Categories and Dilemmas of Youth Arts Programmes in Denmark and England

Frances Howard(iD) and Anne Mette Winneche Nielsen

Department of Social Work, Care and Community, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, UK
Department of Culture and Learning, Centre of Youth Research, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark

Abstract

Youth arts programmes give young people access to different kinds of art skills, social networks and professional standard opportunities. This article explores a typology of youth arts from across five programmes in Denmark and England, examining through observations and interviews with staff and young people what kind of arts practices are centered within the programmes. Our categories incorporate programmes that are art skills focused, event-oriented, entrepreneurial, and open access. We recognize that the intentions and outcomes of youth arts programmes are not always as clearly defined as these categories. Yet we argue that there are dilemmas inherited with each category that can cause youth arts programmes to become diluted, fail to achieve stated aims and negatively affect the young person's experience. We offer a typology that characterizes the motivations and approaches of youth arts programmes, as well as the core potentials and dilemmas they involve, thereby sharing useful insights to the on-going development of current programmes as well as the formation of future programmes.

Keywords

arts, creative industries, socially-engaged, wellbeing, youth, youth work

Introduction

'Youth arts' represents a wide conception of the arts, one which encompasses a spectrum of artistic practices that young people are engaged in today (Howard 2022b). This manifests in mainstream as well as non-mainstream, more informal arts education programmes. The first often involves school settings, while the latter are often in the form of regular workshop-based sessions and creative activities that take place in community or youth settings. Youth arts programmes not only take place in a variety of settings but are also facilitated by different kinds of professionals: artists, arts education practitioners and youth workers or a combination of all three roles. Some programmes focus solely on art practices, whereas others explicitly focus on more social aspects of young people's lives. In this article, we define the latter as 'socially' oriented youth arts programmes.

The article focuses on socially oriented youth arts programmes in Denmark and England, reflecting on the motivations and approaches that characterise them, as well as the core potentials and dilemmas they involve, thereby offering useful insights to the ongoing development of current programmes, as well as the formation of future programmes. *Firstly*, the article engages with a broad range of international research to highlight the many potentialities and dilemmas within youth arts programmes. *Secondly*, based on our former research, the article points out the variety of motivations and approaches that are defining for how different programmes function and the more specific potentials and dilemmas they involve. However, these differences are often overlooked or blurred, both in the contemporary pervasive discourses where the arts are called upon to contribute to social or psychological outcomes for young people and in the critiques arising in the wake of that. It thus becomes difficult for professionals to consciously address and work with the specific potentials and dilemmas within different kinds of programmes, particularly if the orientation at the centre of a programme changes due to shifts in political or social discourses.

In our research, within a variety of socially oriented arts programmes working with young people, we have encountered four categories over the past decade: 'art skills' (Nielsen & Sørensen 2019), 'event-oriented' (Howard & Pickford 2024), 'entrepreneurial' (Howard 2023; Sørensen & Nielsen 2023) and 'open access' (Howard *et al.* 2018). These categories are based upon what is at the centre of the programmes and make underpinned distinctions between socially oriented youth arts programmes across national borders, thus allowing a more generic reflection of the motivations and approaches of these programmes in informal and nonformal art educational practices. *Thirdly*, data is shared in this article which seek to align the core potentials and dilemmas from the international literature and the four categories of arts programmes to show that when programmes shift between paradigms, difficulties can arise in how young people experience their participation in and outcome of the programmes. To make these difficulties visible, we draw on observation data, staff interviews and conversations with the young participants about their journeys and what is important about the programmes exemplified across five diverse settings. *Finally*, we suggest a typology that can bring together the core potentials and dilemmas from the international literature base and connect them to specific motivations and approaches as defined in the four categories of socially oriented youth art programmes in order to assist the reader in understanding the complexity of these practices and the programmes in strengthening their focus.

Youth arts from a critical stance

The arts are frequently called upon within social work with young people, and research literature on youth arts programmes has recorded many potentialities. A recent focus on well-being has pointed to a range of benefits of youth arts programmes documented for social and emotional gains (Ennis & Tonkin 2018), contributing to self-confidence and self-esteem (Bungay & Vella-Burrows 2013) and supporting young people in identifying new pathways in their lives (Nielsen & Sørensen 2017). This has more recently turned into a 'well-being' discourse (McLeod & Wright 2016), where the arts are called upon to contribute to more psychological outcomes for young people. For the past two decades, the growing interest in the social and psychological benefits of youth art programmes has led to an increased focus on arts-based methodologies and their affordances within informal youth settings outside of mainstream education (Howard 2020) as well as more formal school settings (Thomson *et al.* 2012). In addition, an emphasis on creativity and the development of twenty-first-century skills for young people has been used to advocate the valuable outcomes from youth arts programmes (Corbisiero-Drakos *et al.* 2021).

