



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Citation:

Cameron, K-L (2022) Antisocial behaviour or just unmet support needs?: How intervening in nuisance behaviour impacts underlying vulnerabilities. *Cities in a Changing World: Questions of Culture, Climate and Design*, 24 (1). pp. 18-26. ISSN 2398-9467

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/9553/>

Document Version:

Article (Published Version)

Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, OR JUST UNMET SUPPORT NEEDS? HOW INTERVENING IN NUISANCE BEHAVIOUR IMPACTS UNDERLYING VULNERABILITIES

Author:

KIRSTY-LOUISE CAMERON

Affiliation:

UNIVERSITY OF YORK, UK.

INTRODUCTION

Across many welfare provisions internationally, there has arguably been an increase in levels of welfare conditionality, with access to publicly provided social rights contingent on meeting certain responsibilities or behaviours¹. Whilst in the context of housing, this mechanism of social control is longstanding (with tenancy agreements stipulating behaviours such as paying rent), welfare conditionality related to social housing has intensified in England and Wales with the tightening of allocation policies determining who is able to apply for and access social housing and tenancy law which outlines behavioural criteria². Social housing tenancy agreements now generally include clauses to ban antisocial or nuisance behaviour within the locality of the home and hold the tenant responsible for household members and visitors³.

Antisocial behaviour (or ASB) was introduced into policy by the New Labour Government who argued some residents (particularly those living in disadvantaged areas) were regularly suffering from harassment and intimidation, about which they could do very little⁴. Therefore, they introduced a new category of civil order to control this ‘nuisance’ behaviour, which could range from untidy gardens to physical assault. The first definition of ASB was provided in the Housing Act 1996, which defined it as “conduct causing or likely to cause a nuisance or annoyance to a person residing in, visiting or otherwise engaging in lawful activity in residential premises”⁵. This fairly ambiguous definition has broadened over time alongside a steady increase in the powers available to respond to such behaviour. Within this time, ASB policy and practice has begun to focus on the needs of victims who could be classed as vulnerable. Following the death of Fiona Pilkington and her daughter in 2007 after sustained ASB, strong social control of alleged perpetrators of ASB were argued to be needed to protect vulnerable victims⁶. The need to protect victims from further harm and support them following abuse became ingrained in ASB practice and discourse⁷. The provision of care for all tenants is held as a core value for social housing providers⁸. Dobson⁹ argues that the rhetoric of care for tenants perceived as having multiple vulnerabilities appears to have intensified although where a vulnerable tenant’s behaviour is perceived as problematic, such as behaviour resulting in a complaint of ASB, this care and support is likely to be provided alongside sanction.

However, little attention has been given to the vulnerabilities of alleged perpetrators of ASB and how ASB interventions impact them. There is a growing body of work that suggests welfare conditionality particularly impacts those who could be seen as vulnerable and who face increased barriers to meeting the responsibilities placed on them in order to access their social rights, including an increase in

poverty and negative impacts on health and wellbeing¹⁰. Whilst the term ‘vulnerability’ is contested, this paper draws on the work of Brown¹¹ to apply a working definition of vulnerability which combines the lived experiences of individual, structural and situational vulnerability. In this thesis, individuals' lived experiences of vulnerability are understood as shaped by social insecurity or harm through a combination of structural inequalities and social divisions, biological fragility, institutional forces and the individual's understanding, choices and experiences as social actors.

METHODS

The data presented in this paper is drawn from the findings of a PhD research project funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council. Ethical considerations were given utmost importance and ethical approval was granted by the University of York's Social Policy and Social Work Ethics Committee. A bottom-up approach to collecting data was taken and up to two qualitative longitudinal interviews were conducted with 15 social tenants alleged to be engaged in ASB approximately 6 to 9 months apart. Additionally, four single, qualitative, contextual interviews were undertaken with five Key Informants from four stakeholder social housing providers, including three housing associations and one local authority, all situated in the North of England. Rather than attempt to locate a complete ‘truth’, the purpose of this study was to accept the experiences and perspectives of tenant participants under the assumption that understanding how alleged perpetrators of ASB experience ASB interventions provides valuable insight alongside existing research from alternate perspectives¹².

DISCUSSION

Alleged perpetrators of ASB often present a number of vulnerabilities and unmet support needs such as mental ill-health, disability, addictions and poverty¹³. Tenants involved in this study similarly could be classed as vulnerable, with experiences of physical and mental health conditions, domestic abuse, alcohol use, bereavement, care responsibilities, poverty, single parenthood and extreme financial hardship. All 15 tenants reported at least one of these experiences of vulnerability with 12 tenants reporting multiple vulnerabilities. This suggests that the majority of tenants who took part in the study had what some providers and academics call complex needs or multiple, overlapping vulnerabilities which providers state they wish to provide with extra care and support¹⁴. As these tenants were also alleged to be engaging in ASB, this support could be expected to come alongside sanctions¹⁵. However, in reality, the majority of tenants reported only receiving sanctions without receiving any support.

