Chapter 1
Introduction: children, young people and 'care'
John Horton and Michelle Pyer

Preface: three articulations of childhood, youth and 'care'

"Warm, sensitive, and responsive care is the foundation of sociomoral behaviour…Parenting and communal practices such as breastfeeding, touch, alloparenting, and play…are associated with important physiological and psychological outcomes that significantly raise the likelihood of a child interacting with others in prosocial ways…A community of individuals who receive the kind of parenting…associated with sociomoral flourishing is more likely to create a community in which joy and well-being are fostered by and for all" (Gleason and Narvaez, 2014, p.335, 345).

"Today, President Obama outlined his plan to make affordable, quality child care available to every working and middle-class family with young children. His plan includes: making a landmark investment…that helps every eligible family with young children afford high-quality child care;…[and]creating a new innovation fund to help states design programs that better serve families that face…challenges in finding quality care" (White House, 2015, unpaginated).

"**Young people don't care about politics... or do they?**
With the EU referendum just months away, campaigners from both sides of the debate are trying to energise and engage with 18 to 24-year-olds so that they vote...Their turnout in political elections is usually lower than any other age group…Research suggests a significant proportion are not interested in politics and do not turn out to vote" (BBC, 2016, unpaginated).

Starting points: contextualising 'care'

In so many contexts, and in all kinds of ways, when we think about childhood and youth we are always already thinking in terms of 'care'. The very notions of childhood and youth are intimately, normatively and fundamentally connected to contemporary assumptions, discourses and spaces of care, caring and care-giving. Thus, as suggested by our preface, we might find ourselves habitually working to provide safe, nurturing, happy, responsive, sensitive environments for children or young people in our care, or debating the merits or limitations of policy interventions relating to child-care or youth support, or critically reflecting upon the extent to which children and young people (do not) care about democratic processes and political issues. As the first prefatory example articulates, the provision of care is widely figured as both *the* primary responsibility of parents, carers and practitioners who work with children and young people, and *the* primary factor in shaping children and young people's development, education, socialisation, wellbeing and contentment. While specific practices and spaces of care may be socially and historically contingent (as evidenced by diverse anthropological and historical examples of familial, domestic, cultural or communitarian behaviours in relation to care) the expectation that children and young people should be

1

'cared-for', 'nurtured', 'supported' and allowed to 'flourish' by adults may be instinctual, and is certainly so widely-recurrent as to appear essential and fundamental. This normative, discursive responsibilisation of adult *care-for* children and young people is widely reproduced within extensive frameworks of state policy interventions, legal/statutory programmes and institutional spaces devoted to care-provision. In diverse contexts, familial and domestic caring practices are increasingly shaped, regulated and mediated by local, regional, national, and supranational policy, legal and institutional infrastructures. And, as in our second prefatory example, these are often explicitly named as spaces of, or plans for, 'care': as in the global preponderance of policies relating to 'child-care', 'social care', or services provided for young people 'in-care' over the last century. These complex, shifting and often-precarious geographies of formalised care, welfare and service provision are instrumental (for better or worse) in constituting the everyday lives of many children, young people and families. However, as the third example on the preface suggests, children and young people themselves are rarely figured as key actors in the provision of care. In many contexts, an overwhelming presumption that children and young people are to be cared-for, has effectively marginalised their agencies and responsibilities as carers, or in relation to practices and spaces of care. More widely, young people (perhaps particularly teenagers) are too-often represented as *uncaring* and apathetic in relation to all manner of political, social and community issues.

This edited collection draws together new research exploring these kinds of interconnections between childhood, youth and care. Although chapters are predominantly written by researchers working in the disciplinary tradition of Human Geography – representing the significant array of geographical work on children, young people and families (see Kraftl et al 2014, Skelton et al 2016, and the international journal *Children's Geographies*) – they engage with a remarkably diverse range of conceptual and empirical work on the topic of 'care'. In the following chapters, the term 'care' surfaces in different ways in diverse research contexts and via parallel theoretical or methodological traditions. Indeed, a key point of this book is to demonstrate and juxtapose some of the complex, multiple ways in which care happens and matters and is articulated in diverse scholarly contexts, and in different children and young people's lives. It is therefore hard, and arguably problematic, to settle on a neat, singular definition of 'care' (see Bowlby et al 2010, pp.39-41, Milligan and Wiles 2010, pp.737-738). However, as a minimal and inclusive point of departure we understand care, in the geographer David Conradson's (2003a, p.508) terms, as "the proactive interest of one

person in the well-being of another". As Sophie Bowlby (2011, p.618) notes, in practice this definition encompasses a wide range of tasks, relationships, situations and modes of "intimacy, care and support that people use to get through the vicissitudes of life, both major and minor". Many authors have attempted to map the multiple ways in which care exists and matters in different situations, relationships and practices (see Barnes 1997, 2012, Noddings 2013, Rogers and Weller 2013). For example, the feminist political scientist Joan Tronto's (1993) fourfold typology of phases and capacities of care has been widely influential. As table 1.1 summarises, Tronto (1989, 1993, 2013, also Fisher and Tronto 1990) argues that care can entail at least four different kinds of activity, and at least four distinctive, corresponding kinds of moral-ethical disposition (note that although these fundamental activities are termed 'phases', Tronto recognises that they may very often overlap, repeat, intersect and occur in complex nonlinear sequences)…

[Table 1.1 about here]

…As we outline in the following section, this kind of typology has been the basis for a series of important critical theorisations of the politics and ethics of care. In particular, a great deal of social scientific work begins from a distinction between what are typically termed *caring-about* (corresponding to point 1 of Tronto's typology) vis-à-vis *caring-for* (approximately corresponding to points 2, 3 and 4). As Milligan and Wiles (2010) explain, *caring-for* "implies a specific subject as the focus of caring" whereas *caring-about* comprises "a more general form of commitment that refers to less concrete objects". Thus while caring-about is theorised as a somewhat generalised disposition toward, or feeling of, *being caring* , the more specific work of caring-for may encompass performances of caring-for including diverse,

> "activities undertaken by formal paid workers or informal, unpaid workers such as family, friends and volunteers. It exceeds the norms of reciprocity commonly practiced between adults… At its most fundamental, caring *for* is about the personal, the performance of proximate and personal care tasks but it can include other everyday tasks such as childminding, pet care or household tasks. At a distance it can involve arranging and monitoring paid and professional care" (pp.740-741).

Or, moreover, as Bowlby (2011) elaborates,

> "[care] can involve 'caring for' – that is tasks of care – as well as 'caring about', which refers to emotional investment in another person's problems and concerns. Clearly the two are related but 'caring about' does not necessarily lead to 'caring for', while 'caring for' can occur without 'caring about'. However, the experience of 'caring for' often leads to 'caring about' someone. Care is part of many different kinds of social relationship – for example, care can be paid or unpaid, formal or informal, and may result from social obligation, lover, fear or because of a need for income" (p.606).