Despite these benefits and potentials, the changes in young people's access to engage with the arts have raised a range of critiques highlighting a variety of dilemmas. In an in-depth analysis of the changes in the use of art in youth art programmes Hickey-Moody's book *Youth, Arts and Education* signposts the risk of using youth arts as forms of social governance producing 'impoverished arts practices' and taking away young people's voices (2013). She argues that 'arts-based methodologies routinely naturalize contemporary understandings about youth, risk, art, and salvation, and, indeed, tend to craft a narrativized relationship between these ideas' thereby turning youth art programmes into instrumentalised technologies for the control of youth populations (Hickey-Moody 2013, 63). In addition, McRobbie explores how engagement with art and creativity as a way to gain a specific set of capacities positions youth as human capital in the precarious cultural and creative industries (2016) instead of offering the critical sites of knowledge production for understanding the everyday and gain the kind of transformative power, that Hickey-Moody calls for (Hickey-Moody *et al.* 2022). Her and others who have done research on young people's entry into professions within the creative industries, show us that these professions are highly precarious (McRobbie 2016), remain classed, raced and often gendered (Brook *et al.* 2023) guarded by a class ceiling (Friedman & Laurison 2020) and facilitated through the 'bank of mum and dad' (Toft & Friedman 2021). Socially oriented youth art programmes can be critiqued for setting marginalised young people up for uncertain futures, by encouraging them towards self-employed careers in the arts and creative industries, rather than tackling the conditions excluding them from working within those industries.

Categories of socially oriented youth art programmes

Approaching socially oriented youth programmes more closely on an empirical level nevertheless shows how potentials and benefits, as well as dilemmas and critiques, differ depending on the specific motivations and approaches guiding them. The most obvious characteristic of a socially oriented youth arts programme would be

that it affords young people opportunities to develop art skills; however, we found that this was far from at the centre of all programmes. In our previous research within a large number of socially oriented art programmes working with young people mainly in the United Kingdom and Denmark (Nielsen & Sørensen 2019; Howard 2022a), but also in six global cases (Howard 2022b), we identify a variety of ways that arts are interpreted and offered to young people. In the following, we have summed them up into four categories.

Art skills

The first kind of programmes value *art skills* and employ mechanisms that ensure arts practice can be impactful on young people (Nielsen & Sørensen 2017). How-ard has previously identified disparities in social class which restricted which young people were allowed to envisage themselves as artists, aligning with the pedagogy of poverty, thus challenging the use of this mechanism in socially oriented youth art programmes (Howard 2020). Within these programmes, access to the arts was socially streamed and instrumental in its aims for social cohesion or desistance from crime, for example.

Event-oriented

In the second kind of programmes, an *event-oriented* approach is valued. These pro-grammes employ mechanisms where some kind of event or public showing is worked towards, developing project management skills as opposed to arts skills, which has been previously identified within the work of Howard. We note that these programmes are participatory in nature, but do not always hold arts as cen-tral to the ways of working with young people (Howard & Pickford 2024). We also note that they form part of a wider tendency to frame young people's participation through project-based activities. While they often allow for less hierarchical rela-tions between young people and professionals and new possibilities of participa-tion, the space for young people's own priorities is often limited and young people are seldom granted the possibilities to create thorough changes and address more permanent concerns in the institutions or arenas that accommodate the activities (Bruselius-Jensen & Nielsen 2021).

Entrepreneurial

Building upon a cultural and creative industries adaptation of youth arts pro-grammes, the third kind holds *entrepreneurism* at its centre (Sørensen, & Nielsen 2023; Howard 2023). Youth arts programmes represent an opportunity to cele-brate young people as agentic and entrepreneurial artistic producers, as opposed to simply market consumers. However, these programmes are at risk of placing a solely economic value on the arts and a policy focus on income generation for the cultural industries, often at the expense of young people's human capital (McRobbie 2016).

Open access

The final kind of youth arts programme is sited within 'open access' youth work settings, where young people participate based on their own experience of benefits of their engagement in the arts (Ritchie & Ord 2017). However, over the past decade many of these programmes have moved towards more of a targeted and project-based approach and within these settings, funders often expect a return on investment and behaviour modification of 'at risk youth' (Howard 2022c). Young

people enter the programmes out of interest or in order to make a difference, but they know they are, themselves, the main problem that they are supposed to solve (Eliasoph 2015).

Methodology

The empirical analysis is based on data from a small cross-country research study aiming to analyse what makes a difference to young people when they engage in socially oriented arts programmes in Denmark and England. The study includes five youth arts programmes that all aim to facilitate a space for marginalised young people's participation in art and culture. The data shared is an amalgamation of observation notes, interview data and young people's discussions.

