

Young people's views of multi-agency working

Alma Harris^{*} and Tracey Allen

Institute of Education, University of London, UK

This article outlines the findings from an Economic and Social Research Council funded research project that investigated the impact of multi-agency working on children and their families. It explored the ways in which young people experience multi-agency working and it investigated whether young people perceive any benefits from a coordinated approach to frontline service delivery. The in-depth, qualitative study focused on a cross-section of five local authorities and collected data through semi-structured interviews with young people and their parents. The study found that where multi-agency working is effectively integrated and where different professional services are streamlined, there is evidence of a positive impact on young people and their families.

Introduction

The Children's Plan (Department for Children, Schools and Families [DCSF], 2007, 2009a) outlines clear ambitions to deliver a step change in outcomes for young people and their families. Schools are at the epicentre of this reform. They are responsible for embedding the holistic priorities set out in the Children's Plan and embodied in 'Every Child Matters' (Department for Education and Skills [DfES], 2003, 2005, 2006). The Children's Plan clearly states that to deliver such priorities schools need to be 'at the heart of the community they serve' (DCSF, 2007, p. 13). It notes that by 2010, all primary and secondary schools in England will be expected to be involved in an extended schools network within their locality. In summary, the expectations and demands on schools to deliver the ambitions set out in the Children's Plan are extensive and far reaching.

It is evident that legislation alone is unlikely to bring about the step changes necessary to deliver the positive outcomes for young people anticipated in the Children's Plan. To be most effective, integrated services and multi-agency teams require deep-rooted cultural change to ensure that different professional groups work together

^{*}Corresponding author. Institute of Education, University of London, 20 Bedford Way, London, WC1H 0AL, UK. Email: a.harris@ioe.ac.uk

effectively across various organisational boundaries and fault lines (Harris & Allen, 2009). Different professional areas will need to work together to develop stronger information-sharing practices and, in some cases, to integrate resources in order to provide 'joined up' provision for children (Laming, 2009). Evidence would suggest that progress towards this end is still variable. Some local authorities and schools are offering young people coherent, effective multi-agency support, while others are struggling to get to the first base of effective delivery and provision.

Given the expectations associated with multi-agency working and, conversely, the implications and ramifications of failing to work in a coordinated way, the question remains, what evidence do we have that multi-agency working makes any difference to young people and their families? The volume of guidance available to schools and local authorities on multi-agency working is substantial, as is the amount of resources being redirected to this form of provision. But what return on this investment has there been? In the rush to secure joined-up provision, to provide integrated services and secure multi-agency working, what evidence do we have about the impact of this way of working?

This question of impact was central to an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) research study which explored multi-agency working, from the perspectives of the young people who experienced it. The study was qualitative in design and it adopted a case-study approach. It explored the perceptions, views and experiences of multi-agency working of young people and their families. The study also explored the school and local authority structures and processes that best supported effective multi-agency working. The aim of the research was to explore whether and in what ways approaches to multi-agency working made a difference to the young people and their families.

Research design

The theoretical framework that informed the research was derived from notions of communities of practice and professional collaboration (Wenger *et al.*, 2002). This framing was used primarily because of its explanatory power concerning social learning and the attention to learning through social participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Within communities of practice the process of sharing information and experiences within the group allows members to learn from each other and to develop new forms of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This theoretical framing provided the basis for analysing how different professional groups reformulated their professional practice and how this practice was negotiated across very different boundaries and interpretations of expertise (Spillane, 2001).

Multi-agency practice necessarily involves more complex forms of social interaction than single-agency provision and requires the renegotiation of power, control and authority across different professional boundaries. Multi-agency working is not only a reconfiguration of professional practice but is also a redefinition of professional practice. Ideas of professional autonomy, professional boundaries and capability therefore also informed the theoretical, conceptual and analytical framework of the

study. In particular, the analysis was informed by Eraut's (1994) notion that professional knowledge cannot be characterised in a manner that is independent of how it is used and how it is learned. The idea that professional knowledge is created through experience, and that its nature depends upon the cumulative acquisition, selection and understanding of that experience, assisted the analysis and the interpretation of findings.

