

assessment 2

by Omodunni Adeoba

Submission date: 28-Jul-2023 01:52AM (UTC+0100)

Submission ID: 210775256

File name: 20417_Omodunni_Adeoba_assessment_2_503774_1489507655.docx (35.9K)

Word count: 3845

Character count: 22510

The Effect ¹ of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Children, Young People and Families Living in Poverty in the UK

MODULE: CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES

BY: OMODUNNI ADEOBA

STUDENT NUMBER: 1914727

LECTURER: COLLINS BARR

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY	4
EFFECTS OF COVID-19 ON POOR FAMILIES, YOUNG PEOPLE AND CHILDREN DURING THE LOCKDOWN.	5
1. FOOD INSECURITY AMONG THE POOR	5
2. MENTAL HEALTH EFFECTS	6
3. ACADEMIC IMPACT	7
4. SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND HEALTH INEQUALITIES	7
5. ECONOMIC HARDSHIP AND FINANCIAL INSECURITY	8
6. HOUSING INSECURITIES	9
7. FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS	9
CONCLUSION	10
REFERENCES.....	11

17

INTRODUCTION

The Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), a novel viral respiratory disease that led to the global COVID-19 pandemic that swept rapidly through the globe in 2020, left significant impacts in its wake (Yang *et al.*, 2020). With about 24.7 million total confirmed cases in the UK and 227,928 deaths (Flynn *et al.*, 2020; WHO, 2023), an associated 13-month lockdown period (Brown *et al.*, 2021), the increased cost of living in the country and the economic recession it caused, its impact in the United Kingdom was undeniably significant (Harari *et al.*, 2021; Welsh, 2022). Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory of childcare opines that child development occurs at four main levels in overlapping contexts the broadest of which is the macrosystem/sociocultural environment (Sonnenschein *et al.*, 2022). From the perspective of this theory, the pandemic, a societal crisis with far-reaching global consequences, can affect the development of children and young persons in the long term (Henderson *et al.*, 2020) and even more so when combined with poverty, a microsystem influencer (Iruka *et al.*, 2020).

In 2021, families living in poverty in the UK were estimated to be about 14.4 million (22%), after housing costs, 4.2 million of which are children, and these levels were similar to poverty levels pre-pandemic and during the pandemic (Francis-Devine, 2023). Post-pandemic, the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) estimates that relative income would fall by 5.7% in 2023/2024 which means an additional 800,000 people will fall into poverty in the UK (Francis-Devine, 2023). Poverty has been known to be one of the precipitators of social and health inequalities in society (Featherstone *et al.*, 2019) and the pandemic further buttressed this as depicted by its impact on this class of people. According to the World Bank, the poorest have been most impacted by this pandemic with the increasingly expensive cost of living being one of the facilitators of these negative impacts (Sánchez-Páramo *et al.*, 2021). Young persons and children born into such households were not spared from the negative impacts either (Hu, 2020).

This essay, through the lens of the ecological theory of childcare, highlights the socio-economic situation of children, young persons, and people living in poverty prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. With this in perspective, this essay further discusses the socio-economic and health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the population of interest

¹ (children, young people and families living in poverty) in the United Kingdom (UK) in light of the already existing inequalities. It also briefly highlights the policy responses of the government to some of these impacts.

Theoretical Framework: Ecological Systems Theory

According to Bruffenburger's Ecological systems theory of childcare, child development is influenced at four main levels in overlapping contexts (Henderson *et al.*, 2020). At the microsystem level, the home, school, and peer groups are major contributors followed by the mesosystem (interactions or connections between these microsystems). The next level of influence, exosystems, comes from the indirect environment i.e the government, parents' workplace, businesses etc. and lastly, from the larger sociocultural environment/macrosystem (Pereda & Díaz-Faes, 2020). The pandemic with macro-level consequences, led to a major disruption with long-term ¹⁸ impacts on the lives of most children and young person's especially in combination with pre-existing microsystem factors with negative consequences such as poverty (Henderson *et al.*, 2020). This theory provides a useful theoretical framework for assessing the needs of children, young persons, and their families living in poverty for the development of effective policies aimed at mitigating ⁸ the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on their lives (Sonnenschein *et al.*, 2022).

