The Antisocialisation of Children and Young People: Undermining Professionals and Colonising Everyday Life

Stuart Waiton

Abstract

This paper analyses the changing nature of relationships between adults and young people. Adopting aspects of the work of Frank Furedi, the question of the socialisation of children is addressed. It is argued that the problematisation of behaviour, coupled with the development of new state and institutional processes, has led to a growing spread of 'professional' and contractual involvement in everyday life. This is something that relates to and is accelerated by the emergence of micro-politics and micro-social policy over the last few decades. This colonisation of the lifeworld, it is argued, is increasingly formalising informal relationships and undermining spontaneous relationships between adults and young people. It also distorts the nature of professions and the relationships developed between them and young people. The real relationships between adults and young people are consequently being undermined and replaced by an ersatz form of socialisation.

Key words: antisocial, state, behaviour, socialisation, regulation.

Within critical sociology attempts to understand and explain changes in social policy often focus upon the socio-economic changes that have taken place. What is in essence a left wing critique of modern capitalism, this approach often emphasises the issue of power and inequality, focusing on structural questions like poverty to explain the 'real' problems in society. This paper in contrast focuses less on these socio-economic issues than upon the nature of institutions today and the expanding nature of state and professional intervention and colonisation of everyday life, a form of colonisation that is arguably impacting upon every adult-child relationship, and undermining the socialisation of the young.

This is a process that has been identified, particularly in the United States, since at least the 1950s, but which has become more systematic and qualitatively problematic in the last two decades in the UK – not least of all, because of the collapse of political life. In this regard this paper, unlike those that focus on the 'neo-liberal' nature of society, suggests that many of the problems discussed below have developed less because of the enforcement of any right wing agenda, but rather, because today there is no agenda.

The problematisation of behaviour

In the 1990s as the social and political imagination shrank, 'big' outlooks, (whether national or international) declined, while smaller things, like 'community' (Bauman, 2001) and the 'individual' (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002) emerged as the focus for government and state attention. However, and ironically, as Hobsbawm notes, this focus on community did not reflect a new vibrancy in community life but actually emerged at a time 'when communities in a sociological sense became hard to find in real life' (Hobsbawm, 1994: 428). Likewise, the new focus in social policy on the individual reflected something quite different from the individual of previous times. The moral and political subject of the past is today far more likely to be understood and engaged with through a fragmented psycho-social lens, one that is increasingly preoccupied with how we behave and react, rather than what we believe and how we consciously act (Waiton, 2008).

As the understanding of social problems moved away from structural questions, an increased gaze was set upon the behaviour of individuals within politics, schools, communities and families. Within the realm of politics, the Labour MP Frank Field, for example, argues that we have entered a period where the 'politics of *behaviour*' is central (Field, 2003). The government has helped to make the problem of antisocial *behaviour* into a national issue and in schools the *behaviour* of pupils has become of great concern for education authorities and teacher's unions alike. Meanwhile behaviour in the home and the issue of parenting has become problematised and understood as a relatively new 'skills' – based issue, necessitating expert intervention (Furedi, 2001). Consequently, the 'management of behaviour' has become a growth industry, something that is at times imposed, but is perhaps more often demanded or seen as a necessary form of support in our more individuated world.

If the telecommunications advert is correct and we really are the product of 'every one – to – one we've ever had', it increasingly appears that these one – to – ones should be carried out with the assistance of a third party, or at least by following a form of awareness training that helps us to understand the correct way to act and react to one another in our daily lives.

It is this emerging and professionalised framework through which everyday interactions occur which is the focus of this paper. Interactions that were often informal, or were informed by the specific nature of a professional relationship with a young person – like that of a teacher and pupil – have been transformed in recent years. Through the problematisation of relationships, a form of colonisation of the 'lifeworld' has emerged, a process that is arguably undermining the spontaneous and autonomous relationships between people – and especially between adults and children. This is a process that despite its intentions should be understood as a form of antisocialisation.

