

Connected Communities

Communities in care:

A scoping review to establish the relationship of community to the lives of looked after children and young people

Leslie Hicks, Diane Simpson, Ian Mathews, Karin Crawford, Harriet Koorts with Kevin Cooper



Communities in care: a scoping review to establish the relationship of community to the lives of looked after children and young people

**Leslie Hicks, Diane Simpson, Ian Mathews,
Harriet Koorts with Kevin Cooper**

Executive Summary

Friendship networks and relationships with communities are important parts of the lives of looked after children and young people (LACYP). Much of legislation, policy, practice and research focuses on 'the care experience' itself, as distinct from young people's everyday lives and their connectivity with wider environments. Considerable lack of understanding remains about what being 'in care' means. This often results in prejudice and stigma. Groups set up specifically for LACYP offer opportunities to develop networks and relationships with adults and young people, and to raise awarenesses. Transitions may happen early and be experienced frequently by LACYP, however, they can offer new opportunities and positive relationships with different people. Meaningful participation in communities such as schools is an important factor in developing stability in relationships. Concepts of participation and empowerment form part of an ecological framework which locates the community context as central to building resilience for LACYP. What constitutes community cohesion and connectedness for LACYP requires a fine balance between the interests of protection and participation. Successful interconnectedness is a matter of shared concern for all. The key challenge remains that of identifying how stable community relationships for LACYP may be strengthened and supported to dynamic mutual benefit.

Researchers and Project Partners

School of Health and Social Care, University of Lincoln

Key words looked after children; young people; participation; social networks

Communities in Care

Introduction and background to the review

The scoping review on which this short paper is based is one of a series of small studies commissioned under the Arts and Humanities Research Council *Connected Communities* research programme. The review set out to establish what is known currently about the relationship between 'community'¹ and 'looked after children and young people' (LACYP)² and the corresponding implications for future research. Findings from the review inform four short practice- and policy-based guides. An extended version of this paper provides further information about the project, including details of the consultation workshops held with young people³.

KEY MESSAGES

- From an ecological perspective, secure relationships formed with families and carers lay the foundations for establishing networks which form part of community life.
- Positive relationships with family, friends, informal and formal carers, teachers and wider social networks are crucial to development and contribute towards continuities, connectedness and stability.
- Understanding the perspectives of LACYP about their networks needs to be ongoing, as there are frequent changes in contexts and cultures.
- Transitions may disrupt relationships and networks. 'Starting again' requires particular life-skills which enable the rebuilding of connections and a sense of belonging.
- Participation helps in developing meaningful and sustainable relationships from within community contexts.
- Balance is needed between an 'ordinary life' and developing understanding in communities, to combat stigma about what 'being in care' means.

¹ We take AHRC's broadest thinking as our basis for what is entailed in the term 'communities':

"cooperative or interactive groups sharing a virtual or physical environment and aspects of identity (such as location, race, ethnicity, age, history, occupation), culture, belief or other common bonds and/or a shared interest in particular issues or outcomes".

² For the purposes of this review, we define LACYP as any child looked after by the Local Authority, including children who have been taken into care, through care or emergency orders, and those who are looked after on a voluntary basis under section 20 of the Children Act, 1989. Government statistics (Department for Education, 2011) indicate that there are approximately 65,500 children 'in care' in England and that young people age 10 - 15 are the largest group in the looked after children population. Reasons for being placed in care include: physical or sexual abuse; neglect; ill-health or disability of a parent; family in acute stress; family dysfunction; being disabled or having SEN requiring residential care; remanded by Youth Court to LA care; being orphaned; and behavioural difficulties.

³ This can be found at: http://www.lincoln.ac.uk/hshsc/staff_hull/2394.asp

Few would disagree that an ecological approach to children's lives has great potential to enable life chances^(43, 44, 47, 98, 105, 117). The multi-faceted interaction between individual development and context which underpins an ecological perspective is enshrined in statutory guidance for those working with children and families⁽³²⁾. Notwithstanding the apparent consensus which surrounds the value of an holistic approach to enhancing children's lives, much of the research literature about LACYP focuses on 'the care experience' itself. Strikingly little centrality is given to factors beyond the family, the immediate services being experienced and their overall effects, or their potential for enhancement. In terms of the daily lives of young people who are looked after by local authorities, the roles of context and culture – and thereby community – receive little emphasis.

Our study set out to know more about the dynamic relationships between LACYP and their communities, the contribution which LACYP make, the positive value which LACYP place on being 'in care', the role of resilience and the influence of transitions. Four core questions guided the study and serve to locate the debate introduced here. The main findings in relation to each core question are summarised and a short discussion introduces each section. The paper concludes with recommendations for future research.

FINDINGS⁴

1 Conceptualisations of looked after children and young people

An extensive range of legislation and policy is geared towards the improvement of outcomes for LACYP⁵. Clearly, there are likely to be drawbacks associated with being identified as a member of a disadvantaged group. Crucial to LACYP are the issues of stigma and prejudice. Conversely, at times these disadvantages may be outweighed by the positive benefits which come with being identified in this way, such as belonging to groups set up specifically on behalf of LACYP.

