Going Full Circle?: Integrating Provision for Young People in the Connexions Service

Kepa Artaraz

Lecturer in Social Policy, School of Applied Social Science, Mayfield House, Room 256, University of Brighton, Falmer Campus, Falmer BN1 9PH
E-mail: k.artaraz@bton.ac.uk

Welfare initiatives introduced by New Labour have emphasised the integration of service provision by sponsoring the creation of new professional roles and by promoting closer interagency links. The Connexions service exemplifies these two levels of integration. This article argues that the process of integration in Connexions was limited and it offers two main types of explanations. The first set concentrates on the changes brought to the professional role of Connexions workers. The second uses the example provided by interagency links between schools and the Connexions service in order to explore the role played by power relations to explain limitations to integration. The article concludes with a consideration of some of the effects brought about by Youth Matters and by the introduction of Children's Trusts on the provision of services for young people in the future.

Introduction

In the UK, the arrival of New Labour to power in the late 1990s brought a renewed sense of purpose in trying to tackle poverty and social exclusion. Part of the problem preventing the effective provision of services, it was argued, was that professional and service boundaries failed to take account of the interconnected nature of many of the issues (unemployment, poor housing, low educational levels) that keep significant sectors of society locked in a spiral of poverty and marginalisation (SEU, 2004). In the biggest welfare revolution of a generation for children, families and young people, the government's policy response to the new awareness of social exclusion saw the introduction of a series of complex and multi-layered initiatives with common objectives for bringing excluded sections of society into the mainstream through the seamless provision of services. Age-specific initiatives such as Sure Start, the Children's Fund and Connexions, all share this common purpose.

Connexions is a support service for young people that helps them prepare for adult life. It provides confidential advice and information on a range of issues, including education and training, careers, health and personal development (DfEE, 2000a). The service operates through a network of personal advisers (PAs) drawn from a wide range of professional backgrounds, with particular skills in the delivery of services for young people. The intention is to provide services that are based on a holistic understanding of the range of needs young people have in their transition into adulthood. PAs are located in a range of settings, including education (schools and colleges), training, Connexions one-stop shops, and in a variety of outreach services and centres to bring together the youth service, education, the careers service, youth offending teams and the voluntary sector (Coles, 2003). The expectation was that higher levels of coordination and integration of

services would lead to better service user experiences and positive outcomes. Yet, the publication of *Youth Matters* in July 2005 restated some of the original criticisms against youth support services such as the lack of integration and coordination of services and proposes new reforms for Connexions (DfES, 2005, 2006).

This article examines some of the issues that have affected the ability of the Connexions service to fulfil its mission with particular reference to the provision of services for young people in education. The article proposes that the Connexions strategy was originally conceptualised with two forms of integration in mind that have only marginally prospered. The first form of integration was based on the idea of creating a new professional who incorporated the generic skills common to a range of specialists in all areas of support for young people. It was envisaged that this 'generic' PA would be fundamental to a service built on the understanding that the mentoring and guidance needed to effect behavioural changes in young people required a strong professional relationship between PAs and young people (Coles *et al.*, 2004; DfEE, 2000b). The second form of integration was aimed at facilitating the process of partnership between Connexions and other agencies, to prevent young people from losing contact with professional support networks and to provide better all-round cumulative outcomes (SEU, 1999). In other words, the policy conceptualisation of the new service was based on the integration of roles into a new professional form and on the creation of tighter interagency links.

The limited success of the Connexions service to deliver on these forms of integrated service provision has key policy implications because the introduction of the principle of partnerships and service integration has been one of the cornerstones in New Labour's reforms in the delivery of welfare services (Balloch and Taylor, 2001; Powell and Dowling, 2006). This includes the creation of 'generic', all-purpose practitioners, a characteristic also discussed in the literature in relation to other major policies like the Children's Fund and Sure Start (NECF, 2004). The literature has considered the importance of team-work as well as interprofessional work (Leathard, 2003; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Molyneux, 2001). Other research has also explored the processes by which partnerships learn and evolve through time (Hart and Fletcher, 1999). What is less well understood is the result of service attempts to create new professional roles on the one hand, and the effects of individual services' delivery objectives and power in the working practices of interagency teams on the other, although this issue has been explored in some depth in the case of different types of partnerships (Glendinning and Coleman, 2003; Glendinning *et al.*, 2005; Peck *et al.*, 2002; Powell and Dowling, 2006; Poxton, 1999).

