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1.0 About the Study

The support of the Economic and Social Research Council is gratefully acknowledged.
2.0 Conditionality and Anti-social Behaviour: Rationalities and Mechanisms
New Labour and ‘Coercive Welfare’

- A belief that “everyone can change” and that the state can ‘grip’ families and make them change their behaviour
- Increasing focus on the take-up of support:
  - It is possible ‘to make people who need help take it… households can be forced to take help’
- A belief that sanctions provide a very strong incentive to encourage those households to undertake rehabilitation when they have refused other offers of help
- A belief that such support is non-negotiable
Policy Measures

• ASBOs, Parenting Orders, Family Intervention Tenancies, Pilots of Housing Benefit Sanctions
• Based on set of prohibited behaviours (ASBOs) or required behaviours (Parenting Orders)
• Viewed as a contractual arrangement (as well as Acceptable Behaviour Contracts), balancing support with sanctions for non-compliance
• Family Intervention Projects: different models but focus on key worker model with holistic whole-family approaches
• Latter focus on early and supportive interventions (mirrored in the Scottish Government’s approach)
Coalition Government and a Rehabilitation Revolution?

- Belief that ‘current measures impose stringent measures to prevent future ASB but don’t address underlying causes’
- Need for simple, clear and effective sanctions regime
- More rehabilitating and restorative rather than criminalising and coercive, but still ‘real consequences for non-compliance’
- Continuing belief that ‘sanctions provide a proper deterrent to the ‘persistent minority’ and that Parenting Orders can compel parents to attend programmes
- Recognition that some practitioners reluctant to use sanctions, relying on a voluntary ethos
- Reduction in ambition from ‘everyone can change’ to ‘government working with people who want to take the necessary steps’
- To provide support beyond the welfare support system and to reduce top down state intervention: i.e. localised provision with greater role for community, voluntary and private sectors
Troubled Families Programme

• Troubled Families Programme: to ‘turn around’ the lives of 120,000 families during the 2010-2015 Parliament
• ASB one of four criteria for inclusion in the programme and payment by results partly determined by reductions in ASB
• Retrospectively supported by two DCLG research publications
• Five key intervention factors: a dedicated worker; practical hands on support; a persistent, assertive and challenging approach; considering the family as a whole and gathering the intelligence; and a common purpose and agreed action.
Anti-social, Crime and Policing Act 2014

- Existing measures/ powers consolidated to six new powers
- Broadening of the definition of ASB
- Powers easier to use, extended geographical reach and available to more agencies
- Crucially, new Injunctions to Prevent Nuisance and Annoyance and Criminal Behaviour Orders can impose positive requirements upon individuals as well as prohibitions (this was not possible with ASBOs or ASB Injunctions- it was possible with Individual Support Orders but these were not widely used).
3.0 Research Evidence
Previous Research Findings

• Importance of key worker role with assertive approach and ‘non-negotiable expectations’
• Importance of holistic whole-family approach, identifying and tackling underpinning issues
• Recognising centrality of relationships with family but also liaison and advocacy, not just direct support
• Recognising importance of crisis management, stabilising and ‘soft’ transformative outcomes as prerequisite for ‘hard’ and ‘measurable’ outcomes
• Concerns over limited time period for working with families, exit planning and longer-term outcomes
• Concerns over resources, access to expert services and flexibility of key agencies to support families
• Understanding voluntary and engaged ethos of many interventions
Contested Research Evidence

- Claim that evaluations of Family Intervention Projects have over-estimated positive outcomes
- Considerable controversy about Louise Casey’s report on troubled families and arising conclusions and recommendations
- Critique that, despite all the research, there has been very little ‘accumulated learning’ about how to tackle ASB and troubled families
4.0 Understanding Interventions and Outcomes
Understanding Interventions

• Assessment
• Direct Support (Emotional, practical, financial)
• Liaison and Advocacy

• Engagement – assessment - support plan and contract - provision of support - exit planning
Understanding All Outcomes (Not just ‘hard’ transformatives ones)

- **Crisis Management**: reducing immediate risk or harm and responding to trauma
- **Stabilising**: maintaining environments, relationships and dynamics
- **Transformative**:
  - *Soft Outcomes*: improved self-esteem, mental and physical health, domestic environment and management, inter-family relationships
  - *Hard Outcomes*: Education (attendance and attainment); employment/training; reduced risky behaviour or ASB; prevention of eviction or entry to criminal justice system
5.0 Initial Findings from the ESRC Study
Indicative Early Findings

- Confirms existing evidence and evaluations
- Individuals/households with range of vulnerabilities, exacerbated by welfare reform
- Still need to address underpinning problems
- Chaotic and dynamic situations in which ‘rational and future-orientated decision making’ challenging
- Tension between ethos of support and use of sanctions
- Many individuals not fully aware of nature of interventions, forms of sanction or behavioural requirements
- Concerns about resources and extent to which expertise is being lost due to budget reductions
- Reduction of ASB as priority impacting on partnerships
Indicative Early Findings 2

• Complex relationship between sanctions and support
• Sanctions ineffective without any form of support (but not necessarily visa versa)
• Key role of key workers, including new role to negotiate sanctions regime
• Emphasis on employment sanctions rather than tackling underpinning causes
• Lack of joining up of different sanction elements (housing, ASB, benefits)
• Varied views on the extent to which threat of sanction acts as a motivation or catalyst for engagement in support
Further Reading


See also: [www.welfare@conditionality.ac.uk](http://www.welfare@conditionality.ac.uk) for ASB and other briefing papers and more information about the study.
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