The five youth arts programmes

We carefully selected five programmes covering different participants, settings, aims, sizes, terms, access points and art forms in order to identify patterns of similarities and differences in socially oriented youth art programmes in England and Denmark. Four of the programmes are well known by the authors from former and current studies. Three programmes are set within existing institutions or organisations, while two of the programmes are independent and located in their own space. The programme with the most regular participants had 30 young people enrolled on a daily basis; the programme with the fewest had six attending on a weekly basis. In the longest running programme, one of the young people had been part of the programme for five years; in the short-term programme, the young people met eight to ten times. The youngest participant we met was around nine years old in one programme, while the oldest participant in another programme was 29.

In four of the programmes, we conducted group interviews with young people, group and single interviews with professionals working with the young people and observations during workshops. In the last programme, we conducted interviews with professionals and observations. All group interviews with young people were conducted as 'journey mappings' (Hall 2005; Nielsen & Bruselius-Jensen 2021). Within arts and cultural contexts, the method offers a space for reflection and a mechanism for surfacing disparate interpretations of the creative experiences. As with other art-based research methods, journey mapping aims to support a process where young people can reach an understanding of and share with others what any one experience, or series of experiences, has meant for them, without any predefined outcomes or outputs against which to measure that experience. In this study, the young people worked on individual journey maps, presenting the situations, events or aspects they found to be most significant to their participation in the programmes. The interviews began with them recounting their individual journey and subsequently discussed and reflected upon their experiences in groups, facilitated by the researcher. This enabled both individual and group perspectives to be unfolded. All interviews were recorded and transcribed, and illustrations were photographed or scanned. Thematic analysis was conducted, which enabled an exploration of the discernible patterns and individual affordances of the four categories and leading into the more comprehensive typologies presented in this article.

Findings: categories of socially oriented youth arts programmes

Art skills focused

Youth arts programmes that have the acquisition and development of arts skills (Category 1) at their core afforded young people different forms of expression. Young people reported an exploratory use of materials and the 'pushing' of artistic boundaries. Extending participants' arts skills benefitted young people's different forms of expression where they enjoyed being free to test out a wide range of materials and techniques under expert tuition. Freedom was enjoyed in the lack of boundaries to what could be created, with some participants enjoying making 'ugly art' because they felt like it. Being able to try out and test new materials and equipment was also appreciated in terms of taking away the cost of investing in specialised arts products. We noted across programmes where art for arts' sake was valued, young people reported a 'creative energy' in working with others. Young people described these processes as for themselves, with no external pressures or audiences to satisfy and notably programmes were longer term, lasting between one and five years. Young people described starting off with 'safe' art medium in which they had experience, such as colour pencil and then developing more specialised techniques, such as painting. This focus on art skills enabled young people to feel empowered by experimentation, and sometimes failure, and be able to appreciate the 'artful' within everyday. At the end of each semester, young people get the opportunity to share the work they have created in public, either through an exhibition, an installation or a performance.

The ethnographic notes below describe Howard's experience of spending a day immersed in the art intensive environment of the studio. The aesthetics of the space, the work being created and the 'creative energy' is described in order to convey the young people's experience of arts skill acquisition:

> An old school building has been converted into a youth arts space. But it does not feel like a school, as young people's artwork is everywhere: walls, stairs, framed drawings, etchings, clocks, even the furniture was a creative project. There is an aesthetic to the building: underground, grungy, edgy. Young people get to visit here before they decide whether to join the programme, to see if they would fit. Art hangs from ceilings, covers all walls, every inch is covered.

> In the 3D session, there is much excitement as the ceramic work has come out of the kiln. Young people examine their pieces and discuss the colours from the glazes and the different effects these have made. The ceramic work, the first time that the group are doing this, is a mix of flatter dish shapes and more constructed bowls. There is delicate moulding and shaping to add texture and detail. Some muted green and blue colours, contrast the bright orange. Some pieces are functional, bowls, small plates, others are decorative, designed for jewellery. The ceramics are also tactile. A young person runs her fingers over the different surfaces of the different pieces.

The 3D art room feels like an art school. Each young person has a table, working on their own piece in a wide variety of mediums. Here young people get the chance to try many art skills and develop a body of work. Around the room I can see wire figures, wooden natural sculptures, faces and forms, photo light printing and canvas collage. A young person tells me that the space makes her feel creative. There is an energy. And artwork done by previous cohorts, still in place, leaves an artistic legacy.

In the 2D artwork session, there is calm and silence. Young people remain focused on their individual artwork, with some light conversation in-between. Like the 3D space, each young person has their own table with a wall full of different work they have created behind them: fine drawings with detail, fine painting skills, some firey colourful work, but also some calm black and white, monotone pieces, aesthetics much like tattoo. The quality is striking: printing techniques, precision and the preciousness of each work created. Here the focus in on making art and young people as artists, rather than an end production.

