
 Эдебиееттер

1. Burns P. M. Social Identities, Globalisation, and the Cultural Politics of Tourism // Global Tourism. Ed. By W. F. Theobald. - Oxford: Elsevier Inc., 2005.
 2. Nye J., Jr. Soft power / Nye J., Jr. // Foreign Policy. – Washington. – 1990. – № 80.
 3. Козлов Л.Е. Применение культурных инструментов в современной внешнеполитической практике. Вестник Челябинского государственного университета, № 12 (266), 2012.
 4. Най Дж. «Мягкая» сила и американо-европейские отношения // Свободная мысль – XXI, 2004.
 5. Василенко Е.В. Культурная дипломатия как инструмент «мягкой силы» государства. // URL:<http://politinform.su/analitika/42491-kulturnaya-diplomatiya-kak-instrument-myagkoy-sily-gosudarstva.html>
 6. Milton C. Cummings Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: a Survey / C Milton. // Center for Arts and Culture. –2003. –Vol. 1.
 7. Фокин В.И. Формирование содержания понятий «внешняя культурная политика» и «культурная дипломатия» // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета. Серия 6. 2004.
 8. Николаева Ю.В., Боголюбова Н.М. Выработка определения внешней культурной политики в современном научном дискурсе. 2012. No 4 (18).
 9. Simon Mark. A Greater Role for Cultural Diplomacy. – Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'. -2009.- ISSN 1569-2981.
 10. Тенденции и перспективы культурной интеграции обсудили в Астане// веб-сайт strategy 2050.kz [Электронный ресурс]. – <https://strategy2050.kz/ru/news/15699>.
 11. Попов В.И. Современная дипломатия: теория и практика. Дипломатия – наука и искусство : курс лекций. 2-е изд, доп. М. : Международ. отношения, 2003.
-

ANALYSIS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF APPRENTICESHIPS PROGRAMME IN ENGLAND AS A POLICY TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF YOUNG PEOPLE NOT IN EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT OR TRAINING (NEET)

Abstract. Various difficulties in the transition from school to work, causing non-participation in education, training or work, can lead to the social exclusion or to the casual unskilled work or unemployment, delinquency and crime. As there is a higher proportion of young people not in education, employment or training (hereafter – NEET) in England compared to other the OECD countries, England has strong political will to reduce this number. However, even if there is strong political will and a good policy, the desired results can be determined by the implementation stage. The aim of this study is to analyse the implementation of the apprenticeships policy in England to reduce the number of NEETs with an emphasis on the degree of successful policy implementation and main causes of this phenomenon.

This study has revealed some areas for the future research: the level of ambiguity and conflict of policy may vary at different levels of implementation process – central and local, which is not mentioned in the work of Matland (1995), since both central and local levels are considered as a whole. However, in practice depending on single cases, this can be different, and this has been proven by this study.

Keywords: public policy, policy analysis, policy implementation, implementation failure, apprenticeship policy, young people not in education, employment or training (NEET), England.

**OSPANKULOV
GABIDULLA**

an assistant-professor of the National School of Public Policy of the Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Director of Youth Policy Department of the Ministry for Religious and Civil Society Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Introduction

Policy-making is a complex process (Lindblom, 1959), in which, while attention of policy makers and society is increased at the stages of agenda setting and policy formulation, it is reduced after policy is adopted (Cairney, 2012). However, an achievement of intended results of policy requires an effective implementation (Grindle and Thomas, 1991; Matland, 1995; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973; O'Toole and Montjoy; 1984, Lundin, 2007). Matland (1995) argues various factors causing implementation problems can lead to the implementation failure, and policy goals can be implemented successfully depending on how these implementation problems are tackled.

This research limited itself to study the level of ambiguity and conflict of the apprenticeships policy, which provides a more comprehensive, and coherent platform on which the independent variables of desired implementation outcomes can be considered from four implementation perspectives: Administrative Implementation; Political Implementation; Experimental Implementation; and Symbolic Implementation. The aim of this study is to analyse the implementation of the apprenticeships policy in England to reduce the number of young people not in education, employment or training with an emphasis on the degree of successful policy implementation and the main causes of this phenomenon. Although the terminology is debatable and there is considerable confusion in the literature as to what constitutes successful implementation, in this study, a successful implementation is defined as the degree to which objectives of public policy are achieved and this implementation is successful in producing a desired outcome (Knill and Lenschow, 2000; Matland, 1995; Palumbo et al., 1984).