What follows is an analysis of the experience of Connexions in educational settings since its national rollout began in 2001. The article draws substantially on research conducted as part of a national evaluation of the Connexions service for young people at risk, which included fieldwork in educational settings and interviews with hundreds of young people and professionals. The study, conducted over a period of two years, aimed to understand the nature of the impact that the service had on young people with varying needs as well as the process by which positive changes took place in young people's lives. The fieldwork for the study took place in seven Connexions regional partnerships in as many parts of the country (Hoggarth and Smith, 2004).

The article begins by putting into context the Connexions strategy and the type of provision it was expected to deliver in mainstream educational settings. After that, the article explores two areas that can help explain the limited success that the translation of that strategy in the form of the Connexions service has had in fulfilling its promise in

these settings. The first is the issue of professional resistance to the proposed generic PA role. Secondly, the article concentrates on ways in which the power relations between educational establishments and the Connexions service have shaped the provision Connexions has been able to make. The article concludes with an assessment of the effect that the introduction of Children's Trusts in the context of the publication of *Youth Matters* is likely to bring to the provision of Connexions services for young people in schools.

The Connexions service: a holistic policy response to young people's needs?

The creation of the Connexions service followed the increasing governmental awareness in the 1990s that growing numbers of young people were failing to engage with any form of employment, education or training after compulsory education (DfEE, 2000a). The Social Exclusion Unit (SEU), set up in 1997, responded to the high political visibility of the link between poor educational achievement and poverty in later life. Indeed, social exclusion was defined as 'a shorthand term for what can happen when people and the communities in which they live suffer from a combination of linked problems, such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, unfair discrimination, poor housing, bad health, and family breakdown' (SEU, 2004: 2). The policy response to the holistic understanding of social exclusion came partly in the form of the Connexions service, announced in 1999 in the report *Bridging the Gap*, which explored multiple forms of social and economic disadvantage (SEU, 1999; Britton *et al.*, 2002).

For SEU, the issue of turning around the lives of young people required much more than simple advice about employment and educational opportunities open to them. It required a sustained effort to understand the all too often interrelated needs presented by young people and helping them make the right life choices in their transition to adulthood (SEU, 1999). In other words, Connexions was created to provide a holistic response to the interconnected range of social needs through advice, guidance and support, to help young people overcome barriers to learning and work and achieve a successful transition from their teenage years into adult life (Walker and Walker, 1997; CYPU, 2001). The result was a comprehensive service that could offer a universal minimum of provision for all young people but which was nonetheless able to respond to the needs of each individual and prioritise accordingly (Grove and Giraud-Saunders, 2003). In particular, the service focussed on those young people presenting the most complex needs, including those who were not in employment, education or training (NEET).

Since the Connexions service was created to support young people aged 13–19, it found a natural home in schools and colleges (DfEE, 2000a; Garrett, 2002). The service was provided by PAs able to assess the needs of young people, provide or broker the necessary interventions to deal with those needs, and review the progress made throughout the period of contact. For example, the PA deals with information, advice and guidance (IAG) needs, including post-16 learning and career choices. The service is also equipped to deal with more complex needs, making Connexions PAs a single point of contact and continuity in the young person's progress into adulthood (Ainley *et al.*, 2002; Coles, 2003: 95; DfEE, 2000b,c). The holistic conceptualisation of young people that was the driving force in the theoretical design of the Connexions service implied that meeting the needs of young people would require professionals from a variety of backgrounds

to supplement the skill base of the existing majority of Connexions PAs who had been transferred from the careers service.

Although an aggressive drive to recruit youth and social workers, teachers and staff from other youth-related professions took place, the single most important professional body in the new service came from the careers service. This is because, in effect, Connexions had absorbed the former careers service (Peck, 2004; Watts, 2001b). The new remit of Connexions had enormous implications for the professional role of careers advisers inside the new service and for their subsequent identity. Indeed, the creation of a single, generic PA was initially driven by an expectation that the different professional groups working as part of Connexions would merge into a single professional form (DfEE, 2000b). However, the professional response to this expectation has been characterised by different forms of resistance, an issue explored later on. In the meantime, the article outlines the ways in which it was envisaged that interagency partnerships between Connexions and the education sector would operate.