The sociologist Carol Thomas (1993) further highlights the complexity of the term 'care' by identifying seven dimensions which characterise any caring practice. The seven dimensions are listed in table 1.2 alongside some prompts for reflection: you may find it productive to use these prompts to think about how any particular act of care (perhaps one from your own work, or from the following chapters) is distinctly patterned in relation to each of the seven dimensions.

[Table 1.2 about here]

As Bowlby et al (2010) note, the dimensions listed in table 1.2 can combine in different ways so that different events of care are patterned and differentiated as a result of the distinctive, contingent constituent features of carers, care-recipients, care practices and social-economic and spatial-institutional contexts. Thus, for example, these dimensions can combine to constitute types of care as diverse as "formal elderly care in America provided by a private firm; informal care exchanged among family members in Africa, or 'free' childcare provided by a state-run nursery in Europe", and ranging across all manner of "domains in which care takes place (such as the family, workplace, hospital) as well as… many types of relations (including intimate partner, relatives, friends, work colleagues)" (Bowlby et al 2010, p.40). Even more complexity and multidimensionality is suggested by a wide range of studies which identify diverse caregiving 'styles' among individuals, care professionals, or organisations. Corcoran's (2011) typology of family caregiving styles in relation to elderly relatives in one particular study in north America (see table 1.3) provides just one illustration of ways in which diverse caring dispositions, habits and preferences may be constituted by individuals' personality, positionality, upbringing, experiences, resources, behavioural styles, social capital and/or social-environmental factors.

[Table 1.3 about here]

Having contextualised the topic and practice of care, the flowing sections of this chapter outline why care has come to be a core concern of much multidisciplinary research over the last two decades. We then develop an argument that recent scholarly work on care poses some particularly important challenges and questions for researchers and practitioners engaging with children, young people and families in diverse

contexts. In the chapter's final section we outline how the authors represented in this collection contribute to this context via a range of new theoretical discussions, research findings and critical reflections on the question of children, young people and care.

So, why care?

The chapters collected in this volume have emerged from, and extend, a large body of multidisciplinary research on diverse aspects of care over the last two decades. For example, one can trace sustained turns to address questions of care in academic disciplines as diverse as Anthropology, Childhood Studies, Early Years practice, Education, Gender Studies, Gerontology, Geography, History, Medicine, Nursing, Occupational Health, Organisational Studies, Philosophy, Playwork, Political Science, Psychology, Social Care, Social Policy, Social Work, Sociology and Youthwork, as evidenced by a substantial array of interdisciplinary edited collections (Brechin et al 1999, Rossi 2001, Dermott and Seymour 2011, Engster and Hamington 2015), literature reviews (Parr 2003, Atkinson et al 2011, Milligan and Wiles 2010) and special issues of scholarly journals (Conradson 2003b, Staeheli and Brown 2003, Raghuram et al 2009, McEwan and Goodman 2010, Zhang and Jean Yeung 2012). This body of work has produced a substantial range of important, rich, thought-provoking material which has challenged researchers and practitioners to *care more about care*. Here, we highlight three particularly important challenges which recur across this multidisciplinary context.

First, multidisciplinary work on care has made plain the significance of caring practices in/for individuals' everyday lives, and also in the ongoing constitution of relationships, homes, families, communities, solidarities, friendships, workplaces, institutions, localities, activisms, civilities, cosmopolitanisms, citizenships, public spaces, and all manner of social-cultural collectives. As we have already suggested, everyday caring practices may take the form of intimately-co-present, proximate, embodied, microgeographical encounters; perhaps,

> "help with personal and intimate activities such as bathing, toileting, or dressing, and activities such as preparing meals, shopping, arranging travel, or manage finances…, everyday acts of practical and emotional support" (Wiles 2011, p.574; see also Milligan 2000, Twigg 2000).

Alternatively, everyday caring practices may be constituted via more spatially complex or translocal practices (Brickell and Datta 2011), or via particular ethical dispositions towards 'distant others' (Silk 1998, 2004) or encounters with 'other' people, places or co-presences (Amin 2002, Barnett 2005, Laurier and Philo 2006, Bell 2007). Research on diverse forms of everyday caring practice has evidenced how such activities matter to individuals (e.g. in terms of emotional significance, preoccupation of time and energy), constitute manifold social-relational connections, and are important foci of multiple forms of paid and unpaid work. However, despite their substantial personal, psychological, socio-cultural, economic, societal and political importance there is considerable evidence of the extent to which everyday caring practices have been significantly, effectively systematically, marginalised, undervalued and concealed within most societal formations (Lawson 2007). A key accomplishment of feminist scholarship on care has been to politicise everyday caring practices to contest this inequity. Thus, for Tronto (1993),

> "care as a political concept requires that we recognise how care – especially the question, who cares for whom? – marks relations of power in our society and marks the intersections of gender, race and class with care-giving" (pp168-169).

It remains the case that answers to the question 'who cares for whom?' reveal overwhelmingly, inequitably gendered, classed and raced divisions of labour: in so many contexts, everyday caring practices are disproportionately done by women and marginalised social groups, and many kinds of caring practices done by women and marginalised social groups are disproportionately undervalued, low-paid or unpaid. In the UK for example, domestic care for children and relatives, employment in jobs which entail hands-on care-provision (e.g. nursing), participation in voluntary work which involves caring practices, and 'extracurricular' taking-on of caring roles (e.g. within educational institutions) all remain significantly, and often overwhelmingly, gendered and politically-culturally-economically undervalued (Silk 1998, ONS 2013, HSCIC 2014, Skills for Care 2015). Thus feminist theorists of care have been important in articulating how, overwhelmingly,

> "care work is women's work. Paid and unpaid, located at home, in voluntary organisations or in the labour force, the overwhelming majority of care is provided by women. It is often invisible, usually accorded little value and only sometimes recognised as skilled" (Armstrong and Armstrong 2001, p.1).

Drawing on longstanding feminist critiques of the (non)place of unpaid domestic and maternal labour in contemporary, international economic systems (see Boserup 1970, Young 1981, Glazer 1984, Nicholson 1988, Gardiner 1997) many authors, such as England (2010), historicise the marginalisation of everyday care – and separation of ''work'-production-public' from 'care-reproduction-private' practices as follows:

"[The] gendering of work has its ideological and historical roots in the social and spatial separation of waged work from social reproduction. 'Work' became constituted as 'economically productive' waged-labour that took place outside the home. Housekeeping, caring for family members and other domestic' activities became non-marketised 'labours of love' primarily associated with the private sphere of family and home, and assumed to be primarily the responsibility of wives and mothers" (p.133).

