Book Reviews


This is the 15th edition of the Social Policy Review, an annual publication that is the successor to the Yearbook Book of Social Policy, which itself ran to 16 editions. Now published by the Policy Press, the title is owned by the UK Social Policy Association. This latest edition is in three parts and comprises three articles on UK social policy, five articles on international issues, and four on pensions and old age. There is also an editors’ introduction, as well as brief editorial introductions to each of the three sections.

The UK section begins with an historical essay by David Gladstone on integration within the community of people with learning disabilities. He points out that, although institutional provision expanded in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the family was always the predominant locus of care. He concludes from this that integration was not a product of the 1960s and beyond, but has been one of the key continuities in British social policy.

Ian Greener examines the concept of ‘choice’ in UK health policy documents. He shows that the concept has been given different meanings at different times to fit in with government reforms of the NHS. He concludes that New Labour’s attempt to place patient choice at the heart of its latest reforms is unlikely to secure the changes that it desires and — more controversially — that it may simply be part of an attempt to make government less accountable for the NHS.

In the international section, Holcomb and Martinson provide an excellent overview of the first five years’ experience of implementation of the 1996 welfare reform in the USA, the centrepiece of which was Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Although much attention in Britain has focused on the introduction of time limits on claim durations, it is clear that the reform was far more wide-ranging than that. It gave considerable leeway for the states to vary the parameters of the reform, making generalisation difficult. Holcomb and Martinson argue that, at the heart of TANF, ‘is a complex, evolving and often unappreciated story of local efforts to translate welfare reform goals and policies into operational realities’ (p. 137).

Holiday and Wilding examine social policy in Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. They argue that an East Asian welfare approach, if not exactly a model, does exist. Although there are differences between these four societies, they are differences of emphasis and method. They predict, however, that the future will see more divergence, with perhaps Hong Kong and Singapore retaining their limited social provision, and South Korea and Taiwan taking a more expansionary route.

The pensions section begins with a chapter by Bonoli and Gay-des-Combes on pension reform in eight countries. Four of these countries (France, Germany, Italy and Sweden) are characterised as having predominantly social-insurance-based pension provision. The remaining four (Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the UK) have multi-pillar systems in which relatively limited state provision has left considerable scope for occupational and
private pensions. The authors contend that, despite facing broadly similar labour market challenges, pension reforms in these countries reflect the institutional structures of their existing pension systems. They also argue that social insurance pensions are better able to provide for carers and atypical workers than are multi-pillar systems.

Falkingham and Rake review the challenges facing pension provision in the UK, outline what they see as the desirable criteria for pension systems, and evaluate New Labour’s ‘pension settlement’. They conclude by arguing for a substantial increase in the Basic State Pension (BSP), indexing it to earnings, redesigning pension credits to reward caring, and several other changes that would make the BSP more generous for women as well as men. They do not spell out whether the increase in the BSP would be introduced immediately (and, if so, how it would be paid for) or gradually over time. However, by 2050, their reform package would raise annual public expenditure on pensions by 2.5 per cent of GDP.

Debora Price considers the implications of divorce for women. She argues that the relative poverty of older women reflects, not just the gendered accumulation of pension provision, but also the divorce process, which favours men over women. She believes that pension sharing on divorce, introduced by the Labour Government in December 2000, is unlikely to make much difference and that the prospects for divorced women in old age remain poor.

In the other contributions to this edition, Parry looks at the UK public spending review 2002, Schwartz contributes to the academic debate about globalisation and welfare, Carpenter discusses the health transition in Greece, and Kirk Mann considers retirement and pensions in the context of debates about risk, reflexivity and identity.

Altogether this is an interesting collection of essays that will be very useful for both teaching and research purposes. And yet it left me wondering about the Social Policy Review’s terms of reference. To judge from this edition, it no longer seems to provide a selected review of recent social policy developments in Britain. The three essays that comprise the UK section, together with a further three on pensions, cover too limited a range of topics to claim to be that. And it would be difficult, in the remaining six contributions, to cover the most important developments in social policy world-wide. Has the Social Policy Review lost its way?

Peter Kemp
University of York
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Keeping in mind a definition of the study of implementation as ‘little more than a comparison of the expected versus the achieved’ (p. 8), Hill and Hupe embark on a discussion across nine chapters of the complexity of putting policy into practice. They position the study of implementation within an international literature that takes as its problematic the notion of an implementation gap, although this is not a concept which the authors regard as particularly useful given the presence of interactions in policy processes. Early chapters review classic debates about top–down versus bottom–up perspectives, a middle section considers the state and practice of implementation research, and then a penultimate and substantial chapter on ‘governance and managing implementation’ is followed by a brief conclusion that summarises the book. Pressman and Wildavsky’s, Implementation, published in 1973, is Hill and Hupe’s main reference point, to which they often return, but it is the grassroots perspective of Lipsky and his ‘street-level bureaucrats’ that sets the stronger agenda.
What I found to be one of the most valuable features of this book was the way that the authors document the emergence and development of implementation studies that usefully contextualises some of the recent debates about new public management, networks and governance. This means the book really needs to be read as a whole, but as such would be a challenge for many undergraduates who may find the rather dense style hard-going. At times it is difficult to follow the thread of the argument, partly because of the extent to which complex ideas and findings from other authors’ work are summarised, although each chapter concludes with a helpful overview of its key points. It is, however, the mostly implicit argument that implementation studies represent a sub-discipline, therefore defining unnecessary boundaries in the literature, that I found weakened what the book has to offer an increasingly post-disciplinary social science.

Hill and Hupe do not attempt a theoretical or methodological synthesis, and instead seek to clarify concepts and processes which, although largely taxonomic, also aims at ‘the systematic development of insights’ (p. 199). This, they argue, can be achieved by using ‘traditional social science methods influenced by the positivist tradition’ (p. 199) and, indeed, they place considerable emphasis on identifying the independent and dependent variables that trace policy processes in practice. However, the book sometimes promises more than it delivers in this respect, with issues introduced, worked through and then summarised in terms of key categories (often as cross-tabulations) rather than advanced theoretically. For example, chapter 8 discusses of the importance of local context, and would, in my view, have benefited immensely from some consideration of the work of Pawson and Tilley (1997) or Stacey (2000). The reason for this is partly the authors’ self-imposed discipline of restricting the literature they use to, largely, pre-1999 articles in public policy journals. This means the book steers a difficult course, such as making a not entirely convincing argument about the difference between ‘implementation research’ and ‘evaluation research’ (pp. 140–141).

Implementing Public Policy is at one level basically an extended survey of a fairly narrowly focused literature. But it is also more than this. The authors offer their opinions on this literature and, given their academic experience in this field, these are certainly worth reading. They also test this literature by considering how some of the key concepts might work in clarifying policy problems, both theoretical and practical. In this respect, the penultimate chapter is a particularly interesting read, and arrives at a framework for conceptualising policy processes that many policy researchers are likely to find useful.
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This book is concerned with suggesting an unusual direction of policy transfer. Much recent policy transfer in the worlds of work and welfare has been from the US to Britain, leading to
However, it is claimed that over the past five years welfare reform in Britain has in many ways moved beyond what has been accomplished in the US, with the results worthy of attention as a source of ideas or points of reference for the resumed US debate over welfare and connecting social assistance to work (p. 2). The text consists of seven chapters. The first by the editors sets the broad context of sharing ideas of welfare. Michael Wiseman then provides a review of welfare in the US. Alan Deacon writes on the British perspective on reform: transfers from, and a lesson for, the US. The following three chapters cover three main areas in the UK: child poverty by Mike Brewer and Paul Gregg; lone parents by Jane Millar; and disabled people and young unemployed persons by Bruce Stafford. The final chapter by the editors focuses on shaping a vision of US welfare.

