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Chapter 1

1.1 Introduction

In the last decades, a strategic component of the development policy has been the social protection agenda (Barrientos, 2011; Devereux & Solórzano, 2016; Midgley, 2014). Some authors have called the rapid amount of social protection programmes implemented by different countries as the "quiet revolution of social protection" (Barrientos & Hulme, 2009, p. 440). Part of the explanation lies in the international recognition that social protection is a useful mechanism for alleviating poverty and fostering broader objectives related to social and economic development (ECA et al., 2012).

Although social protection has been incorporated into development discourse and policies, the concept is still under debate. In the literature, there are multiple conceptualisations of social protection in which the aims, components, instruments and limits are far from having been agreed among the various actors that have participated in this discussion (e.g. multilateral organisations, bilateral organisations, NGO’s, think-tanks) (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004; Hinds, 2014; Morgan & Yablonski, 2011). Multilateral organisations have significantly influenced social protection frameworks implemented in low and middle-income countries, following approaches that define social protection from risk, asset or transformative approach.

This paper considers social protection from the framework of social transformation. This approach defines that social protection must address poverty and social and economic vulnerabilities, considering the structural causes that produce situations of poverty, social exclusion and discrimination towards the most vulnerable and marginalised groups of society. This implies that social protection seeks to reverse the power inequalities of social relations that originate and perpetuate the vulnerabilities of people in society, seeking to achieve higher levels of justice, equity and social inclusion (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004; Sabates-Wheeler & Devereux, 2007).

There is a higher international agreement among scholars about the importance of including specific child protection strategies that address in a differentiated manner the poverty and
vulnerability faced by children (Minujin et al., 2006; Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012). Although the emphases and strategies of the approaches of social protection are different, they converge on the idea that investment in childhood is a central strategy to end chronic poverty transmitted from generation to generation. Besides, it is argued that there would be a moral and pragmatic imperative of societies since otherwise, it would increase the risk in adult life and society in general (Unicef, 2012).

From the perspective of transformative social protection, the need to address children as subjects of rights is firmly emphasis, recognising that their particular status generates specific forms of poverty and vulnerability that must be addressed by social protection (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012; White, 2002b). The approach advocates interventions that acknowledge the multidimensional nature of child poverty and the practical and strategic needs of children, from an integral and long-term perspective that pursues universality in interventions. Furthermore, it emphasises the need to address the intergenerational origins of poverty through preventive, protective, promotional and transformative programmes (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2011; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2009; Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012; Unicef, 2012).

Considering poverty and child vulnerability from a transformative social protection perspective is not an easy task, on the contrary, it poses a series of challenges for governments at the level of financing, policy and administrative and institutional capacity (Unicef, 2012). Moreover, there is no linear path of social protection to achieve transformative results, since many factors can influence and determine its success or failure. In other words, there are different paths in countries to implement more transformative social policies, gradually moving from targeted to more universal approaches (Hujo & Carter, 2019). In this regard, this paper considers that regardless of the path followed by the countries, it is important to address and analyse this issue reflecting on how social protection can become a stronger social policy instrument or mechanism to reach social justice for childhood.

1.2 Research objective and case analysis

The objective of this research is to explore and analyse how social protection, particularly the policy “Subsystem Chile Securities and Opportunities” (“Subsistema Chile Seguridades y Oportunidades” in Spanish), has the potential to contribute to social transformation, addressing poverty and child vulnerability.
The “Subsystem Chile Securities and Opportunities” is a social assistance and targeted social policy implemented by the state of Chile, which aims to establish a series of social guarantees for households in extreme poverty (according to their income level) and that comprises 5% of the country's population.

The proposed research pursues to answer the following questions:

1. What approach has the policy pursued to address and overcome poverty and vulnerability of individuals/households? What type of logic or welfare model does implicitly prevail in the policy?
2. How does the policy address poverty and child vulnerability? What are the main limitations and challenges of the policy to contribute to social transformation for children?

1.3 Methodology and structure

The research follows a qualitative methodology, based on the review of a set of specialised bibliography (articles, books, government documents, programme evaluation reports, among others). The objective is to present, in the chapter of the literature review, the current debate of social protection, considering how the different approaches address poverty and vulnerability and what kind of interventions are proposed to include children and overcome child poverty.

The document is organised in five chapters, beginning in the introduction chapter. The second chapter addresses the definitions, key concepts, approaches and discussion regarding social and child protection, poverty and vulnerability. The third chapter proposes the analytical framework based on the literature review and which will be used as a guide to analysing the case study proposed in the fourth chapter. Finally, the fifth chapter includes the main conclusions of the investigation.
Chapter 2

Literature review

2.1 Social Protection: concept in debate

Social policies, particularly social protection, has become in recent decades, a strategic element of development policy (Barrientos, 2011; Devereux & Solórzano, 2016; Midgley, 2014). It has also been considered as a fundamental tool for the fulfilment of the Sustainable Development Goals to be reached by the year 2030 (ILO, 2017). The growing confidence around social protection has also accompanied with higher expectations. Initially, between 1990 and the beginning of the 2000s, the purpose of social protection was aimed at reducing poverty through a focus on safety net and short-term social funds. More recently, social protection has been defined and implemented based on broader approaches that incorporate multiple development objectives, such as economic growth, access to services -education and health- human capital development, gender equality, transformation and the promotion of social justice (Roelen & Devereux, 2013; Browne, 2015; Barrientos & Hulme, 2009).

Although there is no consensus, the different definitions emphasise that social protection is a set of programmes and interventions oriented at maintaining basic standards of living, seeking to prevent and alleviate poverty and vulnerability. From a broader framework, social protection can include instruments aimed at distributing resources and fostering social equity (Blank et al., 2011; Midgley, 2014).

The state has traditionally implemented social protection from three components. The first component is social insurance that is a contributory programme that seeks to protect the employee (for who they are in a formal labour market) against possible eventualities, such as work accidents, unemployment, and old age (Barrientos, 2011; UNRISD, 2010). The second element, and in which we will focus on this research, is social assistance that is oriented to protect and alleviate individuals or households from poverty, through various instruments such as cash transfers (conditioned or unconditional), transfers in kind, social services, skills training, school feeding, social care, among others (UNRISD, 2010; Barrientos, 2011; Browne, 2015).
Finally, the protection or promotion of employment are interventions that facilitate access to employment or seek to improve working conditions (UNRISD, 2010; Barrientos, 2011).

In general terms, social protection policies have considered, with greater or lesser force, the following functions or components (ILO, 2012; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004):

- **Protection**: These are ex-post interventions designed to provide alleviation from poverty faced by individuals and households.

- **Prevention**: Corresponds to ex-ante interventions that seek to avoid poverty and reduce the likelihood of future crises.

- **Promotion**: Interventions that seek to improve the livelihoods of individuals and their households by increasing income and capacities.