To explore the issue of multi-agency working in some depth, a sample of 10 extended schools was selected which met a range of selection criteria, including high performance; a high degree of socio-economic deprivation; and geographical location. While not representative, the selection process ensured that the sample encompassed schools with varying degrees of socio-economic challenge and that were geographically spread. Within the sample, five schools were selected from the early years and primary sector and five schools were selected from the secondary sector. The 10 schools were located in five different local authorities (LA) which afforded comparison of LA provision and support. All the extended schools in the sample were engaged in multi-agency working and were considered by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) to be effective schools. Over half of the schools served areas of high socio-economic disadvantage where the need for specialist support for young people and their families was considered to be a high priority.

The design provided a basis for comparing localised responses and the differential implementation of multi-agency arrangements. A progressively focusing case-study methodology was used to capture the perspectives of young people. Wider stakeholder perspectives were also sought, including those of senior leaders in schools, senior local authority officers, classroom teachers, multi-agency professionals and multi-agency coordinators.

Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with a cross-section of stakeholder groups at each site with a particular emphasis on collecting data from young people. Data were collected from six major participant¹ groups. Documentary evidence from each site was also used to provide contextualisation and detailed information about the approach of different schools and LAs. Interviews were transcribed and data were analysed using the NVivo qualitative analysis program. The data were coded and then analysed thematically through individual and cross-case comparison. The emerging thematic analysis was informed by the theoretical framework plus the preliminary analysis of interview data.

Key themes from the data were highlighted using the 'Wordle' tool, which creates powerful visual images of commonly occurring themes within and across the interview transcripts. The Wordle images were also used to frame second round interviews with young people and other respondents. All the emerging themes were refined, scrutinised and validated through constant case analysis and interrogated against the original data. The themes were subsequently shared, validated and refined through project reference groups comprising young people and other stakeholders.

Within each theme illustrative quotations were derived across all cases for the purpose of confirming and validating the findings across the entire data set. These quotations are indicative of a grounded set of findings from the detailed analysis

within each case, and across all cases. The quotations that are used in the findings section that follows are intended to be illustrative but also are representative of a general trend or common finding across the entire data set.

Findings

The research found that where multi-agency provision was most effectively delivered there was evidence of a positive impact upon young people and their families. The data showed that young people firstly recognised when services were more aligned and, secondly, they welcomed this approach. One student noted that in the past he had been allocated over 20 different adults to work with him and now he has a key worker and a smaller team working with him. Secondly, young people were able to provide examples of the tangible benefits to them from multi-agency working. The evidence underlined that young people recognised benefits of multi-agency working; they could point to the specific ways in which multi-agency working had benefited them and their families.

The focus groups of young people in the study included individuals who required a range of multi-agency support, both in school and outside the school. For these individuals, in particular, but also for other young people interviewed, multi-agency provision was valued and seen to be of direct benefit where it met individual needs. Interestingly, the young people in the study did not state that they felt any stigmatisation as a result of multi-agency support but rather saw it as their entitlement to specialist support. The majority of young people saw this support as an important service rather than an imposition or intrusion.

Young people in the study explained how they had benefited from professional support. They noted that the most effective form of multi-agency support was aimed at them as an individual as well as their family:

I just think [the family support worker] has been a really good help, well she has to me.
(Year 9 pupil)

The social worker helped me but she also helped my Dad understand some of the problems he was causing. (Year 10 pupil)

In one school, children and their families were involved in health development programmes exploring issues such as nutrition, obesity and diabetes and elsewhere refugee parents were involved in family learning groups. In other schools, children in local authority care were targeted and a needs analysis was undertaken in order to develop individualised packages of support that covered multiple issues such as education and emotional needs as well as practical issues such as travel arrangements; this required coordinated activity across a range of specialist services including social work, youth work and counselling support.

The range of support for young people identified in the study included home-school liaison workers, community workers, refugee workers, mentors, social workers, family workers, counsellors, specialist paediatricians, the police, mental health services, parent partnership groups, the youth service, the youth offending

team, the behaviour support team, youth workers and support from the voluntary sector. Professional help for young people focused on a range of issues including confidence raising, substance misuse, community environmental projects, provision of role models for boys from single-parent families, confidential mentoring and coaching support, support for teenage parents, support for sexual health and well-being, crime reduction, bereavement, safeguarding, family support and civic activities and engagements such as Youth Parliament.