The book provides an excellent description and assessment of the UK programmes in the central chapters, with valuable wider contextual material in the other chapters. Readers seeking information on recent developments in the US and the UK will find clearly written, up-to-date accounts by leading authorities on the topics at hand. One particularly impressive feature is that the paint is still wet on the picture painted, which sets new standards in production times for a publisher already noted for its rapid publication process. For a book published in May 2003, there are some citations of 2003 documents, with websites accessed as late as February 2003. Many of the chapters cite a very high proportion of recent references. For example, Chapter 2 is a spectacular achievement in 82 per cent of its references date from the year 2000 or later. Most of the other chapters are in the range 51–68 per cent, with Chapters 1 and 3 looking dusty by comparison with 38 per cent and 28 per cent respectively.

Despite its many positive features there are three problems that detract from the text. The first two are minor problems relating to the key words in the title. First, the book concerns the potential contribution of British experience to US policy perspectives on both work for those who can and security for those who cannot. However, the can/cannot distinction is only thinly covered. A clearer link to wider contextual issues such as health care, education and lifelong learning, and social care that are not covered in the book would have been useful. The exclusion of pensions is presumably on the grounds that British experience is not one that should be followed, but a clearer rationale for inclusion of issues would be beneficial. After all, as the editors are very aware, the term ‘welfare’ can have different meanings in the US and the UK. Second, it is never fully clear who the ‘we’ in the book’s title are. Despite much talk of vision, there is little discussion of values. It is possible that the UK and US populations may wish for different types of welfare, and entirely likely that a sample of two Professors is not representative of the national populations. Updating Douglas Jay’s famous comment, the gentlemen in Nottingham and Madison-Wisconsin may not know best. The major problem concerns the extremely limited discussion of the relevant policy transfer literature, being confined to two mentions of Rose (1993) in Chapters 1 and 7. This is disappointing given that one of the editors’ previous articles has a subtitle of ‘a case study of policy transfer’. The literature has expanded greatly since Rose’s pioneering text, including an ESRC programme (www.futuregovernance.ac.uk) with a further contribution by Rose. The editors appear to think that ‘Alan Deacon convincingly argues in Chapter 3 that sufficient congruity exists in Britain and the US to permit the exchange of policy ideas’ (p. 175). They discuss briefly in Chapter 1 ‘the limits to compatibility’ having noted that ‘the leap from Wisconsin to Ohio is shorter in cultural, political, and institutional distance than is the leap from Britain to Ohio or to any other American state’ (p. 2). They go on to claim that in spite of important differences there are commonalities between the US and the UK (p. 15). However, none of this begins to scratch the surface of the vast literature on policy transfer, path dependence and context that would provide the conceptual background for the book. The focus on vision may be a necessary but not sufficient condition for successful policy
transfer. The book provides interesting food for thought, but it simply provides a shopping list. With its neglect of policy transfer, it has not yet entered the kitchen, let alone started cooking.
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It is hoped that the limited interest in South Korea will not deter people from reading this splendid book. There are several reasons why this very lucid and well-organised book should be read:

- for the quality of its analysis of policy processes;
- because it strongly demonstrates the interactions between economic policies and social policies;
- because of the challenge it offers to simplistic globalist theory;
- because it demonstrates the way in which Korea (I will leave out the word South, as Dr Shin does), though obviously a late developer in social policy terms, is now developing robust policies of great potential.

The following will explore each of these in turn.

Dr Shin, in a splendidly lucid examination of relevant theories in Chapter 3, sets out a model for his analysis in which he suggests that policy explanation needs to make use of a flow model in which socio-economic structure and the national situation in relation to international markets are seen as influencing but not determining the behaviour of interest groups who operate to try to determine policy in specific institutional contexts. Then, when examining a sequence of policy processes over time, feedback from the resultant policy outputs are important for the earlier variables in that sequence. Hence in his narrative he takes us through recent Korean history as involving a sequence of periods in which the state moved from a situation in which it was the dominant actor in relationships with business, through a period when business (in the form of the influential conglomerate firms, the *Chaebols*) largely had the upper hand, on to the present times when a combination of pressure from the USA and the IMF upon Korea to open up its economy and democratisation has generated a new state-led form of corporatism in which both capital and labour are partners.

This leads to the second comment about the importance of the book. At each stage in the processes described above, Dr Shin explores the implications for social policy of different state approaches to the management of the economy. He argues that, in the early times an autocratic government committed to economic development had a ‘minimalist’ approach to social policy. Then concerns to support and legitimise development led to the development of a ‘residualist’ welfare system. This then evolved into an ‘enterprise-centred regulator welfare system’ and is now undergoing transition into an ‘institutional welfare system’.
As far a ‘globalism’ is concerned, the important events for Dr Shin’s account are the more recent ones. He describes how, in the years running up to the Asian economic crisis in 1997, the Korean government had been progressively trying to open up the Korean economy. The impact of the crisis in 1997 upon Korea was then, Shin argues, in some respects a consequence of this opening-up. He argues there was some substance in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) critique that internal weaknesses within Korea contributed to the country’s problems, but that much of this had to do with the opportunist behaviour of the *Chaebols* in response to the opening of Korea to foreign capital. Hence the IMF intervention enabled government to move more effectively to curb the power of the *Chaebols*. But the really interesting part of the Korean story is that in the aftermath of the crisis measures were taken not merely to strengthen ‘residual welfare’ in Korea, along lines the IMF recommended, but also to strengthen its ‘institutional welfare’ (moving towards universalism in its pension and health insurance systems), measures certainly not supported by the IMF. It was able to do this (a) because earlier policies had laid the foundations, (b) because the Korean economy had an underlying strength and (c) because the government required to implement the post-crisis measures was the first with a clearly democratic mandate. Hence paradoxically global economic pressures ushered in a tri-partite corporatist approach to policy making in Korea and an era of social policy advance. Here then is a case study that shows how a nation state exercised choice in the face of apparently irresistible global forces.

Dr Shin is very cautious about the prospects for social policy in Korea. Where others might want to proclaim a social policy ‘miracle’, he stresses that social policy progress is from very limited beginnings, and in an appendix he outlines continuing problems for the establishment of the social-insurance-based health and pension systems: difficulties in bringing in the self-employed whose incomes tend to be understated, problems about ending government raiding of funded savings, etc. Quoting Marshall he insists that social rights have not been established, inasmuch as both insurance schemes were established on the basis of contributions from employers and employees and not the government, and that the last named still only contributes limited amounts for certain special groups. However, the point is that solidarity across groups is now being established for health insurance whilst the pension scheme has always had a minimum entitlement built in, so that it is in effect redistributive.