Besides, there has been a historical difference in the types of social protection that have been highly determined by the different welfare models and the political, economic and social conditions of each country (Barrientos & Hulme, 2009). For example, in the Scandinavian countries in which have prevailed a “social democratic” welfare state (Esping-Andersen, 1998), social protection has been a universal mechanism aimed at providing adequate living standards for all citizens, providing additional support for people or households that are facing deprivation, temporary situations of poverty or their income decreased. Under this model, the state assumes the obligation to guarantee an adequate level of well-being, since social protection is conceived as a normative principle based on social and economic rights of citizens (UNRISD, 2010; Mkandawire, 2005).

On the contrary, in various countries of Latin America and particularly in Chile, social protection has been conceived from social policies targeted at the poorest of society. This prevails in a political context characterized by high percentage of population living in poverty and the establishment of a "liberal" welfare model in the eighties (Esping-Andersen, 1998). Targeting has meant that governments establish, through targeting instruments, who should and under what conditions receive the benefit, under the argument of maximizing poverty reduction impacts and making efficient use of public resources (Midgley, 2014; Standing, 2007; Mkandawire, 2005; UNRISD, 2010; Devereux et al., 2017).

Although social protection policies have a long history, the concept remains in debate. The authors Barrientos & Hulme (2009), suggest that the different visions of social protection refer
to competitive development visions that have emphasized the approach of risks, needs or rights. The frameworks proposed by the head multilateral organizations, such as the “Social Risk Management (SRM)” of the World Bank (Jorgensen & Siegel, 2019) or the “Social Protection Floor Initiative” of the International Labour Organization (ILO) (ILO, 2012), are examples of these different approaches proposed internationally.

There is a recognition of scholars that the definitions and decisions about social protection are political debates and express ideologies choices and visions of society, more than only be technical discussions (Browne, 2015; Devereux et al., 2011).

Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler (2007), suggest that the ideological debate of social protection can be divided, in an illustrative manner, into two opposing camps. On the one hand, there are the "instrumentalist" actors -like the World Bank- who point out that poverty and vulnerability are explained for the limitations that poor people face for taking advantage of the opportunities of the market. Therefore, the objective of social protection is to implement targeted risk management mechanisms that counterbalance the missing or incomplete insurance markets, through strategies that seek to maximize the efficiency of resources (Barrientos & Hulme, 2009). On the other hand, there are the "activists" -like ILO- who conceive that poverty and vulnerability are caused by structural inequalities, thus social protection constitutes a fundamental mechanism to achieve social justice for all people, from a universal rights approach (Devereux & Solórzano, 2016; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2007). This debate has significantly influenced the decisions made regarding the design, the approaches of social protection programmes (targeting or universality) and the choice of the instruments (conditional or unconditional cash transfers, subsidies, among others) (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2007; Browne, 2015).

Although social protection has diverse areas of dispute and ideological debate, there is an accord among actors that social protection must move towards comprehensive systems that address the different objectives in a coordinated and integral manner (Browne, 2015; Barrientos, 2011). This has also been driven by donors who agree that it is preferable to support integrated systems over individual social protection programmes, from an approach that promotes financing and national ownership of social protection to guarantee sustainable programmes in the long term (Browne, 2015).
2.2 Contributing to Social Protection for children

There is a higher international agreement in recognizing that poverty and the vulnerabilities that children face are age-specific and can have multiple dimensions including social (e.g. gender or ethnic discrimination), physical (e.g. child maltreatment or illness), economic (e.g. child labour or child prostitution) and psychological (e.g. emotional stress, abuse or insecurity) (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2011; Jones et al., 2008; Unicef, 2012). As a consequence, there is a consensus among the actors about the need to incorporate child protection strategies into social protection agenda that address child poverty and vulnerability differently (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012; Minujin et al., 2006).

Child protection is defined as a “set of interventions that prevent and respond to violence, exploitation and abuse. Child protection helps children achieve their basic rights of care, protection and justice and is an element of social policy” (Blank et al., 2011, p.23).

According to Unicef (2012), social protection is a crucial mechanism to contribute to child protection. For example, social protection can favour the protection of children through preventive and protective interventions that address underlying risk factors of violence, abuse and exploitation, or through strategies that allow families to increase their resilience to situations of poverty in order to avoid family separation and the entry of children into institutional care. It can also promote and guarantee access to basic social services, improve the capacity of caregivers, promote policies that address and change discriminatory behaviours and attitudes against vulnerable children and their families, among other interventions.

The argument that supports the incorporation of child protection to the social protection agenda follows the idea that invests in children is a pragmatic and moral imperative of societies, since otherwise, child poverty increases the risk in adult life and society in general (Unicef, 2012). Moreover, from the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) (1989), the conception of childhood has changed. In the first place, the rights of adults to children are extended, as well as, children are no longer conceived as marginal, vulnerable and passive subjects in the design of social programmes, advocating a conception that emphasises their specific rights and that conceptualize as social actors with active agency and participation (White, 2002a). Second, the CRC demands the recognition that the particular status of children generates specific forms of poverty and vulnerability (White, 2002b).
There is no doubt that the children’s rights agenda constitutes an effective approach at the international policy level to address child poverty and vulnerability since the CRC is a legal instrument (which has been ratified by 189 countries), which enables to demand to governments the promotion of child welfare by fulfilling specific rights (White, 2002a). These rights include areas such as; child growth and physical and psychological development (health and education), child protection (protects children from neglect, exploitation, sexual abuse and violence) and strengthening the participation of children (Jones & Summer, 2011; Handa et al., 2011; White, 2002a).

However, according to White (2002a), it should not be ignored that an assumption underlying of the rights approach is that children would compose a homogeneous group with shared interests and a universal body of rights (identified from a Western conception). Therefore, it is essential to keep in mind a critical analysis of this approach that makes it possible to recognise, in the first place, that the conception of childhood is a social construction and therefore, there are different cultural models of childhood. Second, the rights of children and the particular situation of poverty and vulnerability that children face must be analysed taking attention to the social, cultural, economic and political context in which they are immersed (White, 2002a).

2.3 Approaches to Social Protection policies

Multiple approaches to social protection can be distinguished; frequently the literature emphasises the risk, the asset-based and the transformative approach of social protection (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

Social Risk Management approach

From a "Social Risk Management" (SRM) approach, poverty and vulnerability are considered an economic problem generated by low levels of household income. One of the main causes of poverty would be the limitations faced by the poor to take the economic opportunities offered by the markets (Barrientos & Hulme, 2009). Consequently, the political response is mainly economic and is based on public interventions that seek poverty alleviation, resilience and management of risk to stabilize income and consumption of the household (Jorgensen & Siegel, 2019, Barrientos & Hulme, 2009; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2007; Hinds, 2014). Therefore, the effort is aimed at reducing risks, as an investment in poverty reduction and as a fundamental
form to promote the development and economic growth of societies (Barrientos, 2011; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2007).

