National Report on Youth Homelessness and Social Exclusion in the UK

A preliminary study for the European research project '*Combating Social Exclusion among Young Homeless People (CSEYHP)*'

Authors   Nora Duckett
                   Joan Smith

Table of Contents

Objective 1

To describe the national contexts in terms of homeless populations: including ethnic, gender, non-national groups and those with different parental statuses

Objective 2

To analyse the role of different social partners – statutory services, NGOs, charities (not reliant on government funding), religious and ethnic organisations in each partner state, young people's organisations

Objective 3

To identify issues for the European social model and values

The Report

Section 1 reports the circumstances of youth in the UK today, primarily in England. First it reports the ethnic composition and religious affiliation of different populations and the large difference in nationality between those aged under 16 years and those aged 16-24 years of age due to migration. Second it reports the transformation of life chances for youth born in the UK that took place during the 1980s that was the background to the first major rise in youth homelessness. It reports the welfare system for children and young people in the UK and compares government policies towards young people.

Section 2 reports on how ideas of transitions, risk, vulnerability and social exclusion can explore issues surrounding youth homelessness such as problematic transitions, risk factors for youth homelessness, different understandings of vulnerability and different aspects of social exclusion of young people including school exclusion, workless households and deprived neighbourhoods. Further the rise of gang culture and drug and alcohol misuse among young people has led to a media that has emphasised the problem of youth rather than their potential.

Section 3 reports on the numbers of young homeless people in the UK and their characteristics. It describes the working of homeless legislation for young people and recent changes to that legislation and to the way that access to social housing is managed.

Section 4 reports on the provision of three different but connected services – social housing, supported accommodation and additional services for reinsertion within supported accommodation. It describes the contribution made by the *Supporting People* funding stream in the UK. It also reports on two different methodologies – early intervention and key working.

Section 5 reports on the current issues facing the National Inclusion Plan for the UK and lessons to be learned for the European Social Model from the UK experience

Introduction to National Report, UK

This report introduces the main evidence on the socio-economic challenges facing young people in the UK, on youth homelessness and on young people at risk of homelessness.

The term UK refers to four countries with distinct legal and administrative frameworks. Scotland always had a different legal system to England and Wales but following devolution in 1997 there has been a large transfer of domestic powers to the Scottish Parliament leading to different policies in relation to housing, homelessness, social care and youth. In the past legislation has been similar for England and Wales but with the establishment of the Welsh Assembly there is increasing divergence. Northern Ireland, from its very inception in the early 1920s had a different administrative structure and special powers; differences between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK increased during the period of the civil war from the 1970s onwards. The term Great Britain used in some tables in this report refers to England, Wales and Scotland excluding Northern Ireland.

This research project is based in England. It compares the homeless experiences of young people in relation to their gender, their ethnic group and their nationality – young men and women born in the UK from different ethnic groups and those not born in the UK. England has a higher proportion of young people not born in the UK than the other three countries and also a more diverse ethnic pattern. For this report we have interviewed workers in agencies in the South of England, in London and the Medway towns (mouth of the Thames), and in the West Midlands in Birmingham.

It is important to stress that the London area could be considered a fifth country, so different is the profile of this region. Nearly half (45%) of all people born outside the UK live in London. London has the lowest proportion of home ownership (55%) and a low proportion of social housing; more than half of the people placed in temporary accommodation (awaiting re-housing) after being accepted by local authorities as homeless are in London. It has had the greatest prevalence of rough sleeping.

This report also takes a historical perspective as the deeply engrained poverty of some young people and disadvantaged life experiences have their origins in a transformation of British society that took place in the 1980s, a period which saw the establishment of large scale voluntary projects working with young people who were homeless.

1: Relevant national context

1.1 What is the shape of youth in our countries?

1.1.1 Numbers of young people:

In 1981 the number of young people aged 16-24 years in the UK was just over 8 million (8,080,000) in a population of 56,358,000 –c. 14% (This peak coincided with increased unemployment discussed below). Since then the number of young people has been between 7 and 8 million range whilst the total population has increased. In 2011 it is estimated that there will be just under 7 and a half million in this age group out of a population of just under 63 million –c. 12% (Social Trends, 2007). Immigration is now contributing more to demographic growth than natural increase.

1.1.2 Ethnic and religious affiliations:

Using information gathered in the 2001 UK Census the report *Focus on Ethnicity and Religion* (ONS 2005, referred to as *FoER* subsequently) from the National Statistics Office (ONS) identifies eight major ethnic groups in the UK: White British, White Irish, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean, Black African and Chinese. The report also provides some information on those of different mixed ethnic backgrounds and on Travellers and Roma. Minority ethnic groups comprised just over 4.5 million of the UK population in 2001: 8% of the UK population but 9.25% of the population of England.

In 2001 the UK population was mostly White British (88%). The Indian population were the largest non-White ethnic group followed by Pakistani, Mixed, Black Caribbean and Black African. Christians were the largest religious group (72%) followed by those with no religion (15%), Muslims (3%), and Hindus (1%) with other religions being less than 1%. The Pakistani and Bangladeshi populations had the greatest religious homogeneity (92% Muslim). Both the Black Caribbean and Black African populations were predominantly Christian but one in five Black Africans were Muslim (ONS 2005). [i]

FoER reports that people from ethnic minority groups were concentrated in specific geographical areas in England. Nearly half of all non-White people (45%) lived in London; 13% in West Midlands and 8% in the South-East. In specific areas of some cities ethnic minorities formed a majority; in Birmingham Pakistanis formed a majority in some areas whilst in Tower Hamlets in London it was Bangladeshis. Muslims made up a majority in some parts of Birmingham, whilst Hindus formed the majority in some areas of Leicester, Sikhs were a third of the population in parts of Ealing and Birmingham.

Table 1.1 is a summary of information from the *FoER* report and from additional tables available at the Office of National Statistics website. We have only reported on mixed ethnic groups as a whole but together they comprise 1.2% of the population. From Table 1.1 it is apparent that Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Muslim populations have a younger age structure than White British, White Irish, Christian and Jewish populations. The Indian population is younger than the latter group but older than the former. In 2001, 23% of Indians were aged 16 years or younger, compared with 35% of Pakistanis and 38% of Bangladeshis.

It is also apparent that there are distinct gender issues within different ethnic-religious communities. Within the Muslim community there are higher proportions of inactive women. Pakistani and Bangladeshi community women are 31% and 25% economically active compared with 56% of Black African community women. Chinese and Indian women are 57% and 66% economically inactive. Women from

White British, White Irish and Black Caribbean ethnic groups are 75% to 74% economically active.

Table 1.1. also provides summary evidence on whether different ethnic groups were born in the UK. For those aged under 16 years 85%-98% of ethnic groups other than White British (99%) were born in the UK including Black Caribbean (92%), Indian (93%), Pakistani (91%), Bangladeshi (87%) and the four mixed ethnic groups (85% - 98%). Only White Irish (79%) and Black African (66%) were less likely than this to be born in the UK.

However, this is not true of the age group 16-24 years. Amongst this age group compared with 98% of White British being born in the UK, there is still a predominance of born UK among the Indian (81%), Pakistani (71%) and Black Caribbean (83%) ethnic groups but not among other ethnic groups. A minority of Bangladeshi (47%), White Irish (33%), Black African (29%) and Chinese (33%) were born in the UK. This huge difference reflects three trends: first the trend of young adults arriving to join existing family members in the UK (113,000 family members arrived in 2005); second a large influx of students (284,000 in 2005) and third the arrival of young adults as migrants or asylum seekers (25,710 in 2005 decreasing from 84,000 in 2002). These trends are discussed in the next section.

It also provides evidence on the rates of lone parenthood (overwhelmingly lone motherhood) in each ethnic group. The highest rates are amongst Black Caribbean (nearly one half) and Black African (over one third) ethnic groups followed by White British and White Irish at just over one fifth of households.

1.1.3 Not born in the UK – labour, family and asylum migration
In 2001 of the 4.5 million people not born in the UK, large numbers were from India (450,000), Pakistan (300,000) and, surprisingly, from Germany (233,000, reflecting the period that the British Army was based in Germany). Nearly 200,000 came from South and Eastern Africa, 150,000 from Bangladesh and Jamaica nearly the same, then from USA, South Africa, Kenya and the Far East. However many of those not born in the UK from India, Pakistan and the Caribbean are now elderly with younger people from these ethnic groups being born in the UK as reported in Table 1.1.[ii]

Nearly 400,000 people entered the UK as students or to join existing family members in 2004 (check date). Additionally new groups of migrants have arrived in the UK for work. Just over half a million people not born in the UK registered for National Insurance numbers in 2005-6 including people from Poland (nearly 150,000), India (41,000), Lithuania (26,000), Slovak Republic (22,000), South Africa (22,000), Pakistan (21,000), Australia (21,000), France (15,000), Republic of Latvia (12,000) and Nigeria (11,000).

However immigration statistics only record those who settle for up to a one year but not those on short term work permits; immigration statistics therefore exclude about half of people who enter on work permits. Foreign workers are now 6% of the workforce (compared with 3.5% 10 years previously). In general workers on work permits do not accrue housing rights and therefore do not apply to local authorities for housing assistance and not included in homeless statistics. Kofman et al (2007) identify six categories of migrants: workers (work permits, skilled migrants programme, short-term sector based e.g. seasonal agricultural work), working holiday makers, family members (spouses and children), students, refugees (who have been granted leave to remain after an asylum application), asylum seekers and unaccompanied children. While most students

Table 1.1 Characteristics of eight ethnic groups in the UK, 2001 Census: Source 'Focus on ethnicity and religion' (2005) and updates

Eight ethnic groups	% UK popul-ion	% Major Religions	% Born in the UK	% aged under 16 yrs	% aged under 16 yrs born UK	% aged 16-24 yrs born UK	Economic activity rates	% lone parent households	% consider themselves British, Welsh, Scottish (2004)	Specific Countries of Origins
White British	88%	76% Christian 16% no religion	98%	20%	99%	98%	84% men 75% women	22%	99%	
White Irish*	1%	86%, 6% none		6%	79%	33%	83% men 75% women	23%	27%	
Indian	2%	45% Hindus 29% Sikhs 13% Muslim 6% Christian	46%	23%	93%	81%	81% men 66% women	10%	75%	35% born in India, 13% born in East Africa
Pakistani	1%	92% Muslim	55%	35%	91%	71%	72% men 31% women	13%	83%	
Banglad-eshi	0.5%	92% Muslim	46%	38%	87%	47%	71% men 25% women	11%	82%	
Black Caribbean	1%	74% Christian		21%	92%	83%	80% men 74% women	48%	86%	
Black African	1%	69% Christian 20% Muslim		30%	66%	29%	72% men 57% women	36%	53%	16% Nigeria, 10% Ghana, 8%, Somalia
Chinese	0.4%	53% None	29%	19%	77%	34%	63% men 56% women	15%	52%	
Mixed	1.2%			50%	85-99%	64-96%	78% men 66% women		88%	

only stay during their degrees the numbers who have applied for and been granted settlement (after 5 years continuous residence) rose to nearly 180,000 in 2005Refugees and asylum seekers who are family members take the status of the lead person in their family who is the person investigated; in these circumstances the question in relation to the young person will be whether they are that person's dependent and what is the status of the relationship (men and women). Unaccompanied minors under the age of 18 years have their own status and may arrive seeking asylum (Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children) or illegal work, or to join family members (who refused them) or were illegally trafficked. As unaccompanied minors they have the right to support from Social Services under the Children Acts.

Three types of asylum support assistance are funded by the Home Office: a) a quarter receive subsistence only with accommodation from family and friends – Greater Manchester and 10 boroughs (local government areas) in London have the greatest numbers in these categories; b) two thirds are supported in dispersed accommodation outside London, of which the highest number were dispersed to Glasgow (4730 at end of June 2006); and c) other asylum seekers (9%) are supported with initial accommodation.

Although numbers of asylum seekers have fallen from around 100,000 a year in the early 2000s to c. 25,000 in 2005/6 there is a backlog of 450,000 cases being dealt with by the Case Resolution Directorate (CRD). These 'legacy cases' are of all those who applied for asylum before April 2006. Additional to those who are official migrants there are another one third to half a million of 'irregular migrants' – smuggled, false documents, overstaying a visa. Further, there is now evidence that some areas of England have large numbers of onward migrants from other areas of Europe – Somalis in Leicester for example who resettled from the Netherlands. [iii]

Therefore new migrant young people can be homeless because they have left their previous country with their family who are a homeless family or because they are unaccompanied or, as our previous research has found, because they have been sent to relatives who did not support them and made them homeless or who used them as domestics a situation from which they ran away. If a young person has been in the UK for seven years they have the right to remain (for an adult it is 14 years), but anyone who has been settled in the UK for 5 years has the right to apply for settlement and citizenship.

In some areas, particularly in London, new migrants have been perceived as the cause of housing problems, as well as suffering poor housing and a lack of housing security themselves. Unaccompanied minors supported by Social Services have access to public funds, as do families with small children but new migrant single people without access to public funds have begun to be found amongst the homeless and rough sleepers. [iv]

1.2 Legal definition of youth and welfare policies for youth

1.2.1 Definition of youth
The definition of youth is complex, particularly in relation to the age of responsibility (Bell and Jones, 2002). Whilst young people can vote at age 18 years, they do not receive full social security payments until 25 years, and the national minimum wage rate varies by age. Moreover the age of criminal responsibility for young people is 10 years in England and Wales (8 years in Scotland). There is a Youth Offending Programme for those aged 10 to 17 years of age, whilst those aged 18 years and over are treated as adult offenders.

The younger age used in the Criminal Justice System is particularly important in the UK because of the establishment of a class of offence called anti-social behaviour largely targeted at the activities of young people in neighbourhoods. Although anti-social behaviour is a civil offence, if young people breach the Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) then that breach becomes a criminal offence. The consequence of this has been that young people are now coming to homeless agencies with a criminal record in ever greater numbers (see Section 3 on risk of homelessness). The government has also introduced a new class of offences called parenting orders. Parents can receive a short prison term if their child persistently truants or is the subject of anti-social behaviour orders.

1.2.2 Child poverty
The main issue facing the welfare and care system for young people in the UK has been the legacy of the crisis and monetarist years from the late 1970s through to the mid 1990s which led to an extraordinary increase in inequality and rise in poor life chances for the bottom income quintile in British society.

In the decade of the 1980s, unlike every other post-war decade, the gains of economic growth were not shared across income groups but benefited the richest most and the poorest least (Hills et al, 2009). Unemployment peaked at 11% in 1993 but when unemployment fell back to 7% in 1997, the restructured economy had transformed life chances amongst the poorest in the country: 16% of households were workless (the proportion of children in workless households was the highest in the industrialised world, 20%) and youth unemployment was 13%. Inequality was higher in the UK than any other industrialised country except the USA and during these years child poverty as measured by median income of their household rose from one in eight in 1979 to one in four of all children by 1997 (Hills et al, 2009:3-5; 47-48 quoting DWP, 2004).

1.2.3 Children and young people in care
Children and young people in care or 'Looked After' (Children Act 1989) are consistently over represented in the statistics of young homeless people. [v] According to Broadway (2006) of the 2,374 people verified as sleeping rough in London in 2005/06 12% had been in care. Social care for children and young people is governed by the framework laid down in the Children Act 1989 and the acts of 2000, 2004 and 2008. Since 2002 any young person who has been in care is considered 'priority need' and owed a duty of housing support under the homeless legislation (see Section 3). Care Matters (2006) was focused on improving the lives of children in care and looking specifically at low levels of educational achievement.

The Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) figures for the end of March 2008 show there were 59,500 children looked after and of these 3,200 were adopted and 42,300 were in foster placements (71%). Of these 37,200 children were looked after under a Care Order representing 63% of all legal statuses. Most were of White British origin (74%), 3,500 were Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) which was an increase of around 100 children compared to the figure for 2007. In 2008 the percentage of UASC children of Black African origin decreased by 7 % to 24 %, whilst the percentage of UASC children of any other Asian background increased by 7% to 31%. Within this time period and population 280 were mothers aged 12 years and over.

DCFS (2008) reported that 8,300 children aged 16 years ceased to be looked after for the end of March 2008 (an increase from 2003-04 figures where 6,900 young people ceased to be looked after): 61 % of these children ceased to be looked after on their 18th birthday and 24 % ceased to be looked after aged 16

years. Those young people who could not return to the parental home at this age, or to another relative, were frequently placed with homeless agencies in order to discharge Social Services duty towards them under the Homeless legislation. This is discussed in Section 3.

Thoburn's (2007) cross national study of children in out-of-home care provides useful data (see tables below) on the children in care population across the UK. Thoburn differentiates between three data sets: a 'snapshot' population, those actually in care on a given date, 'flow' population, those who enter at any time or and a combination of the two but avoiding double counting. The significance of the difference is illustrated by looking at the in care population in 2004-2005. For example the rate of entrants to care in 2004-5 was 23 per 10,000; the rate in care on 31 March 2005 was 60 per 10,000 and the rate in care at any time in the year was 76 per 10,000. [vi]

Table 1.1 Children in care at a given date and rates in care per 10,000 children under 18 years.

COUNTRY/STATE (year of data)	(Estimated) 0-17 POPULATION	0-17 IN CARE POPULATION	RATE PER 10,000 <18
UK/England (2005)	11,109,000	60,900	55
UK/N. Ireland (2005)	451,514	2,531	56
UK/Scotland (2005)	1,066,646	7,006	66
UK/Wales (2005)	615,800	4,380	71

Table 1.2 Age groups of children and young people in care on a specified date

COUNTRY/ STATE	0-4	5-9	10-15	16-17
UK/England	19%	20%	44%	18%
UK/N.Ireland	16%	34% (5-11)	32% (12-15)	17%
UK/Scotland	18%	35% (5-11)	35% (12-15)	12%
UK/Wales	22%	24%	42%	12%

This low proportion of older children in Scotland is influenced by the fact that 151 children who entered care through the courts for reasons of delinquency are not included in the care and protection statistics, even though the service is provided by the same service.

Table 1.3 Main reason for entering or being in care. for those countries for which data were available (percentages for those in care at a given date in brackets)[vii]

COUNTRY/ STATE	Abuse/neglect (in care)	Parental disabil. /illness (in care)	Child Disabil./other probs of child (in care)	Abandoned / no parent (in care)	Relationship/ other family probs including addictions (in care)
UK/England	48% (62%)	8% (6%)	9% (7%)	11% (8%)	24% (17%)
UK/Wales	48% (68%)	8%	10%		28% (13%)

Looking at ethnicity as an influence on rates into care, two groups that are particularly likely to be over-represented in care and to be in care as a result of

court intervention are children and young people of African Caribbean, and mixed African Caribbean and white heritage. Of other more recent immigrant groups, black Africans are also somewhat over-represented (Thoburn 2007). Overall children from South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh) have lower rates of care (Dickens et al 2007)

According to Thoburn (2007), in general countries such as the UK nations and USA that have introduced performance targets as a way of controlling welfare costs tend to see coming into care and remaining in care as something to be avoided. In these countries the care system is connected to systems for intervening when children are abused. In contrast, other European countries such as Denmark, Germany and Sweden, also see the need for care as an essential part of their family support and child mental health systems.

1.2.4 Children in need of Protection

Besides those children and young people who are taken into care many children and young people are the subject of a Child Protection Plan (CPP; formerly the Child Protection Register which was abolished in April 2008). A CPP may be a stage before the child/young person is taken into care or the child/ young person may remain the subject of a CPP without being removed from their family. Information in England, Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland, is collected on children/ young people subject of a CPP by category of type of abuse and by age and gender.

The most common reason for children being subject of a CPP is neglect. In 2008 13,400 children/young people had a CPP in England, 1,095 in Wales, 1,166 in Scotland and 569 in Northern Ireland for reasons of neglect. The next most common reason was that of emotional abuse (2008: 7,900 in England, 580 Wales; 572 Scotland and 226 Northern Ireland). In 2008 these two categories were followed by the categories of physical abuse (3,400; 315; 513; and 357 respectively) and sexual abuse (2,000; 160; 160 and 225). Some cases were recorded with overlapping reasons such as neglect/physical abuse, or physical abuse/ sexual abuse.

In 2008 slightly fewer girls were subject to CPPs than boys in England (14000 girls vs 14700 boys) and Wales (1090 girls vs 1180 boys) although the difference was greater in Scotland (411 girls vs 598 boys) and Northern Ireland (853 girls vs 952 boys). [viii]

Fewer than one in 50 sexual offences against children result in a criminal conviction (Stuart and Baines, 2004). In particular, children under five, disabled children and children for whom English is not their first language are often excluded from the legal processes, and the *most vulnerable children are almost totally failed by the criminal justice system* (Utting 2005, p140 and 1997:20.10). Up to 5000 children at any one time are victims of child sexual exploitation (Melrose et al, 1999, p5).

There are serious issues of abuse in relation to ethnic minority young women. In 2008 the Home Office estimated that about 3000 women every year are subjected to forced marriage in the UK and men can also be victims of this form of abuse (Khanum, 2008).

There are also issues in relation to trafficking of children. This involves the exploitation of children through force, coercion, threat and the use of deception and human rights abuses such as debt bondage, deprivation of liberty and lack of control over one's labour. Exploitation occurs through prostitution and other types of sexual exploitation and labour exploitation. It includes the movement of people

across borders and also the movement and exploitation of people within borders (DfES, 2006:11.76). A study of trafficked young people identified 330 children suspected or confirmed as trafficked in an 18 month period and of these 183 had gone missing from children's services care. Over 40 source countries were identified and the main countries were China, Nigeria, Vietnam, Afghanistan and Eritrea. In particular 88% of Chinese children had gone missing. 36 African girls were known or suspected as being trafficked for sexual exploitation, the youngest being 12 years old. 14 girls from Eastern Europe and Russia were trafficked for sexual exploitation (CEOP, 2007).