The interesting thing about the contributory pension scheme is that it was developed initially precisely because it was seen as a way of generating savings for industry, with a slow build up of contributions. Dr Shin recognises then that such a scheme faces potential problems in the future, yet even these are being confronted by government (increasing the contribution rate, raising the pension age and lowering the income replacement rate). Looking at all this from a British perspective, the striking thing is that here is a robust and developing *state* pension scheme with distinct redistributive features. The government may not directly contribute to it, but it is better to have a fair and universal government guaranteed scheme than privatisation.

Dr Shin, like other Korean scholars, expresses doubt about the applicability of Esping-Andersen’s regime model to Korea, on the good grounds that it gives too little attention to institutions. But, while it is taking great liberties with the evidence he examines to make this suggestion, it seems to me that there are glimmerings here of the progress of Korea from nothing, through the ‘liberal’ model to the ‘corporatist’ and perhaps on to a social democratic ‘regime’. But above all what is important is that Korea has a government that, according to Dr Shin, has no doubt about its role as a supervisor and regulator of economic policy, the first requirement for being an effective innovator in social policy.

Michael Hill
University of Brighton
This book arises from a three-year EU-funded research project which set out to understand social exclusion from the perspective of those experiencing it, to identify their coping strategies, and to explore the interaction between those strategies and the operation of the welfare state. In-depth interviews with individuals at risk of social exclusion were carried out under the supervision of 20 researchers in eight cities in Austria, Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the UK.

The authors’ eschew the usual format of country reports plus comparative overview in favour of a thematic structure. Chapters 1−3 are based on theoretical papers prepared at the beginning of the research project and can be skipped without compromising the reader’s comprehension of the remainder of the book. Chapters 4 and 5 present the conceptual framework for analysis and interpretation of results. Chapters 6 and 7 explore the ways in which respondents described their experiences of social exclusion. The main bulk of the chapters, numbers 8−18, consider various aspects of exclusion: resources which may be lacking or which may be used to counter exclusion (such as the family, or social networks), and structural causes of exclusion (such as housing, or immigration policy). The final chapter draws together the main findings and sketches some policy implications.

The importance of the perspectives of the socially excluded is frequently acknowledged in other studies, but this book breaks new ground in accessing those perspectives and exploring them so thoroughly. A good balance is achieved in most empirical chapters between excerpts from interview notes, which give a glimpse of individual life stories, analysis of material from several interviews, and interpretation through the lens of the conceptual framework outlined in the earlier chapters. When this works well – as in the chapter on labour market participation, for example – it is a fascinating read.

A comparative study on this scale is an ambitious undertaking. Cross-national contrasts and similarities are exploited to the full in some chapters, while in others the references to data, other than those collected by the chapter authors themselves, are sparse. An appendix listing the main characteristics of the cities, and the names of the areas within each city in which fieldwork was carried out, would help readers to contextualise the comparisons being made. It may not be unreasonable to expect readers to know that Bologna is in Italy, and to know a little of its history, but locating Newton Aycliffe is more of a challenge, especially for an international audience, let alone knowing anything about its social and economic context.

The intensive qualitative approach adopted is entirely appropriate for the research objectives but it is frustrating to be given so little on methodology. For example, we are not told how the cities were selected (although we can guess that pragmatic reasons held sway), or how the areas within cities were selected (‘In general the areas chosen are disadvantaged parts of the cities, but nowhere the worst’ [p. 283]: what does this mean?). Most importantly, we have insufficient detail on how individual respondents were selected; we know only that ‘almost all’ research sites used ‘predominantly’ the ‘random walk’ [ibid]. This lack of information makes it difficult to assess the broader relevance of the findings.

The conceptual framework developed extends those already available in the literature and could profitably be applied in future research. Some chapters within the book make good use of it. The framework emphasises the role of individuals as active agents in their own exclusion or inclusion, and asserts the importance of psychological and cultural factors. However it also reserves a place for policy and politics, and the institutions they create. These combine to
provide a structure for analysis based on the availability of internal and external resources (for example, sense of belonging plus welfare entitlements), which are necessary to secure a various levels of participation in a range of activities (for example, subsistence or political expression).

There are many interesting findings but two in particular stand out. The first is the contrast between respondents who expressed indignation at an experience of social exclusion and those who accepted or even took for granted a similar experience. The analysis points to the importance of, firstly, a sense of belonging to the society in question and, secondly, the culture of expectation created by the institutional structure. International contrasts were particularly instructive here: native Swedes were much more likely to express indignation than Spaniards, for example, while immigrants in all countries were more often resonated to their disadvantaged circumstances. It is therefore crucial to recognise that there may be injustice even where this is not perceived by those on whom the injustice is perpetrated.

The second very significant finding is the complexity of coping strategies employed by those at risk of social exclusion, combining, for example, psychological adaptation, drawing on family and friends, seeking support from charitable organisations, and entrepreneurial activity (whether legal or otherwise). The formal welfare state is but one of the resources which may be accessed. An important implication is that welfare policy should be designed so as to complement these strategies, rather than undermine them, as is presently all too often the case.

TANIA BURCHARDT
London School of Economics
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This book brings together an impressive amount of research and information about the US non-profit sector. It is edited by Lester M. Salamon who is currently director of the Centre for Civil Society Studies at the Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I consists of one chapter by Salamon providing an overview of the challenges and opportunities facing the US non-profit institutions in the light of developments during the past 20 years. Part II presents findings from the major fields of non-profit activity in the USA, including health, education and training, social services, arts and culture, housing and community development, international assistance, religious congregations, civic participation and advocacy, infrastructure organisations, foundations and corporate philanthropy, and finally individual giving and volunteering. In Part III major challenges to the non-profit sector such as commercialisation, marketisation, accountability and public trust, and demographic and technological developments are discussed.

What is striking is the special character of the US non-profit sector. I will illustrate this by giving a few key figures from the book and then compare them with Scandinavian findings, which are the countries I know best (see Sivesind et al., 2002). We are told that a conservative estimate puts the total number of formal non-profit organisations at 1.2 million. As of 1998, these organisations employed close to 11 million paid workers, which is more than 7 per cent of the total US work force. In the case of Scandinavia the figure would be around 3–4 per cent. Thus, the US non-profit sector is larger in economic and employment terms. In relation to employment, another difference is the relationship between volunteering and paid employment. Whereas most employment is in paid labour in the US non-profit sector, the reverse is the case in Scandinavia. These differences are due to the historical
difference between the US non-profit sector, dominated by large professional organisations, such as hospitals, universities, and schools operating as service providers, and the Scandinavian voluntary sector, which is dominated by the social movements traditions and an obligation to volunteer.

Another important difference concerns the composition of the sector. Most of the non-profit employment in the USA is concentrated in the fields of health (43 per cent), education (22 per cent), and social services (18 per cent). Organisations that provide health services account for just over half of the revenues of the total US non-profit sector. Education and social services are also important non-profit fields in Scandinavia as measured by employment, but health is a relatively small field, whereas culture and professional organisations are relatively more important than in the USA. This is a clear indication of the importance of different welfare regimes for the role of the non-profit sector. The picture of the sector changes fundamentally, however, when volunteer employment is taken into consideration. Measured by paid and volunteer employment together, religion becomes the second largest non-profit field. Religious congregations are of major importance to the US society — about one-quarter of US adults attend a service at a religious congregation in any given week, and most of the more than 300,000 religious congregations in the US are voluntary membership organisations. In contrast culture, recreation, and advocacy are relatively more important in Scandinavia, as measured by volunteer involvement.