Learning art skills can be intensive and time demanding, and this can be further complicated when young people are experiencing long-term mental health conditions. A notable difference between Danish and English youth arts programmes was the additional offer of social or psychological support from trained professionals. Within the Danish programmes there were three models of long-term social and psychological support with either arts professionals getting training and regular supervision from psychologists, youth arts programmes employing a dedicated Social Worker or scheduling weekly meetings with a psychologist, that is kept separate to the art workshops. Within English programmes, despite programme claims to offer well-being and wider social benefits, artists were expected to deliver this on their own. We refer to this as the 'well-being' discourse (McLeod & Wright 2016), whereby the arts alone are called upon to contribute to well-being or psychological outcomes for young people that are often in a complicated place in their lives.

Event-oriented

The second category depicting the way that arts practice is used within youth arts programmes reflects those that are set up to plan and deliver an event for the public. These programmes were typically shorter term, two months, and focused on sharing a specific art form or cultural format, decided by facilitators and a theme decided by young people. Instead of creative energy being put into producing artwork, young people work in collaboration in teams on the planning, presentation and delivery of an event, ranging from art installations, immersive experiences and open days for family and friends. Facilitators who start these programmes with sessions based around ideas generation then allocate project management tasks, inviting young people to participate in all aspects of the event process from hosting to social media promotion to booking bands, craft stalls and food providers. From these kinds of programmes, young people reported that they had developed organisational, communication and presenting skills and reported positively on the process of both coming up with ideas and listening to other people's ideas. The ethnographic excerpt below illustrates the dialogical processes of planning an arts event, along with the inspiration offered by facilitators:

This is the second session that this group has met together in the theatre space of a college. They are exploring immersive cinema as the artform for their event, which has been decided prior to the program starting by the facilitators from two arts organisations. One facilitator explains that immersive cinema is setting up scenery, actors and props that can bring the film to life. The task of the session today is to decide on the film to be played and the theme for the event. The facilitators have prepared a 'mood board' (powerpoint presentation) with visual images, trailer clips and other materials to act as inspiration for the young people. This is regular part of the program at the beginning 'the inspo' (inspiration). There is a discussion about the different characters in the films and young people suggest that they might like to play the different characters, such as pirates.

The mood board shares particular aesthetics of these films: tropical islands, wooden boats, flags, pirate costumes and the Captain Hook character. The pirate-style aesthetics are popular with the young people. Following watching the film clip the facilitators are encouraging the group to discuss the artistic elements: music, colours, script and childlike qualities of the actors. This is heavily prompted by questions of what young people liked, or did not. Things they liked included the importance of the imagination, and the transition between the real and the imagined world. All agree that this is how they would like visitors to their immersive cinema experience to feel.

The choice is then opened up into the room and young people suggest films that they know. The task of selecting the film is difficult and it is clear that the facilitators feel the pressure of a tight timescale for the program. What can we learn from pirates they ask? There is much discussion from the facilitators about the practicalities of the event: a focus on the audience, limits of the space, food, costumes and hiring actors. The group finally agrees on the pirates theme but with a positive message, as the young people felt this was important. The facilitators return to the powerpoint in order to support more planning. Programme timelines and different roles are introduced. The group is tasked with watching the film: Pirates of the Caribbean, Curse of the Black Pearl over the next week.

Within these event-focused programmes marginalised young people's voice and decision-making is fore-fronted; however, this is often conditioned by the offer of the programme and what is seen as a practical reality by the programme leaders, and there was consensus that making final decisions was challenging. Young people involved in these programmes were often positioned as 'volunteering' as a positive use of their time, but often met by over-controlling and tokenistic involvement of young people in organising arts events that distort meaningful experiences due to the logics of 'project-based regimes' (Bruselius-Jensen & Nielsen 2021). Within this specific programme which included young people with learning disabilities, for the performance roles, it was suggested that 'professional' actors be invited so that there would be a 'high quality' output for the audience.

Entrepreneurial

For programmes that had more of a work-based or creative industries focus, the development of marginalised young people as entrepreneurs and young promoters

was central. This included exposure to industry professionals through a series of masterclasses, and opportunities for networking within particular cultural 'scenes'. In contrast to the previous typologies, young people arrived at these programmes with pre-acquired art skills, usually in digital art forms, that had been self-taught or developed as part of 'bedroom culture' (McRobbie & Garber 1975). Having an industry focus meant that young people valued the programmes as preparation for self-employment and freelance work, often through the undertaking of individual projects such as making EPs, developing brands and hosting gigs. It was interesting to note the offer of paid employment through these programmes, with one of the programmes giving participants funding for a creative project and another offering smaller paid jobs within industry roles. Social connections to professionals in the industry were also important to the young people who often received support with social media profiles and cultivating their image as an artist. The positioning of these programmes as support for the young people's creative community, the local arts scene and the wider industry was clear. The focus on the entrepreneurial side of art was visible through the content on offer to young people in terms of building a financially viable career and public recognition through events, promotions, gigs and royalties from streaming.

One of the programmes in our study was co-produced with the young people. It was multi-artform and collaborative, with the young person in charge of their own learning and progression. This category centres on projecting young artists onto the next level, a level where they might start to see some financial gain from their creativity. When discussing what they value about the programme, young people cite the social connections and tapping into the 'scene', which they see as a stepping stone to their future plans in the creative industries. For the programme leader, this scheme is about maintaining a local cultural scene and nurturing future talent, which is supported through access to networks, venues, partners and funding.

