



Image credit: Za'atari camp, Syria, March 2016. Adeline Guerra/Oxfam.

THE IMPACT OF PROTECTION INTERVENTIONS ON UNACCOMPANIED AND SEPARATED CHILDREN

About this evidence brief

This brief provides an overview of *The impact of protection interventions on unaccompanied and separated children* – a systematic review published in March 2017 by the Humanitarian Evidence Programme and carried out by a team from Save the Children UK, Save the Children Sweden and McMaster University. It summarizes key findings in response to the research question identified, indicates the country contexts from which evidence is drawn, outlines the methodology, highlights research gaps and provides references to the original literature.

The brief aims to assist policy makers, practitioners and researchers in assessing the available evidence in this field. It does not provide advice on which interventions or approaches are more or less appropriate in any given context. The varied and varying nature of crisis, vulnerability, goals of humanitarian programming, local conditions and quality of available data make the evidence highly contextual.

The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of Oxfam, Feinstein or the UK government.

About the systematic review

The protocol, full systematic review and executive summary on which this evidence brief is based are available from [Feinstein International Center](#), [Oxfam Policy & Practice](#) and [UK government](#) websites. Citation:

Williamson, K., Gupta, P., Gillespie, L.A., Shannon, H. and Landis, D. (2017). *The impact of protection interventions on unaccompanied and separated children: A systematic review*. Humanitarian Evidence Programme. Oxford: Oxfam GB.

Research enquiries: Roxanne Krystalli
roxani.krystalli@tufts.edu

About the Humanitarian Evidence Programme

The Humanitarian Evidence Programme is a partnership between Oxfam GB and the Feinstein International Center at the Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University. It is funded by the United Kingdom (UK) government's Department for International Development (DFID) through the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme.

Programme enquiries: Lisa Walmsley
lwalmsley1@ght.oxfam.org

Contents

About this evidence brief	1
Objectives of the systematic review.....	2
Findings	3
Profile of included studies.....	3
Methodology	5
References	6

Objectives of the systematic review

The review synthesizes evidence on outcomes for children from programming on family tracing and reunification (FTR), interim care (residential care centres and foster care) and mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS). It aims to answer one main question and three sub-questions:

- what is the impact of protection interventions on unaccompanied and separated children (UASC), during the period of separation, in humanitarian crises in low and middle income countries?
 - how effective are child protection activities specific to UASC (e.g. FTR, interim care) at restoring a protective environment?
 - how effective are interventions aimed at preventing and responding to abuse, exploitation, violence and neglect at ensuring the safety of UASC?
 - how effective are MHPSS interventions in promoting the mental health and psychosocial well-being of UASC?

The review focuses on protection interventions for UASC in humanitarian crises in low and middle income countries or in proximate countries of

Definitions

Who do we mean by 'unaccompanied and separated children'?

By 'children' we mean every human being below the age of 18 (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989, Article 1).

The Inter-agency Guiding Principles on Unaccompanied and Separated Children define separated children as 'those separated from both parents, or from their previous legal or customary primary caregiver, but not necessarily from other relatives'. Unaccompanied children are defined as 'children who have been separated from both parents and other relatives and are not being cared for by an adult, who, by law or custom, is responsible for doing so' (Inter-agency Working Group on UASC, 2004).

What do we mean by 'child protection in emergencies'?

Child protection in emergencies is defined by the Child Protection Area of Responsibility within the Global Protection Cluster as 'the prevention of and response to abuse, neglect, exploitation of and violence against children in emergencies'.

asylum since 1983. It considers the impact of such interventions undertaken during the period that these children are separated from parents or other caregivers and not during reintegration or long-term alternative care.

Figure 1: Examples of common interventions undertaken with UASC. Source: The research team

Domains of	Sub-domains		Programme		Domain-specific activities	Outcomes	
1. Child protection	UASC-specific	Interim alternative care	Case management	Community-based mechanisms	Formal foster care	Restoration of a protective environment	
		FTR			Interim care centres		
	General*	Prevention of and response to specific protection risks			Support to peer-headed households		FTR
					Release of children from armed forces	Prevention of sexual violence	
2. Mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS)					Child-focused refugee status	Mental health and psychosocial wellbeing	
					Focused, non-specialized MHPSS support		
					Focused, specialized MHPSS support		

* General interventions are those aimed at children in general that may also affect UASC.

