

Table 6. Qualitative Papers Investigating the link between Poverty and CAN

<i>Mediating Factors between Poverty and CPP Involvement</i>					
Name	Summary	Country	Definition of Poverty	Method	Results
Poverty is the problem – not parents: so tell me, child protection worker, how can you help? (Bennett et al., 2020b)	The article: (1) Narrates how poverty brings child protection into the family; (2) Explores how poverty worsens following child protection intervention; (3) Explores how material and emotional poverty becomes entrenched when children are in long-term care; and (4) Considers the organisational poverty experienced by child protection workers, which impairs their ability to recognise and respond actively to poverty, thereby reducing the likelihood of reunification. It also identifies some implications for improved practice.	Australia	Generalised poverty and other indices of social deprivation, like housing stress, are discussed.	The case studies in the article are drawn from the lived experiences of families supported by the Family Inclusion Network (FIN) Townsville, which is a self-funded, parent led support and advocacy grass roots registered charity.	Bennett et al. (2020b) state that families who attract the attention of child protection services most often had ongoing lived experiences of poverty, gender-based domestic and family violence, problematic substance use and, sometimes, formally diagnosed mental health conditions. For example, the case studies of ‘Marlee’ and ‘Judith’ are provided as examples of losing the care of their children, and experiences of poverty, resulting from having abusive partners. Bennett et al. (2020b) argues that in families with complex problems disadvantage and domestic violence cause spirals into long-term poverty and powerlessness that trigger child protection intervention, along with the seemingly inevitable consequences of a reduced housing standard, less income from Centrelink and the increased likelihood of losing children to long-term care by the state.

					<p>Furthermore, Bennett et al. (2020b) identified that when socio-economic challenges prevail, the burden of child rearing is often borne by mothers who are left to fend for their children. The majority of parents go out of their way to make ends meet even to the detriment of their own well-being (Russell et al., 2008). In one case study, 'Alina', a sole parent, uses a variety of means to provide for her children but eventually hits 'rock bottom'. The case study highlights how stress resulting from poverty, isolation and fatigue experienced by parents became risk factors for child abuse and neglect in turn. Furthermore, when seeking support, the case studies reveal that parents and grandparents experienced shame and stigma due to derogatory remarks and labels from neighbours, kin and human service workers and, therefore, went to extreme lengths to access alternative forms of support.</p> <p>Bennett et al. (2020b) concluded that, in Australia, poverty is largely seen as an individual issue and not a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					structural and systemic failure. Consequently, vulnerable parents are shamed for living in poverty and seeking help for it. As a result, many parents refrain from seeking help from child protection or other agencies for fear of having their children removed, which exacerbates the risk of CAN.
Shifting the Paradigm from Child Neglect to Meeting the Needs of Children: A Qualitative Exploration of Parents' Perspectives (Elias et al., 2018)	This study explores parent perspectives on the challenges of meeting the needs of children in poverty, as a way of reframing our understanding of child neglect.	United States	Participants of the study live at or below the 'poverty level' for the United States	Elias et al. held a total of six focus groups of 54 parents (n=33 women, n= 18 men) participating in Early Head Start (EHS), Head Start, or EHS Childcare Partnership (five with EHS/HS and one with the EHS partner) over a 6-month period 2010 to 2011. One of these focus groups was entirely made up of fathers. Families enrolled in EHS and Head Start had incomes at or below 200% of the federal poverty guidelines, whereas families of the childcare partner may have been above these income guidelines (the majority were not). Fifty-one of 54 participants completed a brief questionnaire regarding their level of education, their children's ages, and whether they had	Twenty-five of 51 respondents to the survey indicated that they, or someone that they knew well, had direct experience with local child protective services. Parents' abilities to meet children's needs were directly challenged by environmental and financial constraints, which then additionally contributed to their high levels of stress and fatigue. At the individual, "in-home" level, parents struggled with financial challenges, fatigue, stress, single parenting, and challenges unique to parenting traumatized children. Family/friends and supports were discussed in the context of parents' challenges to identify social supports that were safe and reliable, and would allow them to work or provide needed

				<p>experience with a number of family services, including local child protective services.</p>	<p>respite for their own mental well-being.</p> <p>Specifically, parents described their efforts at trying to manage the competing financial costs of life when budgeting at or below the poverty level. They described choosing between paying utilities and providing things for their children, caring for their children while making sure they held onto their jobs, and the trade-offs of choosing between necessities (such as a child going to the doctor or clothing) and those things that could be delayed (such as a parent going to the doctor or toys). Fatigue and stress were mentioned as common and significant challenges of parenting across groups, but most especially among single parents, regardless of their gender.</p> <p>Many mothers described the financial challenges of single parenting as exceptional and stressful. Many women described fathers as absent due most often to incarceration. Other single mothers did not want the fathers involved due</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>to physical or emotional abusiveness, often partnered with substance abuse. A majority of single mothers expressed concerns about either the impact on their children of their fathers' behaviour or their absence. They were concerned about their children feeling the loss of a caretaker, but they were also very concerned about their children witnessing violence in the home. Parents who were separated expressed facing additional challenges due to conflicting parenting approaches with their ex-partner.</p> <p>For a sizeable minority of participants, parenting had additional special challenges, due to their children's traumatic past experiences, including witnessing drug abuse, suffering sexual abuse, or experiencing the death of a parent or sibling. Parents were aware that these children had unique and critical needs to be met and struggled to understand how best to respond to their emotional and behavioural issues. Parents across all groups felt unable to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>get adequate and understanding support from family or friends to help meet their children’s needs and rarely were able to identify or access resources to help them know how to help their children deal with specific traumas. Parents expressed significant frustration, aware of their children’s extra needs and fully aware that they were not being met.</p> <p>At the same time, parents contended with neighbourhood level factors including violence, lack of transportation, and lack of safe social and recreational spaces for young children. Lack of success in overcoming any of these challenges increased the likelihood that children’s most basic needs would not be met. All groups in Elias et al.’s study discussed the challenges of learning about, and then qualifying for, supportive resources for their children and families. Participants did not have shared primary sources from which they learned about community programs and resources, and in every group many parents had never heard of resources being described by</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>other participants, including utility assistance, housing support, food, and clothing. Parents described seeking resources—especially school, libraries and church—that would expose their children to positive values and social interactions. Several mothers tried to identify resources allowing their children to learn to trust others, and to see that other adults “are okay”, especially if that was not part of their prior experiences. In their efforts to access resources, all groups of parents described frustrations due to the rules around eligibility requirements—whether it was due to income requirements or their children’s ages.</p> <p>Elias et al.’s sample also described the challenge of qualifying for any variety of assistance programs—ensuring that their income would stay within guidelines because the assistance was critical. Many mothers shared that they needed to do creative accounting to be considered eligible for assistance programs for utilities or childcare. Parents described frustration at not</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>being able to get their children into community sports or afterschool programs due to their children’s young ages, whereas parents of teens were frustrated that their children were too old for what programs might exist. Overall, a dearth of local community activities and programs led parents to seek resources outside of their communities, and then confront transportation costs.</p> <p>Many parents discussed the challenges of having few, or no, family or friends that they could turn to, to provide quality care for their children. A few parents refused to leave their children with others for care, however, many more parents articulated concerns about the compromises they made and constraints they faced when they did turn to friends or family for childcare. The majority of groups discussed the challenges of having potential childcare supports with worrying standards. Parents discussed concerns that their preschool or school environments had inadequate nutrition, tolerated bullying, and were unclean. Many</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>parents expressed dismay when the values and behaviour of potential supports were significantly different than they thought best for their children, especially when this compromised care was provided by extended family and friends. A few participants were mindful of the mental health or substance abuse issues that those family members might be dealing with at a given moment, and the need to change childcare plans suddenly.</p> <p>Parents expressed great concern over their children spending time in communities with deteriorating conditions, without resources and rife with crime and violence. Parents tried to shield their children from the latter and at the same time tried to teach values to help them navigate their communities. This state of affairs required efforts to seek resources outside of their communities, efforts made infinitely more difficult by individual financial constraints, transportation, and eligibility issues related to income</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					guidelines and the ages of their children.
Child welfare involvement and contexts of poverty: The role of parental adversities, social networks, and social services (Fong, 2017)	Based on in-depth interviews with 40 poor parents previously investigated for child maltreatment, the contexts of poverty that provide pathways to child welfare involvement are discussed.	United States	This article extends the definition of poverty as not limited to low income or economic hardship, but also encompassing a set of adversities, social network connections and social service interactions often associated with poverty.	Fong’s (2017) study draws on qualitative interviews with 40 poor, child welfare-investigated parents in Providence, Rhode Island, which has a poverty rate of 28% (almost double the national rate). This article is focused on respondents who reported being investigated by the child welfare system at least once. However, respondents weren’t screened for child welfare involvement, nor was the topic mentioned in recruitment materials. As detailed questions about income were not asked at screening, several respondents’ incomes exceeded the federal poverty threshold, but all qualified for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Each interview began in an open-ended manner, inviting the respondent to share her life story in detail, including childhood experiences, housing,	Interestingly, within the 107 incidents probed by Fong (2017), parents rarely implicated financial constraints directly in their descriptions of how they became involved with child welfare services. Respondents often connected their child welfare involvement not to low financial resources, but to other adverse experiences that are more common among families in poverty. For example, poverty for respondents was not solely an experience of material and financial hardship, but a clustering and compounding of multiple adversities — adversities that could be central to their involvement with the child welfare system. A substantial proportion of incidents parents described (42%) implicated forms of disadvantage associated with poverty: domestic violence, substance abuse, mental illness, and involvement with the criminal justice system. These factors sometimes overlapped, as when drug activity led to police