Connexions and education: the ideal model

The way the Connexions service was to be deployed in schools was not entirely clear and the guidance from DfEE – and later DfES – was not particularly detailed for some time. Instead, the ministry issued documentation that described the main objectives of the service. Thus, the specifics of rolling out the new service in schools and colleges depended largely on local management arrangements between individual institutions and their local Connexions service (Hoggarth and Smith, 2004). For policy makers, Connexions was to support school and colleges through the contribution of personal advisers in order to:

- provide all young people with the help and support they needed to make progress to further stages in education, work and adult life;
- offer information, advice and guidance on learning and career options as well as access to broader personal development opportunities;
- raise aspirations and motivation to retain students and promote achievements;
- identify and address potential problems before they became major barriers to learning and entry to work;
- help young people overcome barriers to participation in learning and work.

(DfES, 2001: 5.)

It was not until a year later that the DfES explained the way in which Connexions was expected to meet the original objectives by building on existing pastoral systems and curriculum provision in schools and colleges. At this point, it was established that 'Connexions will not duplicate or take over where they [school and colleges] already provide effective support, but enhance such support' (CSNU, 2002: 6). This point is important because it draws attention to policy design attempts to make the new service work as part of an integrated interagency team of professionals, adapting itself to fit the needs of young people and to the existing support systems in educational institutions. Furthermore, the same guidance document established that Connexions would be ideally placed to act as the link between support systems inside and outside of the school or college. These support systems included employers and the voluntary and community sector outside schools, but also personal tutors, counselors, Special Education Needs Coordinators (SENCO) and welfare officers inside the school (CSNU, 2002: 11).

176

However, two years later and three after the introduction of the service, a survey conducted by the National Audit Office found that the majority of staff in two-thirds of schools did not fully understand the role of Connexions PAs (DfES, 2004). Further, the document argued that 'the level of success for Connexions depends on the extent to which schools cooperate with Connexions to coordinate support mechanisms for young people' (DfES, 2004: 10).

This statement questions very much the extent to which the Connexions objective of ending the fragmentation of services for 13 to 19 year olds and acting as the 'bonding' element of support systems inside and outside schools was being achieved. If the majority of staff in schools did not fully understand the role of PAs, what went so wrong? What are the issues that limited the ability of Connexions and schools to create the interprofessional care arrangements for those young people who need the service the most by virtue of their mounting and multiple barriers to learning? Some answers to this question are obvious. For one, staffing and resource levels in Connexions were always inadequate to provide the service that was being proposed and to date the service operates with only about half of the originally proposed number of PAs (Hughes, 2005). What follows explores some of the limitations inherent to the two aspects of service integration that were contained in the original design of Connexions.

Limitations to integrated care: contested professional identities in Connexions

The creation of the Connexions service had locked within it a professional body, the careers adviser, with its own specialist knowledge and expertise. In addition to this, the new service embodied a radically new conceptualisation of youth transitions that emphasised the interdependence of the many factors that can act as barriers to learning, employment and successfully reaching adulthood (Catan, 2004). The new Connexions service promoted a 'social' and holistic understanding of youth transitions as opposed to a view that had traditionally concentrated on knowledge about, and the provision of, information on learning opportunities and the labour market. Thus, the understanding of transitions into adulthood embodied in the original Connexions strategy contained an implicit criticism of the limited approach of the service traditionally provided in schools. In addition, research into the ways in which young people make career choices has debunked the technically rational view of decision making that assumes total freedom of choice and a separation between the decision-making process and the cultural contextual factors that inform all decisions (Hodkinson *et al*., 1996; Hodkinson, 1998).

The arrival of the Connexions service was meant to transform all that because it operated under radically different premises. The new service portrayed itself as a support mechanism that could offer a universal service that was appropriate to the level of need presented by young people and was informed instead by a renewed political preoccupation with poverty and social exclusion. Careers advice was still on the agenda but within a context of support to remove barriers for progression in young people, providing a holistic form of support according to need (CYPU, 2001). As a result, the service required a new type of professional that could encompass a wider set of skills and knowledge to take account of all needs presented by young people and prioritise accordingly. The new professional based on the figure of the PA would emerge from the amalgamation of professionals from different backgrounds with a range of types of

expertise in working and engaging with young people (DfEE, 2000b). This expectation was reinforced by the introduction of a Connexions service-specific form of training, the PA diploma, to help workers develop an understanding of the Connexions strategy and the principle of inter-agency working. The PA diploma included units of study covering all the key aspects of the role such as engaging effectively, seeking to effect positive changes in young people, developing ways of working with other agencies, and reflecting on professional practice (Garrett, 2002). However, although an active recruitment drive attracted new professional groups into Connexions, careers advisers continued to be the most prominent professional body inside the new service.