Findings

Figure 2: Profile of included studies. Source: The research team

Domain/ sub-domain of intervention	No. studies /case studies	Methodology	Location	Range of publication dates	Types of humanitarian crisis	Quality range and median
Domain: Child protection						
Sub-domain: UASC-specific programming (please see below for breakdown of details)						
FTR	14 studies, including 17 case studies	Quantitative (all)	Rwanda/DRC (x6), Ethiopia, Mozambique (x2), Angola, Sierra Leone/regional (x2), Guatemala, Aceh (x2), Middle East region	1993–2014	Conflict (x15), Disaster (x2)	<i>Range:</i> Low– medium/high; <i>Median:</i> Low/medium
Interim alternative care	9	Quantitative – 7; Qualitative – 2	Mozambique (x2), DRC (x2), Eritrea (x2), Kenya/Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Aceh	1994–2009	Conflict (x8), Disaster (x1)	<i>Range:</i> Low– medium; <i>Median:</i> Low/medium
Sub-domain: General child protection programming: No studies identified						
Domain: MHPSS	2	Quantitative	Rwanda, Haiti	2003–2015	Conflict (x1), Disaster (x1)	<i>Range:</i> Low– medium; <i>Median:</i> Low/medium

Family tracing and reunification

The scale of separation in Rwanda is unparalleled in the evidence. With an overall caseload of 120,000 UASC registered (or 3.7 percent of the affected child population), this is in excess of 3.5 times the scale of separation in any other crisis. The humanitarian response to this crisis offered rich opportunities for learning about how to effectively identify and document UASC, trace their families and reunify them: Six out of seventeen FTR case studies included in the review focus on Rwanda and surrounding countries.

There is some indication that the scale of separation may be greater in conflicts than in natural disasters. Caseloads in some of the conflict contexts where interventions were undertaken (Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola and Sierra Leone/regional) are of comparable size and scale (ranging from 0.23 percent of affected child population in Angola to 0.99 percent in the Mano River countries). Caseload size both as an overall number and as a percentage of affected child population was significantly lower following the Indian Ocean tsunami in Aceh. This perhaps reflects a critical difference in the degree of separation that takes place in natural disasters compared with conflict settings and warrants further exploration.

Although challenging to attribute, the evidence included in this study indicates an increase in rates of reunification over time. While this may indicate the positive impact of an increased emphasis on addressing separation and the development of programme, approaches to FTR, given the limited number of studies and

wide range of influencing variables caution is required in interpretation.

A number of studies identified factors that had a positive influence on rates of reunification:

- effective coordination between UN, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations and governments
- engaging with communities in the identification, tracing and reunification process
- capacity-building being integral to programming and systems building
- effective information management
- adequate sustained programme funding.

These factors are reflected in the body of standards and guidelines that has been developed since 1983, most notably by the Inter-Agency Working Group on Unaccompanied and Separated Children.

A number of studies raise concerns about missing girls, particularly those that relate to programming with children associated with armed forces and armed groups (CAAFAG).

- Children in interim care centres in Mozambique and Sierra Leone were all male, reflecting the male-centric nature of official disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes.
- In Sierra Leone, 8.5 percent of the children demobilized were girls, yet this number failed to reflect the significant numbers of girls who had been abducted by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF).
- There was a gender imbalance among girls aged 13–18 involved in FTR programming in Sierra Leone and Liberia, indicating a hidden

population of separated girls – including those associated with armed groups – who came to be known as the ‘lost’ girls. The fear of stigmatization was reported as a key reason why girls felt unable to return home.

- In Angola, Save the Children UK documented that abducted girls aged 12–14 were detained in quartering areas by military personnel who claimed that they were their wives.
- This is not exclusive to conflict situations: in post-tsunami Aceh, Dunn et al. (2006) reported that only 40 percent of the FTR caseload was female; similarly, there were documented concerns that fewer girls than boys were identified and supported with FTR programming in Rwanda.