From an SRM perspective, child protection is framed in short-term prevention and protection interventions aimed at poor families with the presence of children. The objective is to increase their resilience and generate risk management strategies, allowing households to invest and accumulate assets to get out of poverty (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004). Improving the well-being of children is conceived as a positive externality of social protection interventions since the household is the unit and the aim of interventions. Besides, it prevails the assumption that welfare improvement is the same for all family members of the household (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

The SRM also emphasises long-term and promotional interventions in social and human capital that enable break the transmission of poverty through generations. This, in order to support the prevention and mitigation of future risk and contribute from a productive approach to equal economic opportunities in society (Browne, 2015; Barrientos, 2011). In this framework, children who are not part of the family structure would not be covered by social protection, since the approach guides interventions to the poor through household income (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler (2007), state that the SRM approach focuses mainly on preventive and protective short-term interventions that cover temporary income shocks and manifestations of material poverty, not considering actions that address structural and social causes that perpetuate poverty and child vulnerability. In addition, other authors point out that this framework is excessively growth-oriented since social protection is conceived as a response from the state to “market failures” and as a means to increase economic growth, through the liberalization of the economy, the creation of jobs and privatization of areas such as pensions, education and health (Devereux & Solórzano, 2016). Furthermore, inclusion, stability and social cohesion are considered positive externalities of social protection programmes that are well-designed. Thus, structural and social risks that contribute to poverty and vulnerability are disregarded (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004).

Based on the typology of welfare states suggested by Esping-Andersen (1990 and 1998), the SRM approach resonates with a "liberal or residual" type of welfare and a neoliberal vision. In this welfare model and vision, the state played a limited role oriented to transferring resources
or services to those people who are not able to satisfy their basic needs through the market. Moreover, the private sector is seen as the most efficient means to achieve better economic growth and improve people's well-being (Hulme, 2003). Consequently, a conception of restricted and selective social policy is adopted, defining through means-testing instruments which individual or household are entitled to receive social benefits. From this model, the level of social solidarity is low, and the level of commodification is high, since people's well-being depends on the market, emphasising a conception of individuals as self-sufficient and responsible for their well-being. In other words, risks are individualised by promoting market solutions with a subsidiary state based on needs (Esping-Andersen, 1990; 1998).

Asset-based Approach

The "Asset-based approach" defines poverty as a lack of assets (natural, physical, social, financial and human) and capital associated to rights (aspirational, psychological, productive and political) (Moser, 2006). Vulnerability is related with asset ownership, that is, with the means of resistance and the rights that people and households have to resist and recover from poverty (Moser, 2008).

The emphasis of assets is related to Sen's concept of capabilities (1997) since it is understood that assets "are not simply resources that people use to build livelihoods: they give them the ability (to individuals) to be and act" (Moser, 2006, p. 16). Therefore, this approach emphasises the promotional aspect of social protection linked to long-term interventions, which seek to create opportunities for households to increase their capacities and assets, becoming economically empowered and thus improve their living standards and to leave of their situation of poverty (Moser, 2006; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004). The "Asset-based approach" assumes that there would be a threshold of critical assets below which households are in a situation of poverty; thus, the political solution is aimed at providing productive safety nets for households (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012; Moser, 2008).

In general, it is conceived that financial, human (educational) and political capital would be promotional assets, while physical capital (land and housing) and human health capital refer to assets linked with prevention and protection interventions against poverty and vulnerability. Social capital would be transversal in all programmes (Moser, 2008).
This approach recognises the agency of individual and collective groups and conceives that asset accumulation actions and strategies are linked to effective risk management, which consists of proactively identifying risk and investing and strengthening opportunities. The potential for the accumulation of household assets would depend on the structure of opportunities to which individuals have access and the political, economic, social and institutional context of which they are part (Moser, 2006; Moser, 2008).

Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler (2012) argue that a problematic aspect of this approach is the identification of the asset threshold to define poverty and vulnerability. Although it is recognised that assets are not only economical, in practice thresholds are estimated based on their monetary value, which leads to emphasising a one-dimensional and economic perspective of poverty and vulnerability, excluding assets that are difficult to express in economic terms, such as social capital. Moreover, the approach maintains the assumption that the improvement of household assets directly benefits children and that the graduation or exit of poverty is the same for all household members. According to these authors, further evaluation is needed to know whether children who have left the asset threshold can effectively sustain this position in the next generation, analysing the extent to which children can maintain asset accumulation when they reach adulthood and form their own homes.

Transformative Social Protection approach

The approach of "Transformative Social Protection (TSP)" considers that poverty is particular according to each social context and manifests itself in inequality and denial of people's rights (Jones & Shahrokh, 2013). Vulnerability is understood as "emerging from and embedded in the socio-political context" which implies reversing the orientation of social protection. Instead of implementing policies oriented to make that vulnerable groups face fewer risks (an approach that SRM would follow), the TSP pursues to change the social and political context in order to reduce the risk of the poorest and most vulnerable individuals (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004, p.6).

The TSP approach considers that preventive, protective and promotional interventions are fundamental components of social protection; however, it adds a transformative objective oriented to change people's lives through programmes and instruments that promote greater social justice (Devereux et al., 2011; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004; Jones & Shahrokh, 2013).
Transformative social protection is founded on a relational perspective of poverty, which understands that chronic poverty is the effect of long-term historical, economic, social and political processes. Poverty is embedded in social and political relations and it is not the result of being marginal to these relations as a residual approach that poverty would consider (Moose, 2007; Hickey, 2007). According to Moose (2010, 2007), in many parts of the world, structural poverty can be understood as a consequence of the contemporary and historical dynamics of capitalism and the economic policy of liberalism that generate and reproduce poverty through the logic of wealth concentration and social exclusion. The capitalist transformation has generated political and social processes characterized by the invisibility of the poor in political agendas and the reproduction of differentiation and social discrimination based on the social identity of people. In this manner, poverty is the consequence of historical and social relations that create an unequal distribution of wealth, opportunities and power (Moose, 2007).

From this perspective, the TSP approach seeks to produce long-term structural changes and responds to the causes that create or sustain poverty and vulnerability (Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2009; Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004; Blank et al., 2011). Therefore, the main contribution of this approach is that it incorporates the goal of social equity, addressing the structural causes of poverty and the abuse of power and inequalities in rights, opportunities and distribution of resources to achieve social justice (Devereux et al., 2011; Sweetman, 2011; Sabates-Wheeler & Roelen, 2011; Jones & Shahrokh, 2013).

According to Morgan & Yablonski (2011), incorporating a transformative approach to social protection implies:

- Implementing integrated protection systems that consider a broad and long-term approach that addresses the economic and social vulnerability, through interventions aimed at providing support (economic and social), access to public services and legal and policy instruments against social exclusion, abuse and discrimination.
- Incorporating mechanisms of accountability and participation of people in social protection programmes, conceiving people from beneficiaries to participants and rights holders.
- Incorporating explicitly into the social protection programmes objectives that address the power and inequality of relations, considering the participants of the program or
who are part of social and economic relations that reproduce power inequalities and social exclusion.

