



**SPAN**  
Single Parent Action Network

## **Response to the Green Paper 'No one written off' July 2008 Cm7363**

**October 2008**

### **About Single Parent Action Network (SPAN)**

Single Parent Action Network is a diverse organisation working to empower one parent families throughout the UK. SPAN envisages a society that values the vital contribution of one parent families and enables them to participate fully in all areas of life.

## **1.Introduction**

Living in a lone parent family still presents a great poverty risk to children. Households Below Average Income (HBAI) figures for 2005/6 indicate that 49% of individuals living in this type of family are poor compared to 24% of single people with no children, 22% of couples with children, and 19% of single pensioners. In comparative terms the higher risk of child poverty in the UK is linked to the high numbers of children living with a lone parent not in employment, which in itself is associated with much lower levels of human capital, as *well as* expensive childcare limited work-life balance policies and high demand for low-paid insecure part-time work<sup>i</sup>. In 2004, 41% of LM had either no qualification or very low ones, compared to ¼ of mothers in couple families<sup>ii</sup>. Lone parents on income support tend to have even lower human capital. In 2000, ½ had no qualification and no relevant work skills or experience<sup>iii</sup>. In fact recent data shows that 35% of LP with children under 7 have no GCSEs and that their employment rate increases with level of qualification, with those with GCSE having an employment rate at 40% which is double that of those with no GCSEs.

Single Parent Action Network (SPAN) therefore welcomes the attention that this Green Paper pays to increasing lone parents skills and the opportunity to respond to '*No-one written off*' and continue our dialogue with the Department of Work and Pension over welfare reform. We undertake participatory research and policy programs with marginalised lone parent families to raise their capacity to have a say on their experiences of policies and services, and to increase understanding about the difficulties that they face in trying to move forward. Our most recent participatory policy program focused on lone parents experiences of intermediate steps to employments, and we just have begun another 3-year participatory research project looking into the experiences of lone parents who will move onto Job Seekers Allowance. We also provide services that engage hard to reach lone parents into intermediate steps to sustainable employment. Our Study Centre is based on a holistic understanding of the needs of lone parents. It seeks to engage lone parents who are not at all work ready, to take the first step towards accredited learning and employment, by providing a range of services and soft-skills learning opportunities in a single parent friendly context.

We therefore welcome the opportunity to disseminate the experiences of marginalised lone parents in our response to '*No-one written off*'. We are pleased to see the proposal to pilot financial incentives to engage lone parents with children under 5 to take up training. But we are disappointed that the same approach is not applied to all lone parents regardless of their child's age. The Green Paper introduces no extra measures to support those whose youngest child is above 7 to access good quality training, and takes a mandatory approach to engaging those whose youngest child is under 7 but above 5 into training. Most of all we remain opposed to the conditionality approach that underlines current welfare reform, and are particularly disappointed to see that this Green Paper proposes to further strengthen conditionality for most claimant groups, and move all lone parents onto the Job Seekers Allowance regime. We do not think that treating all claimants as either JobSeekers or unable to work on the grounds of health/disability is the way forward. Despite the welcome inclusion of safeguards, this approach devalues the unpaid care work that parents and carers undertake and its great contribution to the economy and society. We believe this approach is not going to work and risks further distancing those who are hard to reach and/or experiencing multiple disadvantages, and those who want to care full-time for their children.

## **2. Impact of conditionality on least work ready lone parents**

These proposals are going to affect many lone parents who are not work ready either because they have young children, or because they experience multiple disadvantages and are hard to reach. As Berthoud<sup>iv</sup> argues achieving the employment target will require a significant increase in the employment rates of those who have very young children and those multiply disadvantaged. This is partly because so far employment policies have mostly been able to reach and work with those most work ready and those who have been on benefits for a shorter time. Lone parents long term benefit recipients tend to experience much more acute barriers to employment. For example whilst 66% of those with children over 11 are already in paid work, those remaining on Income Support have more complex needs than other claimants<sup>v</sup>.