According to the Department of Health (2002) at least 750,000 children in the UK every year witness domestic violence. It is also believed that when domestic violence co-exists with parental mental illness or problem alcohol/drug use children are most vulnerable to abuse and long-term adverse effects (Department of Health, 2002).

1.3   Main national routes of youth insertion into adult life
1.3.1 Leaving Home, Partnerships and Parenting
The age of leaving home fell throughout the 1960s through to the 1980s but by the early 1990s it was apparent that this trend had been reversed. By spring 2003 nearly three fifths of men aged 20 to 24 lived with their parents, compared with half in 1991. For women the proportion of 20 to 24 year olds living with their parents increased from a third to nearly two fifths. (Social Trends 34, 2003)

Cohabitation has also become more common across Great Britain and the average age of parenthood has risen. Over the last 20 years, the proportion of unmarried men and women aged under 60 years cohabiting in Great Britain rose from 11% of men and 13% of women, to 24% and 25% respectively. Married women giving birth for the first time were, on average, age 30 in England and Wales in 2006, compared with age 24 in 1971. (Social Trends 2007: Table 2.14). The proportion of married couple families has decreased over the last ten years whilst cohabiting couple families rose: married couple families were 71%of families in 2006 (vs. 76% in 1996) whilst cohabiting couple families were 14% (vs 9% in 1996). The proportion of lone parent families increased by less than 1% between 1996 and 2006.

In 2006, the average number of dependent children in a family was 1.8, compared with 2.0 in 1971. In 2007 in England and Wales women had, on average, 1.92 children; the last time the Total Fertility Rate exceeded 1.92 was 34 years previously in 1973. There were 690,013 live births in 2007 and there were increases in fertility rates for all age groups in 2007, except for women aged under 20 years. The highest percentage increases in fertility rates were among older mothers. The standardised average (mean) age of women giving birth rose to 29.3 from 29.1 in 2006. There was a continued rise in the proportion of births to mothers born outside the UK: 23% in 2007 compared to 13% in 1977.

Despite these general trends the UK still had a high rate of conception amongst disadvantaged younger women and a high rate of lone parenthood (principally lone motherhood). Therefore in this area as in other areas there is a continuation of the polarisation of advantage that took place during the 1980s with advantaged mothers having children at older ages, often in stable partnerships, and disadvantaged mothers having children at younger ages in unstable or no partnerships. An exception to this is however children born to women of particular ethnic minorities as shown in Table 1.1. Young women of Pakistani or Bangladeshi origins, predominantly of Muslim faith. are much less likely to be in gainful employment and more likely to have larger families younger.

1.3.2 Employment and Education

Mizen (2004) has argued that from the late 1970s the monetarist commitment to prioritising inflation replaced previous British governments' commitment to employment. Therefore the UK government's only solution to unemployment and youth unemployment in the early 1980s was the deregulation of the adult labour market and the replacement of a youth labour market with youth training schemes attendance at which was reinforced through loss of benefits for non-attendance. Young people saw no worth in these youth training schemes and largely opted, where family circumstances permitted and their own abilities made possible, to stay on in education.

One million unemployed from the mid 1970s doubled in the two years 1979-81; and the unemployment rate rose from 4.4% to 8.9%, peaking at 11.4% in 1986. Whereas the majority of young people leaving school in the 1960s and 1970s went straight into work by the 2000s only 8% of young school leavers moved directly into employment and unemployment amongst 16-24 year olds in 2005 was 9-10% in England, Scotland and Wales.

This transformation of school leaving opportunities undermined the social inclusion prospects of generations of youth, particularly young men who adapted slowly and badly to the loss of employment opportunities in traditional industries and traditional skills (carpentry, engineering, electrical work, plumbing). All the nationalised industries and the direct labour departments of Local Authorities (whose work became contracted out) had offered a large number of apprenticeships as had large manufacturing concerns. One third of a million apprenticeships in the late 1970s fell to 75,000 in 1996/7. The Apprenticeship Bill currently going through parliament attempts to redress this by creating 250,000 apprenticeships per year but many of these will be pre-apprenticeship courses in Further Education colleges whereas traditional apprenticeships were attached to older workers also acted as mentors to young people, overwhelmingly young men. The new apprenticeships include employers in the retail and service industries.

Therefore increasingly the route into employment for the majority of young people has been through extended education and the government has now recognised this by proposing the raising the School Leaving age from 16 years to 18 years. However the government has to confront the problem of young people who are NEET – not in education, employment or training. A particular focus for successive Labour governments has been the development of policies targeted on 'NEET' – Not in Employment, Education and Training – young people. The problem of NEETs emerged by the end of the 1990s following the transformation of the labour market for youth in the 1980s. It was apparent that whatever the unemployment rate for young people aged 16-24 years there was an equal proportion of young people who were not accounted for in the economic activity statistics. The Office of National Statistics estimated that in 2006 1.24 million young people aged 16-24 years in 2006 were not in education, employment or training (16% of the cohort). (Prince's Trust, 2007).

1.3.3 Independent housing prospects

The number of new houses built in the UK has only just kept pace with the number of new households being formed. Between 1971 and 2006 the number of dwellings in Great Britain rose from 18.8 to 25.7 million, while the number of households rose from 18.6 to 24.3 million. In 2006, 37 %of dwellings bought in the UK cost more than £200,000, while 15 per cent cost less than £100,000. Flats (apartments) were previously associated with the most deprived wards (areas) of the UK but with rising house prices in the mid 2000s became an important part of new build property. In 2006/07, 47 % of new dwellings completed in England

were flats, compared with 16 % in 1996/97 and 26 % in 1991/92 (Social Trends, 2007)

In 2003/04, 70 % of dwellings (18 million) in Great Britain were owner-occupied compared with 12 million in 1981. Over the same period the number of homes rented in the social sector declined steadily through a combination of the 'right to buy' given to tenants and a decline in the number of new builds in this sector. In 1981 there were 7 million dwellings in this sector; by 2003 the number had fallen by one quarter to just under 5 million, from a third of all dwellings to c. 18%.

The UK government emphasis on 'affordable housing' during this period was an emphasis on low-cost home-ownership, or shared home ownership in which a household bought between 25%-75% of a property on a mortgage and rented the other percentage until they could afford to buy. 'Affordable' housing was essentially housing just below market price that was managed by a social housing provider. However many households could not afford to do this. The emphasis on home ownership in the UK led to around a fifth of household reference persons aged under 25 owning their own property with a mortgage in 2000-1. Over half of 25-34 year olds and over two-thirds of 35-44 year olds were buying their property with a mortgage. (Social Trends, 32).

The problem of finding affordable accommodation and lengthening periods in education rather than employment underwrote the declining proportion of those aged 16-24 years who were in a position to leave home. Those young people who did leave home were principally private renters or renters of social housing. ONS reports data from the General Household Survey in Great Britain showing that in 2000-01 over 40 per cent of households where the household reference person was under 25 were living in privately rented accommodation. This was more than twice the proportion for those aged 25 to 34 and far greater than for any other age group. Private renters in furnished accommodation were particularly likely to be young: over the age of 24 there were very few renters of private rented, furnished property. (GHS report at www.statistics.gov.uk/STATBASE/) Just under the proportion of young people privately renting was the proportion socially renting (38%) either from a local authority landlord or a social housing provider. This proportion dropped to 22% for those aged 25 to 34 years and to 17% for those aged over 34 years.

Lone parents were more likely to rent their property rather than own it. In 2003/04 one in three (36 %) lone parent households in the United Kingdom were owner occupiers, 50% rented from the social sector and 15 % rented privately. In contrast, four in five households comprising a couple with dependent children were owner-occupiers, most of whom were buying with a mortgage.

Tenure also varies regionally. In 2003/04 owner-occupation was highest in the South East, East Midlands and East (75%) and lowest in London (58 %) and Scotland (67%). London had by far the highest proportion rented from the private sector (17 %).

Almost 1.8 million households, or 4.5 million people, are now on social housing waiting lists, the LGA is calling for flexibility in central government housing grants that will allow councils to keep home building going during the economic downturn. Further demands include a reform of the council housing subsidy system and the right for councils to keep 100 % of capital receipts from Right to Buy. A full breakdown of every local authority in the country and their 2008 waiting lists can be found at can be accessed on the LGA (Local Government Association) website

1.3.4 Benefits and income support for young people

The benefit regime for young people was fundamentally changed in the 1986 welfare reform regime where young people aged 16 and 17 years were no longer entitled to welfare benefits except in particular circumstances including being estranged from their family. The current benefit regimes is called New Deal but benefit rates have remained low for all young people and is currently around £48 a week and they are expected to be available for work unless they are in education or are a young mother. The benefit regime therefore deals with young people in relation to age – 16/17 year olds, 18-24 year olds, and in relation to circumstances – health, education engagement or parental status. Separate payments are made under housing benefit for the cost of accommodation but for single people aged under 25 years payments are only for a room in a shared house at an area reference rent set by the local authority.

Agencies in this study reported four major issues with the benefits and income support regime for young people:
1. The low level of benefits for single young people which restricts their lives. Higher levels of benefits are paid to young single mothers.
2. Young people in their education and training programmes may be pulled out of these to undertake a course prescribed by New Deal which has less relevance for the young person.
3. Young people cannot continue in full time education beyond 19 years and receive welfare payments. Young people in education over the age of 19 years must be in education for less than 16 hours a week in order to continue to receive their welfare payments because in principle they must be available for work.
4. Young people are placed in jobs including temporary contracts with agencies that end abruptly and they then have great difficulties in reclaiming benefits particularly housing benefits.

A major issue is confronted by young people who are not born in the UK. If they do not have leave to remain or cannot prove they have leave to remain they are in a situation where they 'have no recourse to public funds'. In this situation local authorities and agencies cannot take them into supported accommodation.

1.4. Government policies towards youth
Mizen (2004) has reviewed youth policies and youth experience in the UK after the Second World War and identified and described a fundamental shift from inclusion strategies associated with Keynesianism, to strategies associated with monetarism that excluded young people from social security benefits whilst restructuring the youth labour market into a youth training market. He argues that from 1946 to 1976 affluence led to the expansion of education opportunities, full employment and an attitude of youth that treated them as 'citizens in the making'.
'Under the Keynesian commitment to inclusion, young people were progressively incorporated into a more benign and expansive structure of social security. Provision may have been far from generous, the maintenance of labour discipline and reintegration into the family form never far from view, but the inclusive strategy did bring with it significant concessions for the young, in the form of greater coverage under the social insurance system…' (Mizen, 2004:98-99).

The crises of the 1970s through to the 1990s (1972-5, 1981-3, and 1990-3) and the rise of youth unemployment in the early 1980s transformed youth opportunities. From 1981 through to 1996 16% to 20% of school leavers were unemployed and the national view of young people was transformed from

'citizens in the making' to unemployed and potentially criminal or trouble-making youth.

Therefore in the 1980s a youth labour market was replaced by youth training schemes that were short-term and low-skill and often paid employers to employ young people without significant skills being imparted. Young people, aware of the deficiencies of such schemes increasingly opted to stay in education when they could. The option to stay in education was not possible for all youth nor was the option to stay at home and be supported by the family. A study of the family background of young homeless people found that young people were being made homeless by their parents rather than, as the government believed, wilfully leaving home (Smith et al, 1998). In particular young people from families with a parent and step-parent were more likely to be made homeless and a study of leaving home in Scotland found that young people in step-parented families left home on average two years earlier (Jones, 1995; Smith et al, 1998). Fragile family relationships were further harmed by the withdrawal of welfare benefits from young people placing the burden of their keep back on the family. The year that welfare benefits were withdrawn, 1988, saw an extraordinary rise in the number of youth homeless, including young people sleeping on the streets of London. 1988-9 saw a major effort by the voluntary sector to meet the crisis of homelessness among young people (Section 1.5 below).

Labour governments from 1997 sought to reverse some of the worse consequences of youth unemployment and 'damaged' transitions through targeting resources at particular areas and particular groups of youth. The main policies for all youth from successive Labour governments has been to raise the proportion of young people completing school with 5 GCSEs (at 16 years) and then staying on into further and higher education. First, Labour governments have re-invested in the state education. Second, Educational Maintenance Allowances have been introduced for disadvantaged young people staying in schools beyond the age of 16 years through to 19 years. But there remains a 34% gap between the achievement of 5 GCSEs at age 16 years between the most advantaged neighbourhoods and the most disadvantaged (Lupton et al 2009, in Hills et al, 2009: Table 4.3, p81).

Current government policy on re-insertion for those who missed out on earlier education has several different elements. In the Chatham and Medway Foyer four particular alternatives were on offer: further education college courses that were either academic or BTec/OCR and the proposed new Diploma for 14-19 year olds supported by up to £30 Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA); modern apprenticeships that provided a qualification equivalent to 5 GCSEs and Advanced Apprenticeships that took young people with qualifications; Entry to Employment (E2E) for young people who left school with no qualifications, with support provided by a Connexions adviser; and employment supported by advisors including Job Seeker advisors.

Table 1.1 (overleaf) expands Mizen's summary of the Keynesian and Monetarist policies towards youth, adds a summary of New Labour polices, and includes the transformation of housing prospects for young people and the decline in general youth leisure provision.

Table 1.Government policies towards youth under Keynesian, monetarist and New Labour forms of political management (following Mizen, 2004: Table 1.2 p17 expanded)

Keynesian youth policies	Monetarist-Conservative youth policies	New Labour Targeted youth policies
Direct state support for parents	Cost of child support back on to the family and erosion of young people's welfare benefits.	Child allowances increased. Educational Maintenance All
Consolidate and reorganise secondary schooling	Reorganise secondary schooling, rise in family funded private schooling	Parenting orders for truanting. Extended schools
Expansion of free further and higher education and mandatory grants to study	Expand FE and HE by shifting the cost onto young people and parents	Introduction of fees, grants means tested
Guarantee full employment; work based apprenticeships includes day release FE (5yr).	Guarantee place on a work experience or training scheme.	Modern apprenticeship scheme.
Rising youth wages and an expanding youth labour market	Active depression of youth wages to the level of benefits	Introduction of minimum wage with reduced rates yp
Extend welfare benefits to young people in their own right	Welfare benefits withdrawn for 16 and 17 year olds and harsher eligibility criterion. Value of benefits very low.	Continued but New Deal for youth with advisors – Gateway.
Expansion of social housing to one third of housing units, available at low rent.	'Right to buy' of local authority housing; social housing declines to 18% of stock. '	Shared cost home ownership or private rental market.
Rent support including for students.	Rent support restricted by age. For under 25s it is the cost of a shared room at a local area reference rent	Continued plus Housing benefit paid to tenant rather than landlord
Decriminalise and divert youth offenders	Anti-social behaviour orders	ASBOs and diversion projects
General youth leisure provision – youth clubs and youth service	Selling of school playing fields, under funding of youth provision	More youth services targeted at the 'vulnerable' or diversion projects.

Every Child Matters: The Labour government brought together their aspirations for an improved life for every child in the *Every Child Matters* policy agenda for children under 18 focusing on socially disadvantaged children in need and their families as part of a policy of social inclusion. This agenda aims to provide all children with universal services as children in need rather than to identify those at high risk of significant harm and provide them with a specialist response. The Every Child Matters Green Paper set out five outcomes for children, one of which is staying safe (HM Treasury, 2003). This is quite different from the children's rights perspective that government should make sure that children and young people are protected from abuse, neglect and being harmed by the people looking after them (UNCRC, 1989, Article 19). Outcomes do not give children legal rights to protection but rather place a duty on local authorities.

ECM includes a database for every child in England named ContactPoint and systems such as the Common Assessment Framework, (CAF) Initial and Core assessments and Integrated Children's Systems a framework for working with children in need and their families (ICS). ICS has been criticised by civil liberties groups and children's campaigners and about its scope, role and the security of information. The government has also been criticised that since ECM children have received more government attention as potential criminals than as victims

of abuse requiring protection. In April 2008, the Child Protection Register was abolished on the basis of no research findings at all (Dhanda, 2007).

Youth Matters (Department of Skills and Education, 2005) sets policy proposals aimed at improving outcomes for 13-19-year-olds following the ECM agenda . However, unlike the ECM agenda this was specifically targeted at young people who were multiply disadvantaged as was the Connexions service. Instead of providing specific services in the local area for young people at risk of homelessness (as was established in the Safe in the City programme) the government has been inclined to work through schools, through an extended school programme and school plus. Unfortunately some young people who are most at risk are excluded from schools and others self exclude.

Under the Youth Matters agenda vulnerable young people are defined as those who experience a combination of particular factors: *persistent absence or exclusion from school*; *behavioural problems*; *poor emotional, social or coping skills*; *poor mental health*; *learning difficulties and disabilities*; *low self-efficacy*; *poor aspirations*; *attitudes that condone risky behaviours*; *poor family support, family conflict or problems such as parental substance misuse*; *poor support networks*; *family, friends or involvement in gangs who condone high-risk activities; living in a deprived neighbourhood; and poverty.* (DCFS. 2008)
The government invested £4.6 billion on young people's services - £2billion on social services, £0.5 billion on Connexions (targeted at disadvantaged youth) and 0.3 billion on local authority youth services (targeted at all youth).

One project manager grew up in the area in Birmingham in which she now runs a hostel for homeless youth:

Manager, St Basil project for young men in Birmingham, female, UK born, black Caribbean
…I think as a whole we've lost – the youth service provision when I was a child, going back 30 years – there were places to go. Now we criminalise young people – if you hang around in more than a group of 3, you can get an ASBO 'well, where do you want me to go instead, because there is nothing else out there?' They're pulling money from youth services and they're not putting anything back in place. 'You're telling me I can't hang around here – OK give me somewhere to go'… The youth service perception is that it's all going to charities – actually it's not – from my perception it's not. I know a lot of it's about encouraging us all to do more partnership work but – all I can speak about is personally – and my children are now 16 and 20 – thank goodness they're girls. If they were boys I would be absolutely petrified because where I live, there is no provision for young people at all. I live in the same area I grew up and every night I had somewhere to go and I wasn't hanging around on the streets.

1.5 Need and the expansion of the voluntary sector
Centrepoint was established in 1969 to work with young people who came to the Soho area of London from other towns in a Church in Dean Street. The Berwick Street hostel still works with young people who self-present and offer a nine night stay whilst the young person's situation is addressed. Other Centrepoint supported accommodation takes referrals from particular local authorities and social service departments. They have recently taken over 300 'Stop-over' beds and now have 800 in London and three small emergency projects in the North East and North West of England

The first intimation that young people were more generally presenting as homeless at homeless agencies was the 1979 study *Single and Homeless* (Drake, 1980). This report based in seven areas found that young people were appearing at advice agencies for homeless people and even at some hostels. A large surge in youth homelessness and even street homelessness among young people then

took place in the late 1980s and early 1990s after young people's entitlement to social security benefits were removed and youth unemployment peaked. When agencies that worked with homeless people (previously older male homeless from particular backgrounds such as catering, building, and mental health hospitals) found young people amongst their applicants they developed new provision for young people. The following quote illustrates the development of their youth services over these decades:

> Regional operations manager, DePaul UK London, born UK, white
> *We were established in October 1989 as a direct response [to the rise in youth homelessness, JS]. Cardinal Hulme established us, as De Paul Trust as was, now DePaul UK, because loads of 16 and 17 year olds were going into the Passage day centre, using the same services as your 60-70 year old rough sleeper, because of the change in the legislation, which meant that they couldn't claim certain benefits that they were able to claim before… He established it on the values of St. Vincent De Paul but as an organisation we would be based on values rather than on religious beliefs. We got a house in Willesden and got going, started opening the doors and letting people in. So we were a direct response to those times.*

Ten years later in 1999 the DePaul Trust began working in young offender institutions and in prisons to provide a support pathway when young people came out of prison. In 2004 they became part of the wider international DePaul (created out of the original UK initiative). Part of the services they provide is to be the host organisations for small independent Night Stops that have a circle of volunteers that take young people for up to three nights to prevent them sleeping rough whilst an accommodation solution can be found.

A similar story could be told by each of the agencies being interviewed for this report. St Basils Projects in Birmingham developed out of a church dedicated to working with young rockers run by the Reverend Les Milner who then persuaded the Church Authorities to let him have the Church as a base for young homeless people. St Basils Projects are now the Gold Standard project for the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG)and have 26 projects around Birmingham including family mediation and counselling services, a service that provides peer mentoring in schools (STAMP), resettlement/floating support, emergency accommodation through to foyer accommodation and accommodation for young mothers and even young couples. They are expanding into surrounding rural areas and are developing their own independent housing pathway.

Separate YMCAs, which had a history of accommodating youth who were seeking work in London and other cities in the 1930s, began to transform their provision to provide hostel accommodation for young homeless people alongside those who were working or were students. Many became foyers and comprise about half of the 130 Foyers in the foyer federation. Foyers were a relatively late development from 1993. The first new build foyers were established to provide education and training alongside supported accommodation. Then other supported accommodation providers began to sign up to that ethos and the Foyer Federation was established as a collective of those providers and has around 130 affiliated agencies. Most agencies now provide education and training for the young people they accommodate but in foyers it is still the case that young people must be engaged in order to maintain their licence or their tenancy. Therefore in the 180 bed West London YMCA which has 30 foyer beds out of 110 Supporting People beds, the 30 foyer residents have a separate licence

agreement. In St Basils the agreement within the Edmonds Court foyer is similarly different from all projects.