It may be surprising to learn that the US non-profit sector is heavily dependent upon financial support from government. But this is explained by the fact that governmental efforts to stimulate scientific advance and overcome poverty and ill health in the 1960s and 1970s relied heavily on non-profit organisations. The US non-profit sector is therefore much more vulnerable to budget cuts, which were experienced during the Reagan administration of the early 1980s, than say the Scandinavian non-profit sector whose revenue stream is very different. Here most revenue comes from fees and charges, especially membership dues. Although the welfare state is of utmost importance in the Scandinavian countries, voluntary organisations are relatively autonomous because of this revenue structure. According to conventional thinking and theories one would expect liberal welfare states to foster independent non-profit organisations, whereas strong social democratic welfare regimes would have a smaller, state-dependent non-profit sector. Empirical research, however, tells us a different story.

Thus, besides being an interesting empirical analysis of an important set of institutions, this comprehensive volume is also, and maybe in particular, of interest to non-US readers because it puts our own voluntary or non-profit sector into comparative perspective. We can learn a great deal about ourselves from this volume; and we can learn a great deal about the importance of the historical, political and economic context for the size, scope and role of the non-profit sector.

Part III (and Salamon’s chapter in part I) deals with what is depicted as future challenges of the US non-profit sector. These chapters are also of great value to non-US readers because some of the challenges are due to global changes, and some are due to neo-liberal changes in policies that are recognisable within the European political context as well.

The US non-profit sector faces fiscal challenges not only because of severe cutbacks under the Reagan administration that has only recently been overcome, but also because the form of public support has changed. It is explained that whereas earlier governments offered grants and contracts to non-profit organisations, it is now more common to channel aid to consumers rather than producers through the use of vouchers, tax expenditures and other forms of consumer subsidies. This forces non-profit organisations to compete for clients. This is especially clear within health care and social welfare services, such as day care and home health, where for-profit firms have become much more prominent. In both fields non-profit
organisations have lost market share to for-profit firms. A policy that favours the free choice of the consumer and emphasises price rather than quality represents a challenge to non-profit organisations and puts them in a position where they have to compete much more for resources. It might also force non-profits to market their services to a clientele that are able to afford them. Competition, in turn, leads to another challenge: non-profits have to perform and demonstrate their effectiveness. They have to increase their capacity for evaluation and accountability, with the risk that the measures most legitimate to the institutional environment will dominate. The new information technology also represents both risks and opportunities. It opens hitherto unknown ways to tap charitable contributions, mobilise constituents and citizens and connect to policy makers. But it also poses a threat because the ‘technological imperative’ will favour organisations with capital, capacity and competence to build websites, reach donors via mail, provide on-line services, etc.

Of utmost interest are the challenges to the legitimacy of non-profit organisations. It is reported that public trust in non-profits is declining because they have allegedly become overly professional and lost touch with those they serve, and because they have become a set of specialised interest groups who conspire with government to expand public expenditure needlessly. Adding to this are unrealistic expectations regarding the problem solution capacity of these organisations making them much more vulnerable when expectations are not met.

It is reported that the US non-profit sector in general has responded with resilience to these challenges, and has also been understood to take advantage of some of the opportunities that demographic shifts, greater visibility and resumed growth of social welfare spending have provided. Included in this response are sector trends such as marketing services to a clientele able to afford them, successful pursuit of public funds and creativity in raising charitable contributions, expanded involvement with business partners and a much stronger market culture in organisational practice, and development of a non-profit infrastructure to support and represent the sector. In other words, the non-profit industry has adapted to a changing environment and become more market orientated. This might work as a strategy in the short term, but it also brings risks that in a long term might change the fundamental organisational structure and the idea of a non-profit sector. Although the market culture is much stronger in the US we should pay attention to these trends. Scandinavian and European voluntary and non-profit organisations are not sacred institutions. We also increasingly experience voluntary organisations that regard their members as customers, and we also see a growing number of for-profit activities within fields traditionally dominated by voluntary organisations.

This is an important book. It is rich in information, well edited, and with a structure that allows the reader to select the fields and topics of special interest. It contains much more than I have been able to comment on, but since I am sure that it will occupy a central place in future research and policy discussions there should be plenty of opportunity to continue the debate.
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Christian agencies have a long tradition of contributing to social welfare in Britain. Statutory bodies are now the main providers of social services but the input of Christian agencies is not negligible. For example, in Yorkshire at present, 5,500 church social projects are used by 150,000 people.

In recent years, within urban regeneration the role of faith Communities — a term which indicates that socially active religious bodies now include Muslims, Sikhs, Hindus and other faiths as well as Christians — have come to the fore. The Labour government has identified them as organisations which do benefit deprived communities and appears eager to encourage their involvement. In response, the faith communities have indicated that they should receive more financial support from those who distribute regeneration funds.

In a timely study, five researchers (of differing religious outlooks) have examined the experiences of faith communities in areas of Bradford, Coventry, Newham and Sheffield. The main research tool consisted of semi-structured interviews with 95 regeneration officials and participants in faith projects. It would have been of interest if their resources had stretched to ask 95 residents, who were not directly involved, what they thought of the efforts of the faith communities.

The results are published in ‘Faith’ in Urban Regeneration?. The authors acknowledge that not all faith communities want to run social projects. Some inward-looking groups concentrate on spiritual not social regeneration and have almost a siege mentality towards outsiders. Yet, clearly, other faith communities believe they have a responsibility to serve their neighbourhoods. In regard to urban regeneration, they can bring three advantages.

First, they often possess premises. The authors comment, ‘In all of our study areas faith-related buildings constitute a significant proportion of the space available in the district for community use’ (p. 21). Second, members of faith communities are also often a part of other networks. They may be helpers at schools, users of sports clubs and helpful neighbours. In short, they bring skills, experience and local knowledge. Third, they are long term. Leaders of faith communities as well as members tend not to move on after three years. Over the years, they get to understand well the needs and resources of their areas.

Many faith communities have engaged with statutory bodies in order to increase their part in regeneration. However, the researchers found that often they were critical of and sometimes disillusioned with the system. They complained that the funding mechanisms were complex and time consuming. And, if they did receive grants, these were often less than seemed on offer. After an initial three years of financial help, the faith communities were sometimes left without further support yet they might have committed themselves to improving their buildings in line with the exacting standards set by statutory bodies. Some leaders considered that grants were geared to unrealistic targets, like reducing crime levels, which were beyond the scope of small, local agencies. The regeneration officials were seen as earning high salaries, while being geographically distant from the hard end and having inadequate knowledge of religious practices and local dynamics. The study did conclude that numbers of faith communities — in co-operation with statutory bodies — were having a positive impact on their areas. They added, ‘The close local involvement of faith communities, characterised, at its best, by careful listening to socially excluded people, offers a significant “grassroots” voice to inform and correct “top-down” policies’ (p. 42). In order to maximise the contribution of faith communities, the researchers recommend
that ‘regeneration professionals need to develop religious literacy’ (p. 43). Not least, they believe that the funding of such projects should take into account their long-term nature. This short investigation will be read with profit by regeneration officials and members of faith communities. As a Christian, I welcome the greater involvement of faith projects in urban regeneration. But I would not want the majority of Christians to concentrate their efforts just on specifically religious bodies. I have tended to work with secular welfare and community agencies with the understanding that objectives, like the promotion of greater equality and the building of a less-divisive society, are shared values between religious and non-religious people who strive for the regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods.