Clientization

What is the nature of the state, post welfare? For theorists like Jurgen Habermas who developed the idea of clientization (Habermas, 1987), the activities of the state in the 1970s was seen as being highly problematic. There was a legitimation crisis in Western society he argued, one within which the contradictions of capitalism had been internalised by the state – a state which developed new areas of intervention into more aspects of life but ultimately failed to resolve these irresolvable economic and social problems (Habermas, 1976). Nevertheless a kind of spiral effect resulted where systems, bureaucracies and new state structures consequently felt the need to intervene further, to reform themselves yet again, to develop new and 'rational' forms of 'best practice', to 'perfect the system', or to use an example from today – to make that child ever safer and make sure 'nothing like this happens again' (and again, and again).

In Christopher Lasch's book *Haven in a Heartless World*, American society in the 1970s was understood to be replacing the moral and political framework for state activity with mere laws (Lasch, 1977). For Lasch (1979) the loss of legitimacy of society's dominant ideas and organisations had resulted in laws and regulations becoming a replacement for morals and politics and a more overt mechanism for directing people at a time when moral and political meaning was in decline and less able to direct the 'energy of the people' (Findlayson, 2003).

Interestingly, in his critique of state intervention into the family, Lasch argues that as early as the 1920s in the U.S., helping professionals – 'agencies of socialized reproduction' – monopolised the knowledge of how to socialise the young and then gave it back to the disempowered public in the form of parenting 'knowledge' – giving it back to them in a mystified fashion 'that rendered parents more helpless than ever, more abject in their dependence on expert opinion' (Lasch, 1977:18).

A similar critique of the deforming nature of state institutions and professional life and the new forms of intrusive practices that emerged can be found in Edgar Z. Friedenberg's excellent little book *The Vanishing Adolescent*. Writing in 1959, Friedenberg argues that teachers in America had become disempowered in their relationships with pupils. Having lost a belief in the centrality of enlightenment values, teachers no longer embodied a passion for knowledge as something that formed what they were, how they understood the world and how they taught. Consequently, because teachers had lost the fundamental belief in education as an enlightening process they lost their authority over students. The result Friedenberg believed was that schools, without a clear sense of purpose, began to utilise external 'experts' to 'manage' pupil's behaviour and to adopt therapeutic methods to 'manipulate' rather than to educate young people.[1]

The above authors all highlight a changing and developing form of state and professional intervention into people's lives which disempowers the public. This is a process whereby informal or relatively

autonomous and self regulating areas of life become areas of external intervention, where private life is to some extent exposed to professional and public scrutiny, and where certain professions are degraded, teachers for example becoming counsellors rather than educators and pupils are transformed into clients, users or even consumers.

Therapeutics

More recently Frank Furedi has summed up the latest developments in state formation in his work *Therapy Culture* (Furedi, 2004). Here he argues that therapeutic practices that relate to us as emotional (and fragile) beings have developed throughout society over the last three decades. For Furedi, the trends identified by Habermas, Lasch and Friedenberg were (at least in the UK) held back by the continued existence of conflicting and active political parties, organisations and the associated institutions, in society. With the decline of political ideologies, collective organisations and identity, he argues, today's more individuated society has become re-engaged by a new form of professional authority through the prism of emotionally framed therapeutics. Categories, insights, discourses and practices have consequently reframed social problems and social solutions around the idea of the therapeutic individual. So we develop education to support young people's 'self esteem', we understand ourselves and our experiences through the idea of syndromes, addictions, stress and trauma – and we find institutions and services increasingly incorporating elements of counselling and emotional management. Similarly in the United States, James Nolan in *The Therapeutic State* observes that there are now more therapists in America than librarians, fire fighters or mail carriers, noting that, 'police and lawyers outnumber counsellors, but only by a ratio of less than two to one in both instances' (Nolan, 1998: 8).

