Young People from a Public Care Background: Pathways to Education in Europe (YiPPEE)
Coordinator: Claire Cameron, 2008–2011

Key Search terms:

Disciplines: psychology, social pedagogy, sociology.

Topics / themes: education; governance (ideology, welfare regimes); policy (care, implementation, social inclusion, professional practice); socio-demographic processes (transitions, young people / youth).

Units of comparison: demographic units (age range, young people); legal institutions (legal status); social protection systems (care, education, managers, practitioners, welfare professionals); spatial units (countries, EU member states).

Concepts: culture (education, lifelong learning); politics (participation, pathways); socio-demographic processes (family, youth); welfare (care, welfare (in)dependency).

Funding: European Commission Framework Programme 7.

Methodological approaches: case studies; comparative methods; documentary searches (literature review); mixed methods; qualitative approaches (in-depth interviews, policy analysis, semi-structured interviews, telephone screening interviews); quantitative approaches (statistical analyses, surveys).

Methodological issues: bias (cultural), comparability, interpretation, reliability, universality vs particularity.

Research context

YiPPEE was a multi-national team research project undertaken between 2008 and 2010 with funding from the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme and coordinated from Thomas Coram Research Unit (TCRU), Institute of Education (IOE), University of London, UK. The research proposal was developed from two previous research grants, one on the experiences of young people who had been in care as children and were at university at the point of interview ('By Degrees'), and the other on the views about and experiences of two groups of disadvantaged young people in accessing and using health, welfare and other services. One group were or had recently been in local authority care, and the other had multiple social disadvantages in their lives ('Young People and Services'). The research partnership, from Denmark, Hungary, Spain, Sweden and the UK, drew on the coordinator's experience of participation in an EU FP 5 project Care Work in Europe (2001–2005) and other cross-national European projects.

Research topic / theme

The YiPPEE study was about the educational experiences of young people who had been in public care as children. We were interested in the educational pathways of those young people who had some educational qualification or motivation to study, at a point in their lives when an ever greater proportion of their contemporaries were entering further and higher education. During the period of the research, EU and national policies favoured widening access to higher education, but available evidence, albeit limited, suggested that young people from a public care background were not participating in this trend. Very little was known about the topic in the countries of study, apart from the UK, at the time of preparing the proposal. The topic fitted into DG Education and Culture's concern with youth and social inclusion, as an example of a discreet and highly disadvantaged group for whom policy measures might be formulated.

Aims, objectives and research questions

The primary aim of the YiPPEE project was to inform EU and member states' policies and practices regarding the educational participation of young people from a public care background. Two general objectives of the project were: firstly, to investigate educational pathways among young men and women from a public care background in five EU countries and, secondly, to examine how more young people from a public care background can be retained in education after the end of compulsory schooling.

More specific objectives were to:

1. Map current knowledge about participation rates in EU member states through secondary and primary sources to establish a baseline of current rates of post-compulsory educational participation among young people from a public care background. This included comparative analysis of national policies and procedures with respect to young people at risk, including those in public care.

2. Track and evaluate the educational plans and pathways of a sample of 19–21 year-olds from a public care background, including both residential and family-based foster care.

3. Identify the conditions within the care and education systems that facilitate or inhibit entry to and continuation in post-compulsory education.

4. Explore care leavers' construction of educational identities and trajectories in terms of class, gender, race, ethnicity and care responsibilities, from the perspective both of young men and women themselves and of carers and staff in services designed to support them.

Because there was so little previous work in this area, the extent to which the questions were explicitly comparative was difficult to predict at the formulation stage. A cautious approach was taken to the comparative potential of the study: each country was selected on the grounds that it represented a particular welfare regime the intention being to identify what regime conditions provided a framework for participation in education.