A second major contribution of recent multidisciplinary research on care has been to highlight and explore the complex spatialities of care. For example, an important lineage of work has explored the social-political construction of, and care experiences within, designated spaces and institutions of care. There are rich and affecting seams of research on spaces such as asylums (Philo 1997, 2004), hospitals (Allen 2001, Rowland 2014), hospices (Vivat 2002, Brown 2003), therapeutic landscapes (Williams 2007), mental health services (Kearns and Joseph 2000, Parr 2000, 2008), food banks (Lambie-Mumford and Green 2015), homeless shelters (Williams 1996, Brinegar 2003, Cloke et al 2008, Daya and Wilkins 2013), and community outreach/care services such as those delivered via faith-based or 'post-secular' organisations (Conradson 2003a, Cloke and Beaumont 2013). As well as vividly evoking daily life in these kids of spaces, this line of research has been significant in evidencing how spaces of care – and care-work therein – continue to undergo transformation as a result of processes of professionalisation, commodification, neoliberalisation, regulation and economic restructuring (Williams 2002, Smith 2005, Green and Lawson 2011, Hall 2011). However, as Hall (2011) notes, social scientific research on care has also increasingly shifted its focus beyond these formally designated sites of care to develop an expanded sense of the manifold spaces where care happens (e.g. homes (see Dyck et al 2005, England 2010), or informal or deinstitutionalised sites of community-based care), and also the complex spatialities of care-itself. For example, this latter shift might be detected in recent studies which carefully detail complex geographies such as global migrations of care-workers (Dyer et al 2008, Huang et al 2012), translocal care-giving within diasporic communities (Datta et al 2010), or caring (and indeed *uncaring* and exclusionary) gestures within urban public spaces (Valentine 2008, Laurier et al 2002, Laurier and Philo 2006). A number of Human Geographers working in this context have sought to developing broader theorisations of the spatialities of care. For example, Milligan and Wiles (2010, p.740) use the term *landscapes of care* to think through the "complex and organisational spatialities that emerge from and through the relationships of care". They describe the concept of *landscapes of care* as part and parcel of attempts to,

"articulate care through the differing, and sometimes surprising, social spaces that enable caring interactions…; as individual space-time trajectories through varied social landscapes of care, care-giving roles, employment and social policies, and gendered and generational expectations of care and work…; through the entanglements of inclusion and exclusion, dependency and independency that can manifest

within and across formal and informal space of care…; and through the emotional landscapes that underpin care and care interactions" (Milligan and Wiles 2010, p.738).

They note that these landscapes typically traverse diverse institutional, domestic, familial, community, public, voluntary, private, interpersonal and international geographies Similarly, Sophie Bowlby and Linda McKie use the linked concepts of *caringscapes* and *carescapes* to prompt reflection upon the complex spatialities of any caring practice. They describe *caringscapes* as the

> "shifting and changing multidimensional terrain that comprises people vision of caring responsibilities and obligations: routes that are influenced by everyday scheduling, combining caring work with paid work and the paid work of carers… People create routes through 'caringscapes', which change and evolve as they move through the lifecourse" (McKie and Bowlby 2004, p.2).

Since the concept of *caringscapes* is a touchstone of many chapters in this book, box 1.1 presents a fuller introduction to this idea

[Box 1.1 about here]

Bowlby (2012) also deploys the term *carescape* to denote one particular set of features of the *caringscape* terrain. Thus *carescape* specifically refers to,

> "the resource and service context shaping the 'caringscape terrain'. Thus we might talk about the 'carescape' of a local government area, a nation state or a particular organisation…For example, in a recent project… we have begun to flesh out the notion of carescape by showing how the 'organisation carescape' – the care policies and practices of employing organisations – affect the caringscapes of individual employees within and beyond the workplace" (Bowlby 2011, pp.2112-2113).

Taking these concepts together, Bowlby et al (2010) present a list of propositions about caringscapes which are designed as a framework to assist researchers, practitioners and policy-makers in reflecting upon caring practices. Their eight propositions are reproduced in table 1.4.

[Table 1.4 about here]

As Bowlby et al's propositions about caringscapes as relational, ethical, political and critically-reflective suggest, the topic of care has increasingly been a prompt for wide-ranging and challenging political-ethical reflection among social scientific researchers. Indeed, a third major contribution of multidisciplinary work on care has been to focus discussion on the present and potential ethics of care. Thus, as Atkinson et al (2011)

note, the concept of care has been an important point of mobilisation for politically-charged feminist, political and communitarian critiques of contemporary societies and academic practices. In particular, theorisations of an *ethic of care* have been powerfully influential. Feminist scholars including Tronto (1993, 2013; see also table 1.1) have long argued that normative contemporary social and political structures could be reimagined and recast if greater value were given to caring relationships. As outlined in the preceding section, Tronto (1993) focuses attention on the practical and ethical underpinnings of caring practices. It is also noteworthy that her vision of an ethic of care is predicated upon a wide-ranging conceptualisation of caring responsibilities, such that,

> "caring [should] be viewed as a species activity that includes everything we do to maintain, continue and repair our "world" so that we can live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies, our selves and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web" (p.103).

This vision of an ethic of care both challenges individuals to foster an everyday 'habit of care' in relation to the bodies, selves, co-presences and environments encountered in daily life (Tronto 1993, p.127), and demands a broader recasting of assumptions about citizenship which,

> "requires that citizens take seriously the responsibility for 'caring with' each other… To do so requires a change in the values of citizens. It requires that citizens care enough about caring – both in their own lives and in the lives of their fellow citizens – to accept that they bear the political burden of caring for the future" (Tronto 2013, p.xii).

This ethic of care is therefore powerful in envisioning social-political arrangements focused around personal and communitarian relationships of care, in stark contrast to many normative prevailing social-political inequities (Sevenhuijsen 1998, McDowell 2004, Smith 2005, Held 2006, Lawson 2007). For Milligan and Wiles (2010), thinking-with the concept of *ethic of care*,

> "could be a framework not just for understanding who gives care, where and why… but also for understanding how an approach informed by care might enlightened our entire way of collective and individual being" (p.743).

The implications of this way of thinking – which Milligan and Wiles characterise as fostering more '*care-ful*' or 'passionate' modes of work – are potentially wide-ranging. Lawson (2007) describes the visionary, hopeful criticality of an *ethic of care* in the following, affecting terms.

> "What do I mean by care ethics?...Care ethics questions (neo)liberal principles of individualism, egalitarianism, universalism, and of society organised exclusively around principles of efficiency, competition and a 'right' price for everything. Under neoliberal principles, care is a private affair, occurring in homes and families. In the privatization of care, we construct certain sorts of people as in need of care – the infirm, the young/elderly, the dependent, the flawed – ignoring the fact that we, all of

us, give and need care. By contrast, a feminist ethic of care begins from the centrality of care work and care relations to our lives and societies. Care ethics begins with a social ontology of connection: foregrounding social relationships of mutuality and trust…Care ethics understands all social relations as contextual, partial, attentive, responsive, and responsible…[C]are ethics is concerned with structuring relationships in ways that enhance mutuality and well-being. Care ethics also demands attention to emotions and affective relations (of love, concern, and connection) because of the complex ways in which power is embedded within them…[C]are ethics suggests different ways of theorizing politics…[W]e are not the autonomous individual imagined in liberal political theory, rather we are all profoundly interdependent, and yet not all equally burdened with the work of care" (p.3).

This book seeks to extend this rich seam of work on practices, scapes and political-ethical dimensions of care. Specifically, we have drawn together chapters which foreground and exemplify children and young people's diverse presences, roles and responsibilities in relation to care. In so doing, our broader aim is to bring multidisciplinary theorisations of childhood and youth into closer inter-relation with contemporary theorisations of care, caringscapes and ethics of care.