Recommendations related to FTR interventions

- The humanitarian child protection sector should standardize the disaggregation of data on UASC by gender and age categories, and provide caseload analysis that outlines reasons for separation.
- Findings from assessments to measure the nature and scale of separation in emergencies should be analysed in order to progressively build a picture of the drivers of separation in different contexts.

Interim care

Outcomes for children living in residential care were mixed. Where this was explored, positive outcomes were strongly linked to better standards in care, particularly increasing the staff-to-child ratio and improving the quality of the caregiver relationship.

Outcomes for children in foster care were generally, but not consistently, positive. Study outcomes indicated that significant ongoing monitoring and support to both children and families is required to ensure that foster care is effective for all children.

While the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children recommend foster over residential care as the preferred interim measure, **the findings from this review are not enough in themselves to confirm or refute the prioritization of foster care over residential care as a norm for interim care in emergencies.**

Outcomes for children in interim care were only partially measured in the majority of studies. The research team evaluated outcome indicators and measures of outcome against definitions of ‘adequacy’ and ‘appropriateness’ of care. The majority of papers focusing on interim care evaluated outcomes against some – primarily social and emotional – but not all dimensions of the adequacy of care. Most papers did not evaluate outcomes in relation to the

appropriateness of care. There is also wide variation in the cultural validity of the measures used.

Recommendations related to interim care interventions

- Further research is needed to:
 - understand what aspects of both formal and informal foster care are critical to bring about positive outcomes for UASC in humanitarian contexts
 - compare the outcomes of formal and informal foster care versus residential care in humanitarian contexts.
- The humanitarian child protection sector would benefit from the development of a standardized holistic framework, applied in a contextually appropriate way, for evaluating the outcomes of care interventions on UASC in humanitarian contexts.

General child protection programmes

Recommendations related to general child protection programming

- No studies were identified that evaluate outcomes for UASC involved in general child protection programmes in humanitarian contexts. This perhaps reflects the newness of approaches such as child protection case management in humanitarian response, which would be expected to generate such data. The humanitarian child protection sector should work to systematically analyse case management data, disaggregating by separation status and taking into account age, gender and other key variables related to child protection risks and vulnerabilities.

Mental health and psychosocial support

With only two studies considered eligible for this review, the extent of the evidence on MHPSS interventions is extremely limited. Both of the programmes evaluated were based on externally-conceptualized models of how to promote psychosocial well-being and may not have been appropriate to context. Neither study focuses on the specific impact of separation and loss on the mental health and well-being of children.

Further, indicators of well-being and measures used to evaluate against indicators lacked cultural validity.

Recommendations related to MHPSS interventions

- Further research is required that evaluates outcomes of contextually appropriate MHPSS interventions, with sensitivity to those issues that may be specific to UASC. In order to build up evidence of good practice, research is critically needed to:

- review relevant evidence on the impact of separation on mental health and psychosocial well-being from non-humanitarian contexts and consider how this may apply in humanitarian contexts
- evaluate the impact of separation in humanitarian crises on children’s mental health and psychosocial distress in the short, medium and long term
- identify examples of contextually-appropriate MHPSS interventions with UASC and evaluate their impact on children’s mental health and psychosocial well-being.
- Additionally, it is recommended that a clear approach for the evaluation of MHPSS outcomes for UASC is developed to promote cultural validity in evaluation.

The researchers conclude by raising questions about what constitutes ‘evidence’, given the wealth of information about UASC that was not considered eligible for this review.

- The broader literature on UASC should be synthesized to identify themes and promising interventions with UASC that would then be rigorously evaluated to further develop the evidence base on this topic.

Methodology

This review followed the guidelines and principles developed by the Cochrane Collaboration (2015). It included studies:

- that evaluate an intervention during the period of separation, which were undertaken in a low or middle income country or proximate country of asylum during a humanitarian crisis
- where the subjects are UASC
- that were published from 1983 onwards
- that are written in the English language (or translated into English)
- that are primary empirical research.

Searches of bibliographic databases were conducted in December 2015 and January 2016. Searches of potentially relevant websites (including government agencies and NGOs) were carried out between February and April 2016.