In fact the make up of the group that will be most affected by these proposals is important because the level of multiple disadvantage amongst lone parents is high. According to the Social Exclusion Unit report on mental health and social exclusion, 28% of lone parents suffered from common mental health problems such as anxiety, panic disorders, depression and post-natal depression, compared to 1 in 6 of the general population. A survey by One Parent Families found that this is a hidden problem, because lone parents fear their children will be taken away. So it is likely that many of these lone parents will end up on JSA, although arguably they should be entitled to Employment Support Allowance.

Mental health issues are also likely to be linked to the high rate of domestic violence experienced by lone parents, 4/10 of the British Lone Parent Cohort study had experiences of domestic violence<sup>vi</sup>. The rate of ill health for lone parents on benefits has doubled from 1991-1999, arguably evidence of long term effects of poverty.<sup>vii</sup> 16% of lone mothers that took part in the latest Families and Children Study (FACS) sweep reported a long-standing illness or disability compared to 9% of mothers in couples<sup>viii</sup>. Lone parents not in work and those working less than 16 hours are more likely to have a child with ill-health or disability<sup>ix</sup>.

Although conditionality might have a positive impact on traditional JSA clients as the DWP background paper on the conditionality review has found<sup>x</sup>, lone parents are a very different group and we believe this approach is not going to work for the following reasons.

- At present we have no evidence on the impact of conditionality to attend training for lone parents. What evidence we have on the impact on conditionality for lone parents relates to work focused interviews. Synthesis of WFI effectiveness found that it did not succeed in persuading those lone parents that did not want to work, 2/3 of these saying it made no difference at all<sup>xi</sup>.
- There seems to be an issue of trust, which is exacerbated by the 'work-first' strategy. There is some evidence<sup>xii</sup> to indicate that those least work ready have very negative perception of Job Centre Plus, and fear that the dominant objective is to 'push' them into work. This is not surprising given that long-term

claimants and disadvantaged lone parents have low self-confidence issues, therefore more likely to fear a conditionality approach.

- Indeed engaging those that have multiple disadvantages has been very difficult so far. DWP commissioned qualitative research<sup>xiii</sup> shows that reasons for non participation in NDLP include ill-health, unstable family life due to temporary housing, financial insecurity and low-self confidence.
- Coping with a number of acute issues such as debt, housing instability, domestic violence, school truancy, stress and anxiety whilst single-handedly caring for children is hard enough. We do see a lot of these lone parents at SPAN. Having to comply with requirement to take up training is going to be even harder for this group.

For all of these reasons we do not understand why this Government believes that a conditionality approach is going to succeed with this group. What this group needs is not a requirement to take up work-based training, but the provision of holistic support that will enable them to begin to address the acute barriers to employment that they face. Our participatory research with 68 lone parents across 5 UK cities<sup>xiv</sup>, found that holistic support was key to enabling those experiencing disadvantage to move forward. At present there is no provision for advisers to provide holistic support during interviews with lone parents on JSA, and this Green Paper makes no proposals in this respect. In fact the synthesis of findings on of WFILP<sup>xv</sup> has found that advisers tend to focus mostly on work search, with very little attention to childcare or training, never mind being able to assess acute disadvantage and refer lone parents to the right agencies for support. The work-first target based approach does not provide incentives for adviser to provide holistic support.

We are anxious about the impact that conditionality will have on this group. We believe that it will increase their lack of trust in JCP and their fear that mandatory work-based training will actually mean being pushed to take up the first job available, resulting in non-compliance. Interestingly a JCP adviser reported<sup>xvi</sup> having concerns that negative perceptions and non-compliance to attend WFI were compounded by the use of terms such as 'work-focused'. A Department for Work & Pensions study<sup>xvii</sup> on sanctions found that many claimants did not comply with attending Work Focused Interviews for fear of work pressure. We feel that the same applies to the term 'work-based' training.

