

| Executive Summary
Quarrier's, Aberlour, and Barnardo's Reports
Report for the Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Lynn Abrams

Linda Fleming

October 2019

Project Team

Lynn Abrams

Professor of Modern History, School of Humanities, University of Glasgow

Lynn.Abrams@Glasgow.ac.uk

Linda Fleming

Research Associate, School of Humanities, University of Glasgow

Disclaimer

The views and findings expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Inquiry.

Copyright information

Abrams, L. and Fleming, L. (2019) Executive Summary – Quarrier's, Aberlour, and Barnardo's Reports.

Published by

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry, Edinburgh.

Published date

October 2019

| Executive Summary

Quarrier's, Aberlour, and Barnardo's Reports

Report for the Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Lynn Abrams

Linda Fleming

University of Glasgow



October 2019

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Methodology..... | 1 |
| Staff Recruitment, Qualifications and In-service Training Initiatives | 2 |
| Discipline and Punishment | 8 |
| Complaints..... | 11 |
| Inspection and Monitoring..... | 14 |
| Placement and review of children | 17 |
| After care | 20 |
| Conclusions..... | 22 |

Executive Summary

Quarrier's, Aberlour, and Barnardo's Reports

The following questions were posed in respect of all three providers. Here we summarise the extent to which the records consulted provide evidence of whether systems or procedures existed and were followed in respect of the areas in question for each provider (Quarrier's, Aberlour and Barnardo's) and some tentative conclusions are drawn on this basis in respect of differences between the three providers and the impact on children's care.

Methodology

The Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry (SCAI) commissioned us to review the records pertaining to Aberlour, Quarrier's Homes, and Barnardo's in order to assess the extent to which the providers' records indicate the existence, or otherwise, of systems or processes for the period c.1930-1990 in respect of: staff recruitment, induction, qualifications and training; discipline and punishment; the handling of complaints; internal and external monitoring; and reviews of placements and after care.

The research for all three providers was carried out in a period of circa three months between September and December 2018. The limited time and resources available to conduct the research imposed some constraints on the extent and range of the records that could reasonably be consulted. Thus, the research focused overwhelmingly on a sample of records provided to the Inquiry by the organisations, supplemented by some additional sources located by the authors elsewhere.

Broadly speaking, similar types of records were reviewed for all three organisations. These comprised of children's admission records and case file samples; annual reports, management committee meeting minutes and other comparable material; inspection reports; staff records; and other miscellaneous materials relating to the organisation and operation of the organisation. We were not able to consult the full extent of records kept by any of the organisations or all the material they provided to the Inquiry because of time and resource constraints—though we did examine a significant amount and consider that the research agenda was broadly met without recourse to requesting additional materials.

Staff Recruitment, Qualifications and In-service Training Initiatives

The following questions were posed in respect of all three providers regarding staffing and training in the period in question. The extent to which the records consulted provide evidence of whether systems or procedures existed in respect of the recruitment of staff and the training of those staff are provided here in summary form.

Overview

Throughout the period under review all three providers experienced challenges with recruitment and retention of staff, particularly staff with childcare responsibilities. Annual reports and management meetings consistently provide updates on staffing and recruitment and indicate that staff retention was difficult for those homes located some distance from large centres of population, that recruiting residential staff was a challenge, and that staff with childcare experience, training or qualifications were difficult to recruit before c.1970. In addition, the requirements imposed on prospective applicants by these organisations in respect of religious affiliation, the requirement to live-in, and sometimes marital and family status, limited the pool of potential applicants.

What systems existed in respect of the recruitment (including how staff were recruited) and training of staff?

Organisation records provide little information on precisely how staff were recruited. All three organisations recruited staff for childcare positions and auxiliary positions via advertisements in the regional and national press and it is likely that from the 1960s onwards they utilised more specialist journals to recruit childcare staff. Barnardo's advertised within its own magazine and Aberlour placed advertisements in an Episcopal church publication.

All three organisations also recruited for positions from within, either moving individuals sideways or into more senior positions. The three providers all had a need for significant numbers of auxiliary staff alongside those responsible for child care. Whilst auxiliaries such as cooks and laundry managers were employed from outwith the organisations, both Aberlour and Quarrier's employed care leavers (i.e. children who had reached school leaving age) for domestic and labouring work before the 1960s. There is less evidence that Barnardo's did this.

What checks were made before someone was recruited?