Over time, children in care were seen as 'outsiders' who were perceived at worst as a risk to community well-being and at best as undeserving of community life. To some extent, these notions may be seen to continue to underpin policy insofar as bringing together damaged or dysfunctional children is avoided where possible^(24, 39, 45).

- Stereotypical assumptions held by communities at large frequently serve to support the stigmatisation of LACYP^(30, 53, 58, 62, 71, 93, 100)

⁴ Search procedures identified a considerable range of potentially relevant literature. Few studies focus specifically and at length on the role of community in the lives of LACYP and while this confirms the rationale for the study, it means that relevant literature is drawn from a range of diverse sources, including material concerned with: looked after children; children's participation; social exclusion; and social networks.

⁵ This includes *Quality Protects* in 1998, the *Every Child Matters* framework in 2003, *Care Matters* in 2006 and the *Children's Plan* in 2007. Policy and legislation for LACYP can be found at the Department for Education website: <http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople>

- Alienation from culture, communities and geographical spaces has implications for attachment to people, as well as to places and spaces. This may manifest in various ways, such as negative self-esteem and poor outcomes (27, 64, 72, 77, 84, 124).
- Young people living in residential care may experience unwelcoming or unreceptive responses from their neighbourhoods, depending on levels of awareness and the extent to which the home raises its own profile by engaging locally (14, 55, 114, 129). Equally, there may be implicit benefits for LACYP in the apparent solidarity which comes with residential care and with living alongside young people who share that experience (37, 38, 123, 124).
- Young people may prefer to retain privacy about their looked after status in order to function as 'normal' within communities such as schools. This may mean that young people and staff are uncertain about sharing personal information about LACYP (20, 51).

Communities may be viewed as a positive resource for young people, holding much potential in terms of nurturing, protecting and safeguarding vulnerable children (63, 64, 107, 108). Positive community conceptualisations and resources offer potential strengthening channels of support for LACYP.

2 How do LACYP relate to and interact with the concept of 'community'?

The relationship which children have with communities has become visible relatively recently, largely through a focus on participation and rights. Stable relationships may be mediated through community interactions, for example with families, schools, local groups such as faith groups, leisure and sports teams, neighbourhoods and wider community resources. Virtual spaces offer potential co-existing 'real' life and virtual identities (50, 126). These elements, alongside sustaining positive family relationships, are important for children and young people (10, 11, 12, 21, 23, 31, 32, 48, 49, 52, 57, 73, 111, 115, 121), as they enable participation in life beyond the immediate family.

Creating and sustaining community interactions, networks and friendships may represent major challenges for LACYP and especially those who have particular needs, such as disabled young people (42, 75, 79, 85, 88, 93, 110, 127). Lack of placement stability may influence stability in relationships (65, 66, 89, 112, 117, 119). Groups dedicated to the interests of LACYP may offer capacity to assist with personal development, empowerment and transitions (123).

- Community conceptualisations of LACYP may represent an important barrier to making and keeping friends, thereby increasing a sense of isolation and loneliness (30, 39, 67, 93, 100, 108).
- Establishing a sense of home within new environments requires awareness of the balance between vulnerability and resilience. This is an especially sensitive area in relation to those seeking asylum (70).
- Ordinary lives and familiarity with families and communities may have been lost by some, such as unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC) (69). Practitioner

skills in responding to young people's emotional lives – the 'domain of connection'⁽⁶⁸⁾ – make valuable contributions towards resettlement.

- A move away from potentially damaging circumstances may be beneficial in the short term; implications for leaving care and returning to home communities need to be considered carefully^(34, 41, 55, 67, 99, 114, 125).
- Black and minority ethnic young people experience wide disparities within care, including discrimination and placement instability; these may serve to exacerbate feelings of a lack of a sense of belonging. Those leaving care may find it particularly difficult to interact with wider communities^(7, 8, 9, 27, 94, 109).
- Kinship care⁶ has advantages related to retaining children within their ecological network. The benefits are set against a risk of compounding social exclusion due to any inherent poverty and disadvantage^(1, 7, 18, 56, 82, 91, 101, 112, 113).
- There is some empirical evidence to indicate international variation in participation in the local community by young people living in residential care. More positive experiences are likely to be found where collective life is regarded as valuable to well-being⁽⁹⁵⁾.
- Explicit commitment to the role of community in the well-being of LACYP has been shown as beneficial internationally (e.g. in the USA^(36, 60), Japan⁽⁵⁾, Australia⁽⁸⁷⁾, Finland,⁽¹²⁴⁾ and in England⁽⁷⁴⁾).
- Movements through and out of care – potentially coupled with transience prior to care – may lead to dislocation and disconnection within families and communities as well as detachment from place and space^(3, 6, 79, 88, 93, 127).