Of the 5,535 records identified through a series of searches (academic databases, grey literature websites) and a call for documents, the research team identified 23 studies that were eligible for inclusion. **The extent of the evidence is therefore limited.**

- Fourteen studies are programme evaluations (mainly focused on FTR programme outcomes) and nine are research papers (eight of which focus on interim care or MHPSS programmes).

- Twenty-one use quantitative methodologies and two use qualitative approaches.

Overall, the quality of the evidence is modest.

Most are evaluated as of low to medium quality. The risk of bias (which is converse to the quality rating) is rated as ‘high’ in seven of the 23 eligible studies; eight are rated as ‘high/medium’ risk of bias; six are rated as medium; and two as ‘low/medium’.

These 23 studies include 26 different case studies of humanitarian interventions with UASC. Of these case studies, 21 focus on countries in Africa, two on Indonesia, one on Haiti, one on Guatemala and one on Syrian refugees in the Middle East.

The focus of the evidence is therefore predominantly focused on conflicts in Africa.

Recommendations related to the state of the evidence

The research team made the following recommendations to improve the quality of programme evaluations:

- reports should describe the methods used in gathering and analysing information
- the cost of interventions should be recorded
- the number of children benefiting from programme interventions should be clearly stated
- caseloads should be disaggregated by age and gender, and differences between groups should be tested using robust statistical techniques
- evaluation reports should make clear exactly who is included or excluded and how they were selected for the intervention.

In FTR reports:

- the intervention timeline should be clear
- the report should state whether numbers of registered children are cumulative or new cases in a particular period
- the number of children in the overall caseload and the number reunified should be explicitly stated; and the same data provided for sub-groups as appropriate.

Broadly:

- in order to facilitate effective identification of grey literature, authors should consider including abstracts or executive summaries, as well as titles that accurately describe the intervention
- evidence stemming from national or regional research agendas would be valuable
- further research and evaluations of interventions with UASC are required beyond African contexts and including disasters caused by natural hazards.

References

Articles included in the systematic review

- Boothby, N. (1993). *Reuniting Unaccompanied Children and Families in Mozambique: An Effort to Link Networks of Community Volunteers to a National Programme*. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, 8(2), 11–22.
- Boothby, N. (2006). *What happens when child soldiers grow up? The Mozambique case study*. *Intervention*, 4(3), 244–59.
- Boothby, N. and Thomson, B. (2013). *Child Soldiers as Adults: The Mozambique Case Study*. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 22(7), 735–56.
- Bowley, C. (1998). *A national family tracing and reunification programme in the Republic of Rwanda*. Save the Children UK.
- Brown, M., Charnley, H., and Petty, C. (1995). *Children separated by war: Family tracing and reunification*. London: Save the Children.
- Charnley, H. and Langa, J. (1994). *Community Based Interventions for Separated Children in Mozambique: The Family Tracing and Reunification Programme*. *International Journal of Family Care*, 6(1).
- Culver, K., Whetten, K., Boyd, D., and O'Donnell, K. (2015). *Yoga to Reduce Trauma-Related Distress and Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties Among Children Living in Orphanages in Haiti: A Pilot Study*. *The Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine*, 21(9), 539–45.
- Derib, A. (2001). *Group Care and Fostering of Sudanese Children in Pignudo and Kakuma Refugee Camps: The Experience of Save the Children Sweden from 1990 to 1997*.
- Dowell, S. (1995). *Health and Nutrition in Centres for Unaccompanied Refugee Children*. *JAMA*, 273(22), 1802.
- Duerr, A., Posner, S., and Gilbert, M. (2003). *Evidence in Support of Foster Care During Acute Refugee Crises*. *Am J Public Health*, 93(11), 1904–9.
- Dunn, A., Parry-Williams, J., and Petty, C. (2006). *Picking up the Pieces: Caring for children affected by the tsunami*. London: Save the Children.
- JMJ International for Save the Children Norway (2005). *Global Evaluation: Children Affected by Armed Conflict, Displacement or Disaster (CACD)*. Save the Children Norway.
- Merkelbach, M. for ICRC (2000). *Reuniting children separated from their families after the Rwandan crisis of 1994: the relative value of a centralized database*. ICRC.
- Mirindi, D. and Ntabe, K. (2003). *Emergency Assistance for Unaccompanied Children in Bunia, Beni and Mambassa, Eastern DRC: Final Report*. Save the Children.
- Perrier, F. and Nsengiyumva, J. (2003). *Active Science as a contribution to the trauma recovery process: Preliminary indications with orphans from the 1994 genocide in Rwanda*. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(9), 1111–28.
- Richardson, M. (2003). *Sub-Regional Separated Children Programme Review*. Save the Children UK.
- Robertson, R. and Chiavaroli, E. (1995). *An Assessment of a USAID Grant to UNICEF/Rwanda for Programme on Unaccompanied Children Affected by War*. USAID.
- Save the Children UK. (2002). *Support to the Family Tracing and Reunification Programme (FTRP)*. Save the Children UK.
- UN High Commissioner for Refugees. (2014). *Protection of Refugee Children in the Middle East and North Africa*. UNHCR.
- UNICEF (2009). *Children and the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami: An evaluation of UNICEF's Response in Indonesia (2005–2008)*.
- Williamson, J. (1997). *Review of DCOF Funded Activities in Rwanda*. USAID.
- Williamson, J. and Cripe, L. (2002). *Assessment of DCOF-Supported Child Demobilization and Reintegration Activities in Sierra Leone*. USAID.
- Wolff, P., Dawit, Y., Zere, B. (1995). *The Solomuna orphanage: a historical survey*. *Social Science and Medicine*, 40(8), 1133–9.
- Wolff, P., Tesfai, B., Egasso, H., and Aradomt, T. (1995). *The Orphans of Eritrea: A Comparison Study*. *Journal of Child Psychology And Psychiatry*, 36(4), 633–44.