England has been chosen as a country for several reasons: the proportion of NEETs is

above the OECD average (OECD, 2015); strong political will to reduce this number (Cabinet Office, 2016; House of Commons Library, 2016a); and finally, political system and how this system operates (De Mesquita et al., 1999). In January to March 2016, 81% of the total 865,000 NEETs in the United Kingdom (hereafter – UK) aged 16-24 lived in England (Department for Education (hereafter – DfE), 2016b; Office for National Statistics (hereafter ONS), 2016a)⁶. The immediate call for actions became once more relevant in 2011 after the riots in London and in several areas across England, including Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester, where most participants, according to Lewis et al. (2011) were NEETs. While, difficulties in the transition from school to work cause non-participation in education, training or work in turn can lead to the social exclusion (Thompson, 2011). The apprenticeships policy is employed to make a successful school-to-work transition and is considered as being a crucial safeguard against social exclusion (House of Commons Library, 2016b). As prevailing political parties determine functions of operational institutions in England, that will be sustained or transformed depending on the political objectives of the party in power (Bynner, 2001; Bentley and Gurumurthy, 1999), this can directly affect the implementation results (De Mesquita et al., 1999). Considering the above, the Government is committed to the achievement of 3 million apprenticeships by 2020 and to work together with all main stakeholders to increase the quality of apprenticeships (Department for Business, Innovation and

⁶ However, this data of ONS can be a subject to uncertainty, since the information was gathered from a survey of the UK households employing sampling method rather than from whole population. Therefore, results of these sample surveys can be considered as estimates, not precise figures.

Skills(hereafter – BIS), 2015a; 2016; DfE, 2016d).

Different Approaches to Policy Implementation.

The difficulties in an attainment of the desired objectives of a policy were the subject of the early work of Lindblom (1959)– ‘The Science of ‘Muddling Through’ which dates back to 1959. The main debates in policy implementation studies have been evolving since 1970s; among those scholars there are some who support or oppose top-down (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973; Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975; Sabatier and Mazmanian, 1979; 1980) or bottom-up (Berman, 1978; Hjern and Porter, 1981; Hjern and Hull, 1982; Lipsky, 1980) approaches of implementation. Based on the analysis and synthesis of the strengths and weaknesses of both approaches, this top-down versus bottom-up debate led to third generation studies (Matland, 1995). These studies attempted to integrate merits of both approaches to make combined models (Frederickson et al., 2015; Goggin et al., 1990; Hill and Hupe, 2009). However, an attempt to make a manageable general theory led to failure, mainly due to neglect of a type of policy being carried out which determines the implementation variations (Frederickson et al., 2015; Goggin et al., 1990; Howlett and Ramesh, 2003; Parsons, 1995). Furthermore, bias in a research design can be reflected in hybrid models (Cairney, 2009). Matland (1995) argues that the usefulness of different approaches is determined by various circumstances and appropriateness of either top-down or bottom-up models depends on the level of ambiguity-conflict in a policy. From this perspective Matland (1995) proposed a comprehensive model of policy implementation which evaluates characteristic of a policy through the ambiguity-conflict model.

Implementation Failure and Successful Implementation

By contributing to the main debate, scholars such as Pressman and Wildavsky (1973; 1984), Sabatier and Mazmanian (1979) and Bardach (1977) created the literature regarding implementation failure. Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) argue that the greater likelihood of failure occurs when more actors are involved in the

process of implementation. However, Hogwood and Gunn (1984) by giving a broader explanation, argue that there are three key factors for the implementation failure: poor execution; poor policy and bad luck. Nevertheless, Matland (1995) argues that successful policy implementation, to large extent, can be secured by three factors. First, the policy goals and means should be explicit, which directly affect the implementation success. The second factor is the level of availability of resources to support policy implementation. Finally, the third factor is the existence of a good analysis and implementation strategy to implement a policy in order to minimise discretion and improve efficiency during the implementation process. The ambiguity-conflict model developed by Matland (1995) provides a more comprehensive and coherent platform on which the ambiguity and conflict levels of policies are analysed to determine the independent variables of desired implementation outcomes from four implementation perspectives: Administrative Implementation; Political Implementation; Experimental Implementation; and Symbolic Implementation (Matland, 1995).

Young People Who Are Not in Education, Employment or Training in England

Typically, NEET young people come from disadvantaged family backgrounds and have poor living conditions (Bentley and Gurusurthy, 1999). There are numerous factors that have negative effects on young people and contribute to an increase in the numbers of NEET, which relate to inequality, family and environment variables, personal circumstances, previous experience of the training system and labour market (Bynner, 2001; Serracant, 2014). All these difficulties can contribute to an increase in the number of NEETs (Simmons et al., 2014). Perhaps, the anchor point here is the adoption of an appropriate policy (House of Commons Library, 2016a). Having said that, unemployment and a period out of education can have an extremely damaging impact on NEETs (Wolf, 2011). After reviewing of British and comparative international experience, the UK Government employed apprenticeships to reduce the number of NEETs by helping them to make a smooth

transition from school to work (House of Commons Library, 2016a; 2016b; Staffordshire and Lancashire CSU HR Team, 2013).

