

	SIPR	sipr_1033	Dispatch: December 12, 2011	CE: AFL
	Journal	MSP No.	No. of pages: 25	PE: Jon

1 Social Issues and Policy Review, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1–25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Institutional Care for Young Children: Review of Literature and Policy Implications

12

Mary Dozier*

13

University of Delaware

14

15

16

Q1 Charles H. Zeanah

17

18

Allison R. Wallin

19

20

Carole Shauffer

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Millions of infants and toddlers are in institutional care around the world, care that is poorly suited to meet young children’s developmental needs. In this article, we briefly review the history of institutional care and surrogate care. We then discuss why institutional care is at odds with children’s needs, and review the empirical evidence regarding the effects of institutional care on young children’s development. Finally, we discuss alternatives to institutional care, and make recommendations for changes.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

Orphaned, abandoned, and maltreated children pose problems for societies throughout the world. Although the actual number of children in residential institutions is impossible to gauge accurately, estimates have ranged from 2,000,000 to more than 8,000,000 (Browne, 2009; Save the Children, 2009). Most institutions are staffed with caregivers who work rotating shifts in rather bleak material conditions. Young children in institutional care have often been abandoned at birth or soon after because of poverty or parental instability. In some cases, the state may have intervened to remove young children from their parents’ care. In this article, we argue that institutional care is structurally and psychologically at odds with what young children need and that we should work to develop alternatives for orphaned and abandoned children.

41

42

43

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mary Dozier, Department of Psychology, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716. Tel: 302 831-2286 [e-mail: mdozier@psych.udel.edu].

Q2

1

2

Dozier et al.

2 To support this recommendation, we briefly review the political and economic
3 forces that led to creation of institutional rearing, and we trace its decline (but not
4 extinction) in the United States during the past century. Although by no means a
5 dominant view, there are still those who wholeheartedly endorse institutional rear-
6 ing as a preferred approach (see McKenzie, 1999), and others who have presented
7 evidence that institutional rearing may be less harmful—or no more harmful—
8 than other approaches (Whetten et al., 2009). We review results from a number of
9 studies, including a randomized clinical trial, that indicate that institutional care
10 does indeed have pernicious effects on the development of young children. We
11 suggest foster care, adoption, or keeping families intact as preferable alternatives
12 to institutional care for young children. We make this recommendation fully aware
13 that foster care fails children too often as well, but we believe that the evidence
14 is clear that foster care has greater potential for reducing developmental harm
15 than institutional care, especially for the youngest and most vulnerable children.
16 We present models of foster care with demonstrated effectiveness and consider
17 implications and challenges for national and international policy.

18 This article focuses on children in the first 5 or so years of life. For important
19 developmental reasons, these children have urgent needs for regular contact with a
20 small number of caregivers devoted to their well-being. For older children who can
21 sustain relationships with parents in the absence of regular contact, the situation
22 is somewhat different and beyond the scope of this article.

23

24

25

History

Q3

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

Caring for orphaned, abandoned, and maltreated children through informal kin
care and adoption has a long history (Boswell, 1988; Hrdy, 1999). Formal govern-
mental systems to deal with these children, such as orphanages and government-
sponsored foster care, emerged more recently. The reliance on different systems
of care over time has been influenced by social and political factors, as well as
changing perspectives on child development.

The historical literature describes many examples in which families took
in abandoned children. Boswell (1988) painted a very positive picture of the
treatment children received by surrogate parents, and the likelihood that they
survived abandonment because of the “kindness of strangers.” Hrdy (1999) pointed
out that, prior to the age of sterilized bottles and formula, it was difficult for young
infants to survive abandonment unless a lactating woman was available to care for
them. The care received in these informal foster and adoptive homes was variable,
ranging from children being treated as family members to children being treated
as servants. Nonetheless, fostering and adoption have had at least some acceptance
throughout much of history for parents who felt unable to care for their children.
At times, especially during periods of economic hardship, abandoned babies have
outnumbered those available to care for them through informal systems of care.

Institutional Care for Children

3

2 Foundling homes were first established in the 14th and 15th century in Italy
3 in response to the growing number of abandoned babies in cities (Hrdy, 1999).
4 From the beginning, many of the children placed in these institutional settings
5 were not true orphans, but rather had one or both parents surviving. These first
6 foundling homes had very high documented mortality rates, ranging from 20%
7 to 40% annually, and reaching nearly 100% during some epidemics (Hrdy, 1999;
8 Trexler, 1973). Many infants failed to survive, either because of the outbreak of
9 disease in the homes, or because breast milk was not available.

10 Over the next several centuries, foundling homes increased in number in Italy,
11 and later in England, Russia, and other parts of Europe. Still, throughout most of
12 the 18th century in North America and Europe, institutional care was uncommon;
13 abandoned and orphaned children were typically placed with neighbors or in city
14 almshouses, or indentured into apprenticeships. During the 1800s, religious or-
15 ganizations and charities began to establish orphanages in response to increased
16 urbanization, the American Civil War, and multiple epidemics of cholera, tuber-
17 culosis, yellow fever, and influenza (Crenson, 1998; Hacsí, 1997). The expansion,
18 both in the number of new orphanages created and in the number of children cared
19 for, continued into the early 1900s (Smith, 1995).

20 A nodal event contributing to the eventual decline of institutional care in
21 the United States was the first White House Conference on Children, which
22 was organized on the authority of President Roosevelt in 1909. Child welfare
23 professionals from around the country met and agreed on several policies those
24 remain in place today. Specifically, they endorsed the concepts that: (1) children
25 should be raised by their own families; (2) when it was necessary to remove
26 children from their families, the settings in which they were cared should be
27 other families' homes or resemble families as much as possible; and (3) no child
28 should be removed from parental care because of poverty alone (Crenson, 1998).
29 Subsequent legislation, such as the Social Security Act of 1935, allowed for federal
30 funding to be given to states to address issues of child welfare. Yet, the adoption
31 of such federal policies and the numerous arguments against orphanages did not
32 lead to the immediate end of institutionalized care in the United States. These
33 policies led to a steady decline in institutions, so that by the 1970s orphanages
34 had almost disappeared. There was a brief resurgence in the late 1980s and early
35 1990s when several large urban child welfare systems were overwhelmed by the
36 influx of cocaine-exposed newborns. In some places, institutions were reinvented
37 to cope with the sudden influx of children into state's custody (see Harden, 2002).
38 Although most of these were subsequently closed, many states still have some form
39 of group care with shift workers even for young children, although the numbers
40 are small.

41 Throughout the 20th century, government and church sponsored foster care
42 increased not only in North America but also in Europe. In the mid-20th century,
43 a series of studies began to highlight the harms of institutional rearing (Goldfarb,

1

4

Dozier et al.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

1945; Provence & Lipton, 1962; Skeels & Dye, 1939; Spitz, 1945). The emergence of this evidence was associated with a move away from institutional care in the United States and Western Europe, but countries in the Soviet bloc and China lacked access to these data, and foster care remained scarce there. Furthermore, the communist ideology not only destigmatized institutional rearing but in some cases encouraged it (see Kligman, 1998).

Currently, institutional care for young children is common in Eastern Europe, Asia, Central and South America, Africa, and the Middle East (The St. Petersburg-USA Orphanage Research Team, 2008). Although there are relatively few orphanages in Western Europe, institutions nonetheless exist in Portugal, France, and Belgium, among other countries (see Browne, Hamilton-Giachritsis, Johnson, & Ostergren, 2006).

Description of Institutional Care

The ecology of institutional life for young children has been described (Provence & Lipton, 1962) and studied empirically (Muhamedrahimov, 1999; Smyke et al., 2007; The St. Petersburg-USA Orphanage Research Team, 2008). There are often large differences from one institution to another, from one unit to another within an institution, and even variability in the care individual children receive within the same grouping. Nonetheless, there are certain modal features of institutional care that have characterized these settings across countries and continents. These include: generally high child to caregiver ratios; caregivers with low wages and little education or training who work rotating shifts; regimented and nonindividualized care; and a lack of psychological investment in the children (Chapin, 1915; The St. Petersburg-USA Orphanage Research Team, 2008; Zeanah et al., 2003). These qualities of institutional care present challenges to children's development (Nelson, 2007; Zeanah, Smyke, & Settles, 2006). Older children may be able to develop adequately in a setting that does not allow for close caregiver-child relationships. However, interactions with consistent and committed caregivers are key to the development of young children.

Key Developmental Tasks from Attachment Theory Perspective

We approach our understanding of key developmental tasks from an attachment theory perspective. Bowlby (1969/1982), the architect of attachment theory, proposed that human infants, like the young of many other species, have a need to form attachments to primary caregivers. The attachment system serves to enhance the child's likelihood of survival (and thus survival of the genes) because the infant seeks to maintain proximity to the caregiver under conditions of threat.