Ordinary experiences are vital in the lives of LACYP. Understanding their social worlds requires locating their narratives within context. This may help in enabling a sense of agency for LACYP^(46, 59, 92, 106, 127) and in taking account of the importance of interactions with their wider environments.

3 How do transitions for LACYP influence their experience and perception of 'community'?

Transitions are key features in the lives of young people and offer the prospect of learning new behaviours and approaches to life. They are of particular importance in establishing independence^(28, 54, 98, 118). The experience of being looked after is characterised by fluid and evolving sets of relationships with a changing population of people which influence the connectivity LACYP may have with communities and the continuities which these may offer.

While young people may value transitions as potentially they allow access to new opportunities, a move away from unhappy relationships and improvements in a sense of wellbeing^(93, 113, 127), entry into care can be disruptive of existing friendships and connections and may bring difficulties in sustaining these^(67, 93, 100, 110, 117, 120). Additionally, movements between placements may promote feelings of insecurity and

⁶ The term 'kinship care' relates to children and young people whose parents are unable to care for them and who are looked after by relatives or friends

isolation. Such shifts are demanding of social skills and require flexibility in the face of a history of damaging experiences (75, 93, 100, 110, 128).

Young people leaving care face a range of potentially disruptive issues and concerns, focused on geographical dislocation and loss (e.g. of family and friendship ties; existing care communities; and neighbourhood networks). Transition at this time may lead to a sense of disempowerment and isolation. The effects may be exacerbated for particular groups, such as black and minority ethnic care leavers, whose experience of community and care may be compounded by experiences of racial discrimination and disadvantage (2, 7, 16, 17, 29, 67, 75, 81, 93, 99, 116, 118, 124). Further to this, young people leaving care may be ill-equipped with the life-skills which enable them to make connections and build networks (6, 41, 80, 83, 96, 103).

The role of networks and community relationships may enhance the potential effects of new and positive opportunities which assist in maximising potential. These are especially relevant when making transitions.

- New family environments may offer opportunities not experienced previously in terms of building positive relationships (89, 103, 127).
- Leisure activities which promote social connections include potential benefits, e.g. links to a key adult and enhancing esteem and developmental skills, thereby supporting continuity through and out of care (15, 40, 46, 74).
- Community organisations help in offering models and mentors for young people, these form part of supportive networks at specific points of transition, such as when leaving care (25, 40, 46, 74).
- Some LACYP may experience an identity which is 'on standby' or 'lost' due to being in a position of powerlessness as a result of awaiting placement moves (78, 130).
- Disabled children may be more often isolated and disconnected from communities, especially if they are ineligible for receiving adult services. This is particularly relevant to those who are leaving care; transition to independence might include a move away from family and community (4, 13, 86, 97).
- Formal and informal support networks are important in ensuring a successful transition to independent living (35, 89, 90, 103, 118).

Transitions, although potentially enhancing, may dislocate immediate relationships for LACYP. Acting to strengthen links with communities and networks may offer valuable continuity, support and connectedness in the lives of young people.

4 What role does 'community' play in empowering and promoting the resilience of LACYP?

'Empowerment' and 'resilience' form a major part of contemporary debates about young people and their participation in social life. They go some way towards promoting the identification of 'risk' and 'protective' factors and serve to support functioning within social life.

- Relationships in childhood are seen to enhance resilience and promote a wider sense of well-being, with friendships providing an element of protection against risks, for example, helping to identify which spaces are safe and at what time of day this is the case ^(107, 117).
- Resilience may be enhanced further by the young person distancing themselves from risk, e.g. geographically and emotionally, and from negative elements of community and friends, neighbourhood and family ^(26, 33, 114).
- The identification of 'risk' and 'protective factors' helps by providing a 'strengths-based' focus for intervention ^(54, 76, 98, 102, 104, 117).
- Communities within care may be viewed as offering resources which promote resilience, for example, the 'communities of understanding' in residential care can assist when young people are leaving care ^(22, 24, 26, 37, 38, 61, 100, 114, 119, 129).
- Raised visibility within the community may help LACYP to establish a sense of identity and belonging to a place, thereby promoting resilience ⁽⁶⁴⁾.
- A positive sense of identity and meaningful participation at school are seen as important factors in promoting resilience and mitigating some of the difficulties associated with being in care ^(20, 29, 117).
- School environments are important to LACYP as they offer the opportunity to develop continuing connections and contacts outside of the care system ^(19, 40, 65, 74, 100, 122).
- A major element in building resilience lies in the importance of establishing a trusting and supportive relationship with an adult. The making of these positive relationships enhances self esteem and enables positive contributions within and from the community ^(29, 33).

For LACYP, the concepts of risk, protection, participation and empowerment form part of an ecological framework which locates the community context as a central plank in building resilience.

Implications and recommendations for future research

We can see that the literature supports the principle that relationships with communities of differing forms hold advantages for LACYP in terms of their positive development and ecological stability. However, there is little empirical evidence which focuses on what this entails or how it may be brought about in a manner sensitive to the desire to live a normal life. Our research indicates that there are important gaps in knowledge which merit further attention:

1. The everyday experiences of LACYP in relation to participation in diverse communities and networks (e.g. children in care councils, virtual communities) and correspondingly the experience of communities in relation to the engagement and involvement of LACYP.
2. The differences and similarities in the above respects between the experiences of LACYP and other young people, including diverse and marginalised groups.