Apprenticeships Policy in England

Among other schemes introduced by the UK Government with elements aimed to reduce the number of NEETs, such as raising the participation age, traineeships and work programme, apprenticeships policy seems more attractive (House of Commons Library, 2016a; BIS, 2014a; 2014b). One of the main reasons is that the apprenticeships policy delivers benefits to both employers, in terms of service and productivity, and apprentices in terms of achievement of higher levels of qualification as well as an increase of their own employment prospects, productivity and wages (BIS, 2014a; 2014b).

The apprenticeship scheme in England provides a policy for reducing NEET numbers, creating an opportunity for social inclusion (National Careers Service(hereafter –NCS), 2016; Connexions Sandwell, 2016). In this light, the relationships between the central government agencies, local authorities, employers and education and training providers can be mobilised to reach an intended policy outcome. The implementation process can be divided into two main stages: organisation of recruitment of potential participants as an application stage and organisation of job arrangements and educational opportunities for them as an apprenticeship stage, which includes post application period (BIS, 2014a).

What Is the Degree of Successful Policy Implementation?

In terms of the degree to which objectives of public policy are achieved, it seems to be not at the significant level, and the implementation seems to be not successful in producing a desired outcome, which means there is a low degree of successful policy implementation. An analysis of secondary sources and statistical data shows that the intended outcome – reduction of the number of NEETs (House of Commons, 2016a) seems to be not significant successful compared to the period of both prior and after apprenticeships, although, the potential of the

apprenticeships policy was high. In terms of an effect the apprenticeships policy has on the reduction of NEET number in the post apprenticeships period, the findings of the apprenticeship Evaluation Learner Survey 2014 show that apprentices at Levels 2 and 3 were more likely to be unemployed after completion of apprenticeships if they were NEET prior to enrolment (BIS, 2014a).

Why the Implementation of the Apprenticeships Policy in England to Reduce the Number of NEET Young People at this Degree?

Having high potential in conjunction with the high interests of young people towards the apprenticeships, why is the implementation of the apprenticeships policy to reduce the number of NEETs in England at a low degree?The findings from the qualitative primary data gathered through interviews and research of existing secondary data have revealed the level of policy ambiguity and policy conflict of the implementation process of apprenticeship policy in England. All respondents at both central and local levels noted that the reduction of the number of NEETs is an agreed-upon goal of the apprenticeships policy, and there is no lack of clarity of this goal as well as means of achieving this policy goal. According to Matland (1995) this is evidence that the degree of ambiguity in the apprenticeships policy is low, which is according to the top-down approach, an independent variable of the implementation success (Sabatier, 1986; Sabatier and Mazmanian, 1980; Hogwood and Gunn, 1984). However, this can have a negative effect if there is a high degree of the policy conflict.

In contrast to the policy ambiguity, the extent of policy conflict varies between central and local levels (see Figure 4). The findings from the qualitative primary data gathered through interviews and research of existing secondary data, show that at local level, the degree of policy conflict is lower than at central level. Since an implementation process is a transformation of the policy output into a policy outcome, the degree of policy conflict is determined by comparing the output, which an implementation agency should

implement, with the most preferred outcomes of this agency (Cairney, 2012; Matland, 1995).

In contrast, the agencies at central level prefer to consider their most preferred outcomes from different perspectives, such as working with all young people without dividing them into NEET groups, and to focus on the support of businesses to develop their staff. According to Matland (1995) a difference between the most preferred outcome and the output that the agency should implement indicates the existence of high policy conflict. However, it is problematic to identify the preferred outcomes of agencies at central level, since during interviews it seems interviewees prefer to avoid this type of questions, or are ambiguous in their answers. Nevertheless, in addition to the qualitative primary data, the preferred outcomes can be identified by the primary qualitative research findings supported by existing literature, including the strategic documents of the governmental bodies.

The existence of the high degree of policy conflict at central level can be explained according to Regan (1984), who argues that if at the stage of policy formulation, a policy goal becomes more explicit, it is more likely that a conflict will occur at the implementation stage. Matland (1995) has a similar conclusion. Although a case of implementation of the apprenticeships policy in England does not support this thesis in terms of implementation agencies at local level, since there can be both low level policy ambiguity and low level policy conflict, this thesis can be well supported in terms of implementation agencies at central level. Furthermore, the thesis of Dahrendorf (1958) can be useful, who argues that interdependence of actors, incompatibility of their objectives and a lack of or low level of inter-organisational interactions are the prerequisites for the existence of conflict. These three prerequisites of the existence of policy conflict can be considered as independent variables of the low degree of successful implementation.