Resources and governance

As already indicated, the coordinator had experience of developing and running EU Framework projects through FP5, and had extensive cross-national research experience. The IOE also had a dedicated EU Development Officer, access to the UKRO team for support and advice and an experienced finance team able to assist with the application. The design of the project was lifted from one worked up for an unsuccessful but well reviewed UK grant application by the coordinator and the project director. Most of the consortium members had worked with the coordinator previously. Even with these advantages, the application was extremely time consuming to prepare for the coordinator and the IOE team.

The coordinator used the knowledge resources of the developing consortium during the preparation phase, asking members to review the application for relevance and feasibility and to supply references.

The problems during the preparation phase were lack of dedicated researcher time, and having to justify the time spent to managers as valid; delays in responses from consortium partners; lack of consistency between countries in estimation of time and resources required. The main method of dealing with the problems was repeat email requests. A pre-application meeting would have been very beneficial, particularly for thinking through the feasibility of the research design for each country.

The budget for the project was 1.4 million Euros with a start date in January 2008. The project was originally scheduled for 32 months, but obtained a four month extension to complete the work by December 2010. The budget was intended to cover the staff costs, in the UK, of a 0.6FTE coordinator / researcher, 0.5 FTE project director, a full-time researcher and a 0.6FTE administrator, and travel and equipment costs for the team. The four partner countries provided a team of two (Denmark), three (Hungary, Spain) or four (Sweden) academics, usually a part-time lead researcher and full- or part-time research fellows or assistants. Altogether, there were 18 team members, although not all worked on the project throughout its lifetime.

After favourable evaluation of the proposal, the work contract was drawn up between the IOE and the EC DG Research, and between each partner institution and the IOE. The contract stipulated interim and end-of-project reports, including financial reports, and all deliverables specified in the proposal and as requested by the EU contracts team. The funder provided specifications regarding management (a dedicated workpackage) and dissemination (project website, policy briefs, Brussels-based cluster meetings) of the project. The EU Scientific Officer monitored progress and arranged ethical and technical review. The same person stayed in this post throughout the project's lifetime and attended project meetings that were held in Brussels, an EU media briefing that included the project in Barcelona and assisted with arranging a project policy customer seminar held in DG Education and Culture, Brussels.

Management and coordination

The project was managed and coordinated by the UK team, based at TCRU. The coordinator was responsible for contact with the EU Scientific Officer, assisted by the administrator, who took responsibility, supported by the finance team, for the administrative aspects of the reporting requirements, such as time sheets and auditing. The UK team was responsible for organising the content of seven cross-national meetings of the partners, held in the five countries and in Brussels. Cross-national meetings were scheduled to coincide with critical phases of the project and to ensure meaningful conceptual and methodological discussion in managing the business aspects of the project. The UK coordinating team took responsibility for the minutes of the meetings, which were circulated to all partners, and for final versions of research instruments, information leaflets, consent forms and so on, prior to translation by research partners.

Overall, the team had 17 researchers and one administrator (based in the UK): 11 were experienced researchers, including two full professors and an associate professor; the other six researchers did not hold a PhD. The academics came from Departments of Education, Social Work, Education and Psychology, a multi-disciplinary policy relevant social research unit, a social policy and labour research institute, and Educational Sociology. The funder was known to favour a disciplinary and geographical mix, but this mix was also useful to address the different perspectives on the topic and the different methods to be employed in the

project. Research skills were needed in design, data collection and analysis in respect of large-scale datasets, qualitative data, policy documents, interviews with people in a variety of contexts and with a range of styles. Editing and writing skills, and oral presentation skills, for a variety of audiences, were also required. The UK team undertook more editing work than was planned at the beginning of the project. Each partner team led at least one workpackage with support from the Coordinating team. For example, the Swedish team collated and synthesised the literature reviews carried out by national teams, and the UK team worked with the Swedish team to produce a final version.