3. The factors which enable LACYP to participate and achieve in communities and community life and any mutually supportive connections which might be developed.
4. The factors which help to foster a sense of belonging, to promote well-being and to enable success for LACYP within communities and correspondingly the part which communities might play in developing inclusion.

Taken together these questions have implications for what constitutes community cohesion and connectedness for LACYP. Clearly, there is a fine balance to establish between protection and participation. Successful interconnectedness is increasingly a matter of shared concern; the key challenge remains that of how stable community relationships for LACYP may be strengthened and supported to mutual benefit.

References

1. ALDGATE, J. and MCINTOSH, M. *Looking After the Family: A Study of Children Looked After in Kinship Care in Scotland*. Edinburgh, Social Work Inspection Agency. , 2006.
2. ALDGATE, J. Graduating from Care - a Missed Opportunity for Encouraging Successful Citizenship. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 1994, vol. 16. pp. 225-272.
3. AXFORD, N. Are Looked After Children Socially Excluded?. *Adoption & Fostering*, 2008, vol. 32, no. 4. pp. 5-18.
4. BAKER, C. Disabled Children's Experiences of Permanency in the Looked After System. *British Journal of Social Work*, 2007, vol. 37. pp. 1173-1188.
5. BAMBA, S. and HAIGHT, W.L. Helping Maltreated Children to Find their Ibasho: Japanese Perspectives on Supporting the Well-being of Children in State Care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 4, 2007, vol. 29, no. 4. pp. 405-427 ISSN 0190-7409.
6. BARBER, J.G. and DELFABBRO, P.H. Placement Stability and the Psychosocial Well-being of Children in Foster Care. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 2003, vol. 13. pp. 415.
7. BARN, R. Care Leavers and Social Capital: Understanding and Negotiating Racial and Ethnic Identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 2010, vol. 33, no. 5. pp. 832-850.
8. BARN, R. 'Race', Ethnicity and Child Welfare: A Fine Balancing Act. *British Journal of Social Work*, 2007, vol. 37. pp. 1425-1434.
9. BARN, R. *Research and Practice Briefings: Children and Families - Improving Services to Meet the Needs of Minority Ethnic Children and Families*. London: Department for Education and Skills. , 2006.
10. BARTLEY, M. *Capability and Resilience: Beating the Odds*. UCL Department of Epidemiology and Public Health. , 2006.
11. BEN-ARIEH, A. Children's Well-Being: Indicators and Research S. KAMERMAN, S. PHIPPS and A. BEN-ARIEH eds., , 2010 *From Child Welfare to Children Well-being: The Child Indicators Perspective*, pp. 9-22.
12. BEN-ARIEH, A. Beyond Welfare: Measuring and Monitoring the State of Children – New Trends and Domains. *Social Indicators Research*, 2000, vol. 52, no. 3. pp. 235-257.
13. BERRESFORD, B. On the Road to Nowhere? Young Disabled People and Transition. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 2004, vol. 30, no. 6. pp. 581-587.
14. BERRIDGE, D. and BRODIE, I. *Children's Homes Revisited*. London: Jessica Kingsley, 1998.
15. BIANCHINI, F., et al. *Evaluation of the Cultural Pathfinder Programme*. Local Government Association DCMS. , 2007.
16. BIEHAL, N., CLAYDEN, J., STEIN, M. and WADE, J. *Moving on: Young People and Leaving Care Schemes*. London: HMSO. , 1995.