First, the greater likelihood of failure occurs when more actors are involved in the policy implementation process, and mainly in the cases of both reciprocal interdependence and

sequential interdependence among large number of implementers (Bardach, 1977; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984; O'Toole and Montjoy, 1984). The case of implementation of the apprenticeships programme in England can be considered as a case, which to some extent, can support this idea since there is a large number of actors. This programme was managed by both BIS and DfE (prior July 2016) at the top level, and mainly implemented by SFA through its agencies NAS and NCS, as well as Jobcentre Plus at central level, with involvement of municipal agencies, employers and colleges at local level. As the implementation process of the apprenticeships policy comprises a range of activities, such as recruitments, brokering activities, funding programs, vacancies-search assistance and training practice, the interdependence can occur among these agencies in terms of sharing information and resources, as well as between these agencies and employers in terms of availability of vacancies.

The circumstances in which businesses as an employer are the main actors in terms of creation of the apprenticeships vacancies and decision making regarding who can be offered an apprenticeship place, makes interdependent relationships between them and the implementation agencies. Factors that affect NEETs can lead to a lack of confidence, skill deficits, a lack of work experience and low experience that can be considered as barriers in terms of obtaining the apprenticeships places, which affects the decision of employers negatively (Allard, 1996; Wolf, 2011). From the findings of the study conducted by BIS (2014a) it can be seen that nearly one in five apprentices (19%) aged 16 to 24 reported that they were NEET for three consecutive months prior to starting apprenticeships, which could be an indication that NEETs are less likely to be offered apprenticeships places (BIS, 2014a). If they are offered an apprenticeships place, they are more likely to be offered a fixed duration apprenticeship (BIS, 2014a). Figures show that a quarter (25%) of temporary apprentices reported they were classified as NEET before starting an apprenticeship programme, versus 16% of those

who were on permanent contracts (BIS, 2014a). Moreover, employers prefer to offer apprenticeships places for their current employees, as the findings of the apprenticeship Evaluation Learner Survey 2014 (BIS, 2014a) show that nearly two thirds (64%) of apprentices at Levels 2 and 3 reported that they were internal recruits, which means that they worked for their employer prior to starting the apprenticeship programme.

Second, incompatibility of objectives of these implementation agencies and employers. SFA was established in 2010 after the closure of the Learning and Skills Council, and prior July 2016 SFA was mainly funded and supervised by BIS, when BIS funded all apprentices aged 19 and over, while DfE funded only 16-19-year olds. BIS mainly focused on the support of small and medium size entrepreneurs that take new young apprentices through incentives scheme, and implement methods to make apprenticeships more accessible to them (BIS, 2012). Nevertheless, BIS aimed only to increase of the proportion of apprentices with a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic(hereafter – BAME)background (BIS, 2016), whereas, DfE (2016d) aims to support 16-18-year olds who are classified as NEET and to those who are at risk of becoming NEET, creating technical and professional routes to employment. One of the objectives of DfE is a reduction of the number of NEETs by increasing their participation in education, employment or training (DfE, 2015). Having said that, prior to July 2016, SFA and its agencies were supervised by BIS and that NEETs were under the responsibility of DfE rather than BIS. These circumstances, to a large extent, can have an influence on the objectives of SFA and its agencies as the main implementation bodies that can change the conflict level from the high to the low.

Third, regarding the level of inter-organisational interactions between implementation agencies, the findings of the qualitative primary research provided evidence that in the case of England, there seems to be a low level of interactions between implementation agencies. During the interview of representatives

of implementation agencies at both central and local levels, they noted that if they need any information they usually they obtain it through websites, indicating that each of them implement their part separately, and as in general do not require extra information. As a manager at Connexions Dudley and a coach at Oldbury Jobcentre Plus noted that they contribute to the implementation by doing their part of the job and usually do not usually interact with other agencies⁷. Representatives from SFA and NAS had a similar idea⁸.

Implementation of complex tasks with the involvement of a large number of actors, outputs can be improved by enhancing inter-organisational interaction. Through the high degree of interaction, betterment in coordination activities and usage of additional resources, such as expertise and information shared by cooperation agencies can improve the ability to effectively implement a policy (Lundin, 2007). Maguire (2013) in his analysis of the number of young people aged between 16 and 17-year olds, who participated in education or training between 2000 and 2010, concluded that this number increased in England over a decade due to the effective work of the Connexions services. Sharing the expertise of Connexions regarding the work with NEETs could lead to the successful implementation. Lundin (2007) highlights the inter-organisational relationships as a determinant of either success or failure depending on how these relationships are managed.

Type of the Implementation of the Apprenticeships Policy in England to Reduce the Number of NEET Young People

An analysis of the findings gives some evidence to suggest that according to the Ambiguity-Conflict Matrix (Matland, 1995) the implementation of the apprenticeships policy to reduce the number of NEET young people has the elements of political implementation mainly at

⁷ From the interviews at Connexions Dudley (Mark Barnett - Manager) and Jobcentre Plus services in Sandwell (Bev Ashcroft - Work Coach).

