Youth Affairs 1978) and, while youth care in Canada and South Africa has fought for and obtained professional recognition, there is significant opposition to such a move in Australia and England (Banks 1999a; Denholm & Ling 1990; Millar 1995; Sercombe 1997b, 2000). The debate is not about whether or not youth work is a professional practice, rather the debate centres on whether or not youth workers should seek formal professional status.

As has already been identified, youth workers engage young people in a professional relationship and such a relationship is not dependent on youth work obtaining the status of a formal profession. Koehn (1994) suggests that the following traits are frequently cited as being important for such professional status:

Professionals:

1. Are licensed by the state to perform a certain act
1. Belong to an organisation of similarly enfranchised agents who promulgate standards and/or ideals of behaviour and who discipline one another for breaching these standards.

2. Possess so-called “esoteric” knowledge or skills not shared by other members of the community.

3. Exercise autonomy over their work, work which is not well-understood by the wider community.

4. Publicly pledge themselves to render assistance to those in need and as a consequence they have special responsibilities or duties not incumbent upon others who have not made this pledge (p. 56).

5. Banks (1996, pp. 16-17) argues that the professionalisation of youth work is back on the agenda in England for a number of reasons. A professional association of youth workers could help to articulate the values and principles of youth work, protect youth work from government cutbacks and intervention, and help ensure that youth worker training is appropriate and of a high quality. In Australia, Sercombe (2000, pp. 3-5) identifies a number of reasons why formalising youth work as a profession may be beneficial. First, there are a range of practices claiming to be youth work that are debatable or unethical. A professional association of youth workers would provide some mechanism through which such practices could be addressed. Second, youth workers’ expertise and knowledge is not acknowledged resulting in limited ability to advocate on behalf of their clients. Third, a clear professional position would increase the ability of youth workers to resist attempts to make them work in ways that are inconsistent with good youth work practice.

Since the early 1990s there have been attempts to control and contain youth work (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 312) and for governments to be more directive about the ways in which youth workers do their work (Sercombe 2000, p. 4). Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998) suggest that these attempts to control youth work include:

- Prescribing youth work practices through detailed funding guidelines
- Close surveillance through detailed data collection requirements
- Requiring detailed plans for the service, including objectives, strategies and performance indicators
- The use of funding agreements or funding contracts to require specified outcomes from a youth work project.
• The insistence of representatives of the department on youth work agency management committees
• Increasing the level of integration between youth work agencies and mainstream institutions like the school, the church and the family
• The use of corporate management techniques like total quality control or quality management, and
• Competitive tendering models by which a youth work agency competes with other agencies to win contracts to supply a service for the government (p. 312, see also Sercombe 2000).

Youth services are also being encouraged to be less critical of the government and other social institutions, and agencies that are critical of government policy or challenge the status quo risk losing their funding (Rees 1994; White 1987). The above measures are not solely directed at youth services, nor are they all necessarily negative developments, but they are part of attempts to increase government control of youth workers and other sections of the community services sector (Sercombe 2000). As well as being consistent with the current social and political climate of economic rationalism and an agenda of social control, these measures are motivated by a perception that youth work is an undisciplined field (Sercombe 1997a, 2000) and that it sometimes uses unconventional methods which may even push the boundaries of legality (Bessant, Sercombe & Watts 1998, p. 312). Youth services generally target marginalised, at-risk youth whose needs have not been met by school, family and other mainstream institutions. As Sercombe (1997a) suggests, “in targeting at-risk youth, youth work agencies position themselves at the point of failure of mainstream institutions” (p. 44) and have remained marginal to other major institutions and organisations working with young people (Sercombe 1997b, p. 18). Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998) argue:

Those parts of the youth sector assigned to engage a “marginal population” can then themselves be marginalised, because they talk about the “failure of society” and because they criticise “mainstream institutions” like “the family”, the school and the police. Youth workers are often depicted as anti-family, anti-school or anti-police even though some of their youthful clients see them as extensions of these very institutions. Engaged to “normalise” a problem population, youth work agencies can themselves be held responsible for their disengagement. Youth refuges, for example, are often blamed for youth homelessness, and youth advocacy centres for juvenile crime (p. 311).
Sercombe (2000) argues that professionalisation could address some of these perceptions and that it:

Potentially offers an alternative base for discipline, and a foundation for resistance to various government enterprises which may be oppressive to young people or in violation of their civil rights. There have been many examples ... where professionals have been able to defend themselves against the increasingly coercive demands of government by invoking professional standards (p. 5, see also Banks 1996).

Many youth workers, however, have resisted the professionalisation of youth work on a number of grounds (Banks 1996, 1999b; Millar 1995; Sercombe 1997b, 2000). First, as Banks (1999a) suggests, youth workers generally see themselves as working alongside young people, “as friend, ally, equal or enabler” and thus “traditional models of professionalism which assume a distance between professional and client, with the practitioner as powerful expert, do not fit easily with these conceptions of the role of the youth worker” (p. 5). She also argues that many youth workers resist moves towards professionalisation as they believe there is a danger of it making youth work more elitist and exclusive (Banks 1996, p. 15). Richardson (2001), in expressing concern that child and youth care may become too professional, proposes that there is a danger of “the child becomes a ‘client’ and no longer a gift of God to love and cherish. I suggest that the professional attitude may be legitimate for a social worker or consultant, but more cautiously so for a child care worker” (p. 2).

Second, some youth workers are concerned that professionalisation could create a monopoly through restricting entry into training and registration (Sercombe 1997b, p. 19). Many youth workers do not have formal qualifications, let alone youth work qualifications (Bessant & Evans 1996; Maunders & Broadbent 1995; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991) and there is a fear that their expertise and experience may not be recognised (Sercombe 2000, p. 2). Some youth workers have already experienced the potential impact of a monopoly by being excluded from positions working with young people purely on the grounds that they are not eligible for membership of the Australian Association of Social Workers (Maunders & Broadbent 1995, p. 22).
Third, there is concern that professionalism could lead to the standardisation of practice and eliminate “styles of work which are effective but idiosyncratic and unorthodox” (Sercombe 2000, p. 2). Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998, p. 230) argue that it is the innovative, spontaneous aspects of youth work which have often made it effective in difficult situations.

Fourth, there is a perception that professional associations sometimes act in their own interests (e.g. to protect work conditions and salaries) even if it is against the best interests of the people they are supposed to serve. Sercombe (2000, p. 3) suggests that some people believe that professional associations act in their own interest by:

- Restricting entry to the profession thereby artificially inflating the income of their members
- Mystifying easy to understand processes thereby making themselves less accountable, not more
- Using jargon and technical language that is disempowering and makes questioning of their work less likely
- Closing ranks to protect one another when complaints are made against their members.

Sercombe (2000) demonstrates that there is an ethical aspect of professionalisation, which involves an ethical commitment to clients and processes, and an industrial aspect, which involves they way in which professions are organised and managed. The opposition to professionalisation is focused on industrial aspects. While there is debate about what constitutes ethical youth work (Banks 1999a; Brown 1991; Delaney & Bingham 2001; Sercombe 1997b, 1998) and whether or not youth work should seek formal recognition as a profession (Sercombe 2000), it is universally accepted that youth work should be based on ethical practice.

**CONCLUSION**

While there are some similarities, there are also significant differences between Australian youth work, the British Youth Service, and youth care in Canada and South Africa. Figure 3 – 3 summarises some of these key similarities and differences.
We can perhaps define youth work as the practice of engaging with young people in a professional relationship in which:

- the young person(s) are the primary constituency, and the mandate given by them has priority
- the young person(s) are understood as social beings whose lives are shaped in negotiation with their social context
- the young person is dealt with holistically (Sercombe 1997, p.21)

Youth work helps young people learn about themselves, others and society, through informal educational activities which combine enjoyment, challenge and learning. Youth workers work with young people aged between 11 and 25, particularly those aged between 13 and 19, in order to promote their personal and social development and enable them to have a voice, influence and place in their communities and society as a whole (National Youth Agency 2001c, p. 4).

Youth workers work with young people aged between 11 and 25, particularly those aged between 13 and 19, in order to promote their personal and social development and enable them to have a voice, influence and place in their communities and society as a whole (National Youth Agency 2001c, p. 4).

Figure 3 - 3: Comparison of youth care, and Australian and British youth work

Australian youth work is in the process of “developing a clear self-consciousness and idea of its role” (Sercombe et al. 2002, p. 103). A philosophy of nonviolence is consistent with the current aims youth work and has much to offer in developing practices that promote the social inclusion and social functioning of young people. This and the previous chapter have considered key features of Australian youth work and
youth work/care in other contexts. The following chapter focuses on key principles of nonviolence in order to lay the foundation for the integration of a philosophy of nonviolence into youth work.
Chapter 4
Nonviolence

A philosophy of nonviolence influenced many social change movements (Ackerman & DuVall 2000; Ryan 1996; Sharp 1973a; Wehr, Burgess & Burgess 1994). It is thus likely that some of the more radical models of youth work focusing on social change and social justice have been influenced, at least indirectly, by this philosophy. A philosophy of nonviolence, however, has much broader relevance for youth work and has the potential to become an important guiding framework for youth work practice. This chapter reviews the literature on nonviolence in order to identify principles of nonviolence, and considers the small volume of literature on the implications of Gandhian thought for social work.

DEFINITIONS OF NONVIOLENCE

There are two broad approaches to nonviolence: tactical nonviolence and principled nonviolence. Tactical nonviolence is based on the belief that nonviolence is one tactic or strategy among a range of choices (Bond 1994; Sharp 1973a; Zunes, Kurtz & Asher 1999). From this perspective:

Nonviolent action is a generic term covering dozens of specific methods of protest, noncooperation and intervention, in all of which the actionists conduct the conflict by doing – or refusing to do – certain things without using physical violence. As a technique, therefore, nonviolent action is not passive. It is not inaction. It is action that is nonviolent (Sharp 1973b, p. 64, emphasis in original).

Principled nonviolence is built on a commitment to nonviolence as a philosophy or a way of life, and the belief that nonviolence is morally superior to violence (Burgess & Burgess 1994; Burrowes 1994; Moyer 1999b). Those who adopt a principled approach to nonviolence argue that it “is not simply a matter of abstinence from physical or verbal violence, it is an attitude of mind, an emotional orientation towards loving care and concern” (Curle 1995, p. 17). From this perspective nonviolence is:

A means of breaking the cycle of violence; it is a moral method of social change which is not passive nor violent; it requires human commitment but not military
might; and it seeks to change but not to completely destroy relationships. Employing nonviolence entails breaking from our traditional patterns of resolving conflicts; patterns which distribute power to the strongest and the most violent (Woehrle 1993, p. 209).

For advocates of principled nonviolence, the issue is not whether or not nonviolence is more effective than violence but rather that, regardless of what other people do, nonviolence is the morally right thing to do (Burgess & Burgess 1994, pp. 13-14). According to the Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group (1983), nonviolence is “a principle and a technique, a set of ideas about how life should be lived and a strategy for social change” (p. 26).

Because this study explored the implications of a philosophy of nonviolence for youth work practice, it concentrated on literature on principled nonviolence. Due to the broad focus of principled nonviolence, there are problems with the word nonviolence itself since it implies that “we are still thinking in terms of violence” (Starhawk 2001, p. 2). Mahatma Gandhi was dissatisfied with nonviolence and associated terms (Gandhi 1987, p. 63) and so, following a search to find a more appropriate description, he decided on satyagraha as an alternative (Gandhi 1987, p. 35). Its literal meaning is “holding on to Truth and it means, therefore, Truth-force [where] Truth is soul or spirit. It is, therefore, known as soul-force” (Gandhi 1951, p. 3). Reid (in McAllister 1982) argues that soul-force “implies a more assertive, positive stand than does nonviolence – that we rely on the strength of truth rather than on physical force” (p. vi). Satyagraha relates particularly to the practice of nonviolent action; the philosophy of nonviolence is more closely related to ahimsa, which is discussed in greater depth below. Like Gandhi, Martin Luther King initially did not describe his guiding principle as nonviolence but as Christian love (King 1958, p. 84). Later, he spoke more frequently of nonviolence, which he described as “the persistent and determined application of peaceable power to offenses against the community” (King 1967, p. 184).

Although an alternative is needed that embodies the idea of it being more than the absence of violence, the term nonviolence has a rich tradition, is widely used and, at present, remains the best alternative. Although satyagraha has greater depth of meaning, it has not been adopted in this study because it is strongly linked to nonviolence in the Gandhian tradition and the term has not been widely used in the
West. For some writers and activists, the hyphenated non-violence emphasises the absence of violence (Cumming 1985, p. 9), whereas nonviolence, without the hyphen, refers to the broader philosophy of social change and human relationship (Boulding 1999; Cumming 1985; A. Gandhi 2001; McAllister 1982). This thesis follows this convention by using nonviolence for the latter broad meaning but non-violence when discussing the absence of violence (for example in discussion of the survey and in-depth interviews) or when using quotes from other sources which retain the hyphen.

PRINCIPLES OF NONVIOLENCE

The philosophy of nonviolence, which forms the basis for principled nonviolence, is built upon a number of principles. The following principles have been developed as part of this study from nonviolence literature (for a more detailed description of the process used in developing the principles, see Chapter 6).

1. Nonviolence is a way of life
2. Violence is rejected as a means of control and resolving disputes
3. There is an active commitment to peace and social justice
4. The means are consistent with the ends
5. Power is understood as arising out of relationships
6. There is a profound respect for humanity
7. Actions are based on love
8. There is a commitment to truth and openness
9. Spiritual beliefs and qualities are valued
10. There is a willingness to accept suffering in order to create change.

Nonviolence is a way of life

Principled nonviolence holds that nonviolence is both a tactic and a way of life. In order to create social change, individuals need to change and to live lives that create intentional ripples impacting on wider levels of society (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 219). According to Moyer (1999a), “nonviolent social activism is trying to accomplish the gigantic task of transformation from the dominator to the peaceful model of human relationships” (p. 1).
According to the Dominator Model, we live in a competitive world in which we must fight or flight, win or lose, in our relationships with others, especially in conflict situations where we have different needs, opinions, desires, beliefs or goals. This is doubly true when we perceive that we are being criticised or attacked verbally, emotionally or physically. In contrast, according to the Peaceful Model, we need to live our lives at all times according to the universal values and principles of love, compassion, equality, justice and sustainability in our daily relationships, even at those times when we perceive that we are being attacked (Moyer 1999b, p. 1).

Implicit in nonviolence as a way of life is the recognition that the personal is political, and that wider social change begins with changes in individuals (Burrowes 1994; Cumming 1985; Moyer 1999b; Starhawk 1990). The Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group (1983) criticises “men in the nonviolent movement, whose theory for defeating structural violence may be impeccable, but whose personal behaviour often remains as violent as any other man’s” (p. 39). The group suggests, “individual men attacking individual women is one end of the continuum of violence which leads inexorably to the international military abuse of power” (pp. 39-40). In discussing the structural violence of patriarchy and sexual oppression, Moyer (1995) suggests that male activists also need to address their own behaviour.

Nonviolent male activists, who have adopted values of equality and justice, normally carry out the dominant male role model in more subtle emotionally and verbally controlling behaviours (e.g., unwanted advice, judgments, opinions, argument, presumptions, expectations and passive-aggression, which includes sulking and withdrawal), rather than physical violence. Regardless of which oppressive method is used, its goal is always the same: to successfully compete with others and to get my way (my ideals and beliefs adopted) and have people recognize my status or superior position or authority (p. 2).

Starhawk (1990) uses the image of the self-hater to represent the way in which people are disempowered and discouraged from challenging injustice, structural violence and oppression.

In the dismembered world, in the landscape of power-over where guilt is an endlessly renewable resource, we face the self-hater. We hear the voice of the ruler who has become a voice inside us. Power-over works like sorcery: it casts a spell on us. It
changes our consciousness, clouds our vision so that we don’t notice it in operation. It is the magician who distracts us with a rabbit as he saws the woman in half (p. 95).

She argues that in order to create social change people need to become empowered and live in ways that challenge the internalisation of the self-hater.

To heal the world, and heal ourselves in the process, we must understand both how we internalize domination and how we can foster freedom. We must understand how we internalize each aspect of the self-hater and develop techniques for ridding ourselves of internalized domination. We must envision situations of liberation so that we can create them (p. 117).

King (1958) believed that, while nonviolent action helps create social change, it also has an impact on the lives of those committed to nonviolence. “It first does something to the hearts and souls of those committed to it. It gives them new self-respect; it calls up resources of strength and courage that they did not know they had” (p. 219). In order to be truly nonviolent, Gandhi encouraged his followers to develop self-control so that nonviolence became part of their everyday life (Ritchie 2001). Following Hindu and Buddhist traditions, they were encouraged to be moderate in consumption, practise nonattachment, and to take vows of celibacy and vegetarianism (Ritchie 2001; Walz & Ritchie 2000). Modelling themselves on Gandhi, Soulforce activists (part of an anti-homophobia movement) are encouraged to take a vow to control their passions: “I promise to control my passion for food, sex, intoxicants, entertainment, position, power that my best self might be free to join with my creator in doing justice” (White 1999g, para. 59).

Burrowes (1994, p. 1) argues that, as an activist, the personal aspects of his life are vitally important because he believes that if he wants to change the world, he must also change himself. In particular he is attempting to learn to:

- Tell the truth
- Deal creatively with conflict in his personal life
- Respect others more deeply, including refraining form the use of “manipulative, exploitative, coercive or violent behaviour in his personal relationships” (pp. 1-2)
- Live more simply
- Nurture himself intellectually, emotionally, spiritually, and physically.
Violence is rejected as a means of control and resolving disputes

A rejection of violence is central to a philosophy of nonviolence. One of the main foundations of Gandhi’s theory of nonviolence was *ahimsa*, which means literally “non-harming” (Ritchie 2001, p. 56).

In its negative form it means not injuring any living being, whether by body or mind. I may not therefore hurt the person of any wrong-doer, or bear any ill will to him [or her] and so cause him [or her] mental suffering. ... In its positive form, ahimsa means the largest love, the greatest charity. If I am a follower of ahimsa, I must love my enemy. I must apply the same rule to the wrongdoer who is my enemy or a stranger to me, as I would to my wrong-doing father or son (Gandhi 1986, pp. 212-213).

Gandhi objected to violence not only because it was a barrier to a search for Truth (Ritchie 2001) but also “because when it appears to do good, the good is only temporary; [but] the evil it does is permanent” (Gandhi 1958, p. 95). For Gandhi, violence included untruth, over-use of the world’s resources, eating meat, and injustice (Gandhi 1986; Ritchie 2001; Walz & Correia 1989) all of which need to be rejected.

King (1958) argued it was “impractical and immoral” to use violence, and urged his followers “to love rather than hate” and “to be prepared to suffer violence if necessary but never to inflict it” (p. 87). For King, nonviolence “avoids not only external physical violence but also internal violence of spirit. The nonviolent resister not only refuses to shoot his [or her] opponent but he also refuses to hate him [or her]” (King 1958, p. 103). He believed that violence was “the antithesis of creativity and wholeness. It destroys community and makes brotherhood [sic] impossible” (King 1967, p. 61). According to Moses (1997), King refused “to take up tools of oppression as means of liberation” (p. 49), and consistently rejected violence. In similar vein, Soulforce activists are encouraged to “reject violence (of the fist, tongue and heart) and to use only the methods of nonviolence” (White 1999g, para. 14).

Although they might agree on the principle of rejecting violence, advocates of nonviolence do not necessarily agree on what this means in practice.
1. Some nonviolent adherents refuse to use violence under any circumstance.
2. Some reject organized violence, such as war or violent revolution, but might condone violent self-defense by an individual who is physically attacked.
3. Some may allow violence against property, but not against people.
4. Some do not oppose violence on principle, but believe that its use tends to bring bad results and that nonviolent alternatives hold better possibilities (Ryan 1997, para. 12).

Advocates of principled nonviolence are more likely to reject violence but not necessarily totally.

The questions of which actions are nonviolent can become terribly theological and pointless. For instance, if I had a gun and saw someone with a machine gun about to shoot a room full of people, wouldn’t it be more nonviolent if I killed the person than let the room full of people be killed? (McReynolds 2001, para. 1).

Even Gandhi believed there were occasions when violence was the morally right thing to do (Gandhi 1958, 1986, p. 217). He believed, however, it was important in such situations to acknowledge the violence and not to pretend that it was nonviolence (Gandhi 1986, p. 217).

Determining who has the right to use or prevent violence is a highly political issue (Indermaur, Atkinson & Blagg 1998, pp. 11-12). Distinctions are sometimes drawn between legitimate and illegitimate violence, which raises questions as to who defines acceptability and at what stage legitimate violence becomes illegitimate. Is it legitimate for parents or teachers to physically discipline children, and to what extent? Is there a difference between democratically elected leaders and dictators using the police to limit public protest? Legitimate violence generally includes attempts to prevent an individual or group from hurting themselves or others, and attempts to maintain formal authority (Harlow 1996, p. 61). According to Atkinson, Indermaur and Blagg (1998), illegitimate violence usually implies “unacceptable physical coercion” (p. 8). They also argue, “some forms of physical coercion (war, physical punishment of children in some times and places, police powers, capital punishment etc.) are defined as acceptable and are thus not labelled as violence” (p. 8). Adherents of principled nonviolence challenge these distinctions and believe that all violence, even if defined as legitimate, needs to be challenged.
Violence is also usually defined in personal terms and focuses on individual or collective violence (Cunningham 2000, paras 5-6). Halstead (1992), for example, defines violence as “physical behaviour which results in physical, sexual and/or psychological damage, forced social isolation, or economic deprivation or behaviour which leaves another person in fear” (pp. 1-2). In broad terms, personal violence includes:

- The capacity to inflict physical pain, harm or death.
- The capacity to punish by restricting freedom and limiting choices.
- The capacity to withhold vital resources or rewards.
- The capacity to inflict emotional and psychological damage and to shame and humiliate (Starhawk 2002, p. 1).

There are also structural definitions of violence (Bruyn 1979; Burton 1997; Corvo 1997; Cunningham 2000; Curle 1995; Galtung 1990; White, Underwood & Omelczuk 1991). Here violence is seen as “damaging deprivations caused by the nature of social institutions and policies” (Burton 1997, p. 32), which occur “when people are harmed because of inequitable social arrangements rather than overt physical violence” (Cunningham 2000, p. 3). Hence the Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group’s (1983) claim:

Many people do not recognise any forms of violence other than physical violence, whereas for us violence includes conditions which themselves kill. Poverty, hunger and racism degrade individuals and inflict suffering. Some massacres are considered newsworthy, but we also know that thousands die daily from starvation, neglect, lack of clean water or medical supplies. Yet when physical violence erupts in response to the built-in violence that perpetuates these conditions, the participants are depicted as less than human and without any motivation for their violence (p. 6).

Rather than seeing different forms of violence as separate from one another, Galtung (1990) proposes a violence triangle (see Figure 4 - 1) that emphasises the relationship between different forms of violence, which he labels direct, structural and cultural. Direct violence is the most visible form of violence. Structural violence is less visible and is based on the belief that social structures inflict violence on people when they cause, maintain or reinforce injustice. Cultural violence is seen as a means to legitimise
other forms of violence. It makes “direct and structural violence look, even feel, right – or at least not wrong” (Galtung 1990, p. 291). To demonstrate the interrelationship between these different forms of violence the triangle in Figure 4 - 1 can be rotated and inverted to illustrate different relationships.

Sercombe (1997) provides a definition of violence that helps form the basis of the definition underpinning this study. He defines violence as “the intent to harm” (p. 27). At times, however, the intent may not be to harm, but people are knowingly harmed. As he identifies:

[Violence] is also about the “dark sarcasm in the classroom” (Pink Floyd 1979), about the threats, about leaving the student ignored in the corner for months on end, about “getting rid of” a student, hounding them until they leave or are suspended, about insults, put-downs and spite, about classifying a young person as a “troublemaker” or a “no-hoper”, knowing that the student is being harmed (Sercombe 2003, p. 28, emphasis in the original).

The intent of the teacher might not be to harm – it might be to maintain discipline, to provide a positive learning environment for the others – but, as Sercombe demonstrates, it is still violence.

At the same time, committing harm in itself may not be violence. At times people may be harmed in order to provide a direct benefit to them (for example some medical procedures may harm a person in some ways but provide other benefits) and so a willingness to commit harm is not adequate on its own. The definition of violence used
in this study is thus the intent to commit harm or the willingness to commit harm where there are no direct benefits to the person being harmed.

Nonviolence rejects not only direct violence but also seeks to eradicate structural and cultural violence (McAllister 1982; Moyer 1999b; Ochre & Burrowes 1995; Ryan 1996, 1997; Starhawk 1990; Woehrle 1993). Many groups attempt to develop practices consistent with this broad understanding of violence by addressing issues such as sexism (Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group 1983; Jones 1999; McAllister 1982; Moyer 1995; Roodkowsky 1979; Warnock 1981), homophobia (White 1999a), the overuse of resources (Burrowes 1994; Gandhi 1971; Walz & Canda 1988; Walz & Correia 1989), domination in personal relationships (Garver & Reitan 1995; Jones 1999; Moyer 1999b), interpersonal conflict (Burrowes 1995c; Woodrow et al. 1979), and exclusive decision making processes (Avery et al. 1981; Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group 1983; Tasmanian Wilderness Society 1982; Woodrow et al. 1979).

There is an active commitment to peace and social justice

Nonviolence is built on an active commitment to peace and social justice. Nonviolence “springs from a commitment to and passion for justice” (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 217). It is an action-oriented philosophy (Ritchie 2001) and, at its heart, the philosophy of nonviolence is about creating a more just and peaceful society. Nonviolence involves a “battle with injustice” (McReynolds 1998b) because injustice is seen as a form of violence, and even the failure to address injustice can be seen as a form of violence (Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990). Gandhi (1958) suggested, “no man [or woman] could be actively non-violent and not rise against social injustice no matter where it occurred” (p. 89). He described social justice “as fairness to the individual, with priority to disadvantaged people” (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 214) and expected his followers to work towards the end of untouchability, to be involved in politics and to work towards the elimination of poverty (Ritchie 2001, p. 60).

King (1967) believed that true compassion was more “than flinging a coin to a beggar; it understands that an edifice which produces beggars needs restructuring” (pp. 187-188). King argued that structural change was needed to overcome racism, and that this would only be achieved through struggle and nonviolent social action (Moses 1997).
More recent nonviolent activists have continued to emphasise the importance of social justice. They have demonstrated that nonviolent action offers “an alternative to weak submission to wrongs and violent reaction against them” (Beck 1991, p. 2) and that challenging injustice remains the focus of nonviolence. Its ultimate aim is to put an end to all forms of violence, injustice and oppression (Burrowes 1994; McAllister 1982; Moyer 1995, 1999b; Ochre & Burrowes 1995; Ryan 1996, 1997; Starhawk 1990; Woehrle 1993).

Although not always explicitly stated, numerous writers addressing broad issues of peace and social justice are advocates for a philosophy of nonviolence. Ivan Illich, a protégé of Gandhi, wrote on a broad range of issues including education (Illich 1973; Illich & Buckman 1973; Illich & Lister 1976), the power of professional élites (Illich 1977), gender (Illich 1983), the practice of medicine (Illich 1977) and the nature of work (Illich 1980). Other notable examples include Paulo Freire on adult literacy (Freire 1973, 1998; Freire & Freire 1994), Ernest Schumacher on economics (Schumacher 1973) and Dorothy Day on poverty and workers (Day 1933, 1960, 1961, 1963).

The means are consistent with the ends

Within a philosophy of nonviolence, the means used to bring about social change should be consistent with the desired ends. As the Australian Nonviolence Network (Ochre & Burrowes 1995) states, “the means we use to bring about change must be consistent with our vision of a nonviolent world” (para. 4). If a just and peaceful society is to be created, then the ways in which it is created need to be just and nonviolent.

The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree... We reap exactly as we sow (Gandhi 1951, p. 10).

Gandhi believed that nonviolence was both a means and an end: it was not only a means of bringing about social change but it was also his desired end point (Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990, pp. 8-9). King believed that the means and ends should not be separated, even in extreme situations (Moses 1997, p. 145) and that, “returning violence for violence multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of
stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness: only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate: only love can do that” (King 1967, pp. 62-63).

**Power is understood as arising out of relationships**

Nonviolence activists understand power as arising out of relationships rather than being an inherent characteristic in the individual. This view of power, advocated particularly by feminist nonviolence activists, is linked to a consent view of political power. Sharp (1973b, p. 8) contrasts the consent view of power, which underpins nonviolent action, with the traditional monolith view of power (see Figure 4 - 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monolith view of power</th>
<th>Consent view of power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are dependent upon the good will, the decisions and the support of the government or any other hierarchical system to which they belong.</td>
<td>The government or hierarchical system is dependent upon the people’s good will, decisions and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The power of the government is emitted from the few who stand at the pinnacle of command.</td>
<td>Power continually rises from many parts of society and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power is self-perpetuating, durable, not easily or quickly controlled or destroyed.</td>
<td>Political power is fragile, always dependent for its strength and existence upon a replenishment of its sources by the cooperation of a multitude of institutions and people – cooperation that may or may not continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Sharp 1973b, p. 8)

**Figure 4 - 2: Monolith and consent views of power**

Nonviolent action is based on a consent view of power because people are seen as having the ability to withhold their consent to structures and practices which are violent or unjust. Without support, these structures and practices could not exist. Although there is a danger that the consent view minimises the role of structural factors in determining the way in which power is constituted, it provides a sound rationale for nonviolent action (Beck 1991; Hedemann 1981; Martin 1997; Tasmanian Wilderness Society 1982). Feminist nonviolence literature, however, has taken the exploration of power further (Bruyn 1979, p. 20). Meyerding (1982) argues, “power is not a characteristic owned by any individual, but rather a dynamic which is present in every relationship” (p. 10). Starhawk (1990) suggests:
Power is never static, for power is not a thing that we can hold or store, it is a movement, a relationship, a balance, fluid and changing. The power one person can wield over another is dependent on a myriad of external factors and subtle agreements (p. 268).

Starhawk (1990) identifies three forms of power: power-over, power-with and power-from-within (see also Burgess & Burgess 1994; Clark 1998; Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group 1983; Ochre & Burrowes 1995). Power-over is linked to “domination and control” (Starhawk 1990, p. 9) and motivates through fear.

Its systems instil fear and then offer the hope of relief in return for compliance and obedience. We fear the force and violence of the system should we disobey, and we fear the loss of value, sustenance, comforts and tokens of esteem (p. 14).

Force, which enables one individual or group to make decisions affecting others and to take control, ultimately backs power-over.

It may rule with weapons that are physical or by controlling the resources we need to live: money, food, medical care or by controlling more subtle resources: information, approval, love. We are so accustomed to power-over, so steeped in its language and its implicit threats, that we often become aware of its functioning only when we see its extreme manifestations (p. 9).

Power-with is linked with “social power, the influence we wield among equals” (Starhawk 1990, p. 9).

Power-with sees the world as a pattern of relationships, but its interest is in how the pattern can be shaped, modelled, shifted. It values beings, forces, and people according to how they affect others and according to a history based on experience (p. 15).

It is based on respect, influence and empowerment. It is:

The power of a strong individual in a group of equals, the power not to command, but to suggest and be listened to, to begin something and see it happen. The source of power-with is the willingness of others to listen to our ideas. We could call that willingness respect, not for a role, but for each unique person (p. 10).

Power-from-within, is linked to “the mysteries that awaken our deepest abilities and potential” (Starhawk 1990, p. 9). It sees a world where there are “no simple causes and
effects” and where “all things have inherent value” (p. 15). It arises “from our sense of connection, our bonding with other human beings, and the environment” (p. 10).

We can feel that power in acts of creation and connection, in planting, building, writing, cleaning, healing, soothing, playing, singing, making love. We can feel it in acting together with others to oppose control (p. 10).

Bruyn (1979) argues:

The exercise of power in nonviolent action is not measured by an increase in the authority over people but rather by an increase in the level of independent authority of everyone. The aim is not to maximize the power and authority of oneself over others but rather to create the conditions whereby power can be shared. The purpose is to create the conditions in which each individual’s opportunity to exercise power is maximized in the context of the larger community (p. 21).

One way in which a commitment to power-with has been put into practice is through the use of inclusive forms of decision making, particularly consensus (Ochre & Burrowes 1995; Ryan 1996; Starhawk 1990, 2001; Tasmanian Wilderness Society 1982; Terry 1979). According to the handbook for the Franklin River Blockade (Tasmanian Wilderness Society 1982):

Through the blockade in general, and through some actions in particular, each one of us will be putting ourselves at significant risk. For example, we will be enduring physical hardship in cold wet weather, we may risk arrest and jail or fines, and there is always the possibility of physical injuries. These cannot be taken lightly. Because we all face these risks together it is essential that we all feel we have a say in decisions which determine our actions. There is no point in “majority rules” decisions when something less than half the people may, when the crunch comes, find they can’t go along with the majority, and unity of the blockading group is lost (p. 29, emphasis in the original).

Consensus is the preferred decision making process in many nonviolence campaigns (Ryan 1996, p. 18.1) and, for some, consensus is linked to the spiritual basis of their commitment to nonviolence.

Those of us who love consensus process see it as a spiritual practice rooted in the idea of each person’s immanent value. The North American peace movement adopted
consensus from Quakers, whose religion recognises the Inner Light of the spirit as immanent in each human being (Starhawk 1990, p. 184).

Consensus is improved when a number of conditions are present:

- The group has a unity of purpose and there is common philosophy
- There is equal access to power for all members
- The group is not bound by hierarchical structures
- There is enough time available to devote to the process
- There is willingness in the group to attend to process and attitudes
- There is an understanding of the process, agreement to use the process and a willingness to learn and practice skills for meeting participation
- There is a commitment to the ongoing life of the group
- There is a belief that everybody has something of value to contribute (Avery et al. 1981; Terry 1979).

As Ryan (1996, ch. 18) and Starhawk (1990, pp. 183-188) demonstrate, however, the conditions necessary for the successful use of consensus do not always exist in campaigns, the process is not always the most appropriate and there are other forms of inclusive decision making available. Starhawk (1990, pp. 186-187) suggests that consensus may be inappropriate when:

- The group is not cohesive or when major divisions exist within the group
- There are no good choices
- There is an emergency and a decision has to be made urgently
- The issue is trivial
- There is insufficient information to make a wise decision.

Consensus is not the only decision making process consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence and successful campaigns have been run using other processes. Generally, however, decision making processes which recognise the contribution a range of people can make, value the dignity of individuals and do not rely on coercion are more likely to be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence (Ryan 1996; Starhawk 1990, 2001; Walz 1986).
Starhawk (1990) argues it is important that the nature of power arising out of relationships is made clear because “the most destructive power is secret, capricious, and random” (p. 156). She suggests that responsive leadership can help create power-with, even in hierarchies. A responsive leader:

Responds to the needs of the group and the opportunities in the environment, responds by feeling as well as by thinking and acting. A basic principle of responsive leadership is that power and responsibility work together. If you have power, you are responsible for using it in an empowering way. If you have responsibility, you need the power to meet it (p. 270).

She identifies a number of guidelines for responsive leaderships. Responsive leaders:

- Nurture the capacities of others, provide training and preparation, and encourage others to gain skills and take on new responsibilities.
- Keep commitments they make, especially when they wield power over others.
- Respond to others by listening, consulting, responding to criticism and being willing to change.
- Take responsibility for the decisions they make, and account for them to the group.
- Keep lines of authority, power, and decision making clear and visible. They also ensure that there are clear limitations to their authority, clear checks and balances, and clear appeal processes.
- Think first about the interests and needs of the group, and give them priority, while also looking after their own needs. They are conscious of what demands they make of others and recognise that they have commitments outside the group or organisation.
- Do not expect special benefits, attention, release from a fair share of less desirable tasks, adulation, or an inequitable share of resources. They show respect to people with lower status within the group or organisation. They do, however, deserve and expect support and nurturing from the group.
- Do not abuse or humiliate others.
- Disclose their feelings and vulnerabilities where it is safe to do so, and create environments in which feelings and emotions can be expressed.
- Do not monopolise caring or care giving.
• Make mistakes and take responsibility for fixing their mistakes. They accept the mistakes of others, and encourage responsibility and problem solving rather than guilt and blame (Starhawk 1990, pp. 271-275).

There is a profound respect for humanity

A philosophy of nonviolence involves a profound respect for humanity. As Moyer (1999b) describes it, one of the basic assumptions of nonviolence is, “Human Nature has the innate qualities of love, compassion, patience, tolerance, forgiveness, contentment, a sense of responsibility and harmony with all things” (p. 1). This is not to deny that people also have the “potential for evil” (King 1958, p. 99) but rather it is an affirmation of “human beings as active agents with the potential to transform themselves and their communities on a local and global level” (Ritchie 2001, p. 11). Gandhi believed that people were basically “gentle, cooperative and giving” and even when they acted differently, they could be assisted back to a path of “nobility and selflessness” (Sharma 1989, p. 65).

In nonviolence literature, there is an emphasis on respecting the humanity of opponents in campaigns. The Australian Nonviolence Network, “strive to show respect for all life and to acknowledge the humanity of all people, including our opponents” (Ochre & Burrowes 1995, para. 4). According to the American Peace Test (n.d.):

Nonviolence requires us to respect humanity and to value life. As we seek change nonviolently we approach our opponent with respect, openness and love. We know that each of us has a part of the truth and will benefit from our shared wisdom – opponent and nonviolent actionist alike (para. 4).

Based upon a respect for the humanity of its adversaries, Soulforce encourages the following beliefs:

1. My adversary is also a child of the Creator; we are both members of the same human family; we are sisters and brothers in need of reconciliation.
2. My adversary is not my enemy, but a victim of misinformation as I have been.
3. My only task is to bring my adversary truth in love (nonviolence) relentlessly.
4. My adversary’s motives are as pure as mine and of no relevance to our discussion.
5. My worst adversary has an amazing potential for positive change.
6. My adversary may have an insight into truth that I do not have.
7. My adversary and I will understand each other and come to a new position that will satisfy us both, if we conduct our search for truth guided by the principles of love (White 1999d, par. 17).

Respect does not necessarily involve the acceptance of people’s behaviour, actions or beliefs (Burgess & Burgess 1994, p. 14) and an important aspect of respecting our opponents involves separating the act from the person. For Gandhi there was a distinction between people and their actions: nonviolence involved the “demonstration of love and respect even for one’s so-called enemies” and “doing good even to the evildoer” (Ritchie 2001, p. 56). It was appropriate to resist injustice but to attack the people behind it was “tantamount to resisting and attacking oneself” (Gandhi 1958, p. 88).

According to King (1958), nonviolent action “is directed against forces of evil rather than against persons who happen to be doing the evil. It is evil that the nonviolent resister seeks to defeat, not the persons victimized by evil” (p. 102). Moses (1997) argues, “if justice is not to be achieved by blaming the victims of exploitation, neither will it be achieved by blaming ‘evil men’ for their conspiracies” (p. 61). King believed it was important to distinguish between the individual’s actions and systemic systems of oppression (Moses 1997, p. 51) and that nonviolence provided a means by which the civil rights movement could “oppose the unjust system and at the same time love the perpetrators of the system” (King 1963, p. 15).

In discussing tactical nonviolence, Sharp (1973d, p. 634) argues that, while it is not necessary, nonviolence campaigns are more likely to be successful if activists are able to draw a distinction between the people and the issues involved because it increases the likelihood that opponents will support the campaign or, at least, not oppose it as strongly.

*Actions are based on love*

Closely linked to a profound respect for humanity and the separation of persons from their behaviour, the motivation for nonviolent social change is love rather than hate.
Gandhi believed nonviolence was the law of love and that it involved loving one’s enemy (Gandhi 1958; Ritchie 2001). He believed, “it is no non-violence if we merely love those that love us. It is non-violence only when we love those that hate us” (Gandhi 1958, p. 86). Gandhi went as far as suggesting that hate was the subtlest form of violence (Burgess & Burgess 1994, p. 22).

Because King saw nonviolence as an expression of Christian love (King 1958, pp. 84-87), love played a major role in his practice of nonviolence. He argued that love did not mean “we abandon our militant efforts. With every ounce of our energy we must continue to rid our nation of the incubus of racial injustice. But we need not in the process relinquish our privilege and obligation to love” (King 1967, p. 65). For King, love was not an ineffective, sentimental liberal interpretation of love (Moses 1997, p. 220) but instead it was a love based on a “tough mind and a tender heart” (King 1963, p. 10). A tough mind was characterised by “incisive thinking, realistic appraisal, and decisive judgement” leading to a “firmness of purpose and solidness of commitment” (King 1963, p. 10). But without a tender heart, a person is hard-hearted and never truly loves, and hard-hearted people lack the capacity for genuine compassion being unmoved by the pain and afflictions of others (p. 13). King (1958) drew from his Christian faith to describe this love as agape.

Agape is not a weak, passive love. It is love in action. Agape is love seeking to preserve and create community... Agape is a willingness to sacrifice in the interest of mutuality. Agape is a willingness to go to any length to restore community. It doesn’t stop at the first mile, but it goes the second mile to restore community. It is a willingness to forgive, not seven times, but seventy times seven to restore community. The cross is the eternal expression of the length to which God will go in order to restore broken community (p. 105).

Again Sharp (1973d, pp. 633-635) argues that although love is not necessary for nonviolence campaigns, it does increase the likelihood of success. He argues that it is unrealistic to expect people who have experienced great oppression and violence to love their opponents but strategically it is “desirable for nonviolent actionists to minimize hostility and hatred and to maximize their goodwill for members of the opponent group while firmly continuing the struggle” (p. 635). White (1999g), the founder of Soulforce, describes loving his enemies as the most difficult spiritual task he ever faced.
How can I love those conservative Christian leaders whose words and actions help cause lesbians and gays to be rejected by their families, ex-communicated from their churches, evicted from their apartments, fired from their jobs, hunted down and hounded out of the military, denied their basic human rights and civil protections, harassed, assaulted, maimed and murdered? (para. 46).

At the same time, he argues that we will never “win the minds and hearts of our adversaries until we learn to out-love them” (White 1999d, para. 23) and urges Soulforce activists to be guided entirely by the principles of love, and to confront untruth with love and without a trace of physical, psychological or spiritual violence (White 1999g).

There is a commitment to truth and openness

Gandhi’s (1940) autobiography The story of my experiments with Truth attests that the search for Truth was at the heart of his political, social, economic, and ethical thought. For Gandhi, Truth was inseparable from God and universal justice (Beck 1991; Gandhi 1958; Walz & Ritchie 2000) and the satyagraha movement was a “movement intended to replace methods of violence, and a movement based entirely on truth” (Gandhi 1951). Gandhi defined untruth as violence (Ritchie 2001, p. 45). Since he believed that nonviolence involved a search for truth and that no individual had a monopoly on truth or complete understanding, he believed that his opponents needed to be treated with respect because they had the potential to contribute to a greater understanding of truth (Gandhi 1958; McReynolds 1998a).

While Gandhi’s commitment to truth was much stronger than that of more recent advocates of nonviolence, a commitment to truth and openness remains (Beck 1991; Burrowes 1994; Environment Centre of Western Australia n.d.; McReynolds 1999; Ochre & Burrowes 1995; Starhawk 1990; Walz & Ritchie 2000; White 1999g). Soulforce, for example, encourages its activists to take a vow of truth and to promise to “seek the truth, to live by the truth, and to confront untruth wherever I find it” (White 1999g, para. 17). White (1999d) argues that the involuntary suffering faced by gays and lesbians is based on untruth and suggests that “those who believe (and even those who teach) the untruths about sexual orientation are victims too. To understand the cause of our suffering is to understand the untruths, half-truths, and misunderstandings that have
victimised us all” (para. 3). In order to prevent further suffering, truth must replace untruth.

The commitment to truth also leads to a commitment to openness. In nonviolent campaigns, openness includes a willingness to be open with one’s opponents and to avoid secrecy in planning and organisation (King 1958; Sharp 1973d). Advantages of such an approach include:

- Openness increases the possibility for dialogue with one’s opponents
- Secrecy is based on fear and helps generate greater fear, and as fear frequently blocks action, secrecy can act as a barrier to mass action
- Concerns about informers and spies are lessened because there are no decisions that have to be kept secret
- Avoiding secrecy means that it is easier to involve more people in decision making which increases their commitment to action (Cumming 1985; King 1958; Sharp 1973c; Walz & Ritchie 2000).

**Spiritual beliefs and qualities are valued**

Many advocates of nonviolence have been motivated by spiritual beliefs and value the spiritual aspects of people’s lives. Gandhi claimed that nonviolence came to him because he was “a passionate seeker after Truth, which is but another name for God” (Gandhi 1958, p. 96). His experiments with Truth and nonviolence were part of his quest for “self-realisation, to see God face to face, to attain Moksha [enlightenment or freedom from the cycle of birth and death]” (Gandhi 1940, pp. 4-5). According to Walz, Sharma and Birnbaum (1990, p. 3) Gandhi believed that self-realisation was the ultimate end of human existence and that “self-realisation comes to an individual only through a lifetime of struggle against injustice and promotion of acts of fairness and social justice” (p. 10).

While Gandhi drew mainly upon Hindu, Jainist and Buddhist traditions (Ritchie 2001), King was a Christian. Despite the Eastern religious base to Gandhi’s nonviolence, King believed that Gandhi was “probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and effective social force on a large scale” (King 1958, p. 97). “Christ furnished the spirit and motivation,
while Gandhi furnished the method” (p. 85). King (1963) argued that in order to cast out evil from “our individual and collective lives” (p. 134) people had to allow God to work through them. He also believed that nonviolence was “based on the conviction that the universe is on the side of justice” and that even those who do not believe in a personal God, believe “in the existence of some creative force that works for universal wholeness” (King 1958, pp. 106-107).

The mission of Soulforce (White 1999a) is to “help end the suffering of God’s lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered children” (para. 3) and uses religious or spiritual imagery in discussing its purpose. It encourages activists to see themselves as children of a “loving Creator,” daughters or sons of the “Soulforce at the center of the universe” (White 1999c, para. 12) so that nonviolence “becomes the measure of our commitment to God’s way, the way of love” (White 1999g, para. 53). Starhawk’s (1990) commitment to “the Goddess, to the protection, preservation, nurturing and fostering of the great powers of life as they emerge in every being” (p. 8) leads her to believe that “the heart of nonviolence is the recognition that every person embodies the sacred, that within each of us, even the torturer and the bomb maker, is a holy potential for change and growth” (p. 317). As Starhawk’s beliefs indicate, the spiritual basis of nonviolence is not limited to major religions. According to Beck (1991), the “power of nonviolence comes from the spiritual qualities of love, understanding, communication skill, courage, and persistent endurance” (para. 5). The Rocky Mountain Alliance (1999) suggests that choosing nonviolence as a way of life involves “embracing the spiritual belief of our heart in our own personal and reflective way.” Burrowes (1994, para. 4) found that to live a nonviolent life he needed to listen to his inner voice in all its facets.