The agenda for cross-national meetings was sent out in advance with requests for items and exchange of materials. Work was planned at project meetings and largely carried out in parallel by the project teams, who organised themselves between meetings. Where delays occurred, the UK team consulted the partners on achievable deadlines and rescheduled the project timetable accordingly. This eventually led to negotiating an extension for the project with the funder.

The working language of the consortium was English, with partners using each other's language resources to ensure thorough understanding of technical terms or conceptual language. A principle of the management was inclusion and respect for diversity, so the cross-national meetings included all voices, and opportunities for differences of opinion were heard. At the same time, the coordinator had to achieve a workable consensus by the end of the meeting, or by a feasible deadline after the meeting. Adaptations to the method had to be incorporated during the project, for instance in ways of recruiting the sample, to reflect variations in the organisation of services in different welfare systems. Some elements of the study could not be carried out in some of the partner countries, for instance secondary analysis of large scale datasets was not possible in countries where relevant primary data were not collected.

All members of the team were involved in data collection and analysis. Junior researchers were included as full team members, and as report co-authors. They contributed to the papers for peer review and dissemination events. Three aspects of the project were given special attention through training. First, each country team supplied a briefing about their welfare systems as part of an introductory team meeting and all members of the team in place during the first phase of the project conducted a study visit to one of the partner countries to familiarise themselves with the welfare systems and relevant issues for the research topic. Second, members of the UK team held a training session with an expert in biographical narrative interview methods, which was recorded and circulated, with notes, to all members of the consortium. Third, an expert in computer-aided analysis (NViVO) was commissioned to provide two training days, each tacked onto a project meeting. This helped to ensure that the whole team were using the programme in the same way. National data analysis was the responsibility of each partner team, and three of the partners took responsibility for comparative analysis in respect of four comparative workpackages.

Professional and ethical standards

The professional and ethical standards of the European Commission were accepted by the partner teams. The proposal was reviewed on ethical grounds during the evaluation process. The beginning of the project coincided with widespread adoption of institutional ethical procedures. In some cases, national or institutional ethical standards were more stringent than those of the EU, and access to data required additional measures. For example, the Swedish team incurred delays while their ethics review was completed, and the UK team were required to gain permission from the Association of Directors of Local Authority Children's Services Departments to access data held by their staff. All the partner teams had to make contact with and consult with local authority partners. The information leaflet developed and used for this purpose made reference to ethical standards in place. These included the Data Protection Act and professional standards derived from professional codes of conduct for Sociology and Psychology.

Some questions could not be asked by the project team, and this had an impact on comparability. For example, data relating to objective 4, which aimed to explore young people's educational identity in terms of race and ethnicity, among other factors, could not be collected in those partner countries where it was not legal to ask about a person's race and ethnicity. It was only possible to collect data about nationality and legal status. Partners were asked to be explicit about inconsistencies in the data that might affect comparative analysis and were urged to include an explanation for data sources at each stage of reporting to avoid over-emphasising the validity of comparisons.

As data were collected in own languages, little cross-national checking of validity was possible. Translation happened at the national report stage. However, teams presented their experiences of data collection and emergent findings at project meetings, and any inconsistencies or differences of interpretation were subject to extensive discussion. This process was also facilitated by the study visits and the preliminary exchange of introductory papers about the care and education systems, and relevant issues for care leavers, which was available as a reference point.

All dissemination and output from the study was required to have acknowledgement of the funders, through an FP7 and EU logo and / or through a written acknowledgement of the EU's role in the research. Published papers were in authors' own names, with an acknowledgement of the partners' contribution to the whole project. Acknowledgements and authorship protocols were discussed at a project meeting and, once agreed, followed this standard format.

Rationale for the research design

The rationale for the research design was primarily pragmatic; it was designed to bring to bear a range of disciplinary and cultural perspectives on a previously largely invisible and undocumented topic. The choice of partners was based upon the clustering of characteristics of European countries known as welfare regimes.