Human infants, as well as the young of many other mammals, are dependent upon parents for survival early in life. Evolution has followed different courses

1 Institutional Care for Children

5

2 for different species; humans have evolved such that there is a long period of
3 immaturity with associated dependence on the parent. Infants are dependent on
4 parents for nearly everything, including regulation of temperature, neuroendocrine
5 functioning, safety, and felt security (Hofer, 1994, 2006). Young children whose
6 parents died or were unable to care for them likely only survived if they were taken
7 in by other adults. Having a caregiver therefore likely represents an “experience
8 expectant” condition for the child, that is, an experience the species has evolved to
9 “expect” (Greenough, Black, & Wallace, 1987). Not having a caregiver (biological
10 or surrogate) may exceed the capacity of young children’s capacity to adapt
11 successfully. Findings regarding institutional care for very young children should
12 be considered in this context.

13 During early childhood, caregivers play an especially salient role in help-
14 ing children develop regulatory capabilities. Human infants are born nearly fully
15 dependent upon caregivers for help regulating behavior and physiology. When
16 children do not have primary caregivers, as is the case for many institutionalized
17 children, development is compromised. During the first several years of life, key
18 tasks include forming selective attachments to primary attachment figures and
19 beginning to develop the abilities to regulate physiology, attention, and behavior
20 (Bowlby, 1969/1982; Hofer, 1994). These tasks are integrally related to one an-
21 other. The caregiver functions as a “co-regulator” for the infant, helping the infant
22 return to a homeostatic condition behaviorally and physiologically (Hofer, 1994).
23 Over time and after many experiences of successfully regulating behavior and
24 physiology, the infant/young child becomes increasingly able to regulate behavior
25 and physiology.

26 This process is subserved by what Bowlby (1969/1982) described as the at-
27 tachment “system.” The infant’s attachment to the caregiver develops over the first
28 half year of life, with attachments to primary attachment figures seen clearly by the
29 end of the first year of life (Ainsworth, 1967). By a year of age, nearly all family-
30 raised infants have developed attachments to preferred caregivers (Ainsworth,
31 1967; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). These attachments can be seen
32 in children’s maintaining proximity to caregivers under possibly threatening con-
33 ditions, and in signs of distress when they are not able to maintain proximity.
34 Infants developing under normative circumstances differ in their attachment qual-
35 ity (that is, the security and organization of attachment), but they almost univer-
36 sally develop clear attachments to specific, preferred caregivers (Ainsworth, 1967;
37 Bowlby, 1969/1982). As discussed later, conditions of institutional care make it
38 less likely that children will develop clear, classifiable attachments to their parents
39 and age-appropriate behavioral and physiological regulation.

41 Effects of Institutional Care on Young Children’s Development

42
43 A number of observational studies have compared institutionalized children to
noninstitutionalized children. These studies tell a compelling story of the effects of

1

6

Dozier et al.

2 institutional care; most studies find that institutionalized children have significant
3 developmental deficits across virtually every domain that has been examined
4 (e.g., Gunnar, Van Dulmen, & The International Adoption Project Team, 2007;
5 Johnson et al., 1996; Rutter, Kreppner, & O'Connor, 2001; Rutter et al., 2007,
6 2010; van IJzendoorn, Luijk, & Juffer, 2008). Following adoption into advantaged
7 families, many (though clearly not all) of the developmental delays and behavior
8 problems seen in children living in institutions are no longer evident (Juffer &
9 van IJzendoorn, 2005; van IJzendoorn & Juffer, 2006). This suggests enormous
10 capacity for adaptation. The limitation of these adoption studies is that there is a
11 potential selection bias in terms of which children are adopted. For example, it
12 is plausible that more competent children are more likely to be adopted than less
13 competent children, thus overestimating children's capacities for resilience.

14 One randomized clinical trial, the Bucharest Early Intervention Project
15 (BEIP), has been conducted in which children in institutional care in Romania
16 were comprehensively assessed and then randomly assigned to continued institu-
17 tional care or to quality foster care (Zeanah et al., 2003). The BEIP is especially
18 important because randomized design allows causal inferences about the role of
19 continued institutional care on children's functioning. In fact, the children placed
20 in foster care performed better than the children with continued institutional care
21 on almost every measure, thus supporting the conclusions reached in correlational
22 studies regarding the power of foster and adoptive care in remediating the effects
23 of institutional care (e.g., Marshall, Reeb, Fox, Nelson, & Zeanah, 2008; Nelson
24 et al., 2007; Zeanah, Smyke, & Dumitrescu, 2002). The findings of the random-
25 ized clinical trial, combined with findings from correlational studies of institutional
26 care, underscore the importance of reducing reliance on institutional care.

27 We next present an overview of the literature that provides strong evidence that
28 institutional care of infants and young children has profound effects on essentially
29 all domains of development. When young children experience institutional care,
30 social and interpersonal development is impaired, physical growth is retarded, and
31 cognitive and language development is delayed (Beckett et al., 2006; Carlson &
32 Earls, 1997; Nelson et al., 2007; O'Connor, Rutter, & the English and Romanian
33 Adoptees Study Team, 2000; Zeanah, 2000).

34

35 *Attachment*

36

37 Institutional care is associated with differences in whether children form spe-
38 cific attachments to their caregivers, and the quality of attachments they form
39 to caregivers. Virtually all children raised in families develop clear attachments
40 to specific caregivers (Zeanah, Smyke, Koga, Carlson, & the Bucharest Early
41 Intervention Project Core Group, 2005). However, the attachments of the ma-
42 jority of institutionalized children are incompletely developed or even absent,
43 as demonstrated in two recent studies (Dobrova-Krol, Bakermans-Kranenburg,

Institutional Care for Children

7

van IJzendoorn, & Juffer, 2010; Zeanah et al., 2005). Zeanah et al. (2005) developed a scale for assessing the range of attachment behavior, with the highest rating reflecting definite attachment behaviors that clearly fit with the traditional coding scheme for attachment. Of the never institutionalized children, 100% received this highest rating for clear, classifiable attachment, whereas only 3% of the institutionalized children received this rating. Although about 60% of the institutionalized children showed at least fragmented attachment behaviors, more than 30% showed little to no attachment behaviors.

Attachment security refers to children's ability to find comfort in their caregivers when they are distressed. Among children who have never been institutionalized, van IJzendoorn, Schuengel, and Bakerman-Kranenburg's meta-analysis (1999) has indicated that the majority (62%) develop secure attachments to their caregivers, with a minority (about 24%) of children developing insecure attachments, and a smaller proportion (about 15%) developing disorganized attachments to caregivers. Disorganized attachment is most indicative of risk (Fearon, Bakermans-Kranenburg, van IJzendoorn, Lapsley, & Roisman, 2010) and is characterized by odd behaviors that appear to reflect a breakdown in strategy to obtain proximity. Among children who are institutionalized, disorganized attachments and other aberrant forms of attachment quality (i.e., disorganized, unclassifiable, and insecure other) predominate (Smyke, Zeanah, Fox, Nelson, & Guthrie, 2010; Vorria, Rutter, Pickles, Wolkind, & Hobsbaum, 1998; Vorria et al., 2006; Zeanah et al., 2005). For example, Zeanah et al. (2005) found that only 22% of institutionalized children were classified as having organized attachments (secure or insecure), whereas 65% were classified as having disorganized attachments and 13% were unclassifiable.

Q4

Recovery. As with other domains of functioning, impressive gains in attachment are seen for children adopted following institutional care. Nonetheless, children who have been institutionalized are still distinguishable from never institutionalized children, and the length of time institutionalized plays a role in the likelihood that problems are seen.

Smyke et al. (2010) found that children who were randomly assigned to foster care showed higher rates of secure attachment than children who continued to live in institutional care. Of the children who were assigned to continued institutional care, 17% showed secure attachments to their caregivers in contrast to 49% of the children who were assigned to foster care (Smyke et al., 2010). Thus, this study suggests impressive recovery in the ability to form attachments to new caregivers following institutional care. The proportion of children in the foster care group who were secure (49%) was very similar to those from the meta-analytic results reported by van IJzendoorn and Juffer (2006), in which 47% of adopted children were securely attached. Relative to children who remained institutionalized, this is impressive, but well below the percentage of nonadopted

1

8

Dozier et al.

2

children with secure attachments (67%) (van den Dries, Juffer, van IJzendoorn, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2009). The percentage of adopted children with disorganized attachment is also elevated relative to nonadopted children (33% vs. 15%).

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Indiscriminately Sociable Behavior

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Indiscriminately sociable behavior refers to children's lack of reticence with unfamiliar adults, willingness to approach and engage strangers, and failure to maintain proximity to attachment figures in unfamiliar settings. O'Connor and colleagues (O'Connor et al., 2000; O'Connor & Zeanah, 2003) have emphasized the lack of social boundaries among children with this behavior pattern. Zeanah et al. (2005) found that 44% of institutionalized children showed high levels of indiscriminately sociable behavior as contrasted with 18% of children who had never been institutionalized.