It is not just my intuition: that part of me that guides me when the way forward is not otherwise clear. It is not just my unconscious: that part of me that contains my truest and deepest feelings, and that sometimes presents these feelings in the form of dreams. It is not just my conscience: that part of me that compels me to act, as best I can, truthfully, compassionately and with justice. My inner voice is a combination of all of these things, but it is much, much more. It is also that part of me that offers insights, primarily about myself, from the accumulated wisdom of the Universe, because the spiritual path that I have chosen enhances and enriches my sense of connection with the life-force that unites us all (Burrowes 1995a, para. 4).
There is a willingness to accept suffering in order to create change

Once again, the willingness to accept suffering in order to create change was particularly important to Gandhi, although it still influences much of the more recent practice of nonviolence (Beck 1991; McReynolds 1998c; Sharp 1973a; White 1999f, 1999g). Gandhi believed “satyagraha means fighting oppression through voluntary suffering. There can be no question here of making anyone else suffer” (Gandhi 1987, p. 55). Gandhi claimed that suffering works because “real suffering bravely borne melts even a heart of stone” (quoted in Ritchie 2001, p. 53), and he thus argued that satyagraha requires:

More heroism than does fighting a battle. The soldier has weapons in his [or her] hand; his [or her] aim is to strike the enemy. The satyagraha, on the contrary, fights by suffering himself [or herself]. Surely, this is not for the weak and the diffident (Quoted in Ritchie 2001, pp. 53-54).

King believed that suffering was inevitable when fighting evil or attempting to remove structural violence (Moses 1997, pp. 157-158), and that nonviolence was characterised by a willingness to suffer without retaliation (King 1958, p. 103). Quoting Gandhi, King (1958) suggested, “rivers of blood may have to flow before we gain our freedom, but it must be our blood” (p. 103), and he argued that unearned suffering is redemptive and has “tremendous educational and transforming possibilities” (p. 103). White (1999f) differentiates between voluntary and involuntary suffering.

Accepting suffering without retaliation or complaint does not mean we accept the involuntary suffering that comes from discrimination and intolerance. Soulforce is a call to suffer voluntarily that involuntary suffering might end (para. 29).

The Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group (1983) criticises the importance placed on “seeking out suffering” (p. 35, their emphasis). They argue:

The total number of person hours of suffering does not lead “automatically” to an equivalent amount of success. Kampuchea and Chile would be heaven on earth by now if that were so. These men [who, like Gandhi and King, advocate suffering] are talking about voluntary suffering, with the assumption that its value lies in its being sought – resulting in an extra, shocking and visible impact (p. 35-36).
They go on to argue that, for many women, suffering is rarely sought but is very much part of their lives. “Thus women’s suffering carries less of the visibility and moral virtue” (p. 36). They are, however, “prepared to suffer but we don’t seek it out as something valuable in itself” (p. 36).

Sharp (1973d, p. 552) demonstrates that suffering is likely, if not inevitable, but that suffering is also a feature of violent campaigns. When nonviolent discipline is maintained, he argues that death or physical harm (on both sides) is actually less likely than if violence were used. McReynolds (1998c) suggests that when activists were willing to suffer without retaliation, their opponents were more likely to see them as human and to begin to question their own actions, thereby reducing the level of violence.

**SOCIAL WORK AND GANDHI**

An extensive literature search was unable to identify any literature addressing the implications of a philosophy of nonviolence for youth work practice. There is, however, a small volume of literature exploring the implications of Gandhian thought for social work theory (Ritchie 2001; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990), social work ethics (Walz & Ritchie 2000), social development (Sharma 1989; Sharma & Ormsby 1982) and interventions by social workers (Fong, Boyd & Browne 1999; Schiff & Belson 1988). Walz and Ritchie (2000) and Ritchie (2001) identify a number of features of Gandhian thought that are particularly relevant to social work: the unity of all things, *ahimsa* (non-harming), *sarvodaya* (the welfare of all), *satyagraha* (truth-force), *swadeshi* (human scale and immediacy), and material simplicity. Despite the fact that these concepts are intricately connected and it is difficult to consider one without discussing the others (Ritchie 2001, p. 30), the implications for social work of each concept are discussed briefly below.

*Unity of all things*

Gandhi believed that all beings were “manifestations of the ultimate or Absolute reality” (Ritchie 2001, p. 46) and all living things were interdependent (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p.
Human beings are only one part of the universe and the world needs to be thought of in holistic terms because all things are one. From a Gandhian perspective, social workers thus have a responsibility not only to individuals and the community but also to all living things and they have a moral duty to protect the planet and to promote “sustainable and just lifestyles” (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 216, see also Ritchie 2001; Walz & Canda 1988; Walz & Correia 1989). In social work, the unity of all things goes beyond systems and ecological approaches in that “it denies the necessity of tension between or within systems” and adds a moral dimension with an “imperative to respond” (Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990, p. 8).

**Ahimsa**

For Gandhi, *ahimsa* (non-harming) involved not only the rejection of violence but also an active pursuit of social justice and service to others (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 216). Social workers need to address violence in all its manifestations and promote harmonious loving relationships. For example, the principle of *ahimsa* implies that social workers need to adopt a holistic view of person-to-person violence “by connecting personal violence to the larger landscape of structural violence” (Ritchie 2001, p. 82). In order to address structural violence, social workers need to be actively involved in social action and to be committed to justice (Walz & Ritchie 2000; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990). *Ahimsa* also implies that social workers need to serve others with love that, for Gandhi, involved a commitment to truth (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 216).

Love of all is the absolute ethical position toward which one strives. Applied to the social work relationship, the Gandhian position postulates that social workers should maintain a close, personal, non-exploitative, and non-manipulative relationship with clients. It is a disciplined relationship, not a managed relationship. It is a truthful relationship characterised by absolute honesty and nonviolence and one to be monitored carefully through both supervision and self-evaluation practices. There can be no compromise on issues that, at times, do not command truthfulness from the worker, such as discussing with clients mental or physical states. Nor could a practitioner ethically withhold information from clients for their ‘own good’ (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 216-217).
Gandhi believed that *sarvodaya*, or the “welfare of all” (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 218), began with care for the “poorest of the poor” (Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990, p. 16) and implied “selfless service to others” (Ritchie 2001, p. 67). Gandhi argued that personal and social development were inseparable (Sharma & Ormsby 1982, p. 17) and that social development needed to focus simultaneously on individuals, families and communities, and also on the social, psychological and moral institutions from which economic and political life emanate (Sharma 1989, p. 63). The central component of *sarvodaya* was the “individual and village or small local communities in control of their economic and political life” (Ritchie 2001, p. 66). Only “self-sufficient, self-dependent, and self-governing towns or villages” could provide individuals with the “wholesome and intimate environment” necessary for personal development (Sharma 1989, p. 67). This implies that social workers should focus on both personal and social development, critique the current economic system, ensure that people have access to needed resources, and give priority to the needs of the most marginalised sections of the community (Sharma 1989; Walz & Ritchie 2000; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990).

*Satyagraha*

*Satyagraha*, or truth-force, provides social workers with a philosophy and strategies for social action that are consistent with social work principles (Ritchie 2001; Walz & Ritchie 2000; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990). Although this chapter has concentrated on principles of nonviolence rather than strategies for nonviolent action, there is a great deal of literature that can be used by social workers in developing strategies for social change (see for example Ackerman & DuVall 2000; Beck 1991; Coover et al. 1981; Gandhi 1951; Moyer 2001b; Sharp 1973a). *Satyagraha* also implies that social workers should be committed to truth, love their opponents, accept suffering in order to create change, display moral courage and be staunch advocates for social change (Ritchie 2001; Walz & Ritchie 2000; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990).
Swadeshi


It means a greater dependence on indigenous resources and talents for individual and societal functioning, identifying, exploring, and creating such resources and talents locally, and creating a new social order according to the needs, goals, and aspirations of the local populations (Sharma 1989, p. 67-68).

*Swadeshi* emphasises a human scale of social organisation (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 218) and an economic system that is local, small scale and people-oriented (Sharma 1989, see also Schumacher 1973). *Swadeshi* implies that small, locally based social services are more likely to deliver services meeting local needs than large corporate service bureaucracies (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 219), and that social workers should be involved in developing social and economic systems that promote human worth, productivity, creativity and dignity, while not over-exploiting the world’s natural resources (Ritchie 2001; Sharma 1989; Sharma & Ormsby 1982; Walz & Ritchie 2000).

Material simplicity

Gandhi believed that material simplicity was essential for nonviolence and self-realisation (Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990, p. 12), and over-consumption and excessive wealth constituted violence with potentially disastrous consequences (Ritchie 2001; Walz & Canda 1988; Walz & Correia 1989). Material simplicity involves “living a full life without taking unnecessary material things such as excess food, shelter, clothing and so forth” (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 219). In societies like Australia and the United States, which are so focused on consumption, wealth creation and economic growth (Walz & Canda 1988; Walz & Correia 1989), there are significant dilemmas and challenges for social workers committed to material simplicity. It raises questions such as should social workers be involved in supporting clients to pursue goals that focus on standards of living rather than quality of life? How can social workers address “frivolous and reckless consumption” (Walz & Ritchie 2000, p. 216) as well as poverty? To what extent should youth workers be involved in education about consumption,
world poverty, and environmental sustainability? How much money and how many resources should be devoted to social work conferences and conditions? What are the implications of social workers moving into private practice? (Walz & Ritchie 2000; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990).

Other implications

As Walz, Sharma and Birnbaum (1990), Ritchie (2001) and Walz and Ritchie (2000) demonstrate, Gandhian thought provides a potential theoretical framework for social work. This brief discussion introduces some of the key themes in the literature. Other ways in which Gandhi could shape social work include creating a greater emphasis on self-realisation; assisting in the development of strategies for empowering marginalised individuals, families or communities; providing a framework for integrating clinical and community social work; deepening the understanding of the nature of suffering; and encouraging social workers to address their own spiritual wellbeing (Fong, Boyd & Browne 1999; Ritchie 2001; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990).

Although Gandhi, more than “any other 20th century practitioner or thinker... has shaped our understanding of the capability of humans to use non-violence, to advance social justice, and to envision a community based upon equality, compassion, and social responsibility” (Ritchie 2001, pp. 5-6), this chapter has not focused solely on Gandhi. It also drew upon the experience and insights of other nonviolent social change activists and writers in order to identify ten principles arising from a philosophy of nonviolence. These principles provide the backdrop for the development of a model of nonviolent youth work practice.
SECTION II

METHODOLOGY
Chapter 5
Research Paradigm and Intervention Research

According to Rothman (1974), there is “formidable social distance – characterised by mistrust, differing outlooks, and ostensibly contrasting goals” (pp. 544-545) between social researchers and practitioners (see also Marlow 1998; Reid 1994). The gulf is likely to be particularly significant between researchers and youth workers because many youth workers have no formal qualifications, research is not a strong tradition within youth work and there is an element of anti-intellectualism within this field of practice (Bessant & Evans 1996; Jeffs & Smith 1987; Maunders & Broadbent 1995; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991). Methodological debates are often of little interest to practitioners but need to be addressed in order to explain assumptions underpinning the research, to show the way in which results were obtained and interpreted, and to allow others to evaluate the research. This chapter discusses the heuristic research paradigm, intervention research and its implementation in the study, and ethical issues related to research involving young people. While there is a large volume of research into issues affecting young people, there is little discussion of research in relation to youth work, so this chapter draws heavily on literature discussing an allied field of study, namely, social work research.

RESEARCH PARADIGM

Research paradigms are the frames of reference that researchers use to shape observations and understandings, and include basic assumptions underpinning the research and methods used (Neuman 1997; Rubin & Babbie 2001). Three research paradigms have traditionally been associated with social research: positivist, interpretive and critical (Neuman 1997; Rubin & Babbie 2001). Positivist social research grew from the work of August Comte (1798 – 1857) who argued that human behaviour could be studied and explained in a logical, rational and scientific manner (Babbie 2001; Rubin & Babbie 2001). Neuman (1997) defines positivist social research as:

An organised method for combining deductive logic with precise empirical observations of individual behaviour in order to discover and confirm a set of
probabilistic causal laws that can be used to predict general patterns of human behaviour (p. 63).

Interpretive social research grew from the work of Max Weber (1864 – 1920) and Wilhem Dilthey (1833 – 1911) that was rooted in an “empathetic understanding ... of everyday lived experience of people in specific historical settings” (Neuman 1997, p. 68). An interpretive approach argues that it is not adequate to rely solely on objective measures but that “the subjective meanings and social contexts of an individual’s words or deeds must be examined more deeply” (Rubin & Babbie 2001, p. 35).

Critical social research is often associated with Marxist and conflict theory, feminist analysis and radical psychotherapy (Neuman 1997; Rubin & Babbie 2001). The aim of research in this paradigm is not just to study society but also to play an active role in social change (Alston & Bowles 1998). Critical social researchers believe that research is a political activity and argue that uncritical research is in danger of maintaining the status quo rather than helping to create a better world (Neuman 1997).

For most of the second-half of the twentieth century, positivism was the dominant paradigm for social work research, particularly in the United States (Anastas & Congress 1999; Jackson 1996; Pieper 1995; Tyson 1992) although this dominance has been seriously, at times bitterly, challenged (Goldstein 1995; Hartman 1994; Heineman-Pieper, Tyson & Heineman Pieper 2002; Pieper 1985, 1995; Pieper & Tyson 1999; Shaw & Ruckdeschel 2002; Trevillion 2000; Tyson 1992, 1994, 1995; Webb 2001; Witkin & Harrison 2001). Rubin and Babbie (2001) argue that most positivist social research today is more accurately labeled as postpositivist because, although postpositivist researchers emphasise “objectivity, precision, and generalisability” (p. 34), they recognise that pure objectivity is unattainable and that it is impossible for research to be completely free from political or ideological values. According to Crotty (1998), postpositivism “talks of probability rather than certainty, claims a certain level of objectivity rather than absolute objectivity, and seeks to approximate the truth rather than aspiring to grasp it in its totality or essence” (p. 29).

Pieper and Tyson (Heineman-Pieper, Tyson & Heineman Pieper 2002; Pieper 1985, 1995; Pieper & Tyson 1999; Tyson 1992, 1994, 1995) argue that there is another
alternative – the heuristic paradigm – which is particularly well suited to social work (see also Jackson 1996; Saleebey 1997). Heuristics are ways of knowing, perceiving or solving problems (Heineman-Pieper, Tyson & Heineman Pieper 2002, p. 22) and in this context refer to “any problem-solving strategy that appears likely to lead to relevant, reliable, and useful information” (Pieper 1995, p. 297). The heuristic paradigm is based on a number of beliefs or assumptions, including that:

1. Reality is complex, interactive and uncontrollable.
2. Research cannot be value free, and it is appropriate for social work research to be committed to social justice, empowerment and a humanistic philosophy.
3. It is usually more productive to focus on addressing specific problems rather than defining universal laws or identifying which theories are true.
4. Bias, which is defined as “the inevitable limitations on any one person’s – or group’s – perspective that accompany any act of knowing” (Heineman-Pieper, Tyson & Heineman Pieper 2002, p. 16), is inevitable, and so researchers need to identify biases involved in their research and to manage them.
5. Informed judgement is vital to research and cannot be avoided.
6. Research involves induction.
7. All research methods are heuristic choices in that methodologies are problem-solving strategies.
8. No methodologies or ways of knowing are privileged or given priority: they can all provide useful information.
9. Researchers need to articulate and examine their assumptions, values, options and choices, including their implications, at every stage of the research.
10. Central issues to consider in formulating a research problem include:

   - The values underlying the research, especially in relation to social inequalities and improving human relationships
   - The potential solutions to which the research will lead
   - The importance of the particular problem formulation
   - Who will use the research, and how it might be helpful to them
   - The way in which the boundaries of the environment-system are set
   - The biases involved in the problem formulation and the way in which they can be regulated (Heineman-Pieper, Tyson & Heineman Pieper 2002; Pieper 1985; Tyson 1995).
Two additional features are relevant. First, because there are no privileged ways of knowing, practice wisdom and the informed judgement of practitioners are recognised as legitimate and valued sources of knowledge. Second, it “embraces the full complement of types of rigorous data and methods as potentially useful tools” (Heineman-Pieper, Tyson & Heineman Pieper 2002, p. 24) including experimental, quantitative and qualitative research.

Figure 5 - 1 summarises the key features of the four paradigms. Although some authors argue that the paradigms are fundamentally contradictory and incompatible (Crotty 1998; Heineman-Pieper, Tyson & Heineman Pieper 2002), others argue that it is possible to adopt many ways of knowing, and that each of the paradigms has something to offer social work (Hartman 1994; Reid 1987). As Gray (2000) suggests, rigid thinking is a barrier in the search for excellence in social work practice and in choosing evidence on which to base practice. As in social work practice, where different perspectives can offer different insights, each of the paradigms can be appropriate in different circumstances.

While recognising that the research could have been conducted from a number of paradigms, this study adopted the heuristic paradigm for a number of reasons. In particular, the heuristic paradigm:

- Values the practice wisdom of practitioners, and so the experience and insights of youth workers could be incorporated into the research design.
- Is solution focused and can cope with complex problems found in youth work practice.
- Accepts that values are an integral part of research and so a philosophy of nonviolence could be incorporated into the research.
- Recognises the value of both quantitative and qualitative research methods.
- Encourages researchers to recognise and manage bias in their research, and to clearly state their values, assumptions, and choices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of human beings</th>
<th>Positivist Paradigm</th>
<th>Interpretive Paradigm</th>
<th>Critical Paradigm</th>
<th>Heuristic Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self interested and rational individuals who are shaped by external forces</td>
<td>Social beings who create meaning and who constantly make sense of their world</td>
<td>Creative people, with unrealised potential, trapped by exploitation and social forces</td>
<td>Social beings capable of making informed judgements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of social reality</td>
<td>Reality as objective, and stable reality exists and can be discovered</td>
<td>Reality is subjective and is created by human interaction</td>
<td>Reality defined by the powerful in their own interests &amp; is governed by hidden underlying structures</td>
<td>Reality is complex, interactive and uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for research</td>
<td>To discover “natural” laws so people can predict and control events</td>
<td>To understand and describe meaningful social action</td>
<td>To critique &amp; transform social relations and to change existing unjust social structures</td>
<td>To solve problems, and to improve theoretical knowledge and application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of research</td>
<td>Value-free technological tool, producing knowledge for the good of society</td>
<td>Imperfect, value laden</td>
<td>Usually a political tool shaped by interests of the powerful, often against interests of the powerless. Research cannot be value free</td>
<td>All research involves bias but can contribute to better understanding and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the researcher</td>
<td>Detached, neutral and objective</td>
<td>Interacts with those researched, own values &amp; biases are an intrinsic part of research</td>
<td>An activist on the side of the marginalised or oppressed, working for social change</td>
<td>Recognises and manages biases (not attempt to eliminate them) and uses informed judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the “researched”</td>
<td>Objects of study Little input into how research is carried out</td>
<td>Subjects involved with the researcher in exploring social meanings</td>
<td>People to be liberated; or allies in bringing about social change</td>
<td>Informants with valuable insights &amp; knowledge. Research affected by the relationship between the researcher and “researched”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory looks like</td>
<td>A logical, deductive system of inter-connected definitions, axioms and laws</td>
<td>A description of how a group’s meaning system is generated and sustained</td>
<td>A critique that reveals true conditions and helps people see the way to a better world</td>
<td>A metaphor that helps to organise thinking and assists in directing action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An explanation that is true</td>
<td>Is logically connected to laws and based on facts</td>
<td>Resonates or feels right to those who are being studied</td>
<td>Supplies people with tools needed to change society</td>
<td>Contributes to solving problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good evidence</td>
<td>Is based on precise observations that others can repeat</td>
<td>Is embedded in the context in which it occurs and the meaning given to it by the people involved</td>
<td>Is informed by theory that helps unveil illusions and false beliefs</td>
<td>Is based on informed judgement and is not limited by commitments to particular methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of values</td>
<td>Science is value free, and values have no place except when choosing a topic</td>
<td>Values are an integral part of social life; no group’s values are wrong, only different. Values stated explicitly</td>
<td>All research must begin with a value position: some positions are right, some are wrong</td>
<td>Research cannot be value free, and certain values are more appropriate than others (e.g. racism perpetuates injustice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997; Tyson 1995)

**Figure 5-1: Three Research Paradigms**
INTERVENTION RESEARCH

Like the heuristic paradigm, intervention research is particularly suited to social work, youth work and other human services (Reid 1987; Rothman & Thomas 1994; Thomas 1978a, 1978b, 1987) because it seeks to build a close relationship between research and practice, and focuses on ways of improving interventions by practitioners, administrators and policy makers in human services (Thomas & Rothman 1994). Thomas and Rothman (1994, p. 3) identify three types of intervention research:

1. Intervention knowledge development – developing knowledge relating to intervention
2. Intervention knowledge utilisation – identifying ways the findings from knowledge development can have a practical application
3. Intervention design and development – research seeking to develop innovation in interventions.

The main focus of this research is intervention design and development, which may be described as “a problem-solving process for seeking effective interventive and helping tools to deal with given human and social difficulties” (Thomas 1978a, p. 12). Thomas (quoted in Schilling 1997) defined intervention as:

A planned intrusion into the life or environment of an individual, couple, family, or other target unit that is intended to bring about beneficial changes for the individuals or others involved. The intervention is usually but not necessarily given by a professional in one or another of the fields of human service in connection with some type of organised human service activity. The interventive action is the most conspicuous and central element in producing the desired outcomes of the helping effort, but it does not stand alone. It is, or should be, part of a helping strategy in which the other components help shape the interventive action and have an influence on the outcomes achieved (p. 173).

Intervention research involves six phases:

1. Problem analysis and project planning
2. Information gathering and synthesis
3. Design
4. Early development and pilot testing
5. Evaluation and advanced development

Thomas and Rothman (1994) and Fawcett et al. (1994) identify a number of actions or operations undertaken in each of the phases (see Figure 5 - 2). Activities in italics are identified by Fawcett et al. (1994), other activities are identified by Thomas and Rothman (1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase No</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Problem Analysis and Project Planning</td>
<td>1. Identify and analyse key problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Initiate state-of-the-art review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Determine feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Prepare project plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Set a developmental goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Identify and involve clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Gain entry and cooperation from settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Identify concerns of the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Analyse identified concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Information Gathering and Synthesis</td>
<td>1. Identify and select relevant existing types of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify relevant information sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Establish retrieval procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Gather, process, and store data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Collect and analyse original data, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Synthesise data and formulate conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Use existing information sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Study natural examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Identify functional elements of successful models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1. Identify design problems and intervention requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Specify boundaries of the domain design and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Determine design participants (e.g. a design team, including role of users)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Select a design and development site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Use disciplined problem solving and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Generate, select, and assemble solution alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Formulate an initial intervention or other innovation model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Initiate proceduralisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Design an observational system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Specify procedural elements of the intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 - 2: Phases and activities of Intervention Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase No</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 4  | Early Development and Pilot Testing | 1. Develop plan for trial use in a pilot test  
                     2. Create a limited operation model of the intervention for trial use in the pilot test site  
                     3. Determine the developmental research medium and/or procedure  
                     4. Determine developmental and monitoring instruments (e.g. developmental logs)  
                     5. Identify and address design problems  
                     6. Revise intervention, as necessary  
                     7. Continue proceduralisation and implementation of model  
                     8. Plan field test and select a site  
                     9. Expand the trial field test as informed by the pilot  
                     10. Implement field test and revise intervention, as necessary  
                     11. Develop a prototype or preliminary intervention  
                     12. Conduct a pilot test  
                     13. Apply design criteria to the preliminary intervention concept |
| Phase 5  | Evaluation and Advanced Development | 1. Plan evaluation in light of the degree of interventional development  
                     2. Select evaluation methods  
                     3. Conduct pilot evaluation  
                     4. Carry out systematic evaluation  
                     5. Revise intervention as necessary  
                     6. Select an experimental design  
                     7. Collect and analyse data  
                     8. Replicate the intervention under field conditions  
                     9. Refine the intervention |
| Phase 6  | Dissemination | 1. Assess needs and points of access of potential consumers  
                     2. Formulate dissemination plan  
                     3. Design and develop appropriate implementation procedure  
                     4. Prepare user-ready innovation for potential consumers  
                     5. Develop means and media to reach potential consumers  
                     6. Test use of innovation in a “test market”  
                     7. Monitor and evaluate use  
                     8. Revise (or reinvent) innovation as necessary  
                     9. Develop and conduct large scale dissemination as appropriate  
                     10. Repeat above steps, as necessary  
                     11. Prepare the product for dissemination  
                     12. Identify potential markets for the intervention  
                     13. Create a demand for the intervention  
                     14. Encourage appropriate adaptation  
                     15. Provide technical support for adopters |

(Source Fawcett et al. 1994; Thomas & Rothman 1994)

**Figure 5 - 2 (continued)**

Although the phases are presented in a linear fashion, inferring that they are worked through in sequence, in practice there is some flexibility: some activities continue during the ensuing phases, and looping back to earlier phases also occurs (Thomas & Rothman 1994, p. 9). Full-scale intervention research projects, as conceived by Rothman and Thomas, require large-scale research teams and significant resources but
there is also scope for smaller-scale projects, such as this, that complete only a number of the phases (Fortune & Proctor 2001; Schilling 1997; Thomas 1987).

Despite being developed within a positivist paradigm (Pieper 1985; Tyson 1992), intervention research can be conducted from within a heuristic paradigm. Features of intervention research that are consistent with the heuristic paradigm include:

- Intervention research seeks specific solutions or strategies to address problems – it asks how rather than just why (Whittaker et al. 1994, p. 197).
- It operates within the context of real-world encounters between practitioners, clients and researchers (Thomas & Rothman 1994, p. 13).
- Creativity and imagination have a role in designing interventions and the insights and wisdom of practitioners (in this case youth workers) can be incorporated into the research methodology (Mullen 1994; Whittaker et al. 1994).
- It involves practitioners in a meaningful way throughout the research process (Whittaker et al. 1994).
- It provides a problem solving approach to, and a systematic and deliberate research methodology for, analysis, development and evaluation of intervention strategies (Thomas 1978a; Thomas & Rothman 1994).
- It uses qualitative and quantitative research methods in an integrated way (Fawcett et al. 1994; Whittaker et al. 1994).

The main difference between intervention research within a positivist paradigm and within a heuristic paradigm lies in the evidence that is accepted as appropriate. Barber (in Gray 2000) proposes an evidence continuum (see Figure 5 – 3). Positivist research is more likely to rely on evidence gained through theory testing, whereas heuristic research is likely to accept evidence gained through a variety of methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inductive theory</th>
<th>Hypothetical deductive theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory building</td>
<td>Theory testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspection</td>
<td>Randomised Control Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Fook’s (1996)</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>Indicator analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researcher</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Structured interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Barber in Gray 2000)

Figure 5 – 3: Evidence Continuum
IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTION RESEARCH

This study is part of an ongoing intervention research project investigating ways in which youth service can create cultures of nonviolence. The current study involved six main steps, corresponding to the first three phases of intervention research (see Figure 5 – 4) in order to develop a model of nonviolent youth work practice. As is discussed in Chapter 6, the literature review was conducted in three sweeps (Teaching and Educational Development Institute of the University of Queensland 1997). Figure 5 – 5 provides a flow chart of the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Intervention research phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>A review of literature on youth work and nonviolence</td>
<td>Problem Analysis and Project Planning, and Information Gathering and Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>A statewide telephone survey of 60 youth workers to obtain a broad overview of current practice and issues for further exploration</td>
<td>Problem Analysis and Project Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>In-depth interviews with 15 youth workers and 20 young people to explore their perceptions of violence and discrimination within their services; ways in which youth workers prevent and respond to disruptive, violent and unsafe behaviour; and ways in which youth work practice can be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence</td>
<td>Information Gathering and Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>The development of a model of nonviolent youth work practice</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Two focus groups with youth workers to obtain feedback about results and the draft model</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Refinement of the model based on feedback from the focus groups</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 – 4: Research steps in relation to intervention research phases

As indicated above, within a heuristic paradigm, researchers need to articulate and examine their assumptions, values, options and choices at every stage of the research, and they should discuss:

- The importance of the particular problem formulation
- The potential solutions to which the research will contribute
- Who will use the research, and how it might help them
- The way in which the boundaries of the environment-system are set
- The biases involved in the problem formulation and the way in which they can be regulated.

Each of these is discussed in the following three chapters.
First sweep of literature

Second sweep of literature

Telephone survey

In-depth interviews

Third sweep of literature

Integration of literature and research

Draft model

Focus groups

Model of nonviolent youth work practice

Figure 5 - 5: Research flow chart
Intervention research involves creativity and flexibility, and each stage builds on the findings of previous stages, so changes are inevitable. The following chapters also identify some of the significant changes, including changes to the focus of the research and the problem formulation, and discuss the first three phases of intervention research.

**Ethical Issues**

Before discussing other aspects of the research, it is important to consider some of the ethical issues involved. The main ethical dilemmas in the research centered on the involvement of young people. Principles of ethical research include:

- People involved in the research should be protected from physical, emotional and psychological harm or stress
- The privacy and confidentiality of research participants should be protected
- People should provide their informed consent, without coercion, to take part in the research
- Except in exceptional circumstances, research participants should not be deceived, including deception about the true nature of the research
- The research should not lead people to commit acts that are illegal or diminish their self-respect
- The research should protect people’s right to self determination
- The risk of negative use of the research should be minimised
- Research participants should be treated fairly, considerately and respectfully (Cook 1976; Kellehear 1993; Neuman 1997).

The National Health and Medical Research Council’s (NHMRC) *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans* (NHMRC 1999) places additional ethical requirements on research involving certain groups such as minors. According to the NHMRC, research involving children and young people should only be conducted where:

a) the research question posed is important to the health and well-being of children or young people;
b) the participation of children or young people is indispensable because information available from research on other individuals cannot answer the question posed in relation to children or young people;
c) the study method is appropriate for children or young people; and
d) the circumstances in which the research is conducted provide for the physical, emotional and psychological safety of the child or young person (NHMRC 1999, Section 4.1).

The research was tested against these criteria. First, the research findings have the potential to help improve youth work practice, and are thus important to the wellbeing of young people. Second, the initial research proposal excluded the voices of young people: they were not going to be surveyed or interviewed. Although the focus of the research was on youth workers, it was important that the views of young people were included in the research methodology and so the methodology was changed to include young people in the in-depth interviews. Youth workers and young people have different experiences of youth services, and young people were able to provide insights that could not be obtained from youth workers. Initially two focus groups were also going to be conducted with young people but only the groups with youth workers were held because the nature of the questions were more appropriately answered by youth workers than young people. Third, as discussed in Chapter 7, care was taken to ensure that the interviews were conducted in a manner appropriate for young people. Fourth, a research protocol was developed to protect the physical, emotional and psychological safety of young people, and youth workers involved in the research, and also to address broader research ethics. The protocol stated that:

1. The research will seek to benefit young people and youth services.
2. The research will seek to inform intervention through the development of a model of successful practice.
3. The confidentiality of participants will be protected.
4. Participants will be protected from harm and the risk of harm.
5. The purpose of the research and the ways in which the data will be used will be given in writing and verbally to participants before seeking their consent.
6. Participants in the research will have the right to be informed about the progress of the research, to be provided with feedback and to be involved in action arising from the research.
7. The researcher has a responsibility to observe duty of care, particularly towards young people.

8. Publications arising from the research will actively seek to improve service provision to young people.

9. A research reference group will provide advice and monitor the research.

Parental Consent

Obtaining informed consent led to an ethical dilemma. The NHMRC guidelines state:

4.2 Consent to a child’s or young person’s participation in research must be obtained from:
   (a) the child or young person whenever he or she has sufficient competence to make this decision; and either
   (b) the parents/guardian in all but exceptional circumstances; or
   (c) any organisation or person required by law (NHMRC 1999, Section 4.2).

As with similar codes of ethics overseas, in all but exceptional circumstances, parental consent is required for young people under the age of 18 (Neuman 1997, pp. 450-451). No definition of exceptional circumstances is provided, and in the university’s ethical clearance process, we argued that an exceptional case existed. Young people in youth services frequently face significant family conflict, are homeless, have experienced physical and/or sexual abuse in the home, and/or are living independently from their parents (Bourke & Evans 2000; Grierson 1992; Mapstone 1999; O'Connor 1989; Sercombe 1997b; Standing Committee on Community Affairs 1995; Stuart 1994b). In such cases it could be inappropriate to seek parental consent but in order to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances existed, information not relevant to the research would have needed to have been collected.

In addition, there were other concerns about seeking parental permission. As was discussed in Chapter 3, youth can be understood as a social category of exclusion. Youth work seeks to reduce the social exclusion experienced by young people and young people are the primary constituents of youth workers. The blanket ruling that parental consent has to be obtained for all young people under 18 reinforces the social exclusion experienced by many young people. By the age of 18, young people have the
right to make many decisions for themselves including consenting to medical treatment, deciding to leave school, and consenting to sexual relationships (National Children's & Youth Law Centre 1999). Even though the NHMRC recognises that young people “have the maturity to make a decision whether or not to participate in research” (NHMRC 1999, Appendix 3), the research guidelines do not allow young people to exercise this maturity. Research that follows the NHMRC and many other research guidelines can result in young people being unable to decide for themselves whether or not to take part. Alderson (1999, pp. 60-61) discusses an instance where a 16 year old who wanted to continue to be part of ongoing research was unable to do so because her father and staff at her school “withdrew permission, without regard for her wishes, right to freedom of expression or right to share in making decisions that affect her” (p. 61). The guidelines are thus in danger of reinforcing the powerlessness many young people experience by suggesting that they are incapable of making rational decisions for themselves about whether or not to take part in an interview. This creates barriers to addressing power imbalances and to acknowledging their expertise.

In working with young people there is a power imbalance based on age. Kickey and Fitzclarence (2000) suggest, “despite best intentions, the power differential that exists between adults and young people often acts to circumvent the flow of interaction between them” (p. 123). Young people may experience their power being undermined in schools, the media, public space and family life. At least from the viewpoint of many young people, “power is held by adults and is largely repressive” (Marshall 1996, p. 96). For a researcher working with young people, this power imbalance needs to be acknowledged and addressed. One way in which we responded to this issue was to see young people as experts with valuable knowledge to contribute. They were interviewed because of their specialist knowledge and insights into the way in which youth services operate. We wanted to demonstrate our respect for their expertise and experience, and requiring parental consent could have suggested that they did not even have the expertise and experience to make decisions for themselves.

In the application to the university’s Ethics Committee, we thus proposed:

Interviews will only be conducted with young people aged 14 or over. The age of 14 or over has been chosen because from this age they generally have the legal right to consent to their own medical treatment without their parent's consent (see Minors

At the same time, it is believed that extra care needs to be taken with 14 or 15 year olds so the consent of a youth worker or representative from the Department of Community Services will also be required for under 16s. This standard of extra care for under 16s is consistent with the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998. It is likely that youth workers will be more concerned about issues such as privacy, confidentiality and other ethical issues, while the young people are more likely to be concerned about the practicalities such as how long the interview will take and the outcomes of the research (White, McDonnell & Harris 1996). By seeking the consent of both the youth workers and the young people the likelihood that all the important issues will be considered is increased. Youth workers will give their implied consent for the research to be conducted with over 16s because all young people interviewed will be identified via youth services.

Interviews will primarily be conducted with young people aged 16 or over, but there will be instances where it may be important for the research to interview a young person aged 14 or 15 (e.g. where a youth services target group is under 16s).

Based on the NHMRC guidelines the Ethics Committee responded, "where it is possible and practical, parental consent should be obtained for minors to participate in the research." Our response, which was accepted by the committee, stated:

We are concerned that there could be times when it is "possible and practical" to seek parental consent but it might still be inappropriate. Given the high level of family violence experienced by many young people in youth services, we believe there will be many cases where parental consent might not be in the young person's best interest. The levels of violence experienced by young people is demonstrated by a study of a local youth service which found that 85% of the young people had been physically abused (Stuart 1994a).

At the same time we recognise the principle that parental consent should be sought where appropriate. Following discussion with the Human Research Ethics Officer, we recommend that we follow the advice of the youth service involved to determine whether or not parental consent should be obtained.
The resulting protocol relating to informed consent, which was accepted by the Ethics Committee, was as follows:

1. The primary ethical obligation is to the young people involved in the research.
2. Before taking part in the research, young people must be provided with written and verbal explanations of the research, and provide their informed consent in a manner appropriate for the individual.
3. Where appropriate, young people will be asked to sign a written consent form written in plain English.
4. Where written consent is inappropriate (e.g. young people with poor literacy skills or in a very informal setting), their verbal consent will be taped on an audio tape recorder. They can use a pseudonym or nickname if they wish.
5. Interviews will only be conducted with young people aged 14 or above.
6. Where possible, practical and appropriate, parental consent will be obtained. The advice of the youth service will be sought to discover whether or not parental consent is possible, practical and appropriate.
7. Where parental consent is not possible, practical and appropriate, if young people are over the age of 16, then their own consent will be sufficient.
8. Where parental consent is not possible, practical and appropriate, if young people are aged 14-15, youth workers or staff members of the Department of Community Services will discuss the issues with them and will need to provide their written consent as well as the young people’s.

Confidentiality

Following common practice, the anonymity and confidentiality of the young people and youth workers was protected by using pseudonyms. This meant that the thoughts, experiences and beliefs of published authors were referenced but false names were used for research participants resulting in authors (mostly academics) receiving credit and recognition, while young people and youth workers did do not (Pepinsky 1998). This may create the impression that the experience and insights of the people interviewed had less credibility than those of the authors did.
This poses another ethical dilemma: is it more important to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of young people or to give them due recognition for their input? Is it more important to “respect and promote young people’s rights to make their own decisions and choices” (National Youth Agency 2001b, p.5), and so let them decide whether or not their real names are used, or is it more important to ensure that there is no potential for negative consequences arising from their statements? In this case, the primary concern was to protect the anonymity of young people. In addition, published authors have the opportunity to edit and reflect on what they have written, whereas research participants (regardless of their age) have much less opportunity to refine and edit what they are reported as saying. This means that greater care needs to be taken when quoting or speaking on behalf of research participants.

Reporting abuse

Linked with confidentiality, was the issue of potential disclosures of abuse. While it was unlikely that it would be an issue in this research, the following protocol was developed, so that a response had been planned if needed (which it was not):

1. When confidentiality is discussed with young people, the following statement will be included:
   
   If you tell me that you or someone else is unsafe, I will assume that you want me to do something about it, and I will act on the information you give me. This may include telling someone else about it.

2. If abuse is disclosed, except in exceptional circumstances, the interviewer will ask the young person what assistance she or he wants, and what assistance she or he is already receiving.

3. If the young person agrees and it is appropriate, the situation will be discussed with an appropriate staff member from the young person’s youth service.

4. If the young person does not agree to discuss it with staff from the youth service, or it is inappropriate (e.g. the abuse is related to staff at the service), the interviewer will discuss the situation with the Professor or Head of the Social Work Department at the University of Newcastle and they will develop an action plan. The action plan will be consistent with the relevant principles outlined in Section 9 of the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act (1998).
5. Based on the discussion in 4, the proposed action will be explained to the young person and she or he will have the opportunity to comment on the action plan.

6. The proposed action could include:
   a) Discussing the situation with staff at the youth service.
   b) Discussing the situation with the young person’s parents or guardians.
   c) Discussing the situation with another adult the young person trusts.
   d) Immediately reporting the situation to the Department of Community Services.
   e) Assisting the young person to speak to the Department of Community Services, police or some other person.
   f) In cases where the young person is at risk of harm (as defined in Section 23 of the Act) the action plan will include ensuring that a report is made, or has already been made, to the Department of Community Services.

7. The proposed action will **not** include:
   a) Confronting the person(s) suspected of the abuse
   b) Assisting the young person to stay in an unsafe situation
   c) Doing nothing.

**Writing up the research**

One of the aims of research is to contribute to knowledge and there is a close relationship between power and knowledge (Gaventa & Cornwell 2001). Knowledge can be used in an attempt to control the political and social agenda, and for determining whose voices are heard and what action is taken. On the other hand, knowledge and the production of knowledge can be used to assist people to challenge unjust structures and processes, and to involve people in “shaping the social limits that define what is possible” (Hayward, quoted in Gaventa & Cornwell 2001, p. 72). This places an ethical responsibility on researchers to decide how they will contribute to knowledge. Research can be based on practices which treat people as the objects of research and provide them with limited opportunities to contribute to the production of knowledge, or it can be based on collaborative practices which view people as participants in the production of knowledge.

Writing up the research, particularly in research based on in-depth interviews or observation, puts researchers in a powerful position (Alderson 1999). They are able to
misrepresent viewpoints (by selectively quoting or taking quotes out of context), interpret results to agree with their own preconceptions, and present young people and youth workers in an unfavourable light. This may occur even if it is not the intention. This places an ethical responsibility on researchers to ensure that they treat the participants in the research fairly and that they present the views of participants fairly. Some of the strategies to ensure that informants were protected and treated as participants in the production of knowledge included:

- Using research methods that recognised the insights, experience and knowledge of young people and youth workers.
- Providing people who were interviewed with the opportunity to see the transcripts of their interviews and to make further comment if they wished.
- Distributing summaries of the research to participants and others as the research progressed in order to encourage feedback and the sharing of knowledge throughout the process.
- Attempting to write in a manner accessible to an audience wider than just the thesis examiners.
- Working with a reference group who provided support and guidance throughout the project.

**THE REFERENCE GROUP**

An important component of the research was a reference group that met 11 times between April 2000 and December 2002. (See Appendix 8 for the terms of reference.) The reference group:

- Provided advice on key aspects of the research
- Assisted in ensuring that the research was conducted in an ethical manner
- Assisted in ensuring that the research methodology was rigorous and sound
- Provided feedback on the research findings and resulting model of practice
- Ensured there was a practical application to the research.

The reference group included people with experience in youth work and supervising youth workers, expertise in nonviolence and/or expertise in research methods. The
members of the reference group (with the period of membership if not the whole time) were:

- Marion Armstrong – Hunter Valley Quakers
- Catherine Cusack – Community Services, Hunter Institute of Technology
- Mel Gray – School of Social Sciences, University of Newcastle
- Peter Kembrey – Community Youth Development Project (2001-2002)
- Lou Johnson – Private practice (initially from the Worimi Juvenile Justice Centre)
- Rhonda Murrey – Samaritans Foundation (2000-2001)
- Deirdre Russell – Department of Community Services (2000)
- Grahame Saxon – Alternatives to Violence Project and Port Stephens Youth Support Project.

Having discussed broad issues involved in the research, the following chapters focus on each of the phases of intervention research conducted in this study.
Problem analysis and project planning, the first phase of intervention research, laid the foundation for the rest of the research. It was an ongoing process that ensured the research was appropriate and effective. According to Thomas and Rothman (1994) and Fawcett et al. (1994), problem analysis and project planning comprises:

- Identifying and analysing key problems
- Initiating state-of-the-art review
- Determining feasibility
- Preparing a project plan
- Setting a developmental goal
- Identifying and involving clients
- Gaining entry and cooperation from settings
- Identifying concerns of the population
- Analysing identified concerns.

Rather than discussing each of these activities separately, they are covered through discussion of research conducted prior to the study, and the methodology of the literature review and telephone survey of youth workers.

PRIOR RESEARCH AND INITIAL PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Problem analysis and project planning commenced prior to this study through Help Increase the Peace (HIP), a Samaritans Foundation project funded by the Crime Prevention Division of the NSW Attorney’s General Department. HIP piloted workshops with young people on conflict resolution and nonviolence. Through action research, HIP was used to develop a model of successful practice for running these types of workshops. The model included the following features:

- A clear philosophy underpinning all aspects of the workshops and project.
- Use of experiential learning with experienced facilitators and strong support structures.
• A relevant, flexible and experiential process involving teams of facilitators and small groups of young people, where follow up is provided and facilitators “walk the talk”.
• A target group including young people, staff and parents/caregivers.
• A whole school/service approach where the organisations involved have cultures of nonviolence (Stuart 1994b, 1997).

In terms of the current study, the most significant finding arising from HIP was that the context in which the workshops occurred was vital and that the behaviour of staff needed to be addressed as well as the behaviour of the young people. The workshop themes were undermined when staff at schools and youth services behaved in ways inconsistent with a philosophy of nonviolence. Drawing on their experience, the facilitators, which included the researcher, believed that schools and youth services needed to develop organisational cultures based on a philosophy of nonviolence so that instead of exploring nonviolence and conflict resolution in one-off workshops, young people experienced them on an ongoing basis.

The context of the prior research, and unsuccessful attempts to obtain further funds from the Crime Prevention Division to undertake continuing research, had a large impact on the way in which the initial analysis of the key problem was addressed. As Lee (1993) suggests, funding sources can have a significant impact on research and, in this case, the Crime Prevention Division’s focus on violence prevention meant that the research was initially conceptualised in terms of preventing physical violence by young people. At the outset, there were four assumptions underlying the research. First, violent behaviour was seen as frequently being associated with indicators of disadvantage and antisocial behaviour. A variety of research and reports have found that there is a relationship, not necessarily causal, between youth violence and indicators of disadvantage and antisocial behaviour, such as a family background of violence, socioeconomic disadvantage, marginalisation, problems at school (e.g. non-attendance), alcohol and other drugs, and risk taking (Bargen 1997; Indermaur, Atkinson & Blagg 1998; Salmelainen 1995; Standing Committee on Community Affairs 1995; Standing Committee on Social Issues 1993, 1995; Stuart 1994b).
Second, youth services were seen as working with many young people who were at risk of violent behaviour and were thus appropriate sites for intervention. This assumption was based on the recognition that many young people in youth services come from violent homes, are homeless, have trouble at school, have issues around alcohol and other drugs, and/or are in trouble with the police/courts – all of which have been associated with the risk of violent behaviour. In particular, the link between homeless young people and violence (both as victims and perpetrators) has been well documented (Standing Committee on Community Affairs 1995; Sykes 1993), and the initial problem analysis confirmed that young people in youth services were likely to be at risk of violent behaviour.

Third, a whole service approach was seen as being important in addressing violence. The importance of whole school approaches to violence and bullying prevention has been widely recognised (Indermaur, Atkinson & Blagg 1998; Jenkin 1993; Rigby 1996; Standing Committee on Employment Education and Training 1994; Standing Committee on Social Issues 1995) but there has been little discussion of the need for youth services to do the same.

Fourth, the organisational cultures of youth services were seen as needing to be nonviolent if violence prevention was to be successful in these settings (Indermaur, Atkinson & Blagg 1998). In discussing bullying, Rigby (1996) suggests that the ethos of a school is vital, while Slee (1995) argues that in order to address school violence, it is necessary to address the culture and practices of schools. In discussing some of the factors that contribute to the level of violence experienced in a service, Bowie (1996) includes the power structures within the organisation, the extent of mutual decision making, the leadership style, and the “general physical and emotional climate of the organisation” (p. 28). The focus of the research was thus initially conceived in terms of identifying ways in which youth services could create cultures of nonviolence so they could be more successful in preventing violence by young people.

Although the first phase of the research supported the assumptions of the initial problem analysis, it also highlighted some unintended biases. Because it focused on preventing young people’s violence, evaluation was likely to be based on young people’s behaviour rather than the behaviour of youth workers. A philosophy of nonviolence involves a
rejection of violence regardless of the actions of others. For youth workers this implies that they should be nonviolent regardless of the behaviour of young people and the evaluation of the model should thus be based on how well the model assists youth workers to be nonviolent rather than whether or not it assists young people to be nonviolent. The research supported the belief that if youth workers were nonviolent they would be more likely to be successful in encouraging young people to be nonviolent but this belief needs to be tested, and should not be the main focus of the evaluation. Youth workers adopting a philosophy of nonviolence would be nonviolent even if it did not lead necessarily lead to a significant change in young people’s behaviour. The focus on violence prevention was more consistent with a deficit model of practice than a strengths perspective (Early & GlenMaye 2000; Saleebey 1992b; Weick et al. 1989). Rather than focusing on the skills, abilities and insights youth workers have, there was a danger that there would have been a focus on violence by young people. The telephone survey and in-depth interviews also indicated that youth workers did not believe their services were very violent and the bigger issue was how to promote positive, safe and inclusive behaviour (see Chapter 9 and 10). The new assumptions developed through the research process were:

- It is appropriate for youth workers to adopt a philosophy of nonviolence
- Youth workers should be nonviolent regardless of the behaviour of young people
- A philosophy of nonviolence has relevant implications for youth work practice.