⁸ From the interviews at SFA and NAS (preferred not to indicate the names).

central level due to low level of ambiguity and high level of conflict and to some extent the elements of administrative implementation at local level due to low level of both ambiguity and conflict. This finding is not mentioned in the thesis of Matland (1995), since it considers both central and local levels as whole, and does not divide them. However, in practice, depending on single cases, this can be different, as an example, the case of implementation the apprenticeships policy in England can evidence this.

However, according to the ambiguity and conflict theory due to the low level of ambiguity, the issue which actors should be in the main and active position in implementation must be clear (Matland, 1995). In this relation, the main and active actors of implementation are SFA and its agencies: NAS and NCS. Two interviewees, one at Birmingham Career Service and one at Wolverhampton Connexions, noted that these local implementation agencies are not the main implementation bodies, and that these agencies contribute to the implementation process in terms of helping NEETs to apply for apprenticeships⁹. A Work Coach at Oldbury Job Centre Plus had a similar idea, adding that the Jobcentre Plus as a government-founded employment agency works with young people aged 18 and over to help them to find employment, and that they work with young people from a social security perspective and with those, who seek benefits¹⁰.

SFA as a quasi-governmental body is an executive agency of DfE, which through its agencies NAS and NCS, supports, funds and co-ordinates the delivery of apprenticeships throughout England and gives professional advice on careers, skills and training to young people. Having these functions, they work on the stable basis and with standard operating procedures by using new technological approaches through electronic systems operating

at the 24/7 basis allowing participants to find vacancies, apply for apprenticeships and access the information at any time and from anywhere within England (SFA, 2016a). According to Matland (1995) these conditions make SFA and its agencies, NAS and NCS, the main and active actors of implementation. Hence, the policy implementation type is determined mainly by the degree of ambiguity and conflict of these agencies. Therefore, according to the Ambiguity-Conflict Matrix (Figure 5) due to low level of ambiguity and high level of conflict, the implementation process of the apprenticeships policy in England to reduce the number of NEET young people can be considered as the political implementation, where outcomes are determined by power or bargaining.

Conclusion

This study has revealed some areas that can be considered as an avenue for the future research. Firstly, based on analysis of the study findings, this study considers that although, this study aimed to use a deductive strategy, during the primary research, the findings led this study to put forward a new aspect of ambiguity-conflict theory. From the data collected through qualitative interviews, it can be seen that the level of ambiguity and conflict of policy may vary at different stages of the implementation process – central and local. This finding is not mentioned in the work of Matland (1995), since both central and local levels are considered as whole. However, in practice, depending on single cases, this can be different. If the level of ambiguity and conflict can be studied as a divided variable to the local and central level, this can lead to the reconsideration of the ambiguity-conflict matrix, and perhaps to the adoption of new types of policy implementation, in addition to existing four types. If the level of conflict is different at local and central levels, this can affect the implementation process, depending on which level dominates in the certain case, as described in the bottom-up versus top-down debates. In the case of implementation of the apprenticeships policy in England to reduce the number of NEET young people, the level of conflict was determined by the central level implementers, because implementation agencies at central level

⁹ This qualitative data was collected through interviews conducted with staff at Connexions Wolverhampton (Helyna Hrebinec - Team Manager) and Birmingham Careers Service (Sian Powell - Contracts & Trading Manager).

¹⁰ From the interview at Jobcentre Plus services in Sandwell (Bev Ashcroft - Work Coach).

are the main and active implementers.

Secondly, the aspects of negative factors of being NEET have been acknowledged. These aspects are deemed essential and rich to be studied in depth, through individual interviews with NEET young people, which could reveal significant data regarding their perceptions and attitudes towards factors that affect the implementation process of the apprenticeships policy to reduce the number of NEETs. However, this study has narrowed the scope of the research to the aspect of the implementation problems through identification the level of ambiguity and conflict.

Furthermore, it was identified that the implementation process of the apprenticeships policy in England to reduce the number of NEETs can be considered as the political implementation, where outcomes are determined by power or bargaining. From this perspective, for the implications for future policy and practice, there can be two possible methods that can be used to achieve the intended results.

First, it is essential to manage the level of conflict. The conceptions of both policy ambiguity and policy conflict being low or high can determine one of the ideal implementation processes in achieving the successful policy implementation. In the case of England, it is needed to decrease the conflict level that can lead to the transformation from political implementation to the administrative

implementation. In administrative implementation, according to the Ambiguity-Conflict Matrix, the implementation success to high degree, depends on the availability of resources. In this case, the possible solution in terms of securing successful implementation could be an increase resources, therefore increasing the number of apprenticeships. Aiming for the creation of 3 million new apprenticeship starts by 2020 could be an appropriate solution.