17. BLAKESLEE, J. Expanding the Scope of Research with Transition-Age Foster Youth: Applications of the Social Network Perspective. *Child and Family Social Work*, 2011.
18. BROAD, B., HAYES, R. and RUSHFORTH, C. *Kith and Kin: Kinship Care for Vulnerable Young People*. , 2001.
19. BRODIE, E., et al. *Pathways through Participation: What Creates and Sustains Active Citizenship?* Pathways Through Participation. , 2011.
20. BRODIE, I., et al. *Improving Educational Outcomes for Looked-After Children and Young People*. London: C4EO. , 2009.
21. BRONFENBRENNER, U. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Harvard University Press, 1979.
22. BROWN, E., BULLOCK, R., HOBSON, C. and LITTLE, M. *Making Residential Care Work: Structure and Culture in Children's Homes*. Aldershot: Ashgate. , 1998.
23. CAMINO, L. and ZELDIN, S. From Periphery to Center: Pathways for Youth Civic Engagement in the Day-to-Day Life of Communities. *Applied Developmental Science*, 2002, vol. 6, no. 4. pp. 213 - 220.
24. CARTER, J. Analysing the Impact of Living in a Large-Group Therapeutic Community as a Young Person - Views of Current and Ex-Residents. A Pilot Study. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 2011, vol. 25, no. 02. pp. 149-163.
25. CLAYDEN, J. and STEIN, M. *Mentoring Young People Leaving Care: Someone for Me*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 2005.
26. CLOUGH, R., BULLOCK, R. and WARD, A. *What Works in Residential Care: A Review of Research Evidence and the Practical Implications*. London: National Children's Bureau. , 2006.
27. COLEMAN, D. Where are we Failing the Young. *Social Work Today*, 1987, vol. 18. pp. 21.
28. COTTERELL, J. *Social Networks in Youth and Adolescence*. London: Routledge, 2007.
29. CRAWFORD, M. and TILBURY, C. Child Protection Workers' Perspectives on the School-to-Work Transition for Young People in Care. *Australian Social Work*, 09, 2007, vol. 60, no. 3. pp. 308-320 ISSN 0312407X.
30. CURRAN, L. Longing to "Belong": Foster Children in Mid-Century Philadelphia (1946-1963). *Journal of Social History*, Winter2008, 2008, vol. 42, no. 2. pp. 425-445 ISSN 00224529.
31. DANIEL, B. and WASSELL, S. *The School Years: Assessing and Promoting Resilience in Vulnerable Children*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. , 2002b.
32. Department of Health. *Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and their Families*. The Stationery Office Limited. , 2000.
33. DRAPEAU, S., et al. Processes that Contribute to Resilience among Youth in Foster Care. *Journal of Adolescence*, 12, 2007, vol. 30, no. 6. pp. 977-999 ISSN 0140-1971.
34. DWORSKY, A. and COURTNEY, M. Homelessness and the Transition from Foster Care to Adulthood. *Child Welfare*, 2009, vol. 88, no. 4. pp. 23-56.

35. ECOTEC Research and Consulting Limited. *Young People's Housing Transitions*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 2009.
36. EHEART, B.K. and POWER, M.B. From Despair to Care: A Journey of the Old and the Young at Hope Meadows. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 10, 2001, vol. 23, no. 9-10. pp. 691-718 ISSN 0190-7409.
37. EMOND, R. Putting the Care into Residential Care : The Role of Young People. *Journal of Social Work*, 2003, vol. 3, no. 3. pp. 321-337.
38. EVANS, R. and PINNOCK, K. Promoting Resilience and Protective Factors in the Children's Fund: Supporting Children and Young People's Pathways Towards Social Inclusion?. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, 2007, vol. 13, no. 1. pp. 21-36.
39. FERGUSON, H. Abused and Looked After Children as 'Moral Dirt': Child Abuse and Institutional Care in Historical Perspective. *Journal of Social Policy*, 2007, vol. 36, no. 01. pp. 123 ISSN 0047-2794.
40. FONG, R., SCHWAB, J. and ARMOUR, M. Continuity of Activities and Child Well-being for Foster Care Youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 11, 2006, vol. 28, no. 11. pp. 1359-1374 ISSN 0190-7409.
41. FORRESTER, D., et al. What is the Impact of Public Care on Children's Welfare? A Review of Research Findings from England and Wales and their Policy Implications. *Journal of Social Policy*, 2009, vol. 38, no. 3. pp. 439-456.
42. FRANKLIN, A. and KNIGHT, A. *Someone on our Side: Advocacy for Disabled Children and Young People*. London: The Children's Society. , 2011.
43. FREISTHLER, B., MERRIT, D.H. and LASCALA, E.A. Understanding the Ecology of Child Maltreatment: A Review of the Literature and Directions for Future Research. *Child Maltreatment*, 2006, vol. 11, no. 3. pp. 263-280.
44. GARBARINO, J. An Ecological Perspective on the Effects of Violence on Children. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 2001, vol. 29, no. 3. pp. 361-378.
45. GARRETT, P.M. The 'Daring Experiment': The London County Council and the Discharge from Care of Children to Ireland in the 1950s and 1960s. *Journal of Social Policy*, 2003, vol. 32, no. 01. pp. 75 ISSN 0047-2794.
46. GILLIGAN, R. Enhancing the Resilience of Children and Young People in Public Care by Mentoring their Talents and Interests. *Child & Family Social Work*, 1999, vol. 4. pp. 187-196.
47. GITTERMAN, A. and GERMAIN, C.B. *The Life Model of Social Work Practice*. 3rd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
48. GLOVER, J. *Bouncing Back: How can Resilience be Promoted in Vulnerable Children and Young People?* Barnardos Policy and Research Unit. , 2009.
49. GREEN, A.E. and WHITE, R.J. *Attachment to Place: Social Networks, Mobility and Prospects of Young People*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 2007.
50. GREENFIELD, P. and YAN, Z. Children, Adolescents, and the Internet: A New Field of Inquiry in Developmental Psychology. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 2006, vol. 42, no. 3. pp. 391-394.