Partner countries were selected with their welfare regime in mind, anticipating that different welfare systems would be associated with policy and practice regarding young people leaving care and their educational participation. Given that little was known about the topic at a European level, it was not feasible to include a large number of countries, and in-depth work would be needed to understand questions of educational identity and pathway, and facilitators and barriers to educational participation. The partners represented universalist welfare regimes (Sweden, Denmark), corporate conservative regimes (Spain), emerging economies (Hungary) and a liberal regime (UK). Two countries had devolved responsibilities to autonomous regions or jurisdictions (Spain and UK), two countries contained large numbers of small municipalities (Sweden and Denmark) and one was characterised by large centralised administrative areas (Hungary).

The comparisons sought within the research design were at the level of national policy, local administrative organisation and policy, local managers, and the perspectives of young people aged 19–21 who had been in local authority care at the age of 16, and for at least one year of their childhood, and who had educational promise or motivation to study further. In addition the perspective was included of adults who were nominated by the young people as having been important to them. We were concerned to incorporate young men and women, and the full range of cultural backgrounds represented among young people in care in each country, including those who had arrived in the country as unaccompanied minors.

It was assumed that it would be possible to negotiate access to young people and professionals in each country by seeking permission through relevant gatekeeping bodies. This required different approaches in each country: from the bureaucratic approach in England, where the team applied in writing to a central body for initial permission, and then to each head of service in the local area and to the relevant manager for the topic; to the more informal and closer to practice approach in Catalonia, Spain, where the team presented the research to meetings of various local officials and managers to gain acceptance for the rationale of doing the research and the necessary access.

A research design was required that incorporated both national level data and the perspectives of local actors. Both breadth and depth were needed to produce a credible national picture of a complex phenomenon from which policy recommendations could be drawn out.

Rationale for the research methods

Initially, the design was developed for a UK-based study. The methods selected were, therefore, appropriate for this national context: secondary analysis of published and grey literature, national statistics, national survey of local authorities, and in-depth case studies of five contrasting areas of the country including interviews with professionals and young people (at two points in time), and local policy analysis. The relevant context was a directive national policy, a probable high degree of local variation in practice, and the different perspectives of social actors; hence the need to investigate multiple points of view on the topic. These were mixed methods, tapping into available national and local sources of existing data, and creating new primary data collection where necessary.

When adapting the design for a European study, the orientation changed slightly. As indicated above, the welfare regime represented by different welfare states was included within the study design. The comparative question was then: 'What are the various ways in which welfare regimes approach the question of the post-compulsory educational participation of young people from a public care background?'

Administrative variations in the selected countries led to differences in data sources, and adaptations of the research design. For example, the degree of centralisation in Hungary was such that it was not necessary to use five local authorities to obtain the full range of perspectives on the topic. By contrast, in Sweden, it was necessary to use eight local authority areas to obtain the required number of young people with the specified characteristics. In Spain, the degree of autonomy attributed to each region meant that it was not appropriate or feasible to conduct the research in more than one region, with implications for the 'national' survey of local authorities.

In the first stage of the project, which was a review of literature, it became apparent that none of the four continental European countries had a bank of literature on which to draw. No studies were available in Hungary or Spain, and only one or two in Sweden and Denmark. The research teams had to seek literature on education and the lives of young people in care more generally. Moreover, the second part of the work, analysing large-scale datasets about the educational attainment of young people who had been in care as children, was not possible in Spain or Hungary, as the data were simply not collected. The analysis was possible in Sweden and Denmark following protracted negotiations with national boards that eventually produced a wealth of national-level data. This workpackage, designed to produce a baseline of participation in post-compulsory education, became seriously delayed against the original timetable.