Children and young people *do care*

Although care has come to be a core concern of such a range of interdisciplinary academic research, we are struck by the way in which work in this context has, to date, rarely engaged directly with children and young people. Research *with* – rather than *about* – children and young people in relation to care seems to us to be, problematically, rather marginalised; certainly, it is relatively rare to encounter children and young people's *own* voices, experiences, issues, practices, politics and ethics represented within the very rich body of work on care, caringscapes and ethics of care (for some important exceptions see Robson 2004, Weller 2007, Bartos 2012, Wood 2013, 2016, Day and Evans 2015, Day 2016). Evans (2012) argues that this absence is part and parcel of wider normative, minority world social-cultural constructions of children and young people as 'dependent' 'care recipients', not actively engaged in 'care-giving' themselves. We would further suggest that this assumption is compounded by a range of related social-political discourses and contemporary habits of academic research, particularly: (i) still-prevalent normative binaristic cultural, media and policy discourses of children and young people as *feared* or *feared-for* (in Valentine's (1996; also James and James 2005) oft-cited terms, as vulnerable 'angels' or threatening 'devils'), which do not readily acknowledge or accommodate children and young people's caring practices and roles; (ii) a still-evident tendency (outlined in the preceding section) for everyday care (including intergenerational and intragenerational caring practices involving children and young people) to be somewhat marginalised, undervalued and concealed within many societal formations and modes of scholarship; and (iii) a tendency

for critically valuable work analysing macro- geographical, political and economic aspects of care (e.g. processes of care- neoliberalisation, commodification and regulation previously mentioned) to direct attention away from everyday, intimate, micro-geographical spaces in which care (and perhaps particularly many forms of care involving children and young people) *happens* and *matters*.

Against this grain, this collection brings together a range of multidisciplinary and international research which directly engages with children and young people in relation to care. The collection thus foregrounds a diverse, often-neglected practices, spaces and ethics of care involving children and young people. We suggest that this focus upon children, young people and care is particularly important for three reasons. First, simply, caring practices and experiences are a significant, though often overlooked, part of many children and young people's lives (Harris and Wyn 2009, Bartos 2012, Wood 2016). Children and young people are cared-for and – although this seems to be less often recognised – they *do care* in all kinds of ways, and within all kinds of caring relationships, reciprocities and caringscapes. The Geographer Ruth Evans' work has been important here, both in evidencing and highlighting the existence of children and young people's caring roles and in considering how children's and young people's care intersects with complex mobilities, politics, social-cultural changes and lifecourse transitions within and between particular case study locations (R.Evans 2010, 2012, 2015, R.Evans and Becker 2009). Taking our cue from this pioneering work, the chapters collated in this book provide further evidence of children and young people's diverse experiences and practices of care. They show how care permeates children and young people's lives as they receive care, *care-for*, *care-about* and habitually constitute *scapes*, *politics* and *ethics* of care in all manner of geographical, political and social and historical contexts.

Second, it is the case that a whole range of designated, purposely-constructed spaces of care are important for many children and young people's lives. As we noted in the preceding section, a great deal of social scientific work has explored the histories and experiences of spaces such as hospitals, mental health services, homeless shelters and spaces of community outreach and care. Many chapters in this book complicate and extend this body of research, both by considering the often-underresearched presence of children and young people in these kinds of spaces, and by highlighting the existence of many other institutions and built environments specifically designed for the care of children and young people. Thus the following chapters include consideration of care practices in spaces such as early childhood centres, classrooms, orphanages,

and specialist secure care units in diverse national and political contexts. In so doing, they prompt reflection upon so many other forms of specialist space constructed for the care of children and young people: in effect, they demand further research on many other spaces of care, elsewhere and otherwise (perhaps engaging with children, young people and care in settings like spaces of refuge, crisis care, emergency care, respite care, youthwork, social work, playwork, social care, medical care, palliative care, convalescence, residential and domiciliary care, play, education, therapeutic or counselling contexts). Moreover, the following chapters also call attention to the significant array of pre-emptive biopolitical and state projects which target and regulate the care of children and young people, and underpin the construction of spaces of/for care, politically, discursively, materially and affectively (B.Evans 2010, B.Evans et al 2011, Pykett 2011, 2015, Jones et al 2013). So much of many children and young people's lives is lived with/in designated spaces of care – and governed via policy interventions and regulatory mechanisms which shape caring practices – so the following chapters signpost important ways of researching, understanding and theorising contemporary childhood and youth.

Indeed, third, we would like to suggest that the linked concepts of *care*, *caringscapes* and *ethics of care* potentially offer an important new lens for (re)thinking childhood and youth in a number of ways. We wonder whether thinking-with the concepts and language of 'care' might permit discussion of children and young people's lives without immediate recourse to some normative ideas and assumptions which are habitually associated with childhood and youth. For example, we suggest that concepts of care, caringscapes and ethics of care might make it possible to write and think about children and young people without necessarily falling back upon normative and often-presumptive ideals like Family, Home, Parenthood, Education, Citizenship, Participation, Child Development, and the aforementioned 'Angel'/'Devil' dualism. The following chapters seem to us to offer a series of openings to (re)think childhood and youth more care-fully: acknowledging that children and young people's lives are full of caring relationships and practices; recognising children and young people's presence in, and relationships to, designated spaces of care; critically reflecting upon ways in which complex, diverse care practices and caringscapes are often reductively labelled and understood via a series of arguably quite limited and normatively-loaded concepts (e.g. Family); and always working towards more careful, ethical, hopeful and affirmative ways of working with children and young people, in whatever capacity. As the following collection has materialised, we have increasingly developed a sense that consideration of care can unsettle many prevalent adultist ways of

knowing and researching childhood and youth. Perhaps most immediately, the acknowledgement that

children and young people *do care* – for each other, for family-members, for spaces, for nonhuman

copresences, for issues, for principles, for places, for all kinds of stuff – should challenge many adults

(ourselves included) to figure out some new ways of imagining, writing about, relating to and working with

children and young people (see also Weller 2007, Harris et al 2010, Day and Evans 2015). All those

normative popular, media and political discourses which figure children and young people solely as

dependent *care-recipients*, or as apathetic and *uncaring*, or as folk 'devils' *to-be-feared* 'angels' *to-be-

feared-for*… They simply don't give the full picture. Children and young people *do care*, and it is simply not

accurate or adequate or fair to think otherwise. We also share Ruth Evans' (2012) sense that noticing

everyday, embodied, relational care practices marks a challenge to developmental categories and logics of

childhood and youth. Evans (2012) notes how, in case studies of sibling care in households affected by

HIV/AIDS in Tanzania and Uganda, the regular, ongoing, repetitive intimate forms of caring done, on-and-

on-and-on, by children and young people every day do not neatly fit with linear developmental presumptions

of lifecourse transition. We suggest that many chapters in this book can be read as posing a similar kind of

challenge by making plain: children and young people's wide-ranging participation and reciprocity in caring

relationships and communities; their presence and agency in many politicised spaces of care; and their (or

rather *our*) co-presence and often careful input with/in many spaces of research and practice. And, in so

doing, the chapters collected in this book challenge us (as adults working with children and young people in

diverse spaces and roles) to move from a habit of caring for/about children and young people to an ethic of

caring with children and young people in diverse, plural *caringscapes*.