The below quote from the programme leader explains the model upon which one of the programmes was based: young people attending masterclasses, working for the record label and then working on their own micro-project, for which they are given £500 funding:

> Young people join the program for a year and the first block is learning about the record label, learning about the work we do, learning about the roles. They do 50 hours of workshops, of masterclasses where we bring people in that we're connected to, professionals who work in the industry. Last year, we linked one young person up with Sky TV and he ended up writing some theme music for the James Bond advert. Then they do 50 hours of external work, so that might be supporting us with events, festivals, radio shows, branding, social media, all sorts of stuff. Then another 50 hours, which is on their own micro-project and they get £500 pounds to go directly to that project. And with their micro-project it's also about creating a diverse group, but also a group that will work well together. Last year we had zine makers, radio presenters, fashion brands, musicians, producers, DJ's. This year we've got some cool projects, a lot of people are producing EP's, creative days for the community, someone wants to start small pop-up events in coffee shops and someone has launched a brand called Queer Utopia. They can use any venue in the city, pretty much, because we have done events there and know the people, and we've got all the gear, we've got all the PA systems, we've got

everything they need... It's about the networking, because we have built that up over many years, and in just a couple of months, young people can get connected with venue owners or musicians or they're learning how to get gig licences, how to do tickets and all that stuff.

The entrepreneurial focused programmes have affordances for social networks and connections, educating young people on a way to make a living, how to get funding and industry knowledge. However, it is questionable whether these programmes are setting marginalised young people up for uncertain futures by encouraging them towards self-employed careers in the arts and creative industries. In addition, in order to claim successes within these entrepreneurial programmes, there was a risk of platforming those young people 'who made it' afterwards and overlooking the more vulnerable young people.

Open access

We take the concept of 'open access' for this category from the domain of youth work (Ritchie & Ord 2017). Open access programmes are those that offer drop-in sessions and regular programmes that young people can attend on a voluntary basis. We select this concept because of the shared youth work approaches encompassed within this category; these include shared decision-making and youth leadership, as well as a grassroots approach to cultural production (Batsleer 2011). Youth work approaches of trust, relationship building and supporting marginalised groups are also operationalised. Similar to art skills and entrepreneurial programmes, young people are afforded access to professional-standard spaces, equipment and support with producing high-end artistic products. There is a focus on engaging young people from disadvantaged communities, challenging a discourse of deficit communities and negative stereotypes of young people (Eriksson *et al.* 2022) through platforming a mix of young people who would not normally be positioned as recognised art makers (Friedman & Laurison 2020). Therefore, within this category, showing the wider public the artistic capabilities of the young people who stand out is important.

One of the programmes within our study was based in a newly renovated Chapel hosting two recording studios, a film editing suite, a gallery and workshop space. The focus was on high quality artistic production and this is afforded through access to professional standard equipment and art skilled staff to support young people. The programme leader expressed their clear vision that this is an art house for young people, not a youth club. The programme worked in three areas of social housing, with a large presence of migrant communities, and responded to the sense that the community was tired of short-term arts programmes being 'done to them'. Whilst the programme offers equipment and support with production, the young people bring the artistic content, which is inspired through their everyday lives. This is a dialogical approach with no theme or agenda being set. The programme supports art as a dimension of life, a third common language through which to build community. The programme leader's plan is to support young people's cultural production by helping them to finalise high end artistic end products and present them to the outside. The excerpt below describes open access processes of art making with young people:

It's actually part of the concept that you can come in with the wish to do a song and within almost a few hours or a few days come out with something that you're proud of. It is heavily edited with the help of an adult assistant, but it's a way to draw them in. We actually hear quite a lot that although there may be a studio in the youth club, the work never becomes a song. It never turns into anything, and that's a big issue because the time the door [to young people's sense of themselves as creators] is open for is not very long. So they need to get something quite fast so that they can see themselves be proud and show their friends. And it can also be a part of the learning process, to get your vocal recording super-edited, tightened up, even auto-tuned, because all the music the youth listens to today is heavily auto-tuned. So first, it's more about the process, and the end product plays a big part in the process... Another example was a young girl from Somalia, she did this photo exhibition. For Somali families the use of colorful textiles in everyday life is very important, whereas in Denmark, she felt very embarrassed because everybody was dark blue and black. She felt it was very inappropriate, and had a revelation to do this super beautiful exhibition. It is a very high-end cultural artifact. It took her three weeks, because she was taking all these pictures in her home without any of the instructors being there. But she was getting guided at the program and she was assisted in how to approach that shooting session to make a coherent piece of art and not just random photos. And it was a lot of this editing here with an instructor.