Most of all we are concerned that those experiencing multiple disadvantages might endure sanctions. Recent qualitative research<sup>xviii</sup> on effects of WFI sanctions is supporting our concern. It found that those affected by sanctions tend to be the least work ready, i.e. having been on benefits longer, or never worked, having children with poor health, debt issue and very poor knowledge about the benefit system. Even more worryingly those who lived with the sanctions did so not because they made an active decision not to attend the WFI, but because their challenging home situations and their lack of knowledge meant that they found themselves in this situation. Sometimes they thought the lower level of benefit was due to the Crisis loan they were repaying, other times they simply did not deal with the issue.

Informal discussions with Ministers suggest that sanctions of 40% of benefits will be introduced for non compliance in line with JSA regulations. The impact on sanctions on these families already experiencing deprivation is likely to be very detrimental. Evidence<sup>xix</sup> indicates that although advisers used it as a last resort, the impact of

sanctions was damaging: poverty of all family members increased; many had to go without essentials; many were unable to provide trips for the children or pocket money; their stress levels increased, compounding existing depression/anxieties. In the light of the strong reaction to last year's UNICEF report which placed the UK at the bottom of 21 advanced nations, the implications of benefit cuts on those who are not work ready and their children need to be taken seriously.

### **3. Mandatory training and cycling**

Lone parents are twice as likely than other comparable groups to cycle back into welfare<sup>xx</sup>; they certainly do worse than partnered mothers<sup>xxi</sup>. We are still not sure why this is but is linked to issues of low-pay and inflexible jobs. We are concerned that mandatory requirements to undertake skills health checks and relevant training, is going to increase the number of lone parents that enter low-paid and inflexible jobs.

First there is the issue of the kind of training that is available and second the ability of advisers to support lone mothers to plan ahead and identify training that would enable them to access a job that suits their skills and aspirations and therefore more likely to be sustainable.

Many lone parents want to access good training that leads to medium/high qualifications. Our participatory research<sup>xxii</sup> on experiences of moving forward identified studying or training to gain medium high skills as the best and most effective way to move and sustain employment, because it increases their skills and qualifications but also widen their choice of jobs and raises their career prospects. The training premium attached to the NDLP was seen as positive but the concern was that NDLP only offered training up to level 2. Likewise a review of evidence on what works<sup>xxiii</sup> found that lone parents with low education are less likely to take part in the NDLP because NVQ2 is not what they want or need.

Other evidence indicates that there is a good case to increase the level of qualifications that lone parents can access. Evaluation of NDLP+ which provides access to NVQ3 argued that this had a positive impact on job entry<sup>xxiv</sup>. Hoggart and Versus (2008) also argue that is best to provide opportunities to access good training before entering employment, because once in employment it is very difficult for lone parents to find the time to advance through training, in addition to caring for their children and sustaining a job. Our participatory research findings are similar, with lone parents in low-paid low-skilled jobs being offered very little opportunities to train, and those in professional jobs struggling to meet the expectation to train because this kind of training tends to be offered at weekend or evenings, when they have no childcare.

We recognise that lone parents needs for training are diverse with many also requiring access to basic skills or ESOL. Evaluation of NDLP+<sup>xxv</sup> shows that it has been difficult to provide the right training; either not high enough or not low enough to address issues of illiteracy and innumeracy. But most training being offered through WFI tends to be in IT or Basic skills<sup>xxvi</sup>. What is needed for those lone parents that have little skills is a progressive approach to learning with the opportunity to go further to access higher level training once they have completed ESOL or Basic skills type of training. Unfortunately those who have children aged 6 or above will not have enough time to engage in both levels of training and build up their skills. Moreover the proposal to

enable Job Seekers to study full-time for 8 weeks means that many lone parents will not be in a position to take up qualifications above level 2, many of which require longer period of study.

What we are also concerned about is that if a skills gap has been identified in the skills health check it is up to the lone parent adviser to decide in agreement with the lone parent whether and what kind of training s/he should take up. Evidence on WFI indicates that offering training to lone parents caused the greatest frustration for advisers. They said lone parents' expectations were raised too high by the marketing material and the courses available were not suited to their needs. The report recommends better link and knowledge for advisers to enable them to signpost lone parents to relevant provision, which is also compatible with childcare provision. Clearly also expectations should not be raised too high if training is not going to be available.

