

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/168238/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Evans, Lilly, Fitz-Symonds, Samantha, Long, Fiona, Roberts, Louise , Diaz, Clive and Powell, Shane 2024. "They seem to listen more now I have an advocate": a study into the implementation of parental advocacy in Wales. *Journal of Children's Services* 19 (2) , pp. 89-104. 10.1108/JCS-05-2023-0027

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JCS-05-2023-0027>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.





'They seem to listen more now I have an advocate': A study into the implementation of parental advocacy in Wales

Journal:	<i>Journal of Children's Services</i>
Manuscript ID	JCS-05-2023-0027.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Parental advocacy, user participation, child services, child protection, Wales, qualitative research

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

‘They seem to listen more now I have an advocate’: A study into the implementation of parental advocacy in Wales.

Abstract

Parental advocacy is an emerging area of research and policy interest in Wales and across the UK. Although there is little research in the UK context to date, international research has indicated that parental advocacy can improve the relationship between parent and professional in the field of child protection social work. It is important that research ascertains how the implementation of parental advocacy programmes support parents to play a meaningful role in decision-making when children’s services are working with them and their families.

This **small-scale** study used interviews, surveys, and focus groups to obtain qualitative data from eighteen parents, seven parent advocates, two advocacy managers, and four social workers, in order to explore the potential impact of parental advocacy on decision-making. The study identified challenges in implementing parental advocacy, particularly relating to awareness of the service. Participants also discussed experiences of the child protection system and how parents are supported by advocates. Despite challenges surrounding implementation, initial findings were encouraging, and generated examples of how parental advocacy services have helped parents to understand children’s services and develop relationships of trust with social care professionals. **In doing so, this study provides provisional results which identify potential mechanisms that may be useful to support future service delivery and the need for further exploration in this area.**

Keywords: Parental advocacy; user participation; child services; child protection.

Teaser text

This paper presents findings from an ongoing study in one region of Wales, into the perceived impact of parental advocacy on parents whose families have child protection social work involvement and the professionals they work with. The paper explores how parents are supported by parent advocates and considers their experiences of children’s services. In doing so, the paper draws on data from interviews, qualitative surveys, and a focus group which comprised parents, social workers, and parent advocates. Our initial findings are encouraging, highlighting the ways in which parental advocacy has helped parents to develop better relationships with the social care professionals they work with, in addition to helping to improve their understanding of children’s services and child protection processes.

1. Introduction

Research has consistently highlighted parents’ experiences of distrust and poor relationships with social workers (Diaz, 2020; Featherstone et al., 2017; Gibson, 2017). Parents purportedly found key child welfare meetings such as child protection conferences (CPCs) to be particularly challenging, as they felt unable to participate in decisions about their lives, which left them feeling marginalised and disempowered (Diaz, 2020). In turn, this impacted their willingness to seek help from social workers, and to accept help when it is offered.

1
2
3 Engagement of, and partnership with parents has long been recognised as a crucial
4 component of social work, enshrined in law and policy, and identified as an effective way of
5 helping children and families (Horwitz and Marshall, 2015; Sankaren, 2015). Cohen and
6 Canan (2006) suggested that engagement is an important element of any service provision,
7 because without this, the service could not fulfil one of its key tasks: to help families function
8 better, and when possible, safely keep children with their parents. Research has shown that
9 failure to engage or comply increases the chances of child protection proceedings being
10 initiated (Devine, 2017). Thus, engagement has important legal and ethical components, in
11 addition to the hypothetical claim that it will improve outcomes.
12

13
14 Among social workers, there has been consensus that parental engagement and partnership
15 working is valuable (Corby et al., 1996; Darlington et al., 2010). The participants interviewed
16 by Darlington et al. (2010) all agreed that parents' participation in complex child protection
17 social work, including decision-making, was important ethically and was vital to improving
18 outcomes for children.
19

20
21 Whilst there is currently a paucity of research on parental advocacy in Europe/[UK], some
22 research has been conducted on this topic in the USA. For instance, Tobis et al. (2020) have
23 shown that effective parental advocacy reduced the numbers of children entering state care.
24 Further, for families with children in state care, studies have shown children of programme
25 participants involved in parental advocacy or peer parental advocacy programmes to be
26 more likely to return home than non-participants and parent advocacy was shown to impact
27 decisions around child placements and improve family outcomes (Lalayants et al., 2021;
28 Chambers et al., 2019). This research paper consequently seeks to fill a gap by exploring
29 the topic of parental advocacy with the UK context.
30

31
32 There are different types of parental advocacy, this includes 'professional' advocates
33 advocating for parents; these are advocates independent of local authorities and social
34 services and who have undertaken training and often, obtained qualifications relevant to
35 child welfare to support parents. Another type of parental advocacy is peer parental
36 advocacy, whereby someone with lived experience of the child protection system advocates
37 on behalf of another parent. The vast majority of studies carried out to date relate to peer
38 parental advocacy (Berrick et al., 2011; Lalayants, 2012, 2015; Rockhill et al., 2015).
39

40
41 Whilst UK research on non-peer parental advocacy is scant, Featherstone et al. (2011)
42 undertook an evaluation of a UK-based non-peer parental advocacy service run by the
43 Family Rights Group. The study found that the advocates positively impacted partnership
44 working between parents and professionals. The study also highlighted the lack of political
45 agenda concerning the development of advocacy schemes for parents who are often left
46 unsupported as they try to navigate complex social work processes.
47

48
49 This paper uses the term 'Parent Advocate' (PA), elsewhere referred to as or peer advocate
50 and parent partner.
51

52 **2. The Potential of Parental Advocacy**

53
54 Parental advocacy models have emerged in order to address the marginalisation of parents
55 when navigating complex child welfare systems. Key distinctions can be delineated between
56 peer advocacy approaches and professional advocacy models. For example, peer advocacy
57 programmes engage parents who have previously navigated child protection systems, to
58 mentor and support families currently involved with children's services (Berrick et al., 2011).
59 These peer mentors draw strongly on the power of shared lived experiences when relating to
60 families and building trust. Activities centre on emotional encouragement, tangible
assistance in meeting basic needs, informational support in explaining bureaucratic
processes, insider strategies for effective participation, motivational coaching regarding

1
2
3 goals, such as reunification, and accompaniment to meetings, to represent parent
4 perspectives (Berrick et al., 2011; Frame et al., 2010).

5
6 Various peer models exist, including peer recovery coaches who support the reunification of
7 parents in substance use recovery; volunteer mentors who deliver individualized guidance;
8 group forums which facilitate mutual learning in non-judgmental environments; and
9 representations by parents who are experienced in child welfare conferences and legal
10 proceedings (Berrick et al., 2011; Lalayants, 2021; Marcenko et al., 2010). Research into
11 peer parental advocacy in the United States has identified it as a '*new and significant*
12 *evidenced-based strategy for supporting families*' (Berrick et al., 2011, p. 9) that '*represents*
13 *a new way of doing business*' (Frame et al., 2010, p.3). It has the potential to create a
14 '*paradigm shift*' (ibid, p.2) that '*questions the centrality of professionally driven case planning*'
15 (Sears et al., 2017, p.80), potentially leading to more shared decision-making and improved
16 relationships between professionals and families.