Project worker, St Basils, Birmingham, male, black African, non-UK born

Right now, I'm on a case with a young person who had refused to attend a Connexions appointment. We've got on-site education, she's refusing to engage and she is breaching the rules, having overnight visitors etc. So we went from warning to warning, we made a ABC, an Acceptable Behaviour Contract, they have to sign to say 'you've done that, that and that and we're going to give you a last chance'. If they don't follow the last chance, the ABC, we can still set up a plan, 'this is an action plan, you do this, that and that but if you don't follow it, we might ask you to leave'. And also the licence agreement – because the licence is just a permission to reside – instead of giving them 6 months, we can give them 1 month to sort themselves out, but they've got the choice. But before we reach there, we will try to do everything we can to help them…In education, in any kind of support. A foyer is a French concept, you have to be in education, employment or training if you want to live here. They sign it – it actually says on the first page of the licence agreement…but…It's not compulsory.

2: Youth at risk of social exclusion and homelessness

According to a study of 21 industrialised countries by UNICEF (2007) children in Britain are the unhappiest in the Western world. The report stated young people in UK had the worst relationships with their family and peers, suffered more from poverty and indulged in more "binge drinking" and hazardous sex than children in other countries.

2.1 Discourses on youth – transitions, risk, vulnerability and social exclusion

Four discourses exist side by side in government documents in relation to young people becoming *safely* independent: transition[ix], risk, vulnerability and social exclusion. Under Labour administrations from 1997 the dominant political discourse has been that of social exclusion with other concepts referring to individualised situations.

2.1.1 Transitions

From the late 1970s and early 1980s the usual way to understand youth routes to adulthood was through the transition model. Even in the Social Exclusion Unit report on youth (Social Exclusion Unit, 2005) the key starting point is the idea of youth 'transition'. The 'transitions' model however was developed to fit the life experiences of a specific cohort of babies born in one week in 1958; one of the large sweeps of this cohort was undertaken in 1977 and early transition models were based on this data. The transitions of young people who became young adults in the late 1970s were essentially the transitions of the last 'Keynesian' generation: young people left their parental home to move through different, but smooth, pathways into higher education, work and family building. There was no discussion of homelessness, issues of early leaving or even housing because different forms of housing (owner occupation, or local authority social housing) were readily available. It assumed family patterns that are now quite outdated.

The transitions model is still referred to except that in order to make it fit the current experience of youth it is necessary to write of 'damaged transitions', 'ordered transitions' vs 'disordered transitions', 'extended transitions' and 'protracted transitions', and to distinguish between the different strands of the transition – work, education, family building – because they occur at different times and are more complex. Currently in the UK the young people whose transitions are considered not to fit the model include. 30% who don't stay in education, young people from ethnic minorities (except those with high

educational aspirations), Roma and other travellers, asylum seekers, care leavers and homeless young people (ODPM/ SEU: 2005).

The reasons for the loss of a smooth transition from youth to adult include: a rise in the age of leaving compulsory education, the increasing importance of qualifications for work (more young people are students or trainees between leaving school and full time employment), reduction of opportunities for school leavers to become financially independent through work, loss of welfare provisions for young people, the higher median ages of marriage and childbirth and the loss of affordable housing.

The loss of the opportunity for an ordered transition is particularly important in the UK because traditionally young people have left home at earlier ages and still do so. In 2005 an examination of ECHP (European Household Panel Survey) data provided evidence of both the different age at which young people leave home across EU-13 and EU-15 countries and also, more importantly, of the risk of poverty for young adults leaving home. The team of Aassve, Davia, Iacovou, Mazzuco, and Mencarini (Aassve et al, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c) has also established both the extent of youth poverty amongst those who leave home compared with those youth who have not and variability between countries.

First, the age by which 50% of young people live independently varies greatly between EU-13 countries: in Finland, Denmark, Netherlands and the UK the age varies between 22-24 years, the youngest age; and the proportion of those aged 20-24 years is between 42%-55% in this group of countries. (Aassve et al, 2005c). Second, rates of poverty (measured as 60% of median income) between young people who have left home are higher in all countries compared with those who have not left home. The highest probabilities of being poor among those who have left home are to be found in Finland, Netherlands, Italy and the UK (35-30%).

The IARD project (2001) reviewed education and training, youth and the labour market, well-being, health and values, organisations and political participation and young people's awareness of Europe. IARD identified youth situation in relation to three groups of countries: (1) those where the labour market is the main source of income, followed by family support and social transfers (Austria, Germany, Fr, Ireland, Lux, Portugal, Sweden); (2) those where the labour market is the most important followed by social transfers and then the family (Denmark, UK); (3) those where the family is the most important source of support followed by the labour market and social transfers (Belgium, Spain, Greece and Italy).

Therefore a minority of UK young people leave home younger – age 22-24 years – and in a country where their reliance is on the labour market and social transfers (i.e. welfare payments) rather than on family support. However during the monetarist period welfare support structures were cut back and these have not been restored for young single people; current rates of Job Seekers Allowance are £48.75p per week (approx 50 euros).

2.1.2 Risk
In a wider perspective, all these disruptions to the transition to adulthood can be seen as happening globally. Beck (1992) has argued that we live in a 'risk society' in which individuals must be responsible for their own biographies. In the UK there has been a long tradition, over thirty years, of establishing particular risk factors in relation to young people becoming offenders, young people in care and from the late 1990s young people who were homeless.

Risk factors of youth homelessness: In a first study of risk factors for youth homelessness that drew on two comparative samples, Bruegel and Smith (1999)

undertook a survey of 16-19 year old Londoners including: (i) 198 homeless youths living in hostels, both first and second stage; (ii) 152 young people living with their parents in local areas of similar deprivation to those young homeless respondents had formerly lived in. Compared with domiciled young people, young homeless people had an increased risk of homelessness in relation to the following factors:

Table 2 Odds of being in the Homeless Sample.
London 'Safe in the City' Survey 1998

Variable	Odds Ratio
Didn't get on with mother/ got on with mother	13:1
Moved house more than twice/ less than twice	11:1
Mother aged below 25 years at first child/ mother older	6:1
Badly off as a child/ not badly off as a child	5:1
Living with foster parent/care, step parent, or relative at 12 years/ in two birth parent or one birth parent family at 12 years	5:1
Hit frequently in course of argument/not hit, not hit frequently	4:1
Shared bedroom at 12 years/ not shared bedroom at 12 years	3:1
In rented accommodation at 12/ in other tenure	3:1
No car in household/ at least one car	3:1
Excluded from school/ never excluded	2:1

Source: London 'Safe in the City' Survey 1998

Of course there was a relationship between many of these variables. Following a discriminant analysis using seven variables it was possible to place 82% of the homeless sample into the correct category. Being hit during the course of arguments was one of the seven discriminant variables, as was school exclusion, age of mother, not living with two or one birth parents only, moving house more than twice, sharing a room, being badly off as a child.

The areas of origin of young homeless people were identified based on post-code of last family address or last address living with a family member (foster parents' addresses were excluded), and were mapped on to the ward index of deprivation; 9 out of 10 homeless young Londoners living in London hostels were identified as coming from deprived areas. The first report from the Social Exclusion Unit established by the Labour Government was on the depth of social exclusion across deprived areas (SEU, 1998).

Overall three clusters of factors could be identified in the study and subsequent 'risk' studies: the risk for young people in relation to their own behaviour (school exclusion, school truanting, drugs and alcohol), the risk to young people in relation to their parents behaviour and the risk in relation to social exclusion and poverty – workless households, poor areas and poor families. Box 2a on risk factors the quotations from managers, project managers and key workers in our agencies demonstrate the different ways they talk about risk in relation to the homeless young people they work with. First they speak of the individual risk factors for young people –in relation to their own behaviour, not getting on with their family and in relation to parental behaviour. Second they talk about undertaking risk assessments of each young person in order to manage the risk that young person might be to the project or to other young people. Third they mention the risk of everyday life to the young people they work with in relation to gangs, drug culture, and alcohol.

Box 2.1 Risk factors for young people becoming homeless
Organisation Manager, St Basils, Birmingham, born UK, female, black Caribbean
identified three different sets of issues – family breakdown, their own issues and their
parents issues:
*'Family breakdown, relationship breakdown – that's probably the highest. Issues around
drugs, mental health issues, previous evictions, tenancy breakdown – sometimes their
parents' tenancy breakdown, anti-social behaviour, abuse – anything really. They come
with a whole host of presenting needs.'*

a) disrupted families
Project Manager, Young mothers, St Basils, female white UK
*I think the biggest issue is breakdown of relationships – their parents' relationships. Then
the mother gets a new boyfriend on the scene. They've got this stroppy teenager, who's
not going to stand for this new chap 'telling me what to do' and mothers are siding with
the new partners. I think that is the biggest. Out of my eleven, there's one set of parents
that are together – all the rest, they're all from broken homes and that's massive really,
you don't tend to think about it until you ask the question and then I thought 'actually,
there's one' and actually, those parents didn't want her to leave either.*

b) young person's behaviour
There was a debate between different workers whether drugs were now the main problem
with skunk causing mental ill-health or alcohol.

c) parent' behaviour
Project Manager, emergency and advice worker, St Basils, male white UK
*It seems to me as time's progressing that there's a pattern of people who say – 'you have
reached 16. you are not my responsibility any more. Arguments and conflict start, just
that period when teenagers are finding their own feet and parents think 'oh, well, you're
old enough to step out on your own.'*

Other project workers pointed to parents who themselves had alcohol or mental ill-health
issues.

d) leaving their country of origin
Young refugees were seen as being homeless through outside circumstances rather than
their own or family circumstances.

Risk factors of running away: A major predictor of youth homelessness is
whether young people have run away from home previously. In the UK it is
estimated that over 100,000 young people under 16 run away from (or are
thrown out of) their homes each year. This is the equivalent of one in nine young
people (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002). Rees, in a study of 80 children staying in a
safe house found that physical violence was the most commonly cited reason for
running away from home occurring in just under a half of those interviewed
(1993: 20).

The first and second *Still Running* surveys in 1999 and 2005 found almost
identical rates of 'runaways' before the age of 16 years in the school population:
10% and 10.1% respectively. There were more female runaways than male (12%
vs. 8%) and the most common age for running for the first time was 14 years
(30%). The proportion was highest for white youth and those of mixed origin
(10.6%), black young people of different origins (9.3%) and lowest for young
people whose origins are from the Indian sub-continent (4.5%). Rates of running
were raised among disabled young people (20%) and those with a different
sexuality (25% - 30%). One fifth of runaways were not looked for by their
families nor reported missing (Rees and Lee, 1999 and 2005).

Again there were similar clusters of factors. The economic circumstances of the family of origins of the young person had an impact on rates of running away: 16% for young people living in households with no adult in paid employment vs. 10% from households with at least one adult in paid employment; 13.6% among those entitled to free school meals vs. 9.6% among those not entitled. Rates of running away were also raised for children of lone parent families (13%), step-parent families (18%) and other family types (grandparents, relatives: 31%) and lower for those living with both birth parents (7%).

Young people in the survey were most likely to identify the reasons for running away as being related to: a) problems at home: poor family relationships, arguments and conflict, maltreatment; b) personal problems; and c) problems at school (2% compared with 9% in 1999 survey). The largest number of incidents of being forced to leave occurred for 14 and 15 year olds. In the 2005 survey 26% of overnight runaways said they had been forced to leave. A third (34%) of those with attendance problems at school had run away over night vs. 9% without, and 29% of those school excluded had run away vs. 10% not school excluded. Similarly rates were much higher for those in trouble with the police, or having problems with drugs and alcohol.

When running away half stayed with friends, 35% with relatives and 16% slept rough. A quarter engaged in high risk behaviour of sleeping rough, or sleeping in places where hurt or harm could take place, such as sexual exploitation, and or begging and or stealing. There was a correlation between the age young people started running away and the number of times they ran away. The most likely scenario was that young people ran away once (43%) or twice (28%). In the survey 14% ran away 3 times, 9% ran away between four and nine times, and 6% more than ten times.

One of the issues faced by many children and young people that is now being recognised is the behaviour of their own parents. A study by the Children's Society which gathered information from over 13,000 young people across the UK, concluded that a significant number, aged 7 and over, had experienced scapegoating in the family, were regularly maligned by their parents and treated differently from their siblings. Some said they felt unloved and unwanted and carried the blame for parental conflict and others spoke of pressure to achieve becoming unbearable and said they were not listened to or trusted in the family. Conflict with siblings unaddressed by parents was also a factor as well as being rejected following criminal behaviour or taking drugs. A fifth of the young people who had run away overnight had been forced to leave by their parents (Safe on the Streets Research Team, 2005).

2.1.3 Vulnerability
The concept of vulnerability has a particular meaning in the Homeless Legislation as homeless people deemed more vulnerable than others in their particular situation are given priority need for social housing (see Section 3.2). Over the 30 years of this legislation there has developed case law on vulnerability. In relation to our practitioners young homeless people could be vulnerable for different types of reasons. When we asked key workers and managers in agencies about vulnerable young people their definition of vulnerability varied according to their own experience. Workers who themselves had been born outside the UK identified vulnerability with not having a family to turn to or rely on, having to rely on their own resources only. Whilst workers born within the UK, whatever their ethnic background, identified vulnerable young people as those either with learning difficulties or with undiagnosed mental health issues.

Vulnerability is not having a family to turn to:

> Housing Support Worker, YMCA West London, 41 years, male, Iraqi Kurd
> *There's a few, particularly refugees or asylum seekers. They are very, very vulnerable. They have no families, nowhere to go to. It's not like some English guy, no matter what happens, he can always go back to his mum and dad. But the asylum seekers, there's nowhere to go, they don't know no-one in the country*

Vulnerability is also specific issues in relation to the ability of the young person and the problem of other young people taking advantage of them.

> Project Manager, all male project, black African Caribbean woman, Birmingham
> *Yeah we've got young people with learning difficulties, people who are quite sheltered and don't really know – particularly the young ones, the 16, 17 year olds – who have no clue about life outside, they've been quite sheltered. They don't even know how to make a claim, not sure how to look after themselves. The ones who concern me the most are the ones who have a sort of disability, it might be a learning difficulty or whatever, who end up having up having extra money coming in, because they can be targeted by others*

Some young people are too vulnerable for the project through undiagnosed mental health issues and there is a distinction between vulnerability and risk for some project managers,

2.1.4 Social Exclusion

Under successive Labour governments from 1997 there was a new emphasis on combating social exclusion among disadvantaged youth and the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU), attached to the Cabinet Office, produced a series of reports on youth social exclusion under the general approach of 'Breaking the Cycle'. The report for the SEU and OPDM on *The impact of government policy on social exclusion among young people* (Brynner, Londra, Jones: 2004) reviewed the impact of government policy on youth aged 13 to 25 years whilst the final report from the SEU was Transitions; Young Adults with Complex Needs (2005). (See Section 2)

From 1997 successive labour governments have been committed to tackling child poverty through a national minimum wage, working tax credits that support families in low paid work, higher child support payments for those claiming benefits, and increased nursery and child care places (these places doubled). The quarter decrease in children in poverty that was the first target has not been achieved. In all 700,000 children were lifted out of poverty but children are still disproportionately present in low income households. In 2004/05, children in lone-parent families, children of couples where the parents work only part time or are unemployed, those in families with three or more children, or with a mother under 25 were all at higher risk of low income than other groups of children. Children living in lone parent families were most likely to have been lifted out of poverty through the benefits reforms that were introduced: two thirds of children in lone parent families were living in households below 60% of median income after housing costs in 1997, falling to just over half (52%) in 2007-6 (Stewart, 2009 in Hills et al, 2009: Table 3.3 p59).

Using the before housing costs measure, the nation with the highest child poverty rate is Wales; after housing costs, this is England. The South East and East of England have the lowest child poverty rate, each with 15 % of children in poverty before housing costs and 25 % after housing costs. Child poverty rates vary across the UK. On the before housing costs measure, Inner London (31%) and the North East of England (28 %) have the highest percentage of children poor in the UK. When housing costs have been accounted for, Inner London has by far

the highest rate of child poverty, with nearly half of all children being poor (48 %).

Children in Inner London face the highest risk of being materially deprived, with nearly one-third of children experiencing material deprivation, double the national rate. Children in the East and South East of England are the least likely to be materially deprived. (CPAG, 2008)

2.2. Specific youth populations at risk of social exclusion

2.2.1 Young mothers
The UK has the highest teenage birth and abortion rates in Western Europe (UNICEF 2001). The number of conceptions for young women aged 15 -17 in England in 2006 was 39,003 and of these nearly 50% resulted in abortion (ECM 2008). Young women living in socially disadvantaged areas are less likely to opt for an abortion if they get pregnant (Lee at al 2004). Please et al (2008) found that 10 % of young women accepted as homeless at 16 or 17 years old were pregnant at the point of the CLG survey

2.1.2 Young people and crime
The UK incarcerates more children than any other European country. On August 31st 2006 there were 3030 children in custody in England and Wales. 84% were in Young Offender Institutions. Children in penal custody are known to be among the most disadvantaged in our society. Over a quarter have the literacy and numeracy ability of an average seven year old, 85% show signs of personality disorder, 10% show signs of a psychotic illness, over half have been in care or involved with social services and 41% have been excluded from school. During 2004, 3337 children assessed as vulnerable were nevertheless sent to young offender institutions (CRAE, 2006, p55).

The age of criminal responsibility is 10 in England, Wales and Northern Ireland and 8 in Scotland. In 2006, 1.42 million offenders were sentenced for criminal offences in England and Wales. The majority of these offenders, 80 %, were male and of these 7 % were aged under 18 years. Among males, the highest rate of offending for the most serious (indictable) criminal offences was among 17 year olds at 6,116 offenders per 100,000 population of that age. The highest rate for females was among 15 year olds at 2,168 per 100,000 population. For male offenders in 2005, 15 year olds received more cautions than any other age group while 19 year olds received the most convictions. Among female offenders, 14 and 15 year olds received the most cautions and the most common age to be convicted was 16 years. [x]

While the vast majority of offences are committed by young men there appears to be a significant increase in criminal activity among young women in the UK. Just over one-fifth of crimes reported to Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) are committed by girls representing a 25% increase on the 47,358 offences committed by girls in 2003-04. In 2007, girls carried out 15,672 violent attacks (a rise of more than 50% over the past three years) and more than one-quarter of all assaults by young people. They were also responsible for 19,722 thefts, 5,964 public order offences and 5,748 incidents of criminal damage. One-hundred-and-eighty girls were convicted of arson, while 954 were found guilty of drugs crimes and 1,463 of drugs crimes. (Youth Justice Board http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/). DePaul UK began working in and out of prisons when they realised that so many young homeless men had been through the prison system

Regional Manager, DePaul UK, white male UK

We started delivering services in prisons in 1999 because we found that so many of the young people we were working with who were homeless had had experience of the criminal justice system … Mostly boys, but we're finding much more that – we're now running out of 2 female prisons and interestingly, we've just got a bid in with London Probation…. for a prisons worker and resettlement workers working in the community to provide hand-holding, floating support-type work – every aspect of someone's life, to support them and to make sure that they don't reoffend, this sort of cycle.

Young men aged 16 to 24 have the highest risk (13%) of being a victim of violent crime, 2007/08 (Home Office stats) and around 7 % women of this age reporting that some sort of violence had been used against them. Managers of projects that we interviewed were concerned about the impact of gangs upon residents in their projects:

Project manager, St Basils, Birmingham, female black Caribbean
I think at the moment, we've got a gang problem and because it's in Aston, it's recognised that one side of the gang will come here. So people coming from other sides of the city won't come here. We haven't had any problems, but a lot of that is due to the experience of the staff, rather than that there isn't a problem. I think certain people believe that there isn't as big an issue as we're making out but I think a lot of that is because the staff will pre-empt it. We had a referral from the Link not so long ago. A young man who comes from Handsworth, isn't involved in any gang but…he was referred to Erdington originally and Erdington is part of the same gang as Aston, he said he wasn't safe going there because there were people after him. So then they referred him here and I said 'I don't think he's going to be safe here' because it's the same people, the same bus routes, you have to go through Ashton to get to Erdington. He said 'no, no it's a problem with these people personally rather than a gang thing. He moved in on the Thursday. On the Friday, he was attacked on the bus on his way home and they come off the bus with him, followed him down the road, booted our door in trying to get to him – he was here for two days – it's ridiculous. I think it's simply in the wrong place because of this gang thing …. There are actually a lot of gangs around Birmingham that I don't know a lot about. I know these because they're black and they're the ones in the media the most and they're the ones I'm most likely to come in contact with but there are quite a few Asian gangs out there. Somalians. I know nothing about them; similar things could be happening with them.

Manager, West London YMCA, female white British
There's a lot of fear out there too. It's the black youths that tend to get picked on more. I've had a couple of cases where young black boys have been waiting at bus stops and for no reason, they've been picked on – often by other black youths – so it's not racially motivated – they've been minding their own business, so they say, and one or two I'm inclined to believe, and they've been picked on.

2.1.3 Young people and alcohol, drug misuse and undiagnosed mental health issues
Between one fifth and one quarter of young people use an illicit drug in one year. (Home Office 2007/08, 21,.3% down from 24% previously).