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

Recovery. This is an area of development that is resistant to change following children's removal from institutional care (Chisholm, Carter, Ames, & Morison, 1995; Chisholm, 1998; Gleason et al., in press; O'Connor et al., 2000; Rutter et al., 2007). Rutter et al. (2007) found that indiscriminate sociability among previously institutionalized children was stable from 6 to 11 years, although there was a decrease in the behavior over that time. Hodges and Tizard (1989) found that children who were indiscriminately sociable as 8-year olds were not indiscriminately sociable toward adults as 16-year olds; however, these children were indiscriminately sociable in their relationships with peers. Thus, it is possible that indiscriminate sociability serves as a marker of later problems in social relationships, even though manifesting differently by the teen years. As with most other variables, the duration of institutional care is important for recovery. For example, Chisholm and colleagues (Chisholm et al., 1995; Fisher, Ames, Chisholm, & Savole, 1997) found that fewer of the children institutionalized for less than 4 months showed indiscriminately sociable behavior than children institutionalized for more than 8 months.

40

41

Physical Development

42

43

Children in institutional care lag behind other children in physical development. Relative to their peers, they show atypically short height, low weight, and

Institutional Care for Children

9

small head circumference (Johnson et al., 1996; Smyke et al., 2007). Smyke et al. (2007) found that height, weight, and head circumference of infants and toddlers in institutions were about a standard deviation below norms and significantly different from children living in the community. Johnson et al. (1996) found that children in Romania lost about 1 month of growth for every 3 months of institutional care, whereas children in the former Soviet Union showed 1 month growth delay for every 5 months of institutional care. A meta-analysis conducted by van IJzendoorn, Bakermans-Kranenburg, and Juffer (2007) found that the longer infants remained in institutional care, the more they differed from normal growth parameters. Even in institutions where nutritional needs are met, physical growth is delayed.

Recovery. Although physical development is very much affected by institutional development, rapid recovery is seen after children leave the institution (Boersma & Wit, 1997; Sonuga-Barke, Schlotz, & Rutter, 2010; van IJzendoorn et al., 2007). Among children randomly assigned to foster care in the BEIP, mean height and weight were near normal within a year of placement into families' homes, an outcome not seen for children assigned to continued institutional care (Johnson et al., 2010). The foster care intervention had no effects on head circumference, however. In their nonexperimental study, Sonuga-Barke et al. (2010) found massive catch-up in growth soon after children left institutional care. Although differences between previously institutionalized children and comparison children in height were no longer apparent when children were 10 years old, those differences were significant and pronounced at the age of 15. (This comparison group was made up of three subgroups: children who had been raised continuously by their parents, children who were adopted within the United Kingdom, and children who were adopted from Romania before the age of 6 months.) Sonuga-Barke et al. (2010) interpreted this pattern of results as a function of early puberty of previously institutionalized children (resulting in accelerated early growth followed by deceleration).

Cognitive Development

Children living in institutional care show very significant deficits in intellectual and cognitive development (Carlson & Earls, 1997; Johnson et al., 1996; Kreppner, O'Connor, Rutter, & the English and Romanian Adoptees Study Team, 2001; Moulson, Westerlund, Fox, Zeanah, & Nelson, 2009; O'Connor et al., 2000; Smyke et al., 2007). For example, Rutter (1998) found that the mean IQ of children leaving institutional care in Romania shortly after the fall of Ceausescu was about 50 (population mean = 100, $SD = 15$). In a meta-analysis of 75 studies, van IJzendoorn et al. (2008) found that children living in institutional care scored on average 20 points lower on intelligence tests than children who were

1

10

Dozier et al.

2

raised in families. Differences between institutionalized children and comparison children were similar regardless of whether the comparison data represented children raised by birth parents, children raised by foster parents, or normative data (van IJzendoorn et al., 2008).

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

To assess cognitive functioning at the level of differential brain activation, Marshall, Fox, and the BEIP Core Group (2004) examined differences in alpha and theta power through electroencephalogram (EEG) data among institutionalized and never institutionalized children. Institutionalized children showed lower alpha power at prefrontal cortex sites, and higher theta power at posterior sites, relative to never institutionalized children. This pattern of results is suggestive of either cortical hypoactivation or delayed cortical maturation, that is, either deviant or delayed development (Marshall et al., 2004; McLaughlin et al., 2010). The specific deficits in attention and executive functioning that have been seen among children who have been institutionalized are consistent with these EEG results (Gunnar, Bruce, & Grotevant, 2000; Gunnar et al., 2007; Kreppner et al., 2007).

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Recovery. Adoption serves as a powerful intervention in terms of general intellectual functioning. Children who are placed into the community have higher IQ's than children who remain in institutional care (Fox, Almas, Degnan, Nelson, & Zeanah, in press). Rutter (1998) found that children adopted from Romanian orphanages, who had IQ's of about 50 when they left institutional care, had mean IQ scores of 92 by the age of 11. Nonetheless, even though there are gains, mean intellectual functioning is lower than among comparison groups. Further, a subgroup of children show significant deficits in functioning even after adoption (Beckett, Castle, Rutter, & Barke-Sonuga, 2010; Fox et al., in press; Nelson et al., 2007).

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

A relatively high proportion of previously institutionalized children have problems with attention, with differences persisting for some children years after adoption (Gunnar et al., 2007; Kreppner et al., 2001; Kreppner et al., 2007). Hodges and Tizard (Hodges & Tizard, 1989; Tizard & Hodges, 1978) found that teachers reported elevated levels of concentration problems among previously institutionalized children. These problems with attention seem especially resistant to change, with 42% of previously institutionalized 11-year olds showing elevated levels of attention problems (Kreppner et al., 2007). Similarly, Gunnar et al. (2007) found that early institutional care was associated specifically with attention and social problems, but not with internalizing and externalizing problems more generally.

39

40

41

42

43

The length of time of institutionalization is an important predictor of cognitive problems (Bakermans-Kranenburg, van IJzendoorn, & Juffer, 2008). Beckett et al. (2006) found that children who had been institutionalized for more than 6 months showed lower cognitive functioning than children who had been institutionalized less than 6 months. Duration of institutional care beyond 6 months did not add to

1 Institutional Care for Children

11

2 predictive power, however. Conversely, Nelson et al. (2007) found that the length of
3 time children were institutionalized was linearly related to developmental quotient
4 among children assigned to family care. There was a “cost” of 0.85 developmental
5 quotient points for each additional month institutionalized when children were
6 assessed at 42 months.

8 *Regulation of the Hypothalamic-Pituitary-Adrenal (HPA) Axis*

9
10 A number of studies with humans, nonhuman primates, and rodents have been
11 conducted that suggest that severe early deprivation affects the regulation of the
12 HPA system (e.g., Dobrova-Krol, van IJzendoorn, Bakermans-Kranenburg, Cyr,
13 & Juffer, 2008; Dozier et al., 2006; Gunnar, Morison, Chisholm, & Schuder, 2001;
14 Levine, Wiener, & Coe, 1993). Glucocorticoids (CORT: cortisol in primates, and
15 corticosterone in rodents) represent an end product of the HPA axis. Because the
16 HPA axis appears to be sensitive to perturbations in the caregiving system, and
17 cortisol can be easily and noninvasively measured in saliva, there have been many
18 studies of cortisol production in recent years. Among human young, differences
19 related to early adversity appear most robust when considering the diurnal pattern
20 rather than stress reactivity (e.g., Gunnar & Vazquez, 2001).

21 Results from studies of cortisol production among children in institutional
22 settings are somewhat complex (e.g., Gunnar, Frenn, Wewerka, & van Ryzin,
23 2009). Gunnar et al. (2001) found elevated basal levels of cortisol among postin-
24 stitutionalized children relative to controls. Wismer Fries, Shirtcliff, and Pollak
25 (2009) found that postinstitutionalized children showed slower recovery of the
26 HPA system under some conditions. Extrapolating from the literature on adversity
27 more generally (e.g., Bruce, Fisher, Pears, & Levine, 2009; Dozier et al., 2006;
28 Fisher, van Ryzin, & Gunnar, in press; Gunnar & Vazquez, 2001), it seems likely
29 that the functioning of the HPA system is affected by institutional care.

31 **Interventions for Children Who Have Experienced Institutional Care**

32
33 Institutional care has profound, negative effects on young children across
34 multiple domains of functioning. Still, there are many children in the world who
35 are abandoned or orphaned and in need of care, leaving unanswered the question
36 of how best to provide such care. We consider approaches to this issue below.

38 *Changes to Institution*

39
40 There are differences across institutions, and even within institutions, in the
41 care provided (Groark, Muhamedrahimov, Palmov, Nikiforova, & McCall, 2005;
42 Gunnar et al., 2000; Smyke et al., 2007). For example, staff-to-child ratios and
43 philosophies regarding staff interactions with children vary, but have important

1

12

Dozier et al.

2 implications for child well-being (Groark et al., 2005). Groark et al. (2005) in
3 St. Petersburg, Russia, as well as Smyke, Dumitrescu, and Zeanah (2002) in
4 Bucharest, Romania, found that conditions in institutions can be substantially im-
5 proved (e.g., increasing caregiver interactions with children), resulting in changes
6 in child behavioral outcomes. Yet, despite evidence that improved institutions
7 leads to better outcomes than poorer institutions, even institutional care with rela-
8 tively high staff-to-child ratios and adequate cognitive stimulation has deleterious
9 effects on young children's development (Gunnar et al., 2007; Rutter et al., 2007).