The design had anticipated that national data on educational participation would be difficult to access and for that reason had included a national survey of local authorities. This national survey was completed in England, albeit with a poor response rate, after extensive resources devoted to it were exhausted. In the other countries, research teams knew that the data were not collected locally and did not attempt to obtain it, or, in the case of Spain, that it was only meaningful to collect data in one region. The research teams in Spain and Hungary used estimates from existing data and the judgements of professionals to arrive at a figure for participation in post-compulsory education, and in Sweden and Denmark the national data were used, supplemented, in the case of Sweden, with questions added to a national survey of local managers being conducted for another project.

These difficulties with implementing the design meant that objective one, about a baseline of participation, was only partially achieved. By the end of the project, we knew what national policies were in the five countries and were able, through a combination of national data and educated guesswork, to give a much better estimate than previously of the proportion of young people from a public background who continued in education after the official school-leaving age. We also had extensive data towards meeting objective three, on the conditions that facilitate or act as a barrier to continued educational participation from the perspectives of professionals.

The second stage of the project comprised five local area-based in-depth case studies in each country. The original design envisaged an initial interview with one or two local managers responsible for young people leaving care, and working with administrative officers to achieve a list of young people of suitable ages from which to 'screen' by telephone and sample those meeting the study characteristics. In practice, the methods of achieving the sample of 35 young people in each country varied, and the target number was not achieved in Sweden (33) and England (32). In Spain, the lack of adequate lists of the young people on an administrative area basis meant that the researcher had manually to search case records held on them by a number of different agencies. In Hungary, the only source of young people were those living in specific housing and support services, for whom the characteristics were known by staff, so there was limited 'screening'. In both Sweden and England, finding young people with the required characteristics relied, in addition to screening of local lists, on working with local professionals to nominate and approach young people who were eligible and might be willing to take part. This was a 'hard to reach' population in all partner countries. Each young person interviewed in depth was asked to nominate an adult who had been important to them who might give a further perspective on their educational participation: the numbers of these interviews achieved varied in each country. Finally, the original design stipulated a follow up interview one year after the original in-depth young person interview: not all young people could be traced one year later and, due to delays in the fieldwork schedule, some interviews were held less than one year after the first.

The third stage of the project was dissemination. In keeping with EU DG research policy, and with the aim of the study, dissemination was planned to occur throughout the lifetime of the project particularly in the sense of interaction with local, national and EU policy actors. A variety of means of dissemination was included: regular project bulletins were emailed to local, national and EU policy customers, two policy customer seminars were held in Brussels, and local and national end-of-project conferences were built into the project design. Local conferences were included to give voice to local initiatives and programmes alongside the international research. A project website also hosted output as it emerged.

Conceptual issues

The initial research proposal indicated the expressed intention to explore concepts such as educational or learning identities, and trajectories or pathways in the context of post-compulsory education for young people from a public care background. The expectation was also that concepts of 'education', 'care' and 'child protection' would be examined in the specific national contexts being studied as well as the concept of welfare regime. This work was begun in the first cross-national meeting, where participants were invited to introduce their country contexts, and continued through subsequent project meetings, study visits and bilateral communications. As the project progressed, further concepts became integral to the analysis, such as individualisation and globalisation, as a framework for understanding the data.

Differences were found in understanding or expression of key concepts. A good example is 'child protection'. In the UK, the term child protection refers to a set of procedures for professionals to follow in the event of concern about a child, subsequently widened (via policy instruments) to refer to responsibilities held by all in society in respect of 'safeguarding' children. In other continental European countries, child protection refers to the entire range of services to support children and families: from childcare provision to residential establishments. Without prior discussion, these differences affect the 'lens' with which researchers view research questions. In one country a study of child protection might be based on examining formal procedures, but in another it might be about services for children and families in their entirety.

Cross-national differences were also identified by the team stemming from disciplinary differences and perspectives. For example, the concept of individualisation, with its focus on a societal discourse of individually negotiated choice biographies, was introduced by one member of the research group, a sociologist, but was not taken up by all partners in their analytic reports, although it was included within the final project report.