Another significant change was to the developmental goal. Initially the aim of the study was to develop a model of practice for youth services wishing to create cultures of nonviolence (see the information sheet in Appendix 3). Although the overall aim of the intervention research project remains unchanged, the focus of this study was reduced to a more manageable aim of developing a model of nonviolent youth work practice. Future research will develop the model and explore ways in which youth services can create an organisational culture of nonviolence.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

A literature review is based on the assumption that knowledge is created through the actions of many people and that research should build on what has gone before it
(Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997). Neuman (1997, p. 90) identifies six types of literature reviews although, in practice, reviews often combine features of several types:

- Self-study reviews increase the reader’s confidence in the reviewer’s knowledge of the field.
- Context reviews place a specific project in a broader context, and establish the significance and relevance of a research question.
- Historical reviews trace the development of an issue, idea or theory over time.
- Theoretical reviews compare the way in which different theories approach an issue.
- Methodological reviews explore the way in which different methodologies approach an issue.
- Integrative reviews summarise the current state of knowledge in relation to an issue.

The literature review in this study was primarily a context review. At first, when the research had a violence prevention focus, the literature review included literature on youth work, nonviolence, violence, violence prevention, bullying and school violence prevention. Significant literature was reviewed in relation to the first four areas but with the change in focus, only the literature reviews of youth work and nonviolence were completed and reported. Although some qualitative researchers suggest that literature reviews should be delayed until after data collection, so that the data can be analysed without being unduly influenced by the literature, it is more common to begin the review as soon as possible, and it is usually an ongoing process (Glesne & Peshkin 1992; Padgett 1998a; Rubin & Babbie 2001; Tutty 1996). Thus the literature review was conducted in a number of rounds or sweeps (Teaching and Educational Development Institute of the University of Queensland 1997). The first sweep comprised a broad overview of youth work, nonviolence, violence prevention, bullying, and violence. The main aim was to ensure that the research topic was appropriate, and to obtain an overview of the available literature. Despite some literature being identified that explored the relevance of Mahatma Gandhi for social work (Ritchie 2001; Sharma 1989; Walz & Ritchie 2000; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990) no literature was identified specifically considering a philosophy of nonviolence in relation to youth work. The second sweep, conducted before the analysis of the survey and in-depth interviews, consisted of a more detailed exploration of literature on the topics identified in the first sweep. A detailed review was conducted of literature on youth work,
nonviolence, research in social work, violence in youth services and violence prevention in youth services. A broader overview was obtained of literature on violence, violence prevention and bullying. Because of the change of focus, only the process used to identify literature on youth work and nonviolence is discussed below. The third sweep of the literature was conducted after the data analysis in order to identify literature on issues that had arisen in the in-depth interviews, particularly in relation to working with young people.

Methodology Literature

Literature on methodology focused on surveys, in-depth interviews, focus groups, research in social work, intervention research and the heuristic paradigm. It was not necessary to conduct an extensive literature search, as relevant information was easily available in texts and social work journals available from the University of Newcastle. A more extensive literature search for articles on intervention research and the heuristic paradigm was conducted using Social Work Abstracts and Expanded Academic ASAP.

Youth Work Literature

Figure 6 - 1 identifies the main characteristics of the youth work literature search in the second sweep. The literature selected focused on the history of youth work in Australia, youth work theory, youth work practice, Australian youth services, youth work in the United Kingdom, and youth care in Canada and South Africa. Because there is not a significant volume of literature on youth work in Australia, most literature identified was read. Although there is a great deal of other information on working with young people (e.g. social work with young people) that could be relevant, it was not included because the focus of the research was specifically on youth work. Insights from other disciplines clearly have an important role in identifying successful youth work practice but a discussion of the similarities and differences were beyond the scope of this study.
Nonviolence Literature

The nonviolence literature search (see Figure 6 - 2) was more complicated and involved greater selection than that for youth work. The aim of the nonviolence literature review was to identify principles of nonviolence and thus priority was given to literature that:

- Discussed principled nonviolence rather than tactical nonviolence
- Discussed nonviolence as a means of social change
- Discussed the organisation of nonviolence movements or groups
- Articulated principles of nonviolence
- Was readily available
- Was published after 1990 for books and 1995 for articles.
Particular attention was given to the writings of:


- Gene Sharpe (1973a) because, although writing from a tactical perspective, his book *The politics of nonviolent action* was a groundbreaking work that continues to be widely used.

- Activists associated with the Movement for a New Society in Philadelphia (Coover et al. 1981; McAllister 1982; Moore 1979; Moyer 1995, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 2001b) because they were involved in the training of many social change movements and activists (Moyer 2001a; Tasmanian Wilderness Society 1982).


- Feminist nonviolence activists (Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group 1983; McAllister 1982, 1999; Roodkowsky 1979; Starhawk 1990, 2001, 2002; Warnock 1999) because of their commitment to principles of nonviolence and their influence on subsequent feminist nonviolence campaigns.
1981; Woehrle 1993) because, although women have played a major role in nonviolence, the literature is dominated by male authors.

- Mel White (1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e, 1999f, 1999g) the founder of Soulforce, a group “determined to help end the suffering of God’s lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered children” guided by “the principles of relentless nonviolent resistance as lived and taught by M.K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King” (White 1999a, para. 3) because of its excellent resources at an extensive website.

The principles of nonviolence were developed by identifying significant themes in the literature. These themes had to be identified by a number of authors, and have relevance to youth work practice. Clearly this involved a degree of selection and subjective decisions. In order to test their validity, the principles were presented in a number of different contexts:

- An email list of Australian Quakers concerned about peace and social justice
- Workshops with teachers and youth workers
- Conference presentations to youth workers and interested people
- A meeting of the research reference group
- A research update sent to over 100 interested people
- The focus groups conducted as part of this research.

Based on the feedback, the principles were refined and developed to their current form (see Chapter 4).

**TELEPHONE SURVEY OF YOUTH WORKERS**

According to Thomas and Rothman (1994), the first phase of intervention research includes a state-of-the-art review. A state-of-the-art review generally suggests a review of best practice such as evidence based practice (Webb 2001; Witkin & Harrison 2001) or a meta-analysis (Forness & Kavale 1994; Rigby 2002; Rothman & Damron-Rodriguez 1994). In intervention research, a state-of-the-art review sometimes also appears to refer more broadly to a review of current practice (Thomas 1978a) and, due to the scale of the study, this was the approach taken. An important component of the problem analysis was thus a telephone survey of 60 youth workers in New South Wales. 
in order to obtain a broad overview of current practice around the state. Specifically, its aims were to:

- Investigate whether or not violence and nonviolence were issues of concern for youth workers
- Explore how non-violent and inclusive youth workers perceived their services to be
- Identify current work practices
- Identify issues for further exploration through in-depth interviews with youth workers and young people.

There were three main ways in which a survey could have been conducted: face-to-face, by telephone, or in writing (by mail or by e-mail). A telephone survey was chosen because time and financial limitations meant it was not possible to conduct face-to-face interviews with youth workers throughout New South Wales and, unlike a self-administered written survey, a telephone survey allowed for probing in the open-ended questions. In addition, it was possible to record comments made by youth workers in relation to the closed-ended questions.

**Participant Selection**

The youth services for the telephone survey were selected by a stratified sample in which a researcher divides the population into subpopulations (strata) on the basis of supplementary information and then draws a random sample from each subpopulation (Neuman 1997, p. 212). A stratified sample was used because the wide variety of target groups and foci of youth services (Bessant & Webber 1999; White, Omelczuk & Underwood 1991) meant it was important to ensure that a range of services were contacted. Youth services supported by five diverse funding sources were identified as subpopulations. The funding sources selected are shown in Figure 6 - 3 and a brief description of each follows.
Funding Program | Government Department Responsible
--- | ---
Community Services Grants Program (CSGP) | Department of Community Services (DoCS)
Education Access - Youth Programs (EAYP) | Department of Education and Training (DET)
Innovative Health Service for Homeless Youth (IHSHY) | NSW Health
Job Placement Employment Training (JPET) | The then Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA)
Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) | Department of Community Services (DoCS)

**Figure 6 - 3: Funding programs used for the stratified sample**

The Community Services Grant Program (CSGP) was established in 1990 by the New South Wales Government and is administered by the Department of Community Services (Department of Community Services 1996). CSGP provides financial assistance to “local government and non-government organisations to deliver community services which support families with children, young people, older people and families and adolescents under stress or in crisis; with special emphasis on disadvantaged groups and communities” (DoCS quoted in Ayres 1998, p. 25). There are a number of subcategories of CSGP relevant to youth services:

- Adolescent Support Program
- Area Assistance Scheme - Youth Services
- Community Youth Project - General
- Local Government Salary Subsidies - Youth
- Peak, Co-ordination and Resource Project.

A wide variety of services are funded including child protection projects, generalist youth services, youth centres, adolescent and family counsellors, and youth development projects (Ayres 1998).

Until being replaced by Links to Learning in 2001, the state-funded Education Access - Youth Programs had four subcategories: Circuit Breaker, Helping Early Leavers Program (HELP), Koori Youth Program and Time Out (Department of Education and Training 2000d). Each of the programs targeted young people who had left school, were at risk of leaving school or were alienated from school. They addressed numeracy and literacy; interpersonal, social and work skills; self-esteem and confidence; and barriers
to, and options for, education, training and employment (Department of Education and Training 2000a, 2000b, 2000c, 2000d).

Innovative Health Service for Homeless Youth (IHSY), jointly funded by the federal and state governments, provides community-based health services for homeless and at risk young people. The program seeks to encourage innovation in providing services incorporating a range of health, counselling, support and referral services (NSW Health 1999).

Job Placement Employment Training (JPET) is a federally funded employment and training program targeting disadvantaged young people aged 15-21 including young people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, wards of the state, refugees and ex-offenders (Department of Education Training and Youth Affairs 2000). Services provided by JPET include job training and work experience, goal setting, life skill development, counselling, case management and assistance in finding accommodation or undertaking education, (Interyouth SkillShare 2000; Mission Employment 2000; Samaritans 2000; Upper Hunter JPET 2000).

Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) is jointly funded by the federal and state governments and administered in New South Wales by DoCS. SAAP provides supported accommodation services and other support services to young people who are homeless and in crisis, in order to assist them become independent or to obtain long-term supported housing (Lindsay 1993). Although the SAAP agreement specifically excludes young people under the age of 15 unless they are children accompanying women experiencing domestic violence (Purdon & Morse 1994), in practice, many under 15 year olds use SAAP services (Glazebrook 1993). Services provided through SAAP include crisis to long-term supported accommodation, information and referral, brokerage, case management, early intervention, outreach and counselling (Ayres 1998).

Contact details for youth services were obtained from the relevant department (DoCS and DET) or from their official web sites (DETYA and NSW Health). Between 16% and 22% of the services were randomly selected from each of the funding programs.
using a table of random numbers in Neuman (1997, pp. 484-487). Table 6 - 1 shows the number and percentage of services selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Total services funded</th>
<th>Services selected</th>
<th>Percentage of funding program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSGP</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAYP</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHSHY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPET</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAP</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>613</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A letter and information about the research (see Appendix 3) were sent to the coordinator of each of the services asking them to identify a member of the staff (which could be themselves) who would be willing to take part in the survey. The letters included a consent form to be returned with contact details of the person willing to be interviewed and a suitable time. There were two main problems with this approach. First, while the services were randomly selected, the youth workers surveyed were not, resulting in a disproportionate number of coordinators. Second, the use of a consent form meant that some of the problems associated with obtaining responses from written surveys were experienced (de Vaus 1991; Neuman 1997) and this reduced the response rate. In a follow up phone call to services, many said they had not received the letter (the contact details for some services provided by the funding bodies were incorrect) or could not remember receiving details. The information was then faxed to them. No more follow up phone calls were made unless they returned the consent form or asked for some other form of contact.

Sixty percent of the selected services completed a survey (see Table 6 - 2), which is low for a telephone survey but adequate (Neuman 1997, p. 252). The response rate is slightly improved if the nine services which were uncontactable (due to incorrect contact details, no longer being funded or there were at least five unsuccessful attempts to contact them) are discarded. The response rate of services contacted was 66%. A simplified covering letter and consent process might have increased the response rate.
Table 6 - 2: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Services Selected</th>
<th>Completed Surveys</th>
<th>Response rate for funding program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSGP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAYP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHSHY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPET</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey construction

The survey (see Appendix 1), developed when the research was conceptualised in terms of violence prevention, was based on the results of pilot in-depth interviews with four local youth workers, a focus group of postgraduate social work students at the University of Newcastle and youth work literature. It asked youth workers about:

- The importance of assisting young people develop conflict resolution skills, developing violence prevention strategies and developing cultures of nonviolence in youth services (Questions 1, 2, 11).
- How well they believed youth services typically dealt with violence (Question 3).
- Their perceptions of work practice and resources within their youth service (Questions 4).
- How violent or nonviolent their youth service was in terms of physical, verbal and emotional violence between staff, between young people, and between staff and young people (Questions 5-6).
- How accepting or unaccepting staff and young people were of marginalised groups (Question 7).
- The types of policies their service had, and how familiar they were with the policies (Question 8).
- What they believed were barriers to, and strategies for, their youth services developing cultures of nonviolence (Questions 9-10).
- Demographic information about themselves and their service (Questions 12-21).

De Vaus (1991) suggests the following guidelines when constructing the order of questions:

- Start with questions the participant will enjoy answering.
• Go from easy to harder questions and from concrete to abstract questions.
• Open-ended questions should be kept to a minimum and be towards the end of the survey.
• Group questions into sections.
• Use filter questions to ensure that only relevant questions are asked.
• Intersperse positive and negative items in matrix questions to reduce the likelihood of an acquiescent response set.
• Introduce a variety of question formats so that the survey remains interesting.

Following the advice of de Vaus (1991) the survey construction was based on the following. Questions 1-3 (general introductory questions) led participants into the issues to be discussed. Question 4 (about work practice and resources) and Question 8 (about policies) were based on issues which the pilot study had indicated as being important in preventing violence. Questions 5-7 explored how violent or nonviolent they perceived their services to be. Question 7, (about how accepting staff and young people were of minority groups) was based on the assumption that if services were to be truly nonviolent, they would have to be accepting of difference. Question 11 asked how important it was for youth services to create cultures of nonviolence, and Questions 9-10 were open-ended questions exploring barriers to, and strategies for, youth services doing so. The survey ended with general questions about the participant and his or her service. The survey generally took 15-25 minutes to complete with most questions involving five point Likert response categories (Rubin & Babbie 2001).

Although the guidelines by de Vaus (1991) were followed, there were some challenges. Because the survey was conducted by phone, it was particularly important that the questions be grouped so that they were easy to follow but the way in which it was done meant that there was little variety in the question formats. Most were matrix questions in which several questions had the same response categories (Rubin & Babbie 2001). Matrix questions can lead to an acquiescent response set where participants develop a pattern of agreeing with all statements (de Vaus 1991; Rubin & Babbie 2001). While Question 4 used positively and negatively worded statements to discourage this, the other questions did not. In Question 6 (which asked about the interactions between staff and young people using very violent to very nonviolent) and Question 7 (which asked
about how accepting staff and young people were of minority groups using very unaccepting to very accepting) some participants might have tended to answer nonviolent or very nonviolent and accepting or very accepting, particularly as these were more socially desirable responses.

Open-ended questions were kept towards the end of the survey. Participants, however, were encouraged to make comments throughout the survey, which was formatted so that it was possible to record comments as they arose. These comments were particularly useful in identifying issues for further exploration in the in-depth interviews. The ordering of questions can influence the answers given (Rubin & Babbie 2001) and this was an issue for at least one of the questions. The placement of Question 11 (How important do you think it is that youth services develop a culture of nonviolence?) at the end of the survey probably encouraged participants to state that it was very important, hence all but one person answered this way.

LIMITATIONS OF PHASE 1

Although refinement of the problem analysis is an important component of the first phase of intervention research, the research was weakened because it had first been conceptualised in terms of violence prevention. If this had not been the case, the telephone survey would have been constructed differently, and the first two sweeps of the literature could have been more focused. There were also a number of other limitations to the survey. As has already been identified, there were problems with the initial contact, there was a fairly low response rate, and there were some problems with the survey construction.

It was likely that youth workers presented their service as favourably as possible. Youth workers were unlikely to describe the behaviour of staff as being violent or even to describe their service as being violent. Particularly as many of the surveys were conducted with the coordinator of the service, they may have felt that it would reflect badly on their professional ability if they described the service as being violent or unaccepting.
The sample size was not large enough to allow for generalisation. The smaller the population the bigger the sampling ratio that is needed. As a general guide de Vaus (1991) suggests that for a population of under 1000, a sampling ration of around 30% is needed. The time required to survey such a sample size was not available in this study. While a written survey could have obtained sufficient responses, probing would not have been possible. As a major aim of the survey was to identify issues to be explored in the in-depth interviews, the advantages of being able to use probes outweighed the disadvantages of not being able to generalise from the findings.

A more significant limitation was that no definition was given for violence or nonviolence. Comments made during the survey confirm that there were wide variations in what was considered violent or nonviolent, and so it is inappropriate to assume that the survey provides a true indication of how violent or nonviolent youth services were. The survey gives an indication of the perception of youth workers, no more. In addition, while an attempt was made to explore different aspects of violence (physical, verbal and emotional), once again no definitions were given. While most youth workers appeared to accept the differentiation, it is unlikely that the terms were used in the same ways. It is also worth noting that although nonviolence is generally used in this study to refer to the philosophy of nonviolence, in the context of the survey, non-violence was used in terms of the absence of violence. It was expected that participants in the survey would understand non-violence in terms of its narrower meaning rather than the broad philosophy of nonviolence.

The over-representation of coordinators (nearly two thirds of the participants) resulted in a significant bias. Coordinators are likely to have different experiences and perceptions of their services to those of other staff and young people, and thus the results of the survey may have been quite different if young people or less coordinators had been interviewed. Once again it is important not to generalise from the results of this stage of the research and to bear in mind its relationship to the next phase, namely, information gathering and synthesis.
Chapter 7

Information Gathering and Synthesis

Phase two of intervention research, information gathering and synthesis, could be subtitled “not reinventing the wheel” (Fawcett et al. 1994, p. 31), as this phase identifies what is already known. Key activities of this phase include:

- Identifying and selecting relevant existing types of information
- Identifying relevant information sources
- Establishing retrieval procedures
- Gathering, processing, and storing data
- Collecting and analysing original data, as appropriate
- Synthesising data and formulating conclusions
- Using existing information sources
- Studying natural examples
- Identifying functional elements of successful models (Fawcett et al. 1994; Thomas 1978a).

The literature review (discussed in the previous chapter), particularly the second and third sweeps, was a vital part of this phase. The other way in which information was collected and analysed was through in-depth interviews with youth workers and young people. Thomas (1978a) and Fawcett et al. (1994) suggest that people who have experienced the problem or have knowledge about the issue are important sources of information. For this study, the experiences, insights and ideas of youth workers and young people assisted in the eventual design of the model of nonviolent youth work practice. This chapter discusses the way in which the in-depth interviews were conducted and analysed, and covers the above activities.

In-depth Interviews

A number of methods could have been used to gather information from youth workers and young people including surveys, participant observation, case studies and in-depth interviews. While there are limitations to in-depth interviewing, its ability to explore
and gain insights into issues from the point of view of the participants (Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997), meant it was an appropriate research method for this phase. The aims of the in-depth interview were to:

- Explore the perceptions of youth workers and young people in relation to violence and discrimination within youth services
- Identify ways in which youth workers prevent and respond to disruptive, violent and unsafe behaviour
- Identify ways in which youth work practice can be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence.

Features of in-depth interviews that were particularly relevant include that they:

- Are flexible and able to focus on issues of importance to participants
- Actively seek and value participants’ perceptions
- Recognise the importance of the personal interaction between the researcher and other participants
- Seek to build a more egalitarian relationship between the researcher and other participants than is usual in surveys and other more structured forms of interviewing
- Spend a significant amount of time with participants so that rapport and trust are developed

Participant selection and engagement

Selecting participants for in-depth interviews customarily involves identifying people with the information, insights and experiences to assist in obtaining a greater understanding of the issue being explored (Alston & Bowles 1998; Plath 2000). The process of selection is quite different to processes involving random sampling, statistical rigour, and the ability to generalise from results. Youth workers were selected through a purposive sample (Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997), and young people were selected through a convenience sample (Fuller & Petch 1995; Neuman 1997). Purposive sampling involves selecting participants with a specific purpose in mind (Neuman
1997). The main focus in selecting youth workers for the interviews was to ensure that a range of experiences, settings and practices were included and that there was a range of responses to managing behaviour. It was also important that they were able to provide insights into ways in which youth service could implement principles of nonviolence, and so it was desirable that they had previously thought about related issues. The youth workers were thus selected in two ways. First, through the telephone survey, conferences and other youth networks, eleven youth workers were identified who appeared to have thought about nonviolence and strategies for working in noncoercive, inclusive ways. Second, based on the contact details obtained for the telephone survey, three youth workers were identified who worked in rural settings and one because he worked in an unstructured drop-in centre in a disadvantaged community (as identified by Vinson 1999). This was to ensure that there was a range of services. The resulting bias in the selection of youth workers included:

- A focus on youth workers who had already explored nonviolent, noncoercive, or inclusive youth work.
- All but two of the youth workers were coordinators of services.
- Most of the youth workers had significant experience: ten had ten or more years experience and only one had less than five years experience. An advantage was that all but three had worked in other youth services as well.
- There were no indigenous youth workers or workers from a non-English speaking background.

Youth workers were generally very interested in the research and were happy to take part. During the telephone survey, thirteen youth workers were identified as being potential interview participants because they had previously thought about nonviolence. Of the thirteen, four were asked to take part in interviews based on their location and service type. Seven more youth workers who had thought about nonviolence were identified through conferences or other networks. The remaining four were selected, not because they had thought about nonviolence but in order to ensure that a range of youth workers was interviewed. Three youth workers were selected because they worked in rural areas and one was selected because he worked in a youth centre located in a disadvantaged community. Most of the youth workers were originally approached by
phone, with more detailed written information being sent by mail (see Appendix 4). The initial contact with some of the youth workers identified through conferences was made in person.

The young people were selected through a convenience sample. According to Fuller and Petch (1995), a convenience sample is a pragmatic response that draws upon available people to take part in the research. When interviews were organised with the youth workers, some of them were also asked if they thought there would be any young people in their service who would be willing to be interviewed (see Appendix 6), and they were asked to pass on information about the interviews (see Appendix 5). Six of the youth workers were not asked due to time limitations when visiting the service, and a further three had no young people who were willing and available. In order to interview young people from the service, there had to be at least two young people willing to take part, and they had to be at least 14 years of age, preferably 16 or over. Youth workers asked young people who they thought would not be intimidated by being interviewed and who would have something to say. In two of the services, the youth workers asked young people if they would take part just before the interviews were due to take place, and in two of the services the youth workers had organised young people earlier. Six young people, all over the age of 18, were interviewed at a statewide gathering of young people organised by one of the services. These young people were no longer using youth services (or only using them minimally) and were approached, with the consent of the youth worker, at the gathering. The bias in the selection of young people included:

- The young people currently using services were selected by the youth workers and so they could have selected young people who would discuss the service in a favourable light.
- The range of services was not broad: half the young people came from two youth centres, and only two young people came from each of an accommodation service and an alternative education program. The range of services was improved slightly when it is recognised that some of the young people, especially those interviewed at the gathering, had used other services including accommodation services, employment services, counselling services, and generalist youth services.
• Twelve of the young people had essentially only used the one service, so were unable to compare services.
• There was an over representation of young women, particularly when it is recognised that youth work often targets young males (Higgins 1991; White 1990a).
• While there were a number of indigenous young people, there was only one young person from a non-English speaking background and none with a disability.

There are no hard and fast rules about how many participants should be involved in in-depth interviews (Alston & Bowles 1998; Fuller & Petch 1995; Maykut & Morehouse 1994; Minichiello et al. 1995; Tyson 1995). While Maykut and Morehouse (1994) suggest that between 12 and 25 participants is generally an appropriate size, a more common principle is that there are enough participants when no new information is emerging (Maykut & Morehouse 1994; Minichiello et al. 1995; Punch 1998; Strauss & Corbin 1998). After interviews with 15 youth workers and 20 young people, it was decided that enough data had been collected, and although new information could still have been collected, time limitations meant further interviews were not practical.

Engaging youth workers was assisted by the fact that the researcher was a youth worker and was thus less likely to be seen as an outsider doing research. The researcher was able to present himself as somebody who had become interested in this issue through his own work and who wanted to learn from their experience, rather than as a researcher conducting an academic study. Gummesson (1991) proposes that it is helpful for researchers to have preunderstanding, by which he means the “knowledge, insights and experience” (p. 50) a researcher had before engaging in a research project. In this research preunderstanding clearly assisted in establishing credibility in the eyes of the youth workers. Engagement was also helped by the fact that the researcher had met, or conducted the survey with, all but three of the youth workers before organising the interviews. Engaging the ex-service users was also easy because the researcher had taken part in the gathering and so had built at least some connection with them, and they were all interested in improving youth services for other young people.

Engaging the current service users was more difficult. In the two services where young people were organised immediately before the interviews, engagement was particularly difficult. These interviews were conducted at youth centres during drop-in hours when
young people could play pool, computer games or just hang out. The interviews thus interfered with the young people’s free time and, although the interviews were held in a separate office, their friends were close by and they were generally keen to return to them. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) suggest that it is often helpful to spend time with participants by taking part in activities and talking informally. Such a strategy may have been helpful in these services but distance and time pressures made it difficult. In addition, we did not want to intrude further into the young people’s time and space, so made the decision just to do the interviews. Engaging the young people was also more difficult because the young people had less to gain directly from the research (Marshall & Rossman 1989). The issues covered in the interviews were of real interest to the youth workers and were directly related to their work. All the youth workers and ex-users of the services accepted the offer of receiving updates on the research indicating that they were interested in the results. The current service users, however, did not gain anything directly from the research and generally the issues discussed were not of great interest to them. None of these young people was interested in receiving further information about the research. The lack of interest could possibly have been addressed by changes to the research methodology.

In an attempt to make the young people feel more comfortable in the interviews, they were given the option of being interviewed with a friend. By conducting the interviews in pairs, it was hoped that the interviews would be less threatening and that the young people would feel more relaxed. Except for four of the ex-users of services, the young people were interviewed in pairs. One young person was interviewed by herself because she preferred it that way. Another young person brought two other people with her to the interview because she believed that they would both contribute to the discussion, so all three were interviewed together. It was hoped that by being interviewed in pairs the young people would feel more relaxed and prompt one another to raise issues. At times the young people asked one another questions, or expanded on comments made by the other, and having a friend did appear to help keep the interviews fairly relaxed. In some of the interviews, one young person dominated and the second only added an occasional comment. The results may have been different if the young people had been interviewed individually but the advantages of creating more relaxed interviews outweighed the disadvantages.
The 15 youth workers interviewed came from 14 different services in a variety of settings (see Figure 7 – 1). The participants were not representative of all youth workers in the field. All of them were full-time, and all but two were the coordinator of the service. Two thirds were female, and 11 of them had at least 10 years experience in youth work. Three had no formal qualifications, and two had a youth work qualification. Most of the others had a welfare, social science or psychology degree. Eight of them were employed under the Social and Community Services Award. Joanne and Justin1 were interviewed together. The 20 young people interviewed were also not representative of youth service users. They ranged in age from 14 to 20 and, despite the fact that young males traditionally dominate youth services, 13 of them were female (see Figure 7 - 2). Of the 14 current users of services, ten were interviewed in youth centres, two in a youth refuge, and two in alternative education programs. All six of the ex-users of services were interviewed at a statewide gathering of young people. The youth workers and young people came from urban areas (i.e. Sydney), regional areas (e.g. Newcastle, Wollongong) and rural areas.

The interviews were conducted between 19 March 2001 and 20 February 2002. The length of time between the first and last interview was a result of transcribing the interviews and beginning analysis before all the interviews were completed, as is consistent with grounded theory (see below).

1 All names are pseudonyms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex &amp; Position</th>
<th>Service type</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Years youth work</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Industrial Award¹²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abby</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>Alternative education</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education Other</td>
<td>CETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>Female Not coordinator</td>
<td>Youth Health Service</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Youth work Social Science</td>
<td>Health Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>Outreach, AFC, JPET</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>CETS (rest of staff SACS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Male Not coordinator</td>
<td>Crisis accommodation</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Welfare Other None</td>
<td>SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>Crisis accommodation</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Welfare Other</td>
<td>SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>JPET</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Welfare Education</td>
<td>CETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>Male Coordinator</td>
<td>Counselling, accommodation (crisis &amp; medium term), outreach</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Male Coordinator</td>
<td>Youth centre</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>Community development, youth centre</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Male Coordinator</td>
<td>Youth health centre</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Enterprise agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Enterprise agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Male Coordinator</td>
<td>Youth drop-in centre</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Male Coordinator</td>
<td>Alternative education program</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Youth Work</td>
<td>SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>Alternative education program, supported employment</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SACS (paid to CETS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Female Coordinator</td>
<td>Drop-in, counselling, employment, recreation, education, music programs</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Contract, (rest of staff SACS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Interview number
² CETS = Community Employment, Training and Support Award; SACS = Social and Community Services Award

**Figure 7 - 1: In-depth interview participants – youth workers**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex &amp; age</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Where living</th>
<th>Employment/Study</th>
<th>Service usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bogg</td>
<td>Female 17</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Youth refuge</td>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boris</td>
<td>Male 17</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Youth refuge</td>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>Alternative education program</td>
<td>Used many services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Youth gathering</td>
<td>Shared house</td>
<td>Tertiary study</td>
<td>Used a few services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth gathering</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>Tertiary study</td>
<td>Used a few services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Youth gathering</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>Tertiary study &amp; working</td>
<td>Used many services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Male 15</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Youth gathering</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>Voluntary work</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Male 15</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth gathering</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>Tertiary study</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth gathering</td>
<td>Staying with friends</td>
<td>Tertiary study &amp; voluntary youth work</td>
<td>Used many services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Curley</td>
<td>Male 15</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Alternative education program</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>Alternative education program</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speedy</td>
<td>Male 16</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Alternative education program</td>
<td>Own flat</td>
<td>Alternative education program</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Female 16</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jade</td>
<td>Female 15</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Burnsey</td>
<td>Male 15</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kill</td>
<td>Male 15</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with relatives</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chenille</td>
<td>Female 15</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Female 17</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Shared house</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cynknee</td>
<td>Female 19</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with relatives</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melz</td>
<td>Female 14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Mainly used one service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Iggy</td>
<td>Female 14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Used a few services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tia</td>
<td>Female 14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Living with parent(s)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Used a few services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Interview number

Figure 7 - 2: In-depth interview participants – young people
Interview structure and process

There is a wide variety of ways in which in-depth interviews can be conducted (Alston & Bowles 1998; Marshall & Rossman 1989; Padgett 1998b; Paterson 1997). In-depth interviews are generally semi-structured or unstructured and have the flexibility to explore issues as they arise. In semi-structured interviews, the interviewer develops a guide to the issues to be covered, but generally not the order, and decides on at least the opening question. Some of the subsequent questions may be pre-determined but other questions will arise out of the interview, and interviewers are free to follow up issues as they arise. In unstructured interviews, questions are not pre-determined, topics are raised by the informant and information is obtained through the social interaction between the interviewer and the informant (Alston & Bowles 1998; Marshall & Rossman 1989; Padgett 1998b).

In this study, the in-depth interviews were semi-structured and approached as conversations with a specific purpose (Alston & Bowles 1998; Padgett 1998b). The interviews with youth workers usually began with some general, unrecorded conversation that could include a tour of, or introduction to, the service. The more formal part of the interviews, which was recorded, commenced with a number of structured questions about the service and demographic details in order to increase the youth workers’ sense of security by beginning with straightforward questions (Paterson 1997, p. 10). The interviews then became more unstructured. They usually commenced with a set question but if an issue had arisen during the unrecorded interaction, the first question was changed. The rest of the interview flowed from the interaction, although the conversations were steered towards issues relevant to the study. The interviews with the ex-service users followed a similar pattern to those with the youth workers, with general conversation about the gathering, structured questions about their current situation and the extent of their use of youth services, and less structured questions. The interviews with current service users, were shorter, more structured and did not have the casual conversation beforehand. These interviews commenced with some basic demographic information, such as where they were currently living and how long they had been using the service, before going straight into the main interviews.
Paterson (1997) proposes a humanistic framework for research interviews comprising:

- **Realness**, genuineness or congruency in which interviewers enter into an authentic relationship with the informants by “being the real person that they are” and not creating a “front or façade” (p. 6).

- **Respect**, acceptance and trust in which interviewers demonstrate that they value the informant, respect and accept them as individuals, and create a climate of trust. This is particularly difficult when the informant expresses an opinion with which the interviewer disagrees. Paterson (1997) suggests that in such circumstances it may help if the interviewer sets aside judgmental feelings as being “temporarily inappropriate” (p. 7). Self-awareness and a desire to understand more about a person’s beliefs and experiences may also help.

- **Empathic understanding** in which interviewers demonstrate “sensitivity to respondents’ frames of reference” (p. 8). This requires interviewers to have the ability to reflect the content, feelings and meaning of what the informant says.

As the above framework suggests, in-depth interviewing requires high-level communication skills. Although Paterson (1997) suggests that in-depth interviewers need “training or some background in human relation skills” (p. 5), Padgett (1998b) emphasises that the skills are not the same as those required for clinical or therapeutic interviewing (Padgett 1998b). As well as needing good questioning and verbal communication skills, the interviewer needs non-verbal communications, and the ability to use silence and minimal encouragement such as “mm-mm”, “go on”, “yes” (Paterson 1997, p. 8; see also Seidman 1998, ch. 6). Paterson (1997) goes on to suggest that interviewers need to be careful in coming in too quickly and need to be willing to allow silence. The interviews in this study could have been improved by allowing more silence and space for participants to think.

In-depth interviews need enough time to allow the interviewer and informants to build a relationship and cover the issues under discussion (Plath 2000). Maykut and Morehouse (1994, p. 80; see also Seidman 1998) suggest that in-depth interviews should generally be 90 to 120 minutes, although variation is common. They also believe that informants should usually be interviewed twice so that arising issues can be explored further. The sensitivity of the issues under discussion have an impact on the length of time needed...
because informants may need more time to trust an interviewer and to feel safe enough to discuss sensitive issues (Fontana & Frey 2000, p. 655). Participants in this study were only interviewed once because it was decided that the available time would be better used to interview more youth workers and young people rather than fewer participants twice. The interviews were also shorter than recommended by Maykut and Morehouse (1994) but long enough to build rapport (at least with the youth workers and ex-service users) and to obtain useful information. Excluding the informal conversation before the interviews, which was important in helping to build rapport, the interviews with youth workers ranged from 30 to 75 minutes with most being 40 to 60 minutes duration. The interviews with ex-service users lasted 25 to 30 minutes excluding the informal conversation. Most of the interviews with current service users took only 10 to 15 minutes although two took 20 to 30 minutes.

There was a significant difference in the manner in which the interviews with current service users were conducted compared to the interviews with youth workers and ex-service users. In the latter, a question would usually lead to a relatively long answer, or a brief comment by the interviewer would prompt participants to expand on what they had been saying. In the former, responses were mostly one sentence and so the researcher spoke much more than in the interviews with youth workers and ex-service users. If longer time had been spent building rapport with current service users, responses might have been slightly more detailed but, because many youth service users take time to build relationships with adults (Stuart 1994b), the time to do so was not available. Ideally, the interviews would have been part of fieldwork in youth services so that information could have been obtained over a longer period of time and in ways that were more informal. Although the responses may have still been quite short, issues could have been discussed as they arose in the youth services and a more complete picture may have been developed. At the same time, the interviews with the young people produced useful results, and there were enough consistencies between responses to suggest that the interviews were successful to a certain degree.

The interviews were mostly conducted in the offices of the youth workers. The exceptions were two interviews conducted in the living room of a youth accommodation service, and the interviews conducted at the gathering of young people, which were conducted outside. This meant that the interviews with youth workers were conducted
in their space, and the interviews with ex-service users were conducted in a neutral, relaxed environment. The interviews with most of the current service users, however, were not conducted in their space. There were few alternatives, however, as it would have been inappropriate to conduct the interviews, as they were structured, in the open spaces of the youth services, and moving outside was not appropriate at those services.

The interviews with youth workers focused primarily on the extent of violence in their services, and how they prevented or responded to problems including violence and discrimination. The telephone survey had found that most youth workers did not believe their services were violent and so the interviews explored the level of violence in greater depth. The forms of violence explored included physical violence, verbal abuse, racism, homophobia and sexism. Although structural violence was not specifically explored, by including racism, homophobia, and sexism, more covert forms of violence that grow from structural violence were addressed. The main focus of the interviews, however, was the way in which youth workers attempted to prevent problems from arising in their services, and how they responded when problems arose. Problems not only included violence and discrimination but also more generally challenging or disruptive behaviour. Interview participants were specifically asked about excluding young people from youth services, whether it was short-term exclusion such as time out, or longer-term exclusion such as eviction and banning. The young people were asked about what they liked and did not like in youth workers, the way in which youth workers responded to problems, the way in which they ought to respond, and their attitudes towards exclusion. The young people were not asked about the way in which youth workers could prevent problems from arising, although they were asked about what could help make youth services safe.

Recording and transcribing the interviews

All the interviews were audio-taped and then transcribed. There are both advantages and disadvantages in audio-taping interviews (Alston & Bowles 1998; Fuller & Petch 1995; Minichiello et al. 1995; Padgett 1998b; Seidman 1998; Tyson 1995). The main advantages of taping the interviews were that it was possible to concentrate on being an attentive listener rather than attempting to take notes, and the interviews could be transcribed for detailed analysis (Kvale 1996; Minichiello et al. 1995; Padgett 1998b).
Disadvantages of audio-taping included technical difficulties, and the possibility that the presence of a tape recorder could affect the interaction (Minichiello et al. 1995; Tyson 1995). The beginning of one interview was lost because the tape had not been turned on properly. Fortunately the mistake was discovered before much of the interview was lost. Once the tape was working, the youth worker was asked to summarise the main points made so far, and the interview continued. It is impossible to identify precisely the ways in which the interviews were influenced by the presence of the tape recorder. Only two of the youth workers, and none of the young people, gave a clear indication that they were nervous about being taped, although it is possible that others were nervous but did not show it. Some of the young people appeared eager to be taped, and it might have helped convince them that their input was valued and significant.

Fuller and Petch (1995, p. 73) suggest that in some cases the time spent on transcription could be better spent in other ways but, in this study, transcription was an important component of the research process. The time devoted to transcribing interviews was consistent with Yow’s (1994, p. 236) estimate of six to ten hours for every hour of interview. This estimate did not include editing, proof reading and sending the transcript to participants. Even though transcription required a great deal of time and effort, the process of transcribing the interviews was the first step in data analysis and meant that the researcher became familiar with them (Minichiello et al. 1995, p. 100).

Transcribing involves “translating from an oral language, with its own set of rules, to a written language with another set of rules” (Kvale 1996, p. 165). Such a process of transformation is painstaking, requires good judgement and creativity, and could be approached in numerous ways (Kvale 1996; Moss 1976; Yow 1994). As Kvale (1996, p. 169) suggests, it is important that key decisions are stated explicitly. Figure 7 - 3 identifies key issues addressed during transcribing. In oral history, Yow (1994) argues that it is inappropriate to edit transcriptions because they should “stay as close as possible to the sound you actually hear” (p. 229). Other authors argue that it is appropriate to make some editorial changes in order to improve the comprehensibility of transcripts (Moss 1976; Robertson 1995). They suggest it is appropriate to omit some false starts to sentences, redundancies such as “um” and “er,” and crutch words such as “I mean” and “you know,” and to spell words correctly rather than phonetically (“fishing” rather than “fish’n”).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Possibilities</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interviewee crutch words (e.g. you know, like) | Include all  
Include some for flavour  
Include none – unless significant | Include some for flavour or if significant |
| Stammering and “fill-ins” (e.g. um, er) | Include all  
Include some for flavour  
Include none – unless significant | Include if significant |
| Interviewer crutch words (e.g. you know, like) | Include all  
Include some for flavour  
Include none – unless significant | Include some for flavour or if significant |
| Interviewer’s “active listening” (e.g. hmm, yes) | Include all  
Include some for flavour  
Include none | Include none |
| False starts | Include all  
Include ones that suggest a change of mind or intent  
Include none | Include ones that suggest a change of mind or intent |
| Word spelling | Spell as pronounced (e.g. nothink instead of nothing)  
Include colloquialisms using conventional spelling  
Use conventional English and spelling | Include colloquialisms using conventional spelling |
| Changes in tone, laughter etc | Indicate few  
Indicate most | Indicate major ones |
| Editing | Leave as spoken  
Imagine how interviewee would want to be portrayed  
Convert to standard written English  
Summarise | Capture the feel of the way in which the interviewee spoke but correct some grammar. Imagine how interviewee would want to be portrayed |
| Pauses | Indicate in milliseconds  
Indicate with –  
Indicate with ...  
Indicate with short pause, long pause etc. | Indicate major ones by short pause, long pause etc. |
| Unfinished sentences | Indicate with ...  
Indicate with --- | Indicate with --- because ... is used to indicate something has been left out from a quote |
| Interrupted sentences or abrupt changes of thoughts | Indicate with - | Indicate with - |

(Source: Kvale 1996; Moss 1976; Robertson 1995; Yow 1994)

**Figure 7 - 3: Decisions relating to transcription**
In a text on interviewing in qualitative research, Kvale (1996) argues that decisions about the extent of editing are dependent on the intended audience and the purpose of the transcription. At times, a very precise transcription may be needed, at other times a summary might do. He suggests that one option is to imagine how the participant would want to be represented in writing and then “on behalf of the subjects translate their oral style in a written form in harmony with the specific subjects’ general mode of expression” (p. 170). This study did not involve the very precise analysis of text requiring the exact representation of the spoken word. The analysis was thematic in nature and, when participants were quoted, ease of reading and understanding were priorities. The transcriptions were thus edited so that they were easy to read, captured the meaning of what was said, and adopted the flavour of the way in which the participant spoke. The transcriptions were completed in two drafts. The first draft was much closer to what was actually said including false starts, many crutch words and incorrect grammar. In the final draft, false starts showing a line of thinking were retained but others were omitted, most crutch words were deleted, some grammar was corrected and some editorial changes were made to assist in the clarity of the transcription. As Kvale (1996) suggests, some people experience quite a shock when they read a transcript of their interviews because “verbatim transcribed oral language may appear as incoherent and confused speech, even as indicating a lower level of intellectual function” (p. 172). He suggests that it may be appropriate to send participants transcripts using a more fluent written style, as was done in this study. Although the original, more precise transcriptions were available if needed for checking the context or meaning of comments, the edited versions were the ones used for analysis and quoting. Where possible, after each transcript was edited, a copy was returned to the participant so that she or he had the opportunity to make corrections or add comments. No corrections were received. Most of the service users stated that they were not interested in receiving a copy of the transcript.

Protecting the confidentiality and anonymity of participants was important (Kvale 1996). Thus pseudonyms were used; names of other staff, young people and places were changed; and any other details that could identify participants were edited. The completed transcriptions resulted in nearly 126,000 words of transcription, of which over 96,000 were from interviews with youth workers, 16,000 were from interviews
with current service users, and 13,000 were from interviews with ex-service users. The relative length of transcriptions clearly demonstrated the greater depth of the interviews with youth workers and, to a lesser extent, ex-service users.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Marshall and Rossman (1989) suggest, “data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative, and fascinating process” (p. 112). Miller and Crabtree (1999) describe the process as “the dance of interpretation” (p. 127) and as being a “creative, artistic craft situated within a diverse knowledge-defining community” (p. 130). This section begins with a brief overview of grounded theory (Charmaz 2000; Dey 1999; Glaser 1978, 1995; Glaser & Strauss 1967; Locke 2001; Strauss & Corbin 1998; Strauss 1987) because it is one of the most widely used approaches to the analysis of data from in-depth interviews (Punch 1987) and influenced many other methods of analysis (Alston & Bowles 1998; Flick 2002; Neuman 1997). While not attempting a grounded theory study, the analysis of the in-depth interviews was based on literature discussing grounded theory.

The term grounded theory can be used in two ways. First, it is “theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analysed through the research process” (Strauss & Corbin 1998, p 12). According to Strauss and Corbin (1998) theory is “a set of well-developed categories (e.g. themes and concepts) that are systematically interrelated through statements of relationship to form a theoretical framework that explains some relevant social, psychological, educational, nursing, or other phenomenon” (p. 22). Second, grounded theory is a “research strategy whose purpose is to generate theory from data” (Punch 1998, p. 163). It is the second usage that is used below.

Although this research did not use a grounded theory approach, methods used in grounded theory have been used as heuristic devices (Charmaz 2000) within the framework of intervention research. As Strauss and Corbin (1998) recognise, researchers can view the various methods and strategies involved in grounded theory as a “smorgasbord table from which they can choose, reject, and ignore” various options
depending on their needs (pp. 8-9). The main grounded theory analytical strategies used in this study were:

- Simultaneous collection and analysis of data
- A three-step approach to data analysis
- Comparative methods
- Writing memos
- Theoretical sampling
- Saturation (Charmaz 2000; Strauss & Corbin 1998).

Before discussing each of these strategies, it is worth considering briefly the role of computers in qualitative research. There is now wide acceptance that computers are appropriate tools for assisting in the analysis of qualitative research (Dey 1999; Flick 2002; Padgett 1998b; Punch 1998; Strauss & Corbin 1998; Weitzman 2000; Weitzman & Miles 1995) and concerns about most potential drawbacks can be addressed (Weitzman 2000). In this research, N4 (previously known as NUD*IST 4) was used extensively during the coding and analysis of the data. N4 is a code-based theory builder designed for the storage, coding, retrieval and analysis of data, and to assist in building theory (Qualitative Solution and Research 1997; Weitzman & Miles 1995). When deciding to use N4 rather than other programs, it was a program that was widely used and highly recommended (Alston & Bowles 1998; Creswell 1998; Punch 1998; Weitzman & Miles 1995), and it was affordable. Before commencing data analysis, N4 was updated to N5 and Qualitative Solutions and Research released NVivo, an improved version of NUD*IST. The upgrades were not used because N4 had already been purchased and used for the analysis of the pilot interviews.

One reason that N4 was used was that it is compatible with a grounded theory approach to data analysis (Qualitative Solution and Research 1997; Weitzman & Miles 1995). Care was taken to ensure that the software program did not shape the direction of the analysis but rather it was seen as a tool to assist in data analysis (Weitzman 2000). It influenced the writing up of the research, however, since N4 uses the term “nodes” to describe codes and categories. In the following discussion, the three terms are used interchangeably.
Simultaneous collection and analysis of data

Data analysis began early in the data collection process and guided the direction of subsequent interviews (Alston & Bowles 1998). Charmaz (2000, p. 515) suggests that coding should commence with data collection so that issues needing further exploration can be explored in later interviews or observation. In this study, coding did not commence until most of the interviews had been completed. The process of transcribing and identifying themes, however, began after the seventh interview. The first seven interviews were conducted between mid March and early April 2001, three were conducted in early October, eleven were conducted in November to mid December, and the final three were conducted in mid February 2002. In the periods between interviews, the transcriptions were completed and reread a number of times in order to find general themes and issues that needed to be explored in future interviews.