Project Manager, young mothers project, St Basils, Birmingham, female white UK
They smoke dope - I think it's the new alcohol, to be honest. You remember them having a crafty drink, now …it's the total norm for them. It's like having a cigarette. But we don't allow it on these premises and we say 'if you have the need, you have to do it away from these premises and we will confiscate anything we find in the house'… But the worrying thing is– it's not just the cannabis. We've got a black worker and she knows her father's colleagues have smoked cannabis all their lives – have done from when they were in the Caribbean and they've been able to hold jobs down, look after families, been able to function. The big cannabis users here are smoking skunk, which is a much stronger …But they're paranoid…mental health problems …It seems to be more addictive, they're not coping without it and they're not functioning and we think it's this new skunk… It's their partners who tend to be using it more than the girls.

This was not the only manager or project manager to report the issue of undisclosed mental ill health related it to the use of stronger cannabis.

> Manager, West London YMCA, female white UK,
> *We've got more people coming in with undiagnosed mental health issues. They're not being picked up until they're here. Which is unfortunate because once they're in it's more difficult to move them on. We've got a couple of people I have serious concerns about at the moment, that I have flagged up to all the agencies I can flag them up with them. Of course, they have no insight into their problems. Unless you work with them, superficially, you don't realise what's going on, what's bubbling beneath the surface. So that is a concern. Because drug use is getting so much more common, there's also lots of drug-induced psychosis – more and more. I don't think that some of these people that do assessments are good at recognising when there is a mental health issue.*

2.1.4 Young migrants held in detention

Immigration officials, and staff in detention centres, do not have a duty under Section 11 of the Children Act 2004 to have regard to the welfare of children. There is concern about the neglect of children in detention centres for asylum seekers. In interviews of children at the Yarls Wood detention Centre children said they were *upset I felt I was in Jail,* and *frightened by the big and noisy shoes worn by the officers*. Only 4 out of the 13 children said they felt happy.   In particular there was concern about the length of time children were detained. A quarter of the children were kept between 20 and 112 days (Bonomi, 2006). Save the Children estimates that around 2000 children are imprisoned in detention centres each year for up to 268 days (Crawley and Lester, 2005). Parents of children who have been refused the right to remain in this UK are denied public funds and therefore access to services. This even affects women fleeing violence who are now denied a place in women's refuges.

Home Office statistics do not state clearly the numbers of dependant and unaccompanied children being deported each year. From the total number of deportations, the percentage of minors amongst dependants indicates that around 1500 children are removed from the UK each year. The main destinations of deportees are Iraq, Serbia Montenegro, Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey, Nigeria and until recently Zimbabwe. A number of these children were born in the UK or spent the greatest part of their lives in this country.

2.3 Social exclusion in the UK and its impact on young people

Besides individual disadvantages that young people experience because of their own vulnerability or issues within their families there are three experiences conditioned by socio-economic factors that most impact on their future social exclusion: school exclusion, growing up in workless households, and growing up in areas of deprivation.

2.3.1. School exclusions

School exclusion can be seen as an individual factor but it is concentrated in particular schools, areas and ethnic groups and relates to issues within the school system in the UK. During the monetarist years a declining proportion of GDP was spent on the state education system but under the Labour government investment in state education and private-state partnership supported education increased. Schools Plus was introduced as an extended school system which provides additional support to deprived children. Within schools a Connexions service been established to work particularly with young people who are multiply disadvantaged (identified as 5% of the school population) or at risk of multiple

disadvantage (a further 15%) through a system of personal advisors for young people who were having difficulties at school.

As part of their policy towards creating a more educated population Labour government have also created targets for schools to achieve in relation to educational attainment for their pupils. Partly this has led to lesser tolerance of poor behaviour although schools are also struggling with a decline in standards of behaviour outside school and the rise of gangs in some deprived areas. There has therefore been the use of permanent school exclusions to deal with problems of behaviour in school. There were 8,680 permanent exclusions from primary, secondary and all special schools in 2006/07, representing 0.12 % of the number of pupils in schools (12 pupils in every 10,000). In 2006/07 there were 363,270 fixed period exclusions from state funded secondary schools, 45,730 fixed period exclusions from primary schools and 16,600 fixed period exclusions from special schools.

In 2006/07 the permanent exclusion rate for boys was nearly 4 times higher than that for girls. In 2006/07 the fixed period exclusion rate for boys was almost 3 times higher than that for girls. Boys accounted for some 75 % of all fixed period exclusions.

Boys are more likely to be excluded (both permanently and for a fixed period) at a younger age than girls, with very few girls being excluded during the primary years. The most common point for both boys and girls to be excluded is at ages 13 and 14 (equivalent to year groups 9 and 10); around 54 % of all permanent exclusions were of pupils from these age groups. Pupils with special educational needs (SEN) are over 9 times more likely to be permanently excluded from school than the rest of the school population. Pupils with SEN (both with and without statements) are more likely to be permanently excluded than those pupils with no SEN. In 2006/07, 36 in every 10,000 pupils with statements of SEN and 42 in every 10,000 pupils with SEN without statements were permanently excluded from school. This compares with 4 in every 10,000 pupils with no SEN.[xi]

Table 2.2 (overleaf) reports the number of young people from different ethnic groups who were permanently school excluded (per ten thousand pupils) and the proportion who left school with no qualifications. The number of permanent school exclusions was highest amongst the Black Caribbean and Mixed ethnic group school children and lowest amongst the Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups. The highest proportion of young people leaving school with no qualifications was among the Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Chinese populations.

2.3.2. Workless Households

By the mid 1990s one fifth of all households contained no working adults, some economically inactive through disability or a work limiting health problem. The rate fell during the rise of employment in the subsequent decade but not as substantially as other rates. The SEU (2004) reported three reasons for concentrations of worklessness in particular areas: changes in the nature and location of jobs; the impact of the housing market, in particular the location of disadvantaged families in particular areas including social housing areas; and the effect of living in an area where other households are out of work which can either be place or people effects leading to a lack of information about jobs

Table 2.2 Education and engagement of eight ethnic groups and Roma in the UK, 2001 Census: Source 'Focus on ethnicity and religion' (2005) and updates based on Annual Population Survey, 2004, Office for National Statistics

Eight ethnic groups	% UK popul-ion	% aged under 16 yrs	Permanent school exclusions per 10,000 pupils	% no qualific-ations	% achiev-ing 5 or more GCSEs/ GNVQs	% A-level or equivalent	% Degrees or equivalent	Economic activity rates	Self employ-ment
White British	88%	20%	14	14% boys 16% girls	47% boys 57% girls	30% boys 19% girls	18% men 16% women	84% men 75% women	12%
White Irish*	1%	6%	16	18% boys 16% girls	54% boys 63% girls	24% boys 15% girls	23% men 25% women	83% men 75% women	15%
Indian	2%	23%	2	15% boys 18% girls	62% boys 72% girls	17% boys 16% girls	30% men 21% women	81% men 66% women	13%
Pakistani	1%	35%	7	29% boys 35% girls	39% boys 52% girls	15% boys 14% girls	15% men 10% women	72% men 31% women	21%
Banglad-eshi	0.5%	38%	9	40% boys 49% girls	41% boys 55% girls	10% boys 13% girls	11% men 5% women	71% men 25% women	14%
Black Caribbean	1%	21%	41	18% boys 10% girls	27% boys 44% girls	26% boys 16% girls	11% men 15% women	80% men 74% women	9%
Black African	1%	30%	16	12% boys 18% girls	37% boys 49% girls	18% boys 15% girls	24% men 17% women	72% men 57% women	6%
Chinese	0.4%	19%	(less than 5)	19% boys 29% girls	70% boys 79% girls	14% boys 10% girls	33% men 29% women	63% men 56% women	16%
Mixed	1.2%	50%	25	15% boys 11% girls	37% boys 49% girls	24% boys 22% girls	24% men 17% women	78% men 66% women	9%

and location of jobs; the impact of the housing market, in particular the location of disadvantaged families in particular areas including social housing areas; and the effect of living in an area where other households are out of work which can either be place or people effects leading to a lack of information about jobs and also employers discriminating against people from those areas. Clark (2003) found that an unemployed person's well-being was positively correlated with whether his/her partner and other meaningful social groups were also unemployed. This was also the view of managers in homeless projects. One manager in the predominantly UK born white ethnic group area of the Medway towns identified the problem of engaging with young people whose family background is that of a workless household and who live in areas with many workless households.

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

Manager, Medway Town Foyer – female, white UK
I left school at 15, I didn't go to college or anything, I became a comptometer operator and that was that but there were still expectations all the way through. I've got 4 brothers who are older than me and all of them left school and each of them had an apprenticeship, they all had to have a trade. There was a transition where young men would come up, they'd come to 15, they had to start thinking about what they want to do and then they leave school and do it…. They didn't even have to think about whether they should be on benefits, it was never an option, it was never going to happen… I think also that we were still very poor and the money that was coming into our house then was less than what people would be living on, on benefits now... education was very, very important, employment was very important, so to my mind, it's got nothing to do with money. The 60s changed it to a certain extent, and when we lost all the industry in the 70s and 80s. There were those traditional roles that people just knew they were going to go into and there was a security there and it didn't matter that you had to work really hard, thinking about men down the mines and all the rest – somebody looking into that could think 'oh my god, what a dreadful life' but that was their lives, …they had their standards, they had their families, they had their things that they used to look forward to. My mum used to say the good thing about working is about enjoying a holiday, it's always looking forward. If you're not working, what do you have to look forward to? I think the whole of this social structure has just gone…there is a mindset that is instilled from birth...there are no expectations of these youngsters so if you are a youngster and you are growing up in a family where the mindset is that anybody who goes out to work is a mug, and then there are no expectations of you either to do well at school, do well in the family or anything else, where does the motivation come from

</div>

2.3.3 Social exclusion and area deprivation

Two studies established just how great had been the growth of disparities between the richest and poorest areas of the UK under monetarist policies (Power and Tunstall, 1995; SEU, 1998). Levels of workless households, lone parenthood and benefit dependency were all concentrated in particular areas – the SEU report in 1998 identified 3,000 small areas of deep and entrenched inequality. The 5% poorest wards (small local areas) had two and a half times the proportion of children living in poverty as the national average. Moreover 40% of crime occurred in 10% of areas (Powers, 2009: 119 Figure 6.2 in Hills et al, 2009). In both East London and in Birmingham a third or more of the city's populations lived in wards that were the poorest in the country.

This led to the New Deal for Communities for 39 areas (including nearly 160,000 households), the Sure Start (a programme for the under 5s) in 500 very poor areas in the 80 most deprived local authority areas and the Neighbourhood Renewal Programme gave additional funds to the 86 'most deprived' local authorities. (Powers, 2009: 115-7 in Hills et al, 2009).

A 'decent homes' programme was launched for social housing but by 2009 Powers argued that '*Social housing still dominates almost all the poorest areas and there*

is no sign of this changing fundamentally … Social housing is still 2.5 to 3 times more concentrated than the national average in the poorest areas and social housing has itself become poorer' (Powers, 2009: 132 in Hills et al, 2009). For most young homeless people it is in these areas that they will be re-located, either in social housing or renting social housing that is now part of the private renting market.

Areas of deprivation have become increasingly dangerous for youth, particularly youth from ethnic minorities. A London report found that black, Asian and refugee children were three times more likely to be attacked in the street than white children. Of those questioned 10% had been physically attacked, 80% had been racially abused or threatened and more than a third had direct experience of crime in the past year (GLA, 2003).

Children from ethnic minorities of all ages, particularly those living in areas with few minority ethnic communities, are more likely than their white counterparts to experience bullying. The perpetrators are mainly young people who frequently use violence and racist name-calling and inconsistently may hold anti-racist beliefs whilst also being racist. Racism is recurrent and may be accepted as an inevitable part of life rather than as a deviant or pathological activity. Disabled minority ethnic children commonly experience both verbal and physical forms of racial abuse and harassment and dual heritage children can experience racial abuse, both verbal and physical, within their family settings, mostly by a white relative. Racism in middle class areas has not been examined (Barter, 1999).

Some areas have become very dangerous places and have been increasingly policed through the use of ASBOs (Anti-Social Behaviour Orders). Young people entering youth homeless accommodation are, according to our key respondents, more likely to have a criminal record. This is a consequence of ASBOs which are not a criminal offence in themselves but the breach of which is a criminal offence. This then has an impact on their later ability to gain employment.

Advice and emergency services worker, St Basils Projects, white male, born UK
…a lot of my involvement is doing probation and Rap checks to do with my risk assessments, if I look back it has become quite prolific now, you know, the majority of people who come in here have got some sort of criminal involvement whereas when I first started it was probably 1 in 3, 1 in 5 – it might now be 3 in 5…I think probably the policing's a lot more tight now – they seem to stop and address much more than they used to. When I first started, a lot of the stuff was the kids were thieving to feed their habit but nowadays that doesn't seem to be the case, they're thieving and robbing for no particular reason, not to fund anything in articular…[Mostly] boys still but over the years girl are coming more…up the league table. When I do my referrals, nowadays, whereas in the past you could say 'they've probably got nothing' more so now you have the young females that are involved in criminal activity. There's plenty of things, shoplifting, theft, assault. I put it down to a lot of alcohol. It' so free and easy and cheap

---

Some workers despaired of the poverty of experience among young people.

Project Worker, Mother and child unit, St Basils Projects, Birmingham area, Female, White, UK
I've worked with some fantastic workers and what they've got out of some of the young women is incredible. But it's so hard to motivate them, sometimes. … We do some lovely things with them and there's a lot of people that help us, the coach will turn up, 'I can't be bothered'. It's costs so much money to do this, they've only got to come downstairs and they'll be taken and brought back. Residents meetings, 'shall we do this?' – because when we're doing the life skillsawards, they have £100 pot, each one that does it to dip into to do an activity with the other residents in the house. Some can put theirs together, Sea Life Centre, lovely things, a lot of planning, everybody's totally thrilled and excited until the day comes – 'oh, I don't think I'm going'

> *…I think they're uncomfortable about going certain places because they've never done it. They've never been taken out days when they were kids themselves, swimming, they've never done any of that, eating in a restaurant is something they're not sure about that. I suppose they go to MacDonalds, but actually sitting down in a restaurant with knives and forks and it all laid out…I remember we took some of the girls out for a Christmas meal and you know your wooden boards you get to put your plate on, they thought the food was going on that, because one of the girls said 'my peas are going to fall off'. We also took them on a barge – I couldn't believe how many hadn't seen these animals, there's so much wildlife on the canals that you see. I found out they'd only ever seen these animals on the television, never actually seen them in real life, and you think in this day and age, that's Incredible…And this is what holds them back a lot, in trying things, because they've never been open to anything like that. Sometimes if you go with them, almost hold their hand, it's almost starting as if they were children all over again*

2.4 Public opinion and national media attitudes towards youth

There have been two different and opposing strands in public opinion and national media attitudes towards youth – both encouraged by government activity and legislation. First the Social Exclusion Unit produced a series of reports on excluded youth in the UK and there was extensive supportive coverage of the plight of young people who were homeless. Second, the emphasis on ASBOs, parental failure (parenting orders and custody for parents whose children truant from school), gang violence and street crime has led to an image of young people as potential criminals rather than potential citizens. It was the Labour government that, in 1998, abolished the presumption that children aged 10-14 years were *doli incapax* ('incapable of evil') thus leading to full criminal responsibility at the age of 10 years (Margo et al, 2006: 16).

The 'demonisation' of young people was a prominent theme of the UNICEF review of the rights of the child in the UK in 2008 reporting a 'general climate of intolerance and negative public attitudes towards children' and criticised television reality programmes that were in danger of violating children's rights. It also criticised the use of ultrasound devices to disperse young people from congregating at public buildings and ASBOs that could violate the rights of young people to freedom of assembly (UNICEF, 2008). The IPPR report on youth in Britain (Margo et al, 2006: 14-15) argued that people in Britain were more likely than people in other European countries to believe that young people are predominantly responsible for anti-social behaviour and that 'lack of discipline' is the root cause of this (79% vs 69% Spain, 62% Italy, 58% France).

Brunel University media group have worked on media representations of youth and Wayne (2008) argued that whilst in the past groups of young people were demonised by the press and public opinion such as mods and rockers in the 1960s, for the first time all youth appear to be demonised as threats to the values and interests of 'civilised' society. The 2006 British Crime Survey found that whilst violent crime had fallen since 1995 readers of tabloid newspapers were more likely to think that it was rising than readers of broadsheet newspapers. Reviewing 2,130 news items across all television channels in May 2006 relating to youth the research team found that 13% of the stories were about young celebrities (footballers and others) whilst 82% focussed on young people as the victims of crime or the perpetrators of crime. However amongst those voicing an opinion on the stories only 1% of commentators were young people and they were largely only interviewed about crime.

3: Youth Homelessness:

Concern over youth homelessness has moved through different phases in the UK. In the late 1980s principal concern was over young people who were sleeping

rough on the streets in London having arrived from cities where the unemployment rate for young people was over one third. By the early 1990s the young people arriving at London hostels were predominantly local to London and the emphasis shifted to reporting the background of these young people and led to studies of youth homelessness among young people leaving care and of the family background of young homeless people. Current studies have continued to investigate the care histories and family background of young homeless people, however in London and some other large cities local young people are less prevalent than previously whilst those born outside the UK are more prevalent. The risk factors for homelessness are quite different for young people born outside the UK compared with those young people who are born in the UK, whether they are from care or from difficult family backgrounds.

3.1   Definition of homelessness

The definition of homelessness in the UK relates is derived directly from homeless legislation (1977, 1985, 1996, 2002) which has defined homelessness in relation to whether people are without secure accommodation or will be without secure accommodation (that is facing eviction) within the next 28 days. A young person who presents as homeless will not have to prove any history of sleeping rough but has to prove that their parents or other care givers are no longer willing to accommodate or that they have no care givers and/or were previously accommodated by social services.

Agency definitions of homelessness reflect this broader perspective on homelessness.

Manager, female white UK, West London YMCA
I define homelessness as someone who hasn't got a stable home background and cannot be sure they will have a roof over their head at night.

Organisation Manager, female Black Caribbean UK, St Basils Birmingham
I think there's a whole range of definitions for homelessness depending on what part of the spectrum you come into, living rough, sofa-surfing, temporary accommodation, bed and breakfast, prevention from being homeless, early intervention, a whole host of how we define homelessness. At different points in their lives as well. So we actually define it in very different ways. A lot of it is self-definition. They come and say what their situation is, whether they're homeless or temporary homeless etc

3.2. Homeless legislation

The UK has a particular approach to homelessness in all four countries of the UK compared with other European countries and with the USA, Canada and Australia (DCLG, 2007).
1. A wider definition of homelessness based on whether a person/household is without secure accommodation or potentially homeless within 28 days.
2. Homeless legislation was introduced in 1977 to back up the right of homeless families with dependent children, older people and vulnerable people to a permanent housing solution. These were the priority need groups established in 1977 and they were expanded in 2002 to include young people aged 16-17 years, a young person who had been in social care, and those who were made homeless from institutions (prison, hospital, armed forces). Other countries offer temporary accommodation.
3. The UK makes no special distinction in its legislation between street homeless and homeless. The term 'rough sleepers' is unique to the UK.

This broad definition of homelessness (first established in The Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977 and codified in 1996) was purposively designed to include a wider homeless population than those living on the streets or in hostels, in order to provide housing support for particular types of households who had lost secure

accommodation and were homeless. Subsequent revisions of homelessness legislation have included within the definition of homeless households those who have had to leave their homes because of violence – either domestic (1996) or racial/neighbourhood (2002).

However, the particular households offered support under the homeless legislation are those designated as having a 'priority need' as well as being homeless – families with children and those vulnerable due to physical or mental health problems or old age. The 1977 Act was an outcome of the wave of social concern in the late 1960s and 1970s over poverty amongst the elderly and single-parent families, the abuse of children and domestic violence. The Act gave local housing authorities a duty to secure accommodation for households who applied to them and were unintentionally homeless, in 'priority need' and local to the area. Therefore provision for families, even families where the head is aged under 25 years, has largely been through the working of the homelessness legislation and the majority have been placed either in permanent social housing or in temporary accommodation, not in hostel accommodation or bed and breakfast (now banned for the use of families). Some young mothers (particularly aged under 18 years) will be placed specialist hostels for mothers and their children and in the case of some hostels they will be able to stay until the child is four years of age.

The duty towards 'priority need' groups under the homeless legislation that was passed more than 30 years ago was expanded in 2002 to include young people aged 16 and 17, young people aged up to 21 years who had previously been in local authority care and those deemed vulnerable due to having lived in institutions (army, prison, hospital).

Following the expansion of priority need groups then the proportion of young people who were accepted under the legislation rose from 5% of all acceptances to 8% (Table 3.1, overleaf). In 2001-2 acceptances under the homeless legislation for England only were 117,830 households – i.e. fulfilling the criteria of being national (or having the right to remain), having a local connection, unintentionally homeless and in priority need. These households were distributed by priority need as shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Statutory homelessness: households accepted by local authorities by priority need category (ref: Table 632 from live tables on the DCLG website, DCLG: 2009)

Type of household	% Acceptances in 2001/2	% Acceptances in 2007/8
Households with dependent children	57%	59%
Households with a pregnant women	10%	12%
Old Age (over 60 years)	4%	2%
Physical Disability	5%	5%
Mental ill health	9%	7%
Young person	5%	8%
Domestic Violence	5%	3%
Other	5%	5%
Homeless in emergency	1%	1%
No of acceptances	**117,830**	**63,170**

Table 3.1. shows the slight change in the proportions accepted by different priority need groups– a rise in youth acceptances (following the expansion of priority need in 2002), households with dependent children and with a pregnant

woman, and a fall in acceptances due to domestic violence, mental ill-health and old age. Between two-thirds and 70% of households accepted as homeless by local authorities in England included children or a pregnant woman. The third most common reason for being accepted became being a young person by 2007/8, 8% rising from 5% after the introduction of priority need for some young people.