17
18
19 Parents in Berrick et al.'s (2011) study reported that their PA functioned as an intermediary
20 figure between them and services, especially in translating social work jargon and courtroom
21 terminology. This finding was echoed in Lalayants' study, in which parents described their
22 peer mentors as being able to '*speak their language*', literally and figuratively, and '*explain*
23 *things in a way that they could understand*' (2012, p.35). Berrick et al. (2011) concluded that
24 parents received emotional, material, and practical support from their PAs. The PAs often
25 had a comprehensive understanding of the available resources and support services, having
26 needed to access these previously themselves. The authors note that it might not just be the
27 emotional and practical support, but also *who* provides that support, which is a key
28 ingredient. Peer PAs have been shown to help parents improve their knowledge about
29 resources and support, understand their rights, advocate for themselves, and increase their
30 social support, which are all key to promoting better outcomes for families (Frame et al.,
31 2010; Lalayants, 2015; Thorpe, 2007; Watson et al., 2010; Haworth et al. 2023; Fitz-
32 Symonds et al. 2023). In this way, PAs are intended to complement, and not replace, social
33 worker support (Leake et al., 2012).

34
35
36 Common principles coalesce around empathy and empowerment to make systems more
37 collaborative and family-driven, suggesting a promising approach in improving the
38 relationship between professionals and families (Bohannan et al., 2016; Lalayants, 2014,
39 2017; Rockhill et al., 2015; Trescher and Summers, 2020). However, translating aspirational
40 ideals into equitable practices remains challenging within resistant bureaucracies, whilst
41 issues surrounding role clarity exist (Featherstone et al., 2018; Lalayants, 2015).

42
43 Professional advocacy encompasses those models in which advocates work independently
44 from statutory services to represent parents' interests (Lalayants, 2017). Activities include
45 translating information into accessible language, providing emotional support, advising on
46 rights and responsibilities, attending meetings, and promoting participation in decision-
47 making (Featherstone & Fraser, 2012; Tobis et al., 2021). Professional advocates import
48 knowledge of navigating bureaucracies and upholding dignity amidst stigma (Collings et al.,
49 2018). In addition to the advantages bestowed upon parents, through receiving advocacy,
50 benefits to social workers have also been noted.

51
52
53 It has been reported that the PA facilitates engagement between social workers and parents
54 and increases empathy between social workers and parents (Heubner et al., 2018;
55 Lalayants, 2012; Leake et al., 2012; Sears et al., 2017). Lalayants' (2017) study examined
56 perceptions of partnership between child protection workers and PAs. Among the 30
57 supervisors and 9 advocates interviewed, most social workers described their relationship
58 with PAs positively. However, some social workers did not fully understand the role and
59 purpose of the advocate. Some PAs believed that social workers were fixed in their
60 judgement of a family, thereby hindering collaboration. Finally, some PAs thought that some

1
2
3 social workers preferred the 'old' way of working, which did not promote participation.
4 Lalayants (2017) highlighted that whilst family engagement is highly desirable, agencies still
5 struggled to share power and decision-making with parents.
6

7 Actualising rights-based principles whilst resources are limited poses a dilemma in itself.
8 Independence also requires negotiation, as complete separation may inhibit constructive
9 collaboration with authorities. There remains a need to ground aspirational professional
10 advocacy ideals within lived experiences. For example, Collings et al. (2016) found
11 advocates enabled more inclusive decision-making but faced dilemmas balancing
12 independence versus collaboration with authorities. Morris et al. (2018) noted that advocates
13 increased parents' system understanding, but that adversarial legal structures continued
14 undermining social work aims.
15

16
17 Overall, while different models have proliferated, the majority focus has been on peer or
18 paraprofessional approaches (Tobis et al., 2021), with limited United Kingdom centric
19 evidence on professional advocacy models. When examining the UK policy landscape,
20 some alignment emerges between participatory reforms and parental advocacy goals. For
21 instance, Family Group Conferencing promotes collaborative decision-making which
22 resonates with advocacy ideals of inclusion. However, austerity policies straining resources
23 may pose barriers to fully implementing and evaluating advocacy programmes. There
24 remains a need for exploratory research on the implementation and impacts of professional
25 parental advocacy programmes within child welfare contexts (Featherstone et al., 2018).
26 Elucidating lived experiences and perspectives from a range of stakeholders could enrich
27 conceptual principles, which could lead towards context-specific, equitable practices,
28 ultimately supporting marginalised families. Consequently, it is this 'gap' that the present
29 study aims to help address.
30
31

32 33 **3. The Research Study** 34 35

36
37 This was an exploratory study into the support offered by the expanded Parental Advocacy
38 Project (PAP) in a region in Wales, offered to parents whose children are involved with to
39 children's social care services. We sought to understand how the PAP impacted parents'
40 ability to meaningfully participate in decision-making, and whether the project would
41 empower parents during child welfare meetings, including CPCs.
42
43

44 *3.1 The Research Setting* 45

46 The National Youth Advocacy Service Cymru (NYAS) is a rights-based charity operating
47 across England and Wales. Its core aims are to ensure that marginalised children, young
48 people, and adults have a voice and empower them to take control of their lives through
49 advocacy intervention; to ensure they are aware of their rights and entitlements; and to build
50 resilience and improve wellbeing. NYAS has been developing and delivering parental
51 advocacy services since 2017, and based on the success of the initial PAP pilot, the Welsh
52 Government has funded NYAS Cymru to continue offering PA until March 2023. The charity
53 is also part of a ministerial advisory group, which oversees a large Welsh Government
54 financial investment aimed at supporting families and helping to reduce the need for children
55 to enter care (NYAS, 2018). This is the first time that a government-funded parental
56 advocacy project has been established in the UK, providing a unique opportunity to
57 contribute to the developing evidence base on parental advocacy in Wales. The number of
58 children in care in Wales has risen steeply over the last 10 years (Forrester, 2021). It is
59
60

1
2
3 therefore important to carry out robust research to ascertain whether parental advocacy can
4 help reduce the rates of children entering state care safely.
5

6 Most of the PAs involved in this study have previous experience working in an advocacy-
7 based or supportive role with adults or children. PAs undertake parental advocacy-specific
8 training, generic case management training and receive ongoing peer support from other,
9 established PAs within the service. Referral routes to the service include self-referral or
10 professional referral; these are accepted at any stage of the child protection process. PAs
11 are allocated to a parent and will typically remain allocated to that parent throughout their
12 involvement. PAs communicate with parents via phone, messages, e-mails, and home visits,
13 and attend meetings in-person or online.
14

15 16 *3.2 Methodology*

17
18 This exploratory qualitative study was conducted as part of a broader realist evaluation
19 examining a parental advocacy programme implemented by the National Youth Advocacy
20 Service (NYAS) in Wales. The advocacy service provides independent, specialist support for
21 parents engaged with statutory children's services across several local authorities in Wales.
22 Advocates aim to empower parents, promote their rights, and enhance participation in
23 decision-making regarding their families.
24

25 The study aimed to address two primary research questions:

26
27 RQ1: In what ways was the Parent Advocacy Service perceived to support parents in playing
28 a more meaningful role in decision-making when there were child welfare concerns?