Organisational records indicate that testimonials (provided by the applicant) and/or references (taken up independently) were requested from external applicants. This was the case for more senior posts at Aberlour throughout the period in question, but not necessarily for more junior positions. At Aberlour evidence from records indicates shortlisting and interviewing of applicants for senior appointments, though some appointments were made in-house. Quarrier's required testimonials from applicants (one from a Minister until c.1960s), but from 1970s records were not available to us to indicate whether reference checks were made. Barnardo's required two references (one from a minister at least until 1970s) throughout the period in question. Extensive examples of testimonials and references have not been seen by this study, so it is impossible to indicate their content (for example, whether they referred to candidates' childcare experience).

Evidence does not exist in the records for all three providers for requests for references for auxiliary posts or for the spouses of auxiliary workers who were sometimes employed at the same time.

Was there any implicit or explicit set of characteristics that organisations sought in a candidate?

Until the early 1970s all three organisations placed emphasis on the 'Christian commitment' of applicants for management and childcare positions. At Aberlour, membership of the Scottish Episcopal Church or Church of England was sought in candidates for senior positions. At Quarrier's, applicants had to be from a Protestant denomination. Similarly, until roughly the late 1960s, Barnardo's favoured Protestants.

In addition, advertisements for posts indicate that both Aberlour and Quarrier's sought women with domestic skills (sewing, cooking, etc.) and men and women able to exercise discipline. In one case a military background was mentioned as desirable for male applicants. Quarrier's tended to recruit married couples as cottage houseparents but these were to be childless until around 1960. They also emphasised the desirable personal qualities of houseparents: 'big hearts', love of children. Experience with children was desirable for childcare posts until the early 1970s, but this could take many forms such as Sunday School or youth work (not necessarily in the residential care environment).

Childcare qualifications were not required/desired for posts in these institutions until the 1970s, with exception of nursery nurses (NNEB) and qualified, registered nurses (Matron positions and senior positions in residential nurseries). This is not surprising given the paucity of residential childcare training places in Scotland. By the 1970s, childcare qualifications were increasingly requested by all providers but the evidence reviewed does not indicate that it was a requirement that those in childcare roles should possess qualifications. On the evidence we have reviewed we can say that training appears to have been encouraged in so far as available resources allowed for this, and qualifications were an advantage, but they do not seem to have been compulsory for most childcare roles. On the evidence submitted, Barnardo's was the most committed to having a professionally trained workforce. However, they were larger and had more resources to enable this. The other two providers struggled more, both because of their own traditions and with releasing staff for training in numbers.

What were the profiles/backgrounds of applicants?

Records do not provide details of the profiles of all staff. However, some general observations can be made. Female staff employed in the care of younger children in all three providers tended to have nursing backgrounds or were trained nursery nurses. Quarrier's and Barnardo's also depended greatly on probationer nursery nurses within residential nurseries. Aberlour opened their own residential nursery in 1952 (formally opened 1953); this also had a small number of trainees.

Staff of both sexes in all three providers may have had experience of varieties of youth work until the 1960s (though some had none) but they had limited experience of residential child care unless they had moved within the institution. Aberlour recruited from the Episcopal clergy for the Warden and sub-Warden roles. By the early 1960s, staff in childcare positions were more likely to have some previous childcare experience (albeit often as internal appointments). By the 1980s at Barnardo's, senior staff had relevant qualifications and experience of the childcare system; by contrast in three homes run by Aberlour in 1979, none of the staff had any qualifications identified apart from a Matron (who was possibly a registered nurse).

Was there an induction for new staff? If so, what did this consist of? Was it obligatory?

There is no evidence of *formal* induction procedures in the records of any of the providers across the period. However, records do indicate that new staff were put on probation, anywhere from three to six months. Aberlour employed a three month probation period for some senior staff and childcare staff until the 1960s; by 1979 there is evidence of a six month probationary period. Likewise, at Quarrier's, there is some evidence of a three month probationary period in the 1930s for houseparent staff, but no evidence that this was applied to all staff positions. Records for the later period do not evidence probation policy. Induction procedures, or the lack of them, were heavily criticised in a 1965 official Scottish Office inspection of Quarrier's. The records we have reviewed from Barnardo's do not indicate whether new staff were formally inducted. However, a probationary period was included in the Terms and Conditions of Employment from the 1940s. By the 1970s there was a six month probationary period as standard and staff appraisal was introduced by the 1980s.