BOB HOLMAN
University of Glasgow
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Allsop and Saks have brought together an interesting collection of essays on the regulation of UK health professions. The ten essays are divided into ‘context’ (international perspective, current UK political debates and legal and ethical perspectives) and ‘case studies’ (the medical professions, nursing, dentistry, professions allied to medicine, clinical psychology and alternative medicine).

The editors identify four trends that have led to an interest in new forms of regulation. These are: decline in public trust of professionals (but no decline in demand for their services); government pressure on traditional professions to reform themselves alongside moves to extend professional standards to new groups in the workforce; questions about traditional the division of labour in healthcare as cross-professional training and flexible career paths are developed; and the internationalisation of professional standards to allow professional mobility (particularly within the European Union).

Almost as an afterthought, Allsop and Saks add in their introduction that these trends are ‘partly linked to a concern — common to governments throughout the developed world — to rationalise health care and obtain enhanced value for money’. In a collection of essays that is otherwise excellent in making links between theoretical and practical observations, this afterthought is a constant haunting presence. References to a ‘New Right’ agenda (pp. 2, 10, 42) simply do not do justice to the analyses of ‘new public management’ (McLaughlin et al., 2002) or ‘modernisation’ (Newman, 2001), or ‘managerialism’ (Exworthy and Halford, 1999) that are current in public administration and management research.

The editors, and to a lesser extent the contributors, take a ‘neo-Weberian’ approach to defining (and, by implication, understanding) the health professions. These are groups, licensed to practice by the state, that have successfully ‘drawn a boundary’ around their knowledge to create a monopoly defined by ‘certification and credentialism’. This monopoly is the result of a political bargain. It brings market control and the rights and responsibilities of self-regulation through ethical and disciplinary codes. Although (as functionalists would argue) there are social benefits from professionalisation (assumed quality control) the neo-Weberian view is that self-interest predominates.

Allsop and Saks note that the defining features of a health profession are not easily achieved. The case study chapters assess the ‘bargains’ set by a range of health professions. As Davies notes, professionalisation, ‘has been something of a poisoned chalice’ for nursing. Her essay
does not spell out, however, whether the questioned benefits of professionalisation are linked to the failure of nursing to achieve the same economic and social benefits as those enjoyed by some of the other health professions.

The authors of the different articles in this collection have different views on the future of the regulation of health professions. For the editors it is clear that the boundaries drawn around particular professional bodies of knowledge will alter as hierarchies are weakened, task boundaries change, and more practitioners transfer between professions. In an interesting juxtaposition they argue that, ‘for all the pressures to enhance the flexibility and accountability of professional groups, the editors believe that the future for the professions from a regulatory viewpoint remains relatively high’ (p. 11). The reason for their optimism is that governments benefit from the existence of neutral expertise (a potentially functionalist argument). Moran, on the other hand, argues that the future for professionalism in health care is ‘bleak’. Globalisation, technological development and cultural change all threaten those knowledge boundaries that mark out the professional. Even if nation states and regulatory institutions mediate these forces, the direction is clear. For Allsop and Saks, the future of regulation lies in embracing other stakeholders to find a point between self-regulation and state regulation. For Moran, ‘the decline of the traditional national world of medical hierarchies’ in the face of consumerism and globalisation, ‘may not be bad news after all’ (p. 29).

The ten essays in this collection may not be entirely consistent in either their theoretical approach, their views of the future of regulation of health care professions, or ambitious in their theorisation of health care work at the turn of the twenty-first century. They are, however, rich in their description of the histories and current positions of both regulation, and the different professional groups. Rob Baggott places the regulation of health care professionals in the context of the regulation of other professions and groups and tests the insights of five different approaches to regulation. David Price, assessing different legal approaches to the regulation of health professions stresses the importance of ‘patient safety’ and the development of a ‘learning culture’ in which patient safety will be aligned with cost-efficiency and equity. Julie Stone reviews the contents of professional codes of ethics from both legal and ethical-theory perspectives. She argues that ethics codes have to have practical as well as symbolic value if they are to be part of a strategy that includes taking action against unethical practitioners. Like the editors, she views the future of professional regulation in a partnership/stakeholder approach.

The case study essays provide opportunities to investigate the dynamic of regulation. The nation state changes, as do the professions. Even what constitutes ‘self-interest’ changes as nurses, alternative therapists, and even doctors respond to the redrawing of the boundaries between self-regulation, regulation by the state, and stakeholder regulation. Nicki Thorogood’s article on dentistry is particularly strong in identifying how changes are perceived by ‘male dentists of the old school’ as being a matter of ‘loss of control’, whilst others see the dentist in a multi-disciplinary care team as having more influence than as an isolated practitioner.

This is an interesting collection of essays, and certainly a useful one for anyone trying to understand the regulation of professionals in the changing world of UK health care. The neo-Weberian concept of a profession is a theme through the book. Sometimes implicitly, sometimes explicitly, there is another Weberian theme: bureaucracy.
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Since 1997, the Labour government’s health agenda has reflected an acceptance that health inequalities matter and that socio-economic factors play an important part in determining the health of individuals and communities. Health inequalities are thus seen as a legitimate target for broad government action, not just confined to the NHS or the Department of Health. This shift in official thinking is acknowledged and welcomed by both these publications. However, in their very different ways, they both go on to suggest that government action and the thinking behind it have not gone far enough.

_Tackling Health Inequalities Since the Acheson Inquiry_ takes, as its title suggests, the _Independent Inquiry into Inequalities in Health_, published in November 1998, as its starting point. Based on research funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the aim of this report is to assess progress in implementing the Inquiry’s recommendations. It does not set out to challenge these recommendations or their underlying assumptions (indeed, there is considerable overlap in membership between the original Inquiry and the research project’s advisory group), but considers the government’s response, both in terms of programmes and policies and in terms of mechanisms to ensure their implementation, monitoring and review. The research, which covered the period from April 2001 to November 2002, comprised an initial ‘mapping’ of policies designed to tackle health inequalities, followed by more detailed case studies of particular areas of policy making. Acknowledging how quickly such policy-specific research becomes dated, the report then considers some general themes that emerged and how progress, or lack of it, in certain areas might be explained. Finally, a series of recommendations suggest priorities for future policy making.

As would be expected from these authors, the report is clearly written, logically argued and persuasive. After a description of the policy context, the results of the ‘mapping’ exercise are briefly outlined, sometimes with a lack of detail that will frustrate the reader hoping for a picture of specific aspects, such as the reduction of inequalities related to ethnicity. However, the case studies provide more detail in three areas: tax and benefit reform, performance management and transport. They are well chosen: two contentious policy areas that are not traditionally associated with health inequalities, yet clearly have enormous relevance for health, plus discussion of the government mechanisms that have been introduced to set targets and measure achievements.