The most important information in the above table however is that the numbers of acceptances in England fell from 117,830 to 63,170. This fall in numbers followed the establishment of the Prevention agenda by the Department of Communities and Local Government (see below). This fall could be understandable if it was in the regions of the North East and North West where a greater stock of social housing had led local authorities to accept a higher prevalence of young people than elsewhere (Quilgars et al (2008). However in these areas the fall was less sharp than in London and the South-East where prevalence was already low. In 2001/02 there had been 29,320 priority need acceptances in London, compared with 13,800 in 2007/08 and there was a greater fall in the South-East of 11,300 acceptances down to 4,520. By contrast, the fall in the North-East, North-West and the West Midlands was less than (DCLG, 2009: live tables, Table 635). Given the housing crisis in London and the South-East in this period (house prices were 5 times the average wage) it appears that part of the prevention agenda diverted people from being accepted as homeless under the homeless legislation.

Moreover, increasingly local authorities are fulfilling their duty to young people they accept as homeless by placing them in hostel accommodation. In the UK single homeless people live in a variety of supported accommodation and young single homeless people are mostly accommodated in specialist hostels for the age group 16-25 years although some residents can be older (in their 30s). Some hostel managers argue that this is in the best interests of the young person who should not be left to manage in independent accommodation. (see Section 4).

3.3. Estimates of the numbers of young homeless people
Given the huge decline in numbers of homeless acceptances under the prevention agenda any estimate of the numbers of young homeless people that relies on official figures will differ according to the year that is chosen to make the estimate. The most recent estimate has used figures for 2006-7 looking at both the number of homeless acceptances of young people (not just single young people but young mothers and young couples where the reference head is under 25 years) where local authorities have accepted a homeless duty and at the number of young people accommodated in supported accommodation. The estimate has therefore used two official databases, information from the P1(E) returns made by local authorities on homeless acceptances and information from the Supporting People returns on clients supported by this funding.

In 2006 – 07 the number of homeless young people accepted as statutory homeless by local authorities were 43,000. The numbers in supported accommodation were 31,000 young people (described as non-statutorily homeless but not necessarily so, see Section 4). These figures are for England Scotland and Wales. A small number of rough sleepers were also included in this estimate (Quiglers et al 2008). However, the number of 'hidden homeless' among young people is unknown although there have been various estimates that, like the number of NEET young people, increase the figure substantially. It is important to stress that the figures include households where the reference head was aged under 25 years and children were in the household - young mothers and young couples with children. [xii]

3.4 Identifying young people at risk of youth homelessness

In the 1990s Evans had reported on the factors behind youth homeless (1996) including periods in local authority care and Smith et al (1998) had reported on the family background of young homeless people not in care, identifying a 'Circle of Risk' for young people.

A recent survey undertaken by DCLG of of 350 16 to 17 year old single young people in priority housing need, that is accepted as statutorily homeless, found them to have experienced one or more of the following risk factors in Table 3.2 overleaf (Pleace et al, 2008).

Table 3.2 Risk factors among young people aged 16-17 years statutorily homeless (Pleace et al, 2008:286)

Parents separated or divorced during childhood	67%
Missed a lot of school	58%
Was suspended or excluded from school at least once	54%
Has ever experienced anxiety, depression or other mental health problems	52%
A step-parent moved into the family home during childhood	51%
Never had a settled home as an adult	
Ran away from home and stayed away for more than one night during childhood	47%
Family had financial difficulties during childhood	45%
Parents were violent towards each other during childhood	40%
Experienced domestic violence as child	39%
Has been involved in crime/anti-social behaviour	18%
Has had a drug, solvent or alcohol problem	37%
Family moved house a lot during childhood	35%
Has been in a violent relationship (as abused)	28%
Spent time in care	19%
Was sexually abused as child	17%
Family spent some time homeless during childhood	15%
Has been sexually assaulted as an adult	12%
One or both parents died	12%
Has been on the Child Protection Register	12%
Has been in prison or young offender institution	9%
Has lived as a 'Traveller'	3%
Has had sex in exchange for money, food, drugs, shelter	3%

Source: Pleace et al 2008 p286

These findings are supported by other research evidence which indicates that young homeless people are more likely than the general population to have experience of family conflict, disruption and violence, family poverty and socio-economic disadvantage (Bruegel and Smith, 1999), to have run away from home (Rees and Lee, 2005), had periods of time in State care, been involved in crime or anti-social behaviour and had their education severely disrupted (Smith, 2003). Overall, the risks that lead to social exclusion and youth homelessness in the UK are well documented (Quiglars et al 2008) although there is a lack of reliable data on hidden homeless and knowledge gaps regarding black and minority ethnic (BME) groups (Netto 2006) and gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered (GLBT) young people (Gold 2005).

However although these findings are consistent with what is known of the backgrounds of young people from the UK they are not consistent with what is known of the backgrounds of young people born outside the UK. Most carry some

of the same issues (death of a parent, mental health, lack of a settled home) but not the disrupted, damaged family backgrounds.

3.5 Risks of homelessness for specific populations of young people
3.5.1 Gender
As reported above in terms of gender young women are more likely to be statutorily homeless than young men and young men aged 18 years and over are more likely than young women of this age to be non statutorily homeless (Quiglars et al 2008).

3.5.2 Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Groups
In England and particularly in London, BME groups are around three times more likely than the general population to be homeless (DCLG, 2006, Gervais and Rehman, 2005). This includes single people, couples and /or those who have children (Quiglers et al 2008). Statistics from Centrepoint, a homeless organisation based in London showed that 76% of its hostel users were from a minority ethnic background (Trieu, 2008). Black African and black Caribbean groups are especially vulnerable to homelessness, being twice as likely to be accepted as homeless as people of Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi origin (Netto 2006). Some of reasons for this over representation include that in addition to the common problems faced by the majority population resulting in homelessness, individuals from some BME communities face discrimination in terms of service provision, policies and legislation (Netto 2006).

Gervais and Rehman (2006) found important differences in the main BME communities. For example for South Asian female lone parents, forced marriages, family violence and disputes, were the main causes of homelessness. For couples with children, being forced out of their accommodation by private landlords was common and overcrowding was a frequent cause of homelessness. Homelessness featured for young, single, Black Caribbean women who became pregnant precipitating family disputes, overcrowding and lack of social supports. Homelessness was attributed to problems associated with child abuse, being in the care of the State, drug misuse, school exclusion, criminal activity and mental health problems. The extreme diversity of the Black African population means there is no obvious or typical pattern of causes of homelessness. Overcrowding, pregnancy, family and relationship conflict, linked to acculturation, were all featured.

3.5.3 New Migrants
The total number of asylum seekers in the UK who are supported by NASS (The National Asylum Support Service) is 44,495. Over 15,000 unaccompanied minors have entered the UK since 2000. Refugee organisations argue that unaccompanied minors can be placed in poor quality hostels, mixed with wrong people leading to a criminal record. That leads to being refused asylum and then the young person would not be entitled to NASS support because an adult refused asylum seeker. A further issue is that while people are waiting for assessment they have no entitlement to work, nor recourse to public funds, which means that they work illegally. Asylum seekers have been arrested and jailed for one year for working and for false papers

Homeless Link research found that 15% of people accessing London's day centres, night shelters and outreach teams in March 2006 were A8 nationals. Research by Broadway found that in a one night count of London hostels 19 per cent of bed spaces were occupied by refugees and asylum seekers. The risk factors for these groups of migrants are very different from other homeless people being unrelated to family background and related to leaving their own country.

3.5.4 Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender

According to Crisis (2005) the links between homelessness and the lived experience of GLBT young people are well established and the estimates of the numbers of GLBT youth are as high as 30% in city centres (O'Connor and Nolloy 2003). Intolerance, prejudice and oppression can begin in families and is compounded by institutional homophobia. Running away from home and homelessness may then be a response to an individual's experience of homophobia. Research by the LSE and Crisis shows that GLBT young people are 13 times more likely to have experienced violence compared to the general public.

3.6 Policies: Support and Prevention

The Labour government has rolled out four major policies to tackle homelessness. First is the statutory requirement from 2002 that local authorities should all have a homeless strategy and offer advice services to anyone who seeks support. Second is the expansion of priority need groups in the 2002 act to include young people aged 16-17 years and people leaving institutions (including care, the armed services, hospitals). Third is the Supporting People funding stream that has transformed all services for vulnerable people including supported accommodation for the homeless. Fourth is the prevention of homelessness strategy to deal with the huge rise in homeless acceptances that continued past 2001-2 and peaked in 2003 at 135,000.

3.6.1 Homeless strategies and advice

Each local authority now publishes its homeless strategy on its own website and this strategy must include advice. A first assessment of homelessness strategies is that they have concentrated on prevention and support. It is still much more difficult to source permanent funds for early intervention compared with prevention. Upstream of 16 years care of the young person is seen as part of the Education (Extended Schools), Social Services (Care System) and Health budgets and funding is being taken in-house rather than funding the voluntary sector to work with young people at risk of homelessness (NAVCA, 2009). One issue in relation to prevention strategies is that housing advice work is increasingly targeted at high risk or high priority groups with less support available for others.

3.6.2. Expansion of priority need groups under the homeless legislation

The expansion of priority need groups has had a major impact in that all local authorities now offer more similar services to young homeless people whereas before some local authorities offered almost none. (Quilgars et al, 2008)

3.6.2 Support services

The Supporting People funding stream in its first year was £1.8 billion targeted at support for six vulnerable groups including young homeless people. Subsequent budgets have been lower than this but this level of funding has allowed the quality of supported accommodation, including the service offer to young people, to be raised considerably. Key worker support is funded through this pot of money as is the work of other support workers including move on support.

3.6.3 Prevention of homelessness

Following the 2002 Act the government produced an official policy briefing that identified three stages of intervention to prevent homelessness: early intervention amongst those identified at risk to support the person and their environment; pre-crisis intervention through advice services, family mediation, landlord negotiation, or work with those leaving prison, care or the armed forces;

and prevention of recurrent homelessness through tenancy sustainment (Pawson et al, 2007: 21)

The government invested £200 million pounds in prevention of homelessness over 3 years and pledged further investment. Local authorities have used the money to provide rent deposits to help people obtain tenancies in the private sector, to provide mediation services to help people stay in their family home (principally young people), support victims of domestic violence, prison based services and tenancy sustainment support for those who were vulnerable and with complex needs.

An evaluation of the prevention agenda (Pawson et al, 2007) for DCLG reported that changing numbers of homeless acceptances (a fall of 50% from the peak in 2003 of 137,000 to 2007) has partly been the result of changing local authority procedures. In particular local authorities have stressed the 'housing options' routes to people who previously would have been accepted as priority homeless including helping them be placed in private rented accommodation or introducing a waiting time element in their prioritisation. Some local authorities have established a 'priority need' panel to review all decisions. (Two thirds of homelessness staff who responded to a Shelter survey of 60 local authorities reported that they were under pressure to reduce homelessness acceptances (Roof, Jan/Feb 2005:18)). If a household is helped to a private tenancy without going through a formal homeless acceptance there is no right to appeal. Pawson et al (2007) has argued that it would be important to require all local authorities to log homeless enquiries (a system that existed prior to the 1996 Act).

Another issue is the placing of homeless households in private rented accommodation through assured shorthold tenancies, sometimes with support through rent deposit schemes. Some managers of project we spoke to thought that such placements meant that young people remained trapped in high rent accommodation that they could only afford by remaining on housing benefit; the lower rents of social housing allowed them to access employment more readily.

Manager YMCA West London female White UK

…. We are temporary accommodation here and unfortunately people think that once you're at the YMCA - in the past it probably was truer than it is now – that they just have to stay with us for a couple of years and then they get their council houses. This doesn't happen now – we have a terrible bottleneck. People are frightened of the private rented sector. Every council is trying encourage people to send clients to the private rented sector, but in Ealing they won't do a rent deposit scheme for under-25s. They haven't got the money. Because of the HB variation, if you're under 25, landlords don't really want you because they can't charge what they want to charge. It's difficult changing the mind set. I think a lot of parents throw their children out, thinking they'll be on the streets a couple of days, then they'll go to the nice hostel,then they'll get their own place. But it doesn't work like that.

Project Worker, St Basils Projects, Birmingham area, Female, White, UK

If someone's licence agreement was coming up to an end, say they'd been here 12 months, we could say 'we're not going to renew, they've been here 12 months, it's time they went' and they would be offered something. But that is not the case now, they're (Birmingham City Council) advising them to go private rented. We are discouraging that. We don't want them to go private rented. I know some landlords are very good, but there are some. These young women will go in and do the house or flat up and they'll throw them out and put the rent up for the next person because they've done all the decorating. [It's about] £600 a month. The rents in the council are about £70 a week...They can't afford to get a job because it will all go in rent. Mind you, they can still apply for Housing Benefit and they'll pay a proportion.

The family mediation services offered by local authorities were largely targeted at young homeless people in order to negotiate remaining in their parental home

except where they were at risk of abuse. Some local authorities insisted that young people engage with mediation over a set period despite, in some cases, family relationships having completely broken down. Quilgars et al (2008:62-64) quote several young people and project workers on the way that Housing Options teams were not accepting young people's account of their issues at home. Most family mediation procedures have no measure of long term sustainability of the young person remaining in that home and leaving home safely. Two projects that we interviewed had long term family mediation attached to them and both were seeking to develop methods of registered outcomes. Quilgars et al (2008) also report workers concerns that there is almost no provision for early intervention measures (see Section 4).

SECTION 3.7: Working with young people from different situations: refugees and not born UK, young people from social care, young white UK and young men and young women.
With all key workers and managers we discussed the differences they found in key working and managing young people from different backgrounds – young refugees, young people from social care, young people from the UK and young men and young women. From almost all reports young refugees were more focussed on education with greater social and cultural capital than those born in the UK. For those born in the UK there were differences between those from social care and those from families.

However it was the UK youth that agency managers and workers believed created the most challenges. We sought out one project that worked mostly with young white UK in an area that is currently regenerating but which has experienced decline in traditional employment. The Chatham-Medway Foyer is a supported housing scheme run by a local housing association that overwhelmingly houses white UK young people from the towns at the mouth of the Thames. Their workers described the issues facing the young people they housed as ones of social exclusion unrecognised by the young person themselves. They live within their own small world.

Engagement support worker, Chatham-Medway Foyer, male, white UK
Recently a resident, we were looking at this map of the world, she couldn't tell me where Britain was – she's 16 and she actually pointed to that little island off South West Africa… Yes and then she went over to South America, then above Australia. Even with the map of the UK there, just simple shape identifying, wasn't able to do it. Had never heard of Europe. It's interesting and shocking, to think that you can get to that age… She finished school. Her reason was because she didn't take geography and that the teachers were rubbish. I explained to her that it wasn't the school's responsibility, really, to help her identify where her country is in the world. Just a simple thing of looking at the weather on the news. I would put that firmly on the parents. At 5 or 6, that's when they should be knowing that sort of thing, just local identification, where you are in the world. .. It just reinforces what we already know – that their world is just within these 4 little towns, Chatham, Gillingham, Strood and Rainham. … It's very rare you would come across residents that would regularly travel to London. We try to encourage it because it's about broadening their horizons. They can walk to the train station from here in 20 minutes and within an hour, they could be in the West End.

This argument was supported by workers in other agencies in Birmingham and in London. The Support Worker at West London YMCA argued 'The refugees put our young people to shame really'.

3.7.1: YOUNG REFUGEES
Key workers reported difficulties for young refugees in relation to:
1. Some young refugees were vulnerable because they had no family to fall back on (workers who themselves were not born UK only reported this). Tracing services for families often fail to find a survivor. But this can also be a strength.

Education support worker, West London YMCA, female, black African.
For me, I think so. It goes from the refugees that have lost their family, they've lost everything, so they want to change their life, to better themselves. You cans see more positive outlook from them than from people who feel they have someone and can always go back (where) there's always somewhere to go.
2. Those without recourse to public funds were vulnerable – could only turn to their community.
3. Language barriers difficult and held some young people back– St Basils were seeking interpreters within their own staff.
4. Some experienced major trauma.

Organisation Manager, St Basil Projects, Birmingham, female black African caribbean

We've found – not in all cases, but in some – we've been on new territory. Things around trauma, that whole mental health and trauma side. Things around how we deal with – because it's not just a mental health issue, it's more than that. I know, some years ago, we tried desperately to get someone in in regard to the trauma counselling – the one trauma clinic was in London and it was difficult to get him in, so we had to go through local services. The whole thing of how do you deal with trauma is something we probably never experienced. Issues around bereavement but to a different level – of the mass killings. They have different needs around inclusion more than anything, around breaking down barriers.

5. Young women kept to themselves more.

Manager, West London YMCA, female white UK
The young girls (from Somalia) are quite introverted, they find it difficult mixing, they don't like to eat when men are present. That can be a problem. The young men are much more able to go out and mix and walk with their friends and so on. Some of the young women look very demure most of the time then they'll go out dressed to the nines and you don't recognise them. They're fighting with the culture. They know how they should appear but they want to run out and…

Refugees also had advantages in that;
4. Young people not born in the UK had more social and cultural capital. More respect, more ability to engage with agencies.
5. Educational aspirations were high. In the mostly white foyer in Medway and in other agencies young people moving through to University were more likely to be refugees.
6. They know their rights and want access to social housing they can buy.
7. Most likely to be work engaged. Send money home if they have relatives.
8. Mostly they are older than other homeless young people.

Manager, Mother and Baby Unit, St Basils Projects, Birmingham, female white UK.
Other than the language barrier, they seem to be a lot more focused on education. They're more clued up about what type of services they can access, what they're entitled to. One of the things I found recently is trying to resettle them – without making sweeping generalisations – the young people who are born here tend to want newer flats, red-brick, pretty inside and want to go and live in nice surroundings, whereas the refugees tend to want to want council tenancies only, so they can buy them. I'm like 'how do you know?'

Housing support worker, Foyer, St Basil Projects, Birmingham, male black African non-UK
Very much more focused, very much more focused than young people in this country - they seem to have a goal, an aim from day one and work towards that. The majority have this mission that their next move is going to be a flat of their own. To be truthful, they usually show the better skills for that to be happening. But definitely more focused on things and more realistic

Housing and refugee support worker, West London YMCA, male, Iraqi Kurd
I think the easiest people to work with are the refugee group cos they have very little issues, except their language barrier – that is the main thing.

Section 3.7. 2 : SOCIAL CARE YOUNG PEOPLE

Key workers reported a lack of life skills, more issues in relation to engagement and expecting more support, and more likely to lose a tenancy and return

Project manager, male hostel, St Basils Birmingham, female, black Caribbean UK

RESP   The one's who've been in care tend to have very little in the way of life skills, have no concept of how to communicate. What my mum would call home training, which is general manners, please, thank you. They tend to be quite demanding, not all of them, but I would say a very high percentage of them 'I want this and I want it now' whereas others will knock and wait and 'have I got any post? Thank you very much' and off they go. It's 'give me my post' – 'sorry, who are you talking to?' and they get quite upset when you challenge that. … Sometimes the way you hear them speak to people on the phone as well, you're jut like 'Oh! You can't honestly think if you're ringing the Job Centre and you're screaming at them down the phone that they're going to put your file on the top because I would put it straight to the bottom.

Manager, West London YMCA, female, white UK

They are much harder…You've got young people who are usually confused because they've got no family and then they are pushed from pillar to post, they have different social workers every time we have a meeting, so they've got no constant model. They will send them down late at night without the social worker so that we will take them in. It shouldn't work like that …What they need is constants in their life. Every time to the different social worker, my support workers have to go through everything again. They come to meetings, they haven't read the file.

Housing and Refugee support worker, West London YMCA, male, Iraqi Kurd, not born UK

Because they are the most difficult ones – they have been through a lot of tough times and they don't actually respect the rules and household here. Whatever you tell them, they don't – I had one very young, 16½. I had all the times problems with him. In his room, we caught 3 other people sleeping. We don't allow people to come and stay – all the visitors should leave by 12 midnight. But he used to smuggle people into his room and it was very difficult for us to control him

Emergency advice and support worker, St Basils Birmingham, male, white UK

Absolutely there's certainly a lot more lack of respect and applying themselves to the rules and regulations of the house, they'll always take it to the extremes. I don't know why that should be but definitely. If there's three lads out of ten from a care home, you can usually pick them out, the way they address themselves around the house… it needs to be more one-to-one with them and definite 100% guaranteed key working. They'll lose tenancies at the end of the day – that's the first thing they're going to lose,

Engagement support worker, Chatham-Medway Foyer, male, white UK

You can see how they learn to do things for themselves. It's not unfair to say that a lot of - it's unfortunate to say it, because obviously they've had situations in their life that have put them in care – but you would see that they are used to having things done for them. That's not across the spectrum of young people we have here – it's particularly with care leavers because they've had a social worker and they have money delivered to them, they don't have to go down to the Job Centre to sign on. It doesn't work for everybody, but when it does work, you can see how individual people for their own actions. They can take responsibility for the reasons why they have or haven't got a job, or why they are or aren't getting on in college. Down to simple things like getting up in the morning could be a task.