Despite offering young people the opportunity to speak back to deficit discourse, open access programmes can limit how young people's ideas become art productions. Often socially filtered through charitable foundations or social housing projects that fund this work, instrumental aims such as social cohesion and desistance from crime can challenge the nature of young people's artistic work and their ideas about 'who' can be an artist and 'what' count as art. For example, within this programme, this manifested in the censorship of young people's gangster rap productions, which were not allowed to contain the organisation's logo.

Proposing a typology for socially oriented youth art programmes

Above we have shared how, in socially oriented youth art programmes, the lines between intentions, actualities and outcomes are often blurred. We argue this can cause these programmes to become diluted, lose focus and negatively affect young people's experiences. Bringing the dilemmas of art programmes – as highlighted in international research literature over the past two decades – into closer dialogue with the characteristics of socially oriented youth arts programmes allows for a more domain-specific analysis that sheds light on the difficulties that can arise at the local level. Making distinctions between different kinds of socially oriented youth art programmes can be important in the formation of future programmes, but also helps arts practitioners and youth workers to better understand and work with the dilemmas. We argue that these dilemmas arise particularly when the paradigms of existing programmes are shifted due to changes in the political or social discourses framing cross-disciplinary youth work at the intersection between art and social work.

We therefore propose a typology which synthesises previously published international research and the empirical research carried out by Howard and Nielsen over the past decade, which is anchored in the recent cross-national study carried out between the two authors. The proposed typology (Figure 1) is based upon the main characteristics of the programmes, how they work differently with young people and the dilemmas that are inherited within the distinctive categories.

Category 1 'art skills' was recognisable through intensive expert tuition that explored different mediums and techniques using art. However, these programmes that start to introduce a social or psychological aspect without professional support we have labelled as the 'well-being discourse', which challenges the assumption that arts programmes are unquestioningly positioned as beneficial for young people's mental health. Through our comparative work, we highlight the importance of trained professional support with dedicated roles for mental health, which is separate from the art skills development.

Category 2 sought to develop young people's 'event-oriented' skills, which is seen as the wider endeavour, encompassing ways of engaging with cultural events. Within the programmes in which we conducted fieldwork, several were working on organising public events. These event-oriented programmes were often theme-based and involved teamwork from the young people who would be involved in ideas generation and planning tasks, that did not necessarily involve making art. With event-oriented programmes, in particular those that demonstrated 'project-based regimes', these formed part of the governmentality referred to by Hickey-Moody (2013), whereby arts programmes can be used in an instrumental and individualised way to control young people or to encourage them to come to terms with their previous risk-taking practices (Baker & Homan 2007). Often these programmes are 'parachuted' into 'areas of need' or seen as 'parasites' on institutions that work with marginalised groups of young people. Young people's arts participation risks tokenism, fulfilling promises to funders and arts institutions, leaving them without the event-oriented skills needed to make things happen in their local areas or future lives.

Category 3 highlights the 'entrepreneurial' nature of some youth arts programmes, which were focused on, and valued for, job roles aligned to the creative industries. In these programmes, young people would lead their own artistic activities, often digital in nature, which frequently led to freelance work. Arts programmes with an entrepreneurial focus can obscure the role that scarce resources and competitive cultural economies play in the area of the creative industries. Encouraging all participants to become industry workers, artists or to monetise their artistic expression can be limiting for those taking up the programmes. Preparing some often quite vulnerable young people for the 'risky business' of the creative industries can have unethical undertones (McRobbie 2016). New modes of reflexive governance can reframe these arts programmes as technology for neoliberal economies (Hickey-Moody 2013), whereby those seeking to challenge the source of artistic production can become complicit in reproducing social stereotypes.

Finally, within category 4 'Open access', young people leading the artistic production was also characteristic. However, the value of these programmes was in affording marginalised groups of young people access to highly professional equipment, support and spaces, like recording studios. The open access programmes, which accommodate the most transitory groups of young people, flux in commitment and attendance due to voluntary participation, have limitations on what they

The Categories and Dilemmas of Socially-Oriented Youth Art Programmes				
PROGRAMME CATEGORIES / CHARACTERISTICS	ART SKILLS	EVENT-ORIENTED	ENTREPRENEURIAL	OPEN ACCESS
ATTENDANCE	Long term, immersive	Short term, inclusive, task-based	Long term, selective, future-orientated	Free, voluntary participation, flexible
MAIN OFFER	High quality art materials Intensive professional tuition	Theme-based and place responsive Time line and task coordination	Creative industries work experience Mentoring	Professional equipment Professional production support
DILEMMA	Wellbeing discourse	Project regime Forms of Governance	Economic rhetoric Precarious employment	Deficit view of marginalised group
OUTCOME	Experience with different art mediums and techniques	Experience with team work and planning tasks	Social networks for freelance careers	High end artistic products Speaking back to society

Figure 1
The Categories and Dilemmas of Socially-Oriented Youth Art Programmes.

can achieve. Tending to offer more 'quick fix' or 'quick wins' (Kinder 2004) approaches to art-making, ideas on what art can be and who can be an artist are subject to adult control or leadership. Ideologies of salvation and intentions to provide diversionary and 'positive' activities risk infiltrating these programmes, which often attend to the most marginalised young people in the most disadvantaged geographical areas.