Structure and contributions of book

As a contribution to these debates the following collection of chapters is structured around three key,

overlapping themes. The first group of chapters presents a range of distinctive contributions to the

conceptualisation of childhood, youth and care, extending the discussion in Chapter 1via sustained,

substantive engagements with feminist ethics of care and Bourdieusian accounts of habitus, anthropological

and psychological theories of kinship, postcolonial theory, critical pedagogies and theories of citizenship,

and Foucauldian theories of power, respectively. We hope that this juxtaposition of diversely-theorised

chapters will animate broader consideration of the theorisation of care itself, in relation to childhood and

youth. In Chapter 2, Gill Hughes thinks through feminist ethics of care in relation to Bourdieu's theories of habitus and 'doxa', and empirical research with young people and practitioners involved in a programme of activities for young people Not in Education, Employment and Training provision ('NEET') in northern England. She argues that a key, often-overlooked feature of care is (in Bourdieu's terms) its 'doxicity': that is, how it often seems 'natural', 'self-evident', or 'understood without question'. Hughes draws upon qualitative research with young people to diagram the nexus of multiple signifiers, dispositions and spatial practices which are understood as care in this particular geographical-historical-political context. Importantly, too, she considers the latent 'darker side' of care: for example, its centrality to many normative, hegemonic discourses, and its constitutive role in forms of guilt, coercion, care-lessness or 'over-bearing' social relations. Through these reflections, Hughes argues that ethics of care must pay closer attention to context and spatialities. In particular, she calls for greater attention to the ways in which the everyday caring geographies of children, young people and practitioners are framed, constrained and dis-connected by contexts of neoliberalisation, marketization and welfare reforms. In Chapter 3, Rebecca Pratchett and Paul Rees work with a parallel, and in many ways quite separate, lineage of theory on childhood, youth and care, engaging with biological, sociological, ethological and psychological concepts of kinship. They usefully historicise how these intertwining methodological and conceptual traditions have constituted an influential and efficacious set of understandings of care. For example, they propound Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems theory as one important way in which the contextuality and spatiality of care has been diagrammed in this context. Some readers (perhaps especially those who have – like us – been schooled in feminist, poststructuralist or social constructionist social sciences) may be discomfited by the developmental and apparently universalising logics that underpin such theories of care. However, we urge readers to approach all chapters with a spirit of openness to interdisciplinary dialogue. Our juxtaposition of diversely-theorised work throughout this book is intended to challenge readers to think about how such different ways of knowing, writing and researching care might be brought into productive interdisciplinary conversations in future work.

In Chapter 4, Sarah de Leeuw considers and historicises the concepts of care which underpin Canadian child welfare policies, particularly as they pertain to contemporary Indigenous families in British Columbia. She traces historical, recent and often-tragic evidence regarding the removal of children from Indigenous families

into forms of state 'care'. de Leeuw argues that this kind of state intervention – in the interests of 'child protection' and 'care' – can only be understood with reference to postcolonial critiques of hegemonic colonial systems and logics. In the British Columbian case, she evidences how legal, political and popular discourses of Indigenous communities as 'others' in need of special protection and transformation have become so naturalised as to appear 'common sense'. As such, Chapter 4 highlights the need for theorisations of childhood, youth and care to be carefully attuned to historical-political contexts, and always already critical of 'common sense' understandings of care. As de Leeuw shows, the consequences of 'common sense' can too often be tragic, and well-intentioned forms of 'care' can often produce or legitimise significant, enduring forms of harm. In Chapter 5, Bronwyn Wood and Rowena Taylor consider another widely significant (and, again, seemingly 'common sense') articulation of 'care' in relation to childhood and youth: namely, the global preponderance of policies and practices which promote or require 'active citizenship' (and, therefore, more active forms of care) on the part of children and young people. Drawing on research in New Zealand schools, Wood and Taylor explore how teachers and young people diversely relate to initiatives that effectively require them to care *more* about particular issues, communities and spaces. In so doing they illustrate the multiple ways in which emotions of care (or *not-caring*) are constituted within formal spaces of education, and in policy initiatives that encourage young people to engage in public service, civic participation, social action and volunteering. They also challenge readers to be more critical and creative in considering interconnections between emotions of caring, acts of citizenship, and formal educational and citizenship initiatives.

In Chapter 6, Tom Disney offers another productive way of theorising childhood, youth and care via a substantial engagement with Michel Foucault's writing on biopolitics. He argues that concepts of biopolitics allow for a fuller appreciation of the material, embodied, and bio-social constituents of childhood, care and care-itself. Disney's chapter both introduces Foucault's work on biopolitics and suggests that extant social scientific engagement with this work have tended to be somewhat limited and uncritical, particularly in relation to their spatiality. To illustrate the complex interrelations between childhood, care, biopolitics and spatiality, Disney reviews a range of qualitative research on orphanage spaces. Through a heart-rending discussion of these institutional spaces, he highlights the complex, multiscalar way in which biopower operates within orphanage spaces. In so doing, he calls for further research on spatial forms of power and

control within diverse institutional spaces that are designed to offer 'care' for children and young people. Disney's chapter also forms part of a second group of chapters which present new research focusing upon children and young people in, or in relation to, formal designated spaces or institutions of care. Chapters 6-8 specifically consider orphanages, secure care units and early childhood centres. However, we hope that these empirical discussions will also prompt further reflection and research to explore children and young people's presence in, and relationships to a wider range of diverse spaces of care. As these chapters show, such spaces can impact profoundly – positively or negatively – upon the lives of children and young people. For example, in Chapter 7 Anna Schliehe and Annie Crowley consider the experiences of young women in Scottish 'secure care' units, for individuals deemed to pose a significant risk to themselves or others. Through their deeply-affecting research Schliehe and Crowley highlight some of the practical, legal and spatial tensions which characterise institutions that offer a 'place of safety' via tightly controlled institutional logics and procedures. Drawing on a rich range of research methods, they juxtapose the perspectives of young women and staff in 'secure care' settings and highlight young people's complex pathways through intensely-regulated penal and welfare institutions. They thus call for more careful research to consider the intersections of children and young people's lifecourses with changing policy-legislative spaces of penal-welfare care in diverse contexts. Drawing upon research with young children in New Zealand, Ann Pairman and Carmen Dalli consider the ways in which are is constituted in the quite different (but also intensely spatially regulated) contexts of early childhood centres. In considering children's experiences of these designated spaces of play, care, family support and early childhood learning, Pairman and Dalli highlight the ways in which children themselves are not just recipients of parental, service-providers' or state care; instead they are active participants in the co-construction of care with peers, and with the affordances of complex built environments. Pairman and Dalli thus draw attention to the complex ways in which children and young people engage with the spaces, environments and materialities of spaces of care – and they call for new ways of theorising children's agency, mobility, and social interactions which acknowledge such complexity and co-construction.