Exworthy _et al._ are generally optimistic and argue that substantial progress has been made in some areas. For example, there are a large number of diverse policy initiatives across a range of government departments, and there is evidence of increasing coherence in terms of their influence on and integration into ‘mainstream’ policies. However, while there have been attempts to introduce ways of monitoring and measuring progress, these still pose formidable challenges. Even output measures relating to specific initiatives such as Sure Start remain...
rudimentary. Outcome measures in terms of improved health require not only a (politically difficult) long-term perspective, but also the ability to disentangle the impact of specific policies from all the other factors that influence health inequalities. The report particularly notes the lack of progress in introducing the health impact assessments that Acheson recommended as important in ensuring that any new government policy does not inadvertently increase health inequalities. Policies on tax, trade, asylum seekers and war in Iraq all have health consequences that are likely to be unevenly experienced across the population. Perhaps unsurprisingly so far there seems little commitment to systematically taking these into account.

The broader critical perspective of the editors and contributors to Promoting Health suggests why governments may be wary of serious health impact assessments. This book too is concerned with policy implementation and with practice, though not with Acheson as its specific reference point. According to the back cover, it aims to be ‘an up-to-date and accessible introduction to current health promotion and public health developments in the UK’. The contributors, a mixture of health promotion practitioners, pressure group activists and academics, share a consistent perspective, clearly set out by the editors. The promotion of health, it is argued, is fundamentally a political matter, and the major threats to health in the ‘modern world’ are human conflict, environmental degradation, increasing political and material inequality within and between nations and (suddenly moving to the specific) the marketisation of public services. Consequently, the development of an effective public health movement must be very broad-based — particular emphasis is placed on the inclusion of environmentalists, anti-poverty strategists and campaigners for open government.

The arguments that improving health requires structural change at an international level are persuasive, but rather dispiriting for many who work or are training to work in the health promotion field — a major target audience for this book. However, many of the contributors aim to show that local action can make a real difference to local populations, and that it is possible to challenge the distribution of power and resources while working in specific government funded projects. The chapters are divided into themes: sustainable development, community development, inequality, regeneration and public services. Each starts with an overview, followed by discussions and accounts of particular aspects, or projects related to the theme. Although the message is consistent, the style and approach varies considerably. Descriptive accounts of projects across the country (but with Sheffield taking a prominent place) sit beside more analytical and theoretical discussions of the public health movement (or lack of it), user movements, anti-poverty strategies and sustainable development. The aim is to explore what can be done as well as what should be done, but the task of integrating these two is often left to the reader.

The authors of both these publications are first and foremost concerned to provide policy makers and practitioners with concrete and constructive suggestions for moving forward on a complex and potentially radical health agenda. Neither entirely neglects the academic debates over health inequalities and health promotion, but these are not their main concern. In the end, while acknowledging the challenges to be faced, they provide a refreshingly optimistic view of the feasibility of the prospects for a healthier world.
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These texts are two parts of a three volume set published in association with the production of an Open University undergraduate third-level course entitled *Managing Care* and need to be viewed within that context. The first (Henderson and Atkinson, eds., 2003) aims to provide a theoretical (social, political and managerial) context through which one can comprehend issues of management and managing in social care and is accordingly structured into three main parts: ‘Practice, Policy and Law’, ‘The Context of Care’, and ‘People in Social Care’. The second (Seden and Reynolds, eds., 2003), as its title suggests, focuses on the application of management to care settings, concentrating on the practice issues and tasks faced by social care practitioners dealing with an ever changing social care context. As such, this second volume concentrates on the context within which social care managers work – legal requirements, user involvement, performance management, competing values. Its structure is built around three main sections: ‘Managing with Knowledge and Vision’, ‘Managing Services for People’, and ‘Managing Learning and Development in the Team’. The third volume, not reviewed here, *The Managing Care Reader* (Reynolds et al., eds., 2003) provides an accompanying set of readings which contains more general management texts along with chapters that tackle contemporary challenges faced by managers of care services.

Both texts, along with *The Managing Care Reader*, will be of most value to undergraduate social work and health and social care students, not least those students undertaking newly introduced Degrees in Social Work. The texts are of less obvious immediate use to general social policy students but will be of interest to those students taking social care, public policy and public management modules. Generally the two texts are well written and structured, contain useful ‘key points’ summaries, and include comprehensive reference lists (with a useful indication of in which chapter the reference is made). Overall, the editorial teams are to be congratulated for presenting the material with ‘one voice’ – despite both texts being produced by many writers.

*Managing Care in Context* is probably the more useful volume to social policy students, particularly with its coverage of user involvement (Chapter 2), managerialism (Chapter 3), professional identity (Chapter 8). However, all chapters, perhaps by necessity, tend to be on the brief side. It is always a difficult task to cover both breadth and depth and the editorial team would seem to have chosen to concentrate on the former. By way of example, in a chapter entitled ‘Theories for Understanding People’ (Chapter 9), sections on ‘culture’, ‘time’ and ‘environment’, followed by a section on ‘organisations and people as systems’ are all dealt with within some five pages (pp. 221–225). As stated above, this is perhaps an inevitable consequence of producing this type of general text. However, the impact of this difficulty could have been reduced by clearer references to the appropriate supporting chapter(s) in *The Managing Care Reader* (Reynolds et al., eds., 2003), for example Chapter 31 – ‘Social work management: a systems case study’ (pp. 265–268).

*Managing Care in Practice* is less immediately relevant to general social policy students, with its emphasis on the application of management. Even so, this text also provides useful insights for academics as well as students into the impact of the new managerialist agenda of
the New Right and New Labour’s modernisation proposals for social and health care workers, not least the challenges faced by emphases on leadership (Chapter 3), evidenced-based practice (Chapter 5), partnership working (Chapter 6); along with more general managerial tasks, for example, managing change (Chapter 4) and managing staff development (Chapter 12). However, it frequently reads as a ‘how to . . .’ text with less criticality on the whole managerialist paradigm than members of the social policy community might expect, though again this can be found in The Managing Care Reader (Reynolds et al., eds., 2003), for example Chapter 23 – ‘Doing the right thing? Managerialism and social welfare’.

Perhaps it is what is provided in the accompanying third volume, The Managing Care Reader (Reynolds et al., eds., 2003), that will be of most interest to the social policy community, in that this volume presents a series of deeper considerations of the task of managing social and health care, for example: managerialism (Chapter 23) and professionalism (Chapter 24), collaboration and partnership working (Chapters 27 and 28), the role of service users and citizens in shaping services (Chapter 3), consultation (Chapter 4), reflections on the modernising agenda (Chapter 13), or, care and dependency/independence (Chapter 17).

Overall, though, when considering the three volumes in their entirety, the editorial teams are to be congratulated for producing a coherent set of texts that focus on the managerial challenges faced in providing social and health care services which both social and health care practitioners, as well as social policy students, academics and practitioners more generally, will find illuminating.
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Robinson et al.’s contribution to the pressing debate about immigration and the internal accommodation of asylum seekers and refugees claims to be ‘the first systematic study on UK dispersal policies’. Whether it is or isn’t does not detract from its invaluable input into the growing volume of literature about immigration and social policy. This book is definitely a frontrunner as it sets out to dispel widespread myths fuelled by the media’s hype about ‘the burden’ of settling and integrating refugees. The authors offer a sophisticated analysis of ‘the problem of dispersal’ expressed in a clear and accessible language and with a persuasive argumentation that helps to discern logic from media and politicians’ misrepresentations (p. 174) on this highly emotional political issue.