Young people reported high levels of satisfaction in their relationships with multi-agency staff. This was particularly the case where multi-agency staff provided access to stimulating opportunities for young people and where mutual trust was nurtured. The research showed that young people with low levels of confidence often preferred to engage in support activities accompanied by friends and peers. Conversely, pupils with high levels of confidence tended to see interactions with professionals as a welcome opportunity to develop new relationships and experiences:

You feel better going into an activity if you've got someone there you know don't you? Like if you go into an activity and you don't know anybody you've got a new activity and then you've got to meet new people as well, it's better if you've got people you know already.
(Year 9 pupil)

Young people tended to understand multi-agency support in terms of the individuals they worked with most closely. For example, engagement with a family worker who supported one-to-one needs in school and provided family counselling was simply referred to as, 'time with Alison'. Professionals talked about their conscious efforts to offer accessible support by avoiding institutionalised language and through focusing directly on young people's needs. This approach was viewed as effective by those working in schools:

Time with the youth worker is my time, like no one else has it. That's important because it allows me to think out loud and to be myself, which is good. I'm not someone I'm supposed to be. (Year 10 pupil)

School-based mentors with a youth work background were singled out by young people as offering useful support and intervention. In many schools they play a central role in supporting vulnerable young people through one-to-one discussion in a secure and appropriate environment. The evidence showed that mentors were effective at helping young people to support and articulate their needs and to develop appropriate coping strategies. Young people reported high levels of trust and confidentiality in their relationships with mentors. Support staff were particularly important in mobilising specialist help for certain young people. Frontline non-teaching staff were also identified by young people as a significant source of support and guidance.

Outcomes of multi-agency working

Young people noted a number of positive benefits from multi-agency support. These benefits included greater engagement with learning and improved school attendance. They also commented on the contribution of multi-agency support to their emotional

well-being and that it was most effective in helping them with family issues. Young people also characterised their most effective relationships with multi-agency professionals as ‘high trust’:

I wouldn’t be here any more, I’d be dead and buried. (Year 9 pupil)

I trust him because he is there for me, not like teachers. I come to school because he [the youth worker] is sound and he thinks it’s a good idea that I come, so I come. (Year 9 pupil)

Young people also noted that multi-agency professionals made them aware of other support they could access that could offer them and their families support in the wider community. The research found that multi-agency working, when most effective, actively met a wide range of young people’s needs and impacted positively on educational outcomes as well as more general aspects of well-being.

The evidence shows that multi-agency support is enabling schools to develop personalised responses to young people’s learning needs by drawing upon a wide range of services. The services range from providing specialist learning support in the classroom through partnership with mental health services and the provision of after-school family learning opportunities. This type of engagement also positively affected young people’s confidence about learning and enabled them to articulate their learning needs more clearly. Teachers reported how multi-agency work had assisted them in removing the barriers to learning for certain young people and had resulted in improvements in attainment.

Young people reported that multi-agency support had been effective in addressing some of the root causes of school absence, such as tackling bullying and providing space for young people to confide in mentors:

[The family worker] supported me ... because I deal with a lot of bullying in school, I mean I’m not in my science classes any more, I tried being in two different classes and stuff and all the teachers try and help now because they know it is getting really bad so now in science I don’t work in class, I work in library. (Year 9 pupil)

Support from family workers was also highlighted as important in addressing issues of absence rooted in family difficulty:

The family worker person is really nice, like she knows the stuff going on and tries to help. My Dad is not here and my Mum is out a lot of the time, so she brings the family back together. (Year 10 pupil)

The relationship between in-school and out-of-school support had a positive effect on behaviour. For example, a number of young people attributed difficulties with anger management to behaviour patterns prevalent within their home environment. Young people reported benefits arising from learning new coping strategies and responses through working closely with specialist support services and mentors:

I’ve managed to say things I wouldn’t have said if [support] hadn’t have been there. (Year 9 pupil)

Young people also recognised that the purpose of out of hours activities was to reduce disruptive activity within the community and many young people agreed that it was

effective. One group of young people reported a reduction in the presence of local gangs following this type of initiative.