A number of arguments put by critics of Connexions have aimed to defend the careers profession's traditional image and identity. Firstly, it was argued that by being 'absorbed' into Connexions, the careers service had become linked to young people aged 13–19 rather than to the subject of careers needs of people regardless of age (Peck, 2004: 95). Secondly, it was considered that careers practitioners had become locked into a service that had moved beyond what they considered to be their area of competence and expertise because it prioritised young people with multiple needs rather than those in the mainstream who required access to piecemeal information, advice and guidance (Watts, 2001b). This was further compounded by claims that newcomers to the service without the relevant professional qualifications might be expected to offer careers advice from within Connexions, colonising professional territory beyond their expertise. Thirdly, the creation of the Connexions service was seen as part of a wider agenda to transfer some of the responsibilities for providing IAG to schools, within the new curriculum of citizenship and personal and social education. The warning here was that transferring responsibility for the provision of IAG to schools would break the traditionally upheld principle of impartiality in the advice the careers service provided to young people (Watts, 2001a). To make matters worse, the argument followed, the principle of universal entitlement to careers guidance that the previous service provided was now under risk because Connexions prioritised provision for those most in need, effectively 'neglecting' mainstream young people (Morris *et al.*, 2001).

Yet, the reality of the Connexions service appears to have been rather different. First hand experience gained as part of the national evaluation of the impact of Connexions on young people at risk appeared to show that little had changed in the everyday practice of those PAs within Connexions who still identified with the careers service (Hoggarth and Smith, 2004). The overwhelming majority of them based in educational settings still spoke of themselves as careers advisers rather than Connexions PAs. Basic provision still consisted of information about learning and career paths, rather than the holistic support package Connexions was meant to be. This is supported by the image of Connexions among young people who overwhelmingly considered it to be only about jobs and training (Hoggarth and Smith, 2004).

Thus, there is little evidence that the Connexions service has managed to fuse the diverse professional roles in its midst into a single, generic form. The holistic agenda envisaged by the Connexions strategy never really became a reality and has now been dropped in current policy announcements (DfES, 2005). In fact, individual Connexions partnerships always maintained a separation of roles between personal advisers in education and personal advisers in the community. More often than not, the former were represented by ex-careers advisers, whereas the latter were constituted by the minority of new recruits who shared the Connexions vision of integrated service provision

(Artaraz, 2006). In some respects, some of these differences have been exacerbated by the introduction of the new PA diploma. Either due to the passive resistance of careers advisers or to the practicalities of having to deliver a specific form of provision to large numbers of young people in schools, the result is that the Connexions service has, on the whole, continued to operate a dual-pronged approach to service delivery that maintained the specialist status of careers advisers within the service. In sum, in spite of claims to the contrary (OECD, 2003), the operative reality of Connexions has maintained recognition for the careers profession's specialist role by failing to integrate the various professions into a single generalist form. The next section explores the second aspect of integration expected to produce effective interagency teams between educational settings and Connexions.

Limitations to integrated care: the effect of power relations between organisations

The difference in power relations between educational settings and the Connexions service provides a partial explanation to account for the limited success of the partnership between the two. The Connexions service's operational arrangements in educational settings vary considerably and depend largely on the specific partnership arrangements that exist between the individual institutions and their local Connexions service as well as on the working relationships established between PAs and other members of the interprofessional team (Joyce *et al*., 2004). Thus, authors found that some of the elements that could affect the partnership arrangements between Connexions and schools were better management support for Connexions workers, clarification of protocols and mechanisms for troubleshooting conflicts between agencies (Coles *et al*., 2004).

However, partnership arrangement documents are often based on templates that do not necessarily reflect the complex reality of the relationship between educational establishments and Connexions. Instead, the national evaluation of the impact of the Connexions service found that the relationship between schools and Connexions was mediated by power differences expressed through two interrelated factors: the level of integration of the Connexions service inside the life of the school and the degree to which the service was given access to relevant information, including student data (Hoggarth and Smith, 2004). Both reflected the extent to which Connexions was allowed to act as the binding element within the pastoral care team and between the school and outside forms of provision.