A third group of papers feature empirical case studies of children and young people as carers or recipients of care, in diverse contexts. These chapters prompt reflection upon the many kinds of caring practices and roles which (contra many contemporary discourses of children and young people as uncaring, apathetic and/or as

passive recipients of care) are undertaken by many children and young people. For example, in Chapter 9 Caroline Day presents new research on young people's caring roles in Zambia, in the context of HIV/AIDS epidemic in southern Africa. Day's deeply affecting research shows that, although young people are increasingly called upon to provide a significant array of everyday, medical, emotional and economic support for chronically-ill family members in this context, this work is rarely labelled or acknowledged as care. Indeed, it is notable that the young people consulted in Day's study do not, themselves, identify with the role of 'care-giver', but see their significant responsibilities as just 'what is expected'. Day develops an argument about the difficulty of characterising and narrating young people in terms of their caring responsibilities, when their caregiving is so seldom represented or valued within many contemporary social-cultural contexts. As previously noted, Ruth Evans' research on family caring practices in East and West Africa has been important in acknowledging and theorising children and young people's care. In Chapter 10 she extends this work by presenting research about young people's responses to the death of a parent or carer. In relation to studies of HIV/AIDS epidemics in the global south, Evans notes that, despite a significant literature on mortality and orphanhood, research has tended to diagnose material and social consequences of orphanhood rather than engaging with children and young people's everyday, emotional and familial experiences parental death. Through a moving discussion of qualitative research with orphaned young people in Tanzania, Uganda and Senegal, she highlights the many ways in which children and young people perform caring practices which sustain connections with family members and enact 'continuing bonds' with deceased family-members. Through this empirical material, Evans argues that research on children, young people and care should pay closer attention to experiences of bereavement. She also highlights the significance of social-relationalities (and, specifically 'sibling practices') in constituting everyday lives and caring practices in diverse contexts.

In Chapter 11, Tracy Hayes invites readers to reflect upon incidents from research with 'looked after' young people participating in organised activities designed to engage them in outdoor and 'natural' spaces in the UK. Fundamentally, Hayes challenges us to consider the diverse ways in which people may experience and *care about* a particular space, issue or experience. For example, she notes that young people may care about outdoor walking experiences in ways which differ markedly from the expectations of adult organisers of projects for young people. Her chapter therefore considers the ways in which children and young people care

about – and enact multiple forms of *kindness* towards – themselves, others, co-presences, landscapes and natures. Hayes also opens out a series of challenging questions about the extent to which some predominant habits of academic research, writing and thinking may not always be conducive to *caring scholarship*. Her chapter is an invitation and a plea for researchers to slow down and to pause to reflect how we might work in more *caring*, *careful*, moral and equitable ways. In chapter 12, Sam Wilkinson details the *caring*, *careful* (and occasionally *careless*) practices of young women consuming alcohol in north-west England. She argues that research on children, young people and care has tended to be relatively limited in its spatial and relational foci (tending to focus upon familial care within the home), and in its implicit reproduction of normative representations of care (often figuring young people as uncaring, or as prone to careless, risky behaviour). Against this grain, Wilkinson's chapter highlights the every-night caring practices of friendship groups of young women engaged in drinking practices in a range of spaces, including diverse outdoor drinkscapes. She notes how caring practices in such contexts may be pre-planned, contingent or spontaneous ; the chapter is also important in highlighting some ways in which digital communications technologies may supplement 'face-to-face' forms of care. In so doing, Wilkinson develops a wider call for further research exploring emotional, affective and embodied characteristics of children and young people's caring practices, whilst critiquing normative representations of care.

Chapter 13 – by Sally Robinson, Karen Fisher, Malcolm Hill and Anne Graham – is significant in highlighting the caring relationships and practices of children and young people with diverse disabilities. They note that people with disabling conditions are too-often considered through a normative lens that positions them as inevitably *care-recipients*, *in-need-of-care*. Through their chapter they highlight more critical, affirmative theorisations of disability and care that recognise caring relationalities and mutualities. However, they note that relatively little research has considered how children and young people with disabilities experience, and participate in, caring relationships and interventions. Robinson et al draw upon participatory research with a sample of Australian young people with diverse cognitive disabilities. They evidence how many of these participants were active agents in multiple forms of reciprocal caring relationships, and note how different kinds of support services could facilitate or circumscribe these relationships. They particularly call for policy-makers and service-providers to constitute further opportunities for disabled children and young people to develop their agency in these contexts. In Chapter

14, Karen Wells explores the lifecourses, mobilities and caring relationships of children who are privately fostered across international borders. Through research with young migrants from Bangladesh to the UK, she explores the complexity and multi-dimensionality of care, as children move to live with distant relatives or 'strangers'. As she explores the forms and motivations of this mode of transnational care, Wells is attentive to the experiences and identities of children and young people who are privately fostered: in particular she notes the complex interplays between religions, cultural 'obligations', national identities and belonging within the 'stretched' and extensive networks of private fostering arrangements.

We are sure that this collection of chapters will stimulate wide-ranging reflection, discussion and questioning around the theme of childhood, youth and 'care'. To close the book, we are delighted to present three reflective pieces by discussants who have engaged with this edited collection. First, Kathrin Hörschelmann (Chapter 15) lays out a series of challenging conceptual ambivalences prompted by the book's chapters. For example, she challenges readers: to critique (our) normative, naturalised assumptions about care and responsibility but not allow scepticism about care to become *the-reverse-of-care*; to problematize normative discourses of children and young people as vulnerable recipients of care but not abrogate adult responsibilities to children and young people; to develop more caring practices but also think about our inability to 'care for everyone/everything'; and to 'be prepared to listen to accounts by/of parents and other adults who do not care, who care differently, or who abuse children'. Second, Michelle Pyer (Chapter 16) considers the implications of the book's chapters for policy-makers, practitioners, institutions and service-providers who work with children and young people. She highlights a series of evidence-based messages which recur throughout the book and uses these to develop a series of recommendations for future practice for spaces of care, and more generally for those seeking to work in more caring ways with children and young people. In so doing she develops a critical commentary about the (frequent lack of) interface between scholarly research and practical work with children, young people and families. Second, we (Pyer and Horton, Chapter 16) consider the implications of the book's chapters for policy-makers, practitioners, institutions and service-providers who work with children and young people. We highlight a series of evidence-based messages which recur throughout the book and use these to develop a set of recommendations for future practice for spaces of care, and more generally for those seeking to work in more caring ways with children and young people. Finally, Sophie Bowlby (Chapter 17) offers a concluding

reflection upon spatialities of childhood, youth and care, as manifest so vividly in this book's chapters. As previously mentioned, Bowlby's work on caringscapes and carescapes has been significant in developing conceptualisations of care (and indeed these concepts underpin many chapters in this book) so we are really grateful for her reflective piece upon children and young people's presence and participation within caringscapes.