				<p>employment, experiences with welfare and other social services, and financial strategies. This article is focused on respondents' accounts of child welfare involvement, not child maltreatment. Respondents described 107 incidents leading to a child welfare investigation regarding their children. Each of these excerpts were coded first based on the main allegation of child maltreatment, according to the respondent, using an open coding approach. Excerpts were also coded based on aspects of the situation's respondents described that emerged inductively, such as network members calling out of spite. These themes were developed iteratively after repeated reading and categorization of the incidents as situated in respondents' life history narratives.</p>	<p>involvement. Additionally, many respondents had experienced these adversities and/or were affected through the experiences of those closest to them. Even if respondents did not specify these challenges as precipitating child welfare involvement, these multiple and compounding forms of disadvantage may contribute to a stressful household environment and, indirectly, to parenting practices perceived as abusive or neglectful.</p>
Identifying and understanding the link between system conditions and	Hood et al. (2020a) aimed to gain an 'inside perspective' on the key factors affecting patterns of demand and	UK	Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD; 2015)	Their qualitative study was designed to explore system conditions for CSC in the same six LAs that had provided administrative	Hood et al. (2020a) found that these staff saw the link between socio-economic factors and demand for child welfare services, although their

<p>welfare inequalities in children’s social care services (Hood et al., 2020a)</p>	<p>provision in each LA area, both in a general sense and with reference to the quantitative findings.</p>			<p>data for the quantitative side of their study described above in the preceding chapter. Five managers and senior practitioners in key CSC service areas were approached in each LA to take part in two rounds of qualitative interviews, about five or six months apart. Generally the same people were interviewed twice; if someone left the LA after the first interview then their replacement in the post was invited to do the second.</p> <p>All the interviews were carried out by one qualitative researcher, except for four participants interviewed by the principal investigator. For the first round of interviews a semi-structured interview schedule was used to explore participants’ experience and perception of the factors shaping CSC services in their area. About five months later, each participant was sent a summary of findings from</p>	<p>understanding took different forms in different areas. Financial hardship among families was generally thought to have increased over the past eight years, owing to factors such as stagnant earnings and cuts to benefits, while the introduction of universal credit had increased levels of personal and household debt. Participants thought these factors impacted negatively on family relationships, parental stress and conflict, contributing to higher levels of domestic abuse and mental illness, as well as family breakdown.</p> <p>Particularly for people living in London boroughs, lack of affordability and the poor quality of rental accommodation were linked to deteriorating home conditions and increased risk of homelessness. Densely populated urban areas with high rates of deprivation were the main geographical sources of demand for CSC. Some participants thought that risk to children, including neglect, emotional abuse, alcohol misuse and domestic violence, did exist among materially well-</p>
---	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>their own LA, consisting of key themes from first round interviews as well as results from the bivariate crosstab analysis (see Sections 3.2 and 3.3). This summary formed the basis for the second round interviews, focusing on key findings and any other developments in the LA. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed before being imported into qualitative data analysis software, NVivo12.</p>	<p>off families but were less likely to be picked up; such families were better able to conceal problems, buy in support with childcare (e.g. nannies) and to avoid involvement with services. Cases featuring 'middle class' families were often related to acrimony between parents and the impact on children of divorce and parental separation.</p> <p>Participants with experience of rural districts thought that the dispersal of people and services meant that there was perhaps less surveillance and oversight of families than in urban areas, so that some issues could go undetected. Cuts to community and preventative services over recent years had thinned out their coverage, with further barriers to attendance created by the lack of public transport (also subject to cuts) and affordable childcare. Social inequality also played a part, since even areas that generally were seen as affluent could have pockets of deprivation that were often quite isolated from support services, such as parenting groups and children's centres. Moreover, since these</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>services were more likely to be frequented by middle class parents in affluent areas, they might not be perceived as accessible by more deprived or marginalised groups. Similar problems were experienced by families relocated to social housing on affluent estates that lacked the necessary infrastructure (e.g. children’s centres, play spaces) to meet families’ needs. Most participants thought that isolation and social exclusion contributed to the high levels of mental health problems among families.</p> <p>Several LAs noted a rise in the number of families without recourse to public funds, which was associated with a range of presenting needs, e.g. gang involvement, homelessness, or self-harm. An increase in risks to adolescents was noted in all LAs, particularly in more deprived areas, and while much of this was attributed to the growing threat posed by organised criminal networks, underlying social problems were also thought to be contributing to this trend.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

<p>Understanding out of Home Care Rates in Northern Ireland: A Thematic Analysis of Mixed Methods Case Studies (Mason et al., 2021a)</p>	<p>Despite experiencing the highest levels of deprivation, Northern Ireland (NI) also displays the lowest rates of children in care of all the UK nations. This article proposes explanations for this.</p>	<p>Northern Ireland (although comparisons are made to the rest of the UK)</p>	<p>The paper states that comparing the four nations of the UK using adjusted IMD scores, Abel et al. (Abel, Barclay and Payne, 2016) found that 36.6 per cent of the population in NI live in the 20 per cent most deprived neighbourhoods in the UK compared to 19.5, 18.2 and 21.9 percent of the population in England, Scotland and Wales, respectively. Poverty is discussed in this context.</p>	<p>A large research team, based across seven UK universities, carried out the Child Welfare Inequalities Project. This study was organised around two work streams: (1) a quantitative work stream (Work Stream A) comparing child welfare intervention rates with area-level indicators of multiple Deprivation; and (2) a series of mixed methods case studies (Work Stream B) carried out in England (n= 4), Scotland (n= 2) and subsequently in NI (n= 2). Each of the case studies (Work Stream B) were embedded within host. Local Authorities (LAs) or HSCT. Fieldwork was standardised, as far as possible, and aimed to address two overarching questions: 1. What is the interplay between decisions to intervene in children’s lives and their social, economic and material circumstances? 2. What are the relative strengths of the variables that influence unequal</p>	<p>Using adjusted IMD scores, Mason et al. (2021a) found that 36.6% of the population in NI live in the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods in the UK compared to 19.5%, 18.2% and 21.9% of the population in England, Scotland and Wales, respectively. Mason discusses poverty in this context. However, despite experiencing the highest levels of deprivation, NI also displays the lowest rates of CLA of all the UK nations. Drawing on the narratives offered by child and family social workers, a series of possible explanations for NI’s significantly lower out of home care rates are considered. Here, Mason et al.’s (2021a) focus is on a series of mixed methods case studies carried out in England (n= 4), Scotland (n= 2) and subsequently in NI (n= 2), discussing the role the extended family and neighbourhoods play in mediating poverty and CAN related referrals. Mason et al. (2021a) notes that ‘community’ featured regularly in social workers’ attempts to explain the comparably low foster and residential care rates</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--