51. HARKER, R., DOBEL-OBER, D., BERRIDGE, D. and SINCLAIR, R. *Taking Care of Education: An Evaluation of the Education of Looked-After Children*. London: National Children's Bureau. , 2004.
52. HETHERINGTON, M., et al. *Community Cohesion for Children, Young People and their Families: A Rapid Review of Policy, Practice and Research in Local Authorities*. Slough: NFER. , 2007.
53. HIBBERT, P. *Failed by the System. the Views of Young Care Leavers on their Educational Experiences*. Barnardos. , 2006.
54. HICKS, L. and STEIN, M. *Neglect Matters: A Multi-Agency Guide for Professionals Working Together on Behalf of Teenagers*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families. , 2010.
55. HICKS, L., GIBBS, I., WEATHERLY, H. and BYFORD, S. *Managing Children's Homes: Developing Effective Leadership in Small Organisations*. London: Jessica Kingsley, 2007.
56. HILL, M., DAVIS, J., PROUT, A. and TIDSALL, K. Moving the Participation Agenda Forward. *Children and Society*, 2004, vol. 18. pp. 77-96.
57. HINGORANI, M. *Justice, Equality, our World: Supporting Young People's Active Involvement in Strengthening Communities*. Leicester: National Youth Agency. , 2004.
58. HOLLAND, S. Listening to Children in Care: A Review of Methodological and Theoretical Approaches to Understanding Looked After Children's Perspectives. *Children & Society*, 2009, vol. 23. pp. 226 - 235.
59. HOLLAND, S., RENOLD, E., ROSS, N. and HILLMAN, A. *The Everyday Lives of Children in Care: Using a Sociological Perspective to Inform Social Work Practice*. London: ESRC National Centre for Research Methods. , 2008.
60. HOPPING, D., POWER, M.B. and EHEART, B.K. Hope Meadows: In the Service of an Ideal. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 10, 2001, vol. 23, no. 9-10. pp. 683-690 ISSN 0190-7409.
61. HOUSTON, S. Building Resilience in a children's Home: Results from an Action Research Projects. *Child & Family Social Work*, 2010, vol. 15, no. 3. pp. 357-368.
62. HUDSON, M., PHILLIPS, J., RAY, K. and BARNES, H. *Social Cohesion in Diverse Communities*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 2007.
63. JACK, G. Place Matters: The Significance of Place Attachments for Children's Well-being. *British Journal of Social Work*, 2008, vol. 40, no. 3. pp. 755-771.
64. JACK, G. and GILL, O. The Role of Communities in Safeguarding Children and Young People. *Child Abuse Review*, 2010, vol. 19, no. 2. pp. 82-96 ISSN 1099-0852.
65. JACKSON, S. Education and Children in Care. *Adoption & Fostering*, 1988, vol. 12, no. 4.
66. JONES, R., et al. Factors Associated with Outcomes for Looked-After Children and Young People: A Correlates Review of the Literature. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 2010, vol. 37. pp. 613 - 622.
67. KNIGHT, A., CHASE, E. and AGGLETON, P. 'Someone of Your Own to Love': Experiences of being Looked After as Influences on Teenage Pregnancy. *Children & Society*, 11, 2006, vol. 20, no. 5. pp. 391-403 ISSN 09510605.

68. KOHLI, R. The Comfort of Strangers: Social Work Practice with Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children and Young People. *Child and Family Social Work*, 2006b, vol. 11, no. 1. pp. 1-10.
69. KOHLI, R. The Sound of Silence: Listening to what Unaccompanied Children Say and do Not Say. *British Journal of Social Work*, 2006a, vol. 36. pp. 707-721.
70. KOHLI, R. and MATHER, R. Promoting Psychosocial Well-being in Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Young People in the United Kingdom. *Child and Family Social Work*, 2003, vol. 8, no. 3. pp. 201-212.
71. KRETZMANN, J. and MCKNIGHT, J. Evanston, Illinois: Centre for Urban Affairs and Policy Research., 1993 *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*.
72. LASSON, S. and ØRSTEDSVEJ, H.C. The Cultural Dimension in Childhood. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 2002, vol. 31, no. 3.
73. LEVENTHAL, T. and BROOKS-GUNN, J. The Neighborhoods they Live in: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 2000, vol. 126, no. 2. pp. 309-337.
74. LOMAX, P. *London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Culture for Keeps: Encouraging Participation*. Local Government Association DCMS. , 2005.
75. MASON, J. A Children's Standpoint: Needs in Out-of-Home Care. *Children & Society*, 2008, vol. 22, no. 5. pp. 358-369.
76. MASTEN, A. Promoting resilience in child welfare R. FLYNN, P. DUDDING and J. BARBER eds., Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006 *Promoting Resilience in Development; a General Framework for Systems of Care*.
77. MATTHEWS, H., LIMB, M. and PERCY-SMITH, B. Changing Worlds: The Microgeographics of Young Teenagers. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 1998, vol. 89, no. 2. pp. 193-202.
78. MCMURRAY, I., CONNOLLY, H., PRESTON-SHOOT, M. and WIGELY, V. Shards of the Old Looking Glass: Restoring the Significance of Identity in Promoting Positive Outcomes for Looked-After Children. *Child & Family Social Work*, 2010, vol. 16, no. 2. pp. 210-218.
79. MELTZER, H., et al. *The Mental Health Needs of Young People Looked After by Local Authorities in England*. London TSO. , 2003.
80. MENDES, P. Towards a Community Development Support Model for Young People Transitioning from State Out-of-Home Care: A Case Study of St Luke's Anglicare in Victoria, Australia. *Practice*, 2011, vol. 23, no. 2. pp. 69-81.
81. MENDES, P. and MOSLEHUDDIN, B. From Dependence to Interdependence: Towards Better Outcomes for Young People Leaving State Care. *Child Abuse Review*, Mar, 2006, vol. 15, no. 2. pp. 110-126 ISSN 09529136.
82. MESSING, J.T. From the Child's Perspective: A Qualitative Analysis of Kinship Care Placements. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 12, 2006, vol. 28, no. 12. pp. 1415-1434 ISSN 0190-7409.