10

11 *Moving Children Out of Institutional Care*

12

13 Placing children from institutional care into families can be seen as the most
14 significant intervention possible for any human condition (van IJzendoorn &
15 Juffer, 2006). Although experimental work with nonhuman primates and rodents
16 sometimes involves assignment to extreme conditions (e.g., isolation reared vs.
17 enriched environment), it is hard to imagine human conditions that represent as
18 great a contrast as institutional and family care. The effects of placing institution-
19 alized children in stable foster homes have been examined experimentally (Zeanah
20 et al., 2003). The BEIP's randomized clinical trial and many correlational studies
21 provide support for adoption as a highly potent intervention (e.g., van IJzendoorn
22 & Juffer, 2006).

23 Of course, even after placement in families, some children who were raised
24 in institutions have ongoing difficulties. There has been little systematic study
25 of intervention programs, beyond adoption itself, for this population. Interna-
26 tional adoption clinics often provide some help in anticipating issues, but to our
27 knowledge, there have been no experimental studies of interventions implemented
28 within international adoption clinics. Filling this void for families are interven-
29 tions that lack an evidence base. Interventions for postinstitutionalized children
30 that have gained considerable attention among adoptive parents and clinicians are
31 sometimes called "attachment therapy" (Cline, 1992; Keck & Kupecky, 1995)
32 or "holding therapy." Many of these interventions use coercive techniques, such
33 as rage induction or forced holding. A number of researchers have called such
34 therapies into question (e.g., Chaffin et al., 2006; Lilienfield, 2007; Pignotti &
35 Mercer, 2007), suggesting that the treatment may actually be harmful to children
36 and families. In fact, at least six children have died from coercive holding therapies
37 (Chaffin et al., 2006). This illustrates the urgency of developing evidence-based
38 practice for this population.

39

40 *Interventions for Postinstitutionalized Children*

41

42 We describe here two models of intervention for postinstitutionalized chil-
43 dren. The first model, the BEIP model of foster care, has demonstrated efficacy.

Institutional Care for Children

13

This model was developed by the second author (C. H. Zeanah) along with his colleagues at Tulane University. The second, Attachment and Biobehavioral Catch-up (ABC), represents an adaptation of an evidence-based training program for foster parents. This model was developed by the first author (M. Dozier) and her colleagues.

BEIP model of foster care. The BEIP created a model of foster care and implemented it as an alternative to institutional care (Smyke, Zeanah, Fox, & Nelson, 2009). Government sponsored foster care had been used rarely in Bucharest at the time the study began in 2001. In this attachment-based intervention, foster parents were encouraged to invest psychologically in the children in their care and to love them as if they were their own children. Also, because resources were limited, foster parents were trained in establishing structure and routines, as well as taught basic techniques for language stimulation and behavior management.

In recruiting, BEIP sought foster parents who seemed to understand young children and who seemed to possess the requisite emotional availability for the intensive work of caring for a postinstitutionalized infant or toddler. Foster parent-training manuals, written by and for Romanians, were available from international adoption agencies that had previously developed foster care on a small scale for children awaiting adoption.

Foster parents were monitored and supported by a team of three Romanian social workers hired by the project. They received regular weekly consultation from the United States based clinicians. The social workers helped foster parents manage the complex challenges of caring for the postinstitutionalized children. Each of the social workers was responsible for a third of the study participants in foster care and their foster parents. Initially they visited each foster family on a weekly basis, reducing the visits to three times monthly after a year. Frequent phone contact was maintained with each family throughout the project.

As reviewed earlier, nearly all developmental outcomes were more favorable for the children in foster care compared to children who remained in institutions (e.g., Nelson et al., 2007). For some domains of development, earlier placement was associated with better outcomes but for others, timing of placement did not appear to matter.

Attachment and biobehavioral catch-up. Dozier and colleagues adapted an intervention to specifically target identified issues of children adopted internationally. In particular, the intervention targets regulatory issues, attachment quality, and indiscriminate sociability. The original ABC intervention model had been shown to be effective with high-risk birth children and with foster children (Bernard et al., in press; Dozier et al., 2006). The adapted intervention is currently being tested in a randomized clinical trial with internationally adopted children. Three issues targeted in the intervention are described below:

- 2 (1) The first component of ABC targets children's self-regulatory capabilities
3 by helping parents to learn to behave in synchronous ways with their chil-
4 dren. This component is adapted from interventions that have targeted the
5 importance of interactional synchrony in enhancing regulatory capabilities
6 among infants (Calkins, 2011). Shonkoff and colleagues (Shonkoff & Bales,
7 2011; Shonkoff, Boyce, & McEwen, 2009) have suggested that such inter-
8 actions be referred to as "serve and return" in that the caring adult "returns"
9 the child's "serve." For example, when a child bangs two blocks together,
10 the parent is urged to follow along (e.g., banging two blocks together herself
11 or commenting on what the child is doing) rather than to direct the play
12 (e.g., suggest that the child build a tower or comment on the color or shape
13 of the blocks).

14 Children who have been institutionalized are often dysregulated biolog-
15 ically (e.g., as seen in HPA axis functioning), and behaviorally (e.g., as
16 seen in problems in sustained attention). It is expected that this interven-
17 tion component will enhance children's cortisol regulation, attention, and
18 behavioral control. In randomized clinical trials with foster and high-risk
19 children living with their birth parents, the intervention has been found to
20 enhance cortisol regulation and behavioral outcomes (Dozier et al., 2006;
21 Dozier et al., 2009; Dozier, Peloso, Lewis, Laurenceau, & Levine, 2008).

- 22 (2) The second issue targeted in the intervention is children's attachment qual-
23 ity. This is an especially salient issue because previously institutionalized
24 children are at increased risk for insecure and disorganized attachment (van
25 den Dries et al., 2009). This issue is addressed by helping parents learn to
26 behave in nurturing ways even when children fail to elicit nurturing care.
27 This is critical for children who have experienced early adversity because
28 they often behave in ways that make it unclear that they need nurturance.
29 Stovall and Dozier (Stovall & Dozier, 2000; Stovall-McClough & Dozier,
30 2004) found that children who experienced early adversity often behave
31 in avoidant or resistant ways (e.g., turning away from caregivers when
32 distressed), eliciting complementary behaviors from their parents. In the
33 intervention, adoptive parents are helped to reinterpret their children's be-
34 havioral signals, providing nurturance even when it is not elicited. This
35 intervention component is expected to enhance parental nurturance, and to
36 enhance children's attachment quality. In our randomized clinical trial with
37 high-risk birth parents, only 32% of the children whose parents received the
38 ABC intervention showed disorganized attachments, as contrasted with 57%
39 of the children whose parents received the control intervention (Bernard
40 et al., 2011).

Q6

- 41 (3) The final issue addressed by the ABC intervention is indiscriminately so-
42 cial behaviors. These behaviors are targeted by helping adoptive parents
43

Institutional Care for Children

15

recognize the signs of indiscriminate sociability and develop strategies for discouraging the behavior. Decreased indiscriminate sociability is expected as a result of this intervention component. We do not yet have data that suggest whether we will be successful in affecting this behavior because we have not targeted this behavior in other interventions. Given that this is a persistent behavior among a subset of children, we consider it important to target.

At this point, we do not have outcome data from our randomized clinical trial with children adopted internationally. Intervention data from randomized clinical trials with other populations suggest that this intervention may be effective, but it is critical to await outcomes from the randomized clinical trial with children adopted internationally before assuming it is effective.

Policy Recommendations

Institutional care of infants and young children persists despite numerous calls for its abolition (e.g., Browne, 2009; Save the Children, 2009; Wilton Park Conference, 2009). In many nations, institutions are maintained because there is a widespread belief at the level of the government, the community, and charitable organizations that institutions represent a preferable alternative to families for poor children. Institutional care is also maintained because systems of support exist for establishing and maintaining institutional facilities and there is not an organized system of support for caring for children in the community. For change to occur and to be sustained, each of these three issues needs to be addressed effectively.

Changing Beliefs

One of the first steps in ending reliance on institutional care is changing individuals' and organizations' beliefs regarding the benefits of this type of care. Identifying the factors that sustain these beliefs can help produce targeted messages aimed at changing positive attitudes toward institutional care.

Families and the community. Many of the children living in institutional care are not orphaned, but rather have one or both parents living. In a number of countries, 80–90% of institutionalized children have at least one living parent (Save the Children, 2009). Anecdotal evidence suggests that many parents consider their children's future more promising in the institutional setting than in the family (Save the Children, 2009). For example, parents often consider opportunities for adequate nutrition and education superior in an institutional setting to opportunities that could be provided within their families. Information regarding the importance

2 of the family in raising children and the problematic outcomes of institutional
3 life needs to be shared with parents and with extended family and community
4 members.

5
6 *Donors.* Institutions are maintained partly because donors, the great majority
7 of whom are not from the communities or even the countries where these facilities
8 are located, underwrite the institutional model (Williamson & Greenberg, 2010).
9 The ready availability of resources provides an incentive for establishing and
10 maintaining these facilities. These institutions give the impression that children
11 are being cared for, pulling funding away from more developmentally appropriate
12 interventions.