Henderson *et al.* (2020) predicted that children and young persons would bear the brunt of the negative ² socio-economic and public health consequences of COVID-19 in the long term as they are more likely to fall into and bear the brunt of poverty-induced suffering (Moen *et al.*, 2019). (Sonnenschein *et al.*, 2022). Poverty is a microlevel precipitator of social and health inequalities globally (Bambra *et al.*, 2020; Whitehead *et al.*, 2021). It is regarded as a socio-environmental factor that puts children at risk for poor development of their critical skills, social inequalities, and increased exposure to diseases (Moen *et al.*, 2019; Featherstone *et al.*, 2019). Poor families and children from such families are ³ more likely to live in overcrowded, damp houses with less access to green spaces and clean air and so are more prone to respiratory infections (Sinha *et al.*, 2020). Similarly, inequalities in childhood such as malnutrition due to poverty can contribute to the development of lifelong health issues such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disorder

(COPD) etc. (Sinha *et al.*, 2020). The associated inequalities experienced by persons living in poverty also predispose many young persons and adolescents to ¹⁶mental health issues such as depression (Knowles *et al.*, 2022). This trend was expected and observed in the occurrence of COVID-19 throughout the UK. Research revealed that survival, mortality, and morbidity in people with COVID-19 have been influenced by poverty-induced social inequalities such as access to adequate healthcare, treatment, and/or vaccines (Sinha *et al.*, 2020). While, poverty may have negatively affected the experience of ¹¹children, young persons, and poor families with the COVID-19 disease, the pandemic and the ensuing consequences it brought in its wake might have had more significant impacts on them as well.

⁴Effects of COVID-19 on Poor Families, Young People and Children During the Lockdown.

⁷1. Food insecurity among the poor

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the UK faced issues of poverty and food insecurity with children being the most affected as they are more likely to fall into poverty and bear the brunt of poverty-induced suffering (Moen *et al.*, 2019). This was aggravated by the lockdowns during the pandemic and became one of its unintended consequences (Pautz & Dempsey, 2022). With 2.3 million children estimated to be experiencing food insecurity, poor children were most affected as access to free meals was initially hampered by the closure of schools (Van Lancker & Parolin, 2020). Similarly, the lockdown disrupted the operations and services of food banks so certain populations who were already facing social inequalities such as disabled people, low-income households, and homeless persons experienced heightened food insecurity issues (Cowie & Myers, 2021). The ensuing income crisis also led to an increased need for free meals and a spike in demand for food aid as many low-income households were forced into poverty (Power *et al.*, 2020). Simultaneously, there were disruptions in the food chain due to reduced production and panic buying that led to food shortages in the UK, further aggravating the crisis (Pautz & Dempsey, 2022).

In dealing with food insecurity issues, the UK and Scottish Governments initiated food voucher schemes for children eligible for free meals as well as the food box scheme to provide doorstep delivery of standardised free food to clinically vulnerable persons (Pautz & Dempsey, 2022). The free meals vouchers were administered at a local government level, redeemable at some supermarkets

2. Mental health effects

The pandemic led to high levels of stress among the populace including children and adolescents. A study showed that young people aged 4-16 years experienced increased mental distress due to the COVID-19 lockdown and associated social restrictions (Knowles *et al.*, 2022). The Co-SPACE study which featured young person's ages 4 - 16 years in England reported that for most younger children less than 11 years, restlessness, attentional, and emotional difficulties were evident indicating increased mental health challenges (Cowie & Myers, 2021). Adolescents themselves, however, reported no emotional or mental difficulties though their parents reported the opposite (Waite *et al.*, 2021). Nevertheless, adolescents did report an increase in stress levels due to limited access to friends and social interactions except via the Internet (Creswell *et al.*, 2021). While the effects of the situation were general, studies reported higher levels of emotional difficulties, mental challenges, worries/anxiety and stress among young children (Waite *et al.*, 2021) and persons from low-income households than those from high-income households (Cowie & Myers, 2021). Many more reported feelings of sadness, loneliness, depression etc (Knowles *et al.*, 2022). Dickerson *et al.* (2020) also observed a trend of increased loneliness, anxiety and stress among the mothers of low-income households which was associated with financial insecurities. Therefore, the prevailing evidence suggests that the negative mental health impacts of the pandemic were more on children, adolescents, and people from poor, deprived, or low-income households. For special-needs children and those with pre-existing mental health issues, this was compounded further by the lack of access to adequate physical care and support from professionals, support groups and activities (Sonnenschein *et al.*, 2022).