What training, if any, were staff required to attend?

In all three providers records do not indicate that training was a requirement for staff but by the late 1960s career progression was increasingly dependent on the possession of qualifications (evidenced by job advertisements which indicate that more senior staff would be expected to have qualifications).

There are differences evident in attitudes to staff training between the three organisations. Barnardo's throughout this period provided in-house training for staff, partnered with colleges to support nursery-nurse training, and supported staff to join professional associations and attend refresher courses and ongoing training if staff already had childcare qualifications.

Quarrier's introduced in-house training in the 1950s—it was not compulsory. In-service training (for example, refresher courses run by the central government and attendance at courses run by Further Education colleges) was limited until 1966, when it was made compulsory for staff without childcare qualifications. Quarrier's established an in-service training scheme in c.1968-9. Records do not indicate the extent of take-up by staff.

At Aberlour there was no in-house training in the orphanage years and records provide very limited information on attendance by staff at external training.

Secondments of staff to external training are recorded in the 1970s and, by the 1980s, in-service and external training was available.

Records for all three providers do not indicate a requirement on staff to attend training.

Were there any incentives and/or sanctions for attending or not attending training?

Records for all three providers do not indicate explicitly any incentives or sanctions, though Quarrier's offered a small additional payment for qualifications in the 1960s. As noted above, career progression and opportunity was affected by the possession of qualifications.

Who provided training?

Throughout the period, as noted above, training was provided variously in-house by the provider, by the Scottish Office and (following the 1968 Social Work Act) local authorities and Further Education colleges.

To what extent did the systems that were in place differ from one another?

Records indicate that staff recruitment and induction at all three organisations was broadly similar in respect of how staff were recruited and what checks were undertaken. It is likely that Barnardo's recruited internally (i.e. from homes in England). All three looked for similar qualities in their childcare and other staff and for most of the period the appropriate religious affiliation was required.

In respect of training, Barnardo's offered greater opportunities for in-house training and encouragement of training throughout the period, whilst Quarrier's and Aberlour were slower to support the take up of training either in-house or externally provided. There is no evidence to indicate that training or qualifications were made an absolute requirement in the period under review.

How did the systems that were in place work in practice and what impact did that have on children and young people?

Records indicate few 'systems' governing recruitment and training except for references/testimonials for new appointments.

There is no evidence in the records that the providers made it a requirement that staff underwent training until the 1980s. There is evidence from external inspection that many staff employed lacked the skills or experience to deal with numbers of emotionally disturbed children and adolescents, at least until the 1970s. In Aberlour Orphanage (and later in group homes) and Quarrier's Homes the lack of appropriate support for such staff is also noted in this type of document.

Discipline and Punishment

What systems existed in respect of the disciplining and punishment of children?

All three providers did issue guidance with respect to appropriate discipline and punishment—both their own and later, information about that issued within Scottish Office Regulations.

What guidance was issued to staff on the disciplining and punishment of children?

It was not until 1959 that the Scottish Office issued guidance to staff in children's homes on the use of corporal punishment and discipline in general. This guidance was explicit in permitting corporal punishment, but only within certain defined boundaries. Before this date each organisation issued its own guidance to staff. Aberlour's 'Rules Governing Punishment' were in use in the 1940s. This was a complex system which recorded transgressions, awarded black marks, and permitted corporal punishment. Aberlour's own records indicate that corporal punishment was forbidden in Aberlour homes in the 1960s, unless sanctioned by the Warden, but our review of the evidence offered no information on what guidance was issued to houseparents in Aberlour Group Homes in the 1970s.

In the case of Quarrier's, houseparents were issued with leather straps until the late 1960s as far as can be ascertained from the records (though some houseparents did not accept them). Standing Orders were issued in 1944 regulating discipline and punishments. These permitted corporal punishment within specific guidelines. It must be assumed that staff and especially houseparents, were made aware of these. Sometime in the 1950s Quarrier's issued Home Office Regulations regarding discipline and punishment which had been adapted to circumstances in Quarrier's Homes. The 1959 Scottish Office Regulations were issued to all Quarrier's houseparents in a newsletter. In around 1974 Quarrier's officially withdrew the use of corporal punishment but reintroduced it as a trial in 1977, though records do not indicate whether the trial continued or what policy replaced it.