Other studies cited in the review

- Ager, A., Robinson, S., and Metzler, J. (2014). *Methodologies and Tools for Measuring Mental Health and Psychosocial Well-being of Children in Humanitarian Contexts: Report of a Mapping Exercise for the Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) and Mental Health & Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) Reference Group*. New York: Columbia University, Columbia Group for Children in Adversity and Child Protection in Crisis (CPC) Network.
- Barnett, K. and Wedge, J. (2010) *Child Protection Systems in emergencies*. Save the Children UK on behalf of the CPWG.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cape Town Principles and Best Practices. (1997). Adopted at the Symposium of on the Prevention of Children in to the Armed Forces and on Demobilisation and Reintegration of Child Soldiers in Africa. Cape Town, South Africa, 27–30 April 1997.
- Charnley, H. (2007). *Reflections On The Roles And Performance Of International Organizations In Supporting Children Separated From Their Families By War*. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 1(3): 253–68.
- Child Protection Working Group (CPWG). (2010). <http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/en/areas-of-responsibility/child-protection.html>
- Cochrane. (2011). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. <http://training.cochrane.org/handbook>
- CPWG. (2012). *Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action*.
- CPWG. (2014). *The Role of Case Management in the Protection of Children: A Guide for Policy & Programme Managers and Caseworkers*.