It could be argued that this approach resonates with the principles of the social-democratic welfare model, following the typology used by Esping-Andersen (1990 and 1998). In this welfare model, as well as in the TSP approach, social policies are conceived as a right of all citizens without distinction, seeking to reduced differences in the social status of people in societies (Koehler, 2017; UNRISD, 2010; Roelen & Devereux, 2013; UNICEF, 2012). Besides, this welfare model is characterized by high levels of social solidarity, while it is understood that poverty and vulnerability are social problems, which means a social responsibility shared by the whole society.

Transformative approach to Social Protection for children

The TSP approach recognises that child poverty is a multidimensional problem that requires integral political solutions that consider different dimensions of life (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2009; Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012). Practically it advocates for social protection systems that incorporate interventions in which children occupy a central place and the specific needs of children are considered according to their age and depending on context and the social relations of which they are a part (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

Roelen and Sabates-Wheeler (2012), propose that from a transformative approach, social protection must address the “practical and strategic vulnerabilities of children, their caregivers and the community” (Roelen and Sabates-Wheeler, 2012, p. 296). According to the authors, three vulnerabilities are defined based on the multidimensional nature of poverty, which are:

- **Biological and physical vulnerabilities (practical vulnerabilities):** Children of different ages are more receptive to the adverse effects of poverty, which significantly impact their physical, cognitive and social development. Social protection must meet the practical and differential needs that children experience according to their life cycle, for example, in areas such as education, nutrition and health (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).
- **Vulnerabilities related to dependence (strategic vulnerabilities):** Children have limited autonomy (which increases with early adolescence) that generally defines their social status as legally derived from another (adult). Therefore, the distribution of resources that meet their needs (physical, emotional and social) depends on adults, family or community. Furthermore, children are subject to multiple power relations with adults (hierarchical, egalitarian, reciprocal), often contradictory, which can lead to relationships of love and care, but also, relationships that can conduce to situations of abuse, violence and exploitation (White, 2002b; Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

  As a result, social protection strategies must take into account the multiple relationships established by children with adults, considering the distribution of resources and the behaviour, values and cultural attitudes of parents, caregivers, family or community. This consideration should be applied to children living in households and for children that are marginalised from family and community structures (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

- **Institutionalized disadvantage, invisibility and lack of voice in political agendas (strategic vulnerabilities):** It refers to the cultural devaluation (Kabeer, 2005) and social exclusion faced by some groups in society, such as women and children, depending on their gender, ethnicity, religion and age. Social discrimination generates an inequality that manifests itself in the absence of voice and invisibility of these groups and a lack of recognition and representation (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

Thus, addressing the multiple characteristics of poverty and child vulnerability implies for social protection implementing multidisciplinary and multisectoral strategies that address the different specific needs of children (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2011; Minujin et al., 2006; Sheahan, 2011; White, 2002b). It also means, considering that children are not an objective group isolated from their context. The well-being of children depends on the families and communities to which they belong, that is, children and people, in general, are “essentially constituted in and through their relationship to others” (White, 2002a, p.1098). Consequently, their inclusion in social protection implies the design of interventions that address children from an integral perspective, based on the statement that children cannot be abstracted from their context and from the social relations of which they are part (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2011; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2009; Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012; Unicef, 2012).
The analytical framework presented has been created based on the literature review carried out in Chapter 2. The following table proposes a set of dimensions that allow identifying the main characteristics of a transformative social protection approach that differ from the other approaches that do not pursue social justice as an objective and are characterised for principles closer to the liberal model of welfare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Social Protection</th>
<th>Non-transformative approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Conception of social policy** | · Social policies are conceived as a right for all citizens, and the state assumes the obligation to guarantee an adequate level of well-being (UNRISD, 2010; Mkandawire, 2005).  
· It is understood that poverty is a social problem which implies a social responsibility and a political response that should be shared by the whole society (Esping-Andersen, 1998; UNRISD, 2010). | · The role of the state is limited to transferring resources or services to those who cannot satisfy their basic needs through the market, under a logic of residual welfare policies (Devereux & Solórzano, 2016).  
· It prevails a conception of individuals as self-sufficient and responsible for their well-being (Esping-Andersen, 1998). |
| **Conception of poverty and vulnerability** | · Poverty and vulnerability as a multidimensional problem (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004).  
· Poverty and vulnerability (economic and social) are caused by long-term historical, social, economic and political processes (relational poverty) (Moose, 2007; 2010). | · Poverty and vulnerability as a unidimensional problem linked to material and economic deprivation (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2007).  
· Poverty and economic vulnerability are caused by the limited opportunities that the poor face to take advantage of the market's (Barrientos & Hulme, 2009). |
| **Social Protection objectives** | · It considers the objectives of prevention, protection and promotion. However, it incorporates the objective of social transformation (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004).  
· It seeks to address structural causes of poverty and vulnerabilities (economic and social) that produced situations of | · It considers the objectives of prevention, protection and promotion of social protection (Browne, 2015; Barrientos, 2011).  
· Mainly economic response, through interventions that seek poverty alleviation, reduction and risk management to stabilize household |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention strategies</th>
<th>Social discrimination and exclusion (Devereux &amp; Sabates-Wheeler, 2004).</th>
<th>income/consumption and increase its assets (Jorgensen &amp; Siegel, 2019; Moser, 2008).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Targeting is used to select beneficiaries of social programmes (Midgley, 2014; Mkandawire, 2005).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Social Protection: Child poverty and vulnerability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child conception</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transformative approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Child as a subject of rights that occupies a central place in the social protection agenda (Roelen &amp; Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).</td>
<td>· The child is not a subject of social policy and is conceived as a marginal and passive actor in the design and implementation of social programmes (White, 2002a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Child conceptualized as a social actor with active agency and participation (White, 2000a).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Protection: addressing poverty and child vulnerability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transformative approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· It recognizes that the particular status of children generates specific forms of poverty and vulnerability that differs from the adults, having different causes and impacts on children's lives (Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2009; Roelen &amp; Sabates-Wheeler, 2012; White, 2002a).</td>
<td>· Prevention, protection and promotion interventions aimed at families. The improvement of the well-being of children is conceived as a positive externality of social protection (Roelen &amp; Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· It incorporates child protection as an objective of social protection. It seeks to achieve the basic rights of care, protection and justice for children, together with preventing violence, exploitation and child abuse (Blank et al., 2011, Unicef, 2012).</td>
<td>· The family is responsible for the welfare of the child, and the state is only an actor providing support and assistance for the family to fulfil its responsibility (White, 2002b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· The state has an active role in guaranteeing the minimum conditions of child welfare and it is responsible for child protection (Unicef, 2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives and intervention strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transformative approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· It addresses poverty and “practical vulnerabilities” of children from a rights approach (biological and physical vulnerabilities) (Roelen and Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).</td>
<td>· It emphasises interventions oriented to the family with the presence of children using conditional instruments that pursue the promotion of human capital of children (education, health and nutrition), from a productive approach (Browne, 2015; Barrientos, 2011; Moose, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· It addresses “strategic vulnerabilities” of children (vulnerabilities related to dependence and those related to the institutionalized disadvantage, invisibility and lack of voice of children on political agendas) (Roelen and Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Case study analysis

4.1 Social policies and Social Protection in Chile

Chile has a long history in the implementation of social policies. The current social protection matrix is inherited from this trajectory and the political, social and economic transformations produced in the country in recent decades (Staab, 2013).