Housing support worker, Chatham-Medway Foyer, female, white UK

On the whole, the ones from Social Services – most of them are all mixed up anyway, whether they come from care or not – the ones from Social Services seem to have had some sexual or physical abuse in their background. They have quite dark memories. A lot of them - if they start messing up and you say 'come on, you should be going to college' they will turn round and say 'yeah, but I've had a hard life. I had a bad childhood'. I'm like 'yeah, we know you have' but a lot of them really do that. They say 'I'm getting in touch with the social worker' because they think the social worker is the fairy godmother – she can just put it all right. They do think that. Because they've had them while they've been growing up and before they were 16, they've seemed like that. But when they're 16, they're not, they can't. They are supposed to be independent then, aren't they?

Section 3.7.3: YOUNG MEN AND YOUNG WOMEN

Managers and key workers raised several issues: anger management issues among boys and reported that boys were more depressed than girls. There was more resentment of the benefits system among boys and boys more likely to give up a course if they feel they are not progressing well. Young men also had more problems with alcohol and drugs and violence but this is changing as girls develop 'ladettte' behaviour

Housing and Refugee support worker, West London YMCA, male, Iraqi Kurd, not born UK

INT   So the boys have got anger management stuff

RESP   Yes. Everything they like, they want to get, their attitude, because they are young people , they lack the experience of being mature, of assessing things before you react to them. They do behave a little bit difficult and you felt that sometimes, they are a bit of a risk to themselves and others. That's what's not available in most girls…

INT   What about the refugees – the difference between the young women and men?

RESP   They are different. Culturally they are different. Because I am from the same background, the same culture, I know the difference, I deal woman as woman and male as male. But they are less violent, they have less issues. So they are always busy with their life, their college, doing some part time work… Boys are much more confident in terms of going to work. Girls are more confident in overall management of their lives. They are good at budgeting. They don't fall into arrears. They do plan what they want to do and in my opinion, they do better.

Project Manager, mother and baby accommodation, St Basil Projects, Birmingham, female, white UK

Girls are much more violent these days than I ever remember and I find that very sad But it's all this ladette sort of behaviour isn't it. They can drink as much as the lads, they'll fight as much as the lads, they sleep with as many boys as the boys were sleeping with the girls .. Five (out of 11). .. Because some of the parents are exactly the same. This is where it's all come from, when you see them you think 'no wonder, they didn't have a hope in hell from the word go, they didn't'. It's just your luck who you're born to, just your luck.

This project manager and a worker at a Foyer both made a difference between how young men and young women were influenced: young men were led by their peers; young women were led by their boyfriend.

Section 3.7.4 LOCAL YOUTH

Local young people came from areas of families living on benefit.

Manager, Chatham-Medway Foyer, female, white UK

A lot come from families that have always been on benefit and here we say to them 'yeah, you're on benefit, but that's only while you're studying or looking for work. You've got to try and get yourself out of that benefit trap' and that's a very difficult cycle to break. A lot of them do come from the local area where there is some unemployment and people have been on benefit all their lives and 'why should we work? We'll claim this and we'll claim that'. We do have some success stories. It's not always successful.

None of their workers thought that their young people felt socially excluded because they felt included in their area and 'you have to want to be included'.

Deputy Manager, Chatham-Medway Foyer, female, white UK

INT   Would you say in general the young people are socially excluded?

RESP   No I wouldn't. They're not motivated but not socially excluded… They come from that sort of background and that's normal to them. People have different aspirations for their children. If their parents haven't aspired to much, they're not putting much on their children to aspire to.

4: Services for Young People

From the previous section on homelessness it is apparent that the story of services for young people who are homeless is one of three separate developments: access to social housing, access to supported accommodation and special advice services, and access to specialist services in relation to health, substance misuse etc. The provision of services has relied on a central government funding, local area housing (both local authority and Registered Social Landlord and increasingly the private sector) and voluntary sector supported accommodation. Following the requirement that al local authorities develop and public a homeless strategy there has been increasing partnership working between these agencies and in collaboration with local Social Services and Health departments.

As already described homeless services are laid down in the legislation for particular groups of young people, with the most extensive housing support available through the homelessness services of a local authority to young single mothers or pregnant women (from 1977), young people vulnerable through mental health, physical health needs (from 1977) and young people from care, the armed services, prison or hospital or aged 16-17 years (from 2002).

The most important change to services for young people, apart from prevention agenda previously described, has been the establishment of Supporting People as the integrated government funding stream for vulnerable people including homeless/rough sleepers, ex-offenders, young people at risk, homeless families, the elderly, travellers, teenage parents, people with alcohol and drug problems, survivors of domestic violence, and other vulnerable groups such as people with learning difficulties, or physical difficulties or HIV/Aids. With the establishment of Supporting People funding in 2003 there has been increasing intervention by both central and local government in the provision of support in accommodation provided by the voluntary sector, raising the quality of that support, and also the provision of floating support services for those taking on a social housing or private rented tenancy through housing services. The purpose of housing related support is to develop and sustain an individual's capacity to live independently in their accommodation.

4.1 The provision of housing to those in priority need

The expansion of priority need categories to include some young homeless people who were not previously included in the 2002 was also accompanied by the abolition of a measure introduced by the Conservatives in 1996 that the duty towards homeless households should only last two years. However the 2002 Act was immediately followed by the prevention agenda as described in Section 3.There has therefore been a contradictory approach to the use of social housing as a welfare safety net – both expanding its potential role and also restricting access to it. Labour governments have had an ambiguous attitude to social housing, allowing the continuation of the Conservatives policy of 'right-to-buy' (albeit with restricted discounts), attempting to enforce the transfer of social housing stock from local authority control to those of Housing Companies or Registered Social Landlords, restricting grants for social housing new build (building less than the Conservatives), and stressing low-cost home ownership options including that of shared home ownership. The government has believed both that social housing should be available to the most vulnerable and that it should become a more mixed tenure of choice.

Fitzpatrick and Pawson (2007) discuss this contradiction in a recent paper. Because of the right to buy and reduced tenancy turnover there were falling

numbers of social houses for let in the seven years to 2003/4. Amongst new lets 45% are aged under 25 years. Local authorities run a 'needs based' lettings policy based on 'reasonable preference' for families with dependent children, in insecure accommodation and those with medical or welfare needs as well as giving preference to those judged priority need under the homeless legislation. Lettings to those households judged statutory homeless between 1993 and 2003 varied between 40% and 28%, whilst in London they varied between 68% and 50% and many have included all the family size lettings available in some London boroughs. Fitzpatrick and Pawson argue that this could have contributed to a perverse incentive to 'go homeless' rather than be on an endless waiting list.

One extremely important outcome of the right to buy and the establishment of needs based allocation has been the loss of good quality accommodation and the concentration of poor and homeless households in particular estates. In 1970 11% of households in council housing had no one in paid work compared with 65% in 2003 (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004 quoted in Fitzpatrick and Pawson, 2007). However the employment rate of new entrants to the sector is above that of a decade before. Some of our respondents who said that it was the low rents in the social housing sector that allowed people to seek work compared with the high rents in the private rented sector.

The extraordinary fall in the number of households accepted as statutory homeless in the period between 2003, when the number peaked at 135,590 in England, down to 64,970 (a provision figure) in 2007, due to the establishment of the prevention agenda has already been described. The other major transformation in this period was the introduction of 'choice based lettings' (CBL). Under CBL people had to bid for particular properties although their possibility of becoming the tenant of that property depended on their banding (broad bands of need e.g. priority, gold, silver, bronze in one particular authority), on their waiting time and who else made a bid for the same property. This was designed both to make people understand that the small house with a garden was largely no longer available and also to carry forward the government's agenda of choice in public services, to develop a 'social market' in the sector and create a greater social mix on estates. But as one respondent says there is little possibility of young people achieving a home in a really nice neighbourhood.

Project Worker, St Basils Projects, Birmingham area, Female, White, UK

They can go on [housing options] on a Wednesday and bid on properties. We've got 2 women who are on Solihull council's list, because they have links with Solihull and that's the only way you'll ever get a place in Solihull. If you're happy with inner-city, you can bid on them. A lot of them, because they've come to live here, and it's a nice area, they want to stay here – they've got no chance. If there any council houses, people have bought them anyway. There's just no stock left. They're pulling down all the high rises, so they've got to re-house all those people out of the high rise …They come here. There aren't any flats to move them into. And they're not classed as having a baby until that baby's registered, either…It's their ruling now, Birmingham City Council'

The lack of move on accommodation for young people in their projects and of social housing for homeless households has led to two developments. First has been the development of new housing options: St Basils projects have developed a housing option in association with a local housing association and West London YMCA is discussing the development of a similar provision. One government minister has suggested that social housing should be a 'transitional' housing tenure for up to five years; this has been supported by the idea that 45% of lettings are to those aged under 25 years. Agencies believe this would increase insecurity for poor households unable to deal with the private housing market.

4.2 The provision of supported accommodation

In 2008 the first survey of services provided by the homeless sector was undertaken by Homeless Link and Resources Information Services. Homeless Link provides information and support to all voluntary sector agencies and RIS has collected data on hostel accommodation and managed linked access since the 1990s. The SNAP survey covered three types of services: day centres, direct access hostels and second stage supported accommodation. Day centres worked with 10,000 people per day and there were at least 50,000 beds of which one fifth were direct access/emergency accommodation. They reported that from Supporting People data there were 118,500 episodes of households accessing SP funded accommodation in the three homeless risk groups: single homeless people with support needs, young people at risk and rough sleepers. This includes some double-counting and SP figures put the numbers closer to 75,000. The real figure lies somewhere between (Homeless Link/Resources Information Service, 2008).

In our interviews it has become apparent that this centralised pot of money which is distributed through local authorities has now led to three changes in the work of the voluntary sector. First an expansion of the support services that agencies are able to offer those living in supported accommodation – education and training, life skills training, key worker support during their stay in the accommodation and floating support after they have left their accommodation (which can be provided by the agency concerned or another agency with the contract). Second there has been a real improvement in the quality of these services. Often the work that agencies do also fills a gap in the availability of statutory services to young people – particularly the poor availability of mental health support. St Basils has their own counsellor service attached to family mediation. Some of this work is supported by specialist grants that agencies apply for but the core work of support and floating support is now funded through Supporting People.

> Emergency accommodation and advice worker, Link Services, St Basils, Birmingham, white male UK
>
> *We've got the prevention services as well now, which cater for family mediation, also STAMP which are going into the schools and also counselling, and in the centre, obviously, the floating support. Years ago, when I first started, most of these come under the workers in-house – they done a lot of their own resettlement…, when I was a key worker, you'd have to start from scratch, take them to the council interviews for the flats, move them into the flats – it's all changed a lot now. I don't think you'd last very long without commitment in this. …I did have a spell of nearly 4 months off work, just stressed and burnt out…That's back in 1997,98…Before, you're trying to do your job, you couldn't devote that amount of time you'd do the basics and …you'd do your best…I noticed the change [becoming more specialist] couple of years after I moved over to the New Boot started off supporting people and come on line[in] 2002, 2003 I would say.*

SP funding and the Places for Change programme have also led to a change in the quality of accommodation; young people have been accommodated in their own room and increasingly in self-contained accommodation or at least accommodation where they have their own bathroom and share a kitchen.
.
The third change brought about by Supported People funding, however, is in the referral practice of voluntary agencies. The agencies we interviewed report that they now are taking young people who are from the local area and/or supported by the local authority through referral systems brought in by local authorities. Therefore voluntary sector youth homeless placements are being used by local authorities to place young people from social care, young refugees, and young local people for whom they have a duty. Self-referral has disappeared from most

projects although it is possible for a project to take young people from other projects if the local authority has no one to fill the vacancy.

Manager, West London YMCA, female, white UK born

All our supported housing referrals have to come via Gateway which is the new System that's been going nearly a year. I was one of the guinea pigs. I got into quite a lot of trouble with my line manager who said 'you shouldn't go down that route because we've got a system that works really well'. But my argument was 'if I don't work with them now, I'll have trouble'. And it's worked, after initial teething problems, it's worked, we have a very good relationship. I think in fact our referrals have improved. Of those 111, 10 are rough sleepers and the contact assessment team are allowed to circumnavigate Gateway and make referrals to us, but Gateway are aware that they come out of the 10.

4.3 The provision of reinsertion services

Reinsertion services can be considered both those services which are provided whilst a young person resides in the accommodation and services that are provided to help people settle once they move out of supported accommodation.

The way of entry now into supported accommodation is either through agencies notifying the local authority that they have a vacancy and them sending young people for interview or in the case of St Basils, them notifying their own advice service which is now providing advice for all young people needing homeless or housing advice across Birmingham.

Emergency advice and support worker, St Basils, Birmingham, white UK born male

They'll be sent here for a full risk assessment because now, since January, this is the reason I com e down here, is to make it a single access point for St. Basils so we've done all the emergencies, all the transfers, throughout the agency for different projects come through the one point. Having said that, when there are absolute dire emergencies at night or in weekends, they (two projects with overnight staff who take over the emergency phone line) do the assessments themselves as well. If it's a night, they'll admit them, take their brief details and then we'll do a full interview after they've moved in. Sometimes they'll do it themselves and won't require my input all the time

---

4.3.1 Services within supported accommodation – employment support, education, training and lifeskills

Prior to Supporting People funding charges for different aspects of accommodation were all described as rent. Under SP rent charges (for the building and room) were separated from support costs and rents were paid through housing benefit and support costs through SP. (At West London YMCA they have 110 SP funded beds and a further 40 plus beds for young people not considered to be in need of support who do not receive such intensive key working and other beds supported by other agencies.) Prior to Supporting People it was rare that a young person was able to work whilst living in hostel or other supported accommodation because the costs were higher than their wages. Therefore most services concentrated on getting young people trained in life skills and in gaining further qualifications.

The separation of rent and support costs has allowed some young people to work whilst in supported accommodation but project workers are clear that the work must be permanent. Agency work leads to problems with benefits.

Project manager, St Basils Birmingham, female, UK born, black Caribbean
OK, we've got a young person who works for Tesco's – off the top of my head I can't remember what he earns, but he pays us £86 a week. All his bills are in, he's got no other bills. All he has to do is buy food and as he works for Tesco's he gets a discount (on food) … He's managing very well. But if was doing that casual, his Housing Benefit could have rocketed while we were waiting for them to – because it takes them ages to assess the claim and though the text book says you can ask them for payment on account, to actually get them to is a different thing.

The issue of getting young people employment ready is still one being addressed by the providers of supported accommodation in relation to their life skills, their cvs, and their educational level. Concern over the rise of the NEET generation (not in education, employment and training) and research into the proportion of young people living in hostels that had difficulties with reading, writing or number work first led to the establishment of foyers in 1993 (designed to encourage education and engagement in employment or pre-employment activity) and then to a more general emphasis on life skills training and meaningful activity among all residents funded first through Learning and Skills Council grants. Using these grants many agencies have followed the foyer agenda providing employment and training but without a tenancy or licence agreement that insisted on engagement as a condition of accommodation.

Specific services are designed to enhance the social capital of the young people they accommodate. As Box 3.7.1 reports managers and workers believe that most refugees have more social and cultural capital than local young people. They report the higher emotional needs of those born in the UK - 'they are lost and are looking for validation – (we say) You can do well **–** and a specific lack of life skills amongst those from social care.

Key workers help young people with life skills training and the Learning Power Award organised by the Foyer Federation and now funded directly by the Learning and Skills Council can begin at the most basic level of training. Similarly St Basil Projects have a graduation ceremony for their young people who have moved through their life skills and personal development programme.

Engagement (Learning and Employment), Chatham-Medway Foyer, male, white UK
RESP Predominantly, the Learning Power Award is an independent learning award, so it's up to the individual to seek out their learning independently, but the meetings that we would have initially would be to find out what that client's needs were… Predominantly, the Learning Power Award is an independent learning award, so it's up to the individual to seek out their learning independently, but the meetings that we would have initially would be to find out what that client's needs were…. Long term is where it stops – where they would feel most content. If they're living here, obviously they're in between – where they would like to be. They've moved on from where they were, which obviously wasn't a very suitable situation, and they're in the process of moving on to where they want to be, so long term is quite a vague term. If it was to graduate from university, then that could be long term. Or if it was just to secure full time employment after finishing college. Then to identify what they think their weaknesses are in terms of being independently and living independently, so that we can work on them…. More often than not, the more obvious weaknesses tend to be with more practical life skills, budgeting, money, eating healthily…That's all the variety of modules on offer to them [showing you] and each module is about a specific life skill. There['s 4 different levels, ranging from Entry Level 1 to Level 1

INT   So they have to take 'Me and My Learning'. Then they do two of 'How I Feel and Want to Feel', 'How I am with Others', 'Coping with Change', 'My Space', 'Things I do', plus a further two. And you work on the choices with them?

RESP   Yes we do it together.

They have to have done these sessions, they have to prove that they can budget their money and they've got to prove it, it's not just saying they can, cook a meal, a full meal. This is the other thing, cooking. They don't eat proper food, they never have. My [young person],who's been arrested many times, because her mum has got a drink problem, she alwaysknew there was no point expecting anything from her mother in the morning, not till laterin the afternoon, because she'd be sleeping off the night before. Now she's getting intothat habit of staying in bed all morning but it's not fair to her daughter. But she was saying that treats for food was when her mother was actually going to cook a meal.
… 'Oh the excitement when you knew your mum was up and you were going to get some proper food'…[The resettlement worker's] got her own resettlement files on every girl. Normally we take a photograph of them doing whateverthey're doing. That helps. Because Supporting People want proof as well. It's no good ussaying we're doing it, we've got to prove we're actually doing it with them, so that's another way of proving it.

In order to transform the social and cultural capital of young people some supporting accommodation have close relationships with two external organisations that provide additional social development courses. Fairbridge training takes young people on outward bound courses and gets them involved in collective activities. Prince's Trust provides a range of courses and support for young people who want to get involved in external activities.

4.3.2 Services whilst in supported accommodation – health, counselling, drug and alcohol support
Most of these services are provided by outside agencies and young people access them with the support of their key worker in their supported accommodation. Health services for young homeless people are provided through the National Health Service and local GPs. As young people often stay more than three months in principle they are permanently registered with a local GP practice and their access to health services is through the normal GP route. However, in the case of mental health services St Basils has developed a counselling service of their own.

Project manager, young man's project, St Basils, Birmingham, born UK, Black Caribbean

Counselling, we've got a generic service at Prevention. From what I gather it's got quite a long waiting list now. It was really exciting when she first came in because everybody got access quite quickly. Though it's still the quickest route. There are other organisations that we can tap into - via the GP is going to be the quickest route. But it's always going to be dependant on whether they've got a GP and if they've seen them recently and then persuading the GP to make the referral in the first place

For the mother and baby unit there was a weekly visit from the health visitor to check on the babies and talk about food and also visits from the Sure Start programme:

Project manager, young women and baby project, St Basils, Birmingham, born UK, white
It's even as much as – silly as this sounds – doing stuff in the garden in the summer. If we're out there with them, they'll spend all day out there with the children. If we're not out there, they won't come down. We've got a lovely garden with everything out there, we put a paddling pool out there for the kids. As long as we're out there, they'll be out there. If you come in…but I don't know what we can do. Stay and Play, we have every week, coming from Flying Start… And they don't think they need to talk to the babies because 'they're babies, they don't understand me'. If you've been in care an you haven't had any parenting as such…I say 'it doesn't matter if you read the newspaper to them, as long as you're talking to them'…So, it's really basic stuff you're getting back to. 'What's the point of it? She doesn't understand what I'm saying' or ' she can't answer me back'

In general access to physical health services are good for young people but access to mental health services inadequate. The Foyer Federation established a pilot 'Strong Minds' project to enable young people to gain access to Community Psychiatric Nurses and then to mental health support. This project demonstrated the unmet need within this group of young people. As already reported two of the agencies that have been interviewed for this project run their own family mediation services – St Basils and DePaul Trust. For drug and alcohol support projects refer to their local drug and alcohol teams.

In relation to youth offending all the agencies would work with the young person and some would take him back after a spell in prison. DePaul has their own services that work in prison.

4.3.3 Floating support services for reinsertion
Failures of tenancies among young homeless people were very common prior to the establishment of floating support services. Supporting People funding allowed many more floating support services to be established to work with young people up to six months after they had moved out of supported accommodation. St. Basils runs a city wide floating support service which grew out of their self funded resettlement service under Supporting People Funding although their two projects that work with young mothers also have their own resettlement and floating support workers. The YMCA is funded for floating support for up to six months after a young person has left.

The main support has been tenancy sustainment. Smith (2004) undertook a comparison of the services provided by single site foyers, dispersed foyers (several small housing units developed across a local authority) and floating support services. She found that whilst dispersed foyers worked like single site foryers to support the reinsertion of young people into education and employment and to develop their life skills the focus of floating support services was largely on tenancy sustainment – helping young people manage their money and pay their bills.

Manager, West London YMCA
Some of the London boroughs do amazing things – I went to a conference and it was mainly landlords and people from RSLs - I was the only hostel manager there and the prejudice against hostels was palpable. I said 'we don't refer people on till we're sure they can manage on their own'. We always say the first 6 months, we make sure, we don't get funding or anything for this but we always say 'you can come back, we are happy to support you in any way we can'. But the prejudice!