29 RQ2: What were parents' and professionals' experiences of the Parental Advocacy
30 Programme?
31

32 The methods used were semi-structured interviews, an online qualitative survey, and a focus
33 group involving parents. Using both surveys and interviews encouraged participation by
34 offering choice, convenience, and accessibility. Further, the study was supported by an
35 'experts by experience' Parents Research Advisory Group, whose consultation meetings
36 provided valuable guidance with respect to interview questions, analysis of emerging
37 findings, and dissemination.
38
39
40

41 *3.2.1 Ethics*

42
43 Before commencing the research, we obtained approval from our university's ethics
44 committee. This ensured appropriate consideration of key ethical issues including
45 confidentiality, informed consent, data protection, and protection from harm. Particular
46 consideration was given to the participation of parents who were identified as part of a
47 vulnerable group, as their engagement with Children's Services may be particularly stressful
48 or upsetting. Prior to data collection, participants were given the opportunity to ask
49 questions, it was also discussed that they were free to withdraw from the study at any point,
50 and that they could decline to answer specific questions. We were also prepared to offer
51 support and signposting to appropriate services should any participants become distressed
52 whilst taking part in the study.
53

54 *3.2.2 Sampling*

55
56 Our sampling frame was purposive, as we included PAs and PA managers who worked on
57 the project, and parents and professionals who have worked with the PAP. As an exploratory
58 study, we endeavoured to look at the in-depth experiences and accounts of as broad a
59 range of parents and professionals as possible, within the limits of the study. There was also
60

a convenience element to the sampling, as PA service managers acted as a gatekeepers to accessing participants.

Participants represent a diversity of lived experiences and professional perspectives, which afforded rich, nuanced insights. However, limitations of the non-probability sampling approach are acknowledged regarding representativeness. Additionally, the small non-probability sample limits demographic representativeness and generalisation of findings.

In relation to participant recruitment, we encountered a number of challenges, including engaging with a relatively new and developing service; busy professionals; and vulnerable participants who were going through a stressful and uncertain period. We created a qualitative survey to reach participants who were unable to commit to an interview - some parents felt uncomfortable, whilst professionals were too busy – and thereby extended our sample size. Finally, a focus group was included at a later stage to ensure that our findings reflected the experiences of participants and that we had reached data saturation from the perspective of parent participants (Lietz, Langer and Furman, 2006).

PA service managers provided us with details of consenting participants, we then made contact to discuss the study, ask whether they would be happy to participate in an interview, and if so, to agree a time to meet via Microsoft Teams. PA service managers were also provided with an online survey to distribute to those participants who did not feel comfortable with participating in an interview but wished to take part in the study. In addition to this, PA service managers worked closely with advocates to identify additional parents who would be willing, and would consent to, participating in a focus group. Participants were only invited to participate in one of the data collection methods, to ensure that different perspectives and voices could be heard.

Through a combination of qualitative data collection methods, we engaged a range of stakeholders, including parents, PAs, PA managers (who manage the PA service), and social workers.

Participant	Interview (N=16)	Survey (N=11)	Focus Group (N=4)
Parents	6	8	4
Parent Advocates	2	2	0
Advocacy Managers	5	0	0
Social Workers	3	1	0

3.2.3 Data collection

All interviews took place either online using Microsoft Teams or via telephone, as Covid-19 restrictions prevented face-to-face interviews. They were carried out by the authors. Whilst the interviews were semi-structured, questions tended to centre on specific topics, for example: questions around relationships with professionals or parents; what support PAs provided inside and outside of meetings, including what could be done differently or what the service could be doing more of; and the perceived impact of parental advocacy.

Interviews typically lasted 40-60 minutes, were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analysed using a thematic framework; this allowed codes, categories, and themes to emerge from the empirical data. Data collection and analysis were conducted concurrently, until we had reached a point of saturation.

1
2
3 Surveys were undertaken using Microsoft Forms and were distributed to participants via the
4 service or local authority contacts. The survey framework incorporated some contextual
5 information as well as open-ended questions relating to: the support provided by PAs (if
6 any); what could be improved about the service; whether parental advocacy had impacted
7 relationships with professionals/ parents; and whether it had affected decision-making. We
8 provided a two-week window for survey responses, before we compiled the data,
9 anonymised any details, and analysed them thematically, alongside our interview data.
10

11 We held an in-person focus group with four parents, to further develop some of the themes
12 that had emerged throughout interviews and surveys. The focus group was carried out in a
13 neutral public venue. The focus group was audio-recorded, the data transcribed verbatim,
14 and transcripts were analysed using the same thematic framework as interviews and
15 surveys.
16

17 18 **3.2.4 Data analysis**

19
20 In depth analysis was conducted using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic
21 approach involving: familiarization, generating codes, developing themes, reviewing themes,
22 defining themes, and writing up findings. Coding and thematic development was conducted
23 manually by the lead author to organise the codes. Analysis adopted an inductive approach
24 allowing themes to emerge directly from the data, while fully valuing the subjectivity of the
25 participants' experiences (Becker et al., 2012). Peer debriefing occurred amongst the
26 authors to enhance rigor. Themes were developed in relation to the research questions on
27 perceived impacts of advocacy and participant experiences. Particular focus was placed on
28 how advocacy reportedly influenced parental participation, understanding, communication,
29 relationships and engagement in decision-making. Findings integrate verbatim quotes to
30 privilege participant voices.
31

32 Our analysis paid particular attention to the following themes:
33

- 34 1. Challenges in implementation of parental advocacy services across one region of
35 Wales.
- 36 2. Parents' views of the child protection system and social workers.
- 37 3. Parents' and professionals' perspectives of the parental advocacy service.
38
39

40 Whilst carrying out analysis, we identified several sub-themes which enabled us to identify
41 the impact that PA had on parents. One of the sub-themes looked at how parents were
42 supported by advocates, and how this could be broken down into different categories to
43 answer our research questions.
44
45

46 47 **4. Findings**

48
49 This section presents the results of analysis from participants, concerning how PAs were
50 able to support parents through social work involvement. To protect anonymity, social
51 workers and PAs are distinguished by numbers, and parents have been given pseudonyms.
52 In the following section, we explore parents' and PA's views of the child protection system
53 and social workers before highlighting the ways in which parents and professionals believe
54 the parental advocacy service has helped them.
55
56
57

58 59 **4.1 How PAs support parents**

60

1
2
3 All of the professionals, parents and PAs in this study provided insight into the PA role. The
4 parents identified a range of support methods that PAs had been able to provide. Parents
5 also reflected positively on the impact of PAs insofar as they helped manage the demands of
6 social work involvement.
7