				<p>rates in decisions to intervene? Fieldwork involved a range of activities, including: (i) practice observations; (ii) semi-structured interviews; (iii) focus groups, using a standardised vignette; (iv) mapping of decision-making processes; and (v) analysis of routinely collected child protection data. Interview and focus group schedules were designed to concentrate on one carefully selected geographical location. These 'primary sites' were introduced to respondents at the beginning of each case study and were deemed comparable—across the case studies—in terms of their population size and level of deprivation. Additional fieldwork, in the form of follow-up interviews, observations and focus groups also took place with the child and family social work teams covering the most and least deprived wards within each LA/HSCT. All data were</p>	<p>in NI. In contrast with their English and Scottish data (where deprived neighbourhoods were described in terms of an absence of, or problematised notions of community), the NI data indicate more positive conceptions of community in multiply deprived neighbourhoods, with references to local infrastructure, community cohesion and bonding social ties (Leonard, 2004).</p> <p>Social cohesion and social capital are concepts that feature widely in studies concerned with aspects of neighbourhood or community. The history of tensions and conflicts between communities in NI has arguably produced unique dynamics in this respect, with strong notions of 'community' defined within and against often highly localised groups. It is possible, therefore, that social dynamics manifested at the local level, but associated with Nis broader history of conflict, could have protective consequences for families, mediated through the strengthening of community</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>organised according to the framework method. (Jane and Liz, 2002).</p>	<p>cohesion and bonding social ties.</p> <p>Collective efficacy, understood as the ‘ability of the collective to act effectively’ (Lochner et al., 1999, pp. 261), also featured in respondents’ accounts of the most deprived wards. These communities were said to have histories of campaigning for locally based resources, achieving some level of independence from state support. Again, reported community strengths might be understood in terms of the ‘isolating side effects of poverty [due to] the wider political situation’ in NI (Leonard, 2004).</p> <p>Extended family support was also framed as a distinctive and protective feature of community life in the most deprived localities. Catholic families living in neighbourhoods with a high proportion of Catholic residents were depicted as enjoying a closeness that was both emotional and proximate. Family practices within Catholic neighbourhoods received specific attention in terms of their protective effects. Social</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>workers explained how, when problems escalated, local relatives would be called upon to help. Some noted that it was not uncommon to find extended family members already at the scene when social workers attended emergency home visits. A number of examples were offered to illustrate the role of extended family, both as supports for those experiencing difficulties, and as resources for social workers.</p> <p>The problematization of family where help is needed has been a recurrent theme in studies of child protection social work (Featherstone et al., 2014). Mason et al.'s (2021a) data suggest that social workers in NI positioned the wider family in a less negative frame and made more positive assumptions about abilities to help. The availability of extended family for the uptake of caring responsibilities was also reflected in the higher kinship care rates evident in NI. A recent comparison of kinships care across the four UK nations found higher rates of kinship care as a proportion of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>CLA (31 percent of all CLA) in NI compared with Scotland (29 per cent), England (11 per cent) and Wales (18 per cent) (McCartan et al., 2018).</p> <p>Mason et al. (2021a) proposes that family dynamics, including size, practices and geographic proximity may enhance the availability of informal familial support in times of difficulty. Furthermore, Mason et al. (2021a) argue that greater resistance to state involvement (attributable to the political history of NI) may have prompted the development of alternative (non-family/non-state) support for children and families in some communities. Both of these intersecting ideas offer explanations for the low referral rate in NI.</p>
Unpacking the Relationship between Poverty, Child Maltreatment, and Child Protection Involvement: Service Users' and Practitioners' Perspectives	A critical, in-depth inquiry is conducted into the perspectives of parents and practitioners on the links between poverty and child maltreatment.	Israel	The paper explains how multiple scholars (including (Krumer-Nevo, 2016, 2017); (Featherstone et al., 2019); (Boone et al., 2019); (Chase et al., 2013)) have expanded the definition of poverty as not merely a lack of material capital, but	30 qualitative interviews with parents (n=17, two couples and 13 individuals) and practitioners (n=15) who took part in two Israeli child protection intervention programs for families of children at high risk of maltreatment were undertaken. Interviews were semi-structured and lasted an average of 90	Based on the "wheel of poverty", Saar-Heiman's (2021) analysis of the interviews revealed a matrix of relationships between poverty, child maltreatment, and child protection involvement that they term the ' <i>child protection-poverty matrix</i> '. Saar-Hieman's (2021) matrix consists of three main dimensions: the material, the social, and the relational-

<p>(Saar-Heiman, 2021)</p>			<p>rather a multidimensional phenomenon that, alongside material deprivation, encompasses rational and symbolic dimensions. The authors state that poverty is understood here in the context of unjust and unequal power relations that are constantly generated through the interaction of economic, political, cultural, and psychological mechanisms. The paper focuses on this definition of poverty.</p>	<p>minutes. The purposive sampling of the workers was aimed at maximising the sociodemographic distribution of the workers and ensuring that all participating parents were affiliated with different social workers and all participants had taken part in the pilot program for at least one year. In addition, all parent participants had at least one child identified as 'at high risk', i.e., at risk of being removed from home or already removed by a social services department. The study used the interpretative interactionism approach, which focuses on the meanings people attribute to formative life experiences while relating to the context of reciprocal relationships between individuals and their social environments (Denzin, 2001). The paper states that this approach made it possible to outline a detailed description of the practitioners' and parents' personal realities and provide access to their</p>	<p>symbolic. Each dimension has three realms of influence: on the child, on the parents, and on the parent-child relationship. This matrix is enveloped by an overarching experience of stress. All interviewees described how the stress that is an integral part of living in poverty permeates their parenting and influences it in negative ways. They mentioned experiencing anxiety, depression, familial conflicts, sleep disorders, lack of energy and vitality, and hopelessness. This finding corresponds with an extensive body of empirical knowledge on parenting in poverty (Neppl et al., 2016).</p> <p>Saar-Heiman (2021) noted that the material dimension was perhaps the most visible and clear link between poverty and the creation of an environment that potentially encourages maltreatment. This dimension involves the direct and indirect influence of lack of money on the conditions under which parenting in poverty takes place and on the environment in which children grow up. This influence was believed to be</p>
----------------------------	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>subjective experiences and perceptions regarding the mechanisms that connect poverty to child maltreatment and child protection involvement. The research applied a systematic content and thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) that was conducted by a single coder and consisted of four phases.</p>	<p>particularly relevant to neglect..</p> <p>All the interviewees described how living in poverty was manifested in children not receiving their most basic needs, such as food, clothing, proper housing, electricity, and medicine. Sometimes lack of money could lead to life-threatening situations and unhealthy living conditions, such as unheated apartments or poor sanitary conditions. Although lack of food or medication is clearly an issue of child maltreatment, the interviewees (mainly the workers) separated child maltreatment and material deprivation.</p> <p>For the parents, the implications of raising children with a lack of material resources were manifested first of all in parents' inability to provide their children the most beneficial conditions for development and growth. Parents and workers described both the concrete effects of this inability, i.e., the need to prioritize essential needs and consciously make decisions</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>that will harm children, and the harsh emotional ramifications of this situation, i.e., feeling helpless, guilty, and inadequate. The second important consequence was the need to seek help from the welfare system. All parents stated that the reason for their initial contact with the child protection system was their need for financial aid. Saar-Heiman (2021) concludes that exposure to the welfare system automatically increases parents' odds of being identified as maltreating their children, although this is not a given in the wider literature (Barth et al., 2021).</p> <p>The social dimension refers to a lack of social opportunities available within the societal structures in which parents and children function. In line with the critical poverty knowledge framework, this dimension focused on how the social structure created limited and confined children's life trajectories, and parental paths that, in turn, influence children, the conditions under which they grow up and the treatment they receive. Saar-Heiman</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>(2021) argues that attending to this aspect of poverty makes it possible to single out the direct influence of broader social policies and social arrangements on the occurrence of child maltreatment.</p> <p>The interviews reported far-reaching implications of families' social conditions for relationships between parents and their children. Three main factors were identified. First, at the most basic level, if neither parents nor children receive appropriate social and medical treatment it may significantly encumber the parent-child relationship. For example, the difficult mission of caring for a child with special needs (Spratt et al., 2007) becomes much more complex when children do not receive a proper diagnosis or correct medical treatment. Similarly, parenting while suffering from untreated health problems or without proper psychiatric treatment can have devastating effects on parents' ability to care for their children. Second, both parents and workers pointed to the effect of poor living conditions—i.e.,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>small apartments with inferior infrastructures in neglected neighbourhoods—on the relationships between parents and children. They described how when the physical living space was small and the environment was unsafe, a very tense and narrow family environment may develop. Finally, the fact that psychological therapy services were often poverty-blind and inaccessible made the option of receiving parental guidance or counselling irrelevant and prevented parents from creating change in their relationships with their children.</p> <p>The last dimension identified by Saar Heiman (2021) is the 'relational-symbolic dimension', which will be discussed below, under the sub-heading: 'Inequitable Service Responses Triggered by Social Status of Parents'.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Contradictions in Policy and Practice Responses to Poverty

Name	Summary	Country	Definition of Poverty	Method	Results
Poverty is the problem – not parents: so tell	-	-	-	-	In addition to discussing mediating factors between the poverty and CAN relationship,

<p>me, child protection worker, how can you help? (Bennett et al., 2020b)</p>					<p>Bennett et al. (2020b) also discuss how CP involvement sometimes made poverty worse and harder to escape from. Bennett et al. (2020b) found most parents who come into contact with child protection find that their financial situation worsens when their children are removed from their care. This is particularly so for those dependent on Centrelink payments for income in their Australian sample, as they lose their parenting payment and are, instead, placed on Centrelink's NewStart payment, which is a payment for jobseekers with stricter conditions and less money (Australian Institute of Family Studies, 2019).</p> <p>This reduction in income increases the likelihood of ongoing poverty for these parents. Challenges also exist for working parents, for whom maintaining employment becomes difficult, due to the many daytime commitments following child protection intervention. Furthermore, many low-income parents rely on government housing. However, the size of the social</p>
---	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>housing offered depends on the number of people who will be living there (Queensland Government, 2019). Thus, if a family's number of occupants is reduced to one when children are removed, then the result may be the sole parent losing their right to have government housing which, in turn, is given to a family seen by the government as being more in need (Australian Government Department of Social Services, 2019). Crucially, this outcome undermines one of the requirements child protection agencies place on parents for them to have their children returned to their care – having an adequately sized family home.</p> <p>Bennett et al. (2020b) provide a case study of Bijoux, for whom poverty and other stressors, including domestic violence, led to the removal of her children and the subsequent reactive decline in her mental health (Kaur & Atkin, 2018). The removal of her children led to reduced income, greater poverty and homelessness, jeopardising the possibility of her children's return. In the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					absence of material and social poverty, this situation could have been averted. Yet, it would appear that removal of children into care was being actioned by workers who did not appear to be aware of the depths and despair of poverty for families and, instead of taking action to remediate poverty, focused on perceived deficits in parents – deficits which might well have decreased if relief from poverty was forthcoming (Saar-Heiman & Krumer-Nevo, 2019). Bennett et al. (2020b) concluded that without broader contextual knowledge and understanding, particularly regarding ongoing poverty, decision-making by child protection workers often led to the removal of children, while the family’s material poverty and experiences of violence remained unaddressed.
Parenting under adversity: Birth parents’ accounts of inequality and adoption (Lewis & Brady, 2018)	Lewis et al. (2018) aimed to highlight inequality in current adoption procedures and processes in England and Wales.	UK	‘Poverty’ and ‘Deprivation’ are discussed in a general way, and never specifically defined.	Lewis et al. (2018) conducted unstructured life history interviews were undertaken with 12 birth mothers and two birth fathers, one birth mother identified as British Asian and the remaining participants as White British. Interviews were	Lewis et al. (2018) found that poverty was not identified or described by social workers as a risk factor for children; instead, parental behaviour was pathologised. Lewis et al.’s (2018) focus, through exploring the theme of parental adversity and poverty, is to highlight the ways in which the intervention