3. Academic Impact

With the lockdown and restrictions on physical access to school, the educational system innovatively relied on the Internet to provide services to children and young persons (Van Lancker & Parolin, 2020). Children and young persons from poor households, however, faced challenges with this system due to a lack of access to the Internet as reported by UNESCO (Cowie & Myers, 2021). According to Fisher *et al.* (2020), inequalities in opportunities increased due to the reliance on the Internet and parents most of whom were either dealing with anxiety, had to work from home, or were not experienced in professional teaching to home-school children and young persons. This was even more so with children and young persons from poor socio-economic backgrounds as food insecurity, housing insecurity, and income crisis affected them the most creating even more anxiety and worry (Fisher *et al.*, 2020). Di Pietro *et al.* (2020) report that many of them fell behind in academic activities. For the younger children, academic activities were also affected by increased restlessness and difficulties in paying attention due to heightened anxiety during the pandemic (Cowie & Myers, 2021). Similarly, researchers report that younger children dealt with more difficulty in adapting to the change in learning environments (Di Pietro *et al.*, 2020). To mitigate these impacts, the UK government provided learning aid such as laptops, and subject-specific home-schooling learning tools (Holt & Murray, 2022).

4. Socio-economic and Health Inequalities

For decades, the World Health Organisation has decried its observation that inequalities in the social determinants of health and health inequalities in non-communicable diseases between different groups in a population have contributed to higher morbidity and mortality rates in affected populations (Mishra *et al.*, 2022). Higher cases of infectious diseases and poorer health outcomes have been observed in people from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds (Mishra *et al.*, 2023). The issues of inadequate access to basic amenities such as clean air, green spaces, optimum healthcare etc. precipitated by these inequalities were exacerbated by the pandemic for these individuals and vulnerable populations as shown by research (Bambra *et al.*, 2020). People with manual, low-income

jobs especially in the tourism, care, retail and service industries were reported to have higher rates of infection as their jobs required face-to-face contact with people leading to higher rates of exposure to the disease (Whitehead *et al.*, 2021). Geriatric members of ⁵ low-income households who were more likely to live in poor-quality housing areas with overcrowding, poor access to greenspaces and clean air were more vulnerable to COVID-19 disease than their counterparts from higher-income households (Van Lancker & Parolin, 2020). The rate of COVID-19/comorbidity-induced morbidity and mortality were higher such geriatric patients since they were more likely to have poorly managed pre-existing ailments (Sinha *et al.*, 2020; Whitehead *et al.*, 2021).

5. Economic Hardship and Financial Insecurity

The pandemic lockdowns also meant the shutdown or temporary inactivity for most businesses and thus low production. Despite the initial surge in demand for essential goods, with such low production and the resultant low revenues from sales, some businesses, particularly small and medium enterprises, could not afford to pay their staff. This resulted in a worldwide increased loss of income and immediate financial pressure on many households (Whitehead *et al.*, 2021). Many respondents in surveys during the pandemic and shortly after reported income reductions or job loss for either one or both partners directly or indirectly due to the pandemic (Dickerson *et al.*, 2020; Pautz & Dempsey, 2020). Interestingly, the study by Dickerson *et al.* (2020) showed that, while those well-to-do households reported better economic conditions within the lockdown period, low-income households and poor socio-economic backgrounds reported worse-off economic conditions (Dickerson *et al.*, 2020). As predicted by experts, with the ensuing economic crisis that included loss of employment for many, income reductions for some, and loss of future income for most persons, the UK faced an increasing number of low-income households with more families pushed into poverty. This effect is more long-term than the others as evidenced by the report of the OBR. Three years post-pandemic, the OBR reports that, with absolute low income increasing from 17.02% to 18.3%, 800,000 more families will join the low-income category by 2023/24 and that it would take until 2027/28 for child poverty to regain an upward trend (Francis-Devine, 2023).