Most professionals in the study were confident that multi-agency activity was positively affecting young people and their learning. There was evidence of a positive impact on achievement from the multi-agency work with certain students. There was also tangible evidence of improvements in reading when young people received one-to-one coaching and mentoring support. The act of providing coaching support also resulted in positive outcomes for the younger teenage volunteers providing the coaching and mentoring.

Young people recognised short-term benefits to their well-being such as reduced stress and improved coping mechanisms. They also noted the potential for longer-term benefits where they had developed the capacity to systematically think through difficulties as well as think differently about problems. Multi-agency staff that enabled young people to think in this way tended to be seen as empathetic and positive influences.

Young people in the study reported increased self-confidence as the most important outcome of multi-agency support. They reported considerable effects on their ability to articulate their opinions and to share their needs. Furthermore, they regarded the ability to speak up and to effect change for their local communities as a fundamental achievement and often developed an activist approach to change within their local communities:

I've learnt that if you want something enough for your community you'll tell someone and then you'll go to meetings and help build your confidence up so when you do want something you can tell people that you can go and get it and it is not as scary as you expected.
(Year 9 pupil)

Young people reported increased self-confidence where they had the opportunity to engage in activities outside of their usual experience, where there was a specific focus on confidence building and through activities involving teamwork to meet purposeful outcomes. They also reported enhanced confidence through their engagement with various activities such as environmental projects, outdoor pursuits, raising aspirations for teenage parents transitioning between school-parents-school. This consistent level of support that threaded through home and school was valued by young people and proved to be the most effective form of support for the most vulnerable young people.

Tensions and challenges

The challenge of integrating school, LA and community is recognised by a range of commentators (Breitborde & Swiniarski, 2002; Wade & Badham, 2003; Edwards, 2004; Miller & Stirling, 2004; Aspden & Birch, 2005; Craig, 2005; Chamberlain *et al.*, 2006; Cummings *et al.*, 2007; Kendall *et al.*, 2007; Harris & Allen, 2009; Higham *et al.*, 2009). This research similarly identified some tensions within multi-agency work and some challenges. The evidence showed that some young people

could be apathetic towards multi-agency activity, particularly where the purpose of support was not clearly defined and where there was no discernible benefit to them:

The police woman came into our maths lesson; don't know what that was for. (Year 9 pupil)

In a small number of cases, there were young people in the study who stated that they felt detached from multi-agency professionals and they did not perceive the support on offer as relevant to their needs. For example, weekly transportation to a local football activity by a project worker in response to low achievement was not fully understood by the young people involved and was not entirely enjoyed. However, it was greatly valued by the development worker, who was unaware of how the young people felt. Other examples of activities that young people did not appreciate highlight a gap in communication between frontline professionals and young people.

The research highlighted that the role of the LA remains critical in driving and supporting coherent and high-quality multi-agency provision. The most effective LAs facilitated frontline multi-agency work through school networks or clusters. In contrast, LAs that were less effective in developing multi-agency arrangements were characterised by a more fractured and piecemeal set of structural arrangements. There was a greater reliance on agencies to take the initiative to work together to provide 'joined-up' support for schools. Where there was an absence of clearly defined LA support, this undermined the delivery of effective multi-agency provision. It was clear from the data that multi-agency working could address mainstream and complex needs but only if provision was 'joined up' and streamlined. In some cases multi-agency work was also viewed as reactive, short-term and disjointed.

In schools and localities where multi-agency development was structurally and culturally embedded and where the ethos of young people's voice was integral to mainstream activity within the school, there was some evidence, although limited, of co-construction. In these instances, young people's views were listened to and acted upon to plan certain provision and to guide certain outcomes. For example, in one local authority, young people were invited to engage in multi-agency developments through a youth parliament. Elsewhere young people participated in regular feedback surgeries with the director of Children's Services and other lead professionals.