13 It seems likely that international donors, including those from faith-based
14 organizations, support the concept of orphanages largely because they believe that
15 these institutions provide a home to children without parents or families. Donors
16 are usually unaware of the harm that institutions cause. Indeed, the experience
17 of visiting institutions is likely to be powerful for many donors because institu-
18 tionalized children, often displaying signs of indiscriminately sociability, make
19 visitors feel valued and needed. Further, donors are often unaware that most of
20 the children in institutional care have living parents. The use of the term orphans
21 to refer to the children living in the facilities, and the term orphanages to refer to
22 these facilities, likely perpetuate this misconception. The Wilton Park Conference
23 Report (2009) suggests that the use of the term “orphan” be dropped in favor
24 of more descriptive language (e.g., child who has one parent, or child who has
25 lost both parents). Finally, donors often think that institutional care is essential
26 for the care of children, unaware that community-based alternatives are feasible.
27 Admittedly, supporting community-based programs may not be as appealing as
28 supporting an orphanage. Whereas donors can visit orphanages and see tangible
29 results of financial support, the evidence may be less visible in community-based
30 programs. An education effort should target helping donors and volunteers de-
31 velop a sophisticated understanding of institutional care and its effects, and of the
32 availability and importance of community options for at-risk children.

33 34 *Recognizing Impediments to Transitioning from Institutional Care*

35
36 There are a number of factors that can undermine attempts to transition from
37 institutional to community-based care. Not surprisingly, there may be resistance
38 from those who have a financial interest in the institution, and from those who are
39 employed by the institution. Also, costs of maintaining institutions remain high
40 during the transition whereas, at the same time, new expenditures for supporting
41 families increase. On the one hand, Tobis (2000) argued, on the basis of analysis
42 of experiences of deinstitutionalization in Eastern Europe, that the institutional
43 setting not be closed prior to putting community supports in place. On the other

1 **Institutional Care for Children**

17

2 hand, until the institution is fully closed down, cost savings are not realized, a les-
3 son learned from the United States era of psychiatric deinstitutionalization (e.g.,
4 Fakhourya & Priebea, 2007). In addition, institutions may be perpetuated because
5 of how governments finance them. In Romania, a major impediment to deinsti-
6 tutionalization was the large number of government agencies that received support
7 based upon the number of children who were in institutions (Cristian Tabacaru,
8 personal communication, March 28, 2011). Therefore, although we recognize the Q7
9 risks of closing institutions before community-based services are fully operational,
10 we argue for a very brief transitional period during which institutional facilities
11 are closed; the risk that institutions will remain open indefinitely is too great
12 otherwise. Romania is an example of a country that relied almost exclusively on
13 institutional care and within a decade made dramatic strides toward reducing the
14 numbers of children being raised in institutions (Greenwell, 2006). Finally, it may
15 not be possible to divert funds from institutions to community-based programs if
16 donors are not persuaded of the value of doing so. If these various forces mitigating
17 against closing down of institutions are not anticipated, they can serve to impede
18 or derail progress.

20 *Developing System of Support for Families and Communities*

22 If institutional care is to be eliminated, it is critical to establish an alterna-
23 tive community-based system. Thus, building a child welfare infrastructure that
24 incorporates family support and a system of kinship and foster care is critical.
25 An important step in the development of this system is eliminating, or at least re-
26 ducing, the disincentives for local governments in establishing community-based
27 programs (United Nations General Assembly, 2010). In many nations, the Q8
28 national government runs institutional care facilities whereas local governments are
29 expected to finance family support programs (United Nations General Assembly,
30 2010). Therefore, changing the system of financing programs (e.g., such that the
31 national government provides support to community-based programs) may be
32 essential.

34 *Support for birth parents.* Given that most children are placed into institu-
35 tional care as the result of poverty (Save the Children, 2009), financial support
36 is needed to ensure that children can be cared for adequately in their homes. Fi-
37 nancial support may take a number of forms, including regular cash transfers or
38 financial assistance; short-term housing and food allowances during droughts,
39 floods, and other disasters; and free health and education services (Save the
40 Children, 2009; Tobis, 2000). Conditional cash transfers, that represent an adapta-
41 tion of cash transfers, are contingent on parents complying with certain conditions,
42 such as preventive health and education program requirements. In a randomized
43 clinical trial, Fernald, Gertler, and Neufeld (2008) found that children whose

1

18

Dozier et al.

2

families were enrolled in the conditional cash transfer program showed better physical growth and cognitive outcomes relative to children whose families were not in the program. An advantage of the conditional cash transfer is that it integrates the social welfare system with the system of financial support. However, these cash transfer programs are expensive, raising the possibility that their expense may limit the ability to pay for social support programs (Save the Children, 2009; Wilton Park Conference Report, 2009; Yablonski & Bell, 2009).

9

Vulnerable birth parents need social support, services, and educational programs to promote their ability to care for their children adequately. As discussed previously, introducing programs that target parents' sensitive and nurturing care toward their children is expected to enhance children's developmental outcomes and create more rewarding parent-child relationships. Interventions such as the BEIP and ABC interventions are examples of such programs. A system of kinship and foster care can provide a safety net.

16

17

Kinship and foster care system. Informal kinship care systems should be encouraged and supported at the local and national level. The cost of caring for children in kinship and foster care has been estimated as 1/6 and 1/3, respectively, of the cost of caring for children in institutions (Carter, 2005; Save the Children, 2009). A kinship care network can provide support for parents temporarily or as a longer term solution. Financial support for kinship care is often important to offset the costs for relative caregivers.

24

25

In some situations, a child must be removed temporarily from parental care. This is the case with many children in the United States who are in foster care. Addressing these children's needs requires a robust, high-quality foster care system. The foster care system developed to care for children leaving orphanages in Romania includes many of the components of such a system (Zeanah & Smyke, 2005). Families were chosen carefully for their ability to work effectively with children who had been subjected to the depriving conditions of institutionalization. They were provided with effective training and consistent ongoing support in working with these children. Families were able to provide loving long-term care for children.

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

Adoption. Adoption should be included as a realistic and viable alternative for children who cannot return home. Adoption should not take the place of community supports for parents or appropriate relative care. However, there are some children whose families are unwilling or unable to care for them for whom adoption represents an appropriate option. Depending on legal constraints, this could be legal or de facto adoption, but in any case, involves a lifelong commitment to the child. Increased supports in the form of economic subsidies will be important for community members with limited resources. Appropriate training and support will be important for community members as well as for internationally adopting parents.

1 Institutional Care for Children

19

2 Evaluation and Research

3
4 All too frequently in the area of child welfare, programs are implemented that
5 do not have an evidence base. To the extent possible, programs and services that
6 have strong empirical support should be implemented. It is critical that new and
7 modified services be rigorously assessed.
8

9 Conclusion

10
11 The effects of institutional care are seen in the most tangible indicator of
12 children's functioning, physical growth, and extend to every domain of physical
13 and psychological health examined. Given these profound effects on functioning,
14 the recent proliferation of orphanages worldwide is alarming. The evidence is
15 clear—young children do not belong in institutions. We advocate here for moving
16 toward a system where children are cared for in family environments. As the first
17 White House Conference on Children concluded more than a century ago, young
18 children's needs are best met in families, and if that is not possible, they should
19 be in the most family-like setting possible.
20
21

22 References

- 23
24 Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967). *Infancy in Uganda: Infant care and the growth of love*. Baltimore: Johns
25 Hopkins Press.
26 Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psycho-*
27 *logical study of the strange situation*. Oxford, England: Lawrence Erlbaum.
28 Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Juffer, J. (2008). Earlier is better: A meta-
29 analysis of 70 years of intervention improving cognitive development in institutionalized
30 children. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 73, 279–293. doi:
31 10.1111/j.1540-5834.2008.00498.x.
32 Beckett, C., Castle, J., Rutter, M., & Barke-Sonuga, E. J. (2010). Institutional deprivation, specific
33 cognitive functions, and scholastic achievement: English and Romanian Adoptee (ERA) study
34 findings. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 75, 125–142. doi:
35 10.1111/j.1540-5834.2010.00553.x.
36 Beckett, C., Maughan, B., Rutter, M., Castle, J., Colvert, E., Groothues, C., . . . & Sonuga-Barke, E. J.
37 S. (2006). Do the effects of early severe deprivation on cognition persist into early adolescence?
38 Findings from the English and Romanian Adoptees Study. *Child Development*, 77, 696–711.
39 doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00898.x. Q9
40 Bernard, K., Dozier, M., Bick, J., Lewis-Morrarty, E., Lindhiem, O., & Carlson, E. (In press). Enhancing
41 attachment organization among maltreated infants: Results of a randomized clinical trial. *Child*
42 *Development*. Q10
43 Boersma, B., & Wit, J. M. (1997). Catch-up growth. *Endocrine Review*, 18, 646–661.
44 Boswell, J. (1988). *The kindness of strangers: The abandonment of children in Western Europe from*
45 *late antiquity to the Renaissance*. New York: Pantheon Books.
46 Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
47 Browne, K. (2009). *The risk of harm to young children in institutional care*. Retrieved from Save the
48 Children website: http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/en/54_9896.htm. Q11
49 Browne, K., Hamilton-Giachritsis, C., Johnson, R., & Ostergren, M. (2006). Overuse of institutional
50 care for children in Europe? *British Medical Journal*, 332, 485–487.