Particularly, with the dictatorship of Pinochet (1973-1989) a regime of extreme right was established, based on a model of liberal welfare (Esping-Anderson, 1990) and the neoliberal political-economic theory, which conceives the market as an effective mechanism to grant welfare to most of the population. As a consequence, social policies were designed to address "market failures" (UNRISD, 2010), in a logic of guaranteeing "residual welfare policies", to the "most needy" and who "deserve protection" (Mkandawire, 2005; Standing, 2007). This political transformation was reflected in the transition from universal policies to targeted policies to the poorest and in the privatization of areas such as social security, health and education (UNRISD, 2010; Standing, 2007). Social protection was deeply restructured, replacing the principles of rights and solidarity with those of efficiency and incentives (Staab, 2013).

With the return to democracy, the government initiated different policy reforms aimed at increasing social investment, with a strong accent on improving the efficiency of social spending and strengthen the mechanism of targeting and social service networks. Besides, it was pursued to improve the coordination of social supply and including new groups (such as children and young people) and issues, such as gender equality. Since then, social protection strategies have become a fundamental pillar of social policy, from which it has sought to increase the specialization of programmes to different social groups and establish a system based in the guarantee and rights approach. This, in order to move towards the universalization of minimum
welfare floors provided by the state, based on an integrated social protection and in an intersectoral model (CSP, 2018; Robles, 2015).

Currently, social protection is a system composed of an articulated network of social programmes and contributory and non-contributory sectoral policies, implemented cross-sectorally and designed to support individuals and families throughout the life cycle. The system combines universal policies (for example, in education and health) and other policies focused on specific social groups or according to the life-cycle stage (in areas such as social assistance, employment and housing) (Mideso, 2018b). In the component of the social assistance, one relevant targeted social policy is the “Subsystem Chile Securities and Opportunities (SCSO)” aimed at households in extreme poverty and vulnerability, which is being implemented since 2002.

Chile is one of the countries that has achieved, through the implementation of social policies in democracy, a higher reduction of income poverty in Latin America, from 38% in 1990 to 11.7% in 2015. The neoliberal model, followed by the country, has generated high levels of economic growth and wealth that have allowed a greater investment in social policies and a significant development at the national level. However, capitalist relations have increased the conflict of social and economic inequalities creating and perpetuating poverty and inequity (Moose, 2007). In fact, Chile is one of the least equitable countries in Latin America and between OECD countries (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development - OECD) (ECLAC, 2018; Unicef, 2018).

It cannot be denied that social policies in Chile have made considerable advancement in reducing income poverty and incorporating an integrated system of policies. However, the policies remain embedded in an ambivalent logic (CSP, 2018; Robles, 2015). On the one hand, social protection remains circumscribed in a liberal welfare model, in which the logic of the market plays a preponderant role and where the state continues to be defined in subsidiary terms established by the Political Constitution of the Republic of Chile (1980) created during the dictatorship period (Staab, 2013). On the other hand, the past socialist governments have been tried to implement a social protection model based on more transformative principles linked to rights, progressive universality and social guarantees; however, these changes are hindered by the legal structure (Constitution of 1980) that governs the country (Robles, 2015). This tension is evident in the social policies of Chile, which creates additional challenges to social protection, in the sense of trying to validate two opposed logics of well-being.
4.2 Subsystem Chile Securities and Opportunities (SCSO)

The "Subsystem Chile Securities y Opportunities (SCSO)" constitutes a social assistance policy that seeks to establish a series of social guarantees for 5% of the country's households in extreme poverty. It also considers as potential beneficiaries those who present a particular situation of vulnerability, specifically children who have a significant adult deprived of liberty, the elderly in poverty and people in street situations. For the selection of beneficiaries, the policy mainly uses the targeting instrument called the Social Household Registry (see appendix 7.1). The SCSO is a continuation of the programme "Solidarity Chile" ("Chile Solidario" in Spanish), although, in its redesign in 2012, a set of changes were incorporated. For example, new conditional cash transfers (CCT) were included and also interventions related to improving the employability conditions of the beneficiaries and promoting their participation in the labour market (CSP, 2018; Larrañaga et al., 2014).

The SCSO is composed of four programmes (see appendix 7.2) and a set of bonuses and transfers (see appendix 7.3) that provide a financial protection base for the family for the immediate relief of extreme poverty, while generating opportunities through the rest of the components. The objective of the policy is to support individuals and families to overcome their poverty situation through the generation of autonomous household income. The policy includes social and labour support for the development of family capacities, the granting of social benefits (bonuses and money transfers) and preferential access to the institutional networks of services and programmes provided by the state (such as support for the registration of identity, job training, study levelling, parental skills, school feeding and reinforcement, among others). The policy is conceived as temporary support to the family for 24 months (Mideso, 2016; Mideso, 2017; CSP, 2018).

Approach to overcoming extreme poverty

The SCSO is considered more as a "tool for social promotion rather than social protection" (CSP, 2018, p. 15). It is based on the conception that extreme poverty is overcome through the potential of the family's capacity for income generation, on the basis that employment is the main factor that allows a permanent and autonomous exit from poverty. As a consequence, the strategy is oriented to the creation of opportunities and an incentive to the merit and effort of the household, permeated through a series of monetary transfers conditioned to the fulfilment of specific duties and achievements (Mideso, 2016; Mideso, 2017).
The policy recognizes in its design that poverty is a multidimensional problem; however, at the implementation level, the instruments used by SCCO mainly focus on labour insertion and income poverty. In this sense, monetary incentives are emphasized as the central axis of overcoming poverty, which moves away from a more comprehensive and multidimensional conception of poverty. On the other hand, given that the policy is conceived as a temporary support mechanism, it does not contemplate universal and long-term interventions such as those proposed by a transformative approach which consider the dynamism of poverty and the multiple vulnerabilities faced by the household (CSP, 2018; Steeb, 2013).

The policy does not include in its design the explicit objective of the "transformation" proposed by the TSP approach. However, the SCSO addresses equity primarily by the distribution of economic resources, utilising a set of bonuses and transfers (Midgley, 2014). Also, through the preferential access of poor families and children to the state's social services, reducing economic and social barriers to their access (Unicef, 2012). The empirical results show that the policy has successfully addressed the reduction of income poverty, but not inequality since Chile continues to be a country that presents high levels of social and economic inequity, which is also manifested in the child population (ECLAC, 2018).