Our typology, shown in Figure 1, helps practitioners and programme leaders to become attuned to the risks of these dilemmas across programmes that hold different values at their core. We do not offer any judgement on which category is best or preferred, as we recognise the need to avoid one-size-fits-all approaches and the importance of meeting young people's diverse needs. But we call for cautious and careful reflection on the dilemmas on part of the professionals in order to fully support young people's experience of socially oriented youth art programmes. This implication is relevant for both new and existing programmes, which can inherit new dilemmas when traversing categories. By bringing our new empirical work and our previous research – rooted across many more cases than communicated in this article – together with the literature on dilemmas in youth arts programmes, we highlight different categories of programmes, and how they are underpinned by diverse motivations and approaches.

Conclusion

This article has explored the discernible patterns and individual affordances of four diverse categories of socially oriented youth arts programmes leading to a comprehensive typology. We defined the categories based upon our former research in Denmark and the United Kingdom as well as in six global settings (Howard explored cases in Chicago, Helsinki, Dresden, Glasgow, Dublin and Perth) and unfolded the different potentials and dilemmas through recent comparative

fieldwork across five programmes in England and Denmark. Those that focused on developing young people's *art skills* tended to be longer-term, immersive experiences, where young people received professional tuition and got to experience different art mediums and techniques. In comparison, there were other programmes which *focused on events*, which were shorter-term and task-based, often driven by a theme or a specific place, where young people gained experience of teamwork and planning activities. Another category was the *entrepreneurial* programmes, which developed skills for young people's futures, offering work experience in the creative industries, mentoring and developing social networks for freelance careers. Finally, the programmes that were more *open access* in nature offered free, voluntary and flexible participation, as well as access to professional standard equipment and production support. These programmes were more likely to be attended by marginalised groups and speak back to artistic canons of art production.

We offered these categories, not as a judgement on what is best, but in order to signpost potential dilemmas inherent within our typology. The literature base, including some of our own previous research, highlighted the dilemmas for discussion, including the well-being discourse, project regimes, forms of governance, economic rhetoric and deficit positioning of marginalised groups. We argue that because outcomes for young people can often get lost within these dilemmas, their needs are not properly attended to and socially oriented youth arts programmes may, inadvertently, be set up for failure. Our research shows that artists, arts practitioners and youth workers who support the programmes are not always geared to understand the dilemmas; for example, adding social and psychological elements that are not appropriately staffed. Youth arts programmes are at risk of letting down not only young people's expectations but also the expectations of funders. Within each of the categories, there are challenges of governance and limits of negotiation between young people and adults, which need to be brought into focus in order to deal with these dilemmas.

Acknowledgements

Frances Howard is an Associate Professor in Youth Research at Nottingham Trent University, England. She has previously worked in local authorities, arts education and youth work. Frances has recently published *Global Perspectives on Youth Arts Programs: how and why the arts can make a difference* (Policy Press, 2022) and is an advisory board member of Nottingham Community Artist Network. Her research interests include youth work, arts programmes, music-making and well-being. Frances leads the Youth Rearch group at Nottingham Trent University and is Deputy Director of the Centre for Policy Citizenship and Society.

Anne Mette Winneche Nielsen is an Assistant Professor at the Centre for Youth Research (CeFU), Department of Culture and Learning, Aalborg University, Denmark. Her research focuses on young people's engagement in art, culture and community projects. She has been involved in various large research projects involving new theoretical and methodological approaches to the participation and agency of young people on the edge of society. Recent publications include 'Changing Gellerup Park: Political interventions and aesthetic

engagement in an exposed social housing area in Denmark' (2022); 'Journey Mapping as a method to make sense of participation' (2020); 'The participation project' (2020); 'Youth on the edge of society and their participation in community art projects' (2019).

References

Baker, S. & Homan, S. (2007) Rap, recidivism and the creative self: a popular music programme for young offenders in detention, *Journal of Youth Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 459–76.

Batsleer, J. (2011) Voices from an edge. Unsettling the practices of youth voice and participation: arts-based practice in The Blue Room, Manchester, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 419–34.

Brook, O., Miles, A., O'Brien, D. & Taylor, M. (2023) Social mobility and 'openness' in creative occupations since the 1970s, *Sociology*, Vol. 57, No. 4, pp. 789–810.

Bruselius-Jensen, M. & Nielsen, A. M. W. (2021) 'The participation project – how project organization condition young people's participation'. I, in M. Bruselius-Jensen, K. Tisdall & I. Pitti [Eds] *Young people's participation – revisiting youth and inequalities*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bungay, H. & Vella-Burrows, T. (2013) The effects of participating in creative activities on the health and well-being of children and young people: a rapid review of the literature, *Perspectives in Public Health*, Vol. 133, No. 1, pp. 44–52.