Floating support has also been provided for young people who have not been in supported accommodation but moved directly into tenancies, particularly young mothers and young people from care. Many young people will be dependent on housing benefit for the rent in their tenancies and one of the most recent changes is that housing benefit is paid to the tenant rather than directly to the landlord, whether it is a private landlord or a social housing landlord. Project managers were very worried about this development and though it would lead to tenancy failure.

4.4 Service methodologies
In the UK a shift in methodologies to person-centred, strength models, asset models rather than directional methodologies where a key worker or social worker tells you the next step. There has been little evaluation of key working

methodologies for young people. However in the UK the five target outcomes of *Every Child Matters* for children have young people have had impact across all supporting services and are now being introduced as outcome measures across support accommodation and floating support services for homeless youth[xiii]. Almost all homeless agencies are recasting their measure of support in relation to these outcomes. However, the most recent far reaching changes have followed the government financial system of Supporting People. These changes are described in Section 3.

4.4.1 Prevention of youth homelessness through early intervention.
4.4.1.1 Safe in the City

The most well-designed early intervention programme, working with 13-18 year olds was undertaken in 8 London boroughs from 1998-2003. This give year programme, entitled Safe in the City, funded three projects and a co-ordinating project in each participating borough to provide three interventions for young people deemed at risk of becoming homeless: personal development (often through one to one session and groupwork); educational development; and family mediation (London Development Agency: 2002). Each young person who entered the programme was identified because they triggered one of five risk factors: running away, family poverty, school exclusion/risk of school exclusion, problems at home, disrupted family home. Some of the boroughs' cluster programmes worked with a more limited range of young people who triggered many different risk factors whilst some worked with a broader range of young people that only triggered two of the risk factors.

The first overview of the Safe in the City early intervention programme was made in 2000 for Centrepoint (Nistala and Dane, 2000). The *Staying Safe* report reviewed the early work of agencies engaged in Safe in the City clusters in different boroughs. Even at this stage the early intervention model was developing: '*Nearly all agencies said that the young people they targeted lacked confidence and self-esteem and that developing these was a primary goal*.' (p19) Most agencies provided precisely those services that the young people and parents we interviewed in group interviews said that they wanted (Chapter 7). The second type of skills commented on the report was independent living skills (employability, work orientation) and the third type was family support services. The report put forward alternative models for working with parents: 'parents as partners', 'families under pressure', 'family crisis services', 'youth work model' (the young person has control over the process), family counselling model, and 'time out from the family'. The *Staying Safe* report went on to consider the role of schools and the skills that workers in the programme required. Their discussions closely mirror the desire of parents to have support from schools and to be engaged with non-judgemental workers when their young people were in difficulties.

A second evaluation of the Safe in the City programme was undertaken by the National Centre for Social Research in 2003 (Dickens and Woodfield: 2004).[1] It split the 'risk factors' of the gate-keeping tool into two: family and housing difficulties (experience of running away, disrupted home history, problems at home) and social exclusion (experience of severe or chronic family poverty, experience/risk of school exclusion). They divided their 41 interviewees into two groups and assessed whether the risk to the young person had diminished through participation in the Safe in the City cluster scheme. Most young people at risk through family and housing difficulties reduced their level of risk while on the programme, but a few made no real progress. Some young people at risk through

social exclusion reduced their risk, some improved in some areas and not others, and some had no risk reduction at all. Their conclusion was that:

'The findings support the premise underlying the Safe in the City approach that by tackling the problems associated with family life and social exclusion, the risk of youth homelessness can be reduced. The figures also show that the programme's impact varied, with some young people making significant progress and others more moderate. No young people's situation deteriorated during their involvement with the programme, although in some cases neither was there any improvement. (Dickens and Woodfield: 2004: 30-31)

The final report on the Safe in the City programme for the London Development Agency was made by Nicola Bacon, the Director of Safe in the City, in February 2004, one month before it closed. Her report was based on an analysis of data collected by agencies on over 800 young people who had contact with the programme over a two year period (2002-2004) and 124 parents. When the programme finally closed at the end of March, 470 young people were fully engaged on the programme and the levels of risk of a further 223 were being assessed.

Nicola Bacon's assessment, based on the reports of the co-ordinators of the cluster schemes and on the previous evaluations of the programme, was that:
In most cases, the programme reduced participants' vulnerability to homelessness by tackling the circumstances that placed them at risk. The programme achieved the greatest impact when:
- *young people felt involved with and consulted about their referral to a scheme and they believed their participation was voluntary…*
- *support was tailored to participants' needs and there was ongoing discussion about its appropriateness and content. …*
- *the participant established a supportive relationship with a keyworker. …*
- *the programme rapidly addressed attitudes and situations that affected the young person's involvement, including family problems, low self-worth, entrenched world-views and negative attitudes….*
- *entrenched world-views were turned around*. (Bacon, 2004)

Bacon estimated that the unit cost per young person across the whole scheme was £3,000, which often paid for two to three interventions that would otherwise be separately funded, and/or included work with the young person's parents (in one fifth of cases). Smith and Ravenhill (2007) made a different estimate that if the scheme was only costed on the basis of those fully engaged then some boroughs would spend £5,500 per young person, working with 55 young people. Other boroughs would spend less and two boroughs would spend more. However, a unit cost of £3,000 - £5,500 per individual paid for individually tailored, co-ordinated packages that could include any of the following types of work: literacy and numeracy provision; basic skills provision; IT training; registration qualification; work experience; vocational options; one-to-one sessions; groupwork on particular issues such as bullying, citizenship and rights and responsibilities; activity-based groupwork, including sports and cultural outings; independent living skills; work with the family unit; individual work with parents and carers; parents and carers groups; parenting skills; and an annual residential for young people.

Nicola Bacon argued that one of the most important aspects of encouraging the social inclusion of young people was to challenge the idea that their behaviour was 'the norm'.
A recurrent theme of the interviews was the extent to which young people regarded their behaviour and circumstances as the norm for people like themselves, versus the extent to

which they acknowledged a need to work at or change them. Where a scheme was able to turn around assumptions about 'normal' behaviour young people were more likely to experience positive benefits and engage with other aspects of the intervention." (Ibid:14)

It is important to benchmark the work of Safe in the City against the cost of young people who are 'not in education, employment or training' at age 16-18 years. A research brief from the Social Policy Unit, University of York and University of Hull, reported in 2002 that the cost per average young person in this situation were: £45,000 resource costs and £52,000 public finance costs. Against these costs the cost of £3,000 - £5,500 per young person in eight of the poorest Inner London boroughs seems fully justified (Godfrey et al, 2002).

4.4.1.2 Providing services for young people who runaway
In 2005 '*Responding to Young Runaways: An evaluation of 19 projects, 2003 to 2004'* (Rees et al, 2005) reported on 19 projects for runaways funded under a special initiative of the Children and Young Persons Unit (CYPU). The majority of the referrals to these agencies came through Missing Persons reports and the primary models of intervention that were used were based on short-term crisis intervention, although extended into longer term support in many cases. A major difference between projects was to the extent that they intended to engage with the families of young runaways: there were differences between those agencies that from the outset had a young person centred approach versus those orientated to engaging with the whole family.

Although 1373 young people were referred to the 19 agencies during the period of the evaluation only 406 young people were contacted, of which 27% were living with both parents, 54% were living with a lone parent and 19% were living with a parent and a step-parent. For 243 young people there was information on ongoing contact and work. The evaluation identified change through project workers' end of contact forms for the 239 young people with whom ongoing contact had been established. According to these reports in a quarter of cases (24%) there was increased stability of accommodation, whether with their parents or elsewhere, in a quarter of cases the extent and quality of family relationships had improved (25%), and in a fifth of cases (20%) access to education or attendance at school had improved. In a fifth of cases (19%) access to other agencies had been facilitated. Agency workers also reported that one in seven young people had stopped running away (15%), improvement in mental health and self-esteem occurred in 11% of cases, and improvement in other issues such as drugs, anger management, and sexual exploitation occurred in 7%.

4.4.2. Key working methods within supported accommodation for young people
There are different stages to young people entering supported accommodation and being introduced to support packages by managers and workers in that accommodation. As reported local authorities, who fund the support packages for young people through a government grant under Supporting People, have increasing control over who is deemed homeless and who receives the support package. In the case of Birmingham, St. Basils advice service *Link* is Birmingham City Council's preferred advice service. Workers there report that young people come to them hoping to be offered a flat and when they are offered hostel accommodation they return home. In the case of London local authorities it is the local authority who may make the decision. Some hostels or other supported accommodation keep emergency beds for the young people homeless in an emergency but in other cases they have to wait for a vacancy. In London and afe other arge cities there is a linked computer system that notifies of hostel

vacancies. This was started by Resources Information Service which has now amalgamated with Homeless Link.

Once a vacancy occurs then the local authority might send two or three young people for interview by the agency. If the local authority has no one to send then it is possible for the agency, after 24 hours, to fill the bed with someone else. In the case of one small hostel run by DePaul which can only take low or medium need young people because there is no overnight cover this has allowed several young people from outside the area who are refugees with recourse to public funds to be taken into this small hostel.

The first stage is an interview and a risk assessment based on the paper work that has been sent with the young person from the referral agency; otherwise the organisation undertakes its own assessment. The introduction of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) to be used by local Social Services and other providers will increasingly standardise this part of the process. Some who appears to be difficult or a potential risk of other young people will not necessarily be excluded - managers describe making an assessment as to whether it is possible for the project to manage the risk.

Once a young person is admitted to the accommodation then the most common method of engagement is to provide a key worker who will undertake a holistic assessment of their needs. Because of the need to keep very clear records for the Supporting People funding stream St Basils has developed a database called Spectrum that mirrors the different spheres of intervention in the '8 steps model' and then tracks the work that has been done on each area. Key workers will then refer over to their own family mediation or counselling service.

Project manager, young women and baby home, St Basils Birmingham, female, born UK, white

I like the idea that the boyfriends can stay…Because they never used to be able to, years ago. We're not here to moralise, are we? They've got children, for goodness' sake. And I want these young men to see what it's like when the baby's not all fed and bathed for visiting time, because they need to know these babies cry, if these lads are going to move in with these girls when they move out…When we do our key working, we go into families and if there are issues around families, around trying to get them together again, then we will refer them to family mediation or if they don't want to bring someone in from outside, we would always invite them in and see if we could – in a little 3-way – get to the bottom of what's causing the problem. But usually, once they've left home and they're not under each other's feet any more, things usually greatly improve. And as upset as the parents are when the girls get pregnant and disappointment, and all the rest that goes with that, I always say 'they'll come round once the baby's born' – even if it's pure curiosity, to start with. 'It's not what they would have wished for, for you, but…

However in other projects key workers will refer out to supporting services and St Basils Projects refer out for drug and alcohol services.

The primary focus of the key working sessions is action planning – even quite small steps – in order to re-engage young people or to support those who are engaged and require to go further. Most key workers in larger agencies described action planning key working sessions being monthly in order that the young person could have progressed in the intervening time but actually meeting with the young person more frequently than this. All action plans are agreed with the young person.

In one agency – the small Foyer – one worker did not follow one young person all the way through but different workers took responsibility for organising different aspects of life with the young person – the first assessment was done by the Deputy Manager, then employment/education/ life skills was assessed by that worker, whilst another worker dealt with their benefits and welfare. The whole

team of 11 worked with 27 young people; the only additional staff they used were on contract and had been engaged for many years.

There has been little investigation of the way that key working with young people works in supported accommodation although there has been the development of different models of key working associated with an emphasis on outcomes. The most well known of these models was developed by St. Mungos for use with single homeless people is called the Outcomes Star and has been widely copied by other agencies. In order to ascertain how widespread the use of this and other model is the CSEYHP UK team requested the Homeless Link /RIS (now amalgamated) team to include a question on key working in their latest SNAP telephone survey of agencies. The results of this survey will be available in May 2009.

One issue raised by managers and key workers was how long young people should stay in a hostel. Outside of London, in Birmingham where move on possibilities were more available one project manager working with young mothers and their babies thought young people should only stay up to a year in order to prevent institutionalisation but within London the length of stay is often two years because of the lack of move on accommodation.

There is also the issue about moving young people from emergency accommodation where they stayed 3 months to 6 months to longer term hostel or foyer accommodation. Quilgars et al (2008) reported that some young people found this unsettling. But from our interviews first stage accommodation was generally smaller (less bed units) and worked more intensively on risk and needs assessment during their stay. One Project Manager of DePaul (most of whose supported housing units are under 20 beds) reported weekly meetings and even daily contact for up to six months before a young person moved into a foyer where the key working sessions could be once a month.

From the interviews we have undertaken with project managers and agency workers in five different types of projects several themes have emerged about the changing provision of key work or support work.
1. All agencies have formal risk assessment procedures which are used to manage the risk an individual young person may present. Supported accommodation that have staff covering at night are prepared to accept quite high risk young people, from prison and with drug and alcohol needs, whereas those without night staff cover cannot because of the risk to other residents.
2. As already reported routes into supported accommodation are through referral from local authority housing departments (or homeless departments), social services, and sometimes the local rough sleeper team (Contact and Assessment team). If the local authority cannot fill a vacancy then the agency can fill that vacancy with another young person. One DePaul hostel worked closely with New Horizons that gave advice and support to young people who were refugees (with leave to remain). No agency could take young people who had no recourse to public funds (asylum seekers).
3. Staff are currently being trained in the use of the Common Assessment Form that is being rolled out for the assessment of all children and young people.
4. Supporting People has required proof of all work that is undertaken with young people in supported accommodation and this has led to the development of extensive recording systems. Different key workers use these systems differently. Some prefer to interview and action plan with the young person and then record the outcomes of the interview on

computer but other key workers will work through the form with the young person recording only that which they agree together.

5. Almost all managers and key workers report that whatever the common recording system that is adopted any action plan for a young person has to be personalised. Largely they report that young people not born in the UK are self-motivated and that their hardest work is with those born in the UK for whom they have to challenge the norms of their behaviour. Given their intent to challenge they behaviour of a young person they believe that they must start with very small steps for some young people, whilst more can be asked of others

6. For Foyer residents engagement with a life-skill, education and/or employment action plan is a condition of the licence they have to remain in their accommodation. Some key workers have expressed the view that they would like that to be a common condition.

7. Two of the large providers (Centrepoint and DePaul UK)have recast their outcomes recording for each young person in line with the five outcomes of the Every Child Matters agenda i.e. recording their achievements in relation to employment/life skills/ education achievements, their health etc. We hope to be able to report outcomes data by the end of our project.
<u>Regional Manager, DePaul UK, male white born UK</u>
Our Link database – we've aligned it with the Every Child Matters outcomes, so whenever someone inputs on the system, it's in line with Every Child Matters. We're now able to report back on how we're achieving and how young people are achieving in those 5 areas, as a way to prove what we do, value for money, return on investments.

4.4.3 Re-insertion Methods for young people leaving accommodation

Supporting people funding has allowed the development of different types of floating support for up to six months. However in the projects we interviewed it was apparent that some young people returned up to two years after for advice and help in keeping their accommodation. One study has review floating support methods in comparison with the services provided by single site foyers and dispersed foyers and concluded that the chief role of most floating support is to maintain tenancies and to help young people manage their finances. However some intensive floating support packages are designed to support those at risk and with multiple needs (Smith, 2004).

5   Issues for the European social model and values

In 2006 the UK government set up the Social Exclusion Task Force (SETF) to focus on problems of severe deprivation with two key workstreams – Socially Excluded Adults and Families at Risk building on the *Every Child Matters* model. The work of this taskforce and plans to deal with social exclusion and child poverty impacted directly on the targets for the UK National Inclusion Plan (DWP 2008) which reports all the current government policies to deal with social exclusion including housing and homelessness and tackling workless households through housing providers helping their tenants into employment (reversing residualisation), and tackling inequality in relation to gender, disability, race, ethnic minority employment and gypsies/romas and travellers.

The current National Inclusion Plan for the UK (DWP, 2008) begins from the premise that the UK is one of the most successful economies in Europe and that economic growth will continue. It reports that 3 million jobs have been created since 1997 and builds on this to argue for a new National Action Plan for Social Inclusion in relation to EU common objectives and reports on a range of indicators (Annexe 3) agreed by the EU. It reports that '*Both European and national*

indicators of poverty and social exclusion show that the UK continues to make significant progress. We have better education in schools and colleges and have more peole in work than ever before. The New Deal for Lone Parents has helped more than half a million lone parents in to work since October 1998 … We have lifted 600,000 children out of poverty, and up to 300,000 more will follow as a result of policies announced in July (2008). The number of *people reliant on key out-of-work benefits is down by one million since 1997*. (Introduction. p v) ' The report goes on to argue that through Public Sector Agreements it will be possible to progress on the two central fronts – socially excluded adults (including care leavers and families at risk of exclusion) and child poverty. It argues that full employment is at the heart of this strategy with an ambition of an 80% employment rate. The other important foci in the report are a renewed focus on equality legislation, on efficient public services and on the unacceptable high cost of drug misuse including increased numbers of benefit claimants. It reports that its Children's Plan (published in December 2007) '*sets out an ambition to make Britain the best place in the world to grow up for every child – regardless of their background'*.

However, the premises of the report are no longer true. The prediction for the current crisis is that all the employment gain of 3 million extra jobs will disappear. There have been warnings that 800,000 youth could be affected in relation to youth unemployment, as they were in the early 1980s and early 1990s and alll tracking studies of these earlier cohorts have shown that the effects of youth unemployment last throughout life in terms of lower earnings and greater instability in the labour market. Moreover a general election is due in 2010 and many of the targeted youth policies may be reversed. If youth unemployment rises to previous levels then youth homelessness will also rise.

The issue of young unemployment in particular cohorts is one that challenges the European social model and European social values. As we have argued social exclusion in the UK has particularly affected those young people from workless households and areas where workless households are the norm. The key workers we interviewed report that the most disadvantaged young people are young white males who do not have the cultural capital of young refugees. Key workers report their endeavours to rebuild that cultural capital, educational capital and social capital through small steps over the period of a year. It is better to prevent.

The latest youth survey (The Guardian, 15th April 2009) reports that UK young people still feel assaulted by the media view of them and have experienced homelessness and criminalisation. It reports that despite the recent government turn back to general youth services and towards the provision of high quality youth services, in the most deprived areas there is still only one youth centre per 14,000 young people (compared with one per 6,000 in non-deprived areas).

Appendix 1.   Organisations interviewed for the report

Organisation	Services	Personnel Interviewed	Target Group
St Basils Projects Birmingham and surrounding counties in West Midlands	26 projects including Emergency accommodation Supported accommodation Foyer accommodation with crèche (can take couples) Mother and baby projects Family mediation and counselling STAMP preventive programme in schools Housing Options – creating 8 flats for move on with a local housing provider	5 Operations Manager – female, UK born, black Caribbean Project Manager – Mother and child Home – female, UK born, white Project Manager – Young Men's Project – female, UK born, black Caribbean Emergency support and advice worker – Link Advice Centre – male, UK born, white Support worker – Foyer – male, black African, non-UK born Plus interview with Database Manager - male, UK born, white	Young people 16-25 years including local young people and refugees. Minority now white born UK (45%)
West London YMCA, Ealing and takes referrals across West London boroughs and from Rough Sleepers Team	180 bed hostel, part of a YMCA West London network with 500 beds. Other projects include a mother and baby unit and small unit for those leaving social care. 110 beds are Supporting People, 10 beds rough sleepers, 40 non SP beds This hostel has a nursery, a restaurant, a shop. In discussion over housing options.	4 Manager – female, UK born, white Education and support worker – female, black African, non UK born Housing support worker for refugees and others – Middle East, non-UK born Housing support worker for refugees and other – Middle East, non-UK born	Young people 16-35 years including local young people and refugees. Up to half are now refugees including a large Muslim Somali group.
Chatham and Medway Foyer	2 projects. 27 bed foyer and 9 bed smaller unit for young people from social care and others	4 Manager – female, UK born, white Deputy Manager – female, UK born, white Employment, training and life skills – male, UK born, white Housing support worker, separate unit – female, UK born, white	Young people 16-25 years, predominantly local young people white but 3-4 mixed ethnic groups or others. Have had 3 refugees in accom.

De Paul UK	40 projects nationally 6 areas of work: Supported accommodation Family Mediation Prison support Night Stop	3 Regional Manager – London, South-East and Midlands – male, UK born, white Project Manager – Central London – female, UK born, white Housing Support Worker – Central London – female, UK born, white Plus interview with Database Manager – national database – male, UK born, white	Young people 16-25. Whole range of young people including those in prison
Centrepoint	Predominantly London based with 3 small projects in North England. 500 beds across London and 300 'Stop-Over' Units Large education initiative including 3 projects which are foyers	2 Deputy Director – female, Asian, born UK Director of Operations – female, white, born UK Plus interview with Database Manager –male, mixed ethnicity, born UK	Young people 16-25, nearly a half of whom are born outside the UK because of their London base. A minority are now white born UK.

Appendix 2 Case Studies

ISSUES RAISED BY THE IST SET OF CASE STUDIES
The overwhelming response on three of the prevention case studies was to refer to statutory services, most usually Social Services. For those in trouble at school they would refer back to the school and any school counselling service. For violence they would refer back to Social Services and the Police.

However, St Basils workers would also refer to a) their own family mediation service for those aged under 16 years and b) report that they would take a 15 year old into a mother and baby unit if the young woman was 15 coming up to 16 and could possibly accommodated a young couple with a baby (Edmonds Court Foyer). An education worker at West London YMCA who had a voluntary sector background also would refer to the voluntary sector as well as to social services.