Although the SCSO follows a household economic risk management approach (Jorgensen & Siegel, 2019), the asset approach is the one that is developed most strongly, specifically the one proposed by Kaztman and Filgueira (1999), called “Assets, Vulnerability and Opportunity Structure (AVOS)”. The AVOS approach states that the level of poverty and vulnerability of a household is defined considering the possession or control of assets, which means the resources required to take advantage of the possibilities and opportunities offered by society, the market or the state. As a consequence, changes in household vulnerability may occur based on changes in the resources they own or control and the access requirements to the structure of opportunities (Katzman & Filgueira, 1999).

The approach and intervention actions proposed by the policy to overcome poverty show a clear orientation towards a neoliberal logic that moves away from a TSP approach. In the policy prevails a liberal or residual approach that conceives poverty in terms of marginality, which means, as a consequence of being excluded from growth and market economy, and not as a result of these social, economic and political relations (Hulme, 2003; Hickey, 2007; Moose, 2007). In this sense, the interventions that are promoted seek to activate or transfer the
resources, capacities and competence to the beneficiary families for their integration into the market, leaving the final responsibility for overcoming poverty in the effort of the person and their household, without considering the structural causes of poverty and inequality (CSP, 2018; Standing, 2007). Therefore, the policy does not address the structural and relational factors of poverty.

Additionally, the policy only considers the needs of families that cannot be met through the market, not incorporating at the level of practices a perspective of rights and universal guarantees. Besides, it promotes an individualistic approach, expressed in the vision that the state has about the origin and individual and non-collective responsibility of poverty, prioritizing individual over collective solutions based on the principle of social solidarity (CSP, 2018; Standing, 2007).

4.3 Poverty and child vulnerability through the policy SCSO

In Chile, children have the highest poverty rates at the national level; approximately 1,200,000 children are living in situations of income or multidimensional poverty. Therefore, poverty is a significant issue that impacts 30% of the country's child population (Mideso, 2015).

The “Subsystem Chile Securities and Opportunities” does not explicitly declare children and adolescents as priority subjects of the policy; it only considers them as indirect beneficiaries of intervention strategies (Staab, 2013). In fact, in the last impact assessment made to the SCSO (2018), it is stated that children have been invisible, being a policy challenge to recognize children as subjects of rights and as social actors participating in the process of intervention (CSP, 2018).

The policy considers family as its central focus of intervention and principal agent of change. It is defined as an interdependent system, containing assets that can help in its self-promotion (CSP, 2018; Barrientos & Dejong, 2004). In this sense, the SCSO is based on the idea of the family as a generator of household and children's well-being, becoming the basic unit and criteria for organizing social assistance. From this view, it is possible to affirm that the policy is based on a more conservative capitalist model of well-being. This model affirms that family is a central institution of social architecture and the unit from which welfare is generated for all members of society (Esping-Andersen, 1990; 1998).
The policy assumed that there would be a direct relationship of rights and duties between the family, children and the state, through minimum conditions of well-being and protection that must be guaranteed to children (Staab, 2013). The SCSO follows a conception of rights approach that conceives the family as the primary authority responsible for the care and development of children and as the mediator of the state's relationship with the child. For its part, the state is conceptualized as an actor of assistance and support, guaranteeing resources so the family can fulfill its responsibilities, intervening only in the case where the child has suffered a severe violation of their rights. Therefore, there is a clear intention to identify the family and not the state, as the actor responsible for child protection, which moves away from more transformative principles of social protection (White, 2002b; Staab, 2013).

Intervention strategies promoted by the policy

One of the main instruments used by the policy is the conditional cash transfers (CCT) addressed to the household that has the presence of children and adolescents. CCTs are conditioned to compliance by achievements and duties, in the areas of education (formalization in education, school attendance above 85% and academic achievement of children), health (health control of the child) and insertion into the labour market (Mideso, 2016).

CCTs have been widely used as an instrument to reduce intergenerational poverty in Latin America, producing rigorous and comparative evidence about their effectiveness (Barrientos, 2011; Browne, 2015; Larrañaga et al., 2014). In Chile, evaluations have also shown that CCTs have a positive result on the well-being of children, increasing school enrolment among children aged 6 to 14 years and children's attendance at public health services (Staab, 2013). It could be affirmed that this instrument has positively addressed the practical needs of children in the areas of education and health, which is part of a transformative approach. However, there are several criticisms of the instrument that demonstrate its limitations to address child poverty.

First, the effectiveness of this instrument is questioned in a country like Chile, where access to education and children's health are areas that are practically covered at the national level. However, the inequality in access and the quality of services persist as a problem. In fact, there is a strong association between access to higher quality benefits and the income of the households to which children belong. In Chile, more than 40% of the child population lives in low-income households, which do not necessarily have the means to face the high degree of
commercialization of health and education, which increases significantly social inequality (Staab, 2013).

Secondly, the conditionality of academic performance of children imposed by the instrument conceives children as depositories of the responsibility of increasing income for families, producing negative externalities for families themselves and in the educational communities (CSP, 2018; Steeb, 2013; Barrientos & Dejong, 2004). Besides, the instrument assumed that monetary transfer complements the income of the family, and as a consequence, the well-being of children will also improve. In this sense, the instrument does not deal with the vulnerabilities associated with dependency, being invisible the discussion about power relations in the distribution of resources among the different household members.

Finally, the CCT for achievements is based on the expectation that children can have good academic results, and in the case of women and youth, they will have a successful insertion in the labour market. However, the instrument does not consider other access barriers that deepen poverty situations (such as social discrimination, gender inequality, among others) and that do not depend exclusively on individual motivation and effort, as it is emphasised by the SCSO (Steeb, 2013).

Thereby, the policy and conditionality imposed by the instrument reproduce the logic that welfare of children depends on the conduct and responsibility of the family and not of a state that guarantees a social minimum for child protection (CSP, 2018). Moreover, the policy would not recognise the child as a subject of rights or social actor, as a transformative approach would do. On the contrary, the SCSO and particularly the CCT instrument, operate under the assumption that childhood and adolescence are a crucial stage of the life to invest in the accumulation of human capital (education, health and nutrition), and thus interrupt the transmission of poverty through generations (Steeb, 2013; Barrientos & Dejong, 2006; Browne, 2015; Barrientos, 2011).