#### **4. Availability of flexible training and compatible childcare**

Flexible training is difficult to come by. Participants of our One Parent Proofing<sup>xxvii</sup> program put forward the following solutions: entitlement to take a period of time out due to family or health needs and school holidays without losing out in teaching or training assessment; opportunities to recuperate lost training as a result of caring responsibilities; flexible and short delivery times that meet childcare available; flexible training premiums that can take account of the need to take time out.

Another key issue relates to childcare provision. This is particularly relevant to those with children under school age who choose to take up the training incentive. Childcare which is short-term and part/time is difficult to come by and expensive. Childcare provision attached to training is often provider lead, which means that is often used to subsidise general need for childcare. Another issue for this group is the trusting of formal childcare. There needs to be provision for childcare tasters, and time allowed for lone parents to reassure that their children are settled in well before their training commences. Many nurseries require a month settling period for children who have never experienced formal childcare.

#### **5. Conclusion: an alternative approach**

To sum up our concerns to the proposal in the Green Paper concerning lone parents, rest on the conditionality approach, which we feel is likely to increase lack of trust, fear of work compulsion amongst those who are harder to reach and experiencing multiple disadvantages. We are concerned that compliance is going to be harder for this group because they already have to cope with acute disadvantages as well as care single handedly for their children. We fear many of these lone parents might be affected by sanctions, even endure their detrimental impact, and so be further distanced from accessing those opportunities to train that they need. Paradoxically those are the people that need engaging if the employment and child poverty targets are to be met.

We are also very concerned that the work-first strategy will not enable lone parents to gain the kind of training they want and need to access good quality sustainable jobs. By good we mean well-paid, secure and flexible. This risks increasing the number of lone parents that will end up cycling back to welfare. We also feel that flexible training is

hard to come by and so is compatible childcare, which is a real issues for those who have children under school age. In what follows we provide an alternative approach to engage hard to reach not very work ready lone parents into training.

### **Incentives not sanctions for lone parents whose youngest child is aged 7**

We believe that incentives are more suited to engage hard to reach, not work ready lone parents and those that are multiply disadvantaged into undertaking training. Incentives increase trust in government programs, which these lone parents lack. Incentives send a clear message that engagement in training is a worthwhile activity that does not entail a loss of benefits or financial insecurity. Incentives would go some way to reassure lone parents that sanctions would be used as a last resort as the main aim of the reform is to support lone parents into training and employment. A training premium of £40 a week would be in line with the In Work Credit and therefore entail a better sense of financial security when lone parents move into employment introduced as an opt-in basis for all lone parents.

We are pleased to see the proposal to pilot financial incentives to engage lone parents with children under 5 to take up training, but we believe this approach should be extended to all lone parents with children under 7. Parents should be given a choice as to when they feel it is the right time to take up training. The Employment Retention and Advancement demonstration programmes<sup>xxviii</sup> show that the diverse orientation to work and to caring responsibilities that lone parents have, which we already know affects their decision to enter employment<sup>xxix</sup>, also impacts on their understanding and plans for career advancement and training. Some lone parents prefer to postpone it until their children are older; others need more support to do it when their children are younger.

### **Access to high qualifications and basic training for all**

Access to training and training provision should be improved. Provision is required at both ends of the qualification spectrum. But it is also vital that those who currently require Basic Skills or ESOL training are also enabled to gain higher qualifications once these have been completed. Lone parents should be enabled to take up training that requires long periods of study.

### **Soft-skills and career development training for the hard to reach**

Soft-skills training is an important first step into learning. We need to engage those hard to reach into making that first step, so that they can be enabled to move forward into accredited learning. Many not work ready lone parents have no plans for training or employment. This is partly an issue of low-self confidence and poor work experience. In order to make sure that these lone parents plan ahead for their future and engage in training that would lead them to a good job, skills health check should include a soft-skills domain. At present we understand that it has 4 domains: basic skills; vocational skills; personal attributes and career management. If a need is identified opportunities for soft skills training, to include life coaching and personal development should be provided.