The book is the product of a project funded by the European Commission Directorate General (DG V) Home and Justice, and complements cross-national research by the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) Integration Task Force, whereby a systematic comparison of national models of reception establishes key axes of integration and is conducive
to the identification of best practices. ECRE’s methodological approach is here replicated to analyse the dispersal policies of three European countries, namely the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK, and to suggest a number of ‘desiderata for their success’ (p. 150). The sampling of these three countries is not explained to the reader, but each contributor is an authoritative voice and a national expert on the geography of human dispersal in his home country (respectively Musterd for the Netherlands, Anderson for Sweden and Robinson for the UK). Contrary to the ECRE project and its transferral of good practices from national to supranational level, this research has been admittedly run on a smaller scale in order to analyse the impact of dispersal policies on a specific locality and, thus, detect potential geographical variations. These are, in turn, dependant on historical and demographical specificities.

This spatially based approach is consistently maintained throughout the book. Each contributor presents an account of the ways and motivations that compel his government to introduce policies to disperse asylum seekers and refugees, and describes the mechanisms employed to achieve this dispersal. In reviewing national policies, the argument of the book gathers evidence of successful settlement and ‘distils’ its crucial elements and principles of efficiency and effectiveness in the sixth chapter (p. 150). It finally sets out to redefine dispersal, not as a problem stemming from refugee settlement, but as problem constructed out of fear of the indigenous community losing ‘the purity of space’ (p. 159).

Robinson’s analysis of media and political reaction reveals how these two actors have framed the phenomenon of refugee clustering as both a problem and a threat to the indigenous community and explains how dispersal has been invoked as a suitable solution. He describes spatial concentration of asylum seekers and refugees as concomitant to the concentration of service provision and its economic costs on a number of local authorities and, thus, immediately recognises the interdependence of social, economic and political factors. In Robinson’s analysis, low tolerance towards asylum seekers and refugees and public complaints about their settlement ensue from this onus on local authorities. This legitimises the latter to lead their campaign for ‘burden sharing’, hence dispersal.

The initial and final question posed by Robinson is simple and straightforward: How did the concentration of asylum seekers and refugees in certain European cities come to be seen as a problem? And how could this be reframed in an unproblematic way in order to ensure that policies will be based on evidence and experience? The main tenet of the book is, in fact, that the current dispersal policies are ineffective and driven both by moral panic and by a desire to ‘appease a fearful white electorate’. Robinson calls for a major rethink of government polices for practical and moral reasons. Firstly, Robinson demonstrates how dispersal turns out to be more costly than ‘clustering’ (grouping of asylum seekers and refugees in a number of areas) because the former requires a capillary provision of service throughout the territory. Secondly, Robinson points out that forced settlement infringes on refugees’ basic human rights, such as choice of residence, congregation with co-ethnics and the possibility to build a self-supporting community.

Strong in his belief that the British government has been forced to abandon conviction-based for evidence-based policies, Robinson closes this book by pointing towards areas of improvement for the current dispersal policies and suggests a better way to re-conceptualise the whole approach of refugees’ and asylum seekers’ settlement. The ‘burden’ is finally shifted on to the government to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its policies by changing their underlying rationale. In this the book definitely provides a starting point for an informed debate.

Silvia Mussano
University of Ulster
Through reading this book, a great deal can be learnt about young people today and also about the most widespread kind of homelessness, usually called ‘hidden homelessness’. The author spent a year living with 16–19 year olds in a typical town in the South of England as they moved between a voluntary sector youth homelessness hostel and surrounding ‘grotty bedsits’. This book gives an understanding both of youth and of homelessness which I have not seen before. Through the ethnography, the reader can feel the way of life — the endless boredom, the gossip, and the huge attraction of public events like an arrest or a police raid. The cups of coffee, the rolled cigarettes, the cannabis, the cans of beer are presented as part of this tedium, rather than as a ‘youth problem’. Through individual accounts, the reader is shown the interconnectedness of employment (or unemployment), benefits, housing options and offending — from petty shoplifting to brandishing a knife in public. The ‘getting by’, the constant movement in accommodation and in relationships are well illustrated and explained. This ‘ordinariness’ contrasts markedly with the drama and pathology, which is so often featured in journalistic, or agency accounts of homelessness.

This is extremely skilful ethnography — apparently simple and effortless — so that this not overlong book can be read from cover to cover without a stop. Referencing, most often to social anthropology, is kept to a minimum. Stories of young people, whom the reader gets to know, are interspersed by light and careful comment and theories are not dealt with until three-quarters of the way through the book. In this way, the reader understands, questions and concludes from what he/she has learnt through the stories. The author touches on ideas of culture, subculture, ‘underclass’, age and transition. This material could be used to illustrate social exclusion, but such models do not structure the text. This ethnographic style allows readers – students, practitioners or managers – to think for themselves.

Nevertheless, a main theme of the book is the suggestion that this type of homelessness has become part of what it is like to be a 16–19 year old, albeit a disadvantaged one. Leaving home, the constant movement in accommodation and relationships, the dissent expressed in crime, and socializing in public places are what it is like to be this age — no longer a child, but not yet an adult. By the age of 20, young people speak of ‘slowing down’. They have grown out of this way of life. As young people grow up, they move away and new names appear on the whiteboard of the hostel. Young people are endlessly recruited into ‘homelessness’. Such an interpretation of youth homelessness has implications for policy.

The author has an impeccable background in ethnography. His work is careful and thought provoking. He is an author to watch.
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This is a Report of a study of the resettlement of 64 older homeless people (four of whom were women) in London, Leeds and Sheffield. They were moved to a range of accommodation — to
independent flats, sheltered flats, shared houses and registered care homes. After 24 months, 67 per cent were still housed. These older people (aged 50 years and over) came from varied backgrounds. We are told that 22 per cent had been homeless for more than ten years, 33 per cent were heavy drinkers and that 22 per cent had both alcohol and mental health problems.

Older homelessness is a new area of study, pioneered by the authors. The Report adds to this knowledge and is relevant to the wider study of older people’s housing. There are relatively few resettlement follow-up studies covering this length of time and this Report fills gaps both in the analysis of outcomes and the evaluation of support in housing. Whilst this Publication has a standard report format, which makes it clear reading for students, it necessarily lacks the broader context and bibliographic background that a book might have.

The authors used chi-squared tests to identify the most significant diagnostic features for successful resettlement. They conclude that possessing a stable life prior to homelessness and being able to build up social networks and purposeful activity after being resettled were the two important features. Previous instability and social isolation were linked with failed tenancies but, interestingly, drink and mental health problems were not. In view of these findings, the authors recommend accurate assessment before rehousing, time for the agency to get to know the homeless person and extra support in the early days.