				<p>recorded, transcribed verbatim and the data was analysed thematically, which allowed for both within and across case analysis by the authors. The transcripts were first read as a whole, before using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) to code and organise the data. Initial codes were developed from the data, with broader themes derived from both the data and a conceptual framework developed.</p>	<p>processes reflects and/or exacerbate inequality. The theme of 'parental adversity' is addressed through the sub themes which emerged from the data: (1) parenting under adversity before child(ren) were removed, (2) parenting after removal and (3) parenting after adoption.</p> <p>Lewis et al. (2018) found that deprivation, poverty and parents' previous trauma are over-looked in favour of explanations which focus on individual deficits. Whilst social workers assessing the welfare of a child clearly need to consider individual concerns, Lewis et al. (2018) argued that structural factors were largely unacknowledged. The paper illustrates how birth parents experience a significant amount of adversity prior to their children being removed.</p> <p>Lewis et al. (2018) found in their interviews that poverty may exacerbate domestic abuse and violence by increasing or prolonging women's exposure to it and by reducing their ability to flee. Such social stressors play a role in contributing to creating a space</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>where there is potential for neglect, abuse or other forms of child maltreatment. One key finding within Lewis et al.'s (2018) interviews was how crucial timing was in cases of child welfare and protection. There are various ways that time exerts pressure; in terms of the pressure to intervene early to prevent harm, or permanently damaging harm; in terms of pressure to meet system deadlines; in terms of little time to work with families and offer support. For example, under the Children and Families Act 2014 a 26 weeks maximum time limit for a case to be concluded was introduced in England and Wales. This limited timeframe impacts on parents who are trying to demonstrate that they have made changes or met conditions set by the Local Authority and may then influence whether their children remain with them, are returned to their care or are permanently removed. Parental rights and needs are seen as less important, unable to be supported, as the 'best interests of the child' are the domain of children's social workers. Parents experience</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the pressure to change, to engage with social workers and other professionals, to comply with conditions which are set, to show willing, to listen and to follow advice yet the limited time of 26 weeks in which to make any changes, often with limited support, is felt to be almost impossible to overcome.</p> <p>Parents also reported that any support they were receiving stopped once their children were removed and the focus moved to assessments of their parenting capacities, or that they were in emotional turmoil and unable to accept support during the court process. Such tight decision making timescales constrain social workers in their ability to engage with the complexities of family poverty and child protection conference reports miss ‘attention to the context of family suffering’. Lewis et al. (2018) conclude that accounting for the socio-economic circumstances under which parents are caring for their children it is likely that the parental behaviours become the focus and that parents are regarded as responsible for any</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>shortfall or not meeting expected standards of care. Poverty, in the work of Morris et al. (2018) described above, was reinforced within Lewis et al.'s (2018) study, which also found it not to be identified or described by social workers as a risk factor for children; instead, parental behaviour was pathologized. The birth parents in this current study also describe poverty and difficulty in providing the basics for their children.</p>
<p>Understanding out of Home Care Rates in Northern Ireland: A Thematic Analysis of Mixed Methods Case Studies (Mason et al., 2021a)</p>	-	-	-	-	<p>Mason et al. (2021a) also stated that social workers in NI were more poverty aware than respondents in England and Scotland, reflected in aspects of their practice and subsequent referral rates. Within their sample, social workers described high levels of unmet needs and shared advanced understandings of the complex relationships between poverty and other difficulties. For example, one social worker said (pp. 7): "If you live in poverty, that impacts on every aspect of family life. So mental ill health, stress, anxiety, all of those factors come into play ... Poor people are living on their</p>

					<p>stressors and as a consequence of their poverty that might result in them being less able to cope and if they're less able to cope as parents, the consequence might be you know, more possibility of them maybe losing it with their child and finding it hard or finding basic parenting much more of a challenge.”</p> <p>References to poverty by social workers in Mason et al.'s (2021a) study were often tied up with the practical support that social workers and family support workers could offer. For example, respondents completing longer-term work with families commented on the routine use of Article 18[7] monies as part of the support available. The Department of Health in NI (Morrison et al., 2018) have encouraged social workers to consider making cash grants under both Article 18 of the Children Order and Article 15 of the Health and Personal Social Services (NI) Order 1972, which is a wider general social welfare provision to provide assistance, including cash in exceptional circumstances, to persons in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>need. Providing utilities like oil to heat family homes at Christmas was said to be particularly common, as was the provision of travel bursaries to help families attend contact sessions and support meetings.</p> <p>This observation contrasts with their English and Scottish data, where social workers positioned even very low levels of financial support—like reclaiming bus fare—as difficult to access and steeped in bureaucracy.</p> <p>Mason et al.’s (2021a) evidence suggests poverty awareness in Northern Ireland was also factored into social work systems and practices. For example, at the time of their fieldwork, all social workers carrying out child and family assessments reported a duty to signpost ‘Make the Call’: a free income maximisation service providing benefit needs assessments. It is likely that the formal inclusion of poverty-related questions within assessment packs prompted higher poverty attention in NI compared with England and Scotland, where similar duties</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>did not feature in single assessment materials.</p> <p>However, interestingly, within further analysis Mason et al. (2021a) also indicated that duties to signpost 'Make the Call' did not substantially shift the prioritisation of anti-poverty thinking in social work decision-making. Rather than promoting deeper poverty engagement, respondents' accounts suggest that benefit maximisation signposting was seen as an additional task to fit in alongside the business of responding to concerns articulated within social work referrals. As with England and Scotland, social workers in both NI sites clarified that their primary concern was safeguarding and, though poverty may feature, it was rarely seen as inextricably connected to the quality of relationships or parenting in the home. Despite appearing as one of the standardised questions on the child and family assessment form, some remained clear that discussions about employment with families were rare, unless there were very obvious concerns</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>signalling poverty. On other occasions, respondents were explicit about their inattention to poverty: "... unless it's explicitly mentioned in the referral or you really notice something when you go out to the house, I'm rarely asking people 'what are your finances like'".</p> <p>Despite showing higher levels of poverty awareness, these data evidence a familiar tendency for NI social workers to position families' socio-economic circumstances as secondary to the 'core business' of risk assessment and safeguarding. At the level of child and family assessment, where highly consequential decisions are made, the data suggested that immediate risk-based referral information took priority, in ways that could demote and compromise anti-poverty practice.</p>
<p>Social Work, poverty and child welfare interventions (Morris et al., 2018)</p>	<p>This article considers findings about how social workers describe, discuss and are influenced by the social and economic circumstances of children when arriving at</p>	<p>UK</p>	<p>Fieldwork in six deprived local authorities. All six comparator case studies were ranked amongst the most deprived 20% of wards in England or Scotland</p>	<p>The article draws on a unique mixed methods comparative study of frontline practice in England and Scotland. Two research questions were addressed:</p>	<p>Morris et al. (2018) found that social workers, in a series of studies of practice in England and Scotland, usually treated poverty as a background, rather than foreground, factor in relation to CAN. Morris et al. (2018) considered findings</p>