### **Better links between JCP, LSC and voluntary providers of soft-skills training**

The Education and Skills Committee (2006) report on Further Education recommends the revision of current funding priorities, in the light of cuts to adult courses including

those aimed at increasing *soft skills* of hard to reach groups, and that the Learning and Skills Council make funding available directly to quality and established independent providers of such courses. Evidence<sup>xxx</sup> indicates that lone parents organisations are effective in engaging hard to reach lone parents into soft-skills training. For example the JRF funded quantitative evaluation of SPAN Study Centre (SSC) carried out in 2001, found it successful in reaching hard to reach lone parents: most lived on benefit and over half had physical or mental health problems. It also compared the SSC to local statutory providers and found that it fared much better in raising soft-skills. The House of Commons Work and Pensions committee inquiry on achieving the 80% employment target (2007) recommends that “JCP needs to do more to successfully engage harder to reach lone parents [...] it is essential to ensure good links between the voluntary and community organisations and JCP and the LSC to help engage lone parents with JCP provision”( p.68).

### **Lone parent advisers to provide holistic support for lone parents on JSA**

Training is not the only issue. Resources must be targeted also to holistic support- the danger is that the focus will just be on identifying skill gaps. Advisors should be trained to identify acute barriers to training such as debt, housing instability, domestic violence, school truancy, stress and anxiety, and have the information available to organisations that can help and advice on these matters.

### **Right to request training**

If the job exit rate of lone parents were reduced to those of comparable groups, then the employment target could be met without increasing the job entry<sup>xxxi</sup>. In this respect strategies for employment advancement are key. The proposed Right to Request time to train is too weak. It is only a right to request, only available to those who have been employed for over 26 weeks. This proposal is putting aside the proposed review into a statutory right to train.

### **Valuing care in the language or rights and responsibilities**

Last but not least attention should be paid to the language used in these proposals. Categorising lone parents as Job Seekers, and defining only those who are either in paid work or seeking work as ‘active’ devalues unpaid care work. The principle of ‘Rights and Responsibility’ should recognise the active unpaid work that lone parents in the UK carry out every day to raise 3.1 million children single-handedly. Lone parents who are not ready to work are implicitly labeled as ‘inactive scroungers’ thus increasing the stigma that many poor lone parents as such experience in their every day life, paradoxically decreasing their sense of self-esteem and confidence, which as we know is a key barrier to access training and employment programs.

### **Specific safeguards to account for lone parents’ caring responsibilities when training**

At the very least if the Green Paper proposals go ahead we are pleased to see an intention to include specific safeguards around training and lone parents’ caring responsibilities. We would welcome the opportunity to contribute to consultations on what those safeguards need to be. Requirement to train entails specific safeguards, such as flexible training delivered during school hours, just cause for temporary interruption training due to family emergencies and breakdown in childcare, and the ability to restart

the course without being penalised, special consideration to the needs of childcare for those who have children under school age etc. Advisers would need clear information and specific guidance on training issues.

## **List of Consultation Questions**

**Question 2: How could capacity and capability to provide full-time work experience in the community sector be provided and incentivised to produce the best employment outcomes for participants?**

We support Create proposal to pilot a community allowance alongside work for your benefit. For more detail please refer to their own submission.

**Question 3: Is full-time 'work for your benefit' as an alternative to a sanction of loss of benefit for repeated non-compliance with work search requirements an effective option for some jobseekers? How should it be targeted?**

Full time work is inappropriate for lone parents

**Question 10: In view of the need to help lone parents develop the skills they need to find work, are we right to require lone parents to have a skills health check and training as a condition of receiving benefit?**

No. Please read our conclusion for a brief explanation of why we believe this approach will not work.

**Question 11: Should we pilot extra benefit payments for lone parents in return for training, and if so, when the youngest child is what age?**

Yes, this should be piloted for all lone parents whose youngest child is under 7. Please read our conclusion were we put forward an alternative approach.