According to this study, models of partnership arrangements between schools and Connexions fell within three distinct categories. The first saw Connexions as a fully integrated agency in schools and colleges with freedom to locate and work with young people in need of their service. This 'ideal type' fitted fully with the original Connexions strategy by linking every member of the wider pastoral team inside the educational establishment and outside forms of service provision (Francis, 2003). In the second category, Connexions acted as a neutral agency with restricted access to student information, converting the school or college in question into a gatekeeper to student information that was provided to Connexions on a 'need to know' basis only. The degree of team integration would be incomplete because of reticence and ambivalence towards Connexions, resulting in partnerships with varying degrees of effectiveness. The third model presented Connexions as an outside agency that conducted some of its work within the school premises. This type of arrangement was characterised by high levels of control

of student information on the part of schools, leaving the Connexions PA marginalised and isolated.

The research uncovered worthy examples of teams that fell within the first model. Often these were in Special Educational Need (SEN) Schools that have a strong tradition of collaborative working with other agencies, a condition facilitated by legislative requirements (Hoggarth and Smith, 2004). These examples demonstrated that inter-agency teams could work adequately when the transfer of information and harmonisation of professional roles between school and Connexions had been established. However, other examples showed that the degree of information control exercised by schools – including pastoral care notes or information related to risk factors – could have a negative impact on young people facing barriers to engagement in the curriculum, because it inhibited an adequate Connexions response. In these scenarios, service provision could be based on incomplete information or, alternatively, lead to the duplication of efforts. Some of the schools also acted to prevent greater Connexions involvement for fear that the service might spoil their reputations or wariness about the involvement of 'outside agencies' in the lives of young people in their care (Hoggarth and Smith, 2004). Some of these fears were born out of the conflict between the young person-centred ethos of Connexions and other priorities dominant in certain schools. For example, it is possible to imagine cases where a school's 'high achieving' reputation could collide with independent advice on alternative qualifications or a school's religious ethos could clash with a young person's need for clear advice on contraception. In essence, the unequal power relations between the school and the Connexions service affected the potential for synergy in the partnership, a finding that chimes with some of the existing literature (McQuaid, 2000; Powell and Dowling, 2006).

In sum, a number of reasons might explain why partnerships between Connexions and schools did not work sufficiently well. They include elements that are internal to the Connexions service, and elements that affect the spirit of collaboration between agencies. In any case, these issues were always mediated by the power relations between schools – exercising high levels of independence – and an external agency dependent on effective partnership working in order to succeed.

The future of the Connexions service

There is often a distinction between the ethos of a service and the reality of practice within it. In the case of Connexions, its strategy was originally informed by the theoretical assumption that wrap-around holistic services can deliver better outcomes for individuals. In the case of young people with complex needs, the Connexions service was created to serve this ideal and was based on two distinct forms of integration affecting professional roles and interagency collaboration. The first, assumed that a wide range of professional roles would be able to 'fuse' into a single form with a common understanding of the needs of young people at risk. The second, assumed that the theoretical benefit of synergy between organisations could be effectively achieved by an expectation of partnership work between Connexions and other agencies.

The Connexions service, however, has turned out to be rather different and has presented at least two different types of challenges to the ideal of integration envisaged in the original design of the service. The generic professional form prefigured at the time of

the service's rollout was not successfully developed due, partly, to professional resistance. This has resulted in a *de facto* division of labour within the Connexions service between those workers for whom their roles have changed little since the time before the service came into being, and a new minority of workers unable to impose the ethos of the new service. On the other hand, the second type of challenge to the ideal of service integration originally envisaged has been mounted by the settings in which the new service has been operating. This article has suggested that where this has taken place in schools, a number of factors have affected the relationship between the Connexions service and the wider student support services available. These factors were influenced by the unequal power relations operating between schools and Connexions. In particular, it has been noted how the control of key information about young people by schools put the Connexions service at a disadvantage in trying to deal with young people in a holistic manner.