References

Allen, C. (2001) Back to the old house? 'Sick role' and biographical narratives of the housing needs of short stay hospital patients. *Health and Place* 7, pp.81-92.

Amin, A. (2002) Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity. *Environment and Planning A* 34, pp.959-980.

Atkinson, S., Lawson, V., and Wiles, J. (2011) Editorial. Care of the body: spaces of practice. *Social and Cultural Geography* 12, pp.563-572.

Barnes, M. (1997) *Care, Communities and Citizens*. London, Longman.

Barnes, M. (2012) *Care in everyday life: an ethic of practice*. Bristol, Policy Press.

Barnett, C. (2005) Ways of relating: hospitality and the acknowledgement of otherness. *Progress in Human Geography* 29, pp.2-21.

Bartos, A. E. (2012). Children caring for their worlds: the politics of care and childhood. *Political Geography* 31, pp.157-166.

BBC (2016) Young people don't care about politics... or do they? Available at http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-35775773

Bell, D. (2007) The hospitable city: social relations in commercial spaces. *Progress in Human Geography* 31, pp.7-22.

Boserup, E. (1970) *Women's role in economic development*. London, Allen and Unwin.

Bowlby, S. (2011) Friendship, co-presence and care: neglected spaces. *Social and Cultural Geography* 12, pp.605-622.

Bowlby, S. (2012) Recognising the time-space dimensions of care: caringscapes and carescapes. *Environment and Planning* A 44, pp.2101-2118.

Bowlby, S., McKie, L., Gregory, S. and MacPherson, I. (2010) *Interdependence and care over the lifecourse*. London, Routledge,

Brechin, A., Walmsley, J., Katz, J. and Peace, S. (1999) *Care matters*. London, Sage.

Brickell, K. and Datta, A. (eds.) (2011) *Translocal geographies: spaces, places, connections*. Farnham, Ashgate.

Brinegar, S. (2003) The social construction of homeless shelters in the Phoenix area. *Urban Geography* 24, 61-74.

Cloke, P. May, J. and Johnsen, S. 2008: Performativity and affect in the homeless city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26, 241-63.

Cloke, P. and Beaumont, J. (2013) Geographies of postsecular rapprochement in the city. *Progress in Human Geography* 37, pp.27-51.

Conradson, D. (2003a) Spaces of care in the city: the place of a community drop-in centre. *Social and Cultural Geography* 4, pp.507-524.

Conradson, D. (2003b) Editorial. Geographies of care: spaces, practices, experiences. *Social and Cultural Geography* 4, pp.41-454.

Corcoran, A. (2011) Caregiving styles: a cognitive and behavioural typology associated with dementia family caregiving. *The Gerontologist* 51, pp.463-472.

Datta, K., McIlwaine, C., Evans, Y., Herbert, J., May, J. and Wills, J. (2010) A migrant ethic of care? Negotiating care and caring among migrant workers in London's low-pay economy. *Feminist Review* 94, pp.93-116.

David, T., Goouch, K. and Powell, S. (eds.) (2016) *The Routledge International Handbook of Philosophies and Theories of Early Childhood Education and Care*. London, Routledge.

Day, C. (2016) Education and employment transitions: the experiences of young people with caring responsibilities in Zambia. In Abebe, T., Waters, J. and Skelton, T. (eds.) *Geographies of children and young people volume 10: labouring and learning*. New York, Springer.

Day, C. and Evans, R. (2015) Caring responsibilities, change and transitions in young people's family lives in Zambia. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 46, pp.137-152.

Daya, S. and Wilkins, N. (2013) The body, the shelter, and the shebeen: an affective geography of homelessness in South Africa. *Cultural Geographies* 20, pp.357-378.

Dermott, E. and Seymour, J. (eds.) *Displaying families*. London, Palgrave.

Dyck, I., Kontos, P., Angus, J. and McKeever, P. (2005) The home as a site for long-term care: meanings and management of bodies and spaces. *Health and Place* 11, pp. 173-185.

Dyer, S., McDowell, L. and Batnitzky, A. (2008) Emotional labour/body work: the caring labours of migrants in the UK's National Health Service. *Geoforum* 39, pp.2030-2038.

England, K. (2010) Home, work and the shifting geographies of care. *Ethics Place and Environment* 13, pp.131-150.

Engster, D. and Hamington, M. (eds.) *Care ethics and political theory*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Evans, B. (2010) Anticipating fatness: childhood, affect and the pre-emptive 'war on obesity', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35, 2138. Evans and Colls 2009

Evans, B., Colls R., and Hörschelmann, K. (2011) 'Change4Life for your kids': embodied collectives and public health pedagogy. *Sport, Education and Society* 16, pp.323-341

Evans, R. (2010) Children's caring roles and responsibilities within the family in Africa. *Geography Compass* 4, pp. 1477-1496.

Evans, R. (2011) Young caregiving and HIV in the UK: caring relationships and mobilities in African migrant families. *Population, Space and Place* 17, pp.338-360.

Evans, R. (2012) Sibling caringscapes: time-space practices of caring within youth-headed households in Tanzania and Uganda. Geoforum 43, p.824-835.

Evans, R. (2015) Negotiating intergenerational relations and care in diverse African contexts. In Vanderbeck, R. and Worth, N. (eds.) *Intergenerational Space*. London, Routledge, pp.199-213.

Evans, R. and Becker, S. (2009) *Children caring for parents with HIV and AIDS: global issues and policy responses*. Bristol, Policy Press.

Fisher, B. and Tronto, J. (1990) Towards a feminist theory of caring. In Abel, E. and Nelson, M. (eds.) *Circles of care: work and identity in women's lives*. Albany, State University of New York Press, pp.35-62.

Gardiner, J. (1997) *Gender, care and economics*. London, MacMillan.

Glazer, N. (1984) Servants to capital: unpaid domestic labour and paid work. *Review of Radical Political Economics* 16, pp.60-87.

Gleason, T. and Narvaez, D. (2014) Child environments and flourishing. In Narvaez, D., Valentino, K., Fuentes, A., McKenna, J and Gray, P. (eds.) *Culture, Childrearing and Social Wellbeing*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp.335-348.

Green, M. and Lawson, V. (2011) Recentring care: interrogating the commodification of care. *Social and Cultural Geography* 12, pp.639-654.

Hall, E. (2011) Shopping for support: personalisation and the new spaces and relations of commodified care for people with learning disabilities. *Social and Cultural Geography* 12, pp.589-603.

Harris, A., and Wyn, J. (2009) Young people's politics and the micro-territories of the local. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 44, pp.327-344.

Harris, A., Wyn, J., and Younes, S. (2010). Beyond apathetic or activist youth: 'ordinary' young people and contemporary forms of participation. *Young* 18, pp.9-32.

Held, V. (2006) *The ethics of care: personal, political, and global*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

HSCIC [Health and Social Care Information Centre] (2014) NHS workforce: summary of staff in the NHS. London HSCIC.

Huang, S., Yeoh, B. and Toyota, M. (2012) Caring for the elderly: the embodied labour of migrant care workers in Singapore. *Global Networks* 12, pp.129-134.