The exception to the above advice was KEMIA: If Kemia had no recourse to public funds, managers and workers had no suggestions. Some would refer to the school.

ISSUES RAISED BY THE 2ND SET OF CASE STUDIES of David, Mary, Mohammed and Susan
The issues raised by workers were.

DAVID: Is David intentionally homeless? If so local authority will not rehouse. Social services will not continue a duty to care if older than 16-17 years. Main services will be housing benefit and income support. It is likely that he would be directed to the private rented market and helped to access that.
MARY: would be on minimum wage. The best thing would be for her to return to school. Social Services should be involved with her. It will be hard to go to university because of the cost
MOHAMMED can only access supported accommodation if he has recourse to public funds and Social Services accepts a duty towards him. If not then he can only turn to the community and religious organisations.
SUSAN would get support from Social Services if 16-17 years and perhaps up to 19 years but over 20 years she would be on her own. She could stay for up to 2 years in a mother and child unit if she was accepted as homeless and then be rehoused.

Appendix 3. References

Aassve A, Billari F C, Mazzuco, S and Ongaro F. (2002), *Leaving home: A comparative analysis of ECHP data*. in <u>Journal of European Social Policy</u>, Vol. 12:4 pp. 259-275

AASSVE, Arnstein, IACOVOU, Maria and MENCARINI, Letizia (2005a) *Youth Poverty in Europe: What do we know?* ISER Working Papers, Number 2005-2, University of Essex.

AASSVE, Arnstein, DAVIA Maria A., IACOVOU, Maria and MENCARINI, Letizia (2005b) *Poverty and the Transition to Adulthood: Risky Situations and Risky Events.* ISER Working Papers, Number 2005-23, University of Essex.

AASSVE, Arnstein, DAVIA Maria A., IACOVOU, Maria and MAZZUCO, Stefano (2005c) *Does leaving home make you poor: Evidence from 13 European countries.* ISER Working Papers, Number 2005-24, University of Essex.

Bacon, N. (2004) Final Report on Safe in the City. Safe in the City/Peabody for the London Development Agency

Barter, C. (1999) *Protecting children from racism and racial abuse: a research review*. London: NSPCC. Policy Practice Research Series.

Beck, U (1992), *Risk Society. Towards a new modernity*, London, Sage.

Beck, U and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002) *Individualisation.* London, Sage.

Bonomi, B. (2006) Report on Yarl's Wood calls for complete overhaul of child detention. London. Institute of Race Relations, 10th August. www.irr.org.uk/2006/august/ak000006.html.

British Crime Survey (2006) Annual survey of British Crime. National Statistics published at www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/bcs1.html

Broadway (2006) *Street to home*: Annual Report for London

Bruegel, I. and Smith, J. (1999) Taking Risks. An analysis of the risks of homelessness for young people in London. London: Safe in the City/ Peabody Trust.

Brynner, Londra, Jones (2004) The impact of government policy on social exclusion among young people. Report for the SEU and OPDM

Children Act 1989 London: The Stationary Office

Children Act 2004 London: The Stationary Office

Child Exploitation and Online Protection (CEOP) (2007)

Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG) (2008) *Child Poverty the Stats* London: CPAG www.cpag.org.uk/info/briefings_policy/CPAG_poverty_the_stats_1008.pdf

Child Exploitation and Online Protection (CEOP) (2007) A scoping project on child trafficking in the UK www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/ceop-child-traffick-report-0607?view=Binary

Children and Young Persons Act (2008) London: The Stationary Office www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2008/ukpga_20080023_en_1

Clark A E (2003) 'Unemployment as a social norm: psychological evidence from panel data' *Journal of Labor Economics*, 21 (2) pp323-52 quoted in DWP (2005) by Hasluck and Green

CORE data of Housing Association and Local Authority lettings (from 2003 to current date) at www.core.ac.uk

Crawley, H and Lester, T (2005) No Place for a Child. Children in UK immigration detention: Impacts, alternatives and safeguards. London: Save the Children www.savethechildren.org.uk/en/docs/no_place_for_child_summ.pdf

Crisis (2005) *Sexuality and Homelessness* www.crisis.org.uk/pdf/SexualityandHomelessness.pdf

Dhanda, P. (2007) Response to parliamentary question by Annette Brooks M.P. 5th February 2007, London: Hansard.

Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) (2007) National Statistics: Children looked after in England (including adoption and care leavers) year ending 31 March 2007

Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) (2008) National Statistics: Children looked after in England (including adoption and care leavers) year ending 31 March 2008

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2006) Homelessness Statistics at www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingresearch/housingstatistics/housingstatisticsby/homelessnessstatistics

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2007) An International Review of Homelessness and Social Housing Policy. at www.communities.gov.uk/housing/publications/research-stat

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003) *Every Child Matters*

Department for Education and Skills (DfES), 2005. *Youth Matters* Green Paper

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006) *Working Together to Safeguard Children: A guide for inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*. London: TSO.

Department of Health (2002). Women's Mental Health: Into the Mainstream - Strategic Development of Mental Health Care for Women, p16. Available at www.dh.gov.uk/assetRoot/04/07/54/87/04075487.pdf

Department for Work and Pensions (2004) *Households Below Average Income 1994/5 – 2004/05,* London.

Department for Work and Pensions (2005) *Workless Couples and partners of benefit claimants: a review of the Evidence.* Research Report No 262 prepared by Chris Hasluck and Anne E. Green

Department for Work and Pensions (2008) *Working Together: UK National Action Plan for Social Inclusion* and *Annexe 3 Indicators of Social Exclusion*.

Dickens S and. Woodfield K (2004), *Impact on Users – a Qualitative Evaluation of Safe in the City Cluster Schemes*. National Centre for Social Research/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Dickens, J., Howell, D., Thoburn, J. and Schofield, G. (2007) *Children starting to be looked after by local authorities in England: an analysis of inter-authority variation and case-centred decision-making*, British Journal of Social Work *37*(4), 597-617.

Drake M (1980) *Single and Homeless*, Department of the Environment, HMSO

Dunne GA, Prendergast S, Telford D. (2002) Young, gay, homeless and invisible: a growing population? *Culture, Health and Sexuality* 4:103-115.

Dunne GA, Prendergast S, Telford D. (2002) Young, gay, homeless and invisible: a growing population? *Culture, Health and Sexuality* 4:103-115.

Every Child Matters (2008) Teenage Conception Statistics for England 1998-2006 Available at : www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/resources/IG00200/

Evans A (1996) *We don't choose to be homeless, The Inquiry into Preventing Youth Homelessness*. CHAR, London

Fitzpatrick S and Pawson H (2007) *Welfare Safety Net or Tenure of Choice? The Dilemma facing Social Housing*. Housing Studies March 2007

Forrester, D. and Harwin, J. (2006) *Parental substance misuse and child care social work: findings from the first stage of a study of 100 families* Child and Family Social Work Volume 11 4:325 - 335

Foyer Federation (2003-6) The 'Strong Minded' Project. London: The Foyer Federation. www.foyer.net/mpn/story.php?sid=744

Furlong A and Carme F (2004) *Vulnerable Young Men in Fragile Labour Markets*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York

Gervais, M. C. and Rehman, H. (2005) *Causes of Homelessness Among Ethnic Minority Populations* (London: ODPM).

Godfrey, C et al. (2002) *Estimating the cost of being 'Not in Education, Employment or Training' at age 16-18*, DfES, Research Brief No 346

Gold D. (2005) Sexual Exclusion: issues and best practice in lesbian, gay and bisexual housing and homelessness. London: *Shelter and Stonewall Housing*.

Griffiths, S. (2002) *Assessing the health needs of rough sleepers,* ODPM Homelessness Directorate.

GHS (General Household Survey) annual report at www.statistics.gov.uk/STATBASE/)

Hills J, Sefton T and Stewart K, (2009) *Towards a more equal society: Poverty, inequality and policy since 1997.* Policy Press/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Homelessness Act 2002* at www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2002/ukpga_20020007_en_1

*(Previous Acts of 1977, 1985, 1996 can also be accessed through the Office of Public Sector Information as above)

Homeless Link (2006) *A8 nationals in London* at www.homeless.org.uk

Homeless Link/ Resource Information Service (2008) *Survey of Needs and Provision: Services for Single People and Couples in England* at www.homeless.org.uk

Home Office Crime in England and Wales 2007/08 A summary of the main findings www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs08/hosb0708summ.pdf

IARD (2001), Study on the state of young people and youth policy in Europe. (Contract n. 1999 – 1734/001-001), IARD, Via Soncino 1 – 210123, Milano

Jones G (1995) *Leaving Home*. Open University Press

Jones G and Bell R (2000) *Balancing Acts: Youth, Parenting and Public Policy.* Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Jones G (2002) *The Youth Divide: Diverging Paths to Adulthood. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.*

Khanum, N. (2008) *Forced marriage, family cohesion and community engagement. National learning through a case study in Luton*. Luton: Equality and Diversity.

Kofman et al (2007) *New Migrants in England and their Needs*. Middlesex University and the Metropolitan Support Trust at www.refugeesupport.org.uk/documents/MST_ReportonNewMigrants_07.pdf

Lee E et al (2004) A Matter of Choice? Explaining national variation in teenage abortion and motherhood (York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2004). www.jrf.org.uk

Levison, D., & Kenny, D. (2002) *The Provision of Accommodation and Support for Households Experiencing Domestic Violence in England.* London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Local government reports for issues concerning local authorities in England and Wales can be found on www.lga.gov.uk/lga/publications/publication-home.do

Lupton, Heath and Salter (2009) 'Education: New Labour's Top Priority'. in Hills, Sefton and Stewart (2009) *Towards a more equal society? Povery, inequality and policy since 1997*. Policy Press/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Margo, Dixon, Pearce and Reed (2006) *Freedom's Orphans: Raising Youth in a Changing World,* Institute of Public Policy Research, London

Melrose, M, Barrett, D and Brodie, I (1999) *One Way Street. Retrospectives on childhood prostitution*. London: The Children's Society.

Meltzer, H., Corbin, T., Gatward, R., Goodman, R., and Ford, T. (2003) *The mental health of young people looked after by local authorities in England*. London: Office for National Statistics

Mizen P (2004) *The changing state of youth*. Palgrave Macmillan

The National Youth Homelessness Scheme website commissioned by the Government Homelessness Team www.communities.gov.uk/youthhomelessness/widerneeds/lgbtmodule/

NAVCA (2007), '*Frontline Hopscotch: VCS engagement in delivering change for children and young people: a jumpy start or a step back*? NAVCA (Nat. Assoc. for Voluntary and Community Action), NCVCCO (Nat. Council of Voluntary Child Care Organisations) and NCVYS (Nat. Council for Voluntary Youth Services) research undertaken by Jason Leman at www.navca.org.uk

Netto, G. (2006) *Vulnerability to homelessness, use of homelessness services and BME communities Housing Studies* July 21/4 pp 581-603

Nistala, H. and Dane, K. (2000) Staying *Safe: preventing youth homelessness through early intervention programmes*, London: Safe in the City.

O'Connor, W. and Nolloy, D. (2003) *Hidden in Plain Sight: Homelessness Amongst Lesbian and Gay Youth*. National Centre for Social Research.

Office of National Statistics (2005), *Focus on Ethnicity and Religion* at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub

Office of National Statistics (2002 to date) *Social Trends* 32 (2001) Social Trends 34 (2003) Social Trends 37 (2007) Social Trends 38 (2008), Social Trends 39 (2009) Annual report from ONS at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub/

Osgerbey (2004), *Youth and the Media*, London: Routledge, 2004.

Pawson et al, 2007: *Evaluating Homelessness Prevention* for DCLG at

www.communities.gov.uk/publications/housing/preventhomelessness

Prince's Trust (2007). *The Cost of Exclusion: Counting the cost of youth disadvantage in the UK*. The Prince's Trust, London. Research undertaken by Sandra McNally and Shqiponja Telhaj of the Center for Economic Performance, LSE.

Pleace, N., Fitzpatrick, S., Johnsen, S., Quilgars, D. and Sanderson, D. (2008) *Statutory Homelessness in England: The Experiences of Families and 16–17 Year Olds.* London: CLG

Power A and Tunstall R, (1995) *Swimming against the Tide: Polarisation or Progress on 20 Unpopular Council Estates 1980-1995.* Joseph Rowntree Foundation. York

Power A (2009) 'New Labour and Unequal Neighbourhoods' in Hills J, Sefton T and Stewart K, (2009) *Towards a more equal society: Poverty, inequality and policy since 1997.* Policy Press/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Quilgars D, Jones A, Pleace N and Sanderson D, 2004. The Safe Moves Initiative: An Evaluation. Centre for Housing Policy, University of York. www.foyer.net

Quilgars, D., Johnsen S. and Pleace N. (2008) *Youth homelessness in the UK A decade of progress?* Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Rees, G. and Lee, J. (1999) The abuse of adolescents within the family. London: NSPCC Policy Practice Research Series

Rees, G. and Lee, J. (2005) *Still Running II: Findings from the Second National Survey of Young Runaways.* London: Children's Society

Rees et al, 2005 *Responding to Young Runaways: An evaluation of 19 projects, 2003 to 200'*

Rees, G (1993) *Hidden truths: Young people's experience of running away*. London: The Children's Society

Safe in the City (2002) *A practical Approach to Preventing Youth Homelessness*, London Safe in the City

Safe on the Streets Research Team (2005).

Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health (2004) *The Supporting People Programme and Mental Health. Briefing 26.* London: SCMH.

Social Exclusion Unit (1998) *Bringing Britain Together: A National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal.* Cabinet Office

Social Exclusion Unit, (2001) *Preventing Social Exclusion*: Cabinet Office

Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Young Runaways.* London: ODPM

Social Exclusion Unit (2003) *Breaking the cycle of exclusion*. London: Social Exclusion Unit, www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/publications/reports

Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) (2004), *Jobs & Enterprise in Deprived Areas*: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Social Exclusion Unit (2005) *Transitions; Young Adults with Complex Needs:* Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Social Trends see Office of National Statistics above.

Smith D (2008) *An overview of Transitions and the Contribution of Recent Research*. Paper for the Youth Affairs Unit, De Montfort University Leicester

Smith J, Gilford S and O'Sullivan A, 1998, *The Family Background of Homeless Young People*. Family Policy Studies Centre/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation, London

Smith, J. (2000) *Routes in and out of Homelessness among young people in Birmingham.* Staffordshire: Centre for Housing and Community Research, Staffordshire University.

Smith, J. (2004) *Dispersed Foyers*. London: Foyer Federation. www.foyer.net

Smith, J. (2005) 'Housing, gender and social policy'. In P.Somerville and N.Sprigings (Eds) *Housing and Social Policy*. London: Routledge

Smith J and Ravenhill M (2007) What is Homelessness? At www.centrepoint.org

Stand Up For Children at www.standup4children.org/

Supporting People (2003 to date) at /www.spclientrecord.org.uk/

Stephens, J. (2002) *The Mental Health Needs of Homeless Young People.* London: The Mental Health Foundation.

Stuart, M. and Baines, C. (2004) *Safeguards for vulnerable children: three studies on abusers, disabled children and children in prison. Progress on safeguards for children living away from home. A review of actions since the People Like Us Review*. York. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Stewart K (2009) 'A scar on the soul of Britain': child poverty and disadvantage under New Labour' in Hills J, Sefton T and Stewart K, (2009) *Towards a more equal society: Poverty, inequality and policy since 1997.* Policy Press/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Thoburn, J. (2007) *Globalisation and child welfare: Some lessons from a cross-national study of children in out-of-home care* University of East Anglia, Norwich. www.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.103398!globalisation%201108.pdf.

Trieu, N. (2008) *Centrepoint Services Quarterly Profile and Performance Report*. London: Centrepoint

UNICEF (2001) The State of The World's Children The United Nations Children's Fund www.unicef.org/sowc01

UNICEF (2007) An Overview of Child Wellbeing in Rich Countries The United Nations Children's Fund www.unicef-irc.org//presscentre/presskit/reportcard7/rc7_eng.pdf

UNICEF 2008 The State of The World's Children The United Nations Children's Fund www.unicef.org/sowc08/docs/sowc08.pdf

Utting, W (1997) *People like us. The report of the review of the safeguards for children living away from home*. London: Department of Health.

Utting, W (2005) *Progress on safeguards for children living away from home.* York: Joseph Rowntree Trust.

Youth Justice Board (REF)

Vostanis, P., Gratton, E., and Cumella, S. (1998) Mental health problems of homeless children and families: longitudinal study. *British Medical Journal*, Volume 316, 21 March 1998

Wayne M (2008) papers at www. brunel.ac.uk

[i] Statistics from National Statistical Office, UK, at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase *Focus on ethnicity and religion* (2005). The 2001 British Census provides information on both ethnic and religious identity; 2001 was the first time a question on religion was asked across the UK (previously this question was only asked in Northern Ireland) and only the second time that a question on ethnicity was asked in the Census (ethnicity was first asked in 1991.) The 2005 report based on the 2001 census considered differences between ethnic and religious groups, within ethnic groups according to religion, and also whether differences noted between ethnic groups in 1991 were confirmed by the 2001 data. Four new ethnic categories were added in 2001 in order to refine the category of mixed ethnic groups. There were some variations between questions in Scotland and Northern Ireland compared with England and Wales.

[ii] *New Migrants in England and their Needs, November 2007, MST and Middlesex University*. Research undertaken by Professor Eleonore Kofman, Sue Lukes, Alessio D'Angelo, Dr. Nicola Montagna, Emily Di Florido. The report surveys several local areas including four London boroughs. It is available at www.refugeesupport.org.uk/documents . The numbers from India not born in the UK reflect earlier immigration. In Appendix x we give the figures for those not born UK by ethnic group by age group

[iii] Dr Ilse van Liempt of the University of Sussex reports that whilst the Dutch Somali community in the UK is believed to vary between 10-15,000 the Dutch consul estimates 50,000 'new Dutch' living in England. Overall it is possible that 50,000 EU Somalis have moved to Leicester, Birmingham, Milton Keynes and Coventry. Paper 'Moving onward and looking back' presented at London Metropolitan University, February 2009, i.van-limpt@sussex.ac.uk

[iv] ibid p.39. The report estimates the cost to London Boroughs of supporting destitute migrants as between £10-20 million. However, most local authorities cannot identify migrants from their statistics. The London Borough of Lambeth reports that 70% of households presenting as homeless are from black and ethnic minority compared with 38% of households in the borough being from these groups; they cannot identify the number of new migrants within homeless presentations

[v] Many children, young people and practitioners alike use the term 'in care' to refer to any child in the care of the State however there are important differences. The legal term for children who are in the care of the State in England and Wales is 'Children Looked After' (CA 1989). This term includes children for whom the state has legal jurisdiction and for those who are cared for on a voluntary basis and therefore can be removed at any time by those with legal parental responsibility. In addition, for this latter group and in a technical sense the term 'accommodated' applies and for the former the term 'in care' applies. In Scotland the Children (s) Act 1995 applies and uses different terms to define children in State care.

[vi] 2005 data Thoburn's comes from
http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/VOL/v000646/vweb01-2006.pdf. 2006 data is from
http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/VOL/v000721/Volume01-2007.pdf

[vii] Agreed periods of respite are omitted from the main set of statistics in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. In England, if those who started to be looked after as a part of a series of short term placements are included, the rate entering care during a year goes up from 23 per 10,000 under 18 to 32 per 10,000. These figures are provided as 'main reason only' and therefore under-represent the extent to which disabilities or other problems of children or parents contribute to the need for care.

[viii] Figues taken from a) DCSF (2008) Referrals, assessments and children and young people who are the subject of a child protection plan, England - year ending 31 March 2008; b) Figures from Local Government Data Unit – Wales Personal Social Services (PSS) statistics
http://dissemination.dataunitwales.gov.uk ; c) Scottish Government (2008) Child protection statistics 2007/8 www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/09/23090901/0
d) Northern Ireland, Dept. of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (2008) *Children Order Statistical Bulletin 2007* Belfast: Northern Ireland, DHSSPS. www.dhsspsni.gov.uk/stats_cib_children_order_statistical_bulletin_2007.pdf

ix However, it is important to be aware that the term 'transitions' has a specific meaning in relation to social care. 'Transition' in social care refers to a multi-professional plan made with a young person at age 14 years who has been 'statemented' i.e. has a statement of Special Educational Needs, for the future education, training and support.
x Taken from http://www.statistics.gov.uk/CCI/nugget.asp?ID=1661
xi DCSF 2008 available at
http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000793/SFR_14Revised.pdf

xii As the primary carers of children, homeless mothers have a statutory right to apply for social housing whatever the cause of their homelessness - domestic violence, welfare-benefit poverty or relationship breakdown. By 1991 nearly half (45%) of divorced or separated women heads of household occupied social housing (either local authority or housing association) compared with 28 per cent of divorced and separated men, and the odds that a new lone parent with dependent children entered social housing increased by a factor of 3.6 over other newly formed households. In particularly many women facing domestic violence have relied on homelessness legislation to provide them with secure housing; between 1995 and 2002, 130,000 homeless households were re-housed because of domestic violence. Domestic violence accounts for 16% of homeless acceptances every year – 6% directly and 10% as an underlying cause – and the government believes it is a major factor in 'repeat' homelessness [17].

xiii http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/deliveringservices/targetedyouthsupport/
describes the Every Child Matters programme as introduced for youth and the proposals for targeted youth support in each local authority.

www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingresearch/housingstatistics/housingstatisticsby/homelessnessstatistics/livetables/Tables 632 and 630