A three-step approach to data analysis

Coding, the key analytical strategy of grounded theory and many other forms of qualitative data analysis (Alston & Bowles 1998; Dey 1993, 1999; Miles & Huberman 1994; Neuman 1997; Padgett 1998b; Punch 1998), involves reducing large amounts of data so that it becomes manageable, and analytically categorising it (Neuman 1997, p. 422). Coding is the process of attaching labels, nodes or names to chunks of data. The chunks of data can be words, phrases, sentences or paragraphs (Alston & Bowles 1998; Punch 1998). In grounded theory, coding moves from the concrete to the abstract and from the specific to the general, and the aim is to develop a core concept or category around which theory is built (Punch 1998, pp. 208-210).

Although Charmaz (2000, see also Glaser 1978, Glaser & Strauss 1967) identifies a two-step process for coding data, most recent works are based on three-steps: open coding, axial coding (or theoretical coding) and selective coding (Alston & Bowles 1998; Creswell 1998; Dey 1999; Flick 2002; Neuman 1997; Punch 1998; Strauss & Corbin 1998; Strauss 1987). The coding of the interviews included open and axial coding, while selective coding was undertaken after the focus groups had been held.
Open coding involved categorising the data (Dey 1999, p. 98). It was an unrestricted coding of data, in which the researcher examined the transcripts, opened up the data, located themes and produced tentative conceptual categories (Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997; Punch 1987). According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), during open coding, “data are broken down into discrete parts, closely examined, and compared for similarities and differences. Events, happenings, objects, and actions/interactions that are found to be conceptually similar in nature or related in meaning are grouped under more abstract concepts” (p. 102). The first stage of coding is at a low level of abstraction, is tentative and can be changed later (Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997).

During open coding each of the transcripts was read and nodes were created as themes were identified. Punch (1998, p. 212) suggests that in this stage of coding one question, which takes three forms, is constantly asked: What is this piece of data an example of? What does this piece of data stand for, or represent? What category does this piece of data indicate? Coding can occur at a variety of levels – individual words, lines, sentences or paragraphs – depending on the purpose of the research (Neuman 1997, p. 423). Because the transcripts were seen as a “window into experience” (Ryan & Bernard 2000, p. 790) rather than being the object of study as in more linguistically based traditions, coding was done at a paragraph level, although many paragraphs had multiple codes. The coding was based on broad themes rather than very detailed analysis and so coding at this level was appropriate.

Although it would have been possible to code the data based on the previously identified principles of nonviolence, themes were allowed to emerge from the data. At the same time, many themes were suggested by the questions used in the interviews. For example, because participants were asked about the exclusion of young people from youth services, there were a variety of nodes relating to exclusion. Other nodes arose from the actual words of the participants. For example, a node *friendly* was developed because a number of young people described a good youth worker as being friendly. The open coding also involved ordering and classifying nodes through the development of nodes and subnodes (Punch 1998; Strauss & Corbin 1998; Strauss 1987). Nodes, which were related to the one theme, were brought together under the one broader node. This meant that a number of broad nodes were used including, *violence, discrimination,*
preventing problems, responding to problems, and police, which brought together a number of subnodes. For example, the node discrimination had subnodes for racism, homophobia, sexism, other discrimination, and nondiscrimination (examples of cases where discrimination did not occur).

In the second stage of coding, axial coding, the research focused more intensively on one category or node at a time (Alston & Bowles 1998, pp. 201-202) and attempted to make connections between categories (Dey 1999, p. 98). Through axial coding, the research “begins to build up a dense texture of relationships around the ‘axis’ of the category being focused upon” (Strauss 1987, p. 64). Although some categorisation occurs during open coding, in axial coding connections are made between the various nodes and subnodes in order to clarify relationships or to elaborate the concepts or themes they represent (Alston & Bowles 1998; Neuman 1997). Neuman (1997) suggests that during axial coding, “a researcher asks about causes and consequences, conditions and interactions, strategies and processes, and looks for categories or concepts that cluster together” (p. 423).

During axial coding, the analysis became more abstract and the focus was more on the themes or nodes than on the data itself (Neuman 1997, p 423; Punch 1998). The nodes developed during the open coding were refined and differentiated (Flick 2002) and similarities and relationships between various nodes were investigated. Rather than reading the transcript line by line, the focus was on the broad themes and so all the sections coded at the same node were read in order to refine the coding. For example, during the open coding, nodes and associated subnodes were developed for both preventing problems and responding to problems but, during the axial coding, it became clear that the strategies used for both were related and that it was better to analyse them together under a broad node behaviour management (which became managing behaviour during selective coding).

N4 has the capability to create a hierarchy of nodes (called an index tree) in which nodes can be subcategories of broader nodes (Qualitative Solution and Research 1997). The index tree created by the end of axial coding is provided in Appendix 9. The nodes that formed the basis of the index tree were as follows:
Violence
Discussion of violence including how violent services were; examples of violence by both youth workers and young people; the relationship between “mucking around” and violence; and other general comments about violence.

Discrimination
Discussion of discrimination including how much discrimination there was in services; examples of racism, homophobia, sexism and other discrimination; and discussion of situations where discrimination could have occurred but did not.

Gender issues
Because of the relationship between gender and violence, discussion of gender issues was coded separately. This node included discussion which indicated behaviour by males and females; the impact of sexism; how aware of sexism youth workers were; implications of the gender of workers; ways in which youth workers responded to sexism; and the impact of domestic violence.

Behaviour management
This was the largest category and included discussion related to behaviour management strategies; characteristics which assisted in behaviour management; the role group dynamics had on behaviour management; barriers to good behaviour management; and times when inappropriate behaviour management strategies had been used.

Work practice
Discussion of characteristics or features of good work practice and bad practice (as identified by participants) including characteristics of youth workers; the physical and emotional environment of the youth service; staffing levels; and other features which led to a good or bad youth service.
Power Discussion of the use of power by youth workers and the empowerment of young people including ways in which youth workers responded to the imbalance in power; examples where youth workers used power appropriately or inappropriately; and ways in which young people responded to the use of power by youth workers.

Base data The characteristics of the participants (e.g. gender, age, qualifications) were coded so that specific examples could be retrieved if needed. The main comparison used was between youth workers, current service users and ex-service users. All the comments made by the interviewer were also coded so that they could be retrieved or excluded easily.

At times pieces of data were identified that were significant but, because they were not directly related to the key issues being explored, they did not fit into the index tree. In N4 these can be coded as free nodes. There were four free nodes as follows:

Social change Discussion of the need for social change if youth services were to become nonviolent.

Safety Discussion of the need for, or strategies for, ensuring the safety of youth services.

Organisational culture Discussion of the organisational culture of youth services.

Music and videos Discussion specifically related to music and videos in youth services, including discussion of ways in which decisions should be made about what music is played and what videos are watched.
In the final stage of coding, selective coding, the aim was to identify the core categories that were central to the research and that integrated the other categories (Dey 1999; Flick 2002; Punch 1987; Strauss 1987). Strauss and Corbin (1998) recommend that researchers should limit themselves to one core category which, in an exaggerated sense “consists of all the products of analysis condensed into a few words that seem to explain what ‘this research is all about’” (p. 146). All the other themes or categories should be able to relate to the central themes (Punch 1998). Selective coding did not occur until the final phase of the study, when the interviews and literature on youth work and nonviolence had been integrated, and the focus groups had been conducted. During the selective coding the data and nodes were scanned (Neuman 1997, p. 424) to ensure that the model of practice being developed was consistent with the experience of the youth workers and young people interviewed. The aim was to “integrate and pull together the developing analysis” (Punch 1998, p. 217) and to ensure that all the themes and subthemes identified in the coding could be related to the model.

**Comparative methods**

The use of comparison is essential for identifying and developing categories (Strauss & Corbin 1998). Comparisons can be made at a concrete level by comparing incidents and people, or at a more abstract level by comparing categories and concepts (Punch 1998; Strauss & Corbin 1998). Charmaz (2000) identifies five ways in which comparisons are made in grounded theory:

1. Comparing different people (such as their views, situations, actions, accounts, and experiences)
2. Comparing data from the same individuals with themselves at different points in time
3. Comparing incident with incident
4. Comparing data with category
5. Comparing a category with other categories (p. 515).

In the analysis of the in-depth interviews, these methods were used to identify similarities and differences, and to help define and clarify node boundaries and relationships (Locke 2001). As the analysis progressed, comparisons became more abstract. During open coding, comparisons of pieces of data related to excluding young
people from services highlighted differences in attitudes towards exclusion from youth centres and from youth accommodation services. During axial coding, as already discussed, comparisons of nodes indicated that the nodes related to *preventing problems* and *responding to problems* should be combined under the node *behaviour management*. During selective coding, pieces of data and codes were compared to see whether behaviour management or managing behaviour was a better term to use in describing the practice of youth workers.

**Writing memos**

Memos are used in grounded theory to assist researchers develop their understanding and to move from the concrete to the abstract. Memos record thoughts, questions and ideas that arise during coding (Punch 1987). According to Glaser (1978), memos are:

- The theorising write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding... Memoing is a constant process that begins when first coding data, and continues through reading memos or literature, sorting and writing papers or monograph to the very end... The four basic goals in memoing are to theoretically develop ideas (codes), with complete freedom into a memo fund, that is highly sortable (p. 82).

Memos can be as short as a sentence or as long as a few pages. Glaser and Strauss (Glaser 1978; Glaser & Strauss 1967; Strauss & Corbin 1998) recommend that researchers make frequent use of memos so ideas, insights and questions are not lost during detailed analysis. They suggest that by using memos frequently, researchers “tap the initial freshness of [their] thoughts. In doing so the analyst should take as much time as necessary to reflect and carry his [or her] thinking to its most logical (grounded in the data, not speculative) conclusions” (Glaser & Strauss 1967, p. 107).

Memos were not used as extensively in this study as some grounded theorists recommend (Glaser 1978; Glaser & Strauss 1967; Punch 1998; Strauss & Corbin 1998) but they were an important component of the analysis. Memos took a variety of forms including:

- Brief notes recording such things as ideas, questions or reminders to return to earlier transcripts to look for codes that emerged part way through the analysis
• Memos attached to nodes within N4
• A personal research journal used for reflecting on the research, raising questions, or summarising thoughts
• Discussion papers for the reference group
• Notes prepared for the Ph.D. supervisor
• Research updates produced for the research participants and others
• Papers presented at seminars or conferences.

These memos could have been better organised, and written more regularly but they formed an important part of the analysis. As the following example written after completing transcripts of interviews with seven youth workers and four young people demonstrates, memos were a way in which early ideas could be captured and a conceptual framework for later stages of analysis could be commenced.

Some of the early trends I am picking up are:

• The importance of structure [for youth workers].
• Young people want to feel confident that they can trust youth workers and be confident that the youth workers can handle difficult situations.
• The tension between letting young people make decisions (not power over) and setting boundaries. I suspect the answer will be in how boundaries are set and enforced. I like Smith’s, could be Jeffs’ [it was actually Jeffs and Banks (1999)], differentiation between practice for control and control in practice. The latter is appropriate for youth workers.
• Exclusion is an issue. Some seem to accept it, while other don’t or only as a bottom line. I was thinking that one line might be a principle that exclusion is only used as a last resort and more as a suspension than expulsion (15 October 2001).

Some memos, as above, were unpolished thoughts, whereas other memos, such as discussion papers for the reference group, were more polished.

Theoretical sampling

Theoretical sampling is used to collect more data in order to fill gaps in data or to answer questions which have arisen in developing theory (Alston & Bowles 1998; Charmaz 2000). According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), theoretical sampling is:
The process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his [or her] data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his [or her] theory as it emerges. This process of data collection is controlled by the emerging theory (p. 45).

The purpose of theoretical sampling is to refine ideas and to develop theory, not to increase the sample size (Charmaz 2000, p. 519).

Theoretical sampling can be used at all stages of grounded theory but, in this research, theoretical sampling was only used with the focus groups. The focus groups were structured so that they could help develop emerging categories and ideas, and to explore when, how, and to what extent, they were pertinent and useful (Charmaz 2000, p. 519). Theoretical sampling can refer to both the way in which participants are selected and to the questions asked of the participants or the data (Strauss & Corbin 1998). The participants were selected for their potential to provide new insights into the developing model (Flick 2002, p. 64) and the issues discussed were directed towards refining the model of practice.

**Saturation**

Saturation is the final feature of grounded theory to be considered here. Saturation is “reaching the point in the research where collecting additional data seems counterproductive; the ‘new’ that is uncovered does not add that much more to the explanation at this time” (Strauss & Corbin 1998, p. 136). Saturation applies to various stages of research including data collection, coding, and theory development: data collection stops when no new information is being collected; coding stops when no new categories or subcategories are being developed; and theory development stops when the theory is conceptually complete (Alston & Bowles 1998; Charmaz 2000; Punch 1998; Strauss & Corbin 1998). As Strauss and Corbin (1998) point out, in practice saturation is sometimes reached when “the researcher runs out of time, money, or both” (p. 136).

Although more data could have been generated, after interviews with 15 youth workers and 20 young people, the main themes had been saturated and further interviews would not have added substantially new information. More interviews could have provided
insights into some related issues, and there was scope to explore the perceptions of young people further but enough data was available to develop a model of practice. Coding was completed when new categories were either too similar to other nodes, or were not central to the research aims. The process of saturation in relation to theory building needs to continue after this study is completed, a process built into future phases of intervention research.

**LIMITATIONS OF PHASE 2**

There were a number of limitations to the in-depth interviews, some of which have been identified above. The interviews with current service users were particularly problematic. There were problems in the selection of the young people, building rapport, and the conduct of some of the interviews. The interviews where young people had been organised prior to the interviews worked better than did those where young people were approached just before the interviews. The interviews with the young people who had been pre-selected were longer, more focused and involved greater critical analysis of the youth service by the young people. If more of the interviews had been conducted in this way, more depth to the comments by young people might have been obtained. At the same time, the interviews with the other young people gave some useful insights into how a range of other young people described their experiences of youth services.

The interview results should not be interpreted as necessarily describing or explaining what actually happens in youth services. Participants may have presented themselves or their youth service in a positive manner, they may have been unaware of the role of important factors, the context of the interview and topics discussed may have shaped their responses, or they may not have trusted or felt comfortable with the process. Their words or meanings may have been misinterpreted during analysis, the pace of the interview may have prevented them from thinking more deeply about issues and valuable insights may have been lost, or one interview may not have been enough to explore the issues fully. Although in-depth interviews provide useful information, they cannot answer all questions, and need to be interpreted with care (Seidman 1998). Further insights could have been obtained if participant observation or some other strategy had been used.
Although multiple interviews would have been difficult, some form of follow-up such as a brief phone call would have allowed any questions which arose during the transcription to be answered, and would have encouraged participants to provide feedback or comments about the interview and resulting transcript. The information-gathering phase also focused only on youth services. It is likely that useful information could have been obtained from other areas of practice (Fawcett et al. 1994).

Like the first phase, the second phase of the research was weakened because it had initially been conceptualised in terms of violence prevention. The importance of the change, however, only became clear through the research process, particularly during the later stages of the research.

The in-depth interviews, the results of which are discussed in Chapter 10, were integrated with the literature on youth work and nonviolence in the next phase of intervention research: design.
Chapter 8
Design and Quality Control

The final phase of intervention research undertaken during this study was design. Developmental research, the precursor of intervention research, has been described as being analogous to research and development in engineering (Thomas 1978a), and youth workers are likely to be unfamiliar with the language used, particularly in this phase. For example, the means by which human service practitioners achieve their objectives are described as human service or social technology (Mullen 1994; Thomas 1978a, 1978b; Thomas & Rothman 1994). The description of activities for the design phase (see Figure 5 - 2) is also unnecessarily complicated. Whittaker et al. (1994), however, discuss the activities in plainer terms and suggest that the phase includes:

- Identifying the design objective
- Identifying design criteria
- Identifying design problems
- Involving users in the design process
- Designing the intervention.

This chapter adopts this framework, with particular attention given to the focus groups that were the main means of involving youth workers in the design process. This chapter also considers the way in which the quality of the research was protected.

**DESIGN OBJECTIVE**

The first task in design is identifying the design objective. Thomas (1978a, 1978b) identifies nine social technologies or tools that assist social workers achieve their objectives each of which could be the basis of design:

1. Physical frameworks (e.g. the design of a youth centre)
2. Electromechanical devices (e.g. video recorders, computers)
3. Information systems (e.g. computer-assisted data bases or record keeping)
4. Assessment methods (e.g. intake questions for youth accommodation services)
5. Intervention methods (e.g. strengths based case work, narrative therapy)
6. Service programs (e.g. street work, case management)
7. Organisational structures (e.g. bureaucratic, decentralised, cooperatives)
8. Service systems (e.g. community mental health teams, JPET)
9. Social and welfare policy (e.g. welfare policies of a state or federal government).

Intervention research seeks to develop innovation in one of these areas of practice (Thomas 1990) and this research addressed intervention methods used by youth workers by developing a model of nonviolent youth work practice. Mullen (1994, p. 167) suggests that it is useful to differentiate between the design objective and intervention objective. The intervention objective was to encourage youth workers to adopt a philosophy of nonviolence as a guiding framework for their work. The design objective was to develop the model of nonviolent practice.

**DESIGN CRITERIA**

In order to assist in the process of design, it helps “to identify preliminary design specifications to guide the scope and boundaries of the developmental effort” (Whittaker et al. 1994, p. 202). Thomas (in Mullen 1994, p. 169) argues that it is important to identify elements that are fixed and those which are the focus of the design process. Mullen (1994, p. 169) also proposes that in establishing design criteria, a systems approach be adopted in which interventions are conceptualised as involving a set of interacting and related elements. The intervention system this study was investigating included young people, families, youth workers, youth services, funding bodies, governments, and social institutions that impact on the behaviour of young people and youth workers. In order to keep the research to a manageable size, the focus was on youth workers. Although all of the elements interact with one another and influence one another, many of the elements impacting on youth workers were considered fixed, including:

- The social, political and economic environment in which youth work takes place
- The qualification level of youth workers
- The level of funding received by youth services
- The family and social backgrounds of young people using youth services
- The personal characteristics of young people who use youth services.
Even though these were not addressed, the model has implications for other elements of the intervention system. For example, the model encourages youth workers to be involved in social change activities through which they can have an impact on broader issues. As the model also focuses on the way in which youth workers manage behaviour, it is likely that it will also have an impact on the behaviour of young people. The design focus, however, was on youth workers, and not on other parts of the system.

The design criteria were that the model needed to:

- Ensure good youth work practice (Chapters 2 & 3)
- Be consistent principles of nonviolence (Chapter 4)
- Be acceptable to youth workers
- Assist youth workers to base their practice on a philosophy of nonviolence.

**DESIGN PROBLEMS**

During the earlier phases of intervention research, design problems are highlighted (Mullen 1994; Whittaker et al. 1994). Design problems are “unresolved issues regarding the elements of the intervention under development” (Mullen 1994, p. 170), and can be framed as questions needing answers. Based on the literature review, telephone survey and in-depth interviews, the design problems were identified as:

- What are the implications of a philosophy of nonviolence for youth work practice?
- How can youth workers prevent problems, including violence and discrimination, from arising in youth services in ways which are consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence?
- How can youth workers respond to problems in ways that are consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence?
- How can youth workers operate from a position of power-with?
- What terms do youth workers use in describing, preventing and responding to problems?
INVOLVING USERS

In determining who the users are, it is again useful to return to the distinction between design objectives and intervention objectives. Young people are the users of the youth services where the model of practice will be implemented; the users of the actual model, however, are youth workers. It was thus important that youth workers were involved in the design process. This was achieved in three main ways: through the reference group which met throughout the research; through research updates, workshops, conference presentations and discussion on the Youth Action Research Network (an online discussion group); and through two focus groups with youth workers (see below).

INTERVENTION DESIGN

Designing the intervention involved integrating the results of the literature review, telephone survey and in-depth interviews, and was undertaken in a number of steps. Although presented as such, intervention research is not a linear process and the design process commenced early in the research process. Five distinct phases of the intervention design can be identified:

1. Features of Australian youth work were identified (see Chapters 3 & 6)
2. Principles of nonviolence were developed (see Chapters 4 & 6)
3. The analysis of the in-depth interviews (see Chapters 7 & 10) identified key features of youth work practice that promoted nonviolence
4. Issues needing further consideration were identified and researched through selective reading of literature and the focus group (see Chapter 11)
5. The model of practice was developed (see Chapter 11).

Originally, the study was to include action research with two youth services in order to refine the model in the field. Time limitations did not allow this to occur and implementation in such a context remains an important next step.

Mullen (1994) suggests that social scientists typically struggle with presenting research findings that are of direct use to practitioners. Thus, throughout the research process, an important consideration was ensuring a practical focus by emphasising the practice implications of the findings. One of the challenges was to develop a model that was not
prescriptive but still provided some practical guidance for youth workers. By attempting to keep the research grounded in the practice of experience of youth workers (through the reference group, research updates, in-depth interviews and focus groups), it is hoped that the model of practice will be useful to youth workers.

**FOCUS GROUPS**

Focus groups are widely used in market research and, since the mid 1980s, have become increasingly popular in other forms of research (Morgan 1996; Smith 1995). Key features of focus groups include the collection of data generated through group interaction where the researcher selects the topic and is actively involved in facilitating the group process and discussion (Flick 2002; Krueger 1994; Morgan 1996; Neuman 1997). Morgan (in Flick 2002) argues that they are useful for:

- Orienting oneself to a new field
- Generating hypotheses based on informants’ insights
- Evaluating different research sites or study populations
- Developing interview schedules and questionnaires
- Getting participants’ interpretations of results from earlier studies (p. 120).

Krueger (1994, pp. 44-45) argues that focus groups can be used to:

- Gain insights in exploratory or preliminary studies
- Explore situations where there is a “communication or understanding gap between groups or categories of people” (p. 44)
- Investigate complex behaviour or motivation
- Generate ideas that emerge from the group, rather than the individual
- Obtain information to prepare for a large-scale study.

None of the uses identified by Krueger (1994) adequately describe the way in which focus groups were used in this research. Within the context of the design phase of intervention research, the focus groups were used to involve users in the design process and allowed other youth workers to comment on the research results.
Focus groups typically comprise seven to ten participants (Krueger 1994, p. 6) although they can be run with smaller or larger numbers (Alston & Bowles 1998; Kitzinger 1994; Krueger 1994; Morgan 1996). For this research, two focus groups were conducted: the first with seven people and the second with nine. While there is agreement that focus groups should be composed of people relatively homogenous or similar to one another, there has been debate in literature about whether or not it is appropriate for focus groups to include people who know one another. Traditionally focus group literature recommended using people who did not know one another (Flick 2002; Greenbaum 1988; Krueger 1994; Morgan 1988) but increasingly it is argued that focus groups work as well, and sometimes better, when participants already know one another or constitute an existing group (Kitzinger 1994; Madriz 2000; Morgan 1996; Plath 2000). Both of the focus groups for this research included people who knew one another.

The first focus group was conducted with the reference group for the research and was thus a pre-existing group. There were some potential disadvantages, including their involvement in the research in that they could have had a vested interest in supporting the findings. Clearly, this focus group did not undertake a neutral review of the findings and but their intimate knowledge of the research was seen as a strength. Advantages of using the reference group as a focus group included:

- They all had wide experience in youth work, or training and supervising youth workers.
- They had been reflecting on nonviolence and youth work for some time and had valuable insights and ideas.
- Previous meetings had generated useful, lively discussion, and so it was likely, as a focus group, that they would generate useful data.

The second group comprised youth workers from a regional area, most of whom knew one another. With one exception, the members of the second group had no prior knowledge of the research, and there was a range of experience and service type. Nine youth workers were invited to attend the focus group but one was unable to attend due to sickness and the worker at whose service the focus group was held, brought a colleague. It was decided to include the additional youth worker as she was very new to
youth work and could bring a different perspective to nonviolence in youth work practice.

Participants were selected because of their potential to provide new insights into the developing model (Flick 2002, p. 64). The selection of the first group occurred earlier in the research when participants were invited to join the reference group. Participants were selected for the second group to ensure that there were youth workers with varying levels of experience and from a range of service types. Figure 8 – 1 summarises the gender and experience of the focus group members. The first focus group included people with at least 12 years experience in youth work and related areas. Two of the participants had not been youth workers but had supervised and trained them, and had extensive experience in related fields. The participants had a wide range of experience in many different areas of youth work including youth accommodation, youth centres, community development, juvenile justice, and alternative education. There was a wide variation in the level of experience in the second focus group: two had less than one year’s experience, and three had between 10 and 20 years experience. The members of the second group had also worked in a wide variety of areas of youth work including accommodation, youth centres, counselling, and generalist services. Members in both groups had experience in supervising and training youth workers, and in the management of youth services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focus group 1</th>
<th>Focus group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of direct experience in youth work</td>
<td>11 to 15 years¹</td>
<td>3 months to 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean length of experience in youth work</td>
<td>12.8 years</td>
<td>6.8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of experience in youth work and related work</td>
<td>12 to 35 years</td>
<td>3 months to 22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean length of experience in youth work and related work</td>
<td>19.6 years</td>
<td>11.4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Excluding two members with no direct experience in youth work but over 30 years experience in related work.

**Figure 8 - 1: Gender and experience of focus groups members**

The possibility of using the reference group as a focus group had been discussed and agreed to at an earlier meeting but, following the process set out in the ethics
application, they were still sent information about the focus group and a consent form (see Appendix 7), and could decline to take part if they so wished. All the current members of the reference group attended (although one member was late). Potential participants for the second focus group were first contacted by phone, and then the information and consent form were sent to them. Two youth workers who were initially approached expressed interest but were not free at the time of the focus group. The researcher knew all but two of the participants.

**Structure of focus groups**

The first focus group was held in an informal room at the university and the second was held in a meeting room at a local youth service. The second group was held away from the university to promote an informal, relaxed environment in a context where participants would feel comfortable. Because some of the youth workers had not attended university, there was a possibility that it could have been a strange, threatening environment. This was not an issue with the first focus group because a number of the reference group meetings had been held in the same room as the focus group.

For both focus groups, chairs were arranged in a circle, so that all participants could easily make eye contact, around a low table for tea, coffee and refreshments. As people arrived they were offered a drink and asked to fill in a brief, anonymous form with details about their gender and extent of youth work experience, and were encouraged to take part in informal conversation. Focus groups typically last one to two hours (Morgan 1988, p. 42) and each of the focus groups was planned for two hours including the 10 to 15 minutes informal conversation at the start to help create a relaxed atmosphere and allow for late-comers. The first focus group took two and a quarter hours, which was unfortunate, especially as one participant had to leave before the group was concluded. After two hours the group was asked if they wanted to finish or continue and they decided to keep going. The second group finished just inside the two hours allotted.

Krueger (1994, pp. 54-55) proposes that focus groups involve five types of questions, each of which serves a different purpose:
1. Opening question – an introductory question, usually factually based, that everybody answers at the beginning of the focus group.

2. Introductory questions – questions introducing the general issue to help the group focus on the purpose of the focus group, and promote conversation and interaction among the participants.

3. Transition questions – questions that move the conversation towards the key questions involved in the research.

4. Key questions – questions that drive the study and are the main purpose of the research.

5. Ending questions – questions which bring closure to the discussion.

Following a brief introduction to the research and the purpose of the focus group, most of the focus group involved the researcher presenting research results and the model, and the participants being asked for their reactions. The key questions for the focus group related to the draft model of practice (Appendix 10). As a transition to these questions, principles of nonviolence and the results of the in-depth interviews were presented and discussed. Figure 8 - 2 shows the sequence of topics with examples of questions used.

The introductory phase was brief in both groups, particularly the first, because most participants had already met one another. The introductory question was not used in the first group because it had been covered in previous meetings. The order of the topics covered in the transition questions was changed for the two groups. In the first, an early draft of the principles of nonviolence had been presented at a reference group meeting, and so they were discussed first. In the second, the interview results were discussed first because it was an issue with which participants were more likely to be familiar. It is possible that the change of order impacted on the results of the two groups but it is unlikely that it was significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of question</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening question</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>What is your name and service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory questions</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>What is your interest in this issue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition questions</td>
<td>Principles of nonviolence</td>
<td>Which of these principles do you find most interesting or challenging?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any which concern you, or you think are inappropriate for youth work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think are the implications for youth work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results of in-depth interviews</td>
<td>Which of the results do you find most interesting or surprising?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think are the implications for practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key questions</td>
<td>Model of practice</td>
<td>What do you like about the model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What don’t you like about the model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What would you change in the model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there anything missing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific parts of the model</td>
<td>What term do you use to describe behaviour management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What term should be used in the model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How can a commitment to social justice be put into practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending questions</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to add?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8 - 2: Focus group topics and sample questions**

Two focus groups are less than normally recommended (Kitzinger 1994; Krueger 1994; Morgan 1988). Initially it was proposed to conduct two focus groups with youth workers and two with young people but with the decision to make the key question about the model of practice, the focus groups with young people were abandoned. Krueger’s (1994, p. 88) suggests that the first two groups of a relatively homogenous population produces a considerable amount of new information but after that the quantity of new information decreases. Ideally it would have been better to follow Krueger’s (1994, p. 88) recommendation of conducting three groups and then evaluating whether or not more were justified but time constraints meant this did not occur.
Role of the researcher

In focus group literature the person leading, facilitating or moderating the discussion is usually called the moderator. The moderator’s role is to promote group discussion and to guide the direction of the conversation (Krueger 1994; Morgan 1988). According to Greenbaum (1988, pp. 50-53) good moderators are:

- Quick learners with excellent memories so that they can quickly absorb the input from group members and remember who said what
- Friendly leaders so that they can develop rapport quickly
- Knowledgeable but not all knowing so that group members have confidence in them but do not treat them as experts
- Good listeners so that they are able to hear, and understand, what participants are saying
- Facilitators not performers so that the focus is on the discussion not entertainment
- Flexible so that they can follow the flow of the discussion
- Empathic so that they can help draw people out
- Able to focus on the big picture and not get lost in minor or unimportant details.

Morgan (1988, p. 48) argues that decisions about the level of moderator involvement are important and that there is a continuum from low to high involvement. In more structured focus groups where the level of moderator involvement is high, the moderator controls the topics discussed and the way in which group members interact (Morgan 1996, p. 144). In less structured focus groups where the moderator involvement is low, the moderator keeps his or her comments as nondirective as possible, and allows groups to manage themselves (Morgan 1988, pp. 48-49).

Because these focus groups involved presenting research findings, the researcher’s involvement in the groups was high, particularly with the second one in which he was given, or took on, the role of the expert (Greenbaum 1988, p. 51). Group members were often interested in what the research had found, or what other youth workers had thought. This was particularly the case in the second group because they had not seen the results before. There were occasions where the group could have focused more on
the beliefs and experience of participants rather than the views expressed during other phases but it was also important to respond to questions about the research so that the information flow was not one way.

The roles undertaken by the researcher in the focus groups were complex and, at times, competing. These roles included:

- Establishing the groups
- Introducing the purpose of the focus group and expectations of group members
- Creating a supportive, friendly atmosphere
- Presenting the principles of nonviolence, key results of the in-depth interviews, and the draft model of practice
- Asking questions
- Clarifying comments by participants
- Summarising key points arising from the discussion
- Answering questions about the research
- Monitoring the group to ensure that participants were not disinterested, intimidated or confused
- Ensuring the discussion remained focused on the key issues
- Encouraging participation by all group members
- Preventing some members from dominating the conversation too much
- Audio taping the groups and changing tapes when required
- Keeping track of time.

It may have helped if there had been a neutral facilitator who focused on the group process, and the researcher could have concentrated on presenting the research and answering questions. In particular, more could have been done in the second focus group to encourage the quieter, less experienced members to participate actively.

Transcription and data analysis

Not all that was said at the focus groups was transcribed. The main omissions were where the findings of the research were introduced, information about the results was provided, and discussion was not directly related to the topic. Copies of the
transcriptions and a summary of the main issues raised were sent to all participants and they were invited to make corrections or comments. In addition, a copy of the revised model was enclosed for comment. The data analysis continued the grounded theory approach as discussed in the previous chapter. Consistent with selective coding, the analysis was not as intense as earlier coding. The transcripts were, however, carefully examined in an attempt to discover findings that contradicted previous results.

**LIMITATIONS OF PHASE 3**

Limitations of other phases of the research also applied to this phase of the research because the design phase was dependent on the planning and implementation of earlier phases. In particular if more extensive information gathering and synthesis had been undertaken, the design phase might have proceeded differently. It was in the design phase where the differences between a positivist and heuristic paradigm (discussed in Chapter 5) were particularly significant. Mullen (1994) argues that dimensions such as “relative advantage, engineerability, compatibility with other design components, anticipated usability ... effectiveness, efficiency, risk, equity, and distributional consequences” (p. 178) should be addressed. The emphasis is on objective criteria consistent with a positivist approach. Consistent with the heuristic paradigm, the scale of this study, and the exploratory nature of the research, the design process relied more on practice wisdom, intuition and less objective criteria. This does not mean the resulting model is invalid or unwarranted but it does mean that further research and testing of the model in real situations are vital steps in the continuing research process.

As well as the limitations in the focus groups discussed above, there were a number of other limitations in the design phase. The limited involvement by young people in the design process was a result of the decision not to hold focus groups with young people. Although the focus groups were not appropriate for young people, it might have been possible to identify some other way in which they could have been involved, and this would have been desirable. Further discussion with youth workers about the model could also have been useful. The revised model could have been presented to a further series of focus groups for further refinement. In an attempt to address this, the model was sent to focus group participants with an invitation to provide feedback but there was little response.
QUALITY CONTROL

Despite limitations of the study, numerous measures were implemented in order to ensure the quality of the research and to produce a model which was as useful and practical as possible. There is ongoing debate about the best ways in which to ensure the quality of qualitative research (Flick 2002; Lincoln & Guba 1985; Marshall & Rossman 1989; Maykut & Morehouse 1994; Punch 1998; Seidman 1998), with the traditional approach focusing on reliability and validity, both internal and external, (Alston & Bowles 1998; Flick 2002; Neuman 1997; Punch 1987; Scale 1999).

Reliability is about consistency (Alston & Bowles 1998; Flick 2002). According to Neuman (1997), reliability means that “the information provided by indicators (e.g. a questionnaire) does not vary as a result of characteristics of the indicator, instrument, or measurement device itself” (p. 138). In quantitative research, research is reliable if similar results would be obtained if a different researcher conducted the study, or if the same researcher conducted the study at a different time or with a different, but similar, group of people (Alston & Bowles 1998, p. 51). Validity is about “measuring what the researcher wants to measure” (Alston & Bowles 1998, p. 48). Kirk and Miller (in Flick 2002) propose that the question of validity asks whether or not “the researcher sees what he or she thinks he or she sees” (p. 221). Research can be invalid if it identifies relations or principles when they are incorrect, rejects them even though they are correct, or asks the wrong question (Flick 2002, p. 222).

There are some who argue that these criteria are inappropriate for much qualitative research. Adopting the interpretive paradigm, Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Marshall and Rossman (1989) propose that these criteria should be replaced with the following four criteria:

- Credibility (in place of internal validity), which means that the results should accurately identify and describe the issue under investigation in a way that is credible to the informants or the “constructors of the original multiple realities” (Lincoln & Guba 1985, p. 296).
- Transferability (in place of external validity), which means that the report should contain sufficient detail so that decisions can be made about transferring the findings to related settings. According to Marshall and Rossman (1989), “the burden of
demonstrating the applicability of one set of findings to another context rests more
with the investigator who would make that transfer than with the original
investigator” (p. 145).

- Dependability (in place of reliability), which means that “the research attempts to
account for changing conditions in the phenomenon chosen for study as well as
changes in the design created by increasingly refined understanding of the setting”
(Marshall & Rossman 1989, pp. 146-147). Dependability is based on the recognition
that the social world is always changing and that the process of research influences
the people or issue being researched. It thus may not be possible to replicate the
results but it is possible to check the dependability of data and procedures (Flick

- Confirmability, which means that although the research might not be replicable it
should be conducted and reported in such a way that another person can confirm that
the results are credible and dependable (Marshall & Rossman 1989; Maykut &
Morehouse 1994).

Other researchers, however, argue that the traditional criteria are still relevant as long as
they are not understood in narrow positivist ways but in ways which are consistent with
qualitative research (Alston & Bowles 1998; Flick 2002; Punch 1998; Seale 1999).
Despite the differences, many of the strategies used to ensure the quality of qualitative
research are similar. As debates about terminology and philosophy are continuing, the
focus here is on reporting the steps taken to ensure the quality of the research. In
keeping with the aim of intervention research to improve interventions by practitioners,
the research is best evaluated by whether or not it was successful in meeting this aim.
To increase the likelihood of meeting this aim, the following measures (based on Flick
1998, 2002; Lincoln & Guba 1985; Seale 1999) were taken to protect the quality of the
research:

- Seeking negative cases
- Triangulation
- Building an audit trail
- Working with a reference group
- Member checks.
During the data analysis, negative cases were actively sought. Negative cases were pieces of data that did not support the findings or did not fit into the hierarchy of nodes. An example was that most of the youth workers believed that eviction was a necessary bottom line. One of the youth workers, however, had worked in a youth service that he believed successfully implemented a policy of no evictions. The analysis had to account for such differing perceptions.

Triangulation helps to ensure that findings are valid or credible by using “multiple and different sources, methods, investigators, and theories” (Lincoln & Guba 1985, p. 305). Rather than relying on information provided by one informant, the research relied on multiple sources of information: young people were interviewed as well as youth workers; services were based in rural, regional and urban settings; and informants from various types of youth service were surveyed and interviewed. Multiple sources also meant that themes that were identified by only one or two people were not given as much weight as themes that were identified by both youth workers and young people. The research involved multiple methods: a telephone survey, in-depth interviews and focus groups. The use of multiple investigators was not possible, and so the reference group and the Ph.D. supervisor were used to keep the research “more or less ‘honest’” (Lincoln & Guba 1985, p. 307). Lincoln and Guba (1985) reject the use of multiple theories because they argue that “facts are, in the first instance, theory-determined; they do not have an existence independent of the theory within whose framework they achieve coherence” (p.307). Others, however, argue that it can be useful strategy and can allow a variety of hypotheses or explanations to be explored (Flick 2002; Seale 1999). The process of drawing upon the theoretical perspectives underpinning youth work and nonviolence could be considered to be limited triangulation but it was not true theoretical triangulation as proposed by Denzin (1978).

Throughout the research, an audit trail was built. An audit trial involves establishing records that can be audited based on procedures used in financial audits (Flick 2002; Lincoln & Guba 1985). The audit trail included:

- The research proposal
- The ethics applications
- Annual reports prepared for the university
• Results of the pilot study
• The interview and focus group transcripts (the audio tapes, as required by the ethics application, were destroyed once participants had been given the opportunity to make any comments or corrections)
• Pre and post pilot versions of the telephone survey
• Survey results
• Summaries of interviews and focus groups
• A personal research journal with reflections on interviews and other parts of the research process
• Memos (some automatically generated by N4)
• Information prepared for the reference group and supervision sessions
• Research updates
• Emails sent to online discussion groups
• Papers prepared for conferences and other seminars
• Saved versions of N4 showing the way in which coding progressed
• Lists of nodes made as the coding progressed
• Saved versions of thesis chapters
• The completed thesis.

Even though there was no formal audit, the actual process of creating an audit trail assisted in improving the quality of the research (Lincoln & Guba 1985, p. 319). The reference group and Ph.D. supervisor also addressed some of the tasks of an audit (Seale 1999, p. 142) and were important features of the research quality assurance.

Member checks are processes in which “data, analytic categories, interpretations, and conclusions are tested with members of those stakeholding groups from whom the data were originally collected” (Lincoln & Guba 1985, p 314). Member checks were conducted in a variety of ways including:

• Paraphrasing and checking what participants said
• Providing participants with the opportunity to comment on, or make corrections to, the transcripts of interviews and focus groups
• Providing research updates to participants in the study and other interested people
• Presentations at youth work conferences and interagencies
• Presenting summaries of key issues to online discussion groups
• Presenting findings and the draft model to the focus groups
• Reporting to the reference group.

Having described the methodology used in the research, the following two chapters present the findings from the telephone survey and the in-depth interviews.
SECTION III

RESEARCH FINDINGS
Chapter 9
Telephone Survey

This chapter discusses the results of the telephone survey of youth workers exploring current practice and the context of the research. The complete results are in Appendix 2. The aims of the survey were to:

• Investigate whether or not violence and nonviolence were issues of concern for youth workers
• Explore how non-violent\(^2\) and inclusive youth workers perceived their services to be
• Identify current work practices
• Identify issues for further exploration through in-depth interviews with youth workers and young people.

THE PARTICIPANTS

The range of youth workers surveyed was influenced by the fact that while the services were selected through a stratified random sample, the youth workers themselves were not (see Chapter six). In particular, youth service coordinators (63.3%) and females (73.3%) were over represented. The youth workers surveyed ranged in experience from three months to 23 years, with a mean of seven and a half years. Ten percent had worked less than two years and 26.6% had worked more than ten.

Consistent with other studies of youth workers:

• The participants worked mainly in fairly small services. The services ranged in size from ones with only one or two part time staff, through to two services with 30 full time staff as well as part time and/or casual staff. Nearly two thirds (63.3%) had less than four full time staff.

\(^2\) Note that non-violence is used here rather than nonviolence because it is referring to the absence of violence rather than the philosophy of nonviolence.
They were mostly employed under the New South Wales Social and Community Services industrial award (63.3%).

They provided a range of services, particularly information and referral, recreational activities, counselling, mediation, social and life skill development, accommodation, and educational and training programs.

They worked in services consisting mainly of paid staff. Nearly two thirds (63.3%) worked in services with no volunteers and a further 21.6% of the services had only one or two volunteers.

**IMPORTANCE OF VIOLENCE AND NONVIOLENCE AS ISSUES**

Nearly all the youth workers believed that it was very important youth workers:

- Assisted young people to develop conflict resolution skills (97% agreed or strongly agreed)
- Developed violence prevention strategies (97% agreed or strongly agreed)
- Developed a culture of nonviolence in their youth service (100% agreed or strongly agreed).

When asked how well youth services dealt with violence, however, only 30% agreed or strongly agreed that youth services generally dealt with violent situations very well. As can be seen in Figure 9 - 1, just over half (51.7%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and comments made during the interviews indicated that this response related to a perception that some youth services did respond well to violence but others did not. These results may have been influenced by the knowledge that the research was exploring cultures of nonviolence in youth services and so it could be expected that the researcher believed that conflict resolution, violence prevention and nonviolence were all important. Despite the potentially biased results, they provide an indication that the research addressed issues of relevance to youth workers. Care also needs to be taken in interpreting the results in relation to how well youth services responded to violence. The question was not asking about the youth workers’ own services but was asking about youth services in general, and the results may have been different if the youth workers had been asked about their own service.
Figure 9 - 1: Agreement that youth services generally deal with violence very well

PERCEIVED LEVELS OF NON-VIOLENCE AND INCLUSIVENESS

Youth workers were asked a number of questions about how violent or non-violent and how accepting or unaccepting of minority groups they thought that their services were. Overall, they were much more likely to describe their service as being non-violent or very non-violent (65.0%) than violent or very violent (20.0%). In order to explore their perceptions of violence and non-violence in more detail, they were asked about physical violence, verbal violence and emotional or psychological violence between young people, young people towards staff, staff towards young people and between staff. The youth workers believed that young people were more likely to be violent than youth workers and that verbal and emotional or psychological violence were more likely than physical violence (see Table 9 - 1).
Table 9 - 1: Perceived level of violence in services (n=60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Violent or very violent</th>
<th>Neither non-violent nor violent</th>
<th>Non-violent or very non-violent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between young people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence between young people.</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence between young people.</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional or psychological violence between young people.</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young people towards staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence by young people towards staff.</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence by young people towards staff.</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional or psychological violence by young people towards staff.</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff towards young people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence by staff towards young people.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence by staff towards young people.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional or psychological violence by staff towards young people.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence between staff.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence between staff.</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional or psychological violence between staff.</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that the youth workers believed that they had to deal with verbal and emotional violence by young people more than they had to deal with physical violence, and more youth workers believed that the young people were physically non-violent than believed that they were physically violent. Instead of physical violence being the main concern, it appears as if general behavioural issues such as verbal abuse, intimidation and other forms of verbal and emotional violence were more of a problem. Violence prevention typically seeks to prevent physical and extreme violence, rather than verbal and emotional violence (Atkinson, Indermaur & Blagg 1998; Cameron 2000; National Committee on Violence 1990) and so the results were interpreted as indicating that youth workers also needed to focus on general behaviour management. Interpreting the results in this way involves inferring what the youth workers meant by verbal and emotional violence as the survey did not define, nor ask the youth workers to define, their meaning. This interpretation is supported by the few comments made by youth workers in relation to these questions and the in-depth interviews discussed in the next chapter. The comments made during the survey suggested that the youth workers
included things like “name calling”, “blowing their top”, “paying out” and even “innuendo” in their understanding of verbal and emotional violence.

According to the youth workers, the young people were less likely to be violent towards them than to be violent towards other young people, and once again verbal and emotional violence were more likely than physical violence. As far as the actions of youth workers were concerned, the youth workers believed that they were non-violent with a few youth workers suggesting there was some verbal or emotional violence between staff. Other comments made during the survey suggested that:

- Some youth workers were aware of the potential for violence most of the time.
  
  There is always potential for violence.
  
  I always work as if it is.
  
  Often there has been the threat of violence. We have to be careful.

- Some youth workers saw violence at their youth service as being fairly normal, or were numb to the violence.
  
  You might say it’s pretty violent – I’m numb to it. I’m not sure if it’s violent or not.
  
  Other people, including other staff, say its violent. [From a worker who described her service as being very non-violent.]
  
  No-one’s been hit for a while.

- Some youth workers believed the level of violence fluctuated over time, sometimes depending on which young people were at the service.
  
  12 months ago, it would have been a 1 or 2 [violent or very violent]. The young people are still recovering from it. [From a youth worker who described his service as being non-violent.]
  
  Things have changed. Fourteen months ago, there was more violence and I felt unsafe coming to work.
  
  Six months ago, it was hell.

Perceptions of violence are subjective and differ from individual to individual (Lamplugh & Pagan 1996). Differences in the perceptions about what constituted violence were demonstrated in some of the comments made during the survey. As one
worker asked, “Is raising your voice violence?” When asked about emotional violence by staff, another commented, “I need to use that strategy occasionally.” A third wanted to differentiate between discipline and violence. Within the same service different staff, or young people, might have varying perceptions about the levels of violence. This was recognised by the youth worker quoted above who said that other staff saw the service as being violent. Another worker who described her service as being non-violent, later talked about young people punching holes in the walls, burning things, swearing, and displaying behaviour that other workers might have considered fairly violent. Another one commented that she had not realised the level of violence where she had worked until she encountered a non-violent environment.