Whilst the majority of young people valued multi-agency support, the research showed that they were generally not involved in the decisions that influenced the construction or configuration of provision. In most cases young people were not directly involved in shaping the support on offer. At times young people were called upon to offer summative feedback on multi-agency activities and experiences and this was taken into account in forward planning. However, in the majority of cases young people were rarely asked for their recommendations on how multi-agency provision and support might be constructed.

The professionals who took part in the study tended to agree that young people's involvement was important in developing highly relevant and accessible multi-agency provision. They also noted that involvement was instrumental in providing better calibration between the needs of young people and the services provided. However,

professionals also reported that engaging young people and the community in joint decision-making and planning continued to represent a challenge. This was largely due to some of the professional boundaries and sensitivities that still exist. Also, until recently, LA structures and cultures have focused on single-service provision and specialised professional input. They have not been required to address wide-ranging, multifaceted needs nor have they traditionally centred on voices of young people or their families. Professionals acknowledged the need to engage both the local community and young people more in consultation and decision-making in order to develop more cohesive communities and efficient resourcing.

Impact

All professional groups within the study agreed with the general principle of joint working to provide frontline support for children and young people. Alliances between health, social work, mental health, schools and other agencies were considered critically important in effectively meeting the diverse range of young people's needs. The research identified numerous examples in which inter-agency working was experienced in a positive way.

Most professionals regarded boundary issues as the major challenge in moving towards more integrated and multi-agency provision after many years of separate working. Consequently, trust across agencies was varied and there was evidence of competing power relationships between various organisations. Multi-agency professionals frequently talked about tensions involved in multi-agency work and identified a lack of coherence, inadequate collaborative structures, budgetary constraints and the differential remuneration of various professional groups as problematic.

At the time of the research, the challenging economic climate had begun to impact on multi-agency arrangements. For example, funding for large-scale integrated regeneration efforts such as education and housing partnership projects were under threat due to financial pressures on the public sector and construction industry. This had the potential to undermine progress made with multi-agency developments.

The latter stages of this research also coincided with the high-profile child protection case involving the tragic death of 'Baby P'; this precipitated a sharp focus on the role of multi-agency work and in particular on the role of directors of Children's Services (DCS). It is clear from our study that the DCS is pivotal in augmenting effective multi-agency provision and that there needs to be greater preparation and support for this role. The data also showed that the role of the LA is essential in managing multi-agency provision effectively. Provision organised through local clusters or hubs was associated with accurate needs identification and timely frontline support.

Discussion

The findings to emerge from this research are summarised across four key themes which are:

1. Implementation.
2. Young people's outcomes.
3. Professional learning.
4. Policy issues.

The findings are discussed in relation to the empirical findings as well as drawing on theoretical frameworks to explore underlying change processes.

Implementation

The research found that multi-agency effects were enhanced when agencies aligned efforts with one another. Further, where discourses, leadership and policy-making activities were outward-facing, this encouraged a more expressive form of implementation. This embraced contextual and holistic factors and was not overshadowed by performative or regulatory pressures. Similar findings are identified in recent studies (Ball & Maroy, 2009; van Zanten, 2009).

Policy statements surrounding integrated working also encourage professional collaboration and inclusion of young people and community with a view to developing wider civic participation and informed policy-making practices. Within this investigation it was evident that further work is needed to bring young people and professionals together to form broader structures and better identify need. This challenge is echoed in other studies (Coleman, 2006; Ofsted, 2006, 2009; Raffo & Dyson, 2007; Allen, 2008; Harris & Allen, 2009). There are also wider theoretical bodies of work that suggest collaborations that cross professional and public boundaries are difficult to generate due to the primacy that is attached to professional knowledge rather than mixed modes of public policy making (Beck, 2006).

Outcomes

The research revealed a wide range of benefits for young people from multi-agency working. These include improved educational outcomes and achievement; positive impacts on behaviour; improved attendance; raised confidence levels; improved engagement with learning; enhanced well-being; and better safeguarding processes. Young people especially valued support that raised their self-confidence and had a direct impact on their own lives and those of their family and local people. Young people singled out particular professional groups for praise who supported with well-being rather than instrumental or academic foci. Conversely, apathy was apparent amongst those young people involved in interventions that were largely instrumental and poorly connected to young people's perspectives of need. This form of detachment and dissatisfaction is cited in wider social projects where it is suggested that the lived experiences of the less powerful are neglected (Beck, 2006). Similar issues can be identified here, with young people's views and needs obscured by professional interpretation (Ulrich, 2000).