- 1 **20** **Dozier et al.**
- 2 Bruce, J., Fisher, P. A., Pears, K. C., & Levine, S. (2009). Morning cortisol levels in preschool-aged
3 foster children: Differential effects of maltreatment type. *Developmental Psychobiology*, *51*,
4 14–23. doi: 10.1002/dev.20333.
- 5 Calkins, S. D. (2011). Caregiving as coregulation: Psychobiological processes and child functioning.
6 In A. Booth, S. M. McHale, & N. S. Landale (Eds.), *Biosocial foundations of family processes*.
7 *National symposium on family issues* (pp. 49–59). New York: Springer.
- 8 Carlson, M., & Earls, F. (1997). Psychological and neuroendocrinological sequelae of early social
9 deprivation in institutionalized children in Romania. *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences*,
10 *807*, 419–428.
- 11 Carter, R. (2005). *Family matters: A study of institutional childcare in Central and Eastern Europe*
12 *and the Former Soviet Union*. London: Everychild.
- 13 Chaffin, M., Hanson, R., Saunders, B., Nichols, T., Barnett, D., Zeanah, C., . . . & Miller-Perrin,
14 C. (2006). Report of the APSAC task force on attachment therapy, reactive attachment disorder,
15 and attachment problems. *Child Maltreatment*, *11*, 76–89. doi: 10.1177/1077559505283699. **Q12**
- 16 Chapin, H. D. (1915). Are institutions for infants really necessary? *Journal of the American Medical*
17 *Association*, *LXIV*, 1–3.
- 18 Chisholm, K. (1998). A three year follow-up of attachment and indiscriminate friendliness in
19 children adopted from Romanian orphanages. *Child Development*, *69*, 1092–1106. doi:
20 10.2307/1132364.
- 21 Chisholm, K., Carter, M. C., Ames, E. W., & Morison, S. J. (1995). Attachment security and indis-
22 criminate friendly behavior in children adopted from Romanian orphanages. *Development*
23 *and Psychopathology*, *7*, 283–294. doi: 10.1017/S0954579400006507.
- 24 Cline, F. (1992). *Hope for high risk and rage filled children*. Evergreen, CO: EC Publications.
- 25 Crenson, M. A. (1998). *Building the invisible orphanage: A prehistory of the American welfare system*.
26 Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 27 Dobrova-Krol, N. A., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Juffer, F.
28 (2010). The importance of quality of care: Effects of perinatal HIV infection and early in-
29 stitutional rearing on preschoolers' attachment and indiscriminate friendliness. *Journal of*
30 *Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *51*, 1368–1376. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02243.x.
- 31 Dobrova-Krol, N. A., van IJzendoorn, M. H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Cyr, C., & Juffer,
32 F. (2008). Physical growth delays and stress dysregulation in stunted and non-stunted
33 Ukrainian institution-reared children. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *31*, 539–553. doi:
34 10.1016/j.infbeh.2008.04.001.
- 35 Dozier, M., Lindhiem, O., Lewis, E., Bick, J., Bernard, K., & Peloso, E. (2009). Effects of a foster parent
36 training program on children's attachment behaviors: Preliminary evidence from a randomized
37 clinical trial. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *26*, 321–332. doi: 10.1007/s10560-
38 009-0165-1.
- 39 Dozier, M., Manni, M., Gordon, M. K., Peloso, E., Gunnar, M. R., Stovall-McClough, K. C., Eldreth,
40 D., & Levine, S. (2006). Foster children's diurnal production of cortisol: An exploratory study.
41 *Child Maltreatment*, *11*, 189–197. doi: 10.1177/1077559505285779.
- 42 Dozier, M., Peloso, E., Lewis, E., Laurenceau, J., & Levine, S. (2008). Effects of an attachment-based
43 intervention on the cortisol production of infants and toddlers in foster care. *Development and*
Psychopathology, *20*, 845–859. doi: 10.1017/S0954579408000400.
- Dozier, M., Peloso, E., Lindhiem, O., Gordon, M. K., Manni, M., Sepulveda, S., . . . & Levine, S.
(2006). Developing evidence-based interventions for foster children: An example of a ran-
domized clinical trial with infants and toddlers. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*, 767–785. doi:
10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00486.x. **Q13**
- Fakhourya, W., & Priebea, S. (2007). Deinstitutionalization and reinstitutionalization: Major changes
in the provision of mental healthcare. *Psychiatry*, *6*, 313–316.
- Fearon, R. P., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., van IJzendoorn, M. H., Lapsley, A. M., & Roisman,
G. I. (2010). The significance of insecure attachment and disorganization in the development
of children's externalizing behavior: A meta-analytic study. *Child Development*, *81*, 435–456.
doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01405.x.
- Fernald, L. C. H., Gertler, P. J., & Neufeld, L. M. (2008). Role of conditional cash transfer programmes
for child health, growth, and development: An analysis of Mexico's Oportunidades. *Lancet*,
371, 828–837. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60382-7.

1 **Institutional Care for Children**

21

- 2 Fisher, L., Ames, E. W., Chisholm, K., & Savole, L. (1997). Problems reported by parents of Romanian
 3 orphans adopted to British Columbia. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 20*,
 4 67–82. doi: 10.1080/016502597385441.
- 5 Fisher, P. A., van Ryzin, M. J., & Gunnar, M. R. (In press). Mitigating HPA axis dysregulation
 6 associated with placement changes in Foster Care. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. Q14
- 7 Fox, N. A., Almas, A. N., Degnan, K. A., Nelson, C. A., & Zeanah, C. H. (In press). The effects of severe
 8 psychosocial deprivation and foster care intervention on cognitive development at 8 years of
 9 age: Findings from the Bucharest Early Intervention Project. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
 10 *Psychiatry*. Q15
- 11 Gleason, M. M., Fox, N. A., Drury, S., Smyke, A. T., Egger, H. L., Nelson, C. A., . . . & Zeanah,
 12 C. H. (In press). The validity of evidence-derived criteria for reactive attachment disorder:
 13 Indiscriminately social/disinhibited and emotionally withdrawn/inhibited types. *Journal of the*
 14 *American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. Q16
- 15 Goldfarb, W. (1945). Effects of psychological deprivation in infancy and subsequent stimulation. *The*
 16 *American Journal of Psychiatry, 102*, 18–33.
- 17 Greenough, W. T., Black, J. E., & Wallace, C. S. (1987). Experience and brain development. *Child*
 18 *Development, 58*, 539–559. doi: 10.2307/1130197.
- 19 Greenwell, F. (2006). The impact of child welfare reform on child abandonment and deinstitutional-
 20 ization, Romania 1990–2000. *Annales de Demographie Historique, 1*, 133–157.
- 21 Groark, C. J., Muhamedrahimov, R. J., Palmov, O. I., Nikiforova, N. V., & McCall, R. B. (2005).
 22 Improvements in early care in Russian orphanages and their relationship to observed behaviors.
 23 *Infant Mental Health Journal, 26*, 96–109. doi: 10.1002/imhj.20041.
- 24 Gunnar, M. R., Bruce, J., & Grotevant, H. D. (2000). International adoption of institutionally
 25 reared children: Research and policy. *Development and Psychopathology, 12*, 677–693. doi:
 26 10.1017/S0954579400004077.
- 27 Gunnar, M. R., Frenn, K., Wewerka, S., & van Ryzin, M. J. (2009). Moderate versus severe early
 28 life stress: Associations with stress reactivity and regulation in 10–12-year-old children. *Psy-*
 29 *choneuroendocrinology, 34*, 62–75. doi: 10.1016/j.psyneuen.2008.08.013.
- 30 Gunnar, M. R., Morison, S. J., Chisholm, K., & Schuder, M. (2001). Salivary cortisol levels in children
 31 adopted from Romanian orphanages. *Development and Psychopathology, 13*, 611–628. doi:
 32 10.1017/S095457940100311x.
- 33 Gunnar, M. R., Van Dulmen, M. H. M., & The International Adoption Project Team. (2007). Be-
 34 havior problems in postinstitutionalized internationally adopted children. *Development and*
 35 *Psychopathology, 19*, 129–148. doi: 10.1017/S0954579407070071.
- 36 Gunnar, M. R., & Vazquez, D. M. (2001). Low cortisol and a flattening of expected daytime rhythm:
 37 Potential indices of risk in human development. *Development and Psychopathology, 13*, 515–
 38 538. doi: 10.1017/S0954579401003066.
- 39 Hacsı, T. A. (1997). *Second home: Orphan asylums and poor families in America*. Cambridge, MA:
 40 Harvard University Press.
- 41 Hodges, J., & Tizard, B. (1989). Social and family relationships of ex-institutional adolescents. *Journal*
 42 *of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 30*, 77–97. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1989.tb00770.x.
- 43 Hofer, M. (1994). Hidden regulators in attachment, separation, and loss. *Monographs of the Society*
 44 *for Research in Child Development, 59*, 192–207. doi: 10.2307/1166146.
- 45 Hofer, M. (2006). Psychobiological roots of early attachment. *Current Directions in Psychological*
 46 *Science, 15*, 84–88. doi: 10.1111/j.0963-7214.2006.00412.x.
- 47 Hrđy, S. B. (1999). *Mother nature: Maternal instincts and how they shape the human species*.
 48 New York: Ballantine Books.
- 49 Johnson, D., Albers, L., Iverson, S., Mathers, M., Dole, K., Georgieff, M., . . . & Miller, L. C.
 50 (1996). Health status of U.S. adopted Eastern European (EE) orphans. *Pediatric Research, 39*,
 51 134A. Q17
- 52 Johnson, D. E., Guthrie, D., Smyke, A., Koga, S., Fox, N. A., Zeanah, C. H., & Nelson, C. A. (2010).
 53 Growth and the relationships between axology, caregiving environment and cognition in
 54 socially deprived Romanian infants and toddlers randomized to foster vs. ongoing institutional
 55 care. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 164*, 507–516.
- 56 Harden, B. J. (2002). Congregate care for infants and toddlers: Shedding new light on an old question.
 57 *Infant Mental Health Journal, 23*, 476–495. doi: 10.1002/imhj.10029.