**Question 13: How might we build on the foundations of the current rules so that they do not discourage unemployed people from volunteering as a deliberate back-to-work strategy, while retaining a clear focus on moving off welfare into paid employment?**

We support Create proposal to pilot a community allowance alongside work for your benefit. For more detail please refer to their own submission.

**Question 20: What approach might be suitable to assist partners of benefit claimants who can work into employment?**

We agree that partners of claimants should also be supported into employment. It is an issue of child poverty, given that regardless the family type children living in a household where no one is in paid work has a  $\frac{3}{4}$  change to be poor<sup>xxxii</sup>. It is also an equality issue given that support has been targeted on lone parents. But we do not believe that equality should be achieved in the terms of conditionality, rather on support.

Lets also not forget that there is a high rate of child disability and ill-health amongst families were no one is in paid work<sup>xxxiii</sup>. Also that large families are at higher risk of poverty as well as less likely to be able to engage in paid work due to the very high costs of childcare. Bradshaw's<sup>xxxiv</sup> analysis of national and international data found that in 2004/5 children living in families with 3 or more children represented 42% of all poor children, despite the fact that the numbers of these children has declined considerably in the last 60 years. There will need to be specific and clear safeguards to take account of the specific childcare barriers encountered by large families and by two parent families with disabled children. Particular attention should be paid to childcare tax credits, which at present are ill suited to large families, because the maximum payment is still £300 for two children or more.

There is also a risk of pushing partners of benefit claimants into atypical working hours, i.e at weekends and evening. There is high demand for this kind of work and partners will find it much harder to reject these jobs on the grounds of childcare, because the expectation is that their partner can look after the children. Working evenings and weekends is not necessarily conducive to family life

**Question 22: Is a system based on a single overarching benefit the right long-term aspiration? How could a simpler system be structured so as to meet varying needs and responsibilities?**

In terms of long-term aspirations having a dual benefit system, which simply distinguishes between job seekers and those who cannot work on health/disability grounds, ignores parents and carers and devalues the vital contribution that their unpaid care work makes to our society and economy. Making this dual benefit system simple is problematic when the ambition is also to make it flexible and personalised. The system is streamlined but not simplified, because it still needs many strand to provide additional safeguards for a variety of different groups, parents, carers, lone parents with children of different ages, drug users etc. This renders JSA rules extremely complicated to administer for staff, hence creating too much scope for unfair treatment. The benefit system should be transparent to claimants. Instead it is going to be very difficult for claimants to understand why they might be treated differently to others claiming the same benefit. Hence rising potential for mistaken expectations and misunderstandings, which can have a detrimental impact on compliance and result in sanctions.

**Question 26: What information would providers need to make the Right to Bid effective? How would the evaluation process need to work to give providers confidence that their ideas would be evaluated fairly and effectively? How do we get the balance right between rewarding those who come up with new ideas and the obligation to tender projects?**

Small voluntary sector organisations often develop innovative projects and innovative models of good practice. Unfortunately many of these organisations are not be in the position to bid, either because they lack the capacity to deliver the service on a large scale or because they are opposed to particular aspects of itis policy. Therefore they remain excluded from the bidding process altogether, and unable to contribute ideas and model of good practice to the development and delivery of services. Would it not be possible to reward the submission of models of good practice separately from the tendering?