The local evidence base for the most effective forms and configurations of support for meeting young people's needs was necessarily embryonic (Halsey *et al.*, 2006; Gamoran, 2007). However, there is strong emergent evidence that what works in terms of implementation is a sense of meaningful intervention that is highly geared towards need, is varied and inclusive (DCSF, 2009b).

Professional learning

In order to explore the opportunities for and barriers to professional learning we returned to initial notions of communities of practice that had been used to frame the original proposal for this research. Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that new practices are able to grow when a group is committed to learning for the sake of improving professional practice and effects. This is contingent upon trust, shared identity and common values. Given that new agencies were coming together that had at times little or no history of group working, this was an important focus of the investigation.

Research evidence indicated that understanding and meaning between professionals was most successfully negotiated in environments disposed towards outward-looking discourses and approaches and where a level of risk was tolerated. Engström's (2005) notion of networking provided a useful image of the manner in which such dispersed and flexible cultures generate pliable and rhizomatic structures. However, within the research we also identified the existence of immutable boundaries that were often characterised by differences in language (Churchman, 1979; Ulrich, 2000). The use of different forms of language to speak about young people symbolised strong demarcations of professional identity and orientation (Bernstein, 1975). This represented a rubric and shorthand for core practices. Consequently, language emerged as a key subject and force in attempts to reconfigure, reposition and reculture practice.

The findings from this research highlight the potential to grow collaborative learning cultures and practices within and across local agencies, and most professionals were optimistic that this would emerge over time. However, the pace of change was clearly faster in some localities than others and in places lagged behind integrated policy statements. Parallels exist in the wider literature where it is recognised that national policy takes time to gestate and is subject to local reconstruction (Wenger, 1998; Ozga, 2000; McNeish & Newman, 2002; Miller & McNicholl, 2003; Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Burt, 2004; Gobillot, 2006; Leadbetter *et al.*, 2007; Muijs, 2007; Page *et al.*, 2007; Audit Commission, 2009; Edwards *et al.*, 2009).

This research provides evidence that multi-agency work can make an important difference to young people and is able to reach children and young people in contexts of risk and vulnerability. It has also shown that challenges remain, particularly within some local authorities where there is an ongoing need to organise multi-agency provision to best meet local needs. The findings suggest that no configuration model can be successful unless multi-agency work is integral to school, community and locality. This requires alignment and clarity of vision, centrality of purpose and coordination of delivery. As a consequence, the influence of the LA has a very significant role to

play in terms of establishing infrastructure and momentum for multi-agency working. The unprecedented cross-sector role of the director of Children's Services also places the locus of accountability directly with the local authority. This reinforces a need for the local authority to engender meaningful practices and effective service levels.

Policy issues

Multi-agency developments in this context are driven by a very strong national policy imperative. However, uneven and incremental developments are evident in three major respects. Firstly, this national policy has been applied with varying levels of success. Effective processes include outward-facing approaches, contextualised responses and disposition to work across professional boundaries. However, contrasting district-level and organisational orientations have produced differing interventions and results (van Zanten, 2009).

Secondly, the short-term nature of much of the resource surrounding multi-agency working and a lack of 'ring-fenced support' raises questions about the longevity and sustainability of particular provision. The short-term nature of many projects at times resulted in lack of time for embedding and spreading new ways of working. There is a pressing need to consolidate resources locally and to develop sustainable provision, particularly in the most challenging contexts where service use is relatively high (Huxham & Vangen, 2000, 2005). There is also an important need to monitor threats as well as opportunities within the current financial climate (After School Alliance, 2009). Consequently, there is a need to prioritise funding and resources for multi-agency work while also encouraging long-term forward planning. This pressure is also recognised in related research exploring the way in which schools and local authorities are responding to integrated policy agendas (Harris & Allen, 2009). Young people involved in the research had already begun to recognise degrees of disjointed activity.