When asked how accepting or unaccepting of marginalised groups of young people their services were, as would be expected, the youth workers stated that they believed the young people were much less accepting than the youth workers. As Table 9 - 2 shows, the youth workers believed that gay and lesbian young people were the group least likely to be accepted by other young people in a service. Approximately the same number of youth workers believed that young people were unaccepting of young people with a mental illness as those who believed that they were accepting. The youth workers believed that, in most cases, staff were accepting of minority groups. Only a very small proportion suggested that youth workers were unaccepting of gay and lesbian young people and young people with a mental illness. A few of the youth workers commented that the lower level of acceptance by youth workers of young people with a mental illness was due to a lack of skills or resources in the youth service, and difficulties in dealing with the behaviour of young people who were mentally ill. It is likely that these results were unreliable as youth workers would have been reluctant to describe themselves or their fellow staff as being unaccepting, and so levels of acceptance may have been lower than indicated.
Table 9 - 2: Perceived levels of acceptance of marginalised young people in services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of acceptance</th>
<th>Unaccepting or Very Unaccepting</th>
<th>Neither Accepting nor Unaccepting</th>
<th>Accepting or Very Accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and lesbian young people (n=60)</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people from a non English speaking background (n=58)</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous young people (n=57)</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a mental illness (n=55)</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a physical disability (n=57)</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and lesbian young people (n=60)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people from a non English speaking background (n=58)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous young people (n=59)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a mental illness (n=58)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a physical disability (n=60)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, comments made during the survey suggest that:

- Some youth services may appear to be fairly accepting of minority groups but in reality minority groups did not use the service and may not have been very accepted if they did.
- Young people may have tolerated minority groups but not accept them.
- While some young people appeared to be quite unaccepting (e.g. when talking about Kooris or gays and lesbians), they could be more accepting when they had direct contact with people from minority groups.
- Young people in the same youth service could range from those who were very accepting to those who were very unaccepting.
- Young males were less accepting than young females of gays and lesbians.
- Some youth services had established special programs for minority groups to address discrimination or the under representation of minority groups.

**CURRENT WORK PRACTICE**

The youth workers were asked about issues related to work practice in order to gain some insight into the ways in which they perceived their services’ operations. The questions were based on pilot in-depth interviews and focus groups identifying potential
characteristics of youth services with culture of nonviolence. The six characteristics were that:

1. There were positive staff relationships and teamwork
2. The youth workers respected the young people
3. The youth workers used appropriate behaviour management strategies
4. The staff acted as role models for the young people
5. The services had adequate resources
6. The services had appropriate policies in place.

The survey addressed each of these issues. As the pilot study had not identified appropriate behaviour management, this issue was explored by asking whether or not the behaviour management strategies were based on conflict resolution skills and whether or not they were consistent from youth worker to youth worker. Most of the youth workers surveyed believed that their service followed what would be considered desirable for good youth work practice. The only exception, as is shown in Table 9 - 3, was that more youth workers disagreed (45.0%) than agreed (40.0%) that they had the resources needed to provide a high quality, non-violent service. In addition, 59.6% of the staff agreed that the behaviour management strategies used varied depending on which staff were on duty. Although consistency is often emphasised in behaviour management, these results do not show whether the youth workers believed it was desirable or undesirable that behaviour management strategies varied. It could have been perceived as a negative characteristic, or it could have been perceived as a positive characteristic as was indicated by some of the comments made during the survey:

Different styles work for different people

Even though team members strive for consistency, individual staff approaches will always be different but the desired outcome would be the same.

Once again, these results do not necessarily reflect what occurs in youth services. It is likely that the youth workers presented their services in the best possible light, or perceived their work practice differently to the way in which young people would have described it. The responses to the questions about staff operating as a cohesive team and the staff acting with great respect towards young people, however, were consistent with
the levels of emotional violence between staff and the levels of violence by staff toward young people.

Table 9 - 3: Work practice in the youth services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree or strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree or strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The staff operate as a cohesive team. (n=56)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behaviour management strategies used by staff demonstrate poor conflict resolution skills. (n=60)</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff act with great respect towards the young people who use our service. (n=60)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have the resources we need to provide a high quality, nonviolent service. (n=60)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behaviour management strategies used, vary depending on which staff are on duty. (n=57)</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff act as nonviolent role models for the young people who use our service. (n=60)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are rarely involved in decision making. (n=60)</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The youth workers were also asked about their organisation’s policies. The policies that were specifically explored (with the percentage of youth workers who reported that their service had the policy) were:

- Complaints policy (91.7%)
- Access and equity policy (78.3%)
- Dispute resolution policy (75.0%)
- Discipline policy (in relation to young people not staff) (63.3%)
- Behaviour management policy (53.3%).

Given that youth services face significant challenges in managing behaviour, it is noteworthy that many services did not have behaviour management or discipline policies. The youth workers were not asked about the difference between behaviour management and discipline policies and this is an issue that could be investigated further.

In addition, youth workers identified a number of other policies that they believed were relevant in creating a culture of nonviolence. The main policies identified through the open-ended question were:
• Occupational health and safety policy
• Safety and security policy
• Staff code of conduct
• House rules and code of conduct for young people
• Violence and aggression policy.

ISSUES FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

Two open-ended questions helped identify issues for further exploration through the in-depth interviews:

• What would you say are the main barriers, if any, to your service having a culture of nonviolence?
• What do you think would help your service develop a culture of nonviolence?

Nine youth workers (15.0%) said that there were no barriers to creating, or that they already had, a culture of nonviolence. The other responses were collated into broad and more detailed categories. The broader categories related to where the barrier lay: in the young people, in the staff, in the service, in the youth sector, or in the wider society (see Table 9 - 4). The barriers were most often seen as lying in the young people themselves or the youth service. They are listed in Table 9 – 5.

Table 9 - 4: Location of barriers to having a culture of nonviolence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Barrier</th>
<th>Youth workers identifying focus (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth service</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sector</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider society</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common barrier to having a culture of nonviolence (identified by 25% of the youth workers) was the past experience of young people, especially their experience of violence. Responses included:

A lot of clients we’re working with have grown up in an environment where violence is perfectly natural.
Violence is a learnt behaviour for many of the young people using the centre.

The young people come from a culture where violence is the norm.

**Table 9 - 5: Barriers to having a culture of nonviolence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Youth workers identifying barrier (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young people</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past experience of young people</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and behaviour of young people</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to train young people</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of peers</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and other drugs use</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of skills and expertise in staff (including lack of training)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and behaviour of staff</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict/inconsistency in team</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources (including solo staff)</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor management (e.g. poor supervision of staff, lack of policies)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate service delivery model</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment of service</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support and staff burnout</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of other services</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS Award</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral process (e.g. not knowing enough about the background of clients)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of other services on young person</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider society</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The society we live in</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of mass media</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political climate</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of resources, including lack of funds, lack of staff and lack of other resources, was the second most common barrier.

Resources are short so we don’t have time to put into developing a culture of nonviolence.

Lack of funding… we would have liked to implement a program for people being abusive but couldn’t do it.

Only one staff on at a time and so there is a limit to what they can do.
The attitudes and behaviour of young people was identified by 16.7% of the youth workers:

- Lack of respect towards staff by young people.
- Clients’ inability to accept differences in other people.
- The young people themselves - very judgmental.

Also identified by 16.7% of the youth workers was lack of staff skills and expertise, and the need for more training:

- Need workshops on this [how to work nonviolently].
- More training needed for relief staff.
- Sometimes staff can be inappropriate due to lack of expertise and training.
- Worker skills and competencies. They have the right attitudes but lack confidence and skills.

Many of the barriers identified by the youth workers were beyond the direct control of individual youth workers or youth services. The past experience of youth, the lack of resources, and community services, the Social and Community Services award, the impact of other services on young people, gender issues, the society we live in, the influence of mass media, the political climate, and cultural issues, were all essentially beyond the control of individual youth workers or youth services. To a lesser extent, so were the use of alcohol and other drugs, the physical environment of the service and lack of time. Many of these could be addressed only by significant social change, changes to the context in which youth work occurs or in the event of increased funding and resources.

Most of the responses to the question about strategies to help create a culture of nonviolence related to issues directly under the control of individual youth workers or youth services (see Tables 9 - 6 and 9 - 7). Seven people (11.7%) said their service already had a culture of nonviolence (compared to nine people who said their service had a culture of nonviolence when asked about barriers). The focus of strategies could once again be grouped under the young people, the staff, the service, the youth sector or the wider society. In addition, three youth workers (5.0%) identified families as being a
focus for strategies. The most common foci for strategies were the staff and the youth service.

Table 9 - 6: Focus of strategies to developing a culture of nonviolence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Youth workers identifying focus (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young People</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sector</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Society</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common strategy to assist their service create a culture of nonviolence (identified by 35% of the youth workers) was to provide more training for the youth workers or to improve their skills.

  - Training in conflict resolution for staff.
  - Training in mental illness and how to deal with violent clients.
  - Need to look at training of youth workers in TAFE and Uni and also the quality of teachers.

More resources was the second most common strategy suggested (23.3%) and included more funds, more staff and more time.

  - We need a higher ratio of staff to young people.
  - Be well funded and well staffed.
  - Providing 24-hour support.

Staff commitment, perseverance and awareness was identified by 13.3% of the youth workers, and 11.7% identified training young people in conflict resolution and nonviolence.

  - Perseverance and commitment of staff.
  - Belief we can do it.
  - Keep going over that this is a safe place.
  - Training for young people including conflict resolution and self esteem.
Table 9 - 7: Strategies to help develop a culture of nonviolence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Youth workers identifying strategy (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of young people</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of youth workers</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff commitment, perseverance and awareness</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff selection and management</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication and relationships between staff</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stress and strain for staff</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way in which staff respond to violence</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources (including more staff and more time)</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good management/policies</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate programs</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less or different clients</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change model of service delivery</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between youth services and/or schools</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a variety of services</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider Society</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change government policy</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with families</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to the two open-ended questions helped refocus the research from creating cultures of nonviolence in youth services to developing a model of nonviolent youth work practice. The results suggested that many of the barriers to creating a culture of nonviolence were beyond the direct control of youth workers but there were numerous strategies that youth workers and youth services could implement. By focusing on a model of nonviolent practice, the research focused on issues that were in the direct control of youth workers and would form an important base for developing a culture of nonviolence. It was also interesting that the youth workers did not identify the way in which they managed behaviour as being significant. Besides the two workers who identified improving the way in which staff responded to violence as a strategy for creating a culture of nonviolence, managing behaviour was not discussed. Earlier results had indicated that youth workers needed to address behaviour by young people that was physically, verbally or emotionally violent, or not accepting of minority groups, and yet the youth workers did not identify the way in which they responded to these behaviours as being important. The principle of nonviolence that means should be consistent with
the desired ends, led to the decision that the way in which youth workers managed
behaviour needed to be a major focus of the in-depth interviews.

The survey was an initial exploration of issues facing youth services in relation to
nonviolence. As it was developed when the research was conceptualised in terms of
violence prevention, the survey focused on violence prevention rather than on a
philosophy of nonviolence. At the same time, it provided useful information for further
exploration in the in-depth interviews, the findings of which are discussed in the next
chapter.
Chapter 10

The In-Depth Interviews

This chapter presents the findings emerging from in-depth interviews with young people and youth workers about their perceptions of violence and discrimination within their services; ways in which youth workers prevent and respond to disruptive, violent and unsafe behaviour; and ways in which youth work practice can be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence.

VIOLENCE/NON-VIOLENCE

As in the telephone survey, the young people and youth workers interviewed generally did not believe that their youth services were particularly violent places. While some of the youth workers said that other services were violent, only Ken\(^3\) described his service as being violent at one time.

Ken: They were out of control, that time was incredible. Most of those guys are now in Long Bay [a maximum-security prison]... At that time [mid 1990s], we had a core group of about 35 boys and probably 10 or 15 girls that regularly came... And of that 35, the vast majority ended up as ram raiders and armed robbers and attempted murderers... [The behaviour at the time was] the most extreme stuff you could possibly imagine. Coppers came in and shook their head. “How the hell do you do this?” A psych nurse friend of mine came in one day and was blown away. Couldn’t possibly work in this environment... It was controlled mayhem, and nothing more.

Of the young people, only Kat spoke about feeling unsafe.

Kat: Staying in refuges you do see the violence and it’s pretty much always coming from the young person themselves, although other young people have experiences of youth workers being violent towards them. Yeah, you walk into a crazy situation, you don’t know what to think or what to do, or why you are there even. Like, you feel like you’re safer out on the streets.

\(^3\) Names of young people are in italics, and names of youth workers are in Roman type.
Ken and Kat, however, were exceptions. Justin described his service as having very little violence: only occasional verbal outbursts, tantrums or lashing out. Katie said, “I never had anyone raise their voice towards me, or threaten me, or anything like that.” The young people also said that most of the youth services they used had little violence besides some verbal abuse, threats or intimidating behaviour. Although there were exceptions, physical fights were usually taken away from the youth service. Isabell found that most youth services had a “very calm, nonviolent attitude” but that she knew of instances where youth workers had been “physically assaulted for standing up for a particular group of people.”

Although most of the services were described as being non-violent, there were numerous examples of physical and verbal violence. There were reports of punch ups, groups of other young people coming to a service looking for a fight, a worker being locked in a cupboard, damage to property (smashing windows, punching holes in walls and throwing things around), self harm, and people using weapons, such as a knife or a bow and arrow. Jake discussed a time when there was “constant and unbelievably abusive harassment of staff.” Kat described a youth service as feeling like “World War III” because a young girl was “yelling and screaming, smashing pot plants, belting anything.” Curley spoke of a boy who was coming into the youth service on a regular basis who made other young people feel unsafe because he used stand over tactics such as “If you don’t give me a game of pool I’m going to snap this cue over your head.” The youth workers also recognised that other people might feel threatened by the language and behaviour of the young people in youth services but that some of the fear could be related to societal perceptions of young people.

Linda: I feel OK in my centre, but if I was walking down the street and came across a large group of young people, I would feel threatened... I think that just causes a natural fear. Especially with stories that go around - you know, of late we’ve had a couple of unprovoked beatings by groups of young people where money hasn’t even been stolen... So that makes people a bit fearful I think.

While most of the examples of violence were of violence by young people, there were also examples of violence and the clear abuse of power by staff. Jake and Ross identified incidents where youth workers were sexually abusing young people; and Katie discussed a male youth worker who was “quite rude to young people and would
swear at them and physically push them.” Amanda had been called “a slut, and a whore” and was accused of “rooting” her boyfriend by a youth worker. Megan described a situation where male youth workers used their physical strength to intimidate young people.

Megan: When I first got here, [I noticed] that there was quite a bit of stand over stuff happening. The power play was not to do with philosophical power or any of those sorts of things; it was real physical power. Had some big lads here, and obviously their [the service’s] response to dealing with things in the past was to get big lads [as youth workers], you know, and big security looking lads almost. And what happened was that that provoked the kids into challenging their behaviours.... And these guys, being quite big and being what they were, were very physically intimidating over these kids and pretty much like, “Well, go on, take a swing at me. You take a swing at me and then I can therefore deck you, and I will deck you because I’m bigger than you.”

**DISCRIMINATION**

Discrimination was explored as a form of covert violence that grows from structural violence. The level and nature of discrimination, particularly sexism, homophobia and racism, were discussed with the youth workers and, to a lesser extent, the young people.

**Sexism**

There is a close relationship between gender and violence (Atkinson, Indermaur & Blagg 1998; Fawcett et al. 1996; Lynch 2002). As there has traditionally been a focus on young males in youth work, sexism and the relationship between gender and violence were important issues in the interviews. There were numerous examples of the way in which sexism impacted on services. The language used, mainly by young males in the services, was at times quite derogatory of women. Speedy, when asked what made a good youth worker, said, “A good decent looking chick.” While discussing other issues, Miranda and Megan mentioned verbal abuse which was sexist in nature (“Fuck off bitch,” “White cunt”) and Amanda was called a “slut and a whore” by a youth worker.
Ken, Miranda, Katie and Wayne all mentioned the fact that boys dominated youth centres but only Katie raised it as a problem. As well as being concerned that the pool tables (often found in youth centres) were dominated by young males, generated sexist comments and were often quite intimidating for young females, she believed that it was important for workers to promote equal participation.

**Katie:** Youth services are typically dominated by young men and that’s not okay (laughs). A youth worker that’s serious should be having equal participation by young women and young men, and people need to put in specific strategies so that young women are actively involved with their service... But I think you really need specific strategies for involving young women and other groups in the community.

Miranda and Megan discussed situations where their gender had been an issue with male service users. Miranda suggested that some of the boys did not listen to her because she was female. She gave an example where a young male, who had been refusing to leave the centre, later told her that he had felt that “in front of all the guys he couldn’t let a woman tell him what to do.” Megan had physically restrained a boy who had been throwing things around the room and, as she calmed the situation down, two other boys called out, “You just got done by a chick, you just got done by a chick,” which set the boy off again. Katie and Ross also discussed the way in which male youth workers were sometimes hired because they were seen as being stronger and able to “intimidate” young people, and were thus seen as being better at controlling them.

At times, there was a lack of awareness of some of the factors involved in addressing gender issues. One of the male youth workers appeared to understand sexism as a female issue and said that he believed that “female workers need to be telling us if there is an issue.” Rather than seeing sexism as an issue which male youth workers should address, he appeared to suggest that responding to sexism was the responsibility of the female staff. When there had been some problems with sexual assault in the area, his response was to teach girls self-defence. While this might have been an appropriate response, it would have also been important to challenge the behaviour of the boys. Another male worker who spoke about his service as having no “gender issues,” spoke about some of the girls being “Tom boys” and that some of the girls wanted to do more “girlie stuff.”
The interviews suggested that the relationship between gender and violence was not straightforward. Although there was clearly a link between males and violence, it would be misleading to see it purely as a male issue. Males, both young people and youth workers, were more likely to be involved in abusive, controlling or physically violent behaviour. At the same time, there were numerous examples where females were also involved in such behaviour, and where male workers responded nonviolently. Even youth workers who were aware of sexism, gender and violence, believed that both males and females used violence and coercion. Katie discussed a male youth worker who was quite rude to young people and would swear at them and physically push them but she also knew a female worker who demonstrated the same behaviour. Miranda identified some female workers who used to swear at young people and attempted to “get the upper hand” by being more aggressive than the young people themselves.

As Miranda suggested, responding to sexism was often very hard because it was “so ingrained.” Although the behaviour of both males and females needs to be addressed if youth services are to become nonviolent, the socialisation of males and patriarchal structures mean that work with males is particularly challenging. Issues identified through the interviews include:

- Males were more likely to be involved in the extreme examples of violence, such as sexual abuse, use of weapons and domestic violence.
- Male youth workers were more likely to “have a tougher, more ferocious presence” and to be seen as “physically intimidating.”
- Music played by young people in youth services, such as Eminem and Niggers With Attitude, often had lyrics that were quite degrading of women and homosexuals.
- According to Megan, male workers were likely to “fall into the trap” of setting inappropriate boundaries in their relations with young people “a hell of a lot more than young female workers.” As well as the crossing of boundaries involved in sexual abuse, Megan suggested that males were more likely to try to be friends with young people in ways that could create problems.
- There was a danger that boys in youth services would not respect female workers or would attempt to challenge their authority.
Racism and homophobia

Although some youth workers were concerned about the level of discrimination in their service and others were not, there did not appear to be a great difference in the level of discrimination. The difference appeared to be in the priority given to it as an issue by the youth workers. Some youth workers appeared to think it was not a priority for their attention, while others believed that homophobic or racist language and behaviour needed to be challenged and that youth workers had a role to play in promoting greater acceptance.

Some youth workers believed that there was little need to respond because, while there might be racist or homophobic language and some teasing (within the normal range of teasing according to Belinda), there was little actual discrimination.

**Graeme:** Do you have many problems with discrimination, so homophobia, racism, sexism?

**Ken:** Very, very rare. What I have found, particularly with estate kids, they are a tight homogenous bunch. Generally, they have their own rules and their own boundaries, and they don’t necessarily marry very well with societal rules and boundaries. They have their own little club rules. But, for the most part, they don’t see black and white, and because they are so marginalised and the groups, you know, the racism, and discrimination is generally towards marginalised people in our society. They don’t tend to have that issue. I will hear racist comments that generally don’t even incite response, because it’s almost club members, you know, between themselves. I don’t see many issues at all between black and white.

Some youth workers believed that it was important to respond even to racist or homophobic language because it made discrimination more acceptable.

**Robyn:** If I hear or observe that sort of thing I just come in and immediately challenge it and never - the same with sexist remarks, same with people having a go at people with a disability or whatever it might be - not ever letting a remark go by unchallenged. And that means you’re on your toes all the time talking to people. But it allows them not to become complacent and they know - sometimes they say something and before they’ve even finished the sentence they’ll look and go, “I know Robyn is going to say blah, blah, blah” and it’s like, “Well yes, because it’s not appropriate that you speak like that.”
It is likely that the extent of racism or homophobia was not necessarily apparent to some of the workers. Two young Kooris interviewed described their experience of racism at the youth service which ended in a brawl, despite the youth worker saying that the service did not have any problems with racism and that he had not seen any problems. Megan also suggested that, while homophobia may not be as obvious as 10 or 15 years ago, it was still a major problem.

**Megan:** I think this is probably the distinction; they don’t actually have any major problems with gays or lesbians, or the notion of them. But, if a gay or lesbian tried to actually hit on them, that’s a completely different story, and homophobia is still just as strong. And that’s the difference I think. That in most youth centres and drop-in centres and youth places, they’re not going to be approached. It may be discussed and, you know, adults like myself may be around, but they’re not going to have to deal with it, confront it. Some other young boy isn’t going to sit next to some other lad and put a move on him in a youth centre. So, it just doesn’t happen. So they don’t have to deal with it on that level, so they can keep it out there. But I think it is still just as strong in the day to day functioning of it.

**MANAGING BEHAVIOUR**

As Chapter 11 identifies, some youth workers in the focus groups felt uncomfortable with the terms behaviour management and managing behaviour but were unable to identify a suitable alternative. Despite its limitations, managing behaviour is used in this discussion to include strategies for both preventing disruptive or inconsiderate behaviour, responding to it when it occurred and promoting considerate, safe and nonviolent behaviour (Porter 2000a). Disruptive or inconsiderate behaviour included violence, discrimination and unsafe behaviour. Even though this study focused on nonviolence, managing behaviour was much broader than preventing and responding to violence. Youth workers frequently faced behaviour that, while not violent, was inconsistent with a philosophy of nonviolence and, rather than simply responding to problems as they occurred, youth workers needed to be proactive in promoting a positive environment and preventing problems from escalating.
The youth workers and young people identified diverse strategies for managing behaviour that could be placed on a continuum from coercive to non-coercive responses. Coercive responses such as physical restraint, calling the police and exclusion, involved “doing to” young people rather than “working with” them (Kohn 1996) and took away their choice or control. Non-coercive responses, such as creating a positive environment, meeting the needs of young people and mediation, involved “working with” young people without dominating or forcing them to adopt specific behaviour.

**NON-COERCIVE STRATEGIES**

Non-coercive strategies supported young people, gave them choices and assisted them to adopt behaviour that was considerate and did not disrupt others. The focus was usually on creating a positive environment and preventing disruptive, violent, unsafe or disrespectful behaviour. Strategies included building good relationships with young people, understanding and working with group dynamics, negotiation and mediation, establishing boundaries and structure, teamwork, and prevention.

**Building relationships**

Building relationships was seen as being vital to good youth work and managing behaviour. While young people generally did not talk in terms of building relationships with youth workers, they did suggest that a good youth service depended on workers who cared about young people, were friendly, related well to young people and were supportive. These characteristics helped the youth workers build a good relationship with the young people and to be more effective.

*Amanda:* Oh she was really nice... She understood what it was like, I mean even if she hadn’t been there, she still understood that you were having a rough time and she really like had empathy for your situation. And these other ladies working in the centre, like full on just didn’t give a rat’s ass. They were just there for the money and they couldn’t care less, it was just a job to them. But for her it was a real passion. And I think that’s what makes a great youth worker. I think if you don’t have a passion for youth then you shouldn’t be in the field because it doesn’t pay that well anyway
(laughs). I think it’s just - I hate to see youth workers out there without a passion for youth because I’ve seen how much damage they can cause. It’s really horrible.

**Graeme:** So what do you like about him?

**Jade:** He makes jokes and stuff.

**Amber:** He mucks around.

**Jade:** Whenever you walk in the youth centre he always makes sure like he says hello to you.

**Amber:** Even when you’re out of the youth centre.

**Tia:** One that you can talk to and relate to and that. They can tell your problems, like and that’s fun and that.

**Iggy:** Someone that’s kind and fair, yeah.

Without a good relationship, workers struggled not only in managing behaviour but in being an effective worker. Megan discussed a situation where young people were giving a gay worker a hard time, and her response assisted him to build relationships with the young people.

**Megan:** It was a matter of me having to sit down with him and saying, “We have to create some worth for you. You need to be worth something for this to go away... These kids have to find a worth in you and that will get rid of all the antagonism, and name-calling, the everything else. If they have a reason to see you, or you can actually provide them with something, then that will go.” So he got heavily into the music program, and was very, very good at music, and helped the kids lay their own CDs, and it all disappeared, you know, his issues, because he become something to them, he could offer something to them, plus the interactions and it just went away. But if he’d just remained a drop-in worker upstairs, which is mainly just supervision in their own space, he was just open to getting bagged. You know, “There’s 10 minutes before the play station, let’s go and have a go at so-and-so.”

More specifically, good relationships were an important component of managing behaviour because non-coercive strategies were more likely to be successful if there were good relationships. Ross believed that having a clear, well-defined and very strong relationship was vital to working with young people, because it increased the likelihood that they would listen to youth workers even when the young people were extremely
angry. Jake suggested that youth workers needed to build a positive relationship so that young people would not say, “Fuck it, who gives a stuff,” but instead, because the staff valued the young people and made a commitment to them, be willing to make a commitment to the service and the staff. Without this commitment, young people had little to lose by being disruptive or inconsiderate. Curley spoke about his respect for Jason and the importance of this.

Curley: I’ve got a lot of respect for Jason. He’s done a lot for me and for Speedy. He’s done a lot to respect. I’ve got that much respect for Jason. If he asked us to do something for him, we do it for him. In return, we’d get something.

Graeme: So what do you think would happen if you didn’t respect him? Then what would it be like?

Curley: I wouldn’t turn up, I wouldn’t do nothing for him. I wouldn’t - If people don’t have respect for me, I don’t have respect back for them.

Having good relationships allowed youth workers to adopt a “low key, gentle response,” remain non-threatening, remind young people about expectations of behaviour, and use their power appropriately. Amanda suggested that youth workers could remain calm, focus on the young person’s good behaviour and “coax them to not do what they are doing.” Boris and Bogg spoke of a “low-key” response as follows:

Boris: Say it’s something small, they go -
Bogg: “Keep it down.”
Boris: “Pardon” or “we don’t want to hear that.”
Bogg: Yeah.
Boris: If it was something you know loud or dirty, they’d say that... But they’d say it in a nice way. Like the tone of their voice is nice and -
Graeme: Right, so it’s not really -
Bogg: They’re not telling you what to do.
Boris: It’s, “Hey, stop it.” It’s something like that.
Graeme: So it’s not threatening or -
Bogg: No, it’s like, “Keep it down” (softly)
Boris: Or they just go, “Ay.”
Bogg: Yeah (laughs).
Boris: Like just to let you know that you’ve said something wrong.
Low-key or non-coercive responses were often connected with increasing young people’s awareness of the impact their behaviour had on others and with attempts to elicit alternative, nonviolent forms of behaviour. Rose believed that youth workers could address pertinent issues by mingling with young people, engaging in relaxed, casual conversations and “educating by stealth.” Justin argued that some of the young people might not have had many people with whom they could discuss situations and so this was an important role. He suggested that youth workers could assist young people to identify their feelings and to consider options. “You can go and smash this window if you like or there’s a punching bag out the back, or there’s a soccer ball.” While the approach could be more formal, it was usually informally done through conversation individually or in groups.

**Rose:** I have a personal motto, you can’t reason with somebody who is being unreasonable. So I work on the theory here of, let them be, let them get it out. And when they’re finished - it’s like a tornado. Because their anger can be very physical, whether it’s verbal or physical, or they’ll come back and tell us, “Oh you know what I did? I smashed my painting and I did this.” And then we can start to talk about it. I don’t know, we kind of just let them be, let them be who ever they are being. Whether it’s angry, whether it’s happy, whether it’s whatever. And then try, “Let’s see what you’re doing about that, let’s talk about it.” Sometimes they just talk amongst themselves and one of them will say, “Well that was a pretty fucked thing to do. You smashed your painting and it was great.” And they’re like, “Oh yeah.”

Increasing young people’s awareness was considered particularly important in relation to discrimination. A lesbian worker suggested that through her relationships with young people and by being open about her sexuality, she encouraged young people to be more accepting because they could ask her questions and break down some of the mystery. Jason challenged the use of the word “queer” to describe anything young people, particularly young males, didn’t like. Robyn, Katie and Miranda also all spoke about the importance of challenging discriminatory comments. **Troy** spoke about a youth worker who challenged young people about linking poor performance to a person’s sexuality.

**Troy:** These kids were just bagging out the previous youth worker that was there, like saying, “Oh she was fucking hopeless, fucking lesbian” and stuff. And the new youth worker was a lesbian as well. And she’s turned around to them and said to them, “Did you not like her ‘cos - you know, was she fucking hopeless because she was a bad
youth worker or is she fucking hopeless because she was a lesbian?” And they thought about it and, “She was fucking hopeless because yeah, a pretty shit youth worker.” And she’s gone, “Right, so it has absolutely nothing ---.”

In order to build strong relationships with young people, youth workers needed the right personality and attitude. According to the young people, youth workers need to be friendly, welcoming, kind, understanding, caring, willing to help, nonjudgmental, young at heart, fun, not angry, nice, cool, fair, encouraging, positive, willing to listen, respectful and worthy of respect.

Jane: They’ve got to be pretty friendly and open, and can’t have any kind of hang ups about certain people.

Amanda: I suppose it’s good for them to be friendly and to want you there, to want you around and want to help you... They treat you with respect and they listen to what you have to say. Probably most of them, I think, treat you like you’re an adult rather than like you’re a kid.

Curley: They just do stuff for you, but other people just tell you to piss off.

Sarah: ‘Cos they listen to you and they come up and say, “G’day,” and everything to you, and shit like that.

While youth workers used different language, they identified similar characteristics.

Katie: I suppose one of the big things is equality and treating everyone that comes into your service fairly, or trying to do the best you can to do that. And people know if you don’t like them. It’s a really bad situation when youth workers set up a system of having favourites or setting some people up as the bad ones or that kind of thing and people get a vibe off that and respond negatively to that. Especially young people if they’re rejected by their parents or rejected by their school as well, to come into a place where they’re supposed to be safe and to get rejected yet again. Then obviously they’re going to be unhappy about that and react to that.

Joanne: And we also get to have a great time. What a cool place to be, like to work in regards to what we get to experience with these young people... So you know, we have like a blast, the sort of stuff we do. I think we’re a bit warped (both laugh) at times...
I’ll be in cupboards occasionally, just jump out at them and they shit themselves, it’s all part - so it’s not just this worker. You know we also have an interaction that’s positive and it’s not a role.

Jake: If you’ve got someone who has natural analytical skills, knows how many beans make five, have got a good intuitiveness and have a genuine care and respect for the young people, they’ve got a sense of humour. Have got endurance and patience, then you know, you’ve got basically the perfect worker.

Understanding group dynamics

Youth workers needed to understand and be mindful of group dynamics and relationships. Hence, some youth workers believed that it was important that the dynamics and structures of groups be monitored and managed carefully so as to prevent disruptive behaviour.

Jake: But soon as your numbers start to go up when you’ve got extremely challenging young people, one or two just tips, can tip the scales dramatically, because it just becomes, yeah, just becomes too many balls to juggle for the worker.

Joanne: We used to have 12 to 18 year olds here, which was major developmental gaps and we only had the three bedrooms - we only had two bedrooms really - so putting 12 year olds with 17 year olds would cause conflict. We know there are developmental life stages. You’ve got a 12 year old being in your face, in your face.

Some youth workers used diversionary tactics when the group dynamics were becoming potentially violent, disruptive or unsafe. Particularly with boys, using physical activity such as football or punching bags was seen as a way of “transferring energy” and getting them “worn out a bit”. This strategy, however, was not only used for boys. Bogg and some of the girls Rose worked with found it helped if they “put on the gloves and punched the boxing bag.” At other times, youth workers diverted them non-physically through other activities or just by diverting their attention: “Oh, guys, can you come over here and give me a hand.”

Youth workers also needed to recognise, however, that young people could also have a positive impact on one another.
**Jake:** They [dominant players within the peer group] can actually start to positively affect the behaviours of younger members or less dominant members within the peer group who would normally be unworkable, I suppose, within a group setting. But by getting the peer group, or getting the dominant players within the peer group on side, they can be of real support because what they do is actually help check that young person’s behaviour and they start to bring it within the norms of that group. And a young person, if they can see, “Hang on,” here’s another young person who might only be a year older than me, or who might even be a similar age, and I can see that they’ve got this positive regard for this worker and the worker’s got this positive regard there, then that might be a whole new experience for a young person who has basically been in a situation of long term abuse with adults, or been in a long term situation of abusing adults.

**Rose:** It seems their peers have as much influence over their behaviour, positive as well as negative, and we encourage that, for them to talk as a group with themselves. And that’s had some really interesting outcomes recently around drug taking and risk taking and stuff like that. Just other young people who are in that circumstance absolutely reading the riot act to somebody who’s been on the needle and stuff like that, to the point where they’ve stopped. And it’s been a complete turn around. And we’d been telling them, oh it’s bad, telling them all the stuff about informed decisions, and harm minimisation stuff and all it took was an afternoon of one kid telling her how bad it was and she stopped (laughs). Put us out of a job.

**Negotiation and mediation**

In order to develop cooperative individual and group relationships, youth workers needed to be able to negotiate with the young people and mediate conflict. Although the young people did not use the term “negotiation,” they wanted youth workers to listen to their story, pay attention to their perspective and to take it into account. This particularly arose in relation to the music played in youth services, especially youth centres. At the time of the interviews, Eminem had recently released a high-selling, controversial CD that many people found offensive, sexist and homophobic. Although the CD was popular with many of the young people interviewed, some of the youth workers were concerned about the content of the lyrics. Young people were angry when youth workers did not negotiate with them about whether or not his music could be played.
**Boris:** Like we have Eminem playing in the car, it doesn’t matter what song it is, doesn’t matter what swearing it is, they turn it off saying, “Nope, you’re not listening to that, get rid of it.”

**Graeme:** How do you feel about that?

**Boris:** Well I get really pissed off ‘cos, that’s like - say if all us kids in the car like that music, well they turn it off ‘cos they think, “Nah it’s offensive” and all this. Then it’s like, it’s their taste, their taste in music. That’s what it mainly involves, their taste not ours.

Some of the young people thought they should be able to play whatever they liked but other young people and youth workers thought that there had to be some negotiation to come up with a compromise. **Amber** and **Jade** thought that they should be able to play it so that it couldn’t be heard outside of the building. Although Ken believed that music like Eminem could “get the kids moving and get them feeling angry” (while having a great time), he believed that it was important to let young people play their music, however, the concerns of the youth workers also needed to be respected as well.

**Ken:** So we don’t rotate it, we let them play it once or twice for example. We advise them that it’s quite inappropriate if a parent walks in to pick up another kid, for that to be on. So that if it goes off quickly, don’t go screaming out, “Who fucking turned that off!” Because it’s likely a worker’s turned that off because they’ve seen a parent enter and they’d rather that the parent didn’t experience that.

At a more structured level, mediation could be used not only in conflict between young people but also between young people and staff, or young people and people from outside the service. Jake described mediation as “an important skill for youth workers” and youth workers used mediation, either formal or informal, in a variety of situations.

**Establishing boundaries and structure**

As the case of Eminem showed, the youth workers and, to a lesser extent, the young people believed that it was important that youth workers set clear boundaries and expectations so that young people knew the limits to behaviour. Some of the youth services had rules on the walls or written contracts which young people signed.
**Megan:** I think the big thing too is that we set up a membership process... After we’ve seen them for a little while, we then sit down and have a chat and get them to fill out a membership form... It also has our rules if you like, or membership obligations is what we call them, and that outlines for them what is acceptable and what’s not. So obviously it’s got in there no violence, no violence towards workers or other young people, not to use racist or sexist language, not to bring stolen goods on to the premises, not to bring drugs on to the premises, stuff like that. If you are overly intoxicated, you may be asked to leave. Those types of things, and they sign that... So if their behaviour starts to act up or they do something or if they do have a go at a kid, we always bring them down. We remove them from the environment up there, we don’t try and, if we can we remove them and say, “Come on down, you know, let’s have a chat about this.” And that’s when we can bring that out, and it’s like, “Well you actually agreed to this, what now don’t you think is acceptable about this?” And so we talk it out with them.

Other youth services did not have a formal process but nevertheless made their expectations clear to young people.

**Jake:** Explaining the boundaries very clearly from the start with the young people. Explaining how we work, explaining the commitment we can give, and are willing to give, but also explaining the bottom line. So you start to build up the culture of the place.

Youth workers also believed that, when they were faced with negative behaviour, it was important to reiterate their expectations and the rules of the service.

**Belinda:** And being able to say, “No,” if they’re exceptionally violent - “I’m not dealing with you until we can at least sit down and be reasonable together.”

**Miranda:** I maintained a steady voice, like and I maintained a strong position. And I didn’t engage - he was going, “Blah, blah, blah” and just yelling and raising his voice and I didn’t engage in that. I was just saying, “Look, OK that’s fine. I understand you’d like to drink, it’s no problem, but you can’t do it here. That’s all I’m saying.”

Some of the youth workers also emphasised the importance of structure in providing high quality service. Structure was seen as being important for both youth workers and young people.
**Megan:** When I first got here, I sort of put some things in place. There was no structure here, the kids had no structure, there wasn’t any consistency in opening hours. Sorts of things that might frustrate kids. So if your doors aren’t open when they think they’re going to be open, they’re going to get angry, if they’re in the middle of a crisis.

**Linda:** We have discovered that if we don’t have some form of structure then that encourages a whole lot of stuff to be going on between the clients that can lead to some form of violence... Also without a little bit of structure, as staff we burn out, and when we start burning out, then that’s when we’re going to create a far more tense environment as well.

**Wayne:** A lot of times we’ve got nothing here structured and the kids get a bit carried away, they might get a bit bored, whatever. But if you put something on as simple as a kelly pool comp... they don’t appear to become as agitated or run wild like they probably would if they’ve got nothing to do... A lot of youth workers sit back when there’s nothing to do and they’ll just watch, but if they’ve got a program, they’re involved as well.

**While Ken believed that structure was important, he also thought a balance was needed.**

**Ken:** You can’t be too structured because of the nature of the young person we’re dealing with. They have exited school early, dislocation blah, blah, blah. And as a result the structure has to be there and visible but not necessarily too tight, too bounded if you like.

**Teamwork**

To build sound and effective relationships with young people in their services, it was important that the staff worked well as a team and communicated with and supported one another.

**Jake:** Being also, not divisive within the team, being a strong team. OK being prepared to get someone else in to discuss a situation. Debriefing sessions are very, very important. Consensus within the team, trying to find consensus. Now you won’t always find consensus. But also a willingness of the group, that OK so in this case if you can’t get consensus, then a majority may have to do, but I’m prepared to support
the team decision at the time. Yeah, because in some ways you’ve only got yourselves to look after yourselves. It’s a small group, it’s a fairly unsupported group outside of the group. And so you have to support each other.

Some of the youth workers believed that policies and procedures were important in ensuring that staff members were consistent. Isabell, Robyn and Katie also believed that there was a need for an external code of ethics or standards of service to promote high quality service delivery throughout the youth sector.

Robyn: If there was some sort of accreditation standards, which was linked to their funding, where they had to employ appropriately trained people, and they had to have a series of policies in place that provided the framework around which behaviours like that were managed, then we might see a bit better service delivery to those people

Katie: I think that a code of conduct or a code of ethics is very, very important because that sets out expectations of how a worker will behave. That is really important.

_Prevention_

Although prevention was particularly important within a non-coercive approach, it could also be used within a more coercive approach. Prevention was used mainly to promote a positive environment, prevent smaller issues from escalating into bigger issues and address external issues that could lead to disruptive or violent behaviour. At times, all that was needed was for the youth workers to be present, remain calm, and be sensitive and tactful. Rose pointed out that this required enough staff to mingle and defuse situations.

Wayne: Just being there. Sometimes you might be at the other end of the room or the other end of an area where it’s happening and you just present yourself, without even saying anything. If you just come in to that particular area and you’re there, they know you’re there, a lot of times that just stops them straight away, they’ll whinge to you about it, but it does actually stop them fighting or verbally arguing.

Amanda: Just say, “Oh that’s not very nice” or, “Maybe you should try and get along” and try to stay friends with them, the young people.
When intervening more actively, it was important that youth workers did not respond aggressively but rather responded in ways that decreased the tension and defused the situation.

**Kat:** Like if the young person is angry at you and you just yell back at them, you know, it keeps the cycle going. But the youth workers who stand back and just take a breath and don’t respond to it and the young person thinks, “Why am I yelling,” and then they say, “Are you OK now?” Or you know just something pretty casual that acknowledges that they’re angry.

**Robyn:** Well I suppose not engaging in the violence. So if somebody says something that’s - if a young person, or even an adult for that matter, says something that is provocative, that is abusive, that looks to be the first step before it blows up, not responding to that with an equally abusive or - so disengaging from that level.

**Rose:** It’s hard to be angry at someone who is not mirroring that, who’s not being angry back at you. Who lets you be angry and then says, “Well you can still come back here.”

It was also important that youth workers were sensitive and tactful, allowing the young people to save face by not addressing issues in front of other young people.

**Jake:** You confront an individual in front of the peer group, you know then they will feel like they have to stand up for themselves and fight.

**Ken:** Giving the kids face saving opportunities again is very important. If there is a confrontation they need to have some way of exiting that confrontation without losing face amongst peers.

While preventing issues from escalating was considered important, particularly by the youth workers, some of the young people complained that youth workers came in too quickly or too hard when they were just mucking around.

**Boris:** He [the other young person] was on the ground and he was just saying, “Yeah, we’re only sparring, there’s nothing wrong, we’re not fighting with other, we’re only mucking around and having a few little punches.” We had gloves and that on, and we nearly got kicked out for that. And like that’s not right, ’cos you’re only mucking around, you do it out on the street or anything. As long as he don’t care, he don’t want
to press charges or anything like that... But what happened, we were having a spar in
here and he was lying next to the thing, he weren’t crying, there was no blood or
anything like that. And he got up and said, “We were only sparring” and [youth
worker’s name] said, “It happens again youse are out.” Like you can’t spar or
anything.

Sarah: Well if they know they’re mucking around, they should just let it go. ‘Cos it’s
only going to make matters worse by saying something to them and making them stop
fighting.

Other young people thought it was appropriate for youth workers to intervene.

Graeme: Just say you got into a play wrestle, here. You’re just mucking around.
Should the youth workers do anything or should they just let it go?
Curley: Oh they do tell you like to quit it.
Graeme: Do you think that’s the right thing to do, or would it be better not to worry
about it?
Curley: No, it’s the right thing to do.
Speedy: Just in case it turns into a fight.

Melz: [Young people are] not allowed to muck around, ‘cos they [youth workers] tell
them straight away to stop.
Cynknee: Or somebody gets hurt.
Graeme: And is that good?
Both: Yeah.

For youth workers it presented a dilemma of deciding when to intervene and when not
to.

Rose: Boys just wrestle. I know, it’s pretty much a boy thing too. That they do push
and shove, and they wrestle and they jostle and that’s part of being a boy from what I
understand, and what I watch... It’s OK for a bit of horseplay but if the other person is
going, “No I don’t like it,” then maybe you need to intervene or put some education in
place around that, that if somebody’s getting hurt or doesn’t like it, then you’re
responsible for stopping it. You’re responsible for saying, “No... Nobody gets hurt”
and that’s more than just physical, it’s emotional, spiritual as well. “Nobody gets
hurt,” that’s our bottom line with rough housing boys. It’s OK as long as everybody is
having fun, but if they’re not, then you have to intervene, or you have to have some
sort of process so that the workers know that at this point we intervene... I don’t know, it’s hard. Because boys like it. Especially adolescent boys. I mean I have two of my own, and they’re always bashing the hell out of each other and I’ll go, “Stop it, stop it” and they just go, “No he doesn’t mind.” “No I don’t mind.” “OK.” So I don’t know, that’s always a hard call that one.

In order to be able to prevent the escalation of behaviour and to gain the trust of young people, youth workers needed the experience and skills to deal with a wide range of issues. *Isabell* suggested that youth workers should be “equipped with the knowledge and information to help anybody at any time,” although *Jane* (in the same interview) pointed out that “you can’t expect everyone to know everything” but that youth workers should know where and how to get the information they needed. The youth workers discussed the complex issues faced by youth workers and the need for experienced, well trained staff.

**Jake:** They [another youth service] hired people who applied to us and we wouldn’t hire because they didn’t have the experience or we didn’t feel confident in them... You don’t have to be a guard, but you have to have some sort of assertiveness or presence or character. OK character for want of another word. You know to be able to be able to operate, like an actor, to be able to operate on the stage of the refuge and be able to feel comfortable and to juggle all the balls you’ve got to juggle at any one time. And they hired, and it was disastrous.

For some of the young people, it was also helpful if youth workers had experienced, or could at least relate to, challenges in their lives.

**Kat:** I can tell you what I don’t like... Workers that don’t have any experience or practicality, they just - It’s this way because the text books tell them... They just can’t relate to what you’re experiencing, and they’re like relying strictly on their training and it’s hollow. And it’s a real barrier to them being able to help you.

**Graeme:** So does it matter if youth workers haven’t necessarily had the experience? Like does it help if youth workers have been homeless or whatever?

**Kat:** It definitely helps. But yeah, experience is a thing where you have to be in it to develop it.

**Graeme:** So what do you think makes a good youth worker?

**Cynknee:** Their attitude. If they can handle, like -
Melz: Teenagers.

Cynknee: Like knows what’s going through a teenager’s mind. Knows -

Melz: You know, if they’ve been on the streets themselves, you know, been there did that, so they know what we go through, whatever we go through.

In addition to appropriate staff, the youth workers emphasised adequate funding and staffing levels to allow youth workers to prevent the escalation of situations. They were particularly concerned about the potential for harm to youth workers and young people when there was a sole worker.

Jake: The lack of resources to be able to put adequate staff on at any given time. A ratio of one to - with the sort of young people we’re talking about, a ratio of one to six [in an accommodation service] is not fair. OK, you’re into crowd control; you’re not doing any quality work, at one to six in the evenings, if you’ve got a very challenging group. These kids need a lot of quality work.

Katie: I think, probably solo and isolated workers is a really big issue at the moment. And that’s an issue that really needs to be addressed. Some of that might be about prevention, about looking at maybe two services doing Friday nights together that are solo workers, or taking it in turns to visit each other’s services might be a good way of looking at that. So if something does happen there’s another worker there, because there’s lots of workers who are working by themselves and they have 60 young people [in a youth centre] and if a fight breaks out, what can you do? But if you have other workers who’s there, then they can kind of assist in that situation.

The poor pay and conditions of the Social and Community Services (SACS) industrial award, the main industrial award covering youth workers, was identified as a significant barrier to attracting and retaining skilled, experienced staff.