Legalisation

Reconnecting with Lasch's prior observation about the rise of a legal framework for developing (or in reality abandoning) social norms, another American, Philip K. Howard has critiqued the rise of law as another key framework for organising society and relationships between people today. Using the example of children's art work hung on school walls that needed to be taken down because of new fire regulations, for example, Howard notes that fire codes have existed for decades but only in recent times have new bureaucratic rules lost any relationship with common sense and human judgement. As government becomes more distant from the public he believes an avalanche of laws, rules and codes of conduct have filled the political and institutional vacuum, becoming a new regulatory basis of mediation between people. Government by manual, by precise rules, with excruciating detail has replaced the important standard of what a reasonable person would do (Howard, 1994). For Howard, in this more fractured world where big ideas and beliefs have declined, avoiding risks has become a new religion and is something that suffocates individual and indeed institutional responsibility. Instead of looking where we want to go, he observes, Americans are constantly looking over their

shoulders, worried not about doing something wrong but about someone claiming they have. In an impassioned demand for human judgement and authority to be reintroduced in society Howard concludes that:

> *Relying on personal beliefs seems old fashioned, like using a horse and buggy. But what's our alternative? Law can't think. Good values and good judgement aren't provable. Zero tolerance, stupid warning labels, paranoid doctors and burnt-out teachers are all symptoms of a legal system that doesn't allow personal belief* (Howard, 2001: 216).

The preoccupation with and occupation of the informal world

Looking at the issue of state, professional and legal intervention into everyday life, there does appear to be a change from past forms of law, support and intervention. The number of laws for example, being created by government has exponentially increased in the last decade. Liberal Democrat leader Nick Clegg has noted that by 2006 the Labour government had introduced over 3000 new laws – one for every day they had been in office. Not only does this far exceed any previous administration, Clegg also notes that the speed of the introduction of new laws is increasing every year (Waiton, 2008a: 82). As Howard has also observed it is not only the quantity of new laws that has increased enormously, but their detail, to the extent that they are incomprehensible to anyone other than experts. Unlike the entire American Constitution, he notes, which can be written on one piece of paper, fire codes for buildings fill an entire book.

Historically, as Lasch argues, the development of professional expertise and intervention grew significantly in the first three decades of the twentieth century. However there appears to be two differences today in terms of the nature of 'intervention'. Firstly, new codes and laws are more directly involved with the informal interaction that takes place between people and secondly, today there is little opposition to wider and more diffuse levels of intervention and 'support'. Regulations have encroached upon the very day to day interactions between people.

Aspects of everyday life where there would previously have been a cultural expectation for people to resolve things for themselves have become mediated through new legal and institutional practices (Waiton, 2008a). For example, the state intervention and construction of the family has been extended to a point where there is a growing belief in the need to give 'parenting' skills to individuals to enable them to care for their children. Antisocial behaviour initiatives, community wardens and environmental protection officers today act to resolve problems between people in communities. Speech and harassment codes structure what is deemed 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' to say at work and indeed in public. Adverts on buses and trains help us to understand what it means to be polite to one another, while there are codes about bullying and indeed emotional management in both schools and workplaces today.

Rather than these forms of parenting, public and work place behaviour, or institutional practices being developed by and between parents, workers or professionals themselves – often at an informal level – they have become formalised as official rules, skills and contracts.

The socialisation problem

There is a concern today about the behaviour of young people, on the streets, in schools and to some extent in the home itself. Usefully, some, like the Institute of Public Policy Studies (IPPR) have discussed this problem in terms of a 'socialisation gap' (Margo and Dixon, 2006). To some extent this issue has been highlighted by the Conservative leader David Cameron in his discussion about 'broken Britain'. Unfortunately, while these concerns relate in part to genuine social problems, the way the issue of socialisation is understood is situated within a highly problematic framework and one that was already adopted and addressed by the Labour government. This is an approach that often myopically and negatively focuses on the poorest in society, or on the antisocial behaviour of young people, an approach which problematises 'behaviour', further promoting the idea that more controls and greater 'support' and regulation of everyday life is necessary.