Thirdly, this agenda is extremely sensitive to high-profile interruptions and is vulnerable to contextual pressures. The policy emerged from the aftermath of a high-profile child protection tragedy that sparked a national enquiry into integrated working across public services. This became a key reference point for the focus on integrated working in England. In 2009, a child protection tragedy ignited another national enquiry into integrated working across public services in England. This brought a number of recommendations for training, development and accountability at senior district level and reinforced the imperative for integration. In essence, this remains an unstable policy space that could be vulnerable to reactive pressures in place of systematic and systemic change.

This complex and fast-moving agenda opens up possibilities for meeting young people's needs but only if it takes account of the values and meaning that young people bring to multi-agency working. The Children's Plan (DCSF, 2009a) and the Laming Report (2009) reassert central ambitions to improve the life chances of children and young people in England. While the challenges of implementing effective multi-agency working cannot be underestimated, the aspirations outlined in the

Children's Plan and the recommendations made in the Laming Report are impossible to achieve without it.

Note

1. Young people and their families, 77; senior strategic leaders at the local authority level, 6; multi-agency coordinators and lead professionals, 10; school leaders, 12; multi-agency professionals, 14; teaching staff, 10.

References

- After School Alliance (2009) Uncertain times 2009: recession imperilling afterschool programs and the children they serve. Available online at: <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/UncertainTimes2009.cfm> (accessed 27 October 2009).
- Allen, T. (2008) *Developing deep support for vulnerable learners* (London, Esmee Fairbairn and Specialist Schools and Academies Trust).
- Aspden, J. & Birch, D. (2005) *New localism—citizen engagement, neighbourhoods and public services: evidence from local government* (London, Local and Regional Government Research Unit, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister).
- Audit Commission (2009) *CPA—the harder test: scores and analysis of performance in single-tier and county councils 2008* (London, Audit Commission).
- Ball, S. & Maroy, C. (2009) School's logics of action as mediation and compromise between internal dynamics and external constraints and pressures, *Compare*, 39(1), 99–112.
- Beck, U. (2006) *Cosmopolitan vision* (Malden, MA, Polity Press).
- Bernstein, B. (1975) *Towards a theory of educational transmissions* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Breitborde, M. L. & Swiniarski, L. B. (2002) Family education and community power: new structures for new visions in the educational village, *Educational Studies*, 28(3), 305–318.
- Burt, R. (2004) Structural holes and good ideas, *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349–399.
- Chamberlain, T., Lewis, K., Teeman, D. & Kendall, L. (2006) *How is the Every Child Matters agenda affecting schools?* (Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research).
- Churchman, C. W. (1979) *The systems approach* (New York, Dell).
- Coleman, A. (2006) *Collaborative leadership in extended schools* (Nottingham, National College for School Leadership).
- Covey, S. (2006) *The speed of trust* (New York, Free Press).
- Craig, J. (2005), *Taking the wide view: the new leadership of extended schools* (Nottingham, National College for School Leadership).
- Cummings, C., Dyson, A., Muijs, D., et al. (2007) *Evaluation of the Full-Service Extended Schools Initiative*. Final Report. RR852 (London, Department for Education and Skills).
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2007) *The Children's Plan: building brighter futures*. Cm 7280 (London, HMSO).
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2009a) *Children and Young People's Plan guidance 2009* (London, DCSF).
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2009b) *Children's services interventions evaluation*. DCSF-RR160 (London, DCSF).
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003) *Every child matters*. Cm. 5860. (London, The Stationery Office).
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2005) *Extended schools access to opportunities and services for all—a prospectus* (London, DfES).
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006) *Planning and funding extended schools: a guide for schools, local authorities and their partner organisations* (Nottingham, DfES).