Ken: So if you have, sadly, SACS award payments going out, you attract people who aren’t necessarily well skilled and who might be wonderful workers, but have to go through a learning curve. And this stuff, every one of those contacts is a learning experience. By the time they’ve learnt a bit, they’re generally burnt out and moved on.

The physical environment and what Kat called the ‘feeling of the place’ also played a major role in preventing the escalation of violent, unsafe or disruptive behaviour.
**Kat:** But the actual place when you looked around, it wasn’t homelike, it was too institutional, place falling apart, the shower - it was all inappropriate. Male and females, only one toilet, had to share the same bathroom, and like the toilet was only the one door, with the showers. You could see through the slats in the doors for the showers. They also had a shower curtain, see through of course, but it was three quarters high with black mould and yeah it was just disgusting. And you wouldn’t want to be there. Of course you wanted your drugs just to get out of it. Refuges I’ve been in that have been homelike and well cared for, even when they get angry, it might be a slam of the door and that’s it. It somehow makes a difference.

Violence and other inappropriate behaviour could be seen as a form of communication and as an opportunity for youth workers to address issues that might contribute to problems.

**Troy:** My comment would probably be that having an understanding that young people sometimes use violence as a form of communication because they don’t know how to communicate what they want to. So understanding that the reason that maybe young people are using that particular form of communication is because they’re just acting out, they’re just using it as a form of communication ‘cos they don’t have the skills in others ways.

**Jason:** There’s a common thread, particularly with males, and this is generalising, but the people that I’ve come across perceive that violence is a way to communicate or solve problems.

When violence and disruptive behaviour were seen in this way, less coercive forms of managing behaviour were likely to be adopted. Abby recommended showing young people that there were ways of addressing issues rather than causing problems. Linda would sometimes treat a young person coming in and erupting as a sign that something was wrong, and would try to help them deal with whatever was the matter. Joanne believed that her staff attempted to address issues that could lead to problems.

**Joanne:** I think the staff are pretty, are very capable in regards to addressing the escalation of violence before it actually occurs. So we know where a young person’s been. They’re having court tomorrow, that they’re going to be very anxious so we do a lot of work, a lot of prep work beforehand and identify some of those things with
them. Or we’ve had a phone call from family. So we might get some of the brunt of their phone call.

**COERCIVE STRATEGIES**

There were a number of examples where youth workers had verbally abused, pushed, hit or physically threatened young people. In all cases, such behaviour was condemned as being inappropriate in youth work. The coercive strategies for managing behaviour below – physical restraint, exclusion and the use of the police – were identified by at least some of the youth workers and young people as being appropriate.

*Physical restraint*

Physical restraint was seen as appropriate where there was risk of harm to young people or others. Megan, who generally opposed physical restraint, gave a detailed account of a case where she had felt compelled to physically restrain a young person. She believed that, as a direct result of her actions, “boy did I get a lot of kudos around here, and nobody was necessarily going to mess with me again.”

*Megan:* It was an incident where a kid who was angry, really, really angry, came running up the stairs. I knew him, he was screaming and ranting and raving, and I was like trying to verbally calm him down and try to figure out what was going on. And then he just sort of lost it. Picked up the bin, started throwing the bin; picked up the table, started throwing the table. So obviously my immediate concern was to get all the other young people away from him, and to make sure that they were safe. So I moved all of them, tried to move all the obstacles and then he just sort of lost it and started swinging. And he swung at one of the kids, and then he, and I’m not even sure whether it was a swing at me or it was a swing at whoever, but basically (laughs) he almost got me. And I put him in a lock and put him down, face down on the pool table. And I was like, “Oh my God,” and he was like, “Oh my God,” and we were both like that. And so I kept him, and I just kept talking to him while I still had him in the lock, and said, “Look, I can’t let you go until I know we’re safe, we’re all going to be safe.” And he was ranting and raving, and sure enough he calmed down. I let him up and was guiding him towards going down the stairs... Then two of the other young boys sprouted up, “You just got done by a chick, you just got done by a chick” and that was on for young and old. He flung around, the eyes were red, he was glaring and
this time he was going for me. And I basically had to do some maneuvers and keep him flat down on the table again, and told the other workers to go and to call the police.

Other youth workers said they would not use physical restraint. Katie said she did not agree with it and personally would not physically intervene, while Ross did not believe physical restraint “helped at all.”

**Ross:** I’ve never met anybody you physically back them into a corner and physically restrain them and that calms them down. It tires them out, but it doesn’t actually help them learn a different way or respect.

While the young people rarely spoke about physical intervention, there were indications that at least some of them would support it. Speedy was quite angry about a situation where another young person had hit him and the youth worker had done nothing to stop it happening. He clearly felt that the youth worker should have physically intervened. Some of the young people even suggested that youth workers should allow troublemakers to be beaten up by other young people.

**Burnsey:** I reckon they should let the people doing it get the shit kicked out of them.

**Sarah:** Let us - we hold em down while all of us belt him.

**Exclusion**

Exclusion of young people from services was widely used as a way of managing disruptive, violent or unsafe behaviour, and included short periods of “time-out,” longer suspensions, permanent eviction or expulsion, and the non-acceptance of referrals. For the youth workers, whether or not young people should be excluded from youth services and in what circumstances was an ongoing dilemma. The young people were quite polarised in their attitudes. Young people who were currently using services saw it as quite appropriate, whereas ex-users believed it should only be used as a last resort.

The young people currently using services believed that people should be thrown out when they used alcohol and other drugs, got into fights, did not follow the rules, threatened others, made people feel unsafe, did not work, or damaged property. For
these young people, particularly the younger ones, the first response to a problem appeared to be exclusion.

Graeme: So what should youth workers do with people who don’t respect the place?

Burnsey: Throw them out.

Kill: Chuck them straight out.

Graeme: Should they?

Burnsey: Never to come back.

Young people who were ex-users of youth services, mostly opposed exclusion although they believed that there were times when it could be appropriate in order to protect the safety of others. They were concerned that exclusion was a major step, and that it did not help address the issues leading up to the eviction. Isabell suggested that banning a young person from a youth centre or a shopping centre did not solve anything and was likely to create “more fear and resentment.” She saw eviction as saying, “We’re not going to deal with you, you’re in the too hard basket.” Both Jane and Amanda also saw eviction as a negative response.

Jane: It’s wrong. I mean in a youth service, people are there because it’s their only outlet normally, and there’s nowhere else to go. So if they kick them out, then where has that young person got to go, apart from somewhere to do damage?

Amanda: I think it’s really risky. I think it’s a really big step to take. I think youth workers and managers and staff just kick kids out like too easily. I think they should give them a bit more of a chance.

At the same time, both Jane and Amanda, recognised that there were times when the safety of other people meant that eviction could become necessary although they favoured suspension more than permanent eviction.

Jane: If you suspend them, if they’ve done something wrong, like for a week it gives them time to go away and think about what’s happened and kind of sort it out in their own mind and then come back and work through it again.

Exclusion was a significant dilemma for the youth workers. Although all of them had used it as a strategy, often on a regular basis, there was a common belief that young people were excluded too quickly and that the ones who were excluded often needed the most assistance.
Ken: Yeah we go really light with it [exclusion] and try not to, it’s really a last resort with us. Personally I’ve had criticism of lots of services over years because of how quickly they throw out the kids that are obviously making the noises that they need the most help.

The attitudes of youth workers towards exclusion ranged from those who opposed it except as a last resort, to those who used it on a routine basis. Exclusion from youth accommodation posed greater dilemmas than exclusion from youth centres or other youth services. Jake and Joanne, both of whom worked in accommodation services, suggested that the threat of eviction could be a form of violence. At the same time, they believed that eviction could be appropriate and had evicted residents in the past.

Joanne: What I really discourage is the using of, “You will be evicted.” The threats of --- Because that’s violence as far as I’m concerned, it’s abusive. We all know they have nowhere to be. So I think that’s abusive in that regard.

Jake: I think evictions are almost a form of violence as well, in the sense of threats to evict and things like this, unless you are fair dinkum, for want of another word, about that and why, and you’ve got just reasons, and you’ve gone through the processes, warning letters, etc. etc. Unless, of course, it’s an emergency situation or a situation that needs immediate action.

Because of the lack of options available to young people in accommodation services, eviction was seen as a last resort, and was mainly supported when the safety of other young people or staff members was at risk. Eviction in such circumstances could mean that young people had to sleep on the street or were placed in an unsafe situation. Some youth workers believed that services were too quick to label young people as being too hard to work with or to exclude young people who had caused problems in the past. Robyn suggested that young homeless people often had histories of violence, mental illness or a drug and alcohol problem, and that instead of excluding them, youth accommodation services needed to be resourced to a level where they could deal with these issues. At the same time, the youth workers were very aware of the need to protect other residents and staff.
Despite concerns about eviction, only Ross had worked in a service that had a policy of no exclusions.

**Ross:** What we did was we were really up front with young people and said, “Your tenure here [in an accommodation service] is secure. What you chose to do with that is up to you, but bear in mind that these are the consequences if you decide to hurt another young person, or hurt the building...” We followed through on those consequences which was, “OK you’ve totally demolished our hallway, we have to call the police. I will sit with you, however, while the police are here, and I will sit with you while you are charged for malicious damage to property, and then we’ll come back and we will have dinner.” And so young people really started to learn that. They didn’t trust that at first... It really required everybody to be working from the same philosophy. And I was really staggered by the decreases in violence, as young people actually started to hear, “All right, they’re not going to just, you know, reject me immediately. They’re going to continue to support me, and that’s because of who I am not because of what I do.”

Jake, however, believed that eviction was a necessary bottom line and became appropriate when “the safety and security of people is at such risk,” that not to evict a young person could lead to someone else being “seriously hurt” or totally interfere with the functioning of the service. As an example, he discussed a service that he believed faced major problems because of its policy of no exclusion. He acknowledged, however, that the service was also run by an organisation which had “never really dealt with teenagers straight in off the streets” and that the staff lacked the skills and experience to work with the target group.

**Jake:** Those young people [in a new service for homeless state wards] were told, come hell or high water, those kids would remain there. OK? And those kids knew that, they knew there would be no bottom line. And [the organisation] were told, “No bottom line” by DoCS (Department of Community Services). “You’re getting funded for this, there’s no bottom line, you work with those kids come hell or high water.” And so those kids were assaulting workers... So they’d have a policy of charging the kids. So they’d go down charge the kids and next day the workers working with that kid would have a black eye... And so they just ended up having a lock down situation there where the kids took over the office, locked the worker out of the office, running around with knives, and the whole box and dice.
Exclusion from youth centres, alternative education programs and employment services were more likely to be supported and to be used as strategies for managing behaviour. In these contexts, exclusion was used in two ways: as a choice between safe, nonviolent, non-disruptive behaviour or exclusion, or as a punishment for, or “consequence” of, inappropriate behaviour. Curley and Speedy suggested that Jason reminded participants in an education program that they had a choice between doing their work or leaving. Curley and Speedy saw it as a genuine choice and a strategy that worked well. When exclusion was presented as such a choice, the focus was generally on excluding behaviour rather than the young person. Once the behaviour stopped, the young person was welcome to come back.

Miranda: What I’d try and do is like, “You can’t do it here, and, you know, if you want to talk about it fine. Otherwise leave because if you’re going to do this behaviour that’s your choice, but you can’t do it around here...” It’s about, “No, this is a place where you come because you want some time out, you want your own space and you need to respect each other. If you can’t respect each other’s space here, you need to leave.”

Ross had used exclusion as a choice in a structured activity program for young teenagers, and had ensured that expectations of the group were clear.

Ross: So they set up the agreements about, “This is what this place is going to be like, and this is how we want to treat each other” and young people would introduce other young people to that. And then young people came up with consequences as well. So they’d say, “If we decide we don’t want to stick to these agreement’s, that’s telling everybody that we don’t want to be here,” so, you know, “the workers will take you home for this afternoon, but you come back the next day.” And so that is what kids came up with themselves. And that worked really well because it was self enforcing rather than adult enforcing and we saw some great changes in internal locus of control because of that as well, which was good.

At times, youth workers might not have formally excluded young people but encouraged them to stay away for a while.

Robyn: “Look, we really can’t afford to keep replacing windows, we have this tiny little budget, and you know I’d appreciate it if maybe you’d just keep a low profile for a while and come back when you’re prepared to not do that to the building.”
Exclusion also occurred when youth workers made the decision to exclude a young person as a punishment or consequence. Ken spoke about having to “pull the supervisor role” and exclude young people when they had damaged the youth centre or threatened the safety of others. Wayne had banned a number of young people because he was “prepared to get rid of one kid here if 30 kids are going to have a good time.”

Exclusion as a choice was largely a preventative measure: young people could decide to change their behaviour and stay in the centre, or they could continue with their current behaviour and face exclusion. Exclusion as a punishment or consequence was essentially a response to behaviour or a sanction applied by the youth worker following certain behaviour. Where young people had helped develop the expected standards of behaviour, had a choice between following the agreed behaviour or leaving, and could return when they wanted, exclusion could be seen as a more non-coercive strategy. Where young people had no say in the exclusion and it was used as a punishment, it could be seen as a more coercive strategy.

In practice, exclusion lay somewhere between the two extremes. For example, young people may have been given a number of opportunities to change their behaviour but eventually youth workers imposed exclusion for a certain period (e.g. a day or a couple of weeks) rather than until the behaviour stopped.

Megan: Like if a kid is just, constantly acting up, you know, they’re upstairs, they’re loud, they’re constantly hassling people on the pool table... What we do is then we just take them aside and, “You’re really starting to annoy, keep your voice down, dah de dah, look you know how it works.” We watch them for the next half an hour, if it, you know, rears up again we can just go, “Oi, Tony cut it out.” “Yeah yeah yeah.” “We’re watching you Tony.” “Yeah, yeah.” You know, and then they’ll go into it and then we’ll just go, “Not tonight. You’ve done it with us.” And the idea is to keep humour in it as much and to keep it light as possible. (The previous comments have had a fairly light tone.) We don’t go, “Oh for God’s sake, I’ve had enough, get out of here” (said aggressively)... And you see what they’re also aware of, is that the more they argue, the longer it goes for. So if they start to persist and start to chuck up a stink, it’s like, “You’re really pushing this, you keep this up it’s no go tomorrow and won’t be allowed in ‘til Friday.”
Another more coercive strategy for managing behaviour was the threat or actual use of the police. Police were used in three ways: as a threat, as back up for youth workers or as a consequence. The actual or potential threat of calling the police was surprisingly common. Even approaches that on one level were relatively non-coercive sometimes involved the potential for police involvement. If coaxing young people to stop negative behaviour, focusing on their positive behaviour and encouraging them did not work, Amanda suggested that youth workers should call the police. Miranda discussed a situation where a young male who had not been to the youth centre before dropped in with some beer. She adopted a non-confrontational approach, asking him to leave because of the alcohol and inviting him back the next day. When he refused to leave she eventually said, “Look, I’ll have to call the police, I don’t want to do that, there’s no need to do that, all you need to do is leave.” Although she wanted to adopt a non-coercive approach, behind it lay the threat of police involvement. The threat of calling the police was mostly used when young people refused to leave a youth service.

The police were sometimes used as back up for sole workers or in potentially dangerous situations such as incidents involving weapons, physical attacks or the potential for significant violence. Sole workers also called the police when there was no actual violence, or even immediate threat of violence, but young people refused to leave a service or were drunk.

Robyn: One incident that comes to mind where a young woman and her partner came into our service and they were exceedingly intoxicated. I think they started just falling into things and things were getting broken and then it got a bit escalated and they began to intentionally smash things - mostly glass - and so there was quite a lot of blood because they kept cutting themselves. But their state was such that there was no possible way to have a rational discussion with them... It was a question of, other people who were in the building getting them away from where the action was happening so they didn’t get hit by flying glass. And calling the police, because I didn’t have the ability to deal with it as a single person in the building, single adult in the building, and really leaving it in the hands of the police.
As well as calling the police to respond to a situation, youth workers sometimes used the police to press charges against young people as a consequence of their behaviour. The most notable examples were the situations (discussed above) where, instead of evicting young people from accommodation services, the police were asked to charge them with an offence.

Despite numerous reports highlighting tensions between marginalised young people and the police (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1989; Standing Committee on Community Affairs 1995), only one of the young people and none of the youth workers, expressed concern about using the police.

*Jane:* If you involve the police, it basically, a lot of the time in a lot of specific areas, would ruin anything you finally worked towards. ‘Cos a lot of young people don’t trust the police.

**The use of power**

Much of the discussion above has centered on power. In particular, the major difference between coercive and non-coercive strategies for managing behaviour lay in the nature of the power upon which the strategies were built. Coercive strategies were based on power-over and attempts to control young people. Non-coercive strategies were based on power-with and attempts to involve young people in creating a positive, nonviolent and safe environment.

Despite examples where youth workers operated from a position of power-over or abused the power given to them by young people, the youth workers and young people believed that youth workers needed the power to ensure that their youth services were safe, nonviolent and effective. While the interview participants did not use the term, the notion of power-with was consistent with their descriptions of the way in which youth workers should use power. *Curley* suggested the youth workers in the education program he attended had to ensure that participants worked, and did not just muck around, but that there was a large difference in the way in which this could be approached.
Curley: Just for an example, if somebody walks up to you and fucking, “Do you’re fucking work now rah rah rah,” that’s not respect. If someone walks up to you and says, “Come on, stop mucking around, do your work” kind of thing, that’s a bit of respect. But with Jason he said, “You either do your work, you know, or there’s no use coming.” And that’s, I respected that.

The youth workers indicated that they needed to set boundaries without dominating, coercing or forcing young people and that, in doing so, they could still be respectful, cooperative and aware of building positive relationships.

Ross: And sometimes it’s right that you exercise some power to be able to say, “No, this is not appropriate.” But it needs to be done in a way - what I talk to the workers about is where you are really clear about what message you want to be giving. It’s not a message of, “I don’t like you.” It’s not a message about, “I’m stronger that you.” It’s a message about, “This is not appropriate for this situation.” So I have to be clear in my head and my body about what message I give to this young person. So I need to be really clear about my power and what I’m using it for, like in any interaction.

Rose: You know, you don’t have to come at it from an I’m in charge angle I think that’s really important when dealing with young people. That I’m in charge angle just sets up the power imbalance and it also encourages somebody to challenge that. And if you’re talking about young people who are challenging anyway, you might as well paint a target on your chest, as far as I’m concerned... But I think it’s your language. I think it’s just your demeanour and the whole approach you have to a situation of setting out “this is our expectations.” You don’t have to call them rules, you can call them expectations, you can call them, “This is what, this is how we do it here. This is how it is if you want to stay,” you know, so you can make it a bit more relaxed and casual than confronting and oppressive. You don’t have to be oppressive in the way you do it. It’s just about your personal approach to the way you talk to them... You can just do it in a way that’s a bit more relaxed than saying, “I’m in charge and we do it this way.”

Youth workers did misuse power at times and there were examples of the clear abuse of power, such as the cases discussed above, where youth workers sexually abused young people, pushed or threatened them, or verbally abused them. In addition, attempts to dominate, control and intimidate were considered a misuse of power.
Ken: I would be looking very closely at any worker who was seeming to get a rush out of the fact that they might have power over, or perceive they have power over the kids. That’s certainly not the sort of environment we want to portray.

Curley: I don’t like people to have power over me. Like if someone stands over me, I’ll stand up to them, I don’t care how big they are and that. But I’ve always been taught, if someone is not going to stand up to you, you don’t worry about it. You know. It’s like saying to a kindergarten year old, “Come on, I’ll fight you” kind of thing. You know, it’s just like, why waste your time? If they’re not going to stand up and have their go, leave it.

Graeme: So if Jason was to really, control you and tell you what you got to do and all that sort of thing?

Curley: Then I’d walk out and say, “I’m not doing it, that’s it.”

There were also occasions where youth workers misused power by using their position in ways that were against the interests of young people. In the following example, although it is probable that the youth worker was acting with good intentions, by breaking confidentiality she misused the information, and the associated power, given to her by the young person.

Amanda: I know one of the workers did a really bad thing there... The worker broke confidentiality and told this guy who was in the refuge, that this girl had been sexually assaulted and to be like careful and be sensitive towards her and stuff. And he full on tried to take advantage of her and everything, like because she said that. And I just think that’s so wrong.

Graeme: So how did the girl involved react?

Amanda: Oh she freaked out. Like she wouldn’t talk to her any more. She didn’t listen to her case manager any more. No-one could help her any more. She’s never been to another youth service; she’s totally turned from the profession all together. She doesn’t want anything to do with youth workers or any like professionals.

CONCLUSION

There were many examples of practice that were consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence but there were also numerous examples that were not. Approaches to youth work based on building relationships, promoting a positive environment and working
with young people in creating a considerate, safe and nonviolent environment, were more consistent than approaches based on power-over, control and domination. Drawing upon the experiences of the young people and youth workers, as well as earlier phases of the study, the next chapter proposes a model of nonviolent youth work practice.
SECTION IV

NONVIOLENT YOUTH WORK PRACTICE
Chapter 11
A model of nonviolent youth work practice

Based on the previous phases of the research, the final phase involved the design of a model of nonviolent practice. This chapter presents the model and discusses the way in which it was developed. An important stage in the model’s design was presenting a draft model (see Appendix 10) to two focus groups of youth workers (see Chapter 8). This chapter thus discusses the results of the focus groups in relation to each part of the model and identifies ways in which the draft model was refined based on the feedback from the youth workers.

A MODEL OF NONVIOLENT YOUTH WORK PRACTICE

The model of nonviolent youth work practice (Figure 11 – 1) represents key features of nonviolent practice. The model was based on youth work literature (Chapters 2 & 3), principles of nonviolence (Chapter 4), in-depth interviews with youth workers and young people (Chapter 10), and focus groups with youth workers (this chapter). The structure of the model was inspired by a mandala used by the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) to represent key themes in its workshops on nonviolence (see Appendix 11). Although the AVP themes are consistent with the principles of nonviolence identified in this study, it was the structure of the mandala that was incorporated into the model of nonviolent practice. Like many groups that adopt a philosophy of nonviolence, AVP has a strong spiritual commitment (Alternatives to Violence Project 1986; Garver & Reitan 1995) and thus the spiritual significance of a mandala made it an attractive form (AVP Facilitators’ Discussion List, 13 December 2002). The inner circles represent the core themes of AVP workshops and the outer circle has more specific guidelines (Garver & Reitan 1995, p. 34).

Like the AVP mandala, the inner two circles of the model of nonviolent practice are broad principles that underpin the model and the outer circle provides suggestions that are more specific. As identified by Alison in the first focus group, the model of nonviolent youth work practice emanates outward and “each concentric circle builds on
the rest.” Clearly, it is not possible to incorporate all the features of nonviolent practice, thus it should be seen as a starting point for further exploration.

Figure 11 - 1: Model of nonviolent youth work practice

**Be committed to nonviolence in all you do**

Advocates of principled nonviolence argue that nonviolence is not just a tactic but a way of life, and so at the heart of the model youth workers are encouraged to be committed to nonviolence in all they do. Rather than seeing nonviolence as something that can be practised in some areas of their lives and not others, nonviolence is seen as
having implications for all aspects of their lives (Ritchie 2001; White 1999g). Participants in the focus groups supported this perception.

**Luke:** My introduction to AVP was from working in a youth centre and seeing a number of young people for whom violence was a part of their life and so taking them along to a workshop – everyday for three days, and walking out of there saying, “I’ve got to look at my life.” Now AVP is a central part of my lifestyle, which I hope in turn, as a worker, has an impact on the kids that I work with. That I live it, breathe it 24 hours... And again, actions speak louder than words, and I hope there are some young people that have learnt by their association with me, by my actions rather than what I’ve said.

**Ellen:** I saw a huge connection between youth workers in detention centres and them as people outside of there. Their way of life outside of there and sometimes even in there, was so different to the way we were trying to work with young people.

As Alison suggested, “if nonviolence is a way of life, all the others flow from that” and so nonviolence needs to impact on all that youth workers do. Mary, a TAFE youth worker teacher, however, had some concerns about forcing a particular philosophy onto students.

**Mary:** When people come to me, as a trainer, I don’t want to force them into a particular way of thinking, because then we get into right and wrong. But some thinking is not appropriate for the workplace. So do I then just say, “well you change your thinking for the workplace,” or, “you change your thinking holistically”? She was particularly concerned about bringing personal beliefs into youth work.

**Mary:** I have to be careful also, in having hidden agendas with the students as well.... If I was a fundamentalist Christian and I started preaching Christianity to my students, then like that’s not OK. So I have a nonviolent principle that I work by because I do this in my personal life as well, so then do I take that into the workplace as well? ... I’d be very critical of some workers, or some students, who brought some of their personal beliefs and value systems and ways of working into the work place. So then what does that say about me doing the same thing?

Mary was largely convinced when it was suggested that nonviolence could be seen as a foundation of youth work.
Ellen: They’re there to learn youth work, so if youth work is those sorts of behaviours and those sorts of values and beliefs, then you can teach them that. When you used your example of Christianity, if they were there to learn about Christianity, then you would, if you were a fundamentalist Christian, you would teach them all of those, because they were there to learn that.

Simon believed nonviolence was an appropriate foundation for youth work. While other people in the focus groups did not take up this theme, they agreed nonviolence was consistent with youth work and that it had the potential to improve practice. For example, in the second focus group, some of the participants were concerned about the way in which youth workers modelled inappropriate behaviour.

Sophie: I’ve seen two staff members go at each other over an issue, and you’ve got all the kids sitting their watching. Like they’ve got this show on TV. And then when the kids do it later that night, or are running berserkly around the house, they’re jumped on. And the staff may not necessarily treat the kids violently, but they’re witnessing it between the staff or between the management committee and staff. And these are people they’ve started to develop relationships with and trying to model themselves on because they don’t want to necessarily model themselves on their own families.

If youth workers were nonviolent in all they did so that, as Ellen described it, “it’s part of their day to day work that they’re nonviolent,” then the participants believed that they would model nonviolent behaviour.

The heart of the model is also based on the principle that the means should be consistent with the ends. If youth workers are to assist their services and the young people who use them to be nonviolent, then it is important that their actions are consistent with their goals.

Develop a reflective work practice

In the draft model, rather than develop a reflective practice this principle was develop your own self-awareness. The in-depth interviews and literature on youth and social work (Banks 1999a; Bowie n.d.-a; Manning 1992a, 1992b; St Germaine & Kessell 1989) and nonviolence (Burrowes 1994; Moyer 1999b; Starhawk 1990) highlighted the
importance of self-awareness. The first focus group, however, suggested that reflective practice provided a more specific approach.

**Alison:** With self-awareness goes an ongoing reflective approach to practice.

**Ellen:** I think, that the worker who becomes aware of where that response came from, or “why did I deal with that young person in that way. What is it about me? What is it about my life? What is it about my past experiences that have influenced that?” They’re basic reflective questions, and that’s a critical reflective question, “What experience have I had that influenced in that situation?”

**Diane:** And, “What’s in the system that allows that to happen?”

At one level, reflective practice means “thinking issues through in all their complexity and acting towards clients and others in a considered, thoughtful manner” (Payne 2002, p. 124). Reflection at this level can involve:

a) Returning to experience: that is to say, recollecting or describing salient events
b) Attending to (or connecting with) feelings: this has two aspects, utilising helpful feelings and removing or containing obstructive ones
c) Evaluating experience: this involves re-examining knowledge, etc. It also involves integrating this new knowledge into the person’s conceptual framework (Carter, Jeffs & Smith 1995, p. 10).

In critical and radical social work, reflective practice involves a more complex understanding of reflection (Payne 2002, p. 124). According to Fook (2002, p. 40), reflection assists practitioners to consider the context of their practice, to explore theoretical assumptions and application, to develop theory directly from their practice, and to take into account the variety of factors which impinge on situations they need to address. There is a particular focus on “power relations, and how structures of domination are created and maintained” (Fook 2002, p. 41). Fook (2001) presents a number of questions which may be of use in developing a reflective practice:

1. What stands out for me from my account of my critical incident?
2. If I were in the same situation again, what would I do differently and why?
3. Why did I choose to do what I did? What other things could I have done and why didn’t I choose these?
4. What would I ideally like to have happened in the situation?
5. What kinds of interpretations did I make, and what are possible alternative interpretations?
6. What assumptions did my thoughts and actions imply, and what are possible alternative assumptions?
7. Why did I make those particular interpretations and assumptions and where did they come from?
8. Are these particular interpretations or assumptions associated with particular formal theories to which I subscribe?
9. Are my actions and assumptions congruent with these “espoused” theories?

The implications of the proposed model of practice are many, and the model is not meant to be prescriptive. It outlines broad principles that may help workers to build their practice on a philosophy of nonviolence. In order to adapt the model to their specific contexts, youth workers need to reflect on the relationship between theory and practice and to develop their awareness and skills. Reflective practice provides a process for doing so. Because of the importance of reflection, the first focus group suggested that reflective practice belonged in the middle concentric circle rather than the outer circle. As Diane described it, “action that comes out of awareness is a dam sight better than the other way.” In a culture where violence is widely accepted (Burton 1997; Cassell 1995; Elias 1997; Moyer 1999b; Shachter & Seinfeld 1994), adopting a philosophy of nonviolence involves many challenges. For youth workers to develop a nonviolent practice, they need to question many of their assumptions, theoretical frameworks and ways of working. Reflective practice, as espoused by Fook and others, assists youth workers to undertake this task.

Build professional, caring relationships

Two of the principles of nonviolence – that there is a profound respect for humanity, and that actions are based on love rather than hate – were incorporated into the model through building professional, caring relationships. Both the literature on youth work and the in-depth interviews identified the importance of building relationships to youth work in general and managing behaviour in particular. Youth workers need to genuinely care for, and some would say love (Brendtro 1990), young people but as Sercombe
(1997b) argues, the relationship is a professional one with clear boundaries. By emphasising both the caring and professional nature of the relationship, the model encourages youth workers to find a balance. Having positive relationships is also important in achieving each of the following parts of the model:

- Promote a positive environment
- Negotiate clear expectations and boundaries
- Respond to behaviour nonviolently.

**Focus on power-with**

In a philosophy of nonviolence, power is seen as arising out of relationships rather than being a characteristic owned by an individual, and so there is a focus on power-with. As the first focus group identified, the relationship between power and youth work is complex but, as Mary suggested, “we can’t pretend it’s not there.” Sercombe (1998) argues that the issue of power is unavoidable in youth work and that it needs to be dealt with explicitly. He proposes that the idea of mandate is useful when considering the nature of power.

At its simplest, the relation of power involves one party ceding to another the mandate to act on his/her behalf. As such, it involves me being prepared to comply or cooperate with your actions exercised, as they were, in my name. *This relation of cession is the primary power relation.* I allow you to manage my accounts, to represent me on the committee, to work on my car. As such, by handing over to you my power to act on these matters to you, I subject myself – to your judgements, your priorities. Within the limited scope of the matter in questions, I give you my power. The amount of power you get is a function of the number of matters over which I give you a mandate, and how strategic these matters are. (Sercombe 1998, p. 20, his emphasis.)

He goes on to suggest that the more people (the constituency) who cede to another (the delegate) the mandate to act on their behalf; the greater the power held by the delegate. Implication of such an understanding of power include:

- Power relationships are inevitable and are often necessary for cooperative action: they do not need to be destructive or oppressive.
• Power relationships are often not the result of conscious choice – people might have been born into them or might not see them. When they become aware of the power relationships, they then have a choice about what they will do about them.

• No person is powerless, at a minimum they can decide whether or not to cede power to someone else.

• The amount of power a person or group has is largely dependent on “the number of people who have ceded power and the range of spheres of activity over which a mandate has been ceded” (p. 20).

• A delegate may be perceived to have more (or less) power than they actually have. If delegates are perceived as having larger constituencies than they actually have, they are likely to be perceived as having more power than has actually been ceded to them.

• It does not matter whether a mandate has been ceded willingly, under duress or unknowingly: all that is needed for the power relationship to exist is that a mandate has been ceded.

• Structures of power, such as hierarchies, bring together constituencies and scopes of activity, and stabilise and formalise the cession of power. Such structures are particularly effective, but not necessarily ethical, when they construct consent or hide the power relationship (Sercombe 1998, pp. 20-21).

Sercombe argues that such an approach clarifies a number of ethical issues in youth work:

• Power relationships are coercive when cooperation or a cession of power has been obtained through threats, force or fraud. They are legitimate when cooperation or a cession of power has been obtained willingly and without threat or coercion.

• Corruption occurs when youth workers use the mandates given to them by young people to further their own interests in ways that are at the expense of the young people.

• Oppression occurs when youth workers use the power ceded to them by young people against the interests of the young people.

• Dependency can become unethical if it becomes difficult for young people to withdraw their mandate because the scope of activities ceded to the youth worker are too broad (so the cost to the young people of withdrawing their mandate is too
high), the scope of activities ceded becomes unclear (so the possibility of withdrawing the mandate becomes unclear), or the young people do not know about alternative delegates or how to access them.

- **Empowerment** is “the process of making a constituent aware of the power relations they are involved in, aware of their duties as a constituent and of the duties of their delegates. It involves working with people to help them obtain the skills required to be accountable and hold their delegates accountable” (Sercombe 1998, p. 22).

Sercombe’s discussion of power is a useful starting point for youth workers adopting a philosophy of nonviolence. It is consistent with the notion of power-with and assists in establishing clear expectations and boundaries. It is also significant because it places empowerment in a broader context than individualistic terms. At the same time, empowerment of young people needs to go further than the exploration of mandates. According to O’Brien and Whitmore (quoted in Young 1999), empowerment involves an interactive process in which people “experience personal and social change, enabling them to achieve influence over the organisations and institutions which affect their lives and the communities in which they live” (p. 88).

Flowers (1998) suggests that empowerment is sometimes restricted to “the opportunity for young people to exercise a little responsibility, a little freedom of choice, and to do something that one does not have the opportunity to do otherwise” (p. 36). There can be pitfalls in focusing on empowerment at an individual level without taking into account the context, particularly power relations (White 1990a). For example, the empowerment of heterosexual young males in some settings could lead to greater discrimination and harassment of young women and gays. Flowers (1998) argues:

> An alternative notion of empowerment might entertain the idea of helping young people develop a deeper understanding of social context, of developing a greater sense of agency, of analysing ideology in everyday life, of understanding political and economic doctrines, of seizing power rather than simply exercising responsibility (pp. 36-37).

Such notions of empowerment are consistent with the commitment to social justice contained in a philosophy of nonviolence.
Conflict will arise between youth workers or between youth workers and young people, and in order to work from a position of power-with, rather than imposing “solutions” to conflict, youth workers need to adopt a cooperative approach to conflict resolution. Characteristics of such an approach include:

- Conflict is seen as being a natural part of life
- A problem solving approach is adopted based on cooperation rather than competition
- The interests and needs of all parties are respected
- The aim is to find a solution which all parties involved are able to accept
- The focus (at least in the early stages) is on interests or needs rather than solutions
- Communication is seen as vital to solving problems
- Self-awareness is developed in order to improve responses to conflict
- Skills are developed in dealing with difficult situations and people, because conflict is not always easily resolved and others may not use a cooperative approach
- Despite problems or provocation, a cooperative approach is maintained with a focus on finding a fair or just solution
- Emotions are seen as a vital part of conflict, and are acknowledged and addressed

Although not stated in the model, focus on power-with also incorporates a commitment to truth and openness. Walz and Ritchie (2000) identified the importance of truth and openness for the social work relationship (see Chapter 4). If youth workers are truthful and open, young people are in a better position to hold them accountable, which promotes power-with.

*Be committed to social change and apply principles of social justice*

The draft model included be active in social change. Although participants in the focus groups agreed that social change was important in youth work, there was some discussion about what this commitment entailed and about the best way to articulate it in the model. Due to issues raised in the focus groups, the model was changed to be
committed to social change (in the middle circle) and apply principles of social justice (in the outer circle). In particular three issues were discussed during the focus groups:

1. The types of social action that are appropriate for youth workers
2. The ways in which youth workers could respond to situations where they are required to work in ways that they believed were not in the interests of young people
3. The way in which to incorporate social change into the model.

The participants in the focus groups believed that youth workers should be, and were, involved in promoting social justice and social change. They also believed it was important that social change be understood in broad terms.

**Claire:** I think you don’t need to go to the degree of like campaigning. You can do that, and that’s fine. I’m not inspired to do that at all. But I think I can impact on social change through my interaction with the kids... That can initiate social change, maybe in a small way, but that’s good for the young person I’m dealing with and that’s probably how I’d look at social change, instead of writing to some politician or whatever.

**Jacki:** I think you’re involved in it now, just being here. I think youth workers do a lot of informal stuff.

**Emma:** Maybe it’s not so much about trying to change people, but challenging them about why they have attitudes about certain things and getting them to actually think “well is this where I want to come from, is this who I want to be? Or am I like this because of my upbringing or because of situations that have happened in my life?” ...

**Sophie:** I think it depends on what level you take it at. I think you’ve got the smaller level where it is a young person will call another kid, “homo” and it’s sort of like, “why did you do that?” can be a form of challenging that to create some sort of social change within that peer group. Or it can be that higher thing where I’m supposed to have a go at some politician about the silly decisions they make. I think sometimes when we think social change, we think big picture, rather than little things. And sometimes I think the little things can be a stronger foundation.

Youth workers could also be involved in broader campaigns or social change activities, including attending rallies, addressing the use of resources in a youth service and considering products available for sale at services. Some participants emphasised that
there was a limit to what youth workers could do and that time constraints meant that youth workers needed to set priorities.

**Sam:** In principle, it’s something you want to be involved in, but if you’ve got 50 hours work to, but only 30 hours to do it in, then what do you do? And that’s something probably most of us would feel at times that constraint, that you just have to do your core business.

**Diane:** It’s almost like there are areas of influence and areas of concern. And not expend yourself on areas of concern and drive yourself crazy. So it’s like you’ve got to be clear about what you can do.

In the first focus group, there was also discussion about what youth workers should do in cases where they were expected to work in ways that were not necessarily in the interests of young people. Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998) argue that in such cases youth workers should not “do things that are against the interests of the young people” (p. 314). Although essentially agreeing, some of the focus group participants did not believe it was so straightforward. Luke spoke about situations where he was required to report to Centrelink that a young person had not attended an alternative education program as directed, or to report abuse to the Department of Community Services. If he made the report to Centrelink, the young person’s income allowance could be reduced or cut off. In some cases a report to the Department of Community Services was unlikely to have positive outcomes for the young person and could have a “detrimental impact.” Luke believed that in some situation it could be appropriate for a youth worker to decide not to report it but that he or she should not lie if asked directly. This led to some debate.

**Simon:** Whether you like it or not, you’re still an agent of the state, to some extent, and therefore you are married to the values of society and the state and you can’t just pick and chose the ones you like, in the professional context.

**Amy:** Especially when you’re talking about organisations who are reliant of government funding.

**Luke:** It’s just if we don’t challenge it, then it’s never going to change. If we accept what that government organisation is handing down --- ...

**Simon:** Just because you do something doesn’t mean you don’t challenge it. I mean you can still challenge stuff, but you still have to implement it. I mean, if you work in a juvenile detention centre, you might think that some of those young people there are
better off not being there, that it’s not necessarily the greatest place for them. But you
don’t go and release them. But you’d try and challenge it, and make a difference and
advocate within the sphere of influence that you can. But you still have to implement
the process that is there, to some extent.

There was a belief that youth workers could work within a system that was not
operating in the best interests of young people and still be working for change. Ellen
had worked for many years within juvenile detention centres and believed that she had
helped create some significant changes.

Ellen: I wonder then, who within those systems ... is with them [the young people]. I
mean that’s a struggle. But where you have that dual mandate if you like, of that
agency and of the young person, if you don’t have youth workers or the youth work
philosophy at play... then that’s worse, I think. I can clearly see the criticisms about
those particular agencies, and the impact on the young people. I guess this is an
argument I had to have many years ago when I first went into a detention centre as a
youth worker, well it was called a youth worker but I wouldn’t say it was a youth
worker in the first detention centre I went into [there was a rule that the youth workers
could not talk to the young people]. There was a view by my peers, outside of that
environment but in this field, that I somehow condoned detention by being there. And
so I was arguing that there was change without and change within, and if I reflect on
those years, there was a lot of advocacy and support and challenging within the system
for those young people who were detained, about what was happening to them, and
that was done from the youth work perspective.

Amy: And unless you’re within the system, again, how can you implement or
advocate or do the changes? Fair enough, they may say, “No there shouldn’t be youth
work in the detention centres,” but who then is going to do the changing?

In both scenarios (being required to make a report with negative implications for young
people and working in an organisation not respecting the rights of young people), most
of the participants appeared to argue that youth workers may sometimes be required to
do things with which they did not agree but that they should challenge practices that
were unjust or not in the best interests of young people. They recognised the dilemmas
and challenges involved but believed that it was unrealistic to suggest that youth
workers could avoid such dilemmas. They believed that youth workers could be active
in social change by working in, or with, organisations that had policies or practices inconsistent with youth work principles.

When it came to incorporating social change into the model, the first focus group made a number of suggestions resulting in the be active in social change becoming be committed to social change and apply principles of social justice. Social justice was included based on the argument put forward by some participants that social justice should underpin youth work (see also NSW Technical and Further Education Commission 2001; White 1987, 1990b) and that social justice was an important component of social change.

At the same time, the participants thought that the model needed to be action oriented and that youth workers needed to be involved in social change. A commitment to social change means that youth workers need to “actively and consciously situate” their practice within a “framework of broad political and social objectives” (White 1987, p. 25). Moyer (2001b) identifies four roles of social activism or approaches to social change (see Figure 11 - 2), which suggest that youth workers can contribute to social change in a multitude of ways. Some youth workers might be involved in social activism with young people and organise or take part in broad social change movements. Some might challenge social structures that disadvantage marginalised young people through lobbying, advocacy or court action. Some might help develop policies valuing and protecting the interests of marginalised young people. Some might work in ways that challenge work practices based on coercion and control. Not all social change activities require extra work by youth workers. For example, direct service providers could be involved in their day-to-day work by:

- Adopting non-coercive strategies for managing behaviour
- Promoting acceptance of diversity
- Challenging attitudes and behaviour that are discriminatory or violent towards others (such as sexism, racism and homophobia)
- Encouraging young people and colleagues to think critically about society
- Building relationships with young people based on power-with
- Sharing their experiences of working towards social change with other youth workers.
If youth workers were committed to social change and adopted reflective practice, they would identify strategies that were appropriate for their own specific contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Citizen</th>
<th>The Reformer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Upholds a widely held vision of the democratic, good society</td>
<td>• Transmits movement analyses and goals to powerholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates ordinary people support the social movement</td>
<td>• Performs parliamentary and legal efforts – lobbying, referenda, lawsuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives the movement legitimacy</td>
<td>• Works to create and expand new laws and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes it harder for powerholders to discredit the movement</td>
<td>• Acts as a watchdog to ensure the new laws and policies are actually funded and carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces the potential for violent attitudes and actions within the movement</td>
<td>• Mobilises movement opposition to conservative backlash efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Rebel</th>
<th>The Change Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Puts issues on the social and political agenda through dramatic, nonviolent actions</td>
<td>• Supports the involvement of large numbers of people in the process of addressing social problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dramatically illustrates social issues</td>
<td>• Promotes a new social and political majority consensus favouring positive solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shows how institutions and official powerholders violate public trust by causing and perpetuating critical social problems</td>
<td>• Promotes democratic principles and human values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forces society to face its problems</td>
<td>• Supports the development of coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes democracy</td>
<td>• Counters the actions of the powerholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moves society from reform to social change by promoting a paradigm shift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on Moyer 2001b, ch. 2)

**Figure 11 - 2: Four roles of social activism**

**Ensure there are adequate, appropriate staff and resources**

The in-depth interviews emphasised the importance of youth services having adequate and appropriate staff and resources if youth workers were to use nonviolent strategies for managing behaviour. While not being a significant issue in the focus groups, both groups recognised the importance of adequate staff. In particular, some participants in the first group spoke about situations where they had been sole workers in youth centres with up to 50 or 60 young people and the difficulties this had created, particularly in responding to violence.

Sophie also emphasised the importance of management committees in creating the culture of the service and the negative impact management committees could have on the way in which the service operated:
Sophie: I’m just aware of services where the staff have sort of said, “No let’s give this kid another go,” and management have come down occupational health and safety, “No, this kid can’t come in...” Sometimes some management committees are quite violent, verbally, in how they deal with their staff, and then the staff sort of --- It sort of goes way down and back up again.

In order to ensure that there are adequate and appropriate staff and resources, youth workers can:

- Assist their management committees or other management structures to adopt a philosophy of nonviolence
- Ensure the selection criteria for new positions include a commitment to nonviolence
- Lobby for adequate funding
- Seek alternative sources of funding
- Create a supportive environment that encourages the retention of staff
- Seek supervision that improves their skills.

Negotiate clear expectations and boundaries

Negotiating clear expectations and boundaries includes negotiating expectations and boundaries as a basis for managing behaviour, negotiating boundaries to the relationship between young people and youth workers to ensure that the relationship is professional and caring, and negotiating mandates with young people and other stakeholders. The participants in the in-depth interviews emphasised the importance of negotiating clear boundaries and expectations when managing behaviour. Not only did youth workers need to be clear about their expectations, they needed to include young people in setting boundaries. Non-coercive strategies for managing behaviour involve working-with young people and a starting point is ensuring that they help develop agreements about the standards of behaviour in the service (Glasser 1992; Kohn 1996; Porter 2000a).

Both the in-depth interviews and the focus groups emphasised the importance of boundaries to the relationship between youth workers and young people.

Jacki: I worked in a service where there was someone who was one of the kids, and they all went to this person. But when they were in trouble, or when they really needed
assistance, they never went to that person, they went to the uncool, older, straight-
down-the-line person because they knew, they trusted or they respected their advice.
Whereas the other one, they’d hang around and they’d chat with them, they showed a
lot less respect for that person than they did for the other one...

**Sam:** Were they equal workers?

**Jacki:** Yes they were. It was just how it happened...

**Emma:** And on the other hand you don’t want to be too straight-down-the-line and
unapproachable, because all the young people will just think that you’re a total looser,
or whatever. It’s just about that balance. You can’t be one or the other, you’ve got to
be a bit of both, in different situations.

**Sam:** A lot of it’s about respect isn’t it and relationship. Even though you mightn’t be
cool or “one of the boys” they respect you and know that you are trustworthy, that’s
what really counts.

As has already been identified, Sercombe (1998) discusses the importance of youth
workers negotiating a clear mandate with young people to ensure that power is not
misused. Negotiating expectations and boundaries is a two way process. It helps the
young people to be clear about what is expected of them but equally it helps the youth
workers to be clear about what is expected of them. This reciprocal process is important
if youth workers are to operate from a position of power-with.

*Promote a positive environment and respond to behaviour nonviolently*

The focus groups raised a number of issues in relation to the best way of articulating an
approach to managing behaviour. There was particular concern about the term
behaviour management. In the in-depth interviews only Ross had used these words, and
then only after he had been asked about it as a term. His response indicated that some
care was needed: “That implies power straight away, you know, ‘I’m going to manage
your behaviour.’” In the focus groups, participants varied in their reactions to the term
and, if they did not use it, how they described what they did. Like Ross, some of them
reacted negatively to behaviour management as a term. They felt it had connotations
associated with control and behaviour modification.