8 Three categories were identified concerning the ways in which PAs support parents, these
9 related to:
10

- 11 • Communication, understanding jargon, and social work terminology.
- 12 • Improving the relationship between the social worker and parent.
- 13 • Improving parents' understandings of social worker expectations within Child
14 Protection processes.
15
16

17 4.1.2 *Communication, understanding jargon, and social work terminology.*

18
19

20 Most parents noted a marked positive change in their communication with social workers
21 after being supported by PAs. Almost all parents agreed that their PA had supported them,
22 and noted the impact of support in meetings, including being spoken up for in situations with
23 social workers.
24

25 **Rhiannon:** *Yes, sometimes in meetings before you know what to say but being there*
26 *you stumble and forget and my advocate has been my rock, which makes me more*
27 *confident as I know she is there supporting and helping me along the way.*
28

29 **Rosie:** *My advocate has spoken for me and stuck up for me because at times I feel*
30 *like professionals haven't listened to me and haven't understood what I've had to go*
31 *through; my advocate has made them understand that.*
32

33 Some parents reflected on the use of jargon, a recurring and divisive issue that can alienate
34 both parents and children during social work involvement (Community Care, 2018). One
35 parent in the focus group highlighted this by explaining that when they had asked for
36 clarification, their needs has been misunderstood which had affected their self-esteem:
37
38

39 **Karen:** *I was actually asked by a social worker if I had learning difficulties when I*
40 *asked them, 'Can you tell me plainly, please, what you want because you keep*
41 *changing the goalposts?' and I've not got learning difficulties, just because I've got a*
42 *mental illness doesn't mean I've got learning difficulties. They talk to you like crap.*
43

44 Rebecca highlighted how the support of a PA has helped in understanding convoluted or
45 specialised language:
46

47 **Rebecca:** *I found personally um, with myself it's helped me...if I was stuck where,*
48 *where you know I didn't understand any of the like jargon...after meetings I can say to*
49 *her, like X Y Z about it and she's like explained it more in a less jargony way.*
50

51 Both children and parents find the jargon used by social workers and other professionals to
52 be alienating, yet there has been little positive change in this area of practice (Community
53 Care, 2018). Recent research has highlighted that when senior leaders work with young
54 people and parents, that language should change to become more 'humane', which can
55 have a positive impact on engagement and participation (Diaz et al., 2021). A precedent for
56 changing language and jargon within children's services has been set by the successful
57 'Language that Cares' campaign, led by The Adolescent and Children's Trust (Community
58 Care, 2019).
59
60

1
2
3 Importantly, most parents acknowledged the supportive role of PAs during meetings,
4 especially when they were feeling emotionally heightened or under pressure.
5

6 **Rebecca:** *We normally have a meeting beforehand. Um and like she'll ask what I want
7 to say um or want brought up or this that and the other. And if like I forget, I know she's
8 like, there to prompt me to like. You know, it's having that security blanket like you
9 know, that support...I'd probably would have had a massive meltdown because of not
10 understanding things.*
11

12 **Meera:** *Because I'm not good at understanding, she'll speak up for me. I tell her what
13 to say and then she speaks up for me and she, like, comes to meetings with me.*
14

15 **Angela:** *But when I had the new social worker, [name], there was a point where I just
16 could not speak to him at all and [my advocate] would step in then as well because he
17 would be very much the same, he would manipulate stuff and tell lies. At one point, I
18 thought, 'I just can't speak to him, [advocate], because he's twisting all my words'. [...]
19 Yeah, so then I was like, 'I can't speak to him, [name]' so [my advocate] started
20 speaking to him because at that time I just couldn't deal with it, so thank God for her
21 but like I said, now I have meetings with them, and I still find they do try to twist things.*
22
23

24 One PA manager noted that the PAs strengths lay in their combined knowledge of the
25 system and emotional detachment.
26

27 **Manager 3:** I think for a professional advocate the advantage would be that they've
28 got that understanding of the system they've got in a different way, from the point of
29 view of the professional, they are less attached emotionally to the process of going
30 through a conference.
31

32 Most PAs reinforced what parents had said about challenges in communication and social
33 work terminology. The PAs shared the perspective that this was an integral part of their role
34 and their work with parents:
35

36 **Parent advocate 2:** *Some have real difficulty in communicating verbally their views,
37 wishes and feelings, and that will be my main role there.*
38

39 **Parent advocate 3:** *There's a lot of jargon sometimes, which is why afterwards it is
40 really important for us to go through it, because they won't ask there and then, they
41 have all these questions afterwards.*
42
43

44 One PA reflected on changes in a parent's self-esteem after being empowered to
45 communicate confidently and support themselves:
46

47 **Parent advocate 5:** *What I like is when I have parents who...I might get the referral
48 and these parents don't even want to speak. They don't even want to speak at
49 conference, they don't want to speak in their core groups, they don't want to...they feel
50 that they can't speak. And I have those parents know who I...are still open to me, but
51 only for conference, because they actually attend their core groups independently. I
52 don't even go now.'*
53
54

55 Both parent and PA reflections aligned with Brown's (2006) findings, that positive
56 assessments from social workers were usually the result of strong parental skills to navigate
57 social work involvement, including effective communication and the ability to research rights.
58 Brown also found that social workers did not support parents to develop these skills. While
59 our participants did not suggest that social workers had *failed* to support parents in
60 developing these skills, they agreed that the use of complex language and jargon could

1
2
3 create barriers for parents, particularly in highly pressurised social work situations. They also
4 illustrated the power of advocacy to help parents develop effective communication with
5 regards to professionals.
6

7 4.1.3 Improving the relationship between the social worker and parent

8
9 Most parents noted that their relationships with social workers were challenging, with some
10 experiencing issues due to a lack of consistency of assigned worker, whilst others felt that
11 distrust was irreparable:
12

13
14 **Rebecca:** *That's part of what's in the complaint, you know, the inconsistency of social*
15 *workers. So, like even down to when they had done a parenting assessment. It's one*
16 *person who done the assessment and then she left, so another one done a follow up*
17 *instead of like re-questioning me then done an addendum. You know, so all in all, just*
18 *for this time alone there's been like five social workers. There's been no consistency at*
19 *all.*
20

21
22 **Anwen:** *The damage has been done between myself and social services. I've just got*
23 *a huge distrust of them and I can't see any way back from that. In the beginning,*
24 *perhaps, I mean, maybe if I had an um had an advocate from day one, um that might*
25 *have made a difference.*
26

27 Anwen's reflections suggest potential limitations concerning the degree of improvement a PA
28 can reasonably make to the parent-social worker relationship, especially if the PA has
29 become involved part-way. However, there is also an argument for early intervention of PA
30 services. If PAs were involved at an earlier stage, then they could be key to offering
31 consistency, whilst acting as mediators between parents and social workers from the outset.
32

33 Zara had fundamental issues concerning the ways in which social workers operated, and
34 believed that every parent should be able to receive support from a PA:
35

36
37 **Zara:** *So yeah, advocacy services, I would 100% advocate them, you know, put*
38 *forward for anybody, anybody dealing with social workers. It's so important.*
39

40 Some parents noted a consequent improvement in their relationship with social workers,
41 attributing this to their newly developed confidence and ability to communicate effectively,
42 which in turn made them feel heard.
43

44
45 **Caroline:** *Yes, I feel confident to speak more.*
46

47
48 **Rhiannon:** *They seem to listen more now I have an advocate.*
49

50
51 **Ffion:** *Advocate has changed [my relationship with social services] because I learnt*
52 *how to express my way to social [workers] and how to word it tidy.*
53

54 One parent in the focus group reflected on how she felt the PA's presence changed the
55 approach of the social worker towards them, which in turn allowed them to feel heard:
56

57
58 **Kamal:** *The mistakes that are being made that shouldn't be made, and [advocates]*
59 *are there because, actually, they give people like us, that are slightly bullied by social*
60 *workers... and I think it is a matter of, when [advocates] are present, there's a lot*
more respect for the parent if they are represented, and it actually gives the parent a
greater voice, and it is heard.