	<p>decisions to intervene because of care and protection concerns. Poverty is identified as the ‘wallpaper’ of practice: too big to tackle and too familiar to notice.</p>		<p>(The English Indices of Deprivation 2015: Technical report., 2015). This is the context within practitioners talked about their experiences dealing with poverty.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the interplay between decisions to intervene in children’s lives and their social, economic and material circumstances? 2. What are the relative strengths of the variables that influence the unequal rates in decisions to intervene? <p>Data gathering took place throughout 2016 and included: detailed site demographics; visual data; quantitative data about supply and demand; summaries for six to eight family case studies per site; observational data; and comparable qualitative data, collected with standardised tools. Fieldwork took place within six deprived local authorities (LA) in England and Scotland. Each LA hosted a comparator case study site plus satellite sites examining practice in the most and least deprived localities. Comparator sites were comparable in terms of population size and</p>	<p>about how social workers describe, discuss and are influenced by the social and economic circumstances of children when arriving at decisions to intervene because of care and protection concerns.</p> <p>Morris et al.’s (2018) analysis identified evidence in case work of a conscious detachment from poverty and distancing from families and their communities. Respondents across the sites voiced reluctance to allow family socio-economic circumstances to affect attention paid to the immediate risks presented to children. This decontextualized approach was framed as equitable practice. For example, in Swardside, respondents were clear that their practice was child focused and risk oriented. As a consequence, they spent little time considering the circumstances of families or recognizing poverty as a risk in and of itself. One Swardside social worker recounted, “No, I don’t show up to work thinking everybody here has nothing” (pp. 369). Instead, she reflected on having to respond to what was in front of her, and the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>indicators of deprivation. Fieldwork included a minimum of 5 days immersive non-participation observation within social work teams. Researchers also conducted semi-structured interviews with key informants and held focus groups with social workers, senior practitioners, early help workers and team managers. Data were analysed using coding which used a mix of pre-set codes derived from the overarching research questions and data driven codes emerged from initial analysis. Analysis was organised using a framework approach (Jane and Liz, 2002)</p>	<p>behaviours, rather than the circumstances that she might witness.</p> <p>Other respondents reflected on the use of satellite navigation systems to detach from the geographies of social work practice and to negotiate the journey between home visits without having to think carefully about the site. Indeed, this conscious disengagement from the geography of family circumstances is noteworthy and a particularly striking feature of the data. What respondents appear to voice may be a coping mechanism, or an othering process used to manage the stress of carrying out work that is perceived to be unpleasant. There is no doubt that the data contained examples of unkempt homes and poor hygiene, conditions that provoked uncomfortable feelings.</p> <p>Many social workers struggled to decide on the extent to which practice should engage with poverty. Some respondents tussled with the link between deprivation and social work demand. When asked, “Is there</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>a link between deprivation and child abuse?” (pp. 369), most of the respondents answered “yes and no.”</p> <p>The constant movement between acceptance and denial of the association between poverty and child maltreatment was a feature across the data. This problem was understood through the prism of anti-oppressive practice, fuelling the ethical dilemmas social workers faced. The reluctance to associate deprivation with “child maltreatment” was because “not all poor people are bad parents”. Respondents referred to some deprived families as taking “very good care of their children” and some low deprivation families that “neglect and harm their children.” Although an area team leader reflected on the difficulties of poverty for families, she also felt that there must be “accountability,” articulating a concern that if poverty is to be depicted as having a causal link to child abuse, this took away parental responsibility. Such reflections hint at the complex moral and ethical dilemmas that decisions</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					to intervene generated for social workers and the paucity of frameworks for practice that supported a robust understanding of the influence of socio-economic determinants, alongside the experiences and consequences of individual harms and adversities.
Mind the gap: Parental and professional perceptions of 'risk' for children living in poverty (Yona & Nadan, 2021)	This article explored the perceptions and constructions of child risk and protection for children growing up in poverty, from the perspective of parents and social workers serving them, in an impoverished neighbourhood in Israel.	Israel	Poverty is equated to low socioeconomic status in the sampling process.	The research is a case study of a geographical community where parents raise their children in a context of poverty and distress. Of the 50 in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted overall, 35 were with parents and 15 were with social workers employed (4) or previously employed in the last 2 years (11) by the neighbourhood's social services department. Interviewees were located through snowball techniques (<i>Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods Integrating Theory and Practice (Fourth Edition)</i> , 2014). All the parents (15 fathers and 20 mothers) were either divorced or separated, had at least one child between	Within their 50 interviews, Yona et al. (2021) found that in many cases, the meeting between parents and social workers in the neighbourhood was accompanied by different perceptions of the essence and process of the encounter and its desired outcomes. The parents perceived the dialogue as needing to be focused and concrete, with the aim of receiving material help. Most of the parents' applications dealt with requests for material and financial assistance, and they experienced any broader discussion as interfering and irrelevant to the aim of the meeting. Contrary to this, the welfare agency's stance was that the social workers' role does not include provision of material assistance, a response that could even be harmful. To

				<p>the ages of 0 to 8 years and were of low socioeconomic status. All the participating parents were in contact with social workers in the local social services department. Of the 15 interviewed social workers, 11 were women and 4 were men. The researcher asked each parent to show her the places in the neighbourhood that she/he perceived to be of risk for children, as well as places perceived as protective for children. During the tour (which lasted roughly 30 mins), she asked the participants to describe the neighbourhood. Later, in-depth, semi-structured interviews of 1-1.5 hours were undertaken in a location of each participants choice. The interview guide focused on two main issues: (1) perceptions of child risk and protection and (2) perceptions regarding the views of social workers dealing with children at risk and child protection in the neighbourhood. During the social workers' interviews,</p>	<p>reflect this point, one social worker stated that (pp. 586): "In my perception, we need to give the parents crutches; teach them to walk. That means providing them with coping tools, through a therapeutic process, rather than giving them material assistance. [...] Monetary donations do not help. In the end they do not receive skills that help them cope, survive, and improve their situation." Within Yona et al.'s (2021) sample, the social workers explained their view of avoiding provision of material assistance to the applicants by claiming that this type of aid can potentially create dependence, thus maintaining the poverty cycle. They believed that if service users cooperated with a clinical therapeutic process, they would acquire more effective, essential skills to allow them to escape from the poverty trap.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>they were asked open-ended questions about the social services department's policy regarding risk in the context of poverty. Also, the social workers were asked to share their perceptions of at-risk children among the populations they serve, or have served, as well as their perceptions regarding the spatial location of the department in the neighbourhood. Data analysis was based on the thematic analysis method (<i>Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods Integrating Theory and Practice (Fourth Edition)</i>, 2014).</p>	<p>However, the parents did not see clinical treatment as meaningful and appropriate because they perceived their distress as derived from poverty that required a material, concrete and immediate response. For example, one parent stated that (pp. 586):</p> <p>“That treatment they land on your head always makes me laugh. Have you ever seen a person taking treatment without wanting it? If I wanted treatment, I would have asked for treatment. In all honesty, it's just a waste of time and money. I came about issue A, so let us talk about issue A. Why is she starting to drive me crazy now about therapy sessions? If I have nothing to give my children to eat, why should I be interested in hearing about finding my strengths in all this?”</p> <p>In this parent's opinion, focusing on coping with his difficulties based on erroneous</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>understanding of their source, not only failed to lead to solutions but also diverted the conversation and constitutes misuse of already limited time and resources. Meanwhile the social workers felt that it was the parents who neither saw nor understood the present situation.</p> <p>The social workers explained the parents' focus specifically on material assistance when applying to the welfare agency, among other things, as their inability to see beyond the immediate. In their view, living in poverty and distress limited the parents' ability for deep, accurate analysis, which would help them understand the source of their problems, and led them to request assistance inappropriate to their needs.</p> <p>Yona et al. (2021) argued that the atmosphere of tension between social workers and parents seemed to originate in a discrepancy of perceptions regarding giving and receiving help, a longstanding theme in social work research (Mayer and Timms, 1970). Gaps created by these different</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>perceptions existed on two levels: The first related to the source of the problem in which parents perceived the material lack as a direct cause of their day-to-day hardships, whereas the social workers saw the problem as due to the absence of tools and skills. The second level related to the response required to solve the problem.</p> <p>The social workers in this study tended to refer people living in poverty to clinical interventions dealing with psychological problems, which were not in keeping with the parents' perceptions of their needs. Social workers' expected parents' cooperation in therapeutic work, and this was sometimes experienced by the parents as coercion. In this process, the social workers sometimes used the expression 'in return', indicating that a condition for receiving material aid is the parents' cooperation with the therapeutic process.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Inequitable Service Responses Triggered by Social Status of Parents

Name	Summary	Country	Definition of Poverty	Method	Results
Social Class and Child Welfare:	The study found a significant association	Norway	Social class was operationalised using	715 families in contact with the Norwegian child	Fauske et al.'s (2018) analysis found significant class

<p>Intertwining Issues of Redistribution and Recognition (Fauske et al., 2018)</p>	<p>between social class, marginalisation and the experience of recognition within the child welfare system.</p>		<p>European Socioeconomic Classification and low social class acts as a proxy for poverty.</p>	<p>welfare services (CWS) were interviewed in the first wave, in the years 2008-2009. In 16% of the families, either one or both of the parents were immigrants. The survey included questions relating to parents' experience with child welfare, their assessment of their children, the family's and their own situation, as well as information about living standards, income, housing, health, and contact with a variety of helping agencies. A second wave of the study was conducted in 2010-2012. A total of 96 families from the original sample participated. SPSS 24 was used to analyse the data. The data were facilitated with constructions of indexes of marginalisation and experienced recognition. Also, social class was operationalised using European Socioeconomic Classification and low social class acts as a proxy for poverty. Correspondence analysis</p>	<p>differences in terms of the high representation of working-class families and families dependent on welfare, particularly their representation in the supportive part of the CWS. However, the analysis also demonstrated class differences between the children in out-of-home care in relation to the type of services provided and the reason for providing these services. They consider their key finding to be the close association between the degree of marginalization and recognition; parents who scored low on marginalization experienced recognition and parents who scored high on marginalization experienced to a greater degree a lack of recognition in their meeting with child welfare.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--