Second, according to the Ambiguity-Conflict Matrix, due to a low level of ambiguity and high level of conflict, the implementation process of the apprenticeships policy in England to reduce the number of NEET young people can be considered as the political implementation, where outcomes are determined by power, not resources. Hence, another approach is not changing the levels of ambiguity and conflict, just enhancing the implementation process by political pressure to achieve the intended results. However, the first option seems more relevant since the power utilised on the main stakeholders such as business can repel them from participating in this programme. In addition, the recent change in the structure of the implementation bodies, where the skills functions transferred from BIS to DfE, can affect the preferred policy outcomes of the main implementers towards the reduction of number of NEETs since DfE aims to support NEETs and those who are at risk becoming NEET.

Bibliography

1. Allard, A. (1996). Youth Employment: a contradiction in terms. Children's Society.
2. Avis, J. (2007). Education, Policy and Social Justice: learning and skills. Bloomsbury Publishing.
3. Bardach, E. (1977). The implementation game: What happens after a bill becomes a law (MIT studies in American politics and public policy; 1). Cambridge, Mass.; London: M.I.T. Press.
4. Becker, H., & Geer, B. (1957). Participant observation and interviewing: A comparison. Human organization, 16(3), 28-32.
5. Bentley, T., & Gurumurthy, R. (1999). Destination unknown: engaging with the problems of marginalised youth. Demos.
6. Berman, P. (1978). The Study of Macro- and Micro- Implementation. Public Policy, 26(2): 157-184.
7. BIS (2012). Business Plan 2012-2015. Department for Business Innovation and Skills. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/31960/12-p58-bis-2012-business-plan.pdf. Accessed on 16.08.2016.
8. BIS (2014a). Apprenticeships evaluation: learner survey 2014. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/387662/bis-14-1208-Apprenticeships-Evaluation-Learners-December-2014.pdf. Accessed on 5.07.2016.
9. BIS (2014b). Apprenticeships Evaluation: Employers. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/387595/bis-14-1207-Apprenticeships-Evaluation-Employers-December-2014.pdf.

Accessed on 2.07.2016.

10. BIS (2015a). English Apprenticeships: Our 2020 Vision. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/apprenticeships-in-england-vision-for-2020>. Accessed on 19.07.2016.
11. BIS (2015b). Specification of apprenticeship standards for England (SASE). Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/465572/bis-15-572-specification-of-apprenticeship-standards-for-england-SASE.pdf. Accessed on 4.08.2016.
12. BIS (2016). Corporate report: BIS single departmental plan: 2015 to 2020. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bis-single-departmental-plan-2015-to-2020/bis-single-departmental-plan-2015-to-2020>. Accessed on 16.08.2016.
13. Bresler, L. (1995). Ethical Issues in Qualitative Research Methodology. Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, (126), 29-41.
14. Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (1989). Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles (Sage library of social research; 175). Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage Publications.
15. Bryman, A. (2003). Quantity and quality in social research. Routledge.
16. Bynner, J. (2001). British Youth Transitions in Comparative Perspective. Journal of Youth Studies, 4(1), 5-23.
17. Cabinet Office (2016). The Queen's Speech 2016. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/queens-speech-2016>. Accessed on 7.07.2016.
18. Cairney, P. (2009). Implementation and the Governance Problem. Public Policy and Administration, 24(4), 355-377.
19. Cairney, P. (2012). Understanding public policy: Theories and issues. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
20. Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56(2), 81-105.
21. Connexions Sandwell (2016). Connexions Sandwell Mission Statement. Available at: http://www.connexionssandwell.co.uk/parents_carers/introduction/index.aspx. Accessed on 4.08.2016.
22. Dahrendorf, R. (1958). Towards a Theory of Social Conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2(2), 170-83.
23. De Mesquita, B., Morrow, J., Siverson, R., & Smith, A. (1999). Policy Failure and Political Survival: The Contribution of Political Institutions. The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 43(2), 147-161.
24. deLeon, P. and deLeon, L. (2002). What Ever Happened to Policy Implementation? An Alternative Approach. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 12(4), 467-492.
25. DfE (2015). Statistical First Release: Participation in Education, Training and Employment by 16-18 year olds in England: End 2014. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/436526/Main_text_16-18_participation_SFR19_2015.pdf. Accessed on 16.7.2016.
26. DfE (2016a). 16 - 18 year olds NEET and not known - summary (End 2015). 2015 local authority NEET figures. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/neet-data-by-local-authority-2012-16-to-18-year-olds-not-in-education-employment-or-training>. Accessed on 7.08.2016.
27. DfE (2016b). NEET Statistics Quarterly Brief, January to March 2016, England. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/525891/NEET_Brief_Q1-2016.pdf. Accessed on 7.08.2016.
28. DfE (2016c). NEET Statistics Quarterly Brief, October to December 2015, England. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/502684/OFFICIAL_SENSITIVE_NEET_Brief_Q4-2015_FINAL.pdf. Accessed on 10.08.2016.
29. DfE (2016d). Corporate report: Single departmental plan: 2015 to 2020. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/department-for-education-single-departmental-plan-2015-to-2020/single-departmental-plan-2015-to-2020>. Accessed on 16.08.2016.
30. DfE (2016e). NEET estimates by labour market status: SFR16/2016. Part of statistics: NEET and participation. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/neet-statistics-quarterly-brief-january-to-march-2016>. Accessed on 17.07.2016.
31. Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. The Academy of Management Review, 14(4), 532-550.
32. Forslund, A., Froberg, D. and Lindqvist, L. (2004). The Swedish Activity Guarantee, OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 16, OECD Publishing. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/631026763167>. Accessed on 26.07.2016.
33. Frederickson, H., Smith, K., Larimer, C. and Licari, M. (2015). The public administration theory primer. Westview Press.
34. Fuller, A., & Unwin, L. (1998). Reconceptualising apprenticeship: exploring the relationship between work and learning. Journal of Vocational Education and Training, 50(2), 153-173.
35. Fuller, A., & Unwin, L. (2003). Creating a 'Modern Apprenticeship': A critique of the UK's multi-sector, social inclusion approach. Journal of Education and Work, 16(1), 5-25.
36. Fuller, A., Rizvi, S., & Unwin, L. (2013). Apprenticeships and Regeneration: The Civic Struggle to Achieve Social and Economic Goals. British Journal of Educational Studies, 61(1), 63-78.
37. Furlong, A. (2006). Not a very NEET solution representing problematic labour market transitions among early school-leavers. Work, employment & society, 20(3), 553-569.
38. Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction (p. 6). White Plains, NY: Longman.
39. Goggin, M., Bowman, A., Lester, J. and O'Toole, L. (1990). Implementation theory and practice: toward a third generation. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