1
2
3 Improvements in the parent-social worker relationship again reflects Brown's (2006)
4 research, which suggested that a parent's ability to effectively communicate with social
5 workers can lead to increasingly productive and positive outcomes. Some of the PAs
6 mentioned improvements in this relationship during their involvement:
7

8 **Parent advocate 2:** *I can think of one mum who...oh, she really thinks about*
9 *everything a lot, and the social worker had said a few things to her where Mum had*
10 *really caught hold of a few words that the social worker had said and it was taken*
11 *negatively, and then it was sort of, you know, mulled over and over and over. And so I*
12 *suggested that we speak to the social worker about that. They really didn't want to at*
13 *first, but...but after many discussions about it, they said, 'you know what, I think I will...I*
14 *can talk to them about it, will you help me?' And we did. And the relationship after that*
15 *between the two of them was fab. You know, Mum was listening to the social worker*
16 *then. It really cleared that blockage in communication that had been about a few words*
17 *that may or may not have been misconstrued.*
18
19

20 **Parent advocate 5:** *I do think as well, it can be really beneficial for helping them build*
21 *relationships with their children's social workers.*
22

23 One PA noted their role in building bridges between parents and professionals:
24

25 **Parent advocate 2:** *Build bridges, yeah, yeah, definitely. I definitely do. I think that is a*
26 *big part of it as well.*
27

28 The interviews with parents and PAs demonstrated how PAs were able to help support
29 improvements in the parent-social worker relationship, thus assisting with partnership
30 working and collaboration (Featherstone et al., 2011; Berrick et al., 2011). Providing
31 parents with the support in effective communication, clarifying misconceptions and
32 misunderstandings, and helping parents feel heard, were some of the ways in which the
33 presence of a PA helped to enhance collaborative working. Aligning with Leake et al.
34 (2012), this finding illustrates how PAs achieve their intended role, as complementary to
35 social workers. The ability of PAs to help manage communication challenges between
36 parents and professionals can be seen as a valuable tool in assisting social workers,
37 during often intense and emotional interactions.
38
39

40 41 *4.1.4 Improving parents' understanding of social worker expectations within child protection* 42 *processes* 43

44 Parents who feel unsupported during social work involvement are less likely to engage with
45 professionals (Muench et al., 2016). A recent report examining CPCs during the COVID-19
46 pandemic (Baginsky et al., 2020) found that remote CPCs hindered parental engagement
47 further. The report highlighted the alienation parents experienced, particularly when they had
48 not had the opportunity to speak to anyone prior to the CPC. Most of the parents we
49 interviewed echoed these sentiments and noted that the support PAs gave them included
50 improving their understanding of Local Authority expectations during social work
51 involvement. Given the findings of Muench et al. (2016), without the support of a PA,
52 outcomes might have been different in terms of engagement.
53
54

55 **Anwen:** *where my solicitor will provide me with legal information, my advocate is very*
56 *good with, um, what I can and can't do outside of the law sort of thing. So, like,*
57 *complaints procedures and what I'm allowed to ask for and things maybe my solicitors*
58 *won't deal with. She has given very good advice on that.*
59
60

Ffion: *Yes, definitely an example is when they ask about contact with baby's dad and I get to say what I want to happen, instead of social services making a choice.*

When asked whether their advocate had supported them to use their voice in relation to decision-making, one parent expressed that they had gained confidence and an ability to 'speak up':

Rebecca: *Yeah, I feel a lot more like, confident and um, yeah it's having that comfort blanket, you know. I feel like I'm able to speak up, 'cos it's knowing my rights and knowing a lot more um, in depth rather than just like black and white thinking of 'my children are going to be taken off me'. It was more, yeah, so she helped immensely.*

These parents reflected on their improved knowledge of social work processes, including their parental rights in relation to contact and complaints. The reassurance and support of their PA, in helping them to understand complex information, enabled parents to feel less intimidated by the social work process, which lessened their fears, including those relating to removal of children from the family home. **The support of a PA, also has the potential to support parents to speak up when decisions are being made about their families, promoting engagement of parents in key meetings, where decision-making is required.**

Most PAs also reflected on changes in parents' understandings of social services involvement:

Parent advocate 5: *Having a full explanation of the process and the social worker's responsibility can sometimes help parents to understand why social workers are doing the things they're doing.*

Parent advocate 2: *I can think of a parent who, within their child protection conference, the social worker had written up about something that she'd done with her son as if it was a safeguarding issue, and then on discussion with Mum, she said, 'but I put all these safeguards into place'. So during the conference, I supported her to explain all of the things that she'd put in place and that this had been an event that had been really thought through from her point of view to make sure that her son was safe.*

Parent advocate 3: *it's still early days but I can see that it is building the knowledge in families; it's giving them the confidence, it's giving them the knowledge so they can... It's working better as a family unit, and I think working with agencies, informing them that it's not a bad thing to be involved with Social Services. At the end of the day, that they are there to look after them and the children – well, children, fundamentally, and I think it's just kind of helping them. Like educating them to understand that working together is the best scenario really, and that's going to have the best outcome, rather than them automatically thinking Social Services are the enemy.*

Social workers agreed that the addition of a PA had helped parents to understand child protection processes:

Social worker 2: *I think it's just reassuring as well, because I think you know when they say 'you're going to take our kids off us' and things...But I think they are there to help them out with understanding the situation, what they've got to do to progress and get out of child protection or PLO [Public Law Outline] and things like that.*

Social worker 3: *I had one interesting family where the parent was trying to use the advocate to...to her benefit sort of thing, you know. But she...I know her personally as well, and she worked really hard to sort of ground the parent, and it worked in the end, and they were deregistered [...] I think she misunderstood what the advocate was*

1
2
3 *there for. I think she thought she could get away with anything. [...] You know, they're*
4 *there to examine everything you put forward to them and get the very best that they*
5 *can for that parent.*
6

7 These quotes from social workers suggest that PAs can support parents to understand
8 particular processes and expectations. Social worker 3's language of 'ground[ing] the parent'
9 suggests that some emotional management was used by the PA, which enabled the parent
10 to focus on actions and agreements. This resonates with the discussion in the previous
11 section, which highlighted the potentially contentious relationships between social workers
12 and parents.
13