- CPC Learning Network. (2011). *An Ethnographic Study of Community-based Child Protection Mechanisms in Sierra Leone*.
- CPC Learning Network. (2012). *Mapping Community-based Child Protection Mechanisms in Liberia: Montserrado and Nimba Districts*.
- CPC Learning Network. (2013). *Community-based Child Protection Mechanisms in Refugee Camps in Rwanda: An Ethnographic Study*.
- Cross, S. and Madson, L. (1997) *Models of the Self: Self-Construals and Gender*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(1), 5–37.
- Davey, E., Borton, J. and Foley, M. (2013). *A history of the humanitarian system: Western origins and foundations*, Humanitarian Policy Group.
- Department of Health, NSPCC and University of Sheffield. (2000). *The Child's World: Assessing Children in Need. Training and Development Pack*.
- de La Soudière, M., Williamson, J. and Botte, J. (2007). *The Lost Ones: Emergency Care and Family Tracing for Separated Children from Birth to Five Years*, UNICEF.
- Doyle, J. (2010). *Misguided Kindness: Making the right decisions for children in emergencies*, Save the Children.
- Gosling, L. (2009). *Foundation module 5: Advocacy*, Save the Children.
- Eynon, A. and Lilley, S. (2010). *Strengthening National Child Protection Systems in Emergencies through Community-based Programming*. Save the Children UK
- Hepburn, A., Williamson, J., Wolfram, T. (2004) *Separated Children: Care and Protection of Children in Emergencies*, Save the Children.
- Holt, S. et al. (2008). *The impact of exposure to domestic violence on children and young people: A review of the literature*, *Child Abuse & Neglect* 32, 797–810.
- Interagency Standing Committee (IASC). (2007a). *Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings*. IASC: Geneva.
- IASC. (2007b). *Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Humanitarian Contexts*.
- Inter-Agency Working Group on Unaccompanied and Separated Children (IAWG UASC). (forthcoming). *Field Handbook*, developed by UNICEF on behalf of the IAWG UASC.
- IAWG UASC. (2013). *Alternative Care in Emergencies Toolkit*, Save the Children on behalf of the IAWG UASC.
- IAWG UASC. (2014). *Guiding Principles on Working with Unaccompanied and Separated Children*.
- IAWG. (2004). *Inter-Agency Guiding Principles on Unaccompanied and Separated Children*, IAWG
- Maestral International (2011) *Child Protection Systems: Mapping and Assessing East and Southern Africa*.
- Malekpour, M. (2007). *Effects of Attachment on early and later development*. *The British Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, quoting Shore (1994), 53/2(105), 81–95.
- Paris Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups. (2007).
- Patrice, E., Castle, S., Menon, P. (1996). *Child Development: Vulnerability and Resilience*. *Social Science and Medicine*, 43(5), 621–35.
- Rhodes, M. (2013). *How Two Intuitive Theories Shape the Development of Social Categorization*. *Child Development Perspectives*, 7(1), 12–16. DOI: 10.1111/cdep.12007
- Save the Children. (2003). *A Last Resort: A Growing Concern about Children in Residential Care*.
- Save the Children Indonesia. (September 2011). *Key Achievements of Child Protection and Care Programme in Moving Towards Family-Based Care 2005–11*.
- The Sphere Project. (2012). *The Sphere Project Glossary*, 4.
- Thompson, H. (2015). *A Matter of Life and Death*, on behalf of the CWPG.
- Tolfree, D. (2003). *Community Based Care for Separated Children*, Save the Children Sweden.
- Tolfree, D. (2007). *Protection Fact Sheet: Child protection and care related definitions*, Save the Children.
- UN. (2009). *Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children*.
- UN. (2010) *UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children*. UN/Ares/64/142.
- UN General Assembly. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)*, United Nations.
- UNICEF. (2009). *Children and the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami: An Evaluation of UNICEF's Response in Indonesia (2005–2008)*. UNICEF Evaluation Office.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2014). *Alternative Care*, Geneva: UNHCR.
- Wessells, M. (2009). *Do No Harm: Toward Contextually Appropriate Psychosocial Support in International Emergencies*, Columbia University.
- Williamson, J. and Cripe, L. (2002). *Assessment of DCOF-Supported Child Demobilization and Reintegration Activities in Sierra Leone*.
- Williamson, K., Gupta, P, Landis, D and Shannon, H. (2016). *The impact of protection interventions on unaccompanied and separated children in humanitarian crises: An evidence synthesis protocol*: <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/the-impact-of-protection-interventions-on-unaccompanied-and-separated-children-605172>
- World Health Organization, War Trauma Foundation and World Vision International. (2011). *Psychological first aid: Guide for field workers*. Geneva: WHO.
- Wulczyn, F., Daro, D., Fluke, J. et al. (2009) *Adapting a Systems Approach to Child Protection: Key Concepts and Considerations*. Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago.
- Yeşim, D. (2012). *Trying To Understand: Promoting The Psychosocial Well-Being Of Separated Refugee Children*. *Journal of Social Work Practice* 26(3): 367–83.