Support for alleged perpetrators

Key Informants were asked how they consider issues of diversity, but also what support they generally offered to alleged perpetrators of ASB. One Key Informants response to the first question is presented below.

Kirsty (Researcher): How do you take account issues such as gender or race or disability when you are making decisions about how you might intervene?

ASB Manager: Nah, that's a load of bollocks [laughs]. That was a joke.

Whilst the question when framed through a lens of diversity may have caused some difficulty for Key Informants, the question of generalised support was met with more coherent responses. Key Informants suggested the majority of their support for perpetrators came through multi-agency working with the police, social services and mental health services. By signposting to other services Key Informants felt they met their obligations of providing support without being involved in direct care provision. That being said, Key Informants' priorities were generally still to change behaviour through welfare conditionality enforcement processes rather than support provision, with little credence apparently given to the idea that support may also change behaviour in the long term.

“I still think our priority is to stop the problems.” (ASB Manager, Large Housing Association).

“We want... tenants to feel supported but we do want people to behave in our properties and to have - have that balance of communities..” (ASB Manager, Local Authority)

The implied view of the ASB managers above suggests that to stop complaints or to ensure tenants comply with expectations, enforcement and sanction is prioritised over support. Only one tenant (Mel) reported receiving some form of support from her housing officer, who delivered foodbank vouchers to her when she was unwell and unable to work. One tenant reported being asked if she would like some support months after the initial complaint and after she had told her landlord she had already referred herself to a substance misuse service. The remaining tenant participants unanimously stated they had not been offered support from their landlord, either in the form of direct provision or signposting to other services. Power and Bergen¹⁶ highlighted that individual housing officers operate with a level of discretion, allowing them to tailor the service they provide to the needs of the individual tenant. However, discretion in support services can be problematic meaning who gets the care, or who is seen as deserving of care and support, may vary¹⁷. In this case, it appears those alleged to be engaging in ASB are not receiving care they feel they need as focus is placed on sanction over support. It appears sanction is prioritised and support is side-lined or, even non-existent, supporting the findings of Brown¹⁸ who argued that when vulnerability is combined with transgressive behaviour there could be a withdrawal of the status of vulnerability, with individuals reassessed as having agency and making a personal choice to behave in a deviant way, leading to a withdrawal of services or an increase in disciplinary measures

Gender and domestic abuse

The majority of tenants (10) involved in the research were women, and four of these reported being victims of domestic abuse either at the time of, or just before, the research period. The women involved in the study reported different experiences from the male participants which they felt was a result of being a woman, a single mother, or a victim of abuse. A number of female tenants felt intimidated by their housing officers. Jenny reported feeling like she was being “interrogated” (Jenny, Wave A) when she had an ASB interview in her home, a feeling that she felt was heightened because she was on her own. Rachel also felt intimidated by her landlord who she felt judged her parenting and demonstrated their power over her by sending a warning letter threatening legal action without speaking to her about any ASB allegation.

“I just feel like they try to intimidate me a bit like obviously going on about how I mother my son, my house and then it’s just like, they straight taking legal action... without even pre-warning me or giving me heads up or asking me about it first” (Rachel, Wave A)

Notably, none of the men involved in the study reported feeling intimidated by their landlord. ASB interventions felt especially disempowering for women who felt they were routinely intimidated and judged by their landlord.

Four of the female tenants involved in this study had recently been victims of domestic abuse. Jenny moved into her property from a domestic violence refuge, but a week later, her violent ex-partner moved around the corner. She saw him regularly in the street which was very intimidating and scary for her. Jenny received her first warning letter because her window was smashed by her violent ex.

“I didn’t smash the window, somebody else smashed the window not me and I was a victim of that. I wasn’t like outside with them... they were trying to hurt me or whatever they were trying to do. So, how’s that fair?” (Jenny, Wave A)

Not only does this example highlight a failure of services where a survivor of domestic abuse is left to live around the corner from her abuser, it also shows a lack of understanding and empathy for an incident Jenny found very distressing.

“It’s not my fault I’ve been through domestic violence. I didn’t say like come here and do this to me, do you know what I mean?” (Jenny, Wave A).

At the time of the second interview, Jenny had not had any further complaints of ASB made against her, however she was still having trouble with her ex-partner and continued to live around the corner from him and experienced harassment and abuse in the street from him on a regular basis. Jenny felt the lack of support she was given to protect herself and her children from her ex-partner was because services blamed her for her own abuse, supporting the findings of previous research which has argued is placed on victims of domestic violence for not preventing their own abuse¹⁹.