The limited success of Connexions to bring about the integrated forms of care that the service promised at the time of its inception has now been further reinforced by the new policy framework outlined in *Youth Matters*. The Green Paper and the consultation documents that followed, propose a radical overhaul of services for young people that will operate and be managed at the level of local authorities, as part of the wider agenda of Children's Trusts prefigured in the Children's Act 2004 (DfES, 2005; DfES, 2006; Hughes, 2005). In the case of Connexions, *Youth Matters* effectively announces the death of the service as an independent organisation even though it encourages local authorities to maintain the 'Connexions brand' when referring to those services that will substitute current Connexions provision. Within the new arrangements, local authorities, through their Children's Trusts, will plan and commission all services for young people, including those currently provided by Connexions in schools. *Youth Matters* also fits in with the spirit of educational reforms currently being discussed in government because they include the proviso that schools remain largely independent and will be able to carry out their own commissioning of services, including IAG services, if they so choose (DFES, 2005). Finally, careers specialists have put their hopes in current proposals for an all-age universal careers service (Leitch, 2006). If implemented, the Leitch review's proposal is likely to emphasise the professional knowledge of current careers specialists and distance them from the image of being part of a service exclusively for young people.

With regards to the two types of integration that have occupied this article, the current framework means that the experiment of the single, generic professional who could deal with the needs of young people holistically from within Connexions is no longer being pursued and becomes instead part of the wider strategy of Children's Trusts discussed below. The emphasis in current proposals is limited to the issues of learning and training rather than the successful transition to adulthood that informed the original conceptualisation of Connexions and led to the creation of the concept of generic PA. Instead, *Youth Matters* concentrates its efforts in 'clarifying roles', both among professions and institutions. In this regard, the document speaks of the need to 'make clear the distinctive role for each of the professions and services engaging with and supporting young people' (DfES, 2005: 71). This has clear consequences for the processes of integration discussed in this paper. Under the new arrangements being proposed, IAG becomes the dominant activity in schools, whereas responsibility for targeted forms of support for young people with complex needs will be taken over by the local authority via the Children's Trust (DfES, 2005; ECOTEC, 2006). In other words, the current proposals encourage a specialist separation of roles among those dealing with

young people but say nothing about the partnership between agencies that the Connexions service was brought up to bind together. The Connexions service was created to end the fragmentation of services for young people through an integration of roles and teams but its demise is in danger of having reversed the former without significantly advancing the latter.

References

Ainley, P., Barnes, T and Momen, A. (2002), 'Making Connexions: a case study in contemporary social policy', *Critical Social Policy*, 22, 2, 376–388.

Artaraz, K. (2006), 'The wrong person for the job? Professional habitus and working cultures in Connexions', *Critical Social Policy*, 26, 4, 910–931.

Balloch, S. and Taylor, M. (2001), *Partnership Working: Policy and Practice*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Britton, L., Chatrik, B., Coles, B., Craig, G. and Hylton, C. (2002), *Missing Connexions: The Career Dynamics and Welfare Needs of Black and Minority Ethnic Young People at the Margins*, Bristol: The Policy Press and the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Catan, L. (2004), *Becoming Adult: Changing Youth Transitions in the 21st Century*, Brighton: Trust for the Study of Adolescence.

Coles, B. (2003), 'Connexions: an outbreak in purple and orange', *Benefits*, 11, 2, 93–98.

Coles, B., Britton, L. and Hicks, L. (2004), *Building Better Connections: Inter-Agency Work and the Connexions Strategy*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Connexions Service National Unit [CSNU] (2000), *Establishing the Connexions Service in Schools*, Nottingham: DfEE Publications.

Connexions Service National Unit [CSNU] (2002), *Implementing Connexions in Colleges*, Nottingham: DfES Publications.

Children and Young People's Unit [CYPU] (2001), *Tomorrow's Future: Building a Strategy for Children and Young People*, London: CYPU.

Department for Education and Employment [DfEE] (2000a), *Connexions: The Best Start in Life for Every Young Person*, Nottingham: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment [DfEE] (2000b), *The Connexions Service: Professional Framework for Personal Advisers – Proposals for Consultation*, Nottingham: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment [DfEE] (2000c), *The Connexions Service: Prospectus and Specification*, Nottingham: DfEE.

Department for Education and Skills [DfES] (2001), *Implementing Connexions in Colleges*, Nottingham: DfES Publications.

Department for Education and Skills [DfES] (2004), *Connexions Service: Advice and Guidance for All Young People*, London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Education and Skills [DfES] (2005), *Youth Matters*, Green Paper, London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Education and Skills [DfES] (2006), *Youth Matters: Next Steps*, London: The Stationery Office

ECOTEC (2006), *Connexions Moving towards Childrens Trusts: A Report for the Department of Education and Skills*, London: ECOTEC.