**Rebecca:** I think it sounds like that someone is in control of somebody else, and to me
that’s not comfortable.
Claire: And it doesn’t imply any negotiation or anything. As you say, it’s more of a controlling thing, “We’re going to manage your behaviour.” It’s not like we’re going to work together.

Others did not react as negatively equating it with terms such as time management.

Jacki: I don’t see it as a controlling thing. Management doesn’t, to me, feel controlling. It’s about managing something, whether it’s good or bad. I don’t see it as a negative... And when you’re putting it in something like this, I don’t know what else you could call it, because that is what you’re talking about, managing a behaviour, managing a situation, managing something. It’s not saying controlling a behaviour, controlling a situation... You manage your service, you manage your daily budget, so management to me doesn’t feel like a negative or control.

The participants who did not like the term behaviour management had difficulties proposing a better term. Many of the suggestions related only to one part of managing behaviour. For example, participants spoke about charters or agreements but these are about setting agreed standards of behaviour and do not refer to the full range of strategies used by youth workers. Another participant suggested, “it’s responding to challenging behaviour,” but this did not include strategies aimed at preventing problem behaviour. Ellen argued that the term also needed to focus not just on problem behaviour but also on positive behaviour.

Ellen: It refers to not only dealing with problematic behaviour but tapping into positive behaviour, or you know helpful behaviour. I think it covers a lot of things... I see it as an umbrella for both positive and negative stuff. Whatever terminology you use. Because people often limit it to responding to problematic behaviour, then I think its been given negative connotations and I think it’s why we don’t hear that language with youth workers, well most youth work agencies.

Some participants preferred the term managing behaviour and believed that the negative connotations were not as great but others still thought that the word managing still had “an element of control in it” and that they would leave it out. Following the focus groups both behaviour management and managing behaviour were avoided in the model but, as no alternative had been identified, were used in discussion of the model.
During the in-depth interviews, the discussion had focused on preventing and responding to problems. As Ellen indicated, however, managing behaviour also included a focus on promoting positive behaviour. In the final model use _non-coercive behaviour management strategies_ was modified so that it became _promote a positive environment_ and _respond to behaviour nonviolently_. _Promote a positive environment_ was based on the in-depth interviews that had demonstrated the importance of creating such an environment. _Promote_ was selected rather than _create_ because some aspects of a positive environment, such as nonviolent behaviour by young people, could be promoted but not created by youth workers. _Respond to behaviour nonviolently_ related to the way in which youth workers responded to behaviour, particularly negative behaviour, although it could also include responses to positive behaviour. The term _nonviolently_ was used rather than _non-coercive_ because, as Diane suggested, it was more consistent with the focus of the research and the model.

The focus groups reinforced the importance of further consideration being given to ways in which youth workers could manage behaviour nonviolently. The participants believed there were many dilemmas and grey areas. While opposing physical intervention in most cases, some of them believed that there were occasions where it was necessary for youth workers to intervene.

**Matt:** I think taking a weapon off a young person is a tricky area regardless and it should be left to professionals. However, it’s not always easy.

**Jacki:** Well if it’s in the best interests of a lot of young people -

**Sam:** You’ve got a duty of care...

**Claire:** The incidents where that has happened, there’s no opportunity where you could call the police or get a professional in there to do it, without someone getting really hurt before they got there. So it’s the moment and that’s when a decision has to be made.

**Sam:** And the best response I’ve had from the police is 20 minutes anyway.

**Claire:** Exactly. If they turn up. You’ve got youth workers, they should be able to do something.

The use of police, according to Alison, was always going to be an ethical dilemma but a number of participants could see situations where it was appropriate. Sam highlighted some of the dilemmas involved:
Sam: I had one incident where a fairly large, tall guy was quite aggro and going off and very threatening, and I said, “Call the police,” and that was when he started moving outside and settled down, he was still aggro. But when I spoke to him a few days later, I said, “What else could I have done in the situation? What would have calmed you.” And he said, “No calling the police was the best thing, ‘cos I’m 19 and so I’d be going away, so it was the best thing.” Whereas I had another situation just recently where a young person was going off, and heard that the worker had called the police, and that was when he went and assaulted a worker. “If you’re calling the police anyway, I’ll give you something ---.”

Diane suggested that, depending on the police, it was not necessarily coercive and could be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence. If youth workers were going to use the police, participants in the first focus group suggested it was important that, where possible, they built a relationship with them beforehand and discussed ways of intervening that were consistent with the aims of the youth service.

Exclusion from a youth service was also seen as a dilemma. As with the in-depth interviews, participants in the focus groups believed that exclusion from youth accommodation services was more serious than from youth recreation services. Rebecca worked in an accommodation service that also had a small drop-in centre for clients. She said that exclusion from accommodation services was “a real big one” and was dependent on ensuring there was somewhere else for the young person to go. Exclusion from the drop-in centre, however, occurred quite regularly. Ellen expressed concern that the context of the behaviour leading to exclusion was not always taken into account and that reflective practice was important.

Ellen: I think it’s interesting, the exclusion always seems to be, or for the most part seems to be, just based on the young person and their behaviour, and not about how they’ve been responded to. Like I get that sense, that there’s all this problematic behaviour that you’re being hit with, that you’ve now decided we’ve got to exclude him or her, or maybe we need to exclude. And it’s always the sum of that behaviour rather than that behaviour and, “Well, how have we responded so far and is there a different way we can respond? Are there certain circumstances that are exacerbating this behaviour or stimulating this behaviour.” So it’s always looking at the young people and their behaviour and grounds for exclusion... It was very easy for staff to say, “He’s a problem, he needs to go somewhere else.” To then start exploring with them, “Hang on, what are the problem behaviours? When do they occur? How are you
responding to them? Have you responded to them in this range of ways?" And that they have to go through all that before they could be moved out.

Although the model does not provide clear principles for managing behaviour nonviolently, it is a starting point. The Community Service Commission (2001) highlights some of the challenges for youth workers in managing behaviour and demonstrates the need for further debate about appropriate strategies. Unlike youth work literature, there is a great deal of discussion of managing behaviour in education literature. There are many approaches to managing behaviour in the classroom, many of which are based on coercion and control (Charles, Barr & Senter 1999; Docking 1980; Kohn 1996; Rogers 1997). Some approaches, however, are based on meeting the needs of young people, building community and cooperation (see for example Glasser 1986, 1992; Kohn 1986, 1993, 1996; Porter 1994, 2000a, 2000b). These approaches are consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence as they operate from a position of power-with and offer useful guidance to youth workers. While such approaches may still occasionally necessitate the use of more coercive approaches, such as physical intervention, the use of police and exclusion as a punishment, such measures should be a last resort after youth workers have attempted to identify other strategies. It is possible that an important factor in determining whether or not interventions such as physical restraint are consistent with a philosophy and practice of nonviolence is the intent of the intervention. If the intent of the intervention is respectful, seeks to protect the individual from harm and provides the young person with the opportunity to change their behaviour, it may be consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence. If the focus of the intervention is on control or maintaining power-over, it is unlikely to be consistent.

Facilitate informal education

Although youth workers may adopt other roles as well, the model encourages youth workers to facilitate informal education. Informal education provides a useful theoretical framework for youth work (Banks 1996, 1999a; Jeffs & Smith 1990c; Rosseter 1987; Smith 1988): one that is consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence. Informal education is grounded in a commitment to social justice, individual and social transformation, critical thinking, dialogue and collaboration (Jeffs & Smith 1990c). It has been shaped by advocates for social change like Dewey (1963, 1966), Illich (1973),
and Freire (1973, 1994) who have challenged not only the way in which education is practised but also the broader social context of education. Jeffs and Smith (1990b, p. 9) argue that informal education involves dialogue and critical thinking, through which people can recognise the ways in which they are marginalised and disempowered and to take action for change. They also suggest that informal education entails “a respect for truth and for justice, a commitment to collaborative working and a belief in reflectiveness and theory making” (p. 9).

Even when informal education focuses on individuals, it encourages them to reflect on their broader cultural and social contexts (Foreman 1990; Jeffs & Smith 1990b; Smith 1988). Francis (1990, p. 59) gives an example of a hairdressing session with young women that allowed for the exploration of a wide range of issues, some of which focused on the individual and some of which focused on broader issues. Issues explored included healthy diets, hair braiding and beading, self-image, who women look good for, why women change their looks, and the professionalisation of hair dressing and beauty therapy. Foreman (1990, p. 34) suggests that if informal education in youth work was to assist young people in the transition to adulthood, then it needed to increase political awareness and to promote collective action against oppression constraining young people. Through informal education, young people can:

- Gain a deeper insight into their situations and the institutional structures that surround them. They may experience an enhanced sense of freedom and choice, which often leads to more critical questioning, to increased self-respect for their own thoughts and ideas and to greater involvement in community and political life (Francis 1990, p. 59).

Jeffs and Smith (1990a, pp. 137-138) argue that genuinely emancipatory practice, ideally the aim of informal education, promotes positive liberty and autonomy. Young people should have control over their learning (Jeffs & Smith 1990b, p. 8) and so, at its best, informal education is based on power-with and youth workers collaborate with young people in identifying the direction of their learning (Jeffs & Smith 1990b, p. 17). There has been little consideration of informal education in Australian youth work but the philosophical and theoretical base of informal education is consistent with that of nonviolence and so the model promotes it as a useful practice base.
Although a detailed discussion of the implications of adopting informal education as a focus for Australian youth work is beyond the scope of this study, two preliminary observations can be made:

- A focus on informal education could move youth work away from a traditional welfare approach. Rather than being the primary focus of youth work, activities such as providing accommodation or emergency relief would become mechanisms through which informal education could take place.

- Non-coercive approaches to managing behaviour are more likely to be consistent with informal education than coercive approaches. The main focus of responding to disruptive, violent or unsafe behaviour would be to assist young people to learn from their experiences and to protect the safety and wellbeing of others. An example where such an approach could be taken is when young people return to an accommodation service drunk. Rather than treating such behaviour primarily as a discipline issue, possibly leading to exclusion, the focus would be education. The youth workers could model conflict resolution skills and explore issues such as alcohol use, making agreements, why young people are treated differently from adults, and how young people could be protected from harm while still protecting their rights.

**OMISSIONS FROM THE MODEL**

Clearly, a model such as this cannot include every feature of nonviolent youth work practice. In particular, two principles of nonviolence, mainly associated with Gandhian traditions, were not explicitly incorporated into the model:

- Spiritual beliefs and qualities are valued
- There is a willingness to accept suffering in order to create change.

Although Walz, Ritchie and colleagues (Ritchie 2001; Walz & Ritchie 2000; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990) have demonstrated their relevance to social work practice, it was decided that neither warranted inclusion in the model.

Walz and Ritchie (2000) suggest that social work has been reviewing its use of spirituality in practice and that it can be incorporated in a number of ways. According to
Sermabeikian (in Walz & Ritchie 2000), spiritual values can “assist an individual in giving meaning to experience, as well as giving meaning to ultimate reality, a feeling of belonging and universal justice” (p. 214). Youth workers deal with young people holistically and so they should take into account a young person’s spiritual needs as well as their other needs. Youth workers may also benefit from addressing their own spiritual needs but spirituality is just one aspect of a fulfilling, healthy life.

Arising from his spiritual beliefs, Gandhi believed that self-suffering was a necessary part of self-realisation and that it could be a positive experience. He thus saw it as having an important, positive role to play in a philosophy of nonviolence (Gandhi 1987; Ritchie 2001; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990). In contrast, in the West, suffering is often seen as something to be avoided, is treated like a disease and is considered to be a negative experience (Ritchie 2001; Walz, Sharma & Birnbaum 1990). Given this perception, it is perhaps not surprising that the notion of suffering created significant discussion among participants in the focus groups and that they were unsure about its application to youth work. Some of the concern was in relation to the term suffering and its negative connotations.

Claire: Suffering seems like a pretty heavy sort of word that conjures up different images of what suffering is.

Jacki: Suffering sounds violent.

Sophie: I wouldn’t necessarily see it as accepting suffering. I would see it more as dealing with hardship. I think for some people, accepting suffering is just not a path they are prepared to take, so they wouldn’t then even look at the others. It’s kind of like saying you’ve got to go through suffering to have a child, labour is suffering, but for a lot of women it’s a hardship to get to that end goal, whereas they wouldn’t necessarily see it as suffering.

There was also some concern about the implications of accepting suffering and to what extent it was appropriate in youth work.

Mary: We get into that really blurry boundary stuff, where it’s sort of my role to put myself out there so that I’m doing the best thing for the young people. And I think we have to be really careful about that...
Diane: You can find a youth worker who is just laying down and becoming a door mat, and it’s their motive and they need to be understanding what they are doing.

Simon: That’s not particularly nonviolent is it? ...

Mary: Yeah, I was thinking more about the active stuff, like taking young people home and going above and beyond the call of duty.

Ellen: Over-involvement.

Mary: Yeah and then sacrificing themselves in that way, to create change for the young person. Which workers do.

Ellen: They do, but would we say it is a way of creating change for that young person? Even though people are still doing that, over-involving and over-investing, we know that that’s not the most effective way to work with those young people.

Ellen emphasised that if suffering were to occur, it needed to be connected with creating change.

Ellen: If you see the coupling of suffering and creating change, then just laying down and doing nothing is not a process, and it’s not an action. So I think it’s important to couple the two, that if the objective is about creating change, then there’s that willingness to accept suffering in the process of doing that. So it may mean making some modification, but not on the principle that you just do everything the way young people want it to be done, but on the principle that we may have to do it this way to get the best change result, which is not necessarily the best --- the way my personal preference is. But if we are going to get this result, we are going to have to make this sacrifice.

The model did not directly incorporate the role of suffering because it was likely to be a barrier to adoption of the model by youth workers, and focus attention on suffering rather than the overall model. Youth workers may experience suffering or hardship as a result of adopting the model but there is no virtue in seeking out suffering (Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group 1983). Thus suffering is seen as a potential byproduct of the model rather than a defining principle. Although neither principle is explicitly incorporated in the model, both can be implied by be committed to nonviolence in all you do.
CONCLUSION

The model of nonviolent youth work practice was based on literature on nonviolence, literature on youth work and related disciplines, and the focus groups and in-depth interviews conducted as part of this study. Figure 11 - 3 summarises the main sources for each part of the model. The final chapter identifies some of the areas which require further exploration in order to make the model more useful to youth workers and suggests some implications for practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model components</th>
<th>Principles of nonviolence</th>
<th>Youth work &amp; related literature</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be committed to nonviolence in all you do</td>
<td>Nonviolence is a way of life. The means are consistent with the ends</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a reflective work practice</td>
<td>Nonviolence is a way of life</td>
<td>Fook (2002); Payne (2002)</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build professional, caring relationships</td>
<td>There is a profound respect for humanity. Actions are based on love. There is a commitment to truth and openness</td>
<td>Bessant, Sercombe and Watts (1998); Brendtro (1990); Fewster (1990); Sercombe (1997b); Walz and Ritchie (2000)</td>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on power-with</td>
<td>Power is understood as arising out of relationships</td>
<td>Flowers (1998); Sercombe (1998); White (1990a)</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be committed to social change</td>
<td>There is an active commitment to peace and social justice</td>
<td>Brown (1991); Cooper and White (1994); Pisarski (1992); Sercombe (2002); White (1987)</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply principles of social justice</td>
<td>There is an active commitment to peace and social justice</td>
<td>Cooper and White (1994); NSW Technical and Further Education Commission (2001); White (1987)</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure there are adequate, appropriate staff and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth interviews Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate clear expectations and boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sercombe (1997b)</td>
<td>In-depth interviews Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a positive environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth interviews Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to behaviour nonviolently</td>
<td>Violence is rejected as a means of resolving disputes and as a method of control. The means are consistent with the ends</td>
<td>Kohn (1986, 1993, 1996); Porter (1994, 2000a, 2000b)</td>
<td>In-depth interviews Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate informal education</td>
<td>There is an active commitment to peace and social justice</td>
<td>Jeffs (1990c); Smith (1988, 2001b)</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11 - 3: Sources for model of nonviolent youth work practice**
Chapter 12
Conclusion

This study explored the implications of a philosophy of nonviolence for youth work practice by examining literature on youth work and on nonviolence, and exploring perceptions, experiences and attitudes of youth workers and young people. Based on the findings of the study, a model of nonviolent youth work practice was presented and this final chapter suggests some implications of the model, identifies areas requiring further research and discusses future phases of intervention research.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

There are numerous implications for youth workers adopting the model of nonviolent practice. The following implications, not all of which apply to all youth workers, are examples:

*Be committed to nonviolence in all you do* implies that youth workers will:

- View nonviolence as being more than just a tactic to use in difficult situations.
- Make nonviolence a guiding framework for their work practice.
- Practice nonviolence in their personal life as well as their work life.
- Identify potential sources of structural and cultural violence within their services and address them.
- Be open and honest in all they do.

*Develop a reflective work practice* implies that youth workers will:

- Be willing to question and challenge assumptions they hold on a wide range of issues.
- Seek supervision that will assist them to reflect critically on their work practice.
- Explore the implications of nonviolence for all areas of their work practice.
- Explore the relationship between theory and their work practice.
Build professional, caring relationships implies that youth workers will:

- Genuinely care for and respect the young people with whom they work.
- Ensure there are clear boundaries to their relationships with young people.
- Develop professional relationships with young people in which the relationships are intentionally limited to protect the safety of the young people.
- Be open and honest in their relationships with young people.
- Base their actions on love and concern.
- Build positive relationships with fellow staff through cooperative, supportive teams.

Focus on power-with implies that youth workers will:

- View power as arising out of relationships rather than being inherent in a position or individual.
- Negotiate clear mandates with the young people with whom they work.
- Involve young people meaningfully in all aspects of their youth services.
- Adopt inclusive, participatory forms of decision making.
- Allow young people access to files that are kept on them.
- Recognise the skills, experience and wisdom of the young people with whom they work.
- Adopt cooperative approaches to conflict resolution.
- Challenge policies and practices that attempt to control young people.

Be committed to social change implies that youth workers will:

- Adopt models of youth work that contribute to social justice and social change.
- Ensure their services are as inclusive as possible.
- Arrange awareness raising programs within their services.
- Take part in broader social change campaigns where appropriate.
- Discuss nonviolent work practices with other youth workers.
- Challenge policies, work practices and attitudes that contribute to injustice, violence, or marginalisation.
- Challenge policies and practices that view young people in terms of deficits or exclude young people from meaningful participation in the community.
- Encourage their services to adopt nonviolence as a guiding framework.
Apply principles of social justice implies that youth workers will:

- Ensure that their services value equity, participation, access and equality.
- Act as advocates on behalf of young people where necessary.
- Challenge policies and practices that marginalise, or discriminate against, young people or groups of young people.
- Identify marginalised groups of young people who are not using their services and consider ways of meeting their needs.
- Maintain a passion for social justice.

Ensure there are adequate, appropriate staff and resources implies that youth workers will:

- Work with their management committees or other management structures to identify the best use of available staff and resources.
- Include a commitment to nonviolence in their selection criteria for new staff.
- Lobby for adequate staffing and funding for youth work.
- Work with other staff to develop work practices that are consistent with a philosophy of nonviolence.
- Provide support and encouragement to other staff, and promote a positive work environment.

Negotiate clear expectations and boundaries implies that youth workers will:

- Negotiate clear mandates with the young people with whom they work.
- Involve young people in developing clear expectations of behaviour (for both staff and young people).
- State clearly their expectations about the ways in which their services will operate.
- Challenge behaviour that is inconsistent with agreed expectations.
- Be willing to change expectations on a regular basis.
- Comply with agreed expectations in relation to their own behaviour.

Create a positive environment implies that youth workers will:

- Involve young people in creating positive environments.
- Be welcoming, friendly and accepting.
Promote behaviour that is accepting, nonviolent and welcoming.
Address behaviour that is unsafe, discriminatory, or violent.
Listen carefully to young people and address their concerns.
Respond to negative behaviour in ways that do not escalate the situation.
Maintain positive physical environments.

**Respond to behaviour nonviolently** implies that youth workers will:

- Consider developing a policy of no exclusion in situations where young people have few or no other options.
- Only use exclusion when the safety or wellbeing of others is at risk and exclusion is a last resort; or when young people have other options, and they are given the opportunity to make a genuine choice between following agreed expectations of behaviour or being excluded for a period.
- Develop relationships with local police and discuss nonviolent responses with them if they are going to be used as intervention strategies.
- Respond early to disruptive, violent or discriminatory behaviour.
- Avoid attempts to control the behaviour of young people through coercion.
- Identify alternatives to physical intervention, circumstances in which it might become necessary, and ways in which its negative impact can be minimised.

**Facilitate informal education** implies that youth workers will:

- See one of their main roles as being to assist young people to develop skills, experiences and knowledge within their everyday life.
- Assist young people to explore their social, economic, cultural and political contexts.
- View disruptive, violent or discriminatory behaviour as opportunities to explore alternative behaviours.
- Work with young people in their social and cultural context.
- Assist young people to identify their own learning needs and learning styles.
- Use conversation to allow young people to explore issues of interest or importance to them.
FURTHER RESEARCH

Youth work does not have a strong history of research and there are many areas that warrant further study. In relation to this research, there are four that are particularly relevant: managing behaviour, social justice and social change, power-with, and informal education.

Managing behaviour

The implications of nonviolence for managing behaviour require further consideration. While some broad principles have been identified, more detailed strategies need to be developed. The research clearly demonstrated that managing behaviour was a major issue for youth workers and so it is surprising that there has been so little discussion of it in Australian youth work literature (the main exception is Community Service Commission 2001). Further research could explore:

- The extent of various strategies used by youth workers to manage behaviour.
- The effectiveness of different approaches to behaviour management.
- Young people’s attitudes towards, and experiences of, behaviour management by youth workers.
- The effectiveness of youth worker training in preparing them for managing behaviour.
- Current training needs of youth workers in relation to managing behaviour.
- Terms used to describe managing behaviour that are acceptable to youth workers and do not imply external control of somebody else’s behaviour.
- Principles of nonviolent behaviour management.
- Skills needed by youth workers to implement nonviolent behaviour management.

Social justice and social change

Youth work in Australia is built on a commitment to social justice. As White (1987, 1990a, 1990b) and others (Conference of Australian Youth Organisations 1985; Cooper & White 1994; Pisarski 1992; Quixley 1992) argue, however, youth workers are more likely to focus on individual change, and so research into the attitudes of youth workers...
towards, and their involvement in, social justice and social change would be helpful. An important aspect of social change could be exploring ways in which youth services could be nonviolent and inclusive themselves. In particular research could explore:

- How youth workers understand a commitment to social justice.
- Ways in which youth workers implement a commitment to social justice in their day to day work.
- Reasons why youth workers are or are not involved in social change.
- Ways in which youth workers are involved in social change.
- Barriers to youth workers being involved in social change.
- Ways in which young people can be involved in social change.
- The extent of discrimination and violence within youth services.
- Strategies to make youth services safer and more inclusive.

*Power-with*

Ways in which youth workers understand power, and ways in which they exercise it, need more research. Youth participation, which can contribute to power-with, is a growing theme in working with young people but there has not been a great deal of research into ways in which youth workers promote participation by young people in their services. Research into power-with could explore:

- Perceptions and attitudes held by youth workers and young people towards power.
- Ways in which youth workers and young people exercise power.
- Ways in which youth workers assist young people to exercise power meaningfully.
- Ways in which youth workers attempt to empower young people.
- Differences between approaches to empowerment that focus on individual or collective empowerment.
- The extent and nature of youth participation in youth services.
- Ways in which young people can be meaningfully involved in all aspects of the management and development of youth service.
- The impact on young people of different ways youth workers exercise power.
Informal education

Informal education is not a common theme in Australian youth work literature and so there is great scope for further research. As a start, research could explore:

- Attitudes of youth workers and young people towards informal education.
- Ways in which youth workers are currently involved in informal education.
- Appropriate roles for youth workers in informal education.
- Training needed by youth workers in order to become effective informal educators.

CONTINUING INTERVENTION RESEARCH

This study has only undertaken the first three phases of the six phases of intervention research. The priority for the next phase (early development and pilot testing) will be to identify principles, and implication for practice, of nonviolent ways of managing behaviour. The biggest challenge for youth workers in implementing the model is likely to be when they are faced with violent, unsafe or discriminatory behaviour by young people. In order for the model to be of practical use, nonviolent ways of managing behaviour require further exploration. The model also needs to be pilot tested in youth services. During the fifth phase of intervention research (evaluation and advanced development), the model needs to be tested and refined. In particular, further development is needed in relation to the role of administration and management in youth workers adopting a model of nonviolent practice and youth services creating cultures of nonviolence. Because the aim of intervention research is to improve interventions by practitioners, the final phase is dissemination (Corrigan, MacKain & Liberman 1994; Fawcett et al. 1994; Rooney 1994; Thomas 1978a). Through the updates, articles and conference presentations, dissemination has already commenced with the aim of increasing the awareness of issues related to nonviolence and youth work.

CONCLUSION

Since commencing this study in 1999, the World Trade Centre has been attacked; the Bali bombings rocked the Asia Pacific region; the United States of America, Australia
and other countries have gone to war in Afghanistan and Iraq; and Australia has toughened its response to asylum seekers and refugees. Internationally millions of people continue to die or suffer because of starvation and poverty while the West consumes the world’s resources at an unsustainable rate. Locally indigenous Australians continue to experience oppression and injustice, violence in the home continues to be a widespread problem, and many young people are marginalised by social structures and practices that fail to protect their interests. Often the vision of a nonviolent, just society appears to be beyond our reach, and so it is vital that alternative ways of relating are explored at many levels of society. The model of nonviolent practice presented here is one attempt to explore ways in which nonviolence can become a foundation of a better society. The two most important principles contained in the model are *be committed to nonviolence in all you do* and *develop a reflective work practice*. If youth workers are committed to nonviolence and reflect on their practice, they will discover ways of being nonviolent. This model is a starting point.
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Appendix 1

Telephone Survey

Survey No:

Hi, I’m Graeme Stuart from the University of Newcastle, can I please speak to the coordinator?

[When put through to the coordinator.]

Hi, I’m Graeme Stuart from the University of Newcastle. Hopefully you received a letter a few days ago about some research I’m doing into organisational cultures of nonviolence in youth services. Did it get to you? [If not organise to send copy and a time to ring back.]

Do you have any questions about the research or survey?

Are you willing for somebody from your organisation to take part in the survey?

Can I ask who will do the survey and when would be a good time to contact them?

Have they received a copy of the information about the survey?

[Organise a time to talk to the person who will answer the survey and also ensure that they will receive a copy of the information sheet if they haven’t done so.]

[When put through to the person taking part in the survey.]

Hi, I’m Graeme Stuart from the University of Newcastle. Hopefully you have received information about some research I’m doing into organisational cultures of nonviolence in youth services. Did it get to you? [If not organise to send copy and a time to ring back.]

Do you have time to talk about it now? [If not check if it’s OK to make a time to ring back.]

Before agreeing to take part in the survey, can I emphasise that:

• No identifying information will be kept with the survey and all information will be kept confidential.
• The information obtained will be used to identify current work practice around the state and identify issues for further exploration through some in depth interviews.
• A brief paper will be produced summarising the results and you will be sent a copy (unless you would prefer not to receive it).
• You can choose not to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the interview at any stage with no repercussions.
• If you agree to take part, the survey will probably take about 20-30 minutes.

Do you have any questions about the research or survey?

Can I check if you are willing to take part in the survey?
Yes No IF NO, ASK IF SOME OTHER TIME WOULD BE CONVENIENT, IF NOT THANK THEM AND HANG UP.

In the survey, most of the questions are about your beliefs, perceptions or ideas, so there are no right or wrong answers. In quite a few of the questions I will ask how strongly you agree or disagree with a statement using a scale 1 – 5 where:

1 is strongly disagree
2 is disagree
3 is neither agree nor disagree
4 is agree
5 is strongly agree
I’d like to start with a few fairly general questions.

**How strongly do you agree or disagree that it is very important that youth services assist young people to develop conflict resolution skills?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How strongly do you agree or disagree that it is very important that youth services develop violence prevention strategies?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How strongly do you agree or disagree that youth services generally deal with violent situations very well?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I’d like to ask you some questions about your perception of your service.

Using the scale of strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree again, how strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements in relation to your service

**The staff operate as a cohesive team.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The behaviour management strategies used by staff demonstrate poor conflict resolution skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T READ OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The staff act with great respect towards the young people who use our service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T READ OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have the resources we need to provide a high quality, nonviolent service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T READ OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The behaviour management strategies used, vary depending on which staff are on duty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T READ OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff act as nonviolent role models for the young people who use our service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T READ OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Young people are rarely involved in decision making.

**READ OUT**
- strongly disagree 1
- disagree 2
- neither agree nor disagree 3
- agree 4
- strongly agree 5

**DON'T READ OUT**
- refused/don’t know 0

Is it OK to keep going?  
**DON'T READ OUT**  
- Yes  
- No

On a scale of 1-5 where 1 is very violent, 2 is violent, 3 is neither violent nor nonviolent, 4 is nonviolent and 5 is very nonviolent, how violent or nonviolent do you consider your service to be?

**DON'T READ OUT**
- Very violent 1
- Violent 2
- Neither nonviolent nor violent 3
- Nonviolent 4
- Very nonviolent 5
- Refused/don’t know 0

When we talk about violence it is sometimes useful to consider it in terms of physical violence, verbal violence and emotional or psychological violence. I'd like you to consider each of these three aspects in relation to the interaction between young people, the interaction between staff and young people, and the interaction between staff at your service. (For these questions please keep using the scale of 1-5 where 1 is very violent, 2 is violent, 3 is neither violent nor nonviolent, 4 is nonviolent and 5 is very nonviolent.

Starting with the interaction between young people.

When considering your actual experience of physical violence between young people at your work, how violent do you think their interactions are?

**DON'T READ OUT**
- Very violent 1
- Violent 2
- Neither nonviolent nor violent 3
- Nonviolent 4
- Very nonviolent 5
- Refused/don’t know 0

Still with the interaction between young people, when considering your actual experience of verbal violence between young people at your work, how violent do you think their interactions are?

**DON'T READ OUT**
- Very violent 1
- Violent 2
- Neither nonviolent nor violent 3
- Nonviolent 4
- Very nonviolent 5
- Refused/don’t know 0
And finally for the interaction between young people, when considering your actual experience of emotional or psychological violence between young people at your work, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I want you to think about the way young people interact with staff.

When considering your actual experience of physical violence by young people towards staff, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still with the way young people interact with staff, when considering your actual experience of verbal violence by young people towards staff, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still with the way young people interact with staff, when considering your actual experience of emotional or psychological violence by young people towards staff, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I want you to think about the way staff interact with young people.

When considering your actual experience of physical violence by staff towards young people, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When considering your actual experience of verbal violence by staff towards young people, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering your actual experience of emotional or psychological violence by staff towards young people, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And looking at the interaction between staff.

When considering your actual experience of physical violence between staff, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still with the interaction between staff, when considering your actual experience of verbal violence between staff, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And finally for the interaction between staff, when considering your actual experience of emotional or psychological violence between staff, how violent do you think their interactions are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither nonviolent nor violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very nonviolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is it OK to keep going?  DON'T READ OUT  Yes  No
Still thinking about where you work, the next few questions are about how accepting or unaccepting of minority groups you think your service is. I’m going to ask you questions about both the staff and the young people and I would like you to use a scale of 1 to 5 again where 1 is very unaccepting, 2 is fairly unaccepting, 3 is neither accepting nor unaccepting, 4 is fairly accepting and 5 is very accepting. Let’s start with the young people.

How unaccepting or accepting would you say young people are of:

Gay and lesbian young people

READ OUT
Very unaccepting  1
Fairly unaccepting  2
Neither accepting nor unaccepting  3
Fairly accepting  4
Very accepting  5
DON’T READ OUT
Refused/don’t know  0

Young people from a non English speaking background

READ OUT
Very unaccepting  1
Fairly unaccepting  2
Neither accepting nor unaccepting  3
Fairly accepting  4
Very accepting  5
DON’T READ OUT
Refused/don’t know  0

Indigenous young people

READ OUT
Very unaccepting  1
Fairly unaccepting  2
Neither accepting nor unaccepting  3
Fairly accepting  4
Very accepting  5
DON’T READ OUT
Refused/don’t know  0

Young people with a mental illness

READ OUT
Very unaccepting  1
Fairly unaccepting  2
Neither accepting nor unaccepting  3
Fairly accepting  4
Very accepting  5
DON’T READ OUT
Refused/don’t know  0
Young people with a physical disability

Once again using the scale of 1 is very unaccepting and 5 is very accepting, how accepting would you say staff are of:

Gay and lesbian young people

Young people from a non English speaking background

Indigenous young people

Young people with a mental illness
Young people with a physical disability

I now want to ask you about some of the policies your service might or might not have. For each of the following can you tell me whether or not you have the policy and, if you do, how familiar you are with the policy.

Do you have an access and equity policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES How familiar are you with the policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DON'T READ OUT

| Refused/don't know | 0 |

Do you have a behaviour management policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES How familiar are you with the policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DON'T READ OUT

| Refused/don't know | 0 |

Do you have a discipline policy (in relation to young people not staff)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES How familiar are you with the policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DON'T READ OUT

| Refused/don't know | 0 |

Do you have a complaints policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES How familiar are you with the policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READ OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DON'T READ OUT

| Refused/don't know | 0 |
Do you have a dispute resolution policy?

no 1
yes 2  IF YES How familiar are you with the policy?

READ OUT

very familiar 4
fairly familiar 3
a little bit familiar 2
not at all familiar 1
DON'T READ OUT
refused/don’t know 0

Are there any other policies you have which you think are relevant to nonviolent work practice or developing an organisational culture of nonviolence?

We’re nearly finished, is it OK to keep going? DON’T READ OUT  Yes  No

For the rest of the survey, when I say a culture of nonviolence within youth services, I mean an organisational culture which encourages staff and young people to be nonviolent, to respond positively to conflict and to be free of discrimination (eg homophobia, racism, sexism). By nonviolence, I also mean nonviolence physically, verbally and emotionally or psychologically.

What would you say are the main barriers, if any, to your service having a culture of nonviolence?

What do you think would help your service develop a culture of nonviolence?

DON'T READ OUT

CODE AS MANY AS REQUIRED

More staff 1
Training 2
More time 3
More resources 4
Better policies 5
Refused/don’t know 0

How important do you think it is that youth services develop a culture of nonviolence?

READ OUT

Very important 1
Important 2
Neither important nor unimportant 3
Unimportant 4
Very unimportant 5
DON'T READ OUT
Refused/don’t know 0

Finally, I want to ask you a few general questions about you and your service
How many full time staff does your service have?

How many part time staff does your service have?

How many casual staff does your service have?

How many volunteers does your service have?

Are you the coordinator of the service?

- yes  2
- no    1

What are the main services your project offers?

- Street Work     1
- Education and Training  2
- Case Management    3
- Case Work         4
- Community Development 5
- Outreach          6
- Recreational activities  7
- Information and referral 8
- Accommodation (PROMPT FOR)
  - Crisis  9
  - Medium Term  10
  - Long Term  11
- Refused/don’t know  0

What is your service’s target group?

What is your gender?

- Female  1
- Male  2

How many years have you been working as a youth worker?

What Award (if any) are you employed under?

- SACS  1
- CETS  2

Is there anything you would like to add?

Thank you very much for your time and effort.
## Appendix 2

### Telephone Survey Results

**Questions 1-3: Attitudes towards conflict resolution, violence prevention and how well youth service deal with violence.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is very important that youth services assist young people to develop conflict resolution skills. (n=60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very important that youth services develop violence prevention strategies. (n=60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth services generally deal with violent situations very well. (n=60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4: Perceptions of their service.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4.1 The staff operate as a cohesive team. (n=56)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.2 The behaviour management strategies used by staff demonstrate poor conflict resolution skills. (n=60)</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.3 The staff act with great respect towards the young people who use our service. (n=60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.4 We have the resources we need to provide a high quality, nonviolent service. (n=60)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.5 The behaviour management strategies used, vary depending on which staff are on duty. (n=57)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.6 Staff act as nonviolent role models for the young people who use our service. (n=60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.7 Young people are rarely involved in decision making. (n=60)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5: Perceptions of overall level of violence in youth service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How violent or nonviolent do you consider your service to be? (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6: Perceptions of physical, verbal and emotion/psychological violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical violence between young people (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal violence between young people (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional/psychological violence between young people (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical violence by young people towards staff (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal violence by young people towards staff (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional/psychological violence by young people towards staff (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical violence by staff towards young people (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal violence by staff towards young people (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional/psychological violence by staff towards young people (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical violence between staff (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal violence between staff (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional/psychological violence between staff (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Neither Nonviolent nor Violent</th>
<th>Nonviolent</th>
<th>Very Nonviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 7.1: Perceptions of how accepting or unaccepting young people were of marginalised groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unaccepting</th>
<th>Unaccepting</th>
<th>Neither Accepting nor Unaccepting</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
<th>Very Accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay and lesbian young people (n=60)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people from a non English speaking background (n=58)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous young people (n=57)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a mental illness (n=55)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a physical disability (n=57)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7.2: Perceptions of how accepting or unaccepting staff were of marginalised groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unaccepting</th>
<th>Unaccepting</th>
<th>Neither Accepting nor Unaccepting</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
<th>Very Accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay and lesbian young people (n=60)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people from a non English speaking background (n=58)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous young people (n=59)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a mental illness (n=58)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with a physical disability (n=60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8: Existence of policies in youth service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and equity policy? (n=60)</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management policy? (n=60)</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline policy (in relation to young people not staff)? (n=60)</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints policy? (n=60)</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute resolution policy? (n=60)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 8: Familiarity with policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Not at all familiar</th>
<th>A little bit familiar</th>
<th>Fairly familiar</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and equity policy?</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management policy?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline policy (in relation to young people not staff)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints policy?</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute resolution policy?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 9: Barriers to having a culture of nonviolence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Youth workers identifying barrier (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier connected with young people</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past experience of young people</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and behaviour of young people</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to train young people</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of peers</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and other drugs use</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier connected with staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of skills and expertise in staff (including lack of training)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and behaviour of staff</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict/inconsistency in team</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier connected with youth service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources (including solo staff)</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor management (e.g. poor supervision of staff, lack of policies)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate service delivery model</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service practice/priorities (e.g. poor rules, lack of youth participation)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment of service</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support and staff burnout</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier connected with youth sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of other services</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS Award</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral process (e.g. not knowing enough about the background of clients)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of other services on young person</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier connected with wider society</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The society we live in</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of mass media</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political climate</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 10: Strategies to help develop a culture of nonviolence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Youth workers identifying strategy (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focussed on young people</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of young people</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focussed on staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of youth workers</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff commitment, perseverance and awareness</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff selection and management</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication and relationships between staff</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stress and strain for staff</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way in which staff respond to violence</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focussed on service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources (including more staff and more time)</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good management/policies</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate programs</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less or different clients</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change model of service delivery</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focussed on youth sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between youth services and/or schools</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a variety of services</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focussed on wider society</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change government policy</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focussed on families</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with families</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 11: Importance of developing a culture of nonviolence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important do you think it is that youth services develop a culture of nonviolence? (n=60)</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questions 12-15: Number of staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Full-time Staff</th>
<th>Part-time Staff</th>
<th>Casual Staff</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 16 & 19: Gender and position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Coordinator</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17: Main services offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the main services your project offers?</th>
<th>Total (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and referral</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational activities</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling/mediation</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skill/life skill development</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and advocacy</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case work</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis accommodation</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term accommodation</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach support to homeless young people</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment programs</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and cultural</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term accommodation</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent accommodation (e.g. flats)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol support</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency relief</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical support (showers, food, and laundry)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 20: Years experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years experience</th>
<th>Total (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years to less than 6 years</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years to less than 11 years</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years to less than 16 years</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 21: Industrial award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Total (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and Community Services Award</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Employment, Training and Support Award</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Award or Enterprise Agreement</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Health, Social Work, Clerk, Individual contract)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3
Survey Information Sheets and Consent Form

Dear Coordinator,

Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Research Project
Information for Youth Service Coordinators

We are writing to seek the involvement of someone from your service in research into ways in which youth services in NSW can develop organisational cultures of nonviolence. The research, being undertaken by Graeme Stuart as part of a PhD through the Social Work Department at the University of Newcastle, will explore the way in which the organisational cultures of youth services can assist youth workers to adopt work practices which are based on nonviolence.

Specifically we are hoping that a staff member from your service will be willing to take part in a telephone survey lasting about 15-25 minutes.

The survey is part of research, expected to take 2-3 years, involving 8 stages:
1. A literature review.
2. A statewide telephone survey of 100 youth workers to obtain a broad overview of current practice.
3. In depth interviews with 25 youth workers and 25 young people to obtain greater depth to the results obtained from the survey.
4. The development of a model of successful practice (based on the above research) for youth services wanting to develop an organisational culture of nonviolence.
5. Four focus groups (2 with youth workers and 2 with young people) to obtain feedback about the model.
6. Refinement of the model based on feedback from the focus groups.
7. Action research with two youth services in the Hunter to trial the implementation of the model.
8. Further refinement of the model and identification of issues related to its implementation based on the action research.

We hope the results will be disseminated through a variety of means including feedback to organisations which took part in the research, journal articles and conference presentations. Having been a youth worker for over 9 years, Graeme intends to keep the youth sector informed about the research so that youth workers can be assisted to address violence and conflict, and provide high quality service to young people.

August 2000

[Youth service address]
**Telephone survey**

The telephone survey is being conducted with 100 youth workers throughout the state funded by: Community Services Grants Program (CSGP), Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP), Job Placement Employment Training (JPET), Education Access - Youth Programs, or Innovative Health Services for Homeless Youth (IHSY). Your service has been randomly selected from lists of services funded by the above funding organisations. The contact details were either provided by the funding body or obtained from the phone book or youth directories.

Graeme will ask the person doing the survey about a variety of issues including:

- how important they believe conflict resolution and violence prevention are to youth services;
- their perceptions of your youth service including:
  - work practices which might contribute to an organisational culture of nonviolence;
  - how violent or nonviolent they believe interactions are between young people, young people and staff, and staff;
  - how accepting of diversity the staff and young people are;
- the types of policies your service has which could be relevant to developing an organisational culture of nonviolence;
- what they believe are some barriers to services developing an organisational culture of nonviolence;
- what might help a youth service develop an organisational culture of nonviolence; and
- some general demographic questions.

No identifying features will be kept with the survey responses and all information will be kept confidential, so no information about your youth service will be revealed. The results of the survey will be discussed in general terms rather than identifying individual responses. A separate list will be kept of names, contact information and data codes and this list will be destroyed once all the telephone surveys have been completed (or individuals have indicated that they do not wish to take part in the research). Until it is destroyed, this list will be kept in a locked filing cabinet.

People taking part in the survey can choose not to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the interview at any stage.

The information obtained will be used to identify current work practice around the state and to identify issues for further exploration in the in depth interviews. A brief paper will be produced summarising the results and you will be sent a copy (unless you would prefer not to receive it).

If you have any concerns regarding the manner in which this research is conducted please speak to Graeme’s supervisor, Professor Mel Gray (Social Work Department of the University of Newcastle) on (02) 4921 5497. If you would prefer an independent person, you can contact the University’s Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Branch, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2305, ph: (02) 4921 6333.

If you have any questions about the research, please don't hesitate to contact Graeme on (02) 4965 6416 or by E-mail on swgrs@alinga.newcastle.edu.au.

**If you are willing for someone from your service to take part in the survey, please pass on the enclosed information to an appropriate staff person of your choice.** The person who does take part in the survey can be anyone employed by your service (including yourself) as part of the youth project funded by [funding source].

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely,

Graeme Stuart

Professor Mel Gray
Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Research Project
Information for Telephone Survey Participants

This research, being undertaken by Graeme Stuart as part of a PhD through the Social Work Department at the University of Newcastle, is investigating ways in which youth services in NSW can develop organisational cultures of nonviolence. He will be exploring the way in which the organisational culture of youth services can assist youth workers adopt work practices which are based on nonviolence.

The research, expected to take 2-3 years, will involve 8 stages:
1. A literature review.
2. A statewide telephone survey of 100 youth workers to obtain a broad overview of current practice.
3. In depth interviews with 25 youth workers and 25 young people to obtain greater depth to the results obtained from the survey.
4. The development of a model of successful practice (based on the above research) for youth services wanting to develop an organisational culture of nonviolence.
5. Four focus groups (2 with youth workers and 2 with young people) to obtain feedback about the model.
6. Refinement of the model based on feedback from the focus groups.
7. Action research with two youth services in the Hunter to trail the implementation of the model.
8. Further refinement of the model and identification of issues related to its implementation based on the action research.

We hope the results will be disseminated through a variety of means including feedback to organisations which took part in the research, journal articles and conference presentations.

Telephone survey
The telephone survey is being conducted with 100 youth workers throughout the state funded by: Community Services Grants Program, Supported Accommodation Assistance Program, Job Placement Employment Training, Education Access - Youth Programs and Innovative Health Services for Homeless Youth. Your service has been randomly selected from lists of services funded by the above funding organisations. The contact details were either provided by the funding body or obtained from the phone book or youth directories. We asked your service’s coordinator to choose some body to take part in the survey, and they chose you. We hope you are willing to take part.

If you would prefer not to take part, you can either let your coordinator know, and they might ask someone else, or you can let us know, we will not inform your coordinator and we will place no pressure on you to take part. If you do decide to take part in the survey, your responses will not be revealed to your coordinator.
The survey, which takes about 20-30 minutes, consists mainly of questions with a limited number of responses. For example you will be asked how strongly you agree or disagree with a number of statements. There are a few open-ended questions where you will be asked about your views on a number of issues.

There are questions around:
- how important you believe conflict resolution and violence prevention are to youth services;
- your perceptions of your youth service including:
  - work practices which might contribute to an organisational culture of nonviolence;
  - how violent or nonviolent you believe interactions are between young people, young people and staff, and staff;
  - how accepting of diversity the staff and young people are;
- the types of policies your service has which could be relevant to developing an organisational culture of nonviolence;
- what you believe are some barriers to services developing an organisational culture of nonviolence;
- what might help a youth service develop an organisational culture of nonviolence; and
- some general questions about you and your youth service to provide demographic information.

Graeme is using a telephone survey rather than a written questionnaire, so that you are able to expand on any points you want to, and so he can make sure he is clear about what you think and believe.

No identifying features will be kept with the survey responses and all information will be kept confidential, so no information about your youth service will be revealed. The results of the survey will be discussed in general terms rather than identifying individual responses. A separate list will be kept of names, contact information and data codes and this list will be destroyed once all the telephone surveys have been completed (or individuals have indicated that they do not wish to take part in the research). Until it is destroyed, this list will be kept in a locked filing cabinet.

Also in order to protect your privacy and confidentiality, when Graeme makes a time for the interview, he will ask you to ensure that you can use a telephone in private without other staff or service users being in hearing range.

If you agree to take part, you can choose not to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the interview at any stage.

The information obtained will be used to identify current work practice around the state and identify issues for further exploration in the in-depth interviews. A brief paper will be produced summarising the results and you will be sent a copy (unless you would prefer not to receive it).

Graeme will be in touch with you in the next few days to make a time suitable for the survey. If you have any questions about the research, please don’t hesitate to contact him on (02) 4965 6416 or by E-mail on swgrs@alinga.newcastle.edu.au.