Other tenants who had experienced domestic abuse similarly felt they were not offered any support, either directly or in the form of support referrals.

“They knew I was going through that situation, so, why didn’t they put support in place to get myself and my child out of this property?” (Caroline, Wave B).

All tenant participant who experienced abuse in this study reported the lack of support provided to victims during and after abusive relationships, however, it was unclear if this was due to a lack of training or whether social landlords did perceive women as responsible for the abuse they were receiving, supporting the now dated findings previous research into ASB which found women were at increased risk of losing their home through ASB legislation due to the behaviour of violent partners²⁰.

Disability: physical and mental health impairments

Nine of the tenant participants involved in this study declared some form of physical or mental health impairment that affected their ability to live their day to day lives, including the ability manage their own or their visitor’s behaviour or to engage with their housing officer and landlord. Especially prevalent were mental health issues, including depression and anxiety, which tenants reported were exacerbated by ASB interventions. 12 tenants reported negative health impacts as a direct result of ASB interventions, the majority being related to their mental health.

“I feel proper low about the matter. I’ve got mental health issues as it is, and having allegations made when you know a hundred percent that it’s not true it’s not easy to swallow.” (Jason, Wave A).

Whilst for Jason, the allegation on its own impacted his mental health, for others, the ASB interventions that followed the allegation led to deterioration of their mental health.

“They’ve made me, a lot of times they’ve made me really miserable. I mean, obviously I suffer with mental health at the minute with everything that’s been going on... they can make you really upset to the point when you don’t want to leave your house” (Mel, Wave B)

It’s interesting that for Mel, it is “obvious” that she is struggling with her mental health as a result of ASB interventions, and yet, the impact of interventions on alleged perpetrator’s mental health was not mentioned by any Key Informant, suggesting it was not central to their decision-making when they decided how to manage an ASB case.

“If I didn’t have my little uns, I could’ve topped myself, because that’s how low they got me.” (Rosie, Wave A).

“I just wanted to kill myself, I just wanted to end it all” (Rachel, Wave A).

One tenant, Rangers, reported attempting suicide after receiving a Notice of Seeking Possession from her landlord (the first step towards eviction proceedings). Rangers provided a particularly illustrative example of the impact of welfare conditionality in the form of ASB intervention. Rangers was a single woman who suffered from multiple physical and mental health disabilities and health impairments. At the time of the first interview, Rangers had received Notice of Seeking Possession from her landlord and multiple visitors attended her property throughout the course of her tenancy who caused nuisance to her neighbours. Additionally, she was a victim of violence from her two sons who regularly visited

and brought their friends with them. There was evidence of other people being violent in her home, as outlined in her quote below.

“Somebody came into my house and tried to stab my son, a meat cleaver, and I threw myself over my son” (Rangers, Wave A)

After the Notice was served, Rangers received support from a mental health support worker and housing support worker who recognised she was being preyed on by visitors who were using her flat as a base to deal drugs and financially abuse Rangers and her neighbours. These support workers helped Rangers to stop her sons and these visitors coming to her home with the help of the police, however, the landlord had stated their intention to progress with the eviction proceedings, despite receiving no further complaints for a number of months. Rangers said she initially did not understand the severity of the complaints that were being made about her as, due to her health issues, she was unable to understand the housing officer when they came to the property to discuss them and left the room before the meeting was finished. When the Notice of Seeking Possession arrived, there were 30 reports of nuisance from the visitors who were preying on Rangers. Throughout the notice, each incident was preceded by the phrase, “you, and or your visitors,” suggesting Rangers was involved in each case. Whilst there was acknowledgement of “vulnerable neighbours”, throughout the notice, there was no acknowledgment of Ranger’s own vulnerability, victimhood or health issues that may have hindered her understanding of the procedure. Rangers felt that her landlord’s management of the allegations of ASB had a severely negative impact on both her physical and mental health, making her feel she did not recognise herself anymore. She no longer felt able to leave the flat.

“I’ll show you a photo of me before you go and it’s only two years ago and look how much I’ve gone under since then. I just want to be happy again...” (Rangers, Wave A).

When asked what impact the involvement of her landlord had on her, Rangers described continuous fear of leaving her home, and how she now often didn’t leave the bedroom. Rangers’ experience highlights how social control, in the form of welfare conditionality, can especially impact vulnerable and disabled people who may be less able to meet the conditions placed on them (Reeves and Lookstra, 2017), but also highlights how, as Rangers’ behaviour was perceived as deviant, her vulnerability was overlooked in favour of viewing her as both responsible for and able to control the behaviour of herself and her visitors.