The government's 'Furlough' retention system for non-essential workers, Universal Credit benefits, and local housing allowances to aid low-income tenants mitigated the worst of the income crisis in the heat of the pandemic (Power *et al.*, 2020).

6. Housing Insecurities

The majority of the families who faced financial and food insecurities during the pandemic also experienced housing insecurities (Francis-Devine, 2023). Reports stated that tenants of low-income housing were at a higher risk for contracting the disease due to overcrowding and poor living conditions and called for interventions to aid them (Tinson & Clair, 2020). Yet most of these tenants were already in debt and could barely afford better housing as the income crisis led to more borrowing (Lancker & Parolin, 2020). The most affected were low-income households who did not qualify for furlough or the self-employed (Pautz & Dempsey, 2022). Respondents in a survey by Dickerson *et al.* (2020) expressed concerns about how to afford housing costs in the midst of financial insecurity. Three years after the pandemic lockdowns, with more families predicted to fall into poverty and delayed recovery of low-income households from the economic crisis and debt, housing insecurities remain an issue (Francis-Devine, 2023).

7. Familial Relationships

The effect of COVID-19 on familial relationships was mixed. On the positive side, research shows families got to spend more time together and build better bonds (Dickerson *et al.*, 2020). However, studies have shown that poverty is a risk factor for partner and child abuse (Featherstone *et al.*, 2019). Given the increased proximity between family members and the increased mental stress induced by the lockdown situation, experts stated that the heightened tensions increased the likelihood of abuse in historically abusive homes (Douglas *et al.*, 2020; Pereda & Díaz-Faes, 2020). Similarly, separated families experienced high levels of tension that affected familial interactions (Holt & Murray, 2022). Once again, children, young persons and partners from poor socio-economic backgrounds were at a higher risk for such occurrences (Sinha ¹³ *et al.*, 2020).

The efforts of the UK government to mitigate this risk included a policy that allowed such children to attend school even during the lockdown provided that they were listed under the child protection register (Holt & Murray, 2022). Also, permission was granted by the government for children of separated parents in England to move freely between them to aid in better readjustment and bonding with family (Hefferon *et al.*, 2021).

CONCLUSION

For many decades, poverty has been opined to be a precipitator for inequalities between social groups. Families from poor socio-economic backgrounds have always been at risk for social inequalities, health inequalities, abuse etc and children and young persons from such households bear more of the negative consequences. It is for this reason that the UK developed the Child Poverty Act of 2010, to protect children from poor households from these inequalities. However, the COVID-19 pandemic was a novel situation with numerous negative impacts worldwide, yet, as noted by the World Bank, the poor were most impacted. Studies reported worsened cases of financial insecurities which further compounded already existing food and housing insecurities for low-income households. Similarly, the mental health of children, adolescents, and adults from such backgrounds was impacted more by the lockdown than that of their counterparts from better socio-economic backgrounds with higher occurrences of worry, anxiety, loneliness and stress. Academic performance was not spared from the negative impacts as inequalities of opportunities were heightened for children and young persons from low-income households. Children and partners of abusive partners also experienced negative consequences of the pandemic. Perhaps the major positive effect of the COVID-19 lockdowns was the opportunity to build stronger ties with immediate family members due to increased and families living in poverty also benefited from this.