14 Social workers also noted that whilst the primary role of the PA is to help parents in their
15 understanding of social work processes and terminology, some parents may also value the
16 PA for being a physical presence of support:
17

18
19 **Social worker 1:** *So, although their thoughts are shared and although they're*
20 *supported with their understanding, I think they felt that everything that they said would*
21 *be affirmed by her and that when she shared it with me, if it was shared by the*
22 *advocate, then there would be a different response... So the Advocate was there*
23 *to...and she was supporting with their understanding so she was saying, 'your*
24 *cognitive ability is, you know, how you understand things'. So, I think in some respects,*
25 *she does help in their understanding, but I think they see her as more of a kind of*
26 *physical support a lot of the time.*
27

28 The difficult relationships between parents and social workers, and the complexities of the
29 wider child protection system, can be seen to be eased to some extent by PAs. This may be
30 due to their translational role; arbitrating between the two parties to improve relationships; or
31 simply their ability to explain social workers' expectations of parents. The PAs seem to have
32 the potential to effectively challenge or lessen the adversarial nature of the process, also
33 helping to support parental engagement with professionals. This outcome was generally
34 perceived positively by all stakeholders.
35

36 37 38 **5. Limitations**

39 This study was necessarily small in scale as it focused on a relatively new and developing
40 service. In addition, it relied on gatekeepers, i.e., PA service managers in order to access
41 our sample population, who are considered vulnerable and hard to reach. We accept that
42 this may have influenced the sample and the consequent research findings. The Covid-19
43 pandemic also presented challenges in relation to participant recruitment and qualitative
44 interviews, which were all undertaken online.
45
46
47

48 **6 Discussion**

49 This exploratory study provides provisional qualitative insights regarding participant
50 perceptions of a parental advocacy programme in Wales. The findings cohere around three
51 primary mechanisms through which advocacy reportedly supported parents navigating child
52 welfare systems: Communication, understanding jargon, and social work terminology;
53 Improving the relationship between the social worker and parent; Improving parents'
54 understandings of social worker expectations within Child Protection processes.
55 These perceived benefits mirror those suggested in limited prior research on parental
56 advocacy models. For example, the enhanced understanding and system navigation
57 assistance reported here aligns with previous literature suggesting advocates help parents
58 comprehend rights, options and bureaucratic processes (Featherstone & Fraser, 2012;
59
60

Lalayants, 2017). Similarly, the accounts of advocates improving fragile relationships and helping parents express themselves constructively echoes studies proposing that professional advocates can mediate tensions and foster collaboration between parents and authorities (Collings et al., 2018; Tobis et al., 2021).

The perceived facilitation of greater participation and inclusion of parents also resonates with aspirations for advocacy expressed in other scholarship, though actualisation remains challenging (Featherstone et al., 2018; Morris et al., 2018). Overall, while tentative, the findings reinforce the potential value of independent professional advocacy in uplifting marginalised families within largely impersonal, complex and under-resourced child protection systems.

However, important limitations temper conclusions from this preliminary study. As acknowledged by participants, lack of awareness, late referrals, stigma and chronic underfunding constrained the reach and intensity of advocacy support. The reliance on small-scale interview and survey data precludes substantiating perceived benefits with tangible child welfare outcomes like reunification rates or case closures. Causally linking advocacy to decision-making impacts also remains tenuous without comparison groups. Lastly, the study privileged parent perceptions; incorporating perspectives from children, judges and frontline social workers could further enrich understandings.

Nonetheless, the accounts provide clues into processes through which professional advocacy models may empower parents. Findings suggest advocates fostered strengths-based, humanising alliances that helped mitigate the oppression parents encountered within systems. Potential mechanisms spanned expanding system knowledge, modelling constructive communication, lending emotional support, and facilitating participatory spaces. Overall, the data illustrates a disconnect between policy rhetoric espousing partnership, participation and family empowerment versus lived realities of marginalisation for many parents. Parental advocacy emerges as one avenue to help bridge this gulf, but wider action is needed to transform adversarial structures into equitable collaborations.

Moving forward, rigorous mixed-methods research evaluating advocacy models against child protection decisions, interventions and family outcomes will be vital. There is also need for comparative research on peer versus professional advocacy approaches, which likely differ significantly regarding relationship dynamics and system impacts. Furthermore, embedding advocacy evaluation within implementation science frameworks would illuminate how programme theories interact with complex system variables to produce outcomes. Exploring lived experiences is equally crucial for grounding concepts like rights and participation within diverse realities.

Ultimately, reducible impact necessitates moving beyond individualised remedies towards tackling oppressive attitudes, resource disparities and inflexible processes permeating systems. Well-designed, collaborative parental advocacy services grounded in human rights principles demonstrate promise as one constructive approach among many needed reforms. However, transformative change requires political will to confront biases and re-imagine accountability rooted in social justice rather than surveillance. The proliferation of advocacy models signals momentum while underscoring the magnitude of work remaining to overcome marginalization of disadvantaged families and engender equitable, compassionate child protection systems.

7 Conclusion

This exploratory qualitative study provides encouraging preliminary insights into participant perceptions regarding a professional parental advocacy programme in Wales. Analysis suggested advocacy helped parents better understand policies and processes, communicate

1
2
3 constructively with social workers, and participate more actively in influential decision-
4 making forums. These perceived benefits mirror aspirations expressed in the limited prior
5 research on professional advocacy models.
6

7 However, robust research using comparison groups and measuring child protection
8 outcomes is vital to substantiate perceived benefits and causally link advocacy approaches
9 to decision impacts. This will be an aim for subsequent stages of this ongoing research.
10 Furthermore, situating advocacy programmes within broader systemic contexts, power
11 dynamics and implementation factors is crucial to elucidate complexities shaping the design,
12 adoption and operation of initiatives across diverse settings. Ultimately, achieving equity for
13 marginalised families requires moving beyond fragmented interventions towards
14 comprehensive reforms addressing institutional discrimination and lack of resources
15 permeating child welfare systems.
16

17 18 **References**

19
20 Atkins, P., & Frederico, M. (2017). "Supporting Implementation of Innovative Social Work
21 Practice: What Factors Really Matter?" *The British Journal of Social Work*, 47(6), 1723-1744.
22 doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcx091
23

24 Baginsky, M. and Manthorpe, J. (2020). Managing through COVID-19: the experiences of
25 children's social care in 15 English local authorities. NIHR Policy Research Unit in Health
26 and Social Care Workforce, The Policy Institute, King's College London.
27

28 Baginsky, M. Eyre, J. & Roe, A. (2020). Child protection conference practice during COVID-
29 19. Reflections and experiences (rapid consultation September-October 2020). London:
30 Nuffield Family Justice Observatory.
31

32 Baginsky, M., Ixer, G., & Manthorpe, J. (2020). "Practice Frameworks in Children's Services
33 in England: An Attempt to Steer Social Work Back on Course?" *Practice*, 33(1), 3-19.
34 doi:10.1080/09503153.2019.1709634
35