The human capital approach promotes individual initiative and appreciation for education. The concept expresses the idea of an intangible stock that can be accumulated by a person, denying the collective nature of the process of knowledge accumulation. Education and job training are analysed in terms of investments made by rational individuals to increase their productivity and income. Then, income poverty is explained by the low investment of poor families in human and social capital (Dallorso, 2013; Becker & Tomes, 1986). In this sense, the policy promotes a
productive role of individuals, through the investment in children's human capital, conceiving them as "productive adults of the future" (Sabates-Wheeler & Roelen, 2011, p.184). In other words, the policy has a strong orientation to future economic growth and productivity, expressed in the promotion of accumulation of productive assets, the insertion into the formal labour market and the investment in human capital of its beneficiaries (UNRISD, 2010; Midgley, 2014; Sweetman, 2011; Barrientos & Hulme, 2009).

The "Opening Road" programme aimed at families with children who encounter an adult deprived of liberty, is also conceived from a human capital approach. This programme is based on the idea that the deprivation of liberty of a significant adult for the child generates a negative impact on their well-being that is expressed in the reduction of the opportunities they have available to increase human and social capital, and thus participate in social life (CSP, 2018). Therefore, the intervention has the aim to generate family support and promoting children's social skills and competences, mainly in the field of education and social relations, in order to prevent future risk situations (school dropout, school repetition, child labour or criminal behaviour) (Mideso, 2016).

Thus, it can be understood that the policy promotes an individualistic approach that explains poverty based on the attributes and abilities that individuals and families have to influence their opportunities in life. Human capital and social capital (social relations) are understood as a type of assets that individuals can acquire, without considering the broader social, political and economic relations (Moose, 2010; Moose, 2007). As Moose (2007) states "the social networks and relations have themselves been essentialized as a form of capital divorced from issues of history, power and institutional process" (Moose, 2007, p.3).

Concerning with child protection, the policy and the social services associated incorporate as an objective the improvement of the family dynamics. The main activities that are promoted are the prevention of domestic violence and the development of parental skills and childcare. This aspect is fundamentally important in a country like Chile, in which child poverty is highly associated with violence faced by children in the family space, in-state protection institutions, at school and in communities. The last report, developed by Unicef in Chile (2012), shows that 71% of children have suffered abandonment, abuse and violence. Currently, more than 225,000 children and adolescents are under the protection of the state, and about 18,000 children have been separated from their families because of this cause (Unicef, 2018). The various studies also
demonstrate that parents or caregivers perceive punishment as a right, as something legitimate and positive for parenting (Consejo Nacional de la Infancia, 2016c).

The policy addresses child protection as a complementary objective of its interventions. In this sense, it is considered the vulnerabilities associated with dependency relationships between children and adults that lead to relationships of abuse and violence (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012). The training provided by the policy seeks to change the cultural attitudes and behaviour associated with parenting, in a society in which violence has been naturalized as a legitimate manner of relating to children. In this sense, the intervention favours child protection; however, the policy coverage is minimal. For example, the programme "Family Dynamics Support" considers training actions, for only 20 beneficiaries for four months (Mideso, 2018b). Thus, the impact of the policy is restricted, which shows its limitations to address gender violence as a structural problem of a society that demands universal solutions that tackle the unequal power relations between adults and towards children.

Regarding the vulnerabilities associated with the institutionalized disadvantage, the policy does not address the situations of discrimination and social exclusion that are faced by children. This is also particularly central in Chile since one of the major preoccupations of the country is the social and economic inequality in which children grow up. Factors such as gender, ethnicity, geographic location (rural vs urban), or the existence of some disability, exacerbate situations of poverty and vulnerability (Unicef, 2017; 2018). In fact, in Chile, early childhood and children who belong to indigenous groups and live in rural areas are the most affected by poverty and social and economic vulnerability (Mideso, 2017). Specifically, the diagnoses of indigenous and migrant children in the country are coincidental in pointing out that this population faces more considerable gaps in access to education, health and housing services and experiences higher situations of racial violence and discrimination, which enhance their situation of marginality (Consejo Nacional de la Infancia, 2016a-2016b). Social discrimination generates social inequality that manifests itself in the absence of voice and invisibility of these groups, in a lack of recognition and representation (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012).

To sum up, it is possible to affirm that the policy addresses more strongly the biological and physical vulnerabilities of children according to their life cycle, mainly through the instrument CCT that promotes the well-being in children in areas such as education, nutrition and health (Roelen & Sabates-Wheeler, 2012). Vulnerabilities related to dependency and family dynamics are also considered in a limited manner through the prevention of domestic violence.
programmes, childcare support and promotion of parental skills. The policy does not incorporate a reflection on the power of relationships and the distribution of household resources and how it affects the well-being of children. Finally, considering the strategic vulnerabilities linked to the institutionalized disadvantage of children, it is possible to affirm that the policy does not directly address the problem of discrimination and social exclusion. Besides, policy evaluations (CSP, 2018) have shown that children have been invisible as social actors, which is manifested in the lack of voice, representation and participation.
Chapter 5
Conclusion

Challenges to contribute to Social Protection for children from a transformative approach

This investigation stated that social protection is a central tool of social policy to achieve higher levels of social justice, especially for children. For this reason, the lens of transformative social protection was used since the main contribution of this approach is that it incorporates social equity as an explicit objective that social protection must pursue, addressing the structural causes of poverty that reproduce the problems of discrimination and social exclusion.

Social protection is a component of social policy that can contribute significantly to child protection addressing the specific vulnerabilities that children face, recognising that child poverty is a multidimensional problem and has particularities that differ from the adults, can have different origins and effects on children's lives. The literature has also shown that child poverty is a crucial factor that contributes to the transmission of poverty through generations, which demonstrates the need to address it. The challenge of social protection is to implement multidisciplinary and multisectoral strategies that go beyond interventions that consider purely economic poverty. Furthermore, it implies the challenge of incorporating children as subjects of the policy, contemplating their well-being as an objective of social protection and not as a positive externality of social protection policies.

From the analysis of the policy "Chile Securities and Opportunities", a series of limitations and challenges could be identified from a transformative approach. First, the policy recognises at the level of the design that poverty is a multidimensional problem; however, in practice, prevails interventions that promote income generation of households, stressing mainly material poverty. Moreover, a neoliberal perspective is prioritised as a political and ideological vision to reduce poverty through an individual, productive and human capital approach. In other words, it is emphasising the capacity and effort of the children and families to acquire and accumulate productive assets to overcome their situation of extreme poverty. Children are conceived as the "productive adults of the future", showing a clear orientation to economic growth expressed in strategies that support the investment in human capital and the insertion into the formal labour
market. Moreover, a risk and asset approach prevail in policy instruments, which does not consider the structural causes of poverty and social exclusion, nor does it seek social transformation.

Therefore, from the perspective of social justice, an essential challenge of social protection is moving from an approach that emphasises individual responsibility of poverty to social and collective solutions that address child poverty and vulnerability through a relational approach. This also implies that the state assumes its responsibility, beyond the role that the family can play in childcare, to guarantee through a universal approach, a social minimum for child protection as a normative principle based on the right of all citizens.