REFERENCES

- Bambra, C., Riordan, R., Ford, J. and Matthews, F., 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, vol 74, no 11, pp 964-968.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. *Harvard University Press*.
- Brown, J., Kirk-Wade, E., Baker, C. & Barber, S. (2021, Dec 22). Coronavirus: A history of English lockdown laws. *House of Commons Library*. <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9068/> Accessed 17th July 2023.
- Cowie, H., & Myers, A. (2021). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health and well-being of children and young people. *Children & Society*, vol 35, no 1, pp 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12430>
- Creswell, C., Shum, A., Pearcey, S., Skripkauskaitė, S., Patalay, P. and Waite, P., 2021. Young people's mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, vol 5, no 8, pp 535-537.
- Dickerson, J., Kelly, B., Lockyer, B., Bridges, S., Cartwright, C., Willan, K., Shire, K., Crossley, K., Bryant, M., Sheldon, T. A., Lawlor, D. A., Wright, J., C McEachan, R. R., Pickett, K. E., & Group, S. A. (2020). Experiences of lockdown during the Covid-19 pandemic: Descriptive findings from a survey of families in the Born in Bradford study. *Wellcome Open Research*, vol 5. <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16317.2>
- Douglas M, Katikireddi S V, Taulbut M, McKee M, McCartney G. (2020). Mitigating the wider health effects of covid-19 pandemic response *Biomedical Journal* vol 369, pp 1557. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1557
- Featherstone, B., Morris, K., Daniel, B., Bywaters, P., Brady, G., Bunting, L., Mason, W., & Mirza, N. (2019). Poverty, inequality, child abuse and neglect: Changing the conversation across the UK in child protection? *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol 97, pp 127-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.06.009>

Francis-Devine, B. (2023). Poverty in the UK: statistics. *House of Commons Library*. Available at: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/sn07096/>. Accessed 18th July 2023.

Harari, D., Keep, M. & Brien, P. (2021, Dec 17). Coronavirus: Economic impact. *House of Commons Library*. <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-8866/>

Hefferon, C., Taylor, C., Bennett, D., Falconer, C., Campbell, M., Williams, J.G., Schwartz, D., Kipping, R. and Taylor-Robinson, D., (2021). Priorities for the child public health response to the COVID-19 pandemic recovery in England. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 106(6), pp.533-538.

Henderson, M.D., Schmus, C.J., McDonald, C.C. and Irving, S.Y., (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and the impact on child mental health: A socio-ecological perspective. *Pediatric Nursing*, vol 46, no 6, pp.267-290.

Holt, L. and Murray, L., (2022). Children and Covid 19 in the UK. *Children's Geographies*, vol 20, no 4, pp.487-494.

Hu, Y. (2020). Intersecting ethnic and native–migrant inequalities in the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, vol 68, pp 100528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2020.100528>

Iruka, I. U., DeKraai, M., Walther, J., Sheridan, S. M. and Abdel-Monem, T., (2020). Examining how rural ecological contexts influence children's early learning opportunities. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, vol 52, pp.15-29.

Knowles, G., Gayer-Anderson, C., Turner, A., Dorn, L., Lam, J., Davis, S., Blakey, R., Lowis, K., Pinfold, V., Creary, N., Dyer, J., Hatch, S. L., Ploubidis, G., Bhui, K., Harding, S., & Morgan, C. (2022). Covid-19, social restrictions, and mental distress among young people: A UK longitudinal, population-based study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, vol 63, no 11, pp 1392-1404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13586>

Lowe, R. J. (2012). Children Deconstructing Childhood. *Children and Society*, vol 26, pp 269-279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2010.00344.x>

Mishra, V., Seyedzenouzi, G., Almohtadi, A., Chowdhury, T., Khashkhusha, A., Axiaq, A., Wong, W.Y.E. and Harky, A., (2021). Health inequalities during COVID-19 and their effects on morbidity and mortality. *Journal of healthcare leadership*, pp.19-26.

Moen, A.L., Sheridan, S.M., Schumacher, R.E., Cheng, K. C. (2019). Early Childhood Student–Teacher Relationships: What is the Role of Classroom Climate for Children Who are Disadvantaged? *Early Childhood Education Journal*, vol 47, pp 331–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-019-00931-x>

Pautz, H. and Dempsey, D., (2022). Covid-19 and the crisis of food insecurity in the UK. *Contemporary Social Science*, 17(5), pp.434-449.