Antisocial Behaviour

Take the example of antisocial behaviour. Here we have a social problem, 'antisocial behaviour', which in terms of public and political life had no existence until the 1990s (Waiton, 2008: 14). It has in the last 15 years however become an accepted way of understanding a whole array of issue and troubles and which has been backed up by laws, initiatives, council strategies, government speeches, public service advertisements, departmental briefs, police targets and so on. Troubles and issues between people, which may at best have ended up as an issue of concern for the local councillor, are today social problems addressed through a legal and police framework. These in turn are covered by local government strategic plans and targets and become part of the national political agenda (Flint, 2006).

In terms of the extension of both a legalistic and therapeutic state, the ASBO framework is a good example. The 'antisocial behaviour' arrangement both potentially criminalised more aspects of everyday live and acted as an emotional manager of communities. It did this by defining antisocial behaviour as anything that causes alarm or distress to the individual. Here, how we feel towards other people, rather than simply the actions of the 'deviant' person have been central and the role of the state official has been to engage with our feelings of distress and reduce our fear. Despite its intentions the ASBO framework has discouraged people from being active in their community and taking more responsibility for the behaviour of others. It has done this by encouraging a culture of complaint, a kind of 'my rights' perspective, where other people become seen not as part of *your* community, but as something that has nothing to do with you, someone else's problem (Waiton,

2008: 28). Through advertisements and all the various initiatives and forms of political rhetoric, adults – and especially young adults who have never known any other way – have been trained to phone the police or the council to sort out all sorts of relatively petty problems (Waiton, 2008a: 103-127). The result of this third party approach to everyday life in terms of the socialisation question is three fold. Firstly, the level of contact between people declines and where this happens conflicts are no longer resolved between people. Secondly, with regard to young people, the role of local adults in establishing, enforcing and developing community norms over and with young people is reduced or even disappears. Finally, the loss of the experience of dealing with other people, and perhaps especially with young people, undermines individuals' own development of authority and character. Carried to its extreme we end up with communities where the 'socialisation' of the young is carried out by paid officials, where adults and young people never meet, and where to be 'socialised' means to know your 'right' (to a quiet life) and know how to use the correct procedures and protocols to deal with your neighbours (Waiton, 2008).

The problem of adult-child relations

The issue of adult child relationships and the socialisation that takes place – at least in part – through the public interaction between the two should not be confined to the discussion about youth antisocial behaviour. Indeed the preoccupation with young people's behaviour obscures the wider confusion and difficulties that exist when addressing this question.[2]

Stories have appeared in the press in the last decade or so about children in distress being ignored by passing adults. Similarly there is concern about the declining number of men applying for teaching posts in primary schools (*Observer*, 12 July 2009). Adults, and especially men it seems, are today less sure about approaching other people's children at least in part because of the heightened awareness of the issue of 'strangers' or paedophiles. While often denouncing the 'panic' encouraged by certain newspapers around this issue, and dismissing the occasional community outburst about 'paedos', the authorities themselves have engaged the issue more systematically, with for example the establishing of vetting procedures for all adults who come into contact with children and young people. This in turn has heightened the climate of suspicion with little evidence of greater protection of children.

Another issue regarding the relationships between adults and children is that of both adult authority and also adult solidarity – whereby adults more generally accept the authority of other adults with regard to their own children. As Furedi observes, where previously there was an expectation that adults would back each other up when disciplining a child, with neighbours, parents and teachers 'holding the line' (Furedi, 2001: 10), today the reality (or at least the perception of it) is that if you attempt to discipline somebody else's child the parent is more likely to back up their child and question the adult's judgement. But why is this?