Corbisiero-Drakos, L., Reeder, L. K., Ricciardi, L., Zacharia, J. & Harnett, S. (2021) Arts integration and 21st century skills: a study of learners and teachers, *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 2–25.

Eliasoph, N. (2015) Spirals of perpetual potential: how empowerment projects' noble missions tangle in everyday interaction, in C. W. Lee, M. McQuarrie & E. T. Walker [Eds] *Democratizing inequalities*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 165–86.

Ennis, G. M. & Tonkin, J. (2018) 'It's like exercise for your soul': how participation in youth arts activities contributes to young people's wellbeing, *Journal of Youth Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 340–59.

Eriksson, N., Sørensen, A. S. & Yates, M. F. (2022) *Kunst i almene boligområder. Mellem udsathed, inddragelse og forandring*. Available from: https://aauforlag.dk/produkt/sociologi-(1)/kunst-i-almene-boligomrader-1 [Accessed 30th July 2024].

Friedman, S. & Laurison, D. (2020) *The class ceiling: why it pays to be privileged*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, R. (2005) *The value of visual exploration: understanding cultural activities with young people*. West Bromwich: The Public.

Hickey-Moody, A. (2013) *Youth, arts, and education: reassembling subjectivity through affect*. New York: Routledge.

Hickey-Moody, A., Kelly, P., Brook, S., Hulbert, T. W., Cornell, C. & Khan, R. (2022) Youth arts as popular education: cultural studies at the edges of the creative industries, *Continuum*, Vol. 36, No. 5, pp. 699–710.

Howard, F. (2020) Pedagogies for the 'dis-engaged': diverse experiences of the young people's arts award programme, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 672–85.

Howard, F. (2022a) Artistic production and (re)production: youth arts programmes as enablers of common cultural dispositions, *Cultural Sociology*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 468–485.

Howard, F. (2022b) *Global perspectives on youth arts programs: how and why the arts can make a difference*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Howard, F. (2022c) Using and abusing the arts with 'at-risk' youth, *Journal of Applied Youth Studies*, Vol. 5, pp. 101–16.

Howard, F. (2023) *Phlexx & Mimm: youth music incubator.* https://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/49963/1/1818433_Howard.pdf [Accessed 5th December 2023].

Howard, F., Brocken, S. & Sim, N. (2018) Youth work, arts practice and transdisciplinary space, in P. Alldred, F. Cullen, K. Edwards & D. Fusco [Eds] *The SAGE handbook of youth work practice.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE, pp. 271–83.

Howard, F. & Pickford, R. (2024) *Takeover project evaluation report.* Available from: https://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/52422/1/2254415_Howard.pdf [Accessed 17th July 2024].

Kinder, K. H. J. (2004) The arts and social inclusion: what's the evidence? *Support for Learning*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 52–66.

McLeod, J. & Wright, K. (2016) What does wellbeing do? An approach to defamiliarize keywords in youth studies, *Journal of Youth Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 776–92.

McRobbie, A. (2016) *Be creative: making a living in the new culture industries.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

McRobbie, A. & Garber, J. (1975) Girls and subcultures, in S. Hall & T. Jefferson [Eds] *Resistance through rituals: youth subcultures in post-war Britain.* Hutchinson, Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis, pp. 209–22.

Nielsen, A. M. W. & Bruselius-Jensen, M. (2021) 'Journey mapping as a method to make sense of young people's participation'. I, in M. Bruselius-Jensen, K. Tisdall & I. Pitti [Eds] *Young people's participation – Revisiting youth and inequalities.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Nielsen, A. M. W. & Sørensen, N. U. (2017) *Når kunst gør en forskel: unges deltagelse i kunst- og kulturprojekter som alternativ arena for sociale indsatser.* Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.

Nielsen, A. M. W. & Sørensen, N. U. (2019) Youth on the edge of society and their participation in community art projects. I, *International Journal of Education Through Art*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 201–15.

Ritchie, D. & Ord, J. (2017) The experience of open access youth work: the voice of young people, *Journal of Youth Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 269–82.

Sørensen, N. U. & Nielsen, A. M. W. (2023) *Aspiranterne fra et ungeperspektiv: en ny. beskæftigelsesindsats på kulturområdet belyst gennem unges oplevelser og fortællinger.* Copenhagen: Center for Ungdomsforskning.

Thomson, P., Hall, C., Jones, K. & Sefton-Green, J. (2012) *The signature pedagogies project: final report.* Available from: http://old.creativitycultureeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/Signature_Pedagogies_Final_Report_April_2012.pdf [Accessed 18th January 2014].

Toft, M. & Friedman, S. (2021) Family wealth and the class ceiling: The propulsive power of the bank of mum and dad, *Sociology*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 90–109.