James A and James A 2004 Constructing Childhood: Theory, Law and Social Practice Palgrave, London

Jones, R., Pykett, J. and Whitehead, M. (2013) *Changing behaviours: on the rise of the psychological state*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Kearns, R. and Joseph, A. (2000) Contracting opportunities: interpreting post-asylum geographies of mental healthcare in Auckland, New Zealand. *Health and Place* 6, pp.159-170.

Kraftl, P., Horton, J. and Tucker, F. (2014) Children's geographies: an annotated bibliography. *Oxford Bibliographies*. Available at: http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199791231/obo-9780199791231-0080.xml

Lambie-Mumford, H. and Green, M. (2015) Austerity, welfare reform and the rising use of food banks by children in England and Wales. *Area* online early.

Laurier, E. and Philo, C. (2006) Cold shoulders and napkins handed: gestures of responsibility. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31, pp.193-207.

Laurier, E., Whyte, A. and Buchner, K. (2002) Neighbouring as an occasioned activity: 'finding a lost cat'. Space and Culture 5, pp.346-367.

Lawson, V. (2007) Geographies of care and responsibility. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97, pp.1-11.

McDowell, L. (2004) Work, workfare, work/life balance and an ethic of care. *Progress in Human Geography* 28, pp.145-163.

McEwan, C. and Goodman, M. (2010) Place geography and the ethics of care: introductory remarks on the geographies of ethics, responsibility and care. *Ethics, Policy and Environment* 13, pp.103-112.

McKie, L. and Bowlby, S. (2004) *Caringscapes: experiences of caring and working*. Edinburgh, Centre for Research on Families and Relationships.

Milligan, C. (2000) Bearing the burden: toward a restructured geography if caring. *Area* 32, pp.49-58.

Milligan, C. and Wiles, J. (2010) Landscapes of care. *Progress in Human Geography* 34, pp.736-754.

Nicholson, L. (1988) Gender and history: the limits of social theory in the age of the family. New York, Columbia University Press.

Noddings, N. (2013) *Caring: a relational approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

ONS [Office for National Statistics] (2013) *Women in the labour market*. London ONS.

Parr, H. (2000) Interpreting the hidden social geographies of mental health: ethnographies of inclusion and exclusion in semi-institutional places. *Health and Place* 6, pp.225-237.

Parr, H. (2003) Medical geography: care and caring. *Progress in Human Geography* 27, pp.225-237.

Parr, H. (2008) *Mental health and social space: towards inclusionary geographies*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Philo, C. (1997) Across the water: reviewing geographical studies of asylums and other mental health facilities. *Health and Place* 3, pp.73-89.

Philo, C. (2004) *A geographical history of institutional provision for the insane from Medieval times to the 1860s in England and Wales: the space reserved for insanity*. Lewiston, Edwin Mellen.

Pykett, J. (ed.) (2011) Governing through pedagogy: re-educating citizens. Routledge, London.

Pykett, J. (2015) *Brain culture: shaping policy through neuroscience*. Policy Press, Bristol.

Ranghuram, P., Madge, C. and Noxolo, P. (2009) Rethinking responsibility and care for postcolonial worlds. *Geoforum* 40, pp.5-13.

Robson, E. (2004) Hidden child workers: young carers in Zimbabwe. *Antipode* 36, pp.227-248.

Rogers, C. and Weller, S. (eds.) (2013) *Critical approaches to care: understanding caring relations, identities and cultures*. London, Routledge.

Rossi, A. (ed.) (2001) *Caring and doing for others: social responsibility in the domains of family, work and community*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Rowland, E. (2014) *Emotional geographies of care work in the NHS*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. King's College London.

Sevenhuijsen, S. (1998) *Citizenship and the ethics of care*. London, Routledge.

Silk, J. (1998) Caring at a distance. *Philosophy and Geography* 1, pp.165-182.

Silk, J. (2004) Caring at a distance: gift theory, aid chains and social movements. *Social and Cultural Geography* 5, pp.229-251.

Skelton, T. (ed.) (2016) *Geographies of children and young people: major reference work*. New York, Springer.

Skills for Care (2015) *The state of the adult social care sector and workforce in England*. London, Skills for Care.

Smith, S. (2005) States, markets and an ethic of care. *Political Geography* 24, pp.1-20.

Staeheli, L. and Brown, M. (2003) Where has the welfare gone? Introductory remarks to the geographies of care and welfare. *Environment and Planning A* 35, pp.771-777.

Thomas, C. (1993) De-constructing concepts of care. *Sociology* 27, pp.649-669.

Tronto, J. (1993) *Moral boundaries: a political argument for an ethic of care*. London, Routledge.

Tronto, J. (1989) Women and caring: what can feminists learn about morality from caring. In Jaggar, M. and Bordo, S. (eds.) *Gender/body/knowledge: feminist reconstructions of being and knowing*. New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, pp.172-187.

Tronto, J. (2013) *Caring democracy: markets, equality and justice*. New York, NYU Press.

Valentine, G. (1996) Angels and devils: the moral landscape of childhood. *Environment and Planning D* 14, pp.581-99

Valentine, G. (2008) Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography* 32, pp.323-337.

Vivat, B. (2002) Situated ethics and feminist ethics in a west of Scotland hospice. In Bondi, L., Avis, H., Bankey, R., Bingley, A., Davidson, J., Duffy, R., Einagel, V., Green, A., Johnston, L., Lilley, S., Listerborn, C., Marshy, M., McEwan, S., O'Connor, N., Rose, G., Vivat, B. and Wood, N. (eds.) *Subjectivities, knowledges, and feminist geographies*. Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield, pp.236-252.

Weller, S. (2007) *Teenagers' citizenship: experiences and education*. London, Routledge.

White House (2015) *Press release: Helping all working families with young children afford child care*. Available at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/01/21/fact-sheet-helping-all-working-families-young-children-afford-child-care

Wiles, J. (2011) Reflections on being a recipient of care: vexing the concept of vulnerability. *Social and Cultural Geography* 12, pp.573-588.

Williams, A. (2002) Changing geographies of care: employing the concept of therapeutic landscapes as a framework in examining home space. *Social Science and Medicine* 55, pp.141-154.

Williams, A. (ed.) (2007) *Therapeutic landscapes*. Farnham, Ashgate.

Williams, J. (1996) Geography of the homeless shelter: staff surveillance and resident resistance. *Urban Anthropology* 25, pp.75-113

Wood, B. (2013) Young people's emotional geographies of citizenship participation: spatial and relational insights. *Emotion, Space and Society* 9, pp.50-58.

Wood, B. (2016) Excluded citizens? Participatory research with young people from a 'failing' school community. *Children's Geographies* 14, pp.310-324.

Young, I.M. (1981) Beyond the unhappy marriage. A critique of the dual systems theory. In Sargent, L. (ed.) *Women and revolution*. Boston, South End, pp.43-69.

Zhang, Y. and Jean Yeung, W. (2012) Shifting boundaries of care in Asia: an introduction. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 32, pp.612-622.