40. Graham, J. & Bowling, B. (1995). *Young People and Crime. Research Study 145* (London, UK Government, Home Office).
41. Green, A., Maguire, Malcolm J, & Canny, A. (2001). *Keeping track: Mapping and tracking vulnerable young people*. Bristol: Policy Press.
42. Grindle, M. and Thomas, J. (1991). *Public choices and policy change: The political economy of reform in developing countries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
43. Hanf, K. (1982). The implementation of regulatory policy: enforcement as bargaining. *European Journal of Political Research*, 10(2), 159-172.
44. Hill, M. and Hupe, P. (2009). *Implementing public policy*, 2ndedn. London: Sage.
45. Hjern, B. and Hull, C. (1982). Implementation research as empirical constitutionalism. *European journal of political research*, 10(2), 105-115.
46. Hjern, B. and Porter, D. (1981). *Implementation Structures: A New Unit of Administrative Analysis*. *Organization Studies*, 2(3), 211.
47. Hogarth, T., Gambin, L., & Hasluck, C. (2012). Apprenticeships in England: What next? *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 64(1), 41-55.
48. Hogwood, B. and Gunn, L. (1984). *Policy analysis for the real world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
49. Holland, J., & Campbell, J. (2005). *Methods in development research: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Rugby: ITDG.
50. Hood, C. (1976). *The limits of administration*. London; Toronto: Wiley.
51. Hood, C. (2010). Can We? Administrative Limits Revisited. *Public Administration Review*, 70(4), 527-534.
52. House of Commons Library (2016a). NEET: Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training. Briefing Paper. Number 06705, 21 June 2016. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06705>. Accessed on 23.06.2016.
53. House of Commons Library (2016b). Apprenticeships Policy, England 2015. Number 03052, 8 March 2016. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN03052>. Accessed on 25.06.2016.
54. Howlett, M. and Ramesh, M. (2003). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems* (2nd ed.). Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.
55. Howlett, M., Ramesh, M. and Perl, A. (2009). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
56. Hox, J. and Boeije, H. (2005) 'Data Collection, Primary vs. Secondary'. *Encyclopaedia of Social Measurement* 1,593-599;
57. Hughes, D. (2005). *Connexions: Developing options and opportunities*. CeGS Occasional Paper. Derby: Centre for Guidance Studies, University of Derby.
58. Istance, D., Rees, G., & Williamson, H. (1994). *Young people not in education, training or employment in South Glamorgan*. Cardiff: South Glamorgan Training and Enterprise Council.
59. Jick, T. (1979). Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), 602-611.
60. Johnston, R. (1986). *Philosophy and human geography: An introduction to contemporary approaches* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
61. Knill, C. and Lenschow, A. (2000). *Implementing EU environmental policy: new directions and old problems*. Manchester University Press.
62. Learning and Skills Act 2000. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/21/pdfs/ukpga_20000021_en.pdf. Accessed on 3.08.2016.
63. Lewis, Paul, Newburn, Tim, Taylor, Matthew, Mcgillivray, Catriona, Greenhill, Aster, Frayman, Harold, & Proctor, Rob. (2011). *Reading the riots: Investigating England's summer of disorder*. The London School of Economics and Political Science and The Guardian.
64. Lindblom, C. (1959). The Science of "Muddling Through" *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), 79-88. doi:1. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/973677> doi:1 on 29.07.2016.
65. Lipsky, M. (1971). *Street Level Bureaucracy and the Analysis of Urban Reform*. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 6: 391-409.
66. Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-Level Bureaucracy*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
67. Lundin, M. (2007). When Does Cooperation Improve Public Policy Implementation? *Policy Studies Journal*, 35(4), 629-652.
68. Maguire, S. (2013). Will raising the participation age in England solve the NEET problem? *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 18(1-2), 61-76.
69. Mason, J. (2002) *Qualitative Researching*. 2nd edn. London: Sage Publications
70. Matland, R. (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: The ambiguity-conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 5(2), 145-174.
71. Maxwell, S. E., & Delaney, H. D. (2004). *Designing experiments and analyzing data: a model comparison perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Mahwah, NJ.
72. Miller, W. L., & Crabtree, B. F. (1992). Primary care research: A multimethod typology and qualitative road map. In B. F. Crabtree & W. L. Miller, *Doing qualitative research* (pp. 3-28). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
73. NAS (2016). Types of Apprenticeship. Available at: file:///Users/gabidulla/Downloads/Apps_Frameworks.PDF. Accessed on 30.07.2016.