There are objective changes to the nature of society that help explain this declining solidarity between adults. For example, the public sphere has declined in society and people have a more disconnected relationship with institutions and indeed with one another (Habermas, 1992). Alongside this the family has become more insular – consequently children are no longer seen as 'public property' (Furedi, 2001). However the changing and more confused and distant relationships between adults and children has also been accelerated by the problematisation and professionalisation of these relationships.

The title of a recent pamphlet by Frank Furedi and Jenny Bristow sums up this development quite well – *Licensed to Hug*. Here we are offered an analysis of a form of clientization of relationships, where relationships between adults and even very young children have become more problematic, formalised and guided by rules which undermine or at least distort previously spontaneous interactions and norms (Furedi and Bristow, 2008).

This it is argued is a problem not simply in communities but also for professionals working with children. For example, it is becoming common practice today, in gymnastics for example, to ask a child if it is OK to hold them while doing an exercise; in schools and nurseries 'touch' is sometimes seen as acceptable only if it is 'initiated by the child'; some injuries are today being left untreated, while sun cream consent forms are regularly sent out to parents. Even Santa has been advised by Rotary International to always be accompanied by another adult (ibid).

As the researcher Heather Piper has argued, in the process of developing 'correct' procedures around touch, touching itself is becoming confused and confusing and doubt about others and even about ourselves creeps into previously natural and professional behaviour.[3] Ironically, despite the framework for this being in 'the best interest of the child', it appears that this is rarely the outcome as we look over our shoulder more concerned with protecting ourselves than dealing with the crying child (Piper et al, 2006).

One teacher, relating to the emergence of correct 'touch' procedures in schools and nurseries described this process as a form of 'implanted awareness' (ibid). Here you no longer think for yourself, use your experience, your knowledge, indeed your humanity, when relating to children – but rather a rule book, or a check list that both you and the child have been made aware of. You no longer think for yourself, react as a professional or indeed a person, but as a follower of procedures that have been imported from some external authority. In a sense, what Piper is suggesting is that we learn to mediate ourselves, even to distrust and be suspicious of our own instincts; we incorporate a third party approach to relationships with children. Consequently, once again the socialisation of children and young people is deformed as adults neither act naturally or professionally but within a contractual and defensive straightjacket developed by lawyers and relationship experts.

Problematising peers

One recent example of the colonisation of a new area of life previously untouched by professionals is the development of relationship education in schools. Here we see the emergence of a micro-management approach to a newly perceived problem and an invasion of a private part of young people's lives. Rather than peers developing relationships as part of the process of growing up they are actively discouraged from relying on themselves, on one another, and indeed on informal discussions with adults in forming their understanding of sexual relationships (Lee, 2002: 33-48).

Through a problematisation of relationships new 'norms' have been imported into *education*, largely predicated upon the one dimensional outlook of 'zero tolerance towards peer pressure' (ibid). Through this new professional discourse, it is argued, a framework of distrust and suspicion helps young people to re-understand their relationships as potentially dangerous and to reconceptualise themselves as being potentially 'at risk' when developing intimate relationships with their peers. For example, in classroom discussions where the question, 'is it ever OK to put any pressure on your girlfriend or boyfriend', the 'correct' answer must always be 'no'. But is this a 'real' answer or a 'correct' answer, and does it in a one – sided way frame these youthful relationships as dangerous rather than merely immature or awkward, part of what may previously have been interpreted as a rite of passage? Once again, if taken to an extreme level, what we could be witnessing is an area of life that was once developed within young people's informal world, being brought into the classroom, reinterpreted by experts and academics, problematised and, as Lasch would see it, given back to young people as an official – and mystified – part of their education.

There is little room for grey areas here and teachers must themselves be educated about how to manage this process, be aware of the guidelines, the curriculum, the appropriate responses from teacher and pupils, the potential legal aspect regarding child safety, and indeed the therapeutic approach necessary to correctly teach relationship education.