Pereda, N. and Díaz-Faes, D.A., (2020). Family violence against children in the wake of COVID-19 pandemic: a review of current perspectives and risk factors. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health*, 14(1), pp.1-7.

Power, M., Doherty, B., Pybus, K., & Pickett, K. (2020). How COVID-19 has exposed inequalities in the UK food system: The case of UK food and poverty. *Emerald Open Research*, vol 2. <https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13539.2>

Ridge, T. (2011). The Everyday Costs of Poverty in Childhood: A Review of Qualitative Research Exploring the Lives and Experiences of Low-Income Children in the UK. *Children & Society*, vol 2011, pp. 73–84. DOI:10.1111/j.1099-0860.2010.00345.x

Sánchez-Páramo, C., Hill, R., Mahler, D. G., Yonzan, N. (2021, Oct 7) COVID-19 leaves a legacy of rising poverty and widening inequality. *World Bank Blogs*. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/covid-19-leaves-legacy-rising-poverty-and-widening-inequality#:~:text=The%20result%20is%20that%20the,percent%20are%20down%202.8%20percent.>

Sinha, I.P., Lee, A.R., Bennett, D., McGeehan, L., Abrams, E.M., Mayell, S.J., Harwood, R., Hawcutt, D.B., Gilchrist, F.J., Auth, M.K. and Simba, J.M., (2020). Child poverty, food insecurity, and respiratory health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, vol 8, no 8, pp 762-763. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30280-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30280-0)

Sonnenschein, S., Stites, M. L., Grossman, J. A., & Galczyk, S. H. (2022). "This will likely affect his entire life": Parents' views of special education services during COVID-19. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 112, 101941. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101941>

Tinson, A. & Clair, A. (2020). Better housing is crucial for our health and the COVID-19 recovery. *The Health Foundation*, vol 20, no 11, pp.1-25.

Van Lancker, W. and Parolin, Z., (2020). COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: a social crisis in the making. *The Lancet Public Health*, vol 5, no 5, pp.e243-e244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30084-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30084-0)

Waite, P., Pearcey, S., Shum, A., L. Raw, J. A., Patalay, P., & Creswell, C. (2021). How did the mental health symptoms of children and adolescents change over early lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK? *JCPP Advances*, vol 1, no 1, pp.e12009. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcv2.12009>

Welsh, (2022, June 4). Impact of Covid-19 on Poverty in the UK. The Borgen Project. <https://borgenproject.org/impact-of-covid-19-on-poverty-in-the-uk/> Accessed 18th July 2023.

World Health Organisation (2023). WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int/> Accessed 18th July 2023.

Yang, L., Liu, S., Liu, J., Zhang, Z., Wan, X., Huang, B., Chen, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2020). COVID-19: Immunopathogenesis and Immunotherapeutics. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy*, vol 5, no 1, pp 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-020-00243-2>

assessment 2

ORIGINALITY REPORT

8%

SIMILARITY INDEX

7%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to University of Wales, Lampeter Student Paper	1 %
2	research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk Internet Source	1 %
3	cronfa.swan.ac.uk Internet Source	1 %
4	www.pubcovid19.pt Internet Source	1 %
5	www.wellesleyinstitute.com Internet Source	<1 %
6	Submitted to University of Strathclyde Student Paper	<1 %
7	journal.pancabudi.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
8	ubp.uni-bamberg.de Internet Source	<1 %
9	webb.deu.edu.tr Internet Source	<1 %

10	www.thenhsa.co.uk Internet Source	<1 %
11	eprints.soton.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
12	mobt3ath.com Internet Source	<1 %
13	www.frontiersin.org Internet Source	<1 %
14	www.guc19.com Internet Source	<1 %
15	www.london.gov.uk Internet Source	<1 %
16	open.library.ubc.ca Internet Source	<1 %
17	scholarworks.sfasu.edu Internet Source	<1 %
18	www.ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk Internet Source	<1 %
19	www.bag.admin.ch Internet Source	<1 %
20	www.thesmithfamily.com.au Internet Source	<1 %
21	"The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2022", Food and Agriculture	<1 %

Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 2022

Publication

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On