Barnardo's issued guidance on punishment in *The Barnardo Book*, which provided guidance to all Barnardo's homes in the UK (in 1944 and updated in 1955). In 1951, they issued guidance to all homes following the 1951 England & Wales regulations and these were restated in *The Barnardo Book*. Corporal punishment was

discouraged. These regulations applied until the implementation of the 1959 Scottish Office Regulations. In 1977, Barnardo's issued a circular letter regarding corporal punishment (it forbade all corporal punishment with exception of smack on hand for child under ten), but records consulted do not indicate whether this was sent to the Scottish office of Barnardo's.

What recording was there of punishment?

Evidence in surviving records with respect to punishment is scant. Various records indicate that punishment books and other records of punishment were kept at various times by all three organisations and certainly the recording of punishment was required and sometimes staff were reminded to complete these, but examples have not survived.

Aberlour, in order to operate its disciplinary regime, maintained 'black mark books' at least until 1959, but they appear not to have survived. No example of punishment books or log books were provided to us by Aberlour but incidents of excessive punishment were sometimes included in Management Committee minutes. By the 1970s, recording of punishment appears in children's case files.

Quarrier's maintained an official 'Record of Punishments' in the 1940s, but copies have not been recovered. Punishment books were kept to record corporal punishment in 1950s and 1960s, but no surviving examples have been seen.

At Barnardo's the recording of punishment was required (detailed in *The Barnardo Book*) but punishment books in respect of Scottish homes, if they existed, have not been recovered. Some recording of punishments is to be found in the log books of individual homes (evidenced by log books from 1950s to 1960s).

To what extent did the systems that were in place differ from one another?

There was little consistency across all three organisations prior to 1959, when common rules regarding discipline and the exercise of punishment were applied via the Scottish Office 1959 Regulations. Each provider offered different guidance to staff but all accepted corporal punishment was permissible in some cases and within certain boundaries. Quarrier's maintained a belief in the value of corporal punishment into the 1970s when other providers were abandoning it.

It is impossible to compare the implementation of systems of discipline and systems of recording in the absence of punishment books or other systematic records for any of the providers.

How did the systems that were in place work in practice and what impact did that have on children and young people?

In the absence of records such as punishment books it is impossible to know how the guidance was put into practice. Other records offer an indication of the implementation of punishment regimes (such as inspection reports and log books), but these are not systematic and do not cover all homes and the entire period under investigation.

A few complaints about excessive punishment and indications of the use of implements to punish children (tawse, cane) indicate that corporal punishment was employed by some staff. The impact on children can only be inferred from surviving records, for example, evidence of emotional disturbance contained in children's case records. The latter type of evidence must be placed beside other aspects of children's experience both before and while they were in residential care.

Complaints

What systems existed in respect of making complaints about the treatment of children?

Evidence of prescribed and widely understood systems and procedures for handling complaints within organisations are not evident in the records available to us. Available records in general indicate that for most of the period (at least until late 1960s) any complaints by staff, children, or others would have been directed to the Warden, Superintendent, or director of the home in question.

What complaints were made by children and young people?

Evidence for the existence of complaints made by children in the period under review is extremely limited. This does not indicate that there were no complaints made; merely that if they were they were either not recorded or such records have not been retained. In the case of Quarrier's, a few allegations of mistreatment are contained in children's case files (two disclosures have been identified from the sample available). Aberlour Management committee minutes indicate there may have been complaints made by children, though evidence is not conclusive. Barnardo's records reviewed by us have not revealed complaints made by children about mistreatment by staff.

What complaints were made by staff?

The records reviewed once again indicate few staff complaints. Barnardo's records indicate no complaints made by staff. In the case of Quarrier's, no complaints by staff about the system of care are evident in the records available. Records do indicate a few instances of staff complaints about children and about staff treatment. At Aberlour, Management committee minutes and records created by the Scottish Office indicate there were some complaints made by staff about other staff and about the care of children. In 1961, the case of a former assistant housemaster was reported to police and this was recorded in Management Committee minutes.

What complaints were made by others?

The records do not indicate any specific complaints regarding Barnardo's, although an allegation about a member of staff in 1953 led to guidelines on how staff should respond to such an allegation in future. There were no references to such complaints in the Quarrier's records. For Aberlour, records produced by the Scottish Office indicate that complaints were made by others (social workers, parents) about

childcare practices at Aberlour in 1970s but these complaints have not been identified in Aberlour's own records.

What were the responses to complaints, including justifications for lack of action?