Arguably, following the logic of Habermas and Furedi, one consequence of relationship education being professionalised is that an aspect of life where young people can develop and grow and can often establish strong relationships with both friends and lovers at a more mature and intimate level is potentially undermined.

This is also potentially the case in terms of relationships with teachers who will arguably be less inclined to be honest with their older pupils when informally asked for advice about relationships. Faced with the new curriculum and expert knowledge on relationship education, there will be a pressure to stick to the guidelines rather than to use personal judgement based on the experience of life and of teaching. Again, this development will arguably undermine the potential for a more profound, mature and trusting type of relationship with a young person being established.

Where official relationship education has been incorporated into school and youth work activities it runs the risk of transforming previously unmediated relationships between peers, and restricting both professional and personal judgement. Here, the most basic aspect of the informal socialisation process is changed into an expert-led, skills based activity between clients and deliverers of service – rather than people.

Conclusion

Looked at separately, the ASBO framework, touching policies or relationship education appear to be very different, and to be dealing with diverse and dissimilar social problems. However, central to them is the problematic of behaviour and relationships. At a wider political and societal level we can situate this within a new form of state, institutional and professional micro-management of everyday life.

Despite previous forms of state intervention in the twentieth century and previous forms of moralising about behaviour this new framework of intervention and 'support' is arguably quite different, quantitatively, for example in terms of the number of new rules, laws, procedures and proscribed forms of behaviour.

Alongside this there appears to be relatively little opposition today to many of these new forms of intervention, which are in the main understood to be forms of support. This has no doubt been assisted by both the decline of the libertarian right [4], and also the collectivist left who both maintained a sense of separation and opposition to aspects of state 'interference'.

Today with the decline of collectivity, we have a more individuated society and yet also a decline of the traditional liberal sense of individualism. Added to this, as Furedi notes, through today's therapeutic prism the fragmented individual has been recast and understood as vulnerable rather than robust, and therefore in constant need of support in all aspects of their life.

Consequently, with these developments, the very meaning of socialisation has changed. Previously a significant aspect of socialisation was assumed to emerge through direct contact between people. This was developed by the actions and interaction of free individuals acting in both public and private space. Today however, spontaneous relationships have become problematised and confused by legalistic, managerial and therapeutic discourses.

Norms are now established within a defensive framework where unregulated interactions with children and young people are increasingly something we have come to dread. Rather than doing the right thing, adults are inclined, and encouraged, to watch their backs, to stay safe and to mediate their encounters with youngsters through third party professionals with 'expert' knowledge: As a

result newly developing norms have little to do with the experience of local people and the personally developed authority and expertise of adults. Rather, personal authority has been side stepped and the development of these 'norms' are contracted out to those who write 'best practise' manuals and 'correct procedures' codes.

Unfortunately, these new 'correct' forms of behaviour, mediating and educating adults, teachers and even young people's interactions, act as a barrier to a real socialisation process. They minimise the contact between people, discourage the honesty and spontaneity of adults, and replace real relationships with one dimensional men and women nervously clutching their codes of conduct. Here the nature of relationships become more limited while the space for personal judgement and action is diminished.

Consequently, what is meant by socialisation is very different today. Less about the development of relationships between free individuals, than about the restriction and regulation of this freedom. It appears that we have lost trust in society and in individuals within society to become socialised and are actively, if not intentionally, undermining the genuine socialisation of the young.

Further research is needed to examine the extent of the changes outlined above. What, for example, if anything, is acting as a barrier to these developments, and to what extent can we understand these changes as a universal development, or is there a class dimension to the colonisation of everyday life? Are there sections of society, or aspects of 'youth' life, sub-cultures, for example, that insulates people from these trends. Indeed, to what extent are local people, teachers or young people doing things in 'secret', informally, and ignoring 'correct' approaches and procedures?