83. MINTY, B. A Review of the Effects of Living Long-Term in Substitute Care in the Context of a Discussion of Outcome Criteria. *Social Work and Social Sciences Review*, 2000, vol. 8, no. 3. pp. 169-193.
84. MITIC, W. and RIMER, M. The Educational Attainment of Children in Care in British Columbia. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 2002, vol. 31, no. 6.
85. MORRIS, J. *Moving into Adulthood: Young Disabled People Moving into Adulthood*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 2002.
86. MORRIS, J. *Don't Leave Us Out. Involving Disabled Children and Young People with Communication Impairments*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 1998.
87. MOSS, M. Broken Circles to a Different Identity: An Exploration of Identity for Children in out-of-Home Care in Queensland, Australia. *Child & Family Social Work*, 2009, vol. 14, no. 3. pp. 311-321.
88. MUNRO, E. Empowering Looked After Children. *Child & Family Social Work*, 2001, vol. 6. pp. 129 - 137.
89. MUNRO, E.R., LUSHEY, C., WARD, H. and National Care Advisory Service. *Evaluation of the Right2BCared4 Pilots: Final Report*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families. , 2011.
90. MUNRO, E.R., MASKELL-GRAHAM, D., WARD, H. and National Care Advisory Service. *Evaluation of the Staying Put: 18+ Family Placement Pilot Programme. Interim Report: Overview of Emerging Themes and Issues*. London: Department for Education. , 2010.
91. NANDY, S. *Spotlight on Kinship Care: Using Microdata to Examine the Extent and Nature of Kinship Care in the UK at the Turn of the Twentieth Century*. University of Bristol. , 2011.
92. Office of the Children's Rights Director. *Messages for Munro: A Report of Children's Views Collected for Professor Eileen Munro by the Children's Rights Director for England*. Manchester: Ofsted. Office of the Children's Rights Director. , 2011.
93. Office of the Children's Rights Director. Manchester: Ofsted. Office of the Children's Rights Director, 2009 *Care and Prejudice: A Report of Children's Experience by the Children's Rights Director of England*.
94. OWEN, C. and STATHAM, J. *Disproportionality in Child Welfare: The Prevalence of Black and Minority Ethnic Children within the 'Looked After' and 'Children in Need' Populations and on Children Protection Registers in England*. London: Department of Children, Schools and Families. , 2009.
95. PETRIE, P., et al. *Working with Children in Care: European Perspectives*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2006.
96. PROCH, K. and TABER, M. Alienated Adolescents in Foster Care. *Social Work Research & Abstracts*, 1987, no. 23. pp. 9-13.
97. RABIEE, P., PRIESTLY, M. and KNOWLES, J. *Whatever Next? Young Disabled People Leaving Care*. Leeds: First Key. , 2001.
98. REES, G., STEIN, M., HICKS, L. and GORIN, S. *Adolescent Neglect, Research, Policy and Practice*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2011.