Given the paucity of evidence with regard to the systems for dealing with complaints this question is difficult to answer. At Quarrier's, records do indicate the organisation's responses to disclosures by children of mistreatment. In the case of Aberlour, complaints about a member of staff in 1970 led to the individual's dismissal and the case was reported to the Scottish Office. One consequence of this was that in the 1980s staff training was recommended.

What complaints procedures, if any, were in place and how did they work?

Records are limited. Barnardo's issued a guide to how staff should respond to complaints in 1953. At Quarrier's, a booklet of standing instructions (c.1950s) stated that complaints were to be made personally to the Superintendent. At Aberlour we have seen no record of formal complaints procedures across the timeframe.

To what extent did the systems that were in place differ from one another?

The sparseness of the records regarding complaints—both existence of and how handled—precludes an answer to this question. Records contain few concrete examples of complaints made and handled. Any complaints that have been identified were dealt with on a case by case basis.

How did the systems that were in place work in practice and what impact did that have on children and young people?

We have not identified complaint reporting 'systems' for any of the providers. Some very limited evidence from Quarrier's records regarding disclosures made by children suggests children may not have been believed or the child was treated as the problem.

Cases of complaints about the institutions from staff tended to be directed to external agencies (such as the Scottish Office).

The absence of a clear complaints system or the opportunity for children to raise concerns with an independent individual before all children had a designated social worker arguably left children at risk. (See Inspection and Monitoring below which highlights how external inspection of individual children's welfare was unlikely to offer children the opportunity to complain about treatment or care.)

Inspection and Monitoring

What external and internal inspection regimes were there?

External inspection of all residential homes was undertaken by the Scottish Office (Home then Education Department) until the early 1970s when responsibility for inspection and registration was passed to local authorities under the 1968 Social Work Act. Surviving Scottish Office Inspection records are partial. There remain some extant reports from 1930s, 1950s and 1960s; it is unclear if all homes were inspected annually.

In addition, Children's Officers of local authorities were responsible for visiting individual children in their care in voluntary homes throughout the period in question. Children *not* under the care of the local authority (i.e. those placed privately) were not visited by local authority officers before the Social Work Act and thus were not subject to any form of external monitoring apart from being seen by medical and education personnel.

Internal inspection and monitoring is more difficult to discern from the records. Before 1968, when social workers undertook the regular monitoring of children's wellbeing, there was a patchwork of internal inspection.

At Quarriers, monitoring of children's care was undertaken by the Superintendent and the Matron in charge until 1968. There is no evidence to indicate how often individual children were seen. At Aberlour, the Warden and sometimes the sub-Warden and lady Superintendent were responsible for internal supervision and monitoring at the orphanage. Members of the Board of Governors visited. Barnardo's had its own system of inspection undertaken by members of Council and HQ, and from the 1970s field workers employed by Barnardo's were assigned to residential homes.

How frequent were any inspections or monitoring?

The frequency of external inspection and monitoring is unclear from the records. Some homes were visited annually in the 1950s but frequency cannot be determined from surviving records. Some homes were likely visited more often than others. Quarrier's was visited frequently following the in-depth inspection by the Scottish Education Department (SED) in 1965.

Likewise the frequency of internal monitoring cannot be identified for any of the providers.

The inspection and monitoring of children in local authority care was meant to be every six months, increased to every three months after 1959. Records of such visits are noted in the children's case files maintained by the authorities, so within the remit of this report we are unable to say if this frequency was adhered to.

What were the stated criteria for inspections and judgements and recommendations?

Criteria for external and internal inspection have not been identified in the surviving records. External inspection reports, where available, indicate that judgements were made on quality of care broadly in line with the standards of the day.

What were the organisational responses to findings and recommendations?

With regard to external inspections, organisations did not receive the inspection report. Rather, recommendations were communicated either in writing or verbally at the conclusion of a visit. Quarrier's was inspected intensively in the 1960s. A raft of recommendations were communicated to the Superintendent. Quarrier's response was defensive and the organisation was slow to implement change. In Aberlour's case, there is evidence to indicate that the organisation heeded the advice of the Social Work Service Group's Central Advisory Service Report in 1979. In the case of Barnardo's, reports from Barnardo's Scotland were reviewed at Barnardo's HQ in London. Where there is evidence of a home experiencing difficulties, Barnardo's closed it or changed its function.