-
74. Nagel, T. (1986). *The view from nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
75. NCS (2016). Website of National Careers Service, England. Available at <https://nationalcareersservice.direct.gov.uk/Pages/Home.aspx>. Accessed on 23.07.2016.
76. Neuman, W.L. (1994). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
77. O'Toole Jr, L. J. and Montjoy, R. (1984). Interorganisational policy implementation: A theoretical perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 491-503.
78. OECD (2015), Youth not in education or employment (NEET) (indicator). doi: 10.1787/72d1033a-en (Accessed on 10 July 2016).
79. ONS (2013). UK Estimate of Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training. Available at: youngpeoplewhoareneet_tcm77-310540.pdf. Accessed on 15.07.2016.
80. ONS (2016a). Statistical bulletin: Young people not in education, employment or training (NEET):May,2016. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peoplenotinwork/unemployment/bulletins/youngpeoplenotineducationemploymentortrainingneet/may2016>. Accessed on 7.08.2016.
81. ONS (2016b). Youth Unemployment Briefing, Birmingham, July 2016. Data on Job Seekers Allowance claimants in Birmingham. Available at: https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/3470/youth_unemployment_briefing_july_2016. Accessed on 12.08.2016.
82. Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The qualitative report*, 12(2), 281-316.
83. Özerdem, A., & Bowd, R. (2010). *Participatory research methodologies: Development and post-disaster/conflict reconstruction*. Farnham; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
84. Palumbo, D. J., Maynard-Moody, S., & Wright, P. (1984). Measuring degrees of successful implementation achieving policy versus statutory goals. *Evaluation review*, 8(1), 45-74.
85. Parsons, W. (1995). *Public policy*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
86. Pearce, N., & Hillman, Josh. (1998). *Wasted youth: Raising achievement and tackling social exclusion*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
87. Pemberton, S. (2008). Tackling the NEET generation and the ability of policy to generate a 'NEET' solution - Evidence from the UK. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 26(1), 243-259.
88. Pressman, J. and Wildavsky, A. (1973). *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
89. Pressman, J. and Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation: how great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland: or, why it's amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the Economic Development Administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation of ruined hopes*. University of California Press.
90. Rees, G., Williamson, H., & Istance, D. (1996). 'Status Zero': a study of jobless school-leavers in South Wales. *Research Papers in Education*, 11(2), 219-235.
91. Regan, P. M. (1984). Personal information policies in the United States and Britain: The dilemma of implementation considerations. *Journal of Public Policy*, 4(1), 19-38.
92. Rennison, J., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., & Ashworth, K. (2006). *Young people not in education, employment or training: evidence from the Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots Database*. Richard, D. (2012). *The Richard Review of Apprenticeships*. BIS. London. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/34708/richard-review-full.pdf. Accessed on 19.07.2016.
-