Other factors mentioned, but not included in the multi-variate analysis, were problems over Housing Benefit payments, delay in community grants and demands for Council Tax or utility bills for the previous tenant. These demands, sometimes threatening, caused extreme anxiety and on occasion the tenancy was abandoned. There is a danger, particularly when researchers ask personal questions, that outcomes in homelessness are seen as personal achievements or failures rather than quite simple failures in services to a disadvantaged group. However, the strength and interest of this Report is that, from the clear material presented, the reader can draw his/her own conclusions.

SUSAN HUTSON
University of Glasgow

DOI: 10.1017/S0047279403347282

Permanent rehousing is a crucial issue for women experiencing domestic violence, perhaps the crucial need in terms of establishing long-term safety. The Homeless Persons legislation of 1977 established the link in Britain between domestic violence and the need for housing, giving those experiencing violence a right to permanent housing through the local authority. Of course, in 1977, local authorities had ownership and control of a very significant portion of the housing stock: their role in re-housing women experiencing violence was central. But at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the role of local authorities and their housing resources, have changed in crucial respects. With council house sales and new public management, local authorities are more likely to be seen as enabling rather than providing. The developing role of housing associations as providers is therefore an issue of key importance to women experiencing domestic violence.

This is therefore a timely book about housing associations, their relationship to local authorities, and their provision of housing to women experiencing violence. Can local
authorities enable access to housing, when much of the housing stock is not in their ownership? How much control do they have over the policies at street-level? How well do legislation about homelessness, codes of guidance, local authority policy about domestic violence reach through to the ever-more-pressured workers at the housing association desks?

The evidence collected here is about three housing associations in one authority, and about the experience of a small sample of women who had been re-housed through the housing associations. The study uses interviews with policy makers, and those experiencing policy as workers and as users. It is a small-scale study, but it adds significantly to our knowledge of the way that the housing system is developing to meet the needs of women experiencing violence. The study was undertaken in the context of the 1996 Housing Act, which severed the link between homelessness and the right to re-housing – or rather, attempted to sever the link. This legislation has now itself been amended and there is now a Homelessness Act (2002). The book captures these diverse legislative and policy developments, giving a very useful account of the diversifying trends of privatisation, new public management, and consumerism, and keeping us up-to-date with the responses of New Labour to the 1996 Housing Act.

One of the key themes of the book is that the legislative changes may be more appearance than reality. The local authority at the centre of the study by-passed the 1996 Act, making as few changes on the ground as it could. Its policy continued to prioritise the needs of homeless people, including women experiencing domestic violence, and effectively retained the link that Conservative policy was trying to break between homelessness and permanent re-housing. But this story of continuity in the face of central government initiatives is less positive for women experiencing violence when it shows housing association workers at arms length from the domestic violence policy of their local authority and, indeed, the revised legislation and its code of guidance. The study shows the housing association front-line workers under pressure from contradictory targets – to maintain income, work quickly, reduce voids – finding it difficult to give time or priority to women who needed it. The study also finds some housing association staff poorly trained in domestic violence and in operating policies to distinguish the deserving from the undeserving. It also finds loose connections between the local authority and the housing association staff, so that homeless people prioritised by the authority did not necessarily become priorities to the housing associations: ‘how assessment and allocation decisions were made in the associations in this study worked in ways that were largely independent of the local authority. Although the authority might be considered as an “enabler” it had no influence over the ways in which these decisions were made’ (pp. 120–121). Attitudes to women experiencing violence ranged from ‘sympathetic to hostile’ depending in part on ‘the suspicions staff might have personally about women inventing violence to gain priority for housing. Each housing association had developed its own approach’ (p. 121).

A small number of women who had been re-housed were interviewed for this study, and it is able, through them, to take a longer-term view of the experience of reaching permanent accommodation than research based in refuges. The respondents were often critical of the process, the speed with which they had to make decisions, and the attitude of some staff. But – for those who got over the hurdles, and despite continuing fears about being traced – most were pleased with the quality of the housing, and with the ability to make a new start, away from a violent partner.

The study is clearly presented and useful for students of the development of policy in practice in housing and domestic violence, and for people working in these areas.

GILLIAN PASCALL
University of Nottingham
Stuart Waiton’s *Scared of the Kids?* is an accessible and critical account of the over-regulation of young people in contemporary British society. He combines his work experience at the coalface with empirical research to provide an engaging and lively debate about the politics, policies and practices of youth crime prevention.

Waiton pulls no punches in his criticism of New Labour’s anti-social behaviour agenda that seeks to increase the regulation of young people within cultures of intolerance and exaggerated fear. He calls for a socially inclusive youth policy that addresses the social disadvantage and dislocation of many young people rather than a punitive position of criminalisation.

The argument of the book is based on interviews with young people and discussions with parents and professionals. The book does not provide a detailed methodology and the reader is left wondering why the various research approaches were deployed. That said, the book integrates developments in criminal justice policies and practices with community and expert attitudes to provide a text enriched with facts and figures about contemporary youth justice.

There are chapters on zero tolerance that question the rationale of paramilitary styles of policing that emanate from the USA, in particular their application in British society during periods of statistical declines in youth crime. Such policing, Waiton argues, are unnecessary and exacerbate community fear while further marginalising young people. The second chapter focuses on developments in crime prevention with a discussion of multi-agency initiatives, legislative developments, and the public’s growing fear of children. Here Waiton argues that we are witnessing a growing authoritarian ascendancy in contemporary Britain, where the cultures of young people are explained within a politics of intolerance.

Chapters 3–5 deal with curfew orders in Hamilton, notably an area where the author has considerable knowledge and work experience. These chapters are clearly the book’s strongest. Here the book provides an informative account of issues pertaining to the development and operation of the curfew and the ways in which this order has not only impacted upon the lives of children and their families, but also upon professionals and the community at large.

Chapter 6 raises various themes for discussion, including notions of power, culture, risk and regulation in an attempt to contextualise the proceeding empirical evidence within categories for analysis. Chapter 7 captures the voices of adults, and, while it seems rather out of place in the structure of the book, it provides some fascinating insights into the dynamics between adults, youth cultures and contemporary juvenile justice practices. Chapters 8 and 9 provide a summary and recommendations. The recommendations could be criticised for being a little idealistic and they are presented as bold statements rather than comprehensively argued proposals. However, they do offer a way forward.

Overall, the book makes a very useful contribution to contemporary debates about youth crime and anti-social behaviour. Moreover, it provides an excellent example of many of the problems associated with youth curfew orders. My major criticism of the book is its lack of theoretical rigour. Perhaps the intention was not to provide a theoretically in-depth analysis but to simply present the facts and discuss them. I think the book provides a starting point from which the author must go to the next level. There are numerous theoretical inroads that this book could explore, including discourses on risk, governmentality, penal populism, political economy and in particular — cultural criminology.

Finally, I found Waiton’s writing style often dogmatic and somewhat dismissive. Too often the book raises issues that are dealt with briefly and sometimes flippantly (for example, criminological contributions, political policies, the role of the media, criminal statistics, notions
of governance). However, what is clear from Stuart Waiton’s style is that he is not afraid to state his position and he does so forcibly and with obvious passion.

Essentially, the book’s message is a good one and will hopefully provoke reaction. I would certainly recommend it for students, practitioners and policy makers in the fields of juvenile justice or those working with young people.

REECE WALTERS
University of Stirling