1

22

Dozier et al.

- 2 Juffer, F., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2005). Behavior problems and mental health referrals of international adoptees: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *293*, 2501–2515. doi: 10.1001/jama.293.20.2501.
- 3 Keck, G. C., & Kupecky, R. (1995). *Adopting the hurt child*. Colorado Springs, CO: Pinon Press.
- 4 Kligman, G. (1998). *The politics of duplicity: Controlling reproduction in Ceausescu's Romania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 5 Kreppner, J. M., O'Connor, T. G., Rutter, M., & The English and Romanian Adoptees Study Team. (2001). Can inattention/overactivity be an institutional deprivation syndrome? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *29*, 513–528. doi: 10.1023/A:1012229209190.
- 6 Kreppner, J. M., Rutter, M., Beckett, C., Castle, J., Colvert, E., Groothues, C., . . . & Sonuga-Barke, E. J. S. (2007). Normality and impairment following profound early institutional deprivation: A longitudinal follow-up into early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, *43*, 931–946. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.43.4.931.
- 7 Levine, S., Wiener, S. G., & Coe, C. L. (1993). Temporal and social factors influencing behavioral and hormonal responses to separation in mother and infant squirrel monkeys. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *18*, 297–306. doi: 10.1016/0306-4530(93)90026-H.
- 8 Lilienfeld, S. O. (2007). Psychological treatments that cause harm. *Psychological Science*, *2*, 53–70. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00029.x.
- 9 Marshall, P. J., Fox, N. A., & the BEIP Core Group. (2004). A comparison of the electroencephalogram between institutionalized and community children in Romania. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *16*, 1327–1338. doi: 10.1162/0898929042304723.
- 10 Marshall, P. J., Reeb, B. C., Fox, N. A., Nelson, C. A., & Zeanah, C. H. (2008). Effects of early intervention on EEG power and coherence in previously institutionalized children in Romania. *Development and Psychopathology*, *20*, 861–880. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00808.x.
- 11 McKenzie, R. B. (Ed.) (1999). *Rethinking orphanages for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- 12 McLaughlin, K. A., Fox, N. A., Zeanah, C. H., Sheridan, M. A., Marshall, P., & Nelson, C. A. (2010). Delayed maturation in brain electrical activity partially explains the association between early environmental deprivation and symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, *68*, 329–336. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.04.005.
- 13 Moulson, M. C., Westerlund, A., Fox, N. A., Zeanah, C. H., & Nelson, C. A. (2009). The effects of early experience on face recognition: An event-related potential study of institutionalized children in Romania. *Child Development*, *80*, 1039–1056. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01315.x.
- 14 Muhamedrahimov, R. J. (1999). New attitudes: Infant care facilities in St. Petersburg, Russia. In J. D. Osofsky & H. E. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *WAIMH Handbook of infant mental health. Vol. 1. Perspectives on infant mental health* (pp. 245–294). New York: Wiley.
- 15 Nelson, C. A. (2007). A neurobiological perspective on early human deprivation. *Child Development Perspectives*, *1*, 13–18. doi: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00004.x.
- 16 Nelson, C. A., Zeanah, C. H., Fox, N. A., Marshall, P. J., Smyke, A. T., & Guthrie, D. (2007). Cognitive recovery in socially deprived young children: The Bucharest Early Intervention Project. *Science*, *21*, 1937–1940. doi: 10.1126/science.1143921.
- 17 O'Connor, T. G., Rutter, M., Beckett, C., Keaveney, L., Kreppner, J. M., & The English and Romanian Adoptees Study Team. (2000). The effects of severe global privation on cognitive competence: Extension and longitudinal follow-up. *Child Development*, *71*, 376–390. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00151.
- 18 O'Connor, T. G., Rutter, M., & The English and Romanian Adoptees Study Team. (2000). Attachment disorder behavior following early severe deprivation: Extension and longitudinal follow-up. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *39*, 703–712. doi: 10.1097/00004583-200006000-00008.
- 19 O'Connor, T. G., & Zeanah, C. H. (2003). Attachment disorders: Assessment strategies and treatment approaches. *Attachment and Human Development*, *5*, 223–244. doi: 10.1080/14616730310001593974.
- 20 Pignotti, M., & Mercer, J. (2007). Holding therapy and dyadic developmental psychotherapy are not supported and acceptable social work interventions: A systematic research synthesis revisited. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *17*, 513–519. doi: 10.1177/1049731506292530.
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43

1 **Institutional Care for Children**

23

- 2 Provence, S., & Lipton, R. C. (1962). *Infants in institutions*. Oxford: International University Press.
- 3 Rutter, M. (1998). Developmental catch-up, and deficit, following adoption after severe
4 global privation. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *39*, 465–476. doi:
5 10.1017/S0021963098002236.
- 6 Rutter, M., Colvert, E., Kreppner, J., Beckett, C., Castle, J., Groothues, C., . . . & Sonuga-Barke,
7 E. J. S. (2007). Early adolescent outcomes for institutionally-deprived and non-deprived
8 adoptees. I: Disinhibited attachment. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, *48*, 17–30.
9 doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2006.01688.x. Q18
- 10 Rutter, M., Kreppner, J. M., & O'Connor, T. G. (2001). Specificity and heterogeneity in children's
11 responses to profound institutional privation. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *179*, 97–103. doi:
12 10.1192/bjp.179.2.97.
- 13 Rutter, M., Sonuga-Barke, E. J., Beckett, C., Castle, J., Kreppner, J., Kumsta, R., . . . & Bell,
14 C. A. (2010). Deprivation-specific psychological patterns: Effects of institutional deprivation.
15 *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *75*, 1–229. Q19
- 16 Save the Children. (2009). *Keeping children out of harmful institutions: Why we should be investing
17 in family-based care*. London: Save the Children.
- 18 Shonkoff, J. P., & Bales, S. N. (2011). Science does not speak for itself: Translating child develop-
19 ment research for the public and its policymakers. *Child Development*, *82*, 17–32. doi:
20 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01538.x.
- 21 Shonkoff, J., Boyce, W. T., & McEwen, B. (2009). Neuroscience, molecular biology, and the
22 childhood roots of health disparities: Building a new framework for health promotion and
23 disease prevention. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *301*, 2252–2259. doi:
24 10.1001/jama.2009.754.
- 25 Skeels, H. M., & Dye, H. B. (1939). A study of the effects of differential stimulation on mentally
26 retarded children. *Proceedings & Addresses of the American Association on Mental Deficiency*,
27 *44*, 114–136.
- 28 Smith, E. P. (1995). Bring back the orphanages? What policymakers of today can learn from the past.
29 *Child Welfare*, *74*, 115–142.
- 30 Smyke, A. T., Dumitrescu, A., & Zeanah, C. H. (2002). Attachment disturbances in young children.
31 I: The continuum of caretaking casualty. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and
32 Adolescent Psychiatry*, *41*, 972–982. doi: 10.1097/00004583-200208000-00016.
- 33 Smyke, A. T., Koga, S. F., Johnson, D. E., Fox, N. A., Marshal, P. J., Nelson, C. A., & Zeanah,
34 C. H. (2007). The caregiving context in institution-reared and family-reared infants and toddlers
35 in Romania. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *48*, 210–218. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-
36 7610.2006.01694.x.
- 37 Smyke, A. T., Zeanah, C. H., Fox, N. A., & Nelson, C. A. (2009). Psychosocial interventions: Bucharest
38 Early Intervention Project. In D. Schechter & M. M. Gleason (Eds.), *Infant and early childhood
39 mental health, child and adolescent psychiatric clinics of North Carolina*, *18*, (pp. 721–734).
40 Philadelphia, PA: Saunders.
- 41 Smyke, A. T., Zeanah, C. H., Fox, N. A., Nelson, C. A., & Guthrie, D. (2010). Placement in foster care
42 enhances quality of attachment among young institutionalized children. *Child Development*,
43 *81*, 212–223. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01390.x.
- 44 Sonuga-Barke, E. J., Schlotz, W., & Rutter, M. (2010). Physical growth and maturation following early
45 severe institutional deprivation: Do they mediate specific psychopathological effects? *Mono-
46 graphs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *75*, 143–166. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-
47 5834.2010.00551.x.
- 48 Spitz, R. A. (1945). Hospitalizm: An inquiry into the genesis of psychiatric conditions in early
49 childhood. *Psychoanalytic Study of Children*, *2*, 313–342.
- 50 Stovall, K. C., & Dozier M. (2000). The development of attachment in new relationships: Single
51 subject analyses for ten foster infants. *Development and Psychopathology*, *12*, 133–156. doi:
52 10.1017/S0954579400002029.
- 53 Stovall-McClough, K. C., & Dozier, M. (2004). Forming attachments in foster care: Infant attachment
54 behaviors in the first two months of placement. *Development and Psychopathology*, *16*, 253–
55 271. doi: 10.1017/S0954579404044505.

