

useful for a paper like this to grasp this need for critical interrogation.

I admire what the authors have done and indeed that they took part in this inquiry. I stand in unity with their attempts to challenge normative reductionist attempts to misrepresent disadvantage and poverty. This commentary has been produced in a spirit of goodwill and solidarity and as a reminder that as community psychologists we need to be rigorous in our critical appraisal of the processes that we engage in.

**Address for correspondence**

c.j.walker@brighton.ac.uk

**Authors' Reply**

Emma Sampson

Heather Gridley

*Australian Psychological Society*

Colleen Turner

*Lentara Uniting Care, Australia*

We thank Carl Walker and the reviewers for their constructive feedback and solidarity with the intent of our paper. We presented our abridged submission as one way community psychologists can confront poverty by adopting an advocacy role within our respective organisations and positions, or indeed as researchers or academics. We accept the critique of the muted voice we found ourselves employing in attempting to infuse a mainstream APS submission with community psychology principles and practice examples. We were equally aware of how an APS submission on social inclusion would have sounded without our input, and saw it as an opportunity to illustrate to our own colleagues the value of tackling poverty at multiple levels, instead of condoning individualised, victim-blaming approaches. We emphasised neighbourhood/community level advocacy as a key approach that distinguishes community from mainstream psychology, based on our first-hand experience of (and involvement in evaluations demonstrating) its benefits. Community-based approaches can spearhead

and trial attempts to address structural causes of disadvantage, and can complement advocacy that is directed towards government policies and structures that frequently contribute to practices of poverty and disadvantage, as we advocated throughout the submission and paper. While we were conscious of the problematics of 'progressive non-specifics' and did touch on some advocacy-related actions (forming coalitions, working at multiple levels, strengthening local networks), elaborating such actions was beyond the scope of the paper, which was based on one submission. We look forward to continuing and expanding this focus on advocacy in the near future – and in our own right.