- Edwards, A. (2004) The new multi-agency working: collaborating to prevent the social exclusion of children and families, *Journal of Integrated Care*, 12(5), 3–9.
- Edwards, A., Daniels, H., Gallagher, T., Leadbetter, J. & Warmington, P. (2009) *Improving inter-professional collaborations: multi-agency working for children's well-being* (London, Routledge).
- Engeström, Y. (2005) Knotworking to create collaborative intentionality capital in fluid organizational fields, in: M. M. Beyerlein, S. T. Beyerlein & F. A. Kennedy (Eds) *Collaborative capital: creating intangible value* (Amsterdam, Elsevier).
- Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing professional knowledge and competence* (London, RoutledgeFalmer).
- Gamoran, A. (Ed.) (2007) *Standards-based reform and the poverty gap: lessons for 'No Child Left Behind'* (Washington DC, Brookings Institution Press).
- Gobillot, E. (2006) *The connected leadership* (London, Kogan Page).
- Halsey, K., Murfield, J., Harland, J. L. & Lord, P. (2006) *The voice of young people: an engine for improvement? Scoping the evidence* (Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research).
- Harris, A. & Allen, T. (2009) Ensuring every child matters: issues of implementation for school leaders, *School Leadership and Management*, 29(4), 337–352.
- Higham, R., Hopkins, D. & Matthews, P. (2009) *System leadership in practice* (Maidenhead, Open University Press).
- Huxham, C. & Vangen, S. (2000) Leadership in the shaping and implementation of collaboration agendas: how things happen in a (not quite) joined up world, *Academy of Management Journal*, 6, 1159–1175.
- Huxham, C. & Vangen, S. (2005) *Managing to collaborate* (Abingdon, Routledge).
- Kendall, S., Lamont, E. & Wilkin, A. (2007) *How school leaders in extended schools respond to local needs: summary report* (Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research).
- Laming (2009) *The protection of children in England, a progress report* (London, The Stationery Office).
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Leadbetter, J., Daniels, H., Edwards, A. et al. (2007) Professional learning within multi-agency children's services: researching into practice, *Educational Research*, 49(1), 83–98.
- Leadbetter, C. & Mongon, D. (2008) *Leadership for public value: achieving valuable outcomes for children, families and communities* (Nottingham, National College for School Leadership).
- McNeish, D. & Newman, T. (2002) Involving children and young people in decision-making, in: D. McNeish, T. Newman & H. Roberts (Eds) *What works for children: effective services for children and families?* (Buckingham, Open University Press), 186–204.
- Miller, C. & McNicholl, A. (2003). *Integrating children's services: issues and practice* (London, Office for Public Management).
- Miller, C. & Stirling, S. (2004). *Co-production in children's services* (London, Office for Public Management).
- Muijs, D. (2007) Leadership in full service extended schools: communicating across cultures, *School Leadership and Management*, 27(4), 347–362.
- Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2006) *Extended schools: a report on early developments*. HMI 2453 (London, Ofsted).
- Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2009) *Annual performance assessment 2008: performance indicators and outcomes*. Reference no. 0900018 (London, Ofsted).
- Ozga, J. (2000) *Policy research in educational settings* (Buckingham, Open University Press).
- Page, J., Whitting, G. & Mclean, C. (2007) *Engaging effectively with black and minority ethnic parents in children's and parental services*. DCSF RB013 (London, Department for Children, Schools and Families).
- Raffo, C. & Dyson, A. (2007) Full service extended schools and educational inequality in urban contexts—new opportunities for progress? *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(3), 263–282.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R. & Diamond, J. B. (2001) Investigating school leadership practice: a distributed perspective, *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23–28.

- Ulrich, W. (2000) Reflective practice in the civil society: the contribution of critically systemic thinking, *Reflective Practice*, 1(2), 247–268.
- Vangen, S. & Huxham, C. (2003) Enacting leadership for collaborative advantage: dilemmas of ideology and pragmatism in the activities of partnership managers, *British Journal of Management*, 14, S61–S76.
- van Zanten, A. (2009) Competitive arenas and schools' logics of action: a European comparison, *Compare*, 39(1), 85–98.
- Wade, H. & Badham, B. (2003) *Hear by right: standards for the active involvement of children and young people* (London, National Youth Agency/Local Government Association).
- Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W. M. (2002) *Cultivating communities of practice: a guide to managing knowledge* (Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press).

Copyright of British Educational Research Journal is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.