				was used to analyse the associations between social class, marginalisation and recognition.	
An examination of class-based visibility bias in national child maltreatment reporting (Kim et al., 2018)	It is widely assumed among researchers and policy makers that poverty increases children's exposure to professional reporters (e.g., social service providers) causing more professional reports to be made. This is sometimes called "Class-Based Visibility Bias" (CBVB), and it suggests that there must be a higher proportion of reports from professionals as poverty increases. This study examines this relationship using state-wide, individual-level data in four states (Idaho, Michigan, Missouri, and New Hampshire) and nationwide county-level data.	United States	Child poverty data were obtained from the 2009–2013 American Community Survey (Bureau, no date). NCANDS Child File data have three family characteristic indicators relevant to a poverty status: inadequate housing condition (FCHOUSE), financial problems to meet minimum needs (FCMONEY), and public assistance receipt status such as TANF, Medicaid, etc. (FCPUBLIC). At the individual-level examination, a child was identified as "poor" when one or more of these family characteristics (FCHOUSE, FCMONEY, or FCPUBLIC) was indicated.	This study includes analyses both at the county and individual levels. Report data was obtained from NCANDS, which is the federal repository for reported maltreatment cases to CPS (<i>National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN)</i> , no date). Annual NCANDS Child Files were linked to create a single longitudinal database including 50 states and the District of Columbia while excluding territories. From this database, 2009–2013 data were selected based on report date for the current study. Child population and child poverty data were obtained from the 2009–2013 American Community Survey (ACS) (Bureau, no date). To assure reliable counts of maltreatment reports per county, counties having < 10,000 children were excluded. County-level	Interestingly, the proportion of professional-source reports were slightly lower among poor children than among non-poor children. For example, among reported Idaho children, 51.1% of poor children were reported by professionals while 54.2% of non-poor children were reported by professionals. Other states also showed the same trend (i.e., 62.6% professional-source reports among poor children versus 66.4% professional-source reports among non-poor children in Michigan, 49.9% versus 57.5% in Missouri, and 59.1% versus 62.8% in New Hampshire). Although these differences were statistically significant due to large sample sizes, they were not large in a practical sense. These overall trends were consistently observed from professional-source subcategories (e.g., social service, medical, etc.), racial/ethnic groups, and maltreatment subtypes.

				<p>measures of child maltreatment report rates, source-specific proportions of reports, and child poverty rates were generated. Reporting sources were categorised into professionals (including social services, medical, mental health, legal/law enforcement/criminal justice, education, child day care, and substitute care personnel). The dependent variables were further broken down by race/ethnicity and maltreatment type, consistent with available census classifications. Maltreatment types included total, neglect, physical abuse, and sexual abuse which were based on alleged maltreatment concerns in reports. Based on these classifications, race/ethnicity and type-specific rates and proportions were measured. Altogether, there were 112 different dependent variables. Since maltreatment risks are commonly reported in</p>	<p>Kim et al.'s (2018) data, conversely to CBVB hypotheses, suggest a small, unexpected, and currently unexplained effect in the opposite direction. Both county-level and individual-level data consistently showed that children are proportionately <i>less</i> likely to be reported by professionals as poverty increased. One explanation for these findings is that worker bias may have been overemphasised in previous research.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>annual rates, the study distinguished whether a child was reported exclusively by professionals (professional only), by nonprofessionals (nonprofessionals-only), or by both sources (both-source) during each fiscal year. Additive mixed models were used for analysis. The four states selected (Idaho, Michigan, Missouri and New Hampshire) for the individual-level examination had poverty rates within child maltreatment reports within the range expected after viewing previous research (i.e., 65.0% to 79.9%) (Irwin, 2009) (Jonson-Reid, Kohl and Drake, 2012) (Putnam-Hornstein and Needell, 2011) as this ensures that poverty is measured as consistently as possible. We used all screened-in reports in these four states from 2009 to 2013.</p>	
Unpacking the Relationship between Poverty, Child	-	-	-	-	It is important to consider the social status triggers which produce inequitable responses. One example is the last

<p>Maltreatment, and Child Protection Involvement: Service Users' and Practitioners' Perspectives (Saar-Heiman, 2021)</p>					<p>dimension identified by Saar-Heiman in 2021, named the 'relational-symbolic dimension', which involves the micro level of parenting in poverty and highlights the affective dimensions of poverty and inequality. This dimension is based on the understanding that lack of symbolic capital is manifested in stigmatization, discrimination, and disregard for the knowledge and agency of parents in poverty. Saar-Heiman (2021) state that this dimension helps to conceptualize how society and, more specifically, child protection professionals, interpret child maltreatment in the context of poverty and how the power differentials between parents and professionals come into play in this arena. Moreover, Saar-Heim (2021) argue that this dimension helps to explore the ways in which poverty influences parents' experiences when they interact with professionals and vice versa. Unlike the other two dimensions, this one is concerned with poverty's potential influence on the occurrence of maltreatment</p>
---	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>and its construction and identification as well as the treatment parents in poverty receive in the child protection system.</p> <p>The interviews revealed that the main way in which children suffer from lack of symbolic capital is by being marked as different or inferior due to their poverty. Thus, the financial situation of the family dictates what clothing they wear, what food they take to school, and what their homes look like. All the interviewees provided numerous examples of hurtful interactions between parents and professionals that revolved around poverty and parental treatment. Saar-Heiman (2021) divides these into three types of negative experiences:</p> <p><i>Being blamed and shamed.</i> Parents described how parental behaviours that were deeply embedded in the struggle against poverty were interpreted by social workers as irresponsible parenting that should be condemned. Such interpretations mean that parents experience double blaming—both for living in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>poverty and for being irresponsible parents. The emotional response to the blaming process described above is the development of feelings of shame. The parents described feeling shamed both by their children being stigmatized as “needy” and by the accusations made toward them regarding their parenting. Often the desire to avoid feelings of shame discouraged them from seeking help or meeting with professionals.</p> <p><i>Being mistrusted, rejected, and unrecognized.</i> Parents described incidents in which they had explained their situation and their parental actions in the context of poverty and professionals’ responses had implied that their explanation was some kind of excuse. The immediate consequence of such responses was parents’ strong experience of rejection when interacting with social services. These incidents occurred mainly when parents applied for financial aid and were refused in different ways that were often hurtful.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><i>Feeling threatened.</i> Parents and workers pointed to the defensive stance that parents take towards professionals because of their fear that their financial situation will be interpreted as incapable parenting. Although the threat of child protection interventions may be evident in any context, the fact that many workers detach parental hardships from poverty and reduce the significance of poverty in relation to parenting led many parents to believe that their financial deprivation would be assessed as parental incompetency.</p> <p>The main finding regarding the influence of the relational-symbolic dimension in Saar-Heiman’s (2021) analysis was that parents’ negative experiences with professionals become a major barrier to engaging in a meaningful relationship with them. This resulted in parents and children not receiving the help they need and eventually finding it difficult to create change within the relationship.</p>
<p>Poverty Awareness in Social Work</p>					

Name	Summary	Country	Definition of Poverty	Method	Results
Social Work, poverty and child welfare interventions (Morris et al., 2018)	-	-	-	-	Morris et al. (2018) presented evidence that social workers frequently downplayed the role that poverty and inequality played in influencing children’s safety and development, seeing the assessment of risk and parenting, not poverty or the context of parenting, as the ‘core business’ of child protection. The use of individualised discourses to explain the sources of families’ problems linked to neoliberal politics of ‘risk’ may reduce the complex, multifaceted causes of parental difficulties to one of individual deficit and responsibility, with little attention to social determinants of harm or contexts of families’ lives. This lack of attention to issues of poverty and social context has many ramifications for child protection policy and practice.
Framing the ‘child at risk in social work reports: Truth-telling or storytelling? (Roets et al., 2016)	The authors state that in the field of child welfare and protection, the notion of the ‘child at risk’ implies a central ground and legitimation for intervention yet is extremely ambiguous,	Belgium	The study captures insights into the wide environmental situations, including poverty and deprivation, that may occur when assessing ‘children at risk’ and	In order to enable social work students to become aware of their social construction of the ‘child at risk’ while writing reports, Bachelor students of Social Work at Ghent University (n= 152) were asked to	In their analysis, they identified three major issues in the construction of the ‘child at risk’ when social work students approach report writing as an open-ended and reflexive practice of storytelling: recognisability,

	<p>since it can be constructed in radically different ways in practice. This construction process might involve challenges to professional assessment and intervention, since dealing with this complex notion is about more than tools, (risk) management and protocols. The authors therefore focus on the practice of writing reports as an exemplary practice in which social workers exercise their power while assessing and constructing the child as 'at risk'. Two approaches of social workers in interpreting the complexity of situations where children are potentially at risk are considered: truth-telling and storytelling.</p>		<p>how these may be framed, captured and written into formal reports.</p>	<p>watch a short film (about 15 min), titled 'The Sugar Bowl', during a course on documentation and assessment practices in the academic year 2012–2013. 'The Sugar Bowl' represents a very complicated and ambiguous family situation, in which four hypothetical family members act. Throughout the evolving storyline, a subtle yet very arbitrary suspicion of child abuse emerges, and a diversity of questions about the actors' agency and responsibilities in this situation can be raised that lead to different ways of interpreting this social reality.</p> <p>The students were asked to construct a written report individually. The authors framed the assignment as follows: the students were positioned as child and family social workers who had to write a report commissioned by the judge. The reason for this commission was that there were rumours that</p>	<p>comprehensibility and stigmatisation. The normative judgment processes in social work are complex, determined by the analysis of situations in which the child may potentially be constructed as being at risk. Dealing with this complexity therefore requires reflexivity of social workers regarding their perceptions and interpretations at stake in practice. We argue that normative judgment in risk assessment should be an essential area for exploration in social work education. It is clear, as Roets et al. (2016) also highlight in their 156 interviews, that the judgment processes in social work are complex, determined by the analysis of situations in which the child may potentially be constructed as being at risk. Dealing with this complexity therefore requires reflexivity of social workers regarding their perceptions and interpretations at stake in practice (Roets et al., 2016). For some children, additional resources/poverty-aware practice cannot solve the problems and they will need to come into care.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