99. REILLY, T. Transition from Care: Status and Outcomes of Youth Who Age Out of Foster Care. *Child Welfare*, 2003, vol. 82, no. 6. pp. 727-750.
100. RIDGE, T. and MILLAR, J. Excluding Children: Autonomy, Friendship and the Experience of the Care System. *Social Policy & Administration*, 2000, vol. 34, no. 2. pp. 160-175.
101. RITCHIE, C. Looked After Children: Time for Change?. *British Journal of Social Work*, 2005, vol. 35, no. 5. pp. 761 - 767.
102. RUTTER, M. Resilience Concepts and Findings: Implications for Family Therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 1999, vol. 21. pp. 119-144.
103. SCANNAPIECO, M., CONNELL-CARRICK, K. and PAINTER, K. In their Own Words: Challenges Facing Youth. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 2007, vol. 24. pp. 423-435.
104. SCHOFIELD, G. Resilience and Family Placement A Lifespan Perspective. *Adoption & Fostering*, 2001, vol. 25, no. 3.
105. SCHOON, I. and BARTLEY, M. The Role of Human Capability and Resilience. *The Psychologist*, 2008, vol. 21, no. 1. pp. 24 - 27.
106. SCOURFIELD, J., DICKS, B., DRAKEFORD, M. and DAVIES, A. *Children, Place and Identity: Nation and Locality in Middle Childhood*. London: Routledge, 2006.
107. SEAMAN, P., et al. *Findings: Parenting and Children's Resilience in Disadvantaged Communities*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 2006.
108. SEITA, J.R. In our Best Interest: Three Necessary Shifts for Child Welfare Workers and Children. *Child Welfare*, Jan, 2000, vol. 79, no. 1. pp. 77-92 ISSN 00094021.
109. SELWYN, J. Pathways to Adoption for Minority Ethnic Children in England – Reasons for Entry to Care. *Child & Family Social Work*, 2011, vol. 16. pp. 276-286.
110. SELWYN, J., SAUNDERS, H. and FARMER, E. The Views of Children and Young People on being Cared for by an Independent Foster-Care Provider. *British Journal of Social Work*, 2010, vol. 40. pp. 696-713.
111. SILK, J., et al. Neighborhood Cohesion as a Buffer Against Hostile Maternal Parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 2004, vol. 18, no. 1. pp. 135-146.
112. SINCLAIR, I. *Stability and Well-being in the Care System*. NICE, London. , 2008.
113. SINCLAIR, I., BAKER, C., LEE, J. and GIBBS, I. *The Pursuit of Permanence: A Study of the English Care System*. London: Jessica Kingsley, 2007.
114. SINCLAIR, I. and GIBBS, I. *Children's Homes: A Study in Diversity*. London: Wiley, 1998.
115. SMITH, T. Neighbourhood and Preventive Strategies with Children and Families: What Works?. *Children and Society*, 1999, vol. 13. pp. 265 - 277.
116. STEIN, M. Increasing the Number of Care Leavers in 'Settled, Safe Accommodation, 2010.
117. STEIN, M. *Quality Matters in Children's Services: Messages from Research*. London: Jessica Kingsley. , 2009.

118. STEIN, M. Missing Years of Abuse in Children's Homes. *Child and Family Social Work*, 2006, vol. 11, no. 1. pp. 11-21.
119. STEIN, M. *Resilience and Young People Leaving Care: Overcoming the Odds*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. , 2005.
120. STOTT, T. and GUSTAVSSON, N. Balancing Permanency and Stability for Youth in Foster Care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 2010, vol. 32, no. 4. pp. 619-625.
121. SWISHER, R. Neighborhoods and Youth: How Neighborhood Demographics and Social Processes Affect Youth Outcomes. *Prevention Researcher*, 04, 2008, vol. 15, no. 2. pp. 7-11 ISSN 1086-4385.
122. THOMAS, J., et al. *Targeted Youth Support: Rapid Evidence Assessment of Effective Early Interventions for Youth at Risk of Future Poor Outcomes*. EPPI-Centre. , 2008.
123. THOMAS, N. and PERCY-SMITH, B. 'It's about Changing Services and Building Relationships': Evaluating the Development of Children in Care Councils. *Child and Family Social Work*, 2011.
124. TÖRRÖNEN, M. Community in a Children's Home. *Child & Family Social Work*, 05, 2006, vol. 11, no. 2. pp. 129-137 ISSN 13567500.
125. TROUT, A.L., et al. The Departure Status of Youth from Residential Group Care: Implications for Aftercare. *Journal of Childhood & Family Studies*, 2010, vol. 19. pp. 67-78.
126. VALENTINE, G. and HOLLOWAY, S.L. Cyberkids: Children's Social Networks, 'Virtual Communities', and Online Spaces. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 2002, vol. 92, no. 2. pp. 302 - 319.
127. WARD, H., SKUSE, T. and MUNRO, E. 'the Best of Times, the Worst of Times' Young People's Views of Care and Accommodation. *Adoption and Fostering Journal*, 2005, vol. 29, no. 1. pp. 8-17.
128. WEARE, K. and GRAY, G. *What Works in Developing Children's Emotional and Social Competence and Wellbeing?* London, Department for Children, Schools and Families. , 2003.
129. WHITAKER, D., ARCHER, L. and HICKS, L. *Working in Children's Homes, Challenges and Complexities*. Chichester: Wiley, 1998.
130. WINCHESTER, R. Let's Hear from the Experts; Children in Care are Giving their Views on how it Feels to be in the Looked-After System and what they Want from it. *Community Care*, 2003, no. Features; Young People. pp. 26.

The Connected Communities

Connected Communities is a cross-Council Programme being led by the AHRC in partnership with the EPSRC, ESRC, MRC and NERC and a range of external partners. The current vision for the Programme is:

"to mobilise the potential for increasingly inter-connected, culturally diverse, communities to enhance participation, prosperity, sustainability, health & well-being by better connecting research, stakeholders and communities."

Further details about the Programme can be found on the AHRC's Connected Communities web pages at:

www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundingOpportunities/Pages/connectedcommunities.aspx