36 Becker, S. Bryman, A. & Ferguson, H. eds. (2012). *Understanding research for social policy
37 and social work 2E: themes, methods and approaches*. Policy Press.
38

39 Bekaert, S., Paavilainen, E., Shecke, H., Baldacchino, A., Jouet, E., Żytka, L. Z., Bachi, B.,
40 Bartoli, F., Carra, G., Cioni, M.R., Crocamo., & Appleton, J. (2021). "Family members'
41 perspectives of child protection services, a metasynthesis of the literature". *Children and
42 Youth Services Review*, 128, 106094.
43
44

45 Berrick, J., Cohen, E. & Anthony, E. (2011). "Partnering with Parents: Promising Approaches
46 to Improve Reunification Outcomes for Children in Foster Care". *Journal of Family Strengths*,
47 11, 1-13. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/jfs/vol11/iss1/14>
48

49 Berrick, J. D., Young, E. W., Cohen, E., & Anthony, E. (2011b) "I am the face of success':
50 peer mentors in child welfare." *Child & Family Social Work*, 16(2), 179-191.
51

52 Bohannan, T., Gonzalez, C., & Summers, A. (2016). "Assessing the relationship between a
53 peer-mentoring program and case outcomes in dependency court." *Journal of Public Child
54 Welfare*, 10(2), 176-196.
55

56 Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) "Using thematic analysis in psychology." *Qualitative
57 Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp77-101.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Brown, D.J (2006). "Working the system: Re-thinking the institutionally organized role of
4 mothers and the reduction of "risk" in child protection". *Social Problems*, 53(3), 352-370.
5

6 Chambers, J.M., Lint, S., Thompson, M.G., Carlson, M.W., & Graef, M. I. (2019). "Outcomes
7 of the Iowa Parent Partner program evaluation: Stability of reunification and re-entry into
8 foster care". *Children and youth services review*, 104, 104353.
9

10 Cohen, E., & Canan, L. (2006). "Closer to home: Parent mentors in child welfare." *Child
11 Welfare-New York-*, 85(5), 867.
12

13 Collings, S., Spencer, M., Dew, A. & Dowse, L. 2018. "Specialist advocacy for parents with
14 intellectual disability in the Australian child protection system". *Australian Journal of Human
15 Rights*, 36(2), 134-139.
16

17
18 Community Care. (2018). Divisive, demeaning and devoid of feeling: how social work jargon
19 causes problems for families. *Community Care* 10 May. Available at:
20 [https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2018/05/10/divisive-demeaning-devoid-feeling-
21 social-work-jargon-causes-problems-families/](https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2018/05/10/divisive-demeaning-devoid-feeling-social-work-jargon-causes-problems-families/). [Accessed at 09 Oct. 2021].
22

23 Corby, B., Millar, M., & Young, L. (1996). "Parental participation in child protection work:
24 Rethinking the rhetoric." *The British Journal of Social Work*, 26(4), 475-492.
25

26 Darlington, Y., Healy, K., & Feeney, J. A. (2010). "Challenges in implementing participatory
27 practice in child protection: A contingency approach". *Children and Youth Services Review*,
28 32(7), 1020–1027.
29

30 Devine, L. (2017). "Rethinking child protection strategy: Progress and next steps." *Seen and
31 Heard*, 26(4), 30-49.
32

33 Diaz, C. (2020). *Decision making in child and family social work: perspectives on
34 participation*. Policy Press.
35

36 Diaz, C. Westlake, D. & Evans, L. (2021). The perceived impact of peer parental advocacy
37 on child protection practice: A pilot evaluation. What Works for Children's Social Care.
38 Retrieved from: [http://whatworks-csc.org.uk/research-project/the-perceived-impact-of-peer-
39 parental-advocacy-on-child-protection-practice-a-pilot-evaluation/
40](http://whatworks-csc.org.uk/research-project/the-perceived-impact-of-peer-parental-advocacy-on-child-protection-practice-a-pilot-evaluation/)
41

42 Elvin, A. (2019). We need to move towards a language that really cares. Community Care.
43 Retrieved from: [https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2019/03/15/we-need-to-move-towards-a-
44 language-that-cares/ds a language that really cares
45](https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2019/03/15/we-need-to-move-towards-a-language-that-cares/ds-a-language-that-really-cares)

46 Featherstone, B., Fraser, C., Cathy, A. & Ledward, P. (2011). "Advocacy for parents and
47 carers involved with children's services: making a difference to working in partnership?:
48 Advocacy in children's services." *Child & family social work*, 16(3), 266-275.
49

50 Featherstone, B., Gupta, A., Morris, K. & Warner, J. (2018). "Lets stop feeding the risk
51 monster: towards a social model of child protection". *Families, Relationships and Societies*.
52 Available at: [http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/98016/15/Morris%2C%20K%20-
53 %20Lets%20stop%20feeding%20the%20risk%20monster%20-%20acceptance%202015-
54 12-07.pdf](http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/98016/15/Morris%2C%20K%20-%20Lets%20stop%20feeding%20the%20risk%20monster%20-%20acceptance%202015-12-07.pdf) [Accessed 3rd November 2021].
55

56
57 Featherstone, B., Gupta, W., Morris, K. & White, S. (2018). *Protecting children: A social
58 model*. Bristol: Policy Press.
59
60

1
2
3 Ferguson, H. Warwick, L. Cooner, T.S. Leigh, J. Beddoe, L. Disney, T. & Plumridge, G.
4 (2020). "The nature and culture of social work with children and families in long-term
5 casework: Findings from a qualitative longitudinal study." *Child & Family Social Work*, 25(3),
6 694-703.
7

8 Fitz-Symonds, S., Evans, L., Tobis, D., Westlake, D. & Diaz C. 2023. "Mechanisms for
9 Support: A Realist Evaluation of Peer Parental Advocacy in England." *The British Journal of
10 Social Work*.
11

12 Frame, L., Berrick, J. D. & Knittel. (2010). "Parent Mentors in Child Welfare: A Paradigm
13 Shift from Traditional Services." *The Source*, 20(1), 2-6.
14

15 Gibson, M. (2017). "Social worker or social administrator? Findings from a qualitative case
16 study of a child protection social work team." *Child & Family Social Work*, 22(3), 1187-1196
17
18

19 Gibson, M. (2020). "The shame and shaming of parents in the child protection process:
20 findings from a case study of an English child protection service." *Families, Relationships
21 and Societies*, 9(2), 217-233.
22

23 Haworth, S., Bilson, A., Drayak, T. Mayes, T., Saar-Heiman, Y. (2022). "Parental
24 Partnership, Advocacy and Engagement: The Way Forward." *Social Sciences (Basel)*, 11(8),
25 pp. 353.
26

27 Horwitz, M., & Marshall, T. (2015). "Family engagement in child protection social work."
28 *Journal of Family Social Work*, 18(4), 288-301.
29

30 Huebner, R. A., Hall, M. T., Smead, E., Willauer, T., & Posze, L. (2018). "Peer mentoring
31 services, opportunities, and outcomes for child welfare families with substance use
32 disorders." *Children and Youth Services Review*, 84, 239-246.
33