				<p>something was wrong in the family and the students, as social workers, had to go and observe this situation and give feedback to the judge, who then would have to decide if and what further interventions.</p> <p>The 152 completed reports served as data. As a strategy of data analysis, we engaged in a qualitative content analysis of the written reports, as a way to make sense of a volume of qualitative material and attempt to identify core consistencies and meanings. It allowed us to examine key themes and meanings that may have been manifest or latent in the written reports, emerging inductively from the data. They applied a conventional approach to content analysis, which involved ‘allowing the categories and names for categories to flow from the data.</p>	
‘You Decide’: Relationship-Based Knowledge and	“Through a case illustration of a high-risk crisis situation in the Israeli child protection	Israel	The mother in the case study is described to have a ‘worsening financial situation’.	The case illustration is based on the thorough documentation of a crisis intervention the first	Saar-Heiman et al. (2019) sought to explore how this ‘poverty-blindness’ affects the kind of knowledge practitioners

<p>Parents' Participation in High-Risk Child Protection Crisis Interventions (Saar-Heiman & Krumer-Nevo, 2019)</p>	<p>system, this article examines the potential contribution of a developing critical paradigm—the Poverty Aware Paradigm—to the promotion of parents' participation in high-risk crisis situations. Specifically, it points to 'relationship-based knowledge' as an organizing axis for knowledge production, and to its derivative, 'dialogue on power/knowledge', as a useful practice in child protection interventions."</p>			<p>author, Yuval, carried out as part of his long-term treatment of the family in the framework of a child protection community centre. The crisis intervention was carried out at the family's home and lasted for 2.5 hr. Yuval documented it in writing immediately afterwards. The written documentation was analysed by the two authors, the second is an experienced scholar who was not involved in the intervention. The analysis aimed to conceptualize the specific ways in which knowledge was created throughout the crisis intervention, especially the roles of the relationship and power imbalance in it. The research project was approved by the University's ethical committee. Tali and Iyad, the parents involved, were aware that the entire treatment process was documented both in the agency's files and for the purpose of research, and signed an informed consent form to that effect.</p>	<p>incorporate when they engage with parents and moreover how it affects the professional commitment to parents' involvement and participation. The focus of this article was the adaptation of Krumer-Nevo's (2016) poverty-aware paradigm (PAP) to the context of risk and child protection practice.</p> <p>Within a single case design, their analysis of the case illustrated how the dialogue on power/knowledge, with its three analytical features—holding a dialectic stance regarding knowledge, sharing both worries and hopes, and applying considerations regarding the real-life context to the decision making—could improve parents' participation in crisis situations in the child protection system.</p> <p>Taking a dialectical stance regarding knowledge required social workers to find appropriate ways to discuss issues of power/knowledge with service users precisely in those extreme situations in which they can be taken for granted. Paradoxically, it was</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>Furthermore, both of them agreed to the publication of the specific documentation of the crisis intervention. At the final stage of writing, Tali read the case illustration and its analysis and reconfirmed her consent. In order to preserve the family’s anonymity and privacy, pseudonyms were used and key identifying details removed.</p>	<p>the deep awareness of the fact that these situations are about power/knowledge that created the space in which it was possible to oppose designating parents’ knowledge as inferior. Secondly, in contrast to parents’ experiences in which their material condition is not taken into account when their children are defined as being at risk, considering the real-life context enabled the inclusion of knowledge regarding the structural and social context in which risk was constructed. These considerations included direct risk factors that became evident in the assessment process—e.g. the housing situation, food insecurity or lack of accessible social services.</p>
<p>The Poverty-Aware Paradigm for Child Protection: A Critical Framework for Policy and Practice (Saar-Heiman & Gupta, 2020)</p>	<p>This article aims to develop a poverty-aware paradigm for child protection (PAPCP). The focus of the article is the adaptation of Krumer-Nevo’s (Krumer-Nevo, 2016) poverty-aware paradigm (PAP) to the context of risk and child protection practice. The article aims to accomplish two goals:</p>	<p>Israel and England</p>	<p>Poverty as understood in Israeli and English contexts</p>	<p>Adapts PAP to the context of child protection and discusses the PAPCP against the background of the risk-focused paradigm (RFP) that currently dominates child protection in both Israel and England. The article includes three main sections, each of which will focus on one of the paradigm’s facets, on the questions it poses and</p>	<p>Risk within dominant child protection discourses in England and Israel are focused on harm deemed to be caused by parental actions or inactions, with an absence of attention to harms because of structural inequalities. A PAPCP ontology rejects the individualised explanation of the RFP and takes a wider view of risks to children’s well-being to include social harms and policies and</p>

	<p>first, to present a conceptualisation of the paradigmatic assumptions—notions about the phenomenon at hand (ontology), about knowledge (epistemology) and about ethics (axiology)—underpinning poverty-aware social work practice in the context of children at risk. Second and importantly, to provide a clear, practical and applicable link between critical, poverty-aware theories and every-day social work practice.</p>			<p>the answers it gives to issues of risk and child protection. Specifically, the ontological facet addresses the questions ‘What is the nature of risk?’ and ‘What are the lived experiences of parents and children “at risk”?’; the epistemological facet deals with the question: ‘What kind of knowledge is needed in order to identify and access risk?’; while the axiological facet raises the question ‘what ethical stance should guide social workers when working with children at risk and their parents?’. Each section includes examples from the authors’ research and practice for the purpose of enlivening theoretical concepts and exemplifying the implications of a PAP analysis to practice in the child protection arena.</p>	<p>practices that contribute to such harms. A PAPCP ontology also views poverty as a violation of human rights, which has material and psychological consequences, acknowledging that assumptions about poverty and risk are implicated in everyday encounters. The paper states that while incorporating parents’ points of view in assessments and decision-making is necessary for knowledge production (Healy and Darlington, 2009), the PAPCP epistemology asserts that focusing on the interpersonal aspects of knowledge production can obscure its social and political nature. Thus, aside from the focus on parents’ points of view regarding a given situation, relationships-based knowledge incorporates questions such as ‘How does the power imbalance between the parent and the social worker shape their dialogue and the knowledge created in it?’ Furthermore, the PAPCP epistemology aims to incorporate contextual and structural knowledge into assessment processes in both the material and symbolic/relational</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--

					dimensions. The importance of involving families in the co-construction of knowledge about living in poverty and child protection services is a crucial aspect of the PAPCP epistemology. In line with the PAP ontology, which sees harm as having systemic causes and poor parents as active agents fighting poverty, the PAPCP axiological premise emphasises an ethics of solidarity. The PAPCP axiology calls for a relational and contextual ethical stance towards what is perceived as the 'best interests of the child'
<i>Drivers of Demand and System Conditions: Staff Perceptions</i>					
Name	Summary	Country	Definition of Poverty	Method	Results
Identifying and understanding the link between system conditions and welfare inequalities in children's social care services (Hood et al., 2020a)	-	-	-	-	Hood et al. (2020a) aimed to gain an 'inside perspective' from senior and experienced staff on factors affecting patterns of demand and provision in LAs. They found that the fact that child protection interventions were more likely for children from more deprived backgrounds was no surprise to participants. It was attributed to a number of

					<p>factors: parental stress, financial hardship and poor-quality housing, social exclusion and lack of support networks, low educational achievement and employment opportunities, families being (or feeling) 'trapped' in neighbourhoods with high levels of crime, gang activity and anti-social behaviour, and the experience of racism and discrimination for some ethnic groups. Some participants suggested that an intergenerational 'cycle of poverty' could be observed in families with a long history of involvement with child welfare. Such structural issues were perceived to be compounded through additional problems that were known to affect parenting capacity, such as substance misuse, mental or physical health problems and learning difficulties, often leading to concerns about neglect. Social inequality also played a part, since deprived families living in otherwise affluent areas could be quite isolated from support services, such as parenting groups and children's centres.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>However, participants viewed the association between poverty and CAN as not particularly useful for making decisions about individual risk because of the baseline prevalence of poverty in the child population. As a result, social and environmental factors were found to assume secondary importance in social work assessments if mentioned at all.</p> <p>In four of the six LAs, the least deprived children in contact with services were significantly more likely to be older (the reverse pattern was not quite as clear for the most deprived children). Some participants commented on the increasing problems that children with mental health, physical or learning disabilities might pose to parents as they grew older and harder to manage, making it more likely for safeguarding concerns to arise. Several participants talked about finding it more difficult to engage middle class parents, a greater tendency for disguised compliance and the potential for social workers to feel</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>intimidated by parents who were wealthy or well educated.</p> <p>The evidence from this study suggests that attitudes to poverty and affluence were bound up with differential intervention rates, and that the key mechanism for this was the assessment of neglect, particularly in families with young children and White British children. In considering these results, the authors drew attention to two key points. First, the existence of different operational practices in affluent vs deprived LAs when it came to ‘seeing’ neglect in poor families. Second, these operational practices were bound up with system conditions, such as screening, rationing and churn, based on relative funding levels, i.e. they could just be ascribed to cognitive bias or ‘poverty blindness’ among frontline practitioners but were also the product of institutional and policy drivers.</p>
Exploring drivers of demand in child protection services in an English local	The aim of the study was to identify and explore hypotheses for the main drivers of demand held by local authority	UK	Homeshire is in the upper tercile of deprivation rankings based on the weighted average score of the	The aim of the study was to explore the reasons for a rise in demand for CP in “Homeshire,” a single English LA in the south of	Hood et al. (2020b) identified two main themes: long-term drivers and short-term drivers of CP practice. The principal long-term drivers of demand