1

24

Dozier et al.

- 2 The St. Petersburg –USA Orphanage Research Team (2008). The effects of early social emotional and
3 relationship experience on the development of young orphanage children. *Monographs of the*
4 *Society for Research in Child Development*, 73, 1–262.
- 5 Tizard, B., & Hodges, J. (1978). The effect of early institutional rearing on the development of eight year
6 old children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 19, 99–118. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-
7 7610.1978.tb00453.x.
- 8 Tobis, D. (2000). *Moving from institutions to community-based social services in Central and Eastern*
9 *Europe and the former Soviet Union*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- 10 Trexler, R. C. (1973). The foundlings of Florence, 1395–1455. *History of Childhood Quarterly*, 1,
11 259–284.
- 12 United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Guidelines for the alternative care of children* (Resolution
13 No. 64/142). Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4c3acd162.html>. Q20
- 14 van den Dries, L., Juffer, F., van IJzendoorn, M., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2009). Fostering
15 security? A meta-analysis of attachment in adopted children. *Children and Youth Services*
16 *Review*, 31, 410–421. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2008.09.008.
- 17 van IJzendoorn, M. H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Juffer, F. (2007). Plasticity of growth
18 in height, weight and head circumference: Meta-analytic evidence of massive catch-up of
19 children's physical growth after adoption. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*,
20 28, 334–343. doi: 10.1097/DBP.0b013e31811320aa.
- 21 van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Juffer, F. (2006). The Emanuel Miller Memorial lecture 2006: Adoption
22 as intervention. Meta-analytic evidence for massive catch-up and plasticity in physical, socio-
23 emotional and cognitive development. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 47, 1228–
24 1245. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2006.01675.x.
- 25 van IJzendoorn, M. H., Luijk, M., & Juffer, F. (2008). IQ of children growing up in children's homes:
26 A meta-analysis on IQ delays in orphanages. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 54, 341–366. doi:
27 10.1353/mpq.0.0002.
- 28 van IJzendoorn, M. H., Schuengel, C., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. (1999). Disorganized attachment
29 in early childhood: Meta-analysis of precursors, concomitants, and sequelae. *Development and*
30 *Psychopathology*, 11, 225–249. doi: 10.1017/S0954579499002035.
- 31 Vorría, P., Papaligoura, Z., Sarafidou, J., Kopakaki, M., Dunn, J., van IJzendoorn, M. H., &
32 Kontopoulou, A. (2006). The development of adopted children after institutional care: A follow-
33 up study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47, 1246–1253. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-
34 7610.2006.01666.x.
- 35 Vorría, P., Rutter, M., Pickles, A., Wolkind, S., & Hobsbaum, A. (1998). A comparative study of Greek
36 children in long-term residential group care and in two-parent families: 1. Social, emotional,
37 and behavioural differences. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 39, 225–236. doi:
38 10.1017/S0021963097001996.
- 39 Whetten, K., Ostermann, J., Whetten, R. A., Pence, B. W., O'Donnell, K., Messer, L. C., . . . & The
40 Positive Outcomes for Orphans Research Team (2009). A comparison of the wellbeing of
41 orphans and abandoned children ages 6–12 in institutional and community-based care settings
42 in 5 less wealthy nations. *PLoS ONE*, 4, e8169. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0008169. Q21
- 43 Williamson, J., & Greenberg, A. (2010). *Families, not orphanages*. Retrieved from Better Care Network
44 website: <http://www.crin.org/bcn/details.asp?id=23328&themeID=1003&topicID=1023>. Q22
- 45 Wilton Park Conference. (2009). *The neglected agenda: Protecting children without adequate parental*
46 *care*. Retrieved from Child Rights Information Network: http://www.crin.org/docs/Wilton_Park_Background_Paper_FINAL.pdf. Q23
- 47 Wismer Fries, A. B., Shirtcliff, E. A., & Pollak, S. D. (2009). Neuroendocrine dysregulation fol-
48 lowing early social deprivation in children. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 50, 588–599. doi:
49 10.1002/dev.20319.
- 50 Yablonski, J., & Bell, B. (2009). Responding to vulnerability: The role of social welfare services
51 and cash transfers. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, 4, 77–80. doi:
52 10.1080/17450120903128580.
- 53 Zeanah, C. H. (2000). Disturbances of attachment in young children adopted from institutions. *Journal*
54 *of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 21, 230–236.

1 **Institutional Care for Children**

25

- 2 Zeanah, C. H., Nelson, C. A., Fox, N. A., Smyke, A. T., Marshall, P., Parker, S. W., & Koga,
3 S. (2003). Designing research to study the effects of institutionalization on brain and behavioral
4 development: The Bucharest Early Intervention Project. *Development and Psychopathology*,
5 15, 885–907. doi: 10.1017/S0954579403000452.
- 6 Zeanah, C. H., & Smyke, A. T. (2005). Building attachment relationships following maltreatment
7 and severe deprivation. In L. J. Berlin, Y. Ziv, L. Amaya-Jackson, & M. T. Greenberg
8 (Eds.), *Enhancing early attachments: Theory, research, intervention, and policy* (pp. 195–216).
9 New York: Guilford Press.
- 10 Zeanah C. H., Smyke A. T., & Dumitrescu, A. (2002). Attachment disturbances in young children. II:
11 Indiscriminate behavior and institutional care. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and*
12 *Adolescent Psychiatry*, 41, 983–989. doi: 10.1097/00004583-200208000-00017.
- 13 Zeanah, C. H., Smyke, A. T., Koga, S. F., Carlson, E., & the Bucharest Early Intervention Core
14 Group. (2005). Attachment in institutionalized and community children in Romania. *Child*
15 *Development*, 76, 1015–1028. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00894.x.
- 16 Zeanah, C. H., Smyke, A. T., & Settles, L. (2006). Children in orphanages. In K. McCartney &
17 D. Phillips (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of early childhood development* (pp. 224–254). Malden,
18 MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Q24

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Queries

- Q1** Author: Please provide affiliations for all authors except first author.
- Q2** Author: Please check the corresponding author and address details for correctness as typeset.
- Q3** Author: Please check all heading levels for correctness as typeset.
- Q4** Author: Please check the following reviewer’s comment: Author: I couldn’t locate Vorria et al, 2003 in psycinfo, but the citation I added in was in the reference list and appropriate – AW.
- Q5** Author: The year of reference Wismer Fries, Shirtcliff, and Pollak has been changed from 2008 to 2009 to match the reference list.
- Q6** Author: Reference Bernard et al. (2011) has not been provided in the reference list; please supply full publication details.
- Q7** Author: Please check the following reviewer’s comment: Author: Feel free to leave this out.
- Q8** Author: The year of reference United Nations General Assembly has been changed from 2009 to 2010 to match the reference list. Please check.
- Q9** Author: Please provide all author names for reference Beckett et al. (2006).
- Q10** Author: Please update reference Bernard et al. (In press) with volume number and page range if it has been published in print.
- Q11** Author: Please provide access date (month, day, year) for reference Browne (2009).
- Q12** Author: Please provide all author names for reference Chaffin et al. (2006).
- Q13** Author: Please provide all author names for reference Dozier et al. (2006).
- Q14** Author: Please update reference Fisher, van Ryzin, & Gunnar (In press) with volume number and page range if it has been published.
- Q15** Author: Please update reference Fox et al. (In press) with volume number and page range if it has been published.
- Q16** Author: Please provide all authors for reference Gleason et al. (In press) and also update the reference with volume number and page range if it has been published.
- Q17** Author: Please provide all authors for reference Johnson et al. (1996), and also provide first and last pages if it is not a one-page article.
- Q18** Author: Please provide all authors for reference Rutter et al. (2007).

- Q19** Author: Please provide all authors for reference Rutter et al. (2010).
- Q20** Author: Please provide access date for reference United Nations General Assembly (2010).
- Q21** Author: Please provide all authors for reference Whetten et al. (2009).
- Q22** Author: Please provide access date for reference Williamson & Greenberg (2010).
- Q23** Author: Please provide access date for reference Wilton Park Conference (2009).
- Q24** Author: Please provide individual author vitae paragraph containing: Institutional affiliation, PhD granting institution & field, and Primary research focus.

UNCORRECTED PROOF