34 Lalayants, M. (2012). "Parent engagement in child safety conferences: The role of parent
35 representatives." *Child Welfare*, 91(6).
36

37 Lalayants, M. (2013). "Parent representation model in child safety conferences." *Child
38 Welfare*, 92(5).
39

40 Lalayants, M. (2017). "Partnership between child protective services and parent
41 representatives." *Child & Family Social Work*, 22, 40-50.
42
43

44 Lalayants, M., Baier, M., Benedict, A., & Mera, D. (2015). "Peer support groups for child
45 welfare-involved families." *Journal of Family Social Work*, 18(5), 305-326.
46

47 Lalayants, M., Wyka, K., & Saitadze, I. (2021). "Outcomes of the Parent Advocacy Initiative
48 in child safety conferences: Placement and repeat maltreatment." *Child and Youth Services
49 Review*, 130, 106241.
50

51 Leake, R., Longworth-Reed, L., Williams, N., & Potter, C. (2012). "Exploring the benefits of a
52 parent partner mentoring program in child welfare." *Journal of Family Strengths*, 12(1), 6.
53

54 Leitz, C., Langer, C., and Furman, R. (2006). Establishing Trustworthiness in Qualitative
55 Research in Social Work Implications from a Study Regarding Spirituality. *Qualitative Social
56 Work*, 5 (4), 441-458.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Morris, K., Mason, W., Bywaters, P., Featherstone, B., Daniel, B., Brady, G., Bunting, L.,
4 Hooper, J., Mirza, N., Scourfield, J. & et al. (2018). "Social Work, Poverty, and Child Welfare
5 Interventions. *Child & Family Social Work*, (23), p.64-72.
6

7 Muench, K., Diaz, C. and Wright, R. (2017). "Children and parent participation in child
8 protection conferences: a study in one English local authority". *Child Care in Practice*, 23 (1),
9 49 – 63.
10

11 National Youth Advocacy Service. (2018). NYAS Cymru welcomes £15 million Welsh
12 Government Investment aimed at reducing the number of children in care. *NYAS Updates,*
13 *News and Advice* 7 December. Available at: [https://www.nyas.net/news-and-](https://www.nyas.net/news-and-campaigns/news/nyas-cymru-welcomes-15-million-welsh-government-investment-aimed-at-reducing-the-number-of-children-in-care/#:~:text=NYAS%20Cymru%2C%20the%20Welsh%20division%20of%20NYAS%2C%20will)
14 [campaigns/news/nyas-cymru-welcomes-15-million-welsh-government-in-](https://www.nyas.net/news-and-campaigns/news/nyas-cymru-welcomes-15-million-welsh-government-investment-aimed-at-reducing-the-number-of-children-in-care/#:~:text=NYAS%20Cymru%2C%20the%20Welsh%20division%20of%20NYAS%2C%20will)
15 [reducing-the-number-of-children-in-](https://www.nyas.net/news-and-campaigns/news/nyas-cymru-welcomes-15-million-welsh-government-investment-aimed-at-reducing-the-number-of-children-in-care/#:~:text=NYAS%20Cymru%2C%20the%20Welsh%20division%20of%20NYAS%2C%20will)
16 [care/#:~:text=NYAS%20Cymru%2C%20the%20Welsh%20division%20of%20NYAS%2C%20](https://www.nyas.net/news-and-campaigns/news/nyas-cymru-welcomes-15-million-welsh-government-investment-aimed-at-reducing-the-number-of-children-in-care/#:~:text=NYAS%20Cymru%2C%20the%20Welsh%20division%20of%20NYAS%2C%20will)
17 [will](https://www.nyas.net/news-and-campaigns/news/nyas-cymru-welcomes-15-million-welsh-government-investment-aimed-at-reducing-the-number-of-children-in-care/#:~:text=NYAS%20Cymru%2C%20the%20Welsh%20division%20of%20NYAS%2C%20will) [Accessed 13 Nov. 2022].
18
19

20 Roberts, L. Rees, A. Mannay, D. Bayfield, H. Corliss, C. Diaz, C. & Vaughan, R. (2021).
21 "Corporate parenting in a pandemic: Considering the delivery and receipt of support to care
22 leavers in Wales during Covid-19." *Children and Youth Services Review*, 128
23

24 Roberts, L. Mannay, D. Rees, A. Bayfield, H. Corliss, C. Diaz, C. & Vaughan, R. (2021b).
25 "It's been a massive struggle': Exploring the experiences of young people leaving care
26 during COVID-19". *Young* 29(4S), 81-99.
27

28 Rockhill, A., Furrer, C. J., & Duong, T. M. (2015). "Peer mentoring in child welfare: A
29 motivational framework." *Child Welfare*, 94(5),125.
30

31 Sankaran, V. S., Rideout, P. L., & Raimon, M. L. (2015). "Strange bedfellows: How child
32 welfare agencies can benefit from investing in multidisciplinary parent representation."
33 Center for the Study of Social Policy.
34

35 Sears, J. S., Hall, M. T., Harris, L. M., Mount, S., Willauer, T., Posze, L., & Smead, E.
36 (2017). "Like a marriage': Partnering with peer mentors in child welfare." *Children and Youth*
37 *Services Review*, 74, 80-86.
38
39

40 Thorpe, R. (2020). "Family inclusion in child protection practice: Building bridges in working
41 with (not against) families." *Communities, Children and Families Australia*, 3(1), (2007): 4.
42 Tobis, D., Bilson, A. & Katugampala. International Review of Parent Advocacy in Child
43 Welfare. *Better Care Network and IPAN*,166.
44

45 Tobis, D. (2019). "Parents organizing a grassroots movement to reform child welfare." *The*
46 *Routledge Handbook of Critical Social Work* Routledge.
47

48 Tobis, D. Bilson, A. & Katugampala, I. (2020). International Review of Parent Advocacy in
49 Child Welfare: Strengthening Children's Care and Protection through Parent Participation.
50 Better Care Network and IPAN. Retrieved from:
51 <https://www.parentadvocacy.net/activities/international-review/>
52
53

54 Trescher, S., & Summers, A. (2020). Outcome Evaluation Report for Washington State's
55 Parent for Parent Program. Washington, D.C.: Capacity Building Center for Courts.
56 Retrieved from:
57 [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56b0d6d4e707eb68892b71c1/t/5e1d001e44a61407b](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56b0d6d4e707eb68892b71c1/t/5e1d001e44a61407bc11f187/1578958880190/P4POutcomesReport.pdf)
58 [c11f187/1578958880190/ P4POutcomesReport.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56b0d6d4e707eb68892b71c1/t/5e1d001e44a61407bc11f187/1578958880190/P4POutcomesReport.pdf)
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Watson, E., Funk, K., & Twombly, L. (2010). "Using the Peer Recovery Model with Mothers of Substance-Exposed Newborns Identified through CAPTA Requirements." *The Source*, 20(1),15-19.

Journal of Children's Services