Data collection and analysis
The topic of the study was under-researched. Sources of information were not uniformly available across the countries studied and, where national data collection did take place, cross-national differences in the parameters and definitions employed were evident.

The administrative organisation of the country was the first problematic comparative unit: comparing largely decentralised Sweden and Denmark with largely centralised Hungary, and with the country of England within the UK and the autonomous region of Catalonia within Spain.

Second, the organisation of welfare services varied, with specific leaving-care services dedicated to the age group of interest available in England, but not in the other countries, where either general social services were used (Sweden, Denmark) or a number of specialised services (Hungary, Spain) to achieve the desired interview respondents.

Third, nationally collected data on the educational qualifications of young people from a public care background were available in England, via the young people's unique ID in Sweden and Denmark, and not available in Spain or Hungary. Where national data were available, in respect of both being in public care and educational experience, many variations were found in the parameters, such as age groupings, whether completion, entry or participation was recorded.

Fourth, some variations occurred in the success of the recruitment strategy. For example, the study design, created by the UK team, included interviews with adults nominated by young people as having been important to their educational experiences. In Denmark, 14 interviews were completed out of a potential 35, while in Hungary 35 were completed, one for each young person. The difference may be explained by cultural variations in the conceptualisation of young people's independence that have an impact on the principle of nominating an adult, undermining the relative success of the strategy.

Fifth, differences existed within the research team in familiarity with the data collection methods, specifically using biographical-narrative interviews and timelines to record sequences of events of interest to the project concern with pathways. Although considerable discussion of the methods took place, and training sessions were provided, such differences were difficult to overcome within a compressed timeframe, and contributed to differences in analytic approach. Some research partners used a grounded theory approach to analysis, while others took a much more thematic and quantitative approach to the data.

Furthermore, delays in the fieldwork schedule in some countries meant that the intervals for follow-up interviews varied, which had an impact on possibilities for comparative analysis of the data.

The thorough and ongoing discussion of the structure of the national reports, including the headings and sub-headings to be used, afforded a strategy for generating comparisons. This was particularly important in writing up the five national case studies. However, such discussion did not entirely overcome disciplinary differences of perspective on and analytic approaches to the data.

Although obtained through sources that varied across countries, the data showed remarkably consistent findings. However, the extent to which the data were comparative at each level or unit of comparison was limited. Further studies on this topic are necessary to refine methods and comparability.

Interpretation and dissemination of findings

As with other EU studies using similar methods, research team members were aware of the limits to the generalisability of finding from the YiPPEE study to other EU member states. However, the consistent cross-national findings lent credibility to the results and policy recommendations.

The final report, and other dissemination output, referred to the following recommendations for policy and practice:

- Raising visibility of this group through collation of national level and institutional level statistics on education of children in care and once they leave care;
- Uniting care and education systems and developing clear protocols for financial responsibility with the welfare of the young person as the main consideration and giving more prominent status to educational participation, including more individual tuition and mentoring support to compensate for gaps in schooling;
- Extending financial support to avoid labour market reliance in order that higher and further education is a realistic option;
- Being ambitious on behalf of young people in care, from foster carers to policy;
- Reducing changes of care placement and school to a minimum to improve stability of relationships and educational experience;
- Promoting social integration through leisure and social activities and voluntary work.

The dissemination strategy of the project began with the inception of the project and included a range of social actors from EU policy customers to local authorities and national or regional governments. Media attention was also gained through attendance at a media briefing in Spain, a national newspaper feature in the UK's *Guardian*, and coverage of national and regional conferences in Sweden and England.