If the dynamic outlined above is correct perhaps a more appropriate approach to answering these questions is to explore the extent to which the problematisation and 'professionalisation' of behaviour has become an internalised phenomenon. Consequently a deeper exploration of the impact of these developments is needed to examine the effect this is having on not only the development of relationships between people, but also the development of the self.

Notes

1   Friedenberg's idea was that enlightened education was not simply a matter of subject knowledge but was something that informed your entire life and approach to the self and society. As such, educators should be in an ideal position to educate the whole child – not by getting them to focus in on themselves as they do in therapy – but to take them out of themselves and allow young people to understand themselves in the context of the world around them.

2   A year ago in Stansted Airport waiting for a flight to Glasgow there was an interesting example of how awkward we all feel when having to deal with other people's children. Sitting at the

terminal gate I and a hundred or so other adults watched as a couple struggled with their three children to board the flight. We all waited in embarrassed silence as the father attempted to get hold of his three year old twin boys. The mother waited with the six year old girl in arms as the father picked up one of the boys only to watch the other go running off. The father then put one boy down and pick up the other, only for the first child to run off. This carried on for almost five minutes with none of the other passengers or indeed the flight attendants offering assistance to the parents. In the end, simply because of my personal preoccupation about the problem of adult child relationships I offered my assistance to the surprise of the father, picked up the 'free' twin, and carried him onto the aeroplane.

3   See Piper et al 2006.

4   In 2007 for example the British Social Attitudes Survey found that only 15 percent of Labour voters opposed identity cards, compared with 45 percent who opposed them in 1990. Remarking on the decline in libertarian values in the UK Professor Colin Gearty said, 'It is as though society is in the process of forgetting why past generations thought those freedoms to be so very important' (*Guardian* 24 January 2007).

References

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

Bauman, Z. (2001) *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, Cambridge: Policy Press.

Field, F. (2003) Neighbours from Hell: The Politics of Behaviour, London: Politicos.

Finlayson, A. (2003) *Making Sense of New Labour*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Flint, J. (ed) (2006) *Housing Urban Governance and Anti-social Behaviour*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Friedenberg, E. (1959) *The Vanishing Adolescent*, New York: Dell.

Furedi, F. (2001) *Paranoid Parenting*, London: Allen Lane.

Furedi, F. (2002) *Culture of Fear* Revised Edition: *Risk-Taking and the Morality of Low Expectations*, London: Continuum.

Furedi, F. (2004) *Therapy Culture: Cultivating vulnerability in an uncertain age*, London: Routledge.

Furedi, F. and Bristow, J. (2008) *Licensed to Hug*, London: Civitas.

Furedi, F. (2009) *Wasted: Why Education Isn't Educating*, London: Continuum.

Habermas, J. (1976) *Legitimation Crisis*, London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1987) *The Theory of Communicative Action. Volume Two*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (1992) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hobsbawm, E. (1994) *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century*, 1914-1991. London: Michael Joseph.

Howard, P. (1994) *The Death of Common Sense*, New York: Warner.

Howard, P. (2001) *The Collapse of the Common Good*, New York: Ballantine.

Lasch, C. (1977) *Haven in a Heartless World*, New York: Basic Books.

Lasch, C. (1979) *Culture of Narcissism*, New York: Norton.

Lee, E. (2002) *Teenage Sex: What Should Schools Teach Children?*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Margo, J. and Dixon, M. (2006) *Freedom's Orphans: Raising Youth in a Changing World*, London: IPPR.

Nolan, J. (1998) *The Therapeutic State: Justifying Government at Century's End*, New York: New York University Press.

Piper, H., Powell, J. and Smith, H. (2006) 'Parents, Professionals and Paranoia – the touching of children in a culture of fear, *Journal of Social Work*, 6 (2).

Waiton, S. (2008) *The Politics of Antisocial Behaviour: Amoral Panics*, London: Routledge.

Waiton, S. (2008a) *Scared of the kids*, Dundee: Abertay University Press.