<p>authority (Hood et al., 2020b)</p>	<p>managers and practitioners, including the non-statutory “Early Help” (EH) service.</p>		<p>Index of Multiple Deprivation, that is, it is one of the least deprived LAs in the country.</p>	<p>England. Homeshire is in the upper tercile of deprivation rankings based on the weighted average score of the Index of Multiple Deprivation, that is, it is one of the least deprived LAs in the country. Most of the population lives in urban areas defined as city, town, or minor conurbation. Its inspection ratings from Ofsted over the past decade have been either “good” or “adequate/requires improvement.” As is typical for LAs with low average deprivation, Homeshire also has relatively low levels of demand for CSC compared with the national average, including for CP services. However, from April 2017 to March 2018, the LA saw an unusual spike in demand. Rates of child abuse (“Section 47”) investigations and CP plans increased by over 70% compared with the previous year, whereas referrals went up by nearly 50% and CIN (all children receiving a statutory</p>	<p>identified by participants were increasing poverty and need in communities combined with the erosion of preventative services for children and young people. These factors, such as housing, unemployment, crime, debt, and the breakdown of support networks, were seen as linked to broader structural changes, such as widening inequality and the growing precarity of social arrangements.</p> <p>Participants reported that, since 2010, the LA had been forced to make cuts to preventative services such as youth centres, youth outreach and community work, general family support services, and family centres. Such services had previously been able to develop relationships with a range of children and families in local communities, offer safe havens to young people experiencing problems at home, and act on safeguarding concerns before they reached the threshold for statutory intervention. Some participants felt that a lack of this kind of provision, particularly for young people, had led to</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	---	---

				<p>service) by 60%. Over the year, all these indicators apart from referrals reached their highest rate since 2009, the earliest year for which comparable data were available. The spike in CP interventions put CSC services under great pressure, especially because they were resourced to deal with a much lower level of demand. The work reported on below was carried out by the research team over the summer of 2018. The study employed an interpretative qualitative design to elicit explanations of rising demand for CP in Homeshire, drawing on the experience and knowledge of a sample of insider experts. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the faculty research ethics committee of the principal investigator's institution.</p>	<p>problems being overlooked until they grew more serious, and a lack of options for follow-up and support to families following statutory intervention. Other participants observed that community-based workers had accumulated a great deal of local knowledge relevant to child safeguarding, such as the availability and selling of drugs, the experience of domestic abuse, and involvement in criminal activity. Loss of this background knowledge, made it harder for services to identify emerging risks to children in the community or indeed the protective elements of community life.</p> <p>Many participants recognized the effects of increased economic hardship on families over the past 8 years. Some reported visiting more families who were experiencing poverty or acute financial difficulties as a result of cuts in benefits and entitlements, time lapses before new benefits were received, and loss of employment. Increased levels of stress due to economic hardship was thought to be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>leading to higher levels of conflict within families, parental acrimony, and marital breakdown, making it harder for parents to meet their children's needs and pushing up demand for child welfare services. Housing issues were thought to have contributed to demand for CSC in two ways. First, the poor quality and escalating cost of privately rented accommodation, combined with more restricted access to social housing, was putting additional pressure on deprived families. Problems included overcrowding, lack of space and amenities, rising rates of eviction, and longer waiting lists for social housing. Such stress factors were implicated in a higher risk of children experiencing abuse and neglect.</p> <p>In terms of shorter-term drivers, Hood et al. (2020b) identified that many participants considered that the local authority had put greater emphasis on partnership working in CP over the past 3 years, which may have had a cumulative effect contributing to an increase in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>CP referrals. Social workers from CSC felt that other professionals from other agencies were now more able to recognize signs of abuse and neglect, more alert to issues such as child sexual exploitation, and more comfortable sharing information or asking for advice. While participants were generally positive about the new way of working, the bottleneck in provision was placing early help services to find ways of rationing demand, while making it harder for CSC to divert cases that normally would not require statutory intervention.</p> <p>Several participants mentioned the impact of a joint targeted Ofsted inspection in early 2017, which had focused on neglect. The inspection had raised awareness of neglect indicators in more affluent households, especially in relation to emotional neglect, as well as the cumulative impact of neglect on children's development. This was thought by some practitioners to have contributed to a more assertive approach to cases where</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					neglect was identified. There was a perceived change of culture in the LA from a previous emphasis on longer term work and keeping children with their families to a more interventionist culture, resulting in some children being admitted into care as adolescents when they had been known to services for several years.
Responding to Poverty: Material Assistance					
Name	Summary	Country	Definition of Poverty	Method	Results
Redistribution and Recognition in Social Work Practice: Lessons Learned From Providing Material Assistance in Child Protection Settings (Saar-Heiman & Krumer-Nevo, 2021)	This article attempts to describe and conceptualise the practice of material assistance in child protection interventions, and to explore the challenges workers face when implementing it.	Israel	Poverty as seen in an Israeli context	The study adopted a qualitative methodological approach and consisted of 20 in-depth semi structured interviews with social work practitioners who had worked in the Families on the Path to Growth (FPG) program for at least 8 months. FPG is a pilot program that operates in 17 localities. It targets families in which the children (0–18) are identified as being at high risk for child maltreatment and are either on the verge of removal from their homes or with potential to return home from out-of-	Saar-Heiman et al. (2021) write that material assistance is essentially a redistributive practice, both in the sense that it reflects a major shift in child protection policy and in the sense that it provides social workers and parents (relative) autonomy in deciding how to redistribute budgets. On the other hand, findings also pointed to the indisputable importance of relational, intersubjective political recognition within this practice; the relationships between social workers and service users always involve the exercise and distribution of power because they affirm or deny the unjust

				<p>home placement. In addition, families recruited were those with whom social workers had not succeeded to establish previous working relationship. Each social worker in the program works with 12 families. At 40,000 NIS a year (approximately \$11,000), the flexible budget provided to families in FPG is the most generous in comparison with other programs. The money is held by the social worker but marked as the family's money and the social worker cannot transfer it to other families or uses. The use of the money is fairly flexible with 75% designated for educational, therapeutic, and employment-related needs and the rest for basic necessities. In addition to the budget, the program provides the social workers with intensive PAP training before they start the program, and ongoing supervision (4hr a month) to encourage them to perceive the budget as a</p>	<p>social context of service users' lives. As result, this study offers an initial systemic look into the black box of material assistance practice. All three continuums, that is the continuum between collaboration and counter collaboration involving workers' attitudes regarding who owns the budget, transparency, and decision-making concerning how to use the money, demonstrate how a combination of workers' paradigmatic stances regarding the nature of their relationships with parents influences the ways in which workers understand and frame families' needs, motives, and actions, the ways in which they actually utilize material assistance, and ultimately, the distribution of the money. An interconnected and bidirectional influence between workers' positions on the different continuums is apparent. For example, the creation of a collaborative dialogue with parents (on the first continuum) enabled a contextual and integrated understanding of the family's needs (on the second</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>therapeutic tool rather than a threat to psychosocial treatment or merely a manipulation for recruiting service users into treatment. The interviews lasted an average of 90 minutes each. The focus of the interviews was the workers' general experience in the program, their relationships with parents, and their practices. Specific attention was given to their experiences and perceptions regarding the practice of providing material assistance. A systematic content and thematic analysis was applied which consisted of four phases.</p>	<p>continuum), which led to trusting, less monitored utilization of the assistance (on the third continuum).</p> <p>At the practical level, the fact that workers' positioning along the continuums varied not only between workers, but also within each worker's caseload between different families highlights the fact that workers' professional stances are constantly influenced and shaped in relation to particular relationships and contexts and vice versa. It is clear from Saar-Heiman et al.'s (2021) use of a continuums that practicing material assistance involves ideas, values, and adjacent positions that often overlap. Moreover, it indicates that the complexity of this practice requires social workers to constantly adjust to specific contexts while reflecting on their practice. In this context, the workers pointed repeatedly to the supervision they received as an important space, albeit confusing sometimes, that enabled them to continually reflect on their practice of material assistance.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The results of this study contradict the common notion that the provision of material assistance is a technical or bureaucrat act. The findings demonstrate exactly the opposite—material assistance is a relational practice. Second, the study presents a clear theoretical conceptualization of this practice within the critical framework of the PAP and, more specifically, within the framework of the recognition/redistribution debate. Moreover, it serves as an innovative manifestation of Nancy Fraser’s framework of justice within direct child protection practice, that is, it exemplifies that without “reducing either dimension [redistribution and recognition] to the other, it encompasses both of them within a broader overarching framework” (Fraser & Honneth, 2003, p. 35).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

N= 17