Francis, R. (2003), 'Building Connexions: a toolkit to support the integration of Connexions in your school', Connexions Service, at http://www.cegnet.co.uk/resource/content/files/337.pdf [accessed on 09.01.07].

Garrett, P. M. (2002), 'Encounters in the new welfare domains of the Third Way: social work, the Connexions agency and personal advisers', *Critical Social Policy*, 22, 4, 596–618.

Glendinning, C. and Coleman, A. (2003), 'Joint Working: The Health Service agenda', *Local Government Studies*, 29, 3, 51–72.

Glendinning, C., Dowling, B. and Powell, M. (2005), 'Partnerships between health and social care under "New Labour": smoke without fire? A review of policy and evidence', *Evidence and Policy*, 1, 3, 365–381.

Grove, B. and Giraud-Saunders, A. (2003), 'Connecting with connexions: the role of the personal adviser with young people with special educational and support needs', *Support for learning*, 18, 1, 12–17.

Hart, E. and Fletcher, J. (1999), 'Learning how to change: a selective analysis of literature and experience of how teams learn and organisations change', *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 13, 1, 53–63.

Hodkinson, P., Sparkes, A. and Hodkinson, H. (1996), *Triumphs and Tears: Young People, Markets, and the Transition Form School to Work*, London: David Fulton.

Hodkinson, P. (1998), 'How young people make career decisions', *Education and Training*, 40, 6/7, 301–306.

Hoggarth, L. and Smith, D. (2004), *Understanding the Impact of Connexions on Young People at Risk*, Research Report 607, Sheffield: DfES.

Hughes, D. (2005), *Connexions: Developing Options and Opportunities*, Centre for Guidance Studies', at http://www.derby.ac.uk/cegs/ [accessed 12/06/06].

Joyce, L., White, C. and Franses, A. (2004), *Improve Your Connexions: Qualitative Research with Young People*, Research Report RR481, Sheffield: DfES.

Leathard, A. (2003), *Inter-Professional Collaboration: From Policy to Practice in Health and Social Care*, London: Brunner Routledge.

Leitch, S. (2006) *Leitch Review of Skills: Prosperity for All in the Global Economy*, London: The Stationery Office.

McQuaid, R. (2000), 'The theory of partnership: why have partnerships?', in S. Osborne (ed.), *Public–Private Partnerships: Theory and Practice in International Perspective*, London: Routledge.

Miller, C., Freeman, M. and Ross, R. (2001). *Interprofessional Practice in Health and Social Care: Challenging the Shared Learning Agenda*, London: Arnold.

Molyneux, J. (2001), 'Interprofessional team working: what makes teams work well?', *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 15, 1, 29–35.

Morris, M., Rickinson, M. and Davies, D. (2001), *The Delivery of Career Guidance in Schools*, Research Report 296, Sheffield: DfES.

National Evaluation of the Children's Fund [NECF] (2004), 'Collaborating for the social inclusion of children and young people: emerging lessons from the first round of case studies', Brief No RB596, DfES, Sheffield.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] (2003), 'Review of career guidance policies: United Kingdom country note', CEGS Occasional Paper, University of Derby.

Peck, E., Gulliver, P and Towell, D. (2002), 'Governance of partnership between health and social services: the experience in Somerset', *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 10, 5, 331–338.

Peck, D. (2004), *Careers Services: History, Policy and Practice in the UK*, London: Taylor & Francis.

Powell, M. and Dowling, B. (2006), 'New Labour's partnerships: comparing conceptual models with existing forms', *Social Policy and Society*, 5, 2, 305–314.

Poxton, R. (1999), *Working across the Boundaries: Experiences of Primary Health and Social Care Partnerships in Practice*, London: Kings Fund.

Social Exclusion Unit [SEU] (1999), *Bridging the Gap: New Opportunities for 16–18-year-olds Not in Education, Employment or Training*, London: Stationery Office.

Social Exclusion Unit [SEU] (2004), *Tackling Social Exclusion: Taking Stock and Looking to the Future*, London: Stationery Office.

Walker, A. and Walker, C. (1997), *Britain Divided: The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s*, London: Child Poverty Action Group.

Watts, A. G. (2001a), 'Career guidance and social exclusion: a cautionary tale', *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 29, 2, 157–176.

Watts, A. G. (2001b), 'Connexions: the role of the personal adviser in schools', *Pastoral Care in Education*, 19, 4, 16–20.