If you have any concerns regarding the manner in which this research is conducted please speak to Graeme’s supervisor, Professor Mel Gray (Social Work Department of the University of Newcastle) on (02) 4921 5497. If you would prefer an independent person, you can contact the University’s Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Branch, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2305, ph: (02) 4921 6333.

If you are willing to take part in the survey, please complete and return the enclosed consent form in the prepaid envelope.

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Mel Gray

Graeme Stuart
Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Telephone Survey
Consent Form

This consent form seeks the written consent of the survey participant to take part in a 20-30 minute telephone survey as part of research into developing organisational cultures of nonviolence in youth services. Before agreeing to take part in the research, please read the attached information. If you agree and sign the consent form below, please return it (using the prepaid envelope) to:
Graeme Stuart
Reply Paid
Department of Social Work
University of Newcastle
Callaghan, NSW 2308
Fax: (02) 4921 6995

Survey Participant’s Consent
I agree to participate in a telephone survey as part of the Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services Research Project and give my consent freely. I understand that the project will be carried out as described in the Information statement, a copy of which I have retained. I realise that I can withdraw from the study at any time and do not have to give any reasons for withdrawing. I have had all questions answered to my satisfaction.

Signature ……………………………  Name ………………………………….

Date …………………

Contact Phone Number: ……………………  A good time to contact me: ……………………….
Appendix 4

In-Depth Interviews Information Sheet
and Consent Form for Youth Workers

Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Research Project
Information for Interview Participants

This research, being undertaken by Graeme Stuart as part of a PhD through the Social Work Department at the University of Newcastle, is investigating ways in which youth services in NSW can develop organisational cultures of nonviolence. He will be exploring the way in which the organisational culture of youth services can assist youth workers adopt work practices which are based on nonviolence.

The research, expected to take 2-3 years, will involve 6 stages:
1. A literature review.
2. A statewide telephone survey of 100 youth workers to obtain a broad overview of current practice.
3. In depth interviews with 15-25 youth workers and 15-25 young people to obtain greater depth to the results obtained from the survey.
4. The development of a model of nonviolent practice based on the above research.
5. Two focus groups with youth workers and two focus groups with young people to obtain feedback about the model.
6. Refinement of the model based on feedback from the focus groups.

We hope the results will be disseminated through a variety of means including feedback to organisations which took part in the research, journal articles and conference presentations.

In Depth Interviews
The in depth interviews are being conducted with 15 to 25 youth workers and 15 to 25 young people.

The interviews with youth workers will be unstructured and could cover issues such as:
- your experience of violence at work;
- strategies you have found helpful in responding to violence;
- your ideas about what could contribute to nonviolent work practice by youth workers;
- how you deal with specific issues within youth work such as power relationships between youth workers and young people, youth participation in decision making; dealing with challenging behaviour and working with families of young people;
- strategies for responding to discrimination (eg homophobia, sexism, racism);
- how social justice can be incorporated into the work practice of youth workers;
- strategies for responding to conflict with young people or other staff;
- any other issues you think are relevant.

We expect the interviews to take 30-60 minutes and, if you agree to take part, you can choose not to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the interview at any stage. The interviews will be audio recorded and then the interview will be transcribed. You will be sent a copy of the transcription so you can make corrections or changes to it. Once you are happy with the transcription, the audio recording will be returned to you or destroyed by making the audio cassette unplayable.
Information for interview participants

No identifying features will be kept with the audio recordings or transcriptions and all information will be kept confidential, so no information about you or your youth service will be revealed. A separate list will be kept of names, contact information and interview numbers and this list will be destroyed once all the transcriptions have been completed. Until it is destroyed, this list will be kept in a locked filing cabinet.

Until their return or destruction, the audio recordings will only be available to the researchers, the reference group for the research and the transcriber. Where quotes from the interviews are used in articles or reports about the research, no real names or identifying information will be used.

All information will be kept confidential unless child abuse or serious criminal offences are revealed. (See the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998 and the Crimes Act 1900).

A brief paper will be produced summarising the results and if you are interested Graeme will send you a copy.

If you have any questions about the research, please don’t hesitate to contact Graeme on (02) 4965 6416 or by E-mail on swgrs@alinga.newcastle.edu.au.

If you have any concerns regarding the manner in which this research is conducted please speak to Graeme’s supervisor, Professor Mel Gray (Social Work Department of the University of Newcastle) on (02) 4921 5497. If you would prefer an independent person, you can contact the University’s Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Branch, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2305, ph: (02) 4921 6333.

**If you are willing to take part in an interview, please complete and return the enclosed consent form in the prepaid envelope.**

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely,

Graeme Stuart

Professor Mel Gray
Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
In Depth Interviews
Consent Form

This consent form seeks the written consent of participants for a 30-60 minute in depth interview as part of research into developing organisational cultures of nonviolence in youth services. Before agreeing to take part in the research, please read the attached information. If you agree and sign the consent form below, please return it (using the prepaid envelope) to:

Graeme Stuart
Reply Paid
Department of Social Work
University of Newcastle
Callaghan, NSW 2308
Fax: (02) 4921 6995

Interview Participant’s Consent
I agree to participate in an in depth interview as part of the Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services Research Project and give my consent freely. I understand that the project will be carried out as described in the Information statement, a copy of which I have retained. I realise that I can withdraw from the study at any time and do not have to give any reasons for withdrawing. I have had all questions answered to my satisfaction.

Signature ……………………………  Name ………………………………….

Date ………………..

Contact Phone Number: …………………….  A good time to contact me: …………………………
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In-Depth Interviews Information Sheet
and Consent Form for Young People

Hi,

We’re wondering if you would be willing to take part in an interview about how youth services can be nonviolent. Graeme Stuart, a youth worker studying in the Social Work Department at the University of Newcastle, is carrying out the research. Graeme is looking at how youth workers can work nonviolently including how they can be respectful towards young people and involve young people in decision making.

The research, which will take 2-3 years to complete, involves a number of steps including:
1. A telephone survey of 100 youth workers.
3. Two group discussions with youth workers and two group discussions with young people.
4. Working with two youth services to try out the ideas picked up from the survey, interviews and focus groups.

We hope the results will help improve the way youth workers work with young people.

The Interviews
The interviews are being conducted with 15 to 25 youth workers and 15 to 25 young people. The interviews can explore any issues you would like to do with violence and nonviolence including:
• what you think could be done to make youth services less violent;
• what you like and don’t like in youth workers;
• how you think youth workers could deal with conflict, violence or young people who are causing problems in a youth service;
• what a perfect youth service would look like;
• any else you think is relevant.

We expect the interviews will take 20-40 minutes and, if you agree to take part, you can choose not to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the interview at any stage.

Graeme, who will be doing the interviews, will tape the interviews which will then be written up word for word. If you want, we will send you a written copy of the interview so that you can make any corrections or changes. Once you are happy with the written version of the interview, the tape will be destroyed.

We will make sure that nothing we use from the interviews will reveal who was speaking so that you cannot be identified. We will also make sure that you cannot be identified through anything we do and so everything you say will be confidential.

The only times something might be passed on is if you tell us that you or someone else is unsafe. If you tell us about a situation like this, we will assume that you want us to do something about it, and
we will act on the information you give us. This may include telling someone else about it. Also if you tell us something which could lead to someone being charged with a serious crime (eg a serious physical assault) we might need to pass the information on to the police. It might help to remember that we are mainly interested in what youth workers do, rather than what you or your friends do, so it is unlikely that this will cause hassles for you or your friends.

If you are interested in an article about what we find in the surveys let us know and we will send you one. If you have any questions about the research please don’t hesitate to speak to somebody from your youth service or contact Graeme on (02) 4965 6416 or by E-mail on swgrs@alinga.newcastle.edu.au.

If you have any concerns about the way in which the interview is conducted please speak to Graeme’s supervisor, Professor Mel Gray (Social Work Department of the University of Newcastle) on (02) 4921 5497. If you would prefer an independent person, you can contact the University’s Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Branch, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2305, ph: (02) 4921 6333.

**If you are willing to take part in the interview, please let your youth worker know and Graeme will be in touch to make a time to meet with you.**

Thanks heaps.

Regards,

Graeme Stuart

Professor Mel Gray
Nonviolence in Youth Services
Interview
Agreement Form

This agreement form is asking if you are willing to take part in an interview as part of research into nonviolence in youth services. The research should have already been explained to you in writing and/or face to face. If you are happy to take part in the research, please sign the form below and give it to your youth worker or Graeme Stuart.

Agreement
I agree to take part in discussion as part of the research into Nonviolence in youth services. I understand or agree that:
• I have had the research explained to me;
• I don’t have any unanswered questions about the research;
• I don’t need to take part if I don’t want to;
• I can decide not to answer any questions or withdraw from the interview at any time;
• I don’t need to give any reasons if I withdraw or don’t want to take part in the research;
• I need to be over 14 to take part in the research.

Signature ……………………………  Name ………………………………….

Date ……………..                 Youth Service: ………………………………….

Adult Consent (if appropriate)
I agree to the above mentioned young person taking part in the research. They have had the research explained to them, they understand what participation involves and they freely agreed to take part in the research.

Signature ……………………………  Name ………………………………….

Date ……………..                 Relationship or Organisation: …………………………….
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Letter to Youth Workers Seeking Young People for In-Depth Interviews

Professor Mel Gray
Professor of Social Work
Department of Social Work
Telephone: (02) 4921 6302
Facsimile: (02) 4921 6995

Graeme Stuart
PhD Student
Department of Social Work
Telephone: (02) 4965 6416
Facsimile: (02) 4921 6995

Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services Research Project

We are seeking your assistance in identifying some young people who might be willing to be interviewed as part of the above research. This research, being undertaken by Graeme Stuart as part of a PhD through the Social Work Department at the University of Newcastle, is investigating ways in which youth services in NSW can develop organisational cultures of nonviolence. He will be exploring the way in which the organisational culture of youth services can assist youth workers adopt work practices which are based on nonviolence.

The research, expected to take 2-3 years, will involve 6 stages:

1. A literature review.
2. A statewide telephone survey of 100 youth workers to obtain a broad overview of current practice.
3. In depth interviews with 15-25 youth workers and 15-25 young people to obtain greater depth to the results obtained from the survey.
4. The development of a model of nonviolent practice based on the above research.
5. Two focus groups with youth workers and two focus groups with young people to obtain feedback about the model.
6. Refinement of the model based on feedback from the focus groups.

We hope the results will be disseminated through a variety of means including feedback to organisations which took part in the research, journal articles and conference presentations.

In Depth Interviews

The in depth interviews are being conducted with 15 to 25 youth workers and 15 to 25 young people. The interviews with young people will be unstructured and could cover issues such as:

- what they think they could be done to make youth services be less violent;
- what they like and don’t like in youth workers;
- how they think youth workers could deal with conflict, violence or young people who are causing problems in a youth service;
- what a perfect youth service would look like;
- any else they think is relevant.

We expect the interviews to take 20-45 minutes and, if they agree to take part, they can choose not to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the interview at any stage. The interviews will be audio recorded and then the interview will be transcribed. If they want they will be able to see the transcription and make any corrections or changes they would like. Once they are happy with the transcription, the audio recording will be destroyed by making the audio cassette unplayable.

No identifying features will be kept with the audio recordings or transcriptions and all information will be kept confidential, so no information about them or their youth service will be revealed. A separate list will be kept of names, contact information and interview numbers and this list will be
destroyed once all the transcriptions have been completed. Until it is destroyed, this list will be kept in a locked filing cabinet.

Until their return or destruction, the audio recordings will only be available to the researchers, the reference group for the research and the transcriber. Where quotes from the interviews are used in articles or reports about the research, no real names or identifying information will be used.

All information will be kept confidential unless child abuse (see the attached protocol) or serious criminal offences are revealed.

A brief paper will be produced summarising the results and if they are interested Graeme will send them a copy.

Interviews will only be conducted with young people when:
• they have freely agreed to take part in the research and will suffer no negative consequences if they decide not to take part;
• they have been identified by a youth service and the youth service agrees to them being interviewed;
• there are at least 2 or 3 young people being interviewed from the same youth service;
• they are over 14 years of age;
• at least one youth worker is being interviewed from the same youth service; and
• all the conditions of the attached protocol re informed consent have been met.

If you have any questions about the research, please don’t hesitate to contact Graeme on (02) 4965 6416 or by E-mail on swgrs@alinga.newcastle.edu.au.

If you have any concerns regarding the manner in which this research is conducted please speak to Graeme’s supervisor, Professor Mel Gray (Social Work Department of the University of Newcastle) on (02) 4921 5497. If you would prefer an independent person, you can contact the University’s Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Branch, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2305, ph: (02) 4921 6333.

If you have some young people who might be interested in the research, please pass on the enclosed information, discuss the research with them, and, if they give you permission, let Graeme know by ringing (4965 6416) or E-mailing (swgrs@alinga.newcastle.edu.au) him.

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely,

Graeme Stuart

Professor Mel Gray
Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Protocol re Children at Risk of Harm

Whilst it is unlikely that this research will identify instances of child abuse, a process needs to be in place in case this eventuality does occur.

The new Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act (1998) has expanded the range of people required to report suspected abuse. It now applies to “a person who, in the course of his or her professional work or other paid employment delivers health care, welfare, education, children’s services, residential services, or law enforcement, wholly or partly, to children” (section 27). If such a person, during his or her work, “has reasonable grounds to suspect that a child is at risk of harm”, they must “as soon as practicable, report to the Director-General the name, or a description, of the child and the grounds for suspecting that the child is at risk of harm” (Section 27).

This expansion of people required to report suspected abuse, means that youth workers are now mandatory reporters. Although this section may not cover a researcher, there is still a moral responsibility to report abuse, and section 24 allows for anyone who has reasonable grounds to suspect that a child or young person is at risk of harm to make a report to the Director-General.

The following steps will be followed during the research:

1. When confidentiality is discussed with young people, the following statement will be included:

   If you tell me that you or someone else is unsafe, I will assume that you want me to do something about it, and I will act on the information you give me. This may include telling someone else about it.

   This wording has been chosen because it leaves the way open for a variety of responses depending on the situation, it is not too confronting, and it recognises that when young people disclose abuse, they are normally wanting help.

2. If abuse is disclosed, the researcher will ask the young person what assistance they want, and what assistance they are already receiving. (While it will be normal process to discuss the situation with the young person, in cases where this could place the young person at risk of further harm, guidance from the Department of Community Services will be sought before involving the young person.)

3. If the young person agrees and it is appropriate, the situation will be discussed with an appropriate staff member from the young person’s youth service. (All young people interviewed will be contacted through youth services, so they will already be involved with a youth service.)

4. If the young people does not agree to discuss it with staff from the youth service, or it is inappropriate (eg the abuse is related to staff at the service), the researcher will discuss the situation with the Professor or Head of Social Work at the University of
Newcastle and they will develop an action plan. The action plan will be consistent with the relevant principles outlined in section 9 of the Act – see below.

5. Based on the discussion in 4, the proposed action will be explained to the young person and they will have the opportunity to comment on the action plan.

6. The proposed action could include:
   a) discussing the situation with staff at the youth service;
   b) discussing the situation with the young person’s parents or guardians;
   c) discussing the situation with another adult the young person trusts;
   d) immediately reporting the situation to the Department of Community Services;
   e) assisting the young person to speak to the Department of Community Services, police or some other person.

   In cases where the young person is at risk of harm (as defined in Section 23 of the Act - see below) the action plan will include ensuring that a report is made, or has already been made, to the Department of Community Services.

7. The proposed action will not include:
   a) confronting the person(s) suspected of the abuse;
   b) assisting the young person to stay in an unsafe situation;
   c) doing nothing.

It is important to note that abuse will only be reported to the Department of Community Services where there are cases of abuse as defined by the Act. It is inappropriate to report situations based on different values and standards about how children should be cared for. It is also important to note that involving the youth service does not mean that the researchers avoid the responsibility of ensuring that the Department of Community Services is notified about a young person who is at risk of harm.

Relevant Principles of the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act (1998)

The principles to be applied in the administration of this Act are as follows:
(a) In all actions and decisions made under this Act (whether by legal or administrative process) concerning a particular child or young person, the safety, welfare and well-being of the child or young person must be the paramount consideration.
(b) Wherever a child or young person is able to form his or her own views on a matter concerning his or her welfare, he or she must be given an opportunity to express those views freely and those views are to be given due weight in accordance with the developmental capacity of the child or young person and the circumstances.
(c) In all actions and decisions made under this Act (whether by legal or administrative process) that significantly affect a child or young person, account must be taken of the culture, disability, language, religion and sexuality of the child or young person and, if relevant, those with parental responsibility for the child or young person.
(d) In deciding what action it is necessary to take (whether by legal or administrative process) in order to protect a child or young person from harm, the course to be followed must be the least intrusive intervention in the life of the child or young person and his or her family that is consistent with the paramount concern to protect the child or young person from harm and promote the child’s or young person’s development. (Section 9.)
Definition of risk of harm

[A] child or young person is at risk of harm if current concerns exist for the safety, welfare or well-being of the child or young person because of the presence of any one or more of the following circumstances:

(a) the child's or young person's basic physical or psychological needs are not being met or are at risk of not being met,
(b) the parents or other caregivers have not arranged and are unable or unwilling to arrange for the child or young person to receive necessary medical care,
(c) the child or young person has been, or is at risk of being, physically or sexually abused or ill-treated,
(d) the child or young person is living in a household where there have been incidents of domestic violence and, as a consequence, the child or young person is at risk of serious physical or psychological harm,
(e) a parent or other caregiver has behaved in such a way towards the child or young person that the child or young person has suffered or is at risk of suffering serious psychological harm.

Note. Physical or sexual abuse may include an assault and can exist despite the fact that consent has been given.

Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act (1998) Section 23
Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Protocol re Young People and Informed Consent

1. The primary ethical obligation is to the young people involved in the research.
2. Before taking part in the research, young people must be provided with written and verbal explanations of the research, and provide their informed consent in a manner appropriate for the individual.
3. Where appropriate, young people will be asked to sign a written consent form written in plain English.
4. Where written consent is inappropriate (e.g., young people with poor literacy skills or in a very informal setting), their verbal consent will be taped on an audio tape recorder. They can use a pseudonym or nickname if they wish.
5. Interviews will only be conducted with young people aged 14 or above.
6. Where possible, practical and appropriate parental consent will be obtained. The advise of the youth service will be sought to discover whether or not parental consent is possible, practical and appropriate.
7. Where parental consent is not possible, practical and appropriate, if a young person is over the age of 16, then their own consent will be sufficient.
8. Where parental consent is not possible, practical and appropriate, if a young person is under the aged 14-15, a youth worker or a staff member of the Department of Community Services will discuss the issues with the young person and need to provide his/her written consent as well as the young person’s.
Appendix 7

Focus Groups Information Sheet and Consent Form

Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Research Project
Information for Focus Group Participants

This research, being undertaken by Graeme Stuart as part of a PhD through the School of Social Sciences at the University of Newcastle, is investigating ways in which youth services in NSW can develop organisational cultures of nonviolence. He will be exploring the way in which the organisational culture of youth services can assist youth workers adopt work practices which are based on nonviolence.

The research, expected to take 2-3 years, will involve 6 stages:
1. A literature review.
2. A statewide telephone survey of 100 youth workers to obtain a broad overview of current practice.
3. In depth interviews with 15-25 youth workers and 15-25 young people to obtain greater depth to the results obtained from the survey.
4. The development of a model of nonviolent practice based on the above research.
5. Two focus groups with youth workers and two focus groups with young people to obtain feedback about the model.
6. Refinement of the model based on feedback from the focus groups.

We hope the results will be disseminated through a variety of means including feedback to organisations which took part in the research, journal articles and conference presentations.

Focus Groups
The focus groups are being conducted with 8 to 20 youth workers. The focus groups will provide feedback on a model of nonviolent practice which will be developed based on earlier stages of the research. The groups will be unstructured and allow participants to comment on any aspect of the model they want to.

We expect the groups will take 1-2 hours and, if you agree to take part, you can choose not to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the focus group at any stage.

The groups will be audio recorded and then summarised. You will be given the opportunity to receive a copy of the summary so you can make corrections or changes to it. Once the transcription is completed, the audio recording will be destroyed by making the audio cassette unplayable.

No identifying features will be kept with the audio recordings or summary and all information will be kept confidential, so no information about you or your youth service will be revealed. A separate list will be kept of names and contact information and this list will be destroyed once the transcriptions have been completed. Until it is destroyed, this list will be kept in a locked filing cabinet.
Until their destruction, the audio recordings will only be available to the researchers, the reference group for the research and the transcriber. Where quotes from focus group participants are used in articles or reports about the research, no real names or identifying information will be used.

All information will be kept confidential unless child abuse or serious criminal offences are revealed. (See the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998 and the Crimes Act 1900). We expect that you will also keep the discussion confidential and not pass on what others in the group say to anybody else.

A brief paper will be produced summarising the results and if you are interested Graeme will send you a copy.

If you have any questions about the research, please don’t hesitate to contact Graeme on (02) 4965 6416 or by E-mail on swgrs@alinga.newcastle.edu.au.

If you have any concerns regarding the manner in which this research is conducted please speak to Graeme’s supervisor, Professor Mel Gray (Social Work Department of the University of Newcastle) on (02) 4921 5497. If you would prefer an independent person, you can contact the University’s Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Branch, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2305, ph: (02) 4921 6333.

If you are willing to take part in a focus group, please complete and return the enclosed consent form in the prepaid envelope.

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely,

Graeme Stuart

Professor Mel Gray
Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services
Focus Group
Consent Form

This consent form seeks the written consent of participants for 90-120 minute focus groups as part of research into developing organisational cultures of nonviolence in youth services. Before agreeing to take part in the research please read the attached information. If you agree please sign the consent form below and return it (using the prepaid envelope) to:

Graeme Stuart
Reply Paid
Department of Social Work
University of Newcastle
Callaghan, NSW 2308
Fax: (02) 4921 6995

Focus Group Participant’s Consent
I agree to participate in a focus group as part of the Organisational Cultures of Nonviolence in Youth Services Research Project and give my consent freely. I understand that the project will be carried out as described in the Information statement, a copy of which I have retained. I agree to maintain the confidentiality of the group discussion and not divulge the specific content of the discussion to outside parties. I realise that I can withdraw from the study at any time and do not have to give any reasons for withdrawing. I have had all questions answered to my satisfaction.

Signature ……………………………  Name ………………………………….

Date ………………..
Appendix 8

Research Reference Group Terms of Reference

The reference group consists of key stakeholders from a range of backgrounds who have expertise in youth work, nonviolence and/or research.

While the Social Work Department of the University of Newcastle and Graeme Stuart are ultimately responsible for the research undertaken and decisions made, the reference group will:

- Provide expert advise on all aspects of the research
- Assist in ensuring that the research is conducted in an ethical manner
- Assist in ensuring that the research follows a rigorous and sound methodology
- Assist in ensuring that young people are involved in the research in a meaningful way
- Assist in ensuring that the model developed is:
  - Relevant to direct service providers
  - Practical and able to be implemented
  - Likely to improve service delivery to young people.

The role of reference group members may include:

- Becoming informed about relevant issues
- Providing feedback on draft papers, reports and other written material
- Providing feedback on research methodology and research design
- Assisting in the identification of key themes from the research data
- Questioning assumptions or biases in the research
- Suggesting avenues for further exploration
- Anything else which could assist with the research.
## Appendix 9

### List of Nodes (at end of axial coding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node ID</th>
<th>Node Name</th>
<th>Node Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Discussion of violence (excluding prevention and responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence</td>
<td>Examples of violent incidents in youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence egs YP</td>
<td>Examples of violence by young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence egs YP/Physical V</td>
<td>Examples of physical violence by young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 2</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence egs YP/Verbal V</td>
<td>Examples of verbal violence or abuse by young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 3</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence egs YP/Psychological V</td>
<td>Examples of emotional violence by young people including threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 4</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence egs YP/Outside service</td>
<td>Examples where violence by young people has been committed away from the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 5</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence egs YP/Self harm</td>
<td>Examples of self harm by young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 6</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence egs YP/Non yth serv V</td>
<td>Examples of violence not connected with a youth service (e.g. at other services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>Violence/Examples Violence/Violence e.g. YW</td>
<td>Examples of violence by youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>Violence/How violent</td>
<td>How violent young people or youth workers consider their service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 1</td>
<td>Violence/How violent/Little violence</td>
<td>Where service is considered to have little violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 2</td>
<td>Violence/How violent/Medium violence</td>
<td>Where service is considered to have some violence, but not a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>Violence/How violent/Significant violence</td>
<td>Where service is considered to have significant violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>Violence/Victims of Violence</td>
<td>Situations where young people are the victims of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>Violence/Mucking around &amp; sport</td>
<td>Discussion and/or examples of when young people are just &quot;mucking around&quot; and the use of sport and other physical activities (e.g. punching bags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 4 1</td>
<td>Violence/Mucking around &amp; sport/Mucking around</td>
<td>Discussion and/or examples of when young people are just &quot;mucking around&quot; (often in a violent or aggressive way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 4 2</td>
<td>Violence/Mucking around &amp; sport/Sport</td>
<td>Discussion and/or examples of the use of sport &amp; other physical activities (e.g. punching bags) often as a way to prevent more significant violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>Violence/Communication</td>
<td>Violence as a form of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 98</td>
<td>Violence/General</td>
<td>General comments about violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Discussion of discrimination (excluding prevention and responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>Discrimination/Examples Discrimination</td>
<td>Examples of discrimination in youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>Discrimination/Examples Discrimination/Homophobia</td>
<td>Examples of homophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 2</td>
<td>Discrimination/Examples Discrimination/Racism</td>
<td>Examples of racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Discrimination/Examples</td>
<td>Examples of sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>Discrimination/Examples</td>
<td>Examples of other discrimination or general discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Discrimination/Examples Discrimination/Examples of non discrimination</td>
<td>Examples where young people did not discriminate against marginalised young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Discrimination/How much discrimination</td>
<td>How much discrimination young people or youth workers consider there is in their service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Discrimination/How much discrimination/Little discrimination</td>
<td>Service considered to have little discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Discrimination/How much discrimination/Significant discrimination</td>
<td>Services considered to have significant discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>Discussion of gender, or where gender is a significant issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Gender issues/Males</td>
<td>Characteristics of males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Gender issues/Females</td>
<td>Characteristics of Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Gender issues/Sexism examples</td>
<td>Examples of sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Gender issues/Sexism causes</td>
<td>Causes of sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Gender issues/Male ownership</td>
<td>Where young males dominate or feel the &quot;own&quot; a youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Gender issues/Gender of worker</td>
<td>The role of the gender of youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Gender issues/Sexism extent</td>
<td>The extent of sexism in youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Gender issues/Sexism responses</td>
<td>Responses to sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Gender issues/DV</td>
<td>Discussion of domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Gender issues/Awareness of gender issues</td>
<td>Indicators of how aware youth workers are of gender issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Gender issues/Lack of awareness</td>
<td>Examples demonstrating lack of awareness of sexism, avoidance of issues involved, or little analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Managing behaviour</td>
<td>Discussion of managing behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps</td>
<td>Things that help in behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs</td>
<td>Characteristics of youth workers which help in behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Experience, skilled</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers are experienced &amp; skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Train YWs</td>
<td>It helps to train youth workers so that they can respond appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Personality, life experience</td>
<td>The personality and life experience of youth workers can help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Act as models</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers model nonviolent, appropriate behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Non judgmental, unbiased</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers are non judgmental and unbiased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.6</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Worthy of respect</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers have earned the respect of young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.7</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Caring</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers are caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.8</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Agree with philosophy of service</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers agree with the philosophy of the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.9</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Common sense</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers have common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.10</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Good YWs/Communication skills</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers have good communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Relationships</td>
<td>Characteristics of the relationship between youth workers and young people that help behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Relationships/ Build relationship, rapport</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers build rapport and have a personal relationship with young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Relationships/ Respect &amp; trust</td>
<td>It helps if young people trust and respect youth workers (includes mutual respect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 2 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Relationships/ Be supportive</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers are supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 2 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Relationships/ Relationship boundaries</td>
<td>It helps if there are boundaries to the relationship between young people and youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment</td>
<td>It helps if there is a good physical and emotional environment in the youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Physical environment</td>
<td>It helps if there is a good physical environment in the youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 1 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Physical environment/Equipment</td>
<td>Equipment can contribute to behaviour problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 1 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Physical environment/Layout &amp; use of space</td>
<td>It helps if the layout and use of space is appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Physical environment/Shared rooms</td>
<td>The role of shared rooms in preventing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 1 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Physical environment/Location</td>
<td>It helps if the location is appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 1 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Physical environment/General Physical</td>
<td>General comments about the physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Emotional environment</td>
<td>It helps to prevent violence if there is a good emotional environment in the youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 2 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Emotional environment/Calm, peaceful, gentle</td>
<td>It helps if there is a calm, peaceful, gentle environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Emotional environment/Safe</td>
<td>It helps if young people feel safe in the youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 2 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Emotional environment/Youth friendly</td>
<td>It helps if the youth service is youth friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 2 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Emotional environment/Home like</td>
<td>It helps if there is a home like environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 2 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Emotional environment/Music</td>
<td>Music can help create a positive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 3 2 6</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Environment/ Emotional environment/General</td>
<td>General comments about the feel or emotional environment of the youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Not engage, be calm</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers do not become engaged in negative behaviour &amp; remain calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 4 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Not engage, be calm/Not engaging</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers do not become engaged in negative behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 4 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Not engage, be calm/Remain calm</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers remain calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Team work</td>
<td>It helps if there is good team work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 5 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Team work/Strong team</td>
<td>It helps if the youth service has a strong team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 5 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Team work/Consistency</td>
<td>It helps if there is consistency within the youth service team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 5 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Team work/Information sharing</td>
<td>It helps if there is good communication between staff and they share information about young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 5 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Team work/Diverse team</td>
<td>It helps if there is a diverse team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Policies &amp; procedures</td>
<td>It helps if there are appropriate policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4161</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Policies &amp; procedures/Existence of policies</td>
<td>It helps if services have appropriate policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4162</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Policies &amp; procedures/Examples of policies</td>
<td>Examples of policies which can help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4163</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Policies &amp; procedures/Egs of policies</td>
<td>It could help if there are service standards or codes of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4164</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Policies &amp; procedures/Standards or codes</td>
<td>It helps if there are consistent procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4165</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Policies &amp; procedures/Consistent procedures</td>
<td>It could help to conduct a safety audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4166</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Policies &amp; procedures/Safety systems</td>
<td>It helps if there are security systems and processes in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Responding early</td>
<td>It helps to respond early to problems, to address low level problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Save face</td>
<td>It helps if young people are given the opportunity to save face &amp; the situation is dealt with not in front of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Staff &amp; resources</td>
<td>It helps if there are enough staff and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Addressing</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers address problems or stresses faced by young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4112</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Ownership</td>
<td>It helps if there is youth participation and there is a sense of ownership by the young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4113</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Structure</td>
<td>It helps if the youth service has structure (and discussion of structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4114</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Services communicate</td>
<td>It helps if there is good communication between services (e.g. at referrals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4115</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Separate</td>
<td>It helps if behaviour is separated from the person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4116</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Analyse</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers analyse the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/YWs supported</td>
<td>It helps if staff are well supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4118</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Long serving staff</td>
<td>It helps if staff stay in the one position a long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4119</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Culturally appropriate</td>
<td>It helps to be culturally appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4120</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision (of young people) helps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4121</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Think like YP</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers think like a young person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4150</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Helps/Acting out as communication</td>
<td>It helps to understand acting out as a method of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies</td>
<td>Discussion of behaviour management strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Involve YP in responding</td>
<td>Involving young people in behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4211</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Involve YP in responding/YP assess own behaviour</td>
<td>Having young people assess their own behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4212</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Involve YP in responding/YP setting own consequences</td>
<td>Young people setting their own consequences for their behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4213</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Involve YP in responding/YP reinforcing boundaries</td>
<td>Other young people reinforcing appropriate behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4214</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Involve YP in responding/Other YP set consequence</td>
<td>Involving other young people in setting consequences for behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Involve YP in responding/YP making complaint</td>
<td>Supporting young people to make official complaints about discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Talk about it</td>
<td>Talking about the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Talk about it/Just talk about it</td>
<td>Talking about the situation (has little detail about what is discussed &amp; includes talking to them about the rules etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Talk about it/Supportive talk</td>
<td>Talking about the situation in a supportive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Talk about it/Explore behaviour, consequences</td>
<td>Exploring the behaviour and talking about the consequences of behaviour (includes details of what is discussed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Talk about it/Case conference</td>
<td>Using case conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Talk about it/Discuss discrimination</td>
<td>Discussing discrimination when it occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Redirect, divert</td>
<td>Redirecting the energy of young people or diverting their attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 3 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Redirect, divert/Non physical diversion</td>
<td>Diverting young people's attention with non physical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 3 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Redirect, divert/Appropriate activities</td>
<td>Ensuring there are appropriate activities for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 3 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Redirect, divert/Letting it out</td>
<td>Giving young people the opportunity to let out their frustration or energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 3 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Redirect, divert/Physical activities</td>
<td>Using physical activities to redirect or prevent negative behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Education</td>
<td>Increasing young people's awareness and teaching them skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 4 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Education/Campaigns</td>
<td>Use awareness campaigns (especially for discrimination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 4 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Education/Insight, alternative behaviour</td>
<td>Assisting young people to develop insight into themselves, exploring alternative behaviour and teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 4 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Education/Tolerance</td>
<td>Promoting greater tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/State expectations</td>
<td>Stating expectations clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 6</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Rules &amp; limits</td>
<td>Establishing rules and setting limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 7</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Identify consequences</td>
<td>Identifying consequences of negative behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 8</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Give choice, option</td>
<td>Giving choices or options to young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 9</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Mediation</td>
<td>Using mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 11</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Be present</td>
<td>Being visible or present when problems occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 12</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Gentle, low key approach</td>
<td>Using a low key or gentle approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 13</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Social responsibility</td>
<td>Talking about social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 14</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Chill out space</td>
<td>Providing a chill out space or a place to withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 15</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Confront discrimination</td>
<td>Confronting or challenging discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 16</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Separate</td>
<td>Separating people having conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 17</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Allow mucking around</td>
<td>Allowing mucking around (or not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 18</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Other services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 19</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 19 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Police/Relationship building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 19 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Police/Threat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 19 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Police/Backup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 19 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Police/Consequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 19 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Police/Opposed to use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 19 6</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Police/Police general</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 20</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Let YP deal with it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 20 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Let YP deal with it/Talk to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 20 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Let YP deal with it/Bash them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 20 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Let YP deal with it/Other YP intervene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 21</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Physical intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 21 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Physical intervention/Physical intervention not OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 21 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Physical intervention/Physical intervention OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 21 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Physical intervention/No physical contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Threats Exclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 1 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Threats Exclusion/Choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 1 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Threats Exclusion/Negative threats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 1 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Threats Exclusion/Hanging over head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/Violence reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/D&amp;A reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/Damage reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/Non participation reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/Verbal reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2 6</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/Other Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 22 2 7</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/Hypothetical reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/No reason</td>
<td>No reason is given for exclusion or the reason is very general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Examples Exclusion/Didn't exclude</td>
<td>Could have excluded but decided not too or reasons not to exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Attitudes Exclusion</td>
<td>Attitudes towards exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Attitudes Exclusion/Opposed exclusion</td>
<td>Statements opposed (or very concerned about) exclusion (including opposed to except in extreme circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Attitudes Exclusion/Support exclusion</td>
<td>Statements in support of exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Attitudes Exclusion/Opp &amp; Supp Exclusion</td>
<td>Statements which both support and oppose exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Attitudes Exclusion/Excl att users</td>
<td>Views of users to exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Attitudes Exclusion/Excl att ex users</td>
<td>Views of ex users to exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 6</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Attitudes Exclusion/Excl att YW</td>
<td>Views of youth workers to exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Withdrawal</td>
<td>Temporarily withdrawing a young person from a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Time out</td>
<td>Time out or suspension is specifically mentioned or where people are told to leave but they can come back (includes self exclusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 6</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Exclusion/Non acceptance</td>
<td>Where a young person is excluded from a service by non acceptance (not just because the service is full)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Threat of negative consequence</td>
<td>Using some threat (e.g. of eviction, calling the police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Threat of negative consequence/Threat as choice</td>
<td>Using some threat where the threat is presented as a choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 3 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Threat of negative consequence/Threat as consequence</td>
<td>Using some threat where the threat is presented as a consequence of behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Strategies/Punishment</td>
<td>Punishment as behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Group dynamics</td>
<td>The impact of group size and dynamics on behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Group dynamics/Entry and exit</td>
<td>The impact of entry to and exit from a youth service in behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Group dynamics/Group size</td>
<td>The impact group size can have on behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Group dynamics/Range of YP</td>
<td>The impact the range of young people (including age) can have on behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Group dynamics/Interaction within groups</td>
<td>The impact interactions within the group has on behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 5</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Group dynamics/Positive peer influence</td>
<td>Ways in which peers can help in behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Self protection</td>
<td>The importance of self protection in behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 1</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Negative examples</td>
<td>Examples where behaviour management strategies have not helped or have made the situation worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 2</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Barriers</td>
<td>Barriers to behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Response by service</td>
<td>How services respond to problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>Behaviour management/Unaware of strategies</td>
<td>Young people not aware of behaviour management strategies (including comments from youth demonstrating they aren't aware of strategies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work practice</td>
<td>Discussion of good youth work practice and poor youth work practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice</td>
<td>Examples and discussion of good youth work practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs</td>
<td>Examples and discussion of good youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality</td>
<td>Examples and discussion of the personality of good youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Good personality</td>
<td>Good youth workers have a good personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Positive attitude</td>
<td>Good youth workers have a positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Relate well</td>
<td>Good youth workers relate well to young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Friendly</td>
<td>Good youth workers are friendly and fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Supportive, caring</td>
<td>Good youth workers are supportive and caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 6</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Worthy of respect</td>
<td>Good youth workers are worthy of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 7</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Respectful</td>
<td>Good youth workers are respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 8</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Personality/Non judgmental, unbiased</td>
<td>It helps if youth workers are non judgmental and unbiased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Experienced, skilled</td>
<td>Good youth workers are experienced and skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Involve YP</td>
<td>Good youth workers involve young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 3 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Involve YP/Listen</td>
<td>Good youth workers listen to young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 3 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Involve YP/Talks to you</td>
<td>Good youth workers talk to young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 3 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Involve YP/Decision making</td>
<td>Good youth workers involve young people in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 3 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Involve YP/Don't tell what to do</td>
<td>Good youth workers don't tell young people what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 3 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Involve YP/Treat like adult</td>
<td>Good youth workers treat young people like adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Practical things</td>
<td>Good youth workers do practical things for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Practical things/Provide support</td>
<td>Good youth workers provide practical support to young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 4 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Practical things/Give things to do</td>
<td>Good youth workers give young people things to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Same gender</td>
<td>Good youth workers are the same gender as the young person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 6</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Funny answer</td>
<td>Humourous responses re good youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 7</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Realistic expectations</td>
<td>Good youth workers have realistic expectations of young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 8</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Committed, like work</td>
<td>Good youth workers are committed and like their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 9</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Life experience</td>
<td>Good youth workers have relevant life experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Train YWs</td>
<td>Good youth workers need to be trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Act as models</td>
<td>Good youth workers act as models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Communication skills</td>
<td>Good youth workers have good communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 1 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Good YWs/Common sense</td>
<td>Good youth workers have common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Physical characteristics</td>
<td>Physical characteristics of good youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 2 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Physical characteristics/Looks</td>
<td>The look of a good youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 2 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Physical characteristics/Single rooms</td>
<td>Good youth accommodation services have single rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 2 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Physical characteristics/Layout &amp; use of space</td>
<td>The layout of, and use of space in, good youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 2 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Physical characteristics/Location</td>
<td>The location of good services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 2 6</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Physical characteristics/General Physical</td>
<td>General comments about the physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment</td>
<td>The feel or emotional environment of a good youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Safe</td>
<td>Good youth services are safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Accepting</td>
<td>Good youth services are accepting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Calm, peaceful, gentle</td>
<td>Good youth services have a calm, peaceful, gentle environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Welcoming</td>
<td>Good youth services are welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Fun</td>
<td>Good youth services are fun places to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 6</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Music</td>
<td>Music can help create a positive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 7</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Home like</td>
<td>Good youth services have a home like environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 8</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/Youth friendly</td>
<td>Good youth services are youth friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 3 9</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Emotional environment/General</td>
<td>General comments about the feel or emotional environment of the youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Policies, procedures</td>
<td>Policies and procedures of good youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 4 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Policies, procedures/Procedures</td>
<td>Good youth services have appropriate procedures in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 4 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Policies, procedures/Policies</td>
<td>Good services have appropriate policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 4 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Policies, procedures/Standards, codes</td>
<td>Standards and codes would help create a good youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Services offered</td>
<td>The range and types of services offered by good youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 7</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Staff &amp; resources</td>
<td>Good youth services have enough staff and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 8</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Consistency</td>
<td>Good youth services are consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 9</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/Stand up for YP</td>
<td>Good youth workers stand up for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 10</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/YWs make good service</td>
<td>Good youth workers make a good youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1 11</td>
<td>Work practice/Good practice/This service good</td>
<td>Young people who believe their service is a good one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice</td>
<td>Examples and discussion of poor youth work practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs</td>
<td>Examples and discussion of poor youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs/Personality</td>
<td>Examples and discussion of the personality of poor youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs/Don't help</td>
<td>Poor youth workers don't help out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs/Not skilled, experienced</td>
<td>Poor youth workers are not skilled nor experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs/Not respectful</td>
<td>Poor youth workers are not respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs/Not committed</td>
<td>Poor youth workers not committed to youth work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1 6</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs/Put on a front</td>
<td>Poor youth workers put on a front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 1 7</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Poor YWs/Opposite gender</td>
<td>Poor youth workers are the opposite gender to young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Physical environment</td>
<td>The physical environment of poor youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 2 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Physical environment/Shared rooms</td>
<td>Poor accommodation services have shared rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 2 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Physical environment/Uncared for</td>
<td>Poor youth services are uncared for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 2 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Physical environment/Equipment</td>
<td>Equipment can contribute to behaviour problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions</td>
<td>Examples and discussion of actions by poor youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 1</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/Treat like a kid</td>
<td>Poor youth workers treat young people like kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 2</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/Have something against</td>
<td>Poor youth workers have something against a young person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 3</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/Call names</td>
<td>Poor youth workers call young people names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/False accusations</td>
<td>Poor youth workers make false accusations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/Not taken seriously</td>
<td>Poor youth workers don't take young people seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 6</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/Break confidentiality</td>
<td>Poor youth workers break confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 7</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/Strict, go off at</td>
<td>Poor youth workers are strict and go off at young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 3 8</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Bad actions/Don't model</td>
<td>Poor youth workers don't model appropriate behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 4</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Unsafe</td>
<td>Poor youth services are unsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 5</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Management committee</td>
<td>Poor youth services have poor management committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 6</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Smoking</td>
<td>Poor youth services allow staff to smoke with young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 7</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Dealing with bad workers</td>
<td>How poor youth workers are dealt with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 8</td>
<td>Work practice/Poor practice/Specific examples</td>
<td>Examples of poor youth workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Power

6 1 Power/Appropriate use of power

Discussion of the appropriate use of power

6 2 Power/Misuse power

Discussion of the misuse of power
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 3</td>
<td>Power/Empowerment</td>
<td>Discussion of empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 4</td>
<td>Power/Power imbalance</td>
<td>Discussion of the power imbalance between workers and young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>Power/Don't think YWs have power</td>
<td>Youth workers don't think they have much power (c/f consent view of power)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>Power/Checks &amp; balances</td>
<td>Ways of protecting against the misuse of power by youth workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>Power/Reaction to power</td>
<td>Ways young people react to power-over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>Power/Power-with</td>
<td>Discussion consistent with power-with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 9</td>
<td>Power/Power-over</td>
<td>Discussion consistent with power-over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 10</td>
<td>Power/Power within</td>
<td>Discussion consistent with power-within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base data</td>
<td>Characteristics of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1</td>
<td>Base data/Gender</td>
<td>Gender of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1 1</td>
<td>Base data/Gender/Female</td>
<td>Female participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1 2</td>
<td>Base data/Gender/Male</td>
<td>Male participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2</td>
<td>Base data/Participant category</td>
<td>Young person or youth worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2 1 1</td>
<td>Base data/Participant category/Young person</td>
<td>Young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2 1 2</td>
<td>Base data/Participant category/Young person/Current user</td>
<td>Young people currently using youth services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2 1 3</td>
<td>Base data/Participant category/Young person/Ex user</td>
<td>Young people not currently using youth services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2 2</td>
<td>Base data/Participant category/Youth worker</td>
<td>Youth workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td>Base data/Age</td>
<td>Age of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3 1</td>
<td>Base data/Age/14&amp;15</td>
<td>14 to 15 year olds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3 2</td>
<td>Base data/Age/16&amp;17</td>
<td>16 to 17 year olds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3 3</td>
<td>Base data/Age/18+</td>
<td>Young people aged over 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3 4</td>
<td>Base data/Age/Youth worker</td>
<td>Youth workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>Base data/Locality</td>
<td>Where participants live/work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4 1</td>
<td>Base data/Locality/Urban</td>
<td>Urban participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4 2</td>
<td>Base data/Locality/Regional</td>
<td>Regional participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4 3</td>
<td>Base data/Locality/Rural</td>
<td>Rural participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name</td>
<td>Document names (and names of participants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 1</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP1&amp;2</td>
<td>Bogg &amp; Boris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 2</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP3&amp;4</td>
<td>Isabell &amp; Jane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 3</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP5&amp;6&amp;7</td>
<td>Kat, Keith &amp; Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 4</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP8</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 5</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP9&amp;10</td>
<td>Curley &amp; Speedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 6</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP11&amp;12</td>
<td>Amber &amp; Jade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 7</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP13&amp;14</td>
<td>Burnsey &amp; Kill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 8</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP15&amp;16</td>
<td>Chenille &amp; Sarah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 9</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP17&amp;18</td>
<td>Cynknee &amp; Melz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 10</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YP19&amp;20</td>
<td>Iggy &amp; Tia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 11</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW1</td>
<td>Abby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 12</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW2</td>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 13</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW3</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 14</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW4&amp;5</td>
<td>Joanne &amp; Justin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 15</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW6</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 16</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW7</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 17</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW8</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 18</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW9</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 19</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW10</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 20</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW11</td>
<td>Katie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 21</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW12</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 22</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW13</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 23</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW14</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5 24</td>
<td>Base data/Document Name/YW15</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 6</td>
<td>Base data/Graeme</td>
<td>Questions or comments by Graeme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10

Draft Model of Nonviolent Youth Work Practice

Be committed to nonviolence in all you do

Focus on power-with

Build appropriate, caring relationships

Negotiate clear expectations and boundaries

Develop your own self-awareness

Use non-coercive behaviour management strategies

Act as an informal educator

Be active in social change

Ensure there are appropriate, adequate, staff and resources
Appendix 11

Alternatives to Violence Project Mandala

Think before reacting

Respect for self

Transforming Power

Care for others

Expect the best

Seek a nonviolent path

Expect
the
best

Respect
for self