Chile is a country that shows significant progress in reducing income poverty and establishing a social protection system, although as it was shown, the problem of poverty persists, and the social and economic inequality has increased significantly. In fact, Chile is one of the countries with highest levels of inequality among Latin American countries and still about 1,200,000 children are living in poverty, being more strongly the situations of social exclusion and inequality for indigenous, migrant and rural children. Considering that one of the main concerns that the country presents lies in the inequality in which children grow, it is essential that the policy incorporates an explicit aim that addresses inequality and social injustices. Mainly, those related to the situations of discrimination and social, cultural, political and economic exclusion faced by impoverished children, especially indigenous and migrants’ children.

On the other hand, the analysis allowed us to conclude that the instruments of the policy have mainly addressed the practical vulnerabilities of children, through interventions that seek to encourage the responsibility of the family in childcare in the areas of health and education. The policy weakly considers the vulnerabilities associated with dependence through limited-scope actions that contemplate parental skills training to parents or caregivers of children. This is a significant challenge, especially in a country like Chile, where 71% of children have suffered violence in the family or their community space. Concerning to the vulnerabilities associated with the institutional disadvantage, the family prevails as a focus and unit of intervention, conceiving well-being of children as a positive externality of social protection instead of incorporate children as subjects of the policy. Additionally, the policy does not include instruments that enable the participation of children in the processes of design, implementation and evaluation of social protection policies. These limitations become important challenges that
social protection must address to contribute from a transformative approach, to child protection that considers the specific vulnerabilities of children.

It should be clarified that the “Social Protection System” in Chile contemplates an articulated network of programs and interventions that combines universal and targeted policies. In this regard, to assess the transformative impact of social protection for children, it would be a relevant contribution to go beyond the analysis of a specific policy as carried out in this investigation. This means, firstly, analyses the role that the policies play in the architecture of the system and its contribution to reducing child poverty and vulnerability through the lens of social justice. Secondly, implies having a broader view of social, economic and political transformations of the country's, considering the legal structure, reforms or public policies that have been implemented and could have a direct impact on improving child welfare. However, this investigation did not consider these two aspects mentions above, the analysis of the policy "Chile Securities and Opportunities" allowed to identify a series of challenges through the social transformation approach. This analysis contributes to understanding how a specific policy of social protection can become a stronger instrument or mechanism to reduce child poverty and vulnerability and to reach social justice for childhood.
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Appendix

7.1 Instrument for targeting social policies in Chile

Chile uses the Social Housing Registry (RSH) as a targeting mechanism. This instrument allows to select and identify the beneficiaries of the state's programs and services. The process occurs through "proxy means testing", which weighs a set of variables that are conceived as associated with the well-being or deprivation of a household (Devereux et al., 2017).

The RSH combines a series of data provided by the household and by the administrative bases of the state. The information used by the RSH considers the level of household income, access to social services and goods and the number of family members, giving greater importance to individuals with disabilities, older adults and households that have the presence of children and adolescents. As a result, a socioeconomic rating of the household is generated (in percentage), which places each household within a stretch of income or socioeconomic vulnerability (Mideso, 2018).

7.2 Programmes of the SCSO policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMES</th>
<th>Aimed at</th>
<th>Objective of the programme</th>
<th>Annual planned coverage</th>
<th>Instrument of targeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families Programme</td>
<td>Families that are living in extreme income poverty.</td>
<td>Psychosocial and socio-labour support aimed at improving the well-being of families through the generation of autonomous income.</td>
<td>45,000 families</td>
<td>Social Household Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Programme</td>
<td>Older adults who live in poverty and belong to households made up of 1 or 2 people.</td>
<td>Psychosocial and socio-labour support, aimed at promoting autonomy and bonding with peers, significant adults and institutional networks.</td>
<td>11,242 older adults</td>
<td>Social Household Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Paths Programme</td>
<td>Children with a significant adult deprived of liberty.</td>
<td>Psychosocial support and specialized tutoring for children, with emphasis on loss mitigation and family reunification.</td>
<td>2,500 children and their caregivers</td>
<td>Survey in penal centres and database of the Chilean Gendarmerie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Programme</td>
<td>Adults in street situations.</td>
<td>Psychosocial and socio-labour support aimed at improving well-being and overcoming street condition.</td>
<td>2,000 adults</td>
<td>Survey on street points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSP, 2018; Mideso, 2018a.
### 7.3 Cash transfers of the SCSO policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH TRANSFERS</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection Bonus</strong></td>
<td>For those who participate in the interventions of social support.</td>
<td>This bonus is given to facilitate the participation of the beneficiaries in the programmes of the policy. It aims to contribute to the income of the family.</td>
<td>Monthly for 24 months.</td>
<td>USD $17.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Family Bonus</strong></td>
<td>It corresponds to the calculation of 85% of the gap of each family to overcome the extreme poverty threshold of income poverty.</td>
<td>This bonus provides a support of households in situations of extreme poverty, increasing their monetary household income.</td>
<td>Monthly for 24 months.</td>
<td>USD $29.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duty Bonus: Control of healthy child</strong></td>
<td>For families with children under six years old. The family must demonstrate the periodic control of the healthy child in public health institutions.</td>
<td>This bonus is given to families in extreme poverty, to encourage a responsible attitude towards the health of children in order to achieve its proper development and growth.</td>
<td>Monthly for 24 months.</td>
<td>USD $8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duty Bonus: School Attendance</strong></td>
<td>For families with children between 6 and 18 years old who meet a monthly attendance percentage equal to or greater than 85%.</td>
<td>This bonus is given to families in extreme poverty, to encourage a responsible and committed attitude towards the education of children.</td>
<td>Monthly for 24 months.</td>
<td>USD $8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Bonus: Formalization of work</strong></td>
<td>Bonus that is given to people over 18 who participate in the socio-labour programmes and who are inserted for the first time in a formal job.</td>
<td>This bonus seeks to strengthen the access of young people into the formal labour market, encourage contributions to the social security system and worker protection.</td>
<td>For only one time</td>
<td>USD $298.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Bonus: High school degree</strong></td>
<td>Bonus for people over 24 years old and who obtain their high school license recognized by the Ministry of Education.</td>
<td>This bonus seeks to reward the effort of beneficiaries who conclude their high school studies in adult education modality, improve their employability conditions and can have access to the formal labour market.</td>
<td>For only one time</td>
<td>USD $74.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Achievement</strong></td>
<td>Bonus for families with children and adolescents that belong to the most vulnerable 30% of the population.</td>
<td>It seeks to reward the most vulnerable students for the best academic performance of their promotion.</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>Grupo 1: USD $84.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grupo 2: USD $50.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus of women’s work</strong></td>
<td>Bonus for women between 25 and 59 years old of age and belonging to the most vulnerable 40% of the population.</td>
<td>It seeks to reward the efforts of women who enter the formal labour market.</td>
<td>Monthly, for four years.</td>
<td>USD $47.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSP, 2018; Mideso, 2018a.