The two policy customer seminars, both designed with the intention of raising awareness of the issue, were quite different in character. The first, organised within a few months of the start date, attracted few participants and could not advance much on the proposal. The second, 17 months into the project, organised with the sponsorship of the DG Education and Culture, took place in their building and attracted considerable attention, including a video link from Spain. This sponsorship grew from a professional networking contact at DG Education and Culture, gained while visiting in relation to the cluster of Youth and Social Inclusion projects. The idea won the approval of the Director of the DG, and the research team were greatly assisted by the sponsor in organisational details. However, the success of the seminar was in large part also due to the efforts of the research team, each partner country had a brief to present some data, even if incomplete at the time of the seminar as data collection was still in progress. A great deal of planning was involved, in conjunction with the sponsor, to ensure the content was relevant to the agenda in the DGs represented, which included not only Education and Culture, but also Employment and Social Affairs.

End users were kept up to date about the project progress through the regular email publication of a Project Bulletin (stored on the project website), each coordinated by a partner country. Email feedback suggested that this was a valuable way of keeping the project in mind, especially when it came to the end-of-project conference.

The plan for regional conferences was not followed through in all countries for reasons of size of country, degree of variation in practice and, in one case, extreme weather conditions, which forced cancellation. The end-of-project conference, held in London, included all partners, and some UK-based practice examples, and was considered a great success in raising awareness, critiquing policy and practice, taking inspiration from young people's achievements and discussion of many localised examples.

Academic output in peer-reviewed journals began towards the later stages of the project and continued after the project was completed.

Lessons learned

The technical review of the YiPPEE project commissioned by the EU concluded that 'the project uncovers a potential of demonstrating different possible sources of information on youth with public care background and their educational trajectories for being picked up in further research and social reporting. The negative and positive evidences and the recommendations elaborated by the project team form a valuable package of new knowledge about educational pathways of youth with public background in five European countries'.

The review further commented on the invisibility of the social problem and the resulting lack of or difficulties with available data and comparability. The main lesson learned is about expectations of research that concerns such invisible questions: while research teams may search for comparability, a more realistic

option may be to see the phenomena under study in terms of parallel cases, with some comparative possibilities, hedged with caveats. Difficulties of comparison are perhaps compounded by highly multi-disciplinary teams and highly divergent country contexts.

Further lessons learned:
- Study visits for team members were valued and valuable as an orientation to the cross-national question, as were cross-national meetings, and other communication, held in a spirit of dialogue, curiosity and reflection.
- Thorough scrutiny of the proposal by project partners, ideally at a face-to-face meeting at the preparation stage, would have avoided or better anticipated some of the difficulties in putting the design into practice.
- Authorship protocols should be agreed early on to avoid or mitigate conflicts.
- A team should be assembled with experience of working collaboratively in international contexts but team members need to explore at an early stage within-team differences in working practices and how to overcome / work with them.
- Investment should be made in the chairing skills of the coordinator, including training where needed;
- Early and proactive links should be made with policy customers for the study.
- It is important to factor in training for researchers in the study's methods of data collection and analysis, especially where multi-disciplinary teams are employed.

References

The YiPPEE website holds information about the project, and national and consolidated reports: http://tcru.ioe.ac.uk/yippee/ June 2012.

Cameron, C. (2012) 'Continuing educational participation among children in care in five countries: some issues of social class', *Journal of Education Policy*.

Cameron, C. (forthcoming) '"Our young people are worse": Family backgrounds, educational progression and placement options in public care systems', *European Journal of Social Work*, special issue.

Höjer, I, Johansson, H and Hill, M (forthcoming) 'School as an opportunity and resilient factor for children in care', *European Journal of Social Work*, special issue.

Hollingworth, K. (2011) 'Participation in social, leisure and informal learning activities amongst care leavers in England: positive outcomes for educational participation', *Child and Family Social Work*, 17 October 2011, available on http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2011.00797.x/full June 2012.

Jackson, S. and Cameron, C. (2011) Final Report of the YiPPEE Project WP12: Young People from a Public Care Background: pathways to further and higher education in five European countries, available on http://tcru.ioe.ac.uk/yippee/ June 2012.

Jackson, S. (forthcoming) 'Leaving care: looking ahead and aiming higher', *Children and Youth Services Review*.