To what extent did the systems that were in place differ from one another?

External inspection and monitoring was common to all providers across the period though some were inspected more frequently than others. With regard to internal monitoring, records are sparse, making it difficult to compare and contrast systems. Barnardo's likely operated a more centralised monitoring system directed from London.

How did the systems that were in place work in practice and what impact did that have on children and young people?

External inspection was carried out until the early 1970s; thereafter there is no evidence in the records of external monitoring of homes (as opposed to individual children) once local authorities took responsibility. Such evidence would likely be found in local authority records. Criteria applied by external inspectors have not been identified. No evidence has so far been located in records of local authority registration monitoring.

Inspection of individual children by local authority children's officers and social workers is indicated by the records, though not systematically. There is little indication of frequency (i.e. whether they adhered to visiting every six months, then every three months) and records do not indicate whether Children's Officers applied specific criteria to children's wellbeing. Children not under local authority care were not monitored by anyone until the 1960s, when social workers were assigned to each child (by this time the majority of children cared for by these providers came via local authorities).

It is difficult from the records available to comment on how the efficacy or otherwise of inspection systems impacted upon children. Recommendations regarding improvements in material conditions may have impacted positively on children's wellbeing. There is no evidence in the records to indicate that external inspectors before the 1970s met with children independently.

Placement and review of children

What systems existed in respect of the placement of children with the providers and review of placements? What were the criteria for placing children with the provider?

In the case of all three providers plentiful information is usually provided in case file records on the reasons why a child has been removed from their family, but these records do not usually indicate criteria for placing a child with the specific organisation or a particular home (or cottage in case of Quarrier's). The exception, in a very small number of cases, is Barnardo's, which offered specialist provision (e.g. Craigerne school).

What reviews were there of children's placements?

It is impossible to generalise about the quantity and quality of reviews of children and placements over the period in question, owing to the variable quality of children's case files. In general, however, Barnardo's maintained full records for children across the period under review containing annual reports, reviews of placement, requirements for specialist intervention, and medical and school reports. These become more thorough from the 1960s.

In the case of Aberlour and Quarrier's, reviews were sparse or non-existent until the 1960s and even then, there is no consistency of record keeping. At Quarrier's, from the late 1960s, case files tended to include more copious and regular case reviews and fuller records of a child's wellbeing and progress. Children were sometimes referred to Quarrier's own psychologist. At Aberlour, there is no evidence of regular reviews of wellbeing or suitability of placement until the 1960s when houseparents produced monthly reports. The 1970s saw a change in the quality and regularity of reviews to include annual reviews, monthly houseparent reports, and social worker reports and notes.

What were the reasons for removal of children from the provider?

All three providers recorded 'removals' in case files as: return to family, removal to another home, or discharge upon school leaving age. However, records are not consistent in noting details of reasons for removal to another children's home.

Returns home to a child's family are recorded and brief details usually provided. In some cases staff liaised with families about their circumstances to enable children's return.

To what extent did the systems that were in place differ from one another?

Aberlour and Quarrier's operated inconsistent reviews of children until the 1960s, with little evidence from records that suitability of placement was reviewed. Barnardo's, on the other hand, operated a full review system throughout the period evidenced by extensive case files.

All children were subject to regular monitoring of welfare and progress when assigned their own social worker in the 1960s. Across all providers reviews of children improved markedly following the 1968 Social Work Act. This is particularly in cases where the Children's Panel were involved and regular reports were produced for them. Surviving reports of this nature are easier to identify in Barnardo's case files. They are in Quarrier's material but are sometimes difficult to identify because these files are not well maintained.

How did the systems that were in place work in practice and what impact did that have on children and young people?

There appear to have been no or few 'systems' in place to determine suitability of a child's placement and no evidence of detailed assessment of the suitability of a provider or individual home for a child's needs, at least until the 1970s. There are some exceptions, such as Barnardo's residential schools and homes specifically designated for 'maladjusted' children that opened in the 1950s and 1960s. There is no evidence in the records of detailed assessments being undertaken and the child's needs matched with a suitable home. This must mean that in some cases children were placed in unsuitable homes for their needs.

The absence of regular reviews of children's progress and wellbeing, at least until the 1960s in Aberlour and Quarrier's, suggests that children may not have been receiving support for their needs (for example, help with enuresis or emotional disturbance). After the 1968 Social Work Act and the introduction of designated social workers for each child, children's wellbeing and placement were more likely to be externally monitored. When more regular and detailed reviews and monitoring of children's

wellbeing was introduced there was a greater likelihood of children receiving interventions from other professionals.