- <sup>i</sup> Hirsch D (2006) *What will it take to end child poverty?* JRF: London
- <sup>ii</sup> Lyon N, Barnes M and Sweiry D (2006) *Families with children in Britain: Findings from the 2004 FACS*, DWP Research Report No 340: London.
- <sup>iii</sup> Lessof C et al (2001) *New Deal for Lone Parents Evaluation: A Quantitative Survey of Lone Parents on Income Support*, Employment Service, ESR101.
- <sup>iv</sup> Berthoud R (2003) *Lone parents and jobs, can the 70% target be met?* In OPF Working to target: Can policies deliver the paid work for seven in ten lone parents? One Parent Families: London
- <sup>v</sup> Lessof C et al already cited; Haux T (2007), Paper for One Parent Families: London
- <sup>vi</sup> Marsh A and Vegeris S (2004) *The British Lone Parent Cohort and their Children 1991-2001*, DWP Research Report No 209, Leeds: CDS.
- <sup>vii</sup> One Parent Families *One Parent Families Today: The Facts*, OPF: London
- <sup>viii</sup> Lyon N. et al (2006) cited above
- <sup>ix</sup> Barnes, M et al (2004) *Families And Children In Britain: Findings From The 2002 Families And Children Study*, DWP Research Report No 206, DWP
- <sup>x</sup> DWP (2008) *More support higher expectations: the role of conditionality in improving employment outcomes, a background research and discussion paper*, DWP
- <sup>xi</sup> Thomas A (2007) *Lone Parent Work Focused Interviews: Synthesis of findings*, DWP Research Report 443
- <sup>xii</sup> Cambridge Policy Consultants (1997) *Vulnerable Groups in Glasgow Works*, CPC: Cambridge; Social Exclusion Unit (2004b) *Jobs and Enterprise in Deprived Areas*, ODPM: London
- <sup>xiii</sup> Brown and Joyce (2007) *New Deal for Lone Parents- Non Participation Qualitative Research*, DWP Research Report 408
- <sup>xiv</sup> Giullari S. (2007) *Proofed for Parents by Parents: Participatory One parent Proofing: Findings*, SPAN
- <sup>xv</sup> Thomas A (2007) *Lone Parent Work Focused Interviews: Synthesis of findings*, DWP Research Report 443,
- <sup>xvi</sup> Thomas A (2007) cited above.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Joyce L and Whiting K (2006) *Sanctions: qualitative summary report on lone parent customers, DWP working paper 27* Stanley
- <sup>xviii</sup> Goodwin V (2008) *The effects of benefit sanctions on lone parents' employment decisions and moves into employment*, DWP Research Report 511
- <sup>xix</sup> Joyce L and Whiting K (2006); Goodwin V (2008) cited above.
- <sup>xx</sup> Evans, M., Harkness, S., and Arigoni Ortiz, R. (2004) *Lone Parents Cycling Between Work And Benefits*, DWP Research Report WAE 217: London
- <sup>xxi</sup> Yeo, A (2007) *Experience of work and job retention among lone parents: an evidence review*, DWP WP 37: London
- <sup>xxii</sup> Giullari (2007) *ibid*
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Hasluck and Green (2007) *what works for whom?*
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Hosain and Breen 2007 cited above
- <sup>xxv</sup> Hosain and Breen 2007 cited above
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Thomas A (2007) cited above.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Wright and Giullari (2007) *Participatory One parent Proofing: toolkit*, SPAN, Bristol
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Hoggart L et al (2006) *Staying in work and moving up: Evidence from the UK Employment and Advancement Demonstration*, DWP research report 381.
- <sup>xxix</sup> Bell, A., Finch, N., La Valle, I., Sainsbury, R., Skinner, C. (2005) *A question of balance: Lone parents, childcare and work*, DWP Research Report 230: London; Millar, J and Ridge, T (2001) *Families, poverty, work and care: a review of the literature on lone parents and low-income couples with children*, DWP Research Report 153, Leeds: CDS. Bath; Duncan S and Edwards R (1999) *Lone Mothers, Paid Work and Gendered Moral Rationalities*, Macmillan.
- <sup>xxx</sup> John, K., Payne, S. and Land, H. (2001) *Training and support for lone parents, an evaluation of a targeted study programme*; JRF: York; SPAN (2006) *Lone Parents and voluntary work*; Bristol; One Plus (2005) *Volunteering as a path to the labour market*; One Parent Families (2005) *Response To The Women And Work Commission*.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Yeo (2007, cited above;
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Hirsch D (2006) *What will it take to end child poverty?* JRF: London
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> Hirsch D (2006) *What will it take to end child poverty?* JRF: London
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Bradshaw J et al (2006) *Child Poverty in Large Families*, Policy Press-JRF: Bristol