After care

What systems existed in respect of after care?

What were the arrangements and procedures for transition to leaving care?

Barnardo's operated an aftercare service from its inception in Scotland and endeavoured to maintain the Barnardo's family via the Barnardo's Guild.

Neither Aberlour nor Quarrier's had a designated aftercare service as far as records indicate, although Quarrier's did employ someone to look after leavers in the 1950s. Information on how after care operated is scant and disjointed in the records reviewed, but by the mid-1960s Quarrier's did employ some field workers (not trained social workers) called childcare officers who may have been involved with this. At Aberlour, transitions to post-care before the 1970s were managed via the Warden or his officers. This changed in the 1970s, once most of the children at Aberlour and Quarrier's were placed by local authorities. Children's officers and social workers then took on the responsibility of transition to independent living.

What provision was made for children leaving care (such as accommodation, employment and education)?

Each provider operated a different 'system' to support children leaving care. Barnardo's operated training establishments, hostels, and later units within homes, for those transitioning to independent living. Quarrier's transferred some children to Overbridge in Glasgow to manage their transition to training or work, and girls were found lodgings or hostel accommodation. Quarrier's also used vacant cottages for those transitioning to leaving care. Aberlour established an aftercare hostel in Aberdeen in 1960.

One approach to transitioning children to work employed by both Aberlour and Quarrier's was to employ significant numbers of care leavers in their own institutions in domestic and labouring work until late 1960s. Limited numbers of children transitioned to Higher Education though there some evidence of support being provided by Aberlour to those who did.

What ongoing contact was there between providers and children who had left care?

Barnardo's operated the Barnardo's Guild and a newsletter that former 'old boys and girls' were encouraged to subscribe to. They were also encouraged to maintain contact with houseparents and other care leavers.

Aberlour and Quarrier's appear to have operated no formal system for maintaining contact with leavers. At Aberlour, the Warden was the point of contact for correspondence and at Quarrier's, the Superintendent. An old boys' hostel was established in the Aberlour orphanage grounds to accommodate former residents.

To what extent did the systems that were in place differ from one another?

Barnardo's operated an aftercare system from the outset of its operations in Scotland and whilst precise operational details are unclear, after care was recognised as an integral part of the service to children in care with dedicated welfare officers.

Aberlour and Quarrier's appear not to have had 'systems' in place to manage children's transition and arrangements for training and work appear to have been made by Warden/Superintendent contacts; by the late 1960s/1970s transition to independence was increasingly managed by social workers.

How did the systems that were in place work in practice and what impact did that have on children and young people?

Systems in as far as they existed were seemingly implemented.

The absence of a joined-up aftercare service and the absence of trained aftercare staff as far as we can tell from records supplied by Aberlour and Quarrier's suggests care leavers' options were limited. It is clear that employment destinations for young people cared for by all three organisations were 'traditional'—the armed services, merchant marine, farm work and trades for boys; domestic work, nursing, and care roles for girls. There are few instances noted of children attending Higher Education. Records indicate that care leavers were very often dependent on the organisation to place them in work.

Support for the transition to work became more focused on the child's needs from the 1960s and young people were supported for longer with accommodation and employment.

Conclusions

This research into the extent to which records indicate the existence of systems and processes relating to a number of areas of child care over the period 1930-1990 allows us to draw a number of general conclusions.

- Before the 1960s—and particularly before the implementation of the 1968 Social Work Act—the systems operated by all three providers were inconsistent with one another. Each operated its own procedures, especially in the absence of guidance or regulations from the state.
- Common features across all three organisations include: approaches to staff recruitment, lack of clear guidance on dealing with complaints, and external inspection regimes.
- In all three organisations there is little recorded evidence that children placed with them were assessed for suitability for that particular childcare provider or for any particular children's home within that organisation.
- There are clear differences between Barnardo's record keeping and the record keeping of Aberlour and Quarrier's. This is especially evident in respect of children's case files.
- Similarly, Barnardo's conducted reviews of children's wellbeing and progress throughout the period under review. Evidence from Aberlour and Quarrier's case files indicates a failure to keep children under review until the 1960s.
- There are clear differences also between Barnardo's pro-active approach to staff training and to the after care of care leavers and that of the other two organisations.