CONCLUSION

Whilst the rhetoric of care and support for tenants who are perceived as vulnerable, or who have complex needs is apparently intensifying (albeit alongside sanction for those whose behaviour is perceived as problematic)²¹, in practice, at least for alleged perpetrators of ASB, little effective care and support appears to be provided. This was evident when speaking to women who had been victims of domestic abuse for whom this abuse appears to routinely have been ignored, result in sanction and be allowed to continue. Disability and individual vulnerability appear to be overlooked, as well as negatively impacted, by ASB procedures and interventions, with tenants reporting significantly negative impacts on their mental health, resulting, for some, in suicidal thoughts and/or attempts. It appears that routinely, despite the apparent intention of social landlords to support tenants, for those subject to ASB, sanction overrules supportive mechanisms, with tenants overwhelmingly reporting no support being provided by their landlord and resulting in, for some, vulnerability exacerbated.

NOTES

¹ Peter Dwyer, “Creeping conditionality in the UK: from welfare rights to conditional entitlements,” *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 29 (2004) ; Beth Watts and Suzanne Fitzpatrick, *Welfare Conditionality* (London: Routledge, 2018).

² Seán, Damer, “‘Engineers of the human machine’: the social practice of council housing management in Glasgow, 1895 – 1939,” *Urban Studies* 37 (2000) ; Diane Lister, “Tenancy agreements: a mechanism for governing anti-social behaviour?” in *Housing, urban governance and antisocial behaviour*, ed. John Flint (Bristol: Policy Press, 2006) ; Beth Watts and Suzanne Fitzpatrick, *Welfare Conditionality* (London: Routledge, 2018).

³ Elizabeth Burney, *Making people behave: anti-social behaviour politics and policy* (Devon: Willan Publishing, 2005) ; Jacqueline Campbell et al., *Assessing and sustaining social tenancies: exploring barriers to homelessness prevention* (Wales: Shelter Cymru).

⁴ Elizabeth Burney, *Making people behave*.

⁵ Housing Act 1996 (London: The Stationary Office, ch. 52).

⁶ Kate Brown, *Vulnerability & young people: care and social control in policy and practice* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2015) ; Kevin J. Brown, “The developing habitus of the anti-social behaviour practitioner: from expansion in years of plenty to surviving the age of austerity,” *Journal of Law and Society* 9 (2013).

⁷ Brown, 9.

⁸ Emma R. Power and Tegan, L. Bergan, “Care and resistance to neoliberal reform in social housing,” *Housing, Theory and Society* 35, no. 1 (2018): 426-447, doi: [10.1080/14036096.2018.1515112](https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2018.1515112)

⁹ Racheal Dobson, “Complex needs in homelessness practice: a review of ‘new markets of vulnerability,’” *Housing Studies* (2019), doi: 10.1080/02673037.2018.1556784.

¹⁰ Mhairi Campbell et al. “Lone parents, health, wellbeing and welfare to work: a systematic review of qualitative studies,” *BMC Public Health* 16, no. 1 (2016), doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-2880-9 ; Peter Dwyer et al. “Work, welfare and wellbeing: the impacts of welfare conditionality on people with mental health impairments in the UK,” *Social Policy and Administration* 54 (2020) ; Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi et al. “Effects of restrictions to Income Support on health of lone mothers in the UK: A natural experiment study,” *The Lancet Public Health* 3 (2018) ; Kate Pybus et al. “Discrediting experiences: outcomes of eligibility assessments for claimants with psychiatric compared with non-psychiatric conditions transferring to personal independence payments in England,” *BJPsych Open* 5 no 19 (2019): 1-5, doi: 10.1192/bjo.2019.3 ; Aaron Reeves and Rachel Loopstra, “‘Set up for fail?’: How welfare conditionality undermines citizenship for vulnerable groups,” *Social Policy and Society* 16 (2017) ; Guy Shefer et al., “Only making things worse: a qualitative study of the impact of wrongly removing disability benefits from people with mental illness,” *Community Mental Health Journal*, 52 (2016).

¹¹ Kate Brown, “Vulnerability and child sexual exploitation: towards an approach grounded in life experiences,” *Critical Social Policy*, 39 (2019).

¹² Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke, *Successful qualitative research* (London: Sage, 2013).

¹³ Brown, *The developing habitus*. 9 ; Caroline Hunter, Judy Nixon and Sigrid Shayer, *Neighbour nuisance, social landlords and the law* (Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing, 2000) ; Anwen Jones et al. *Addressing antisocial behaviour: an independent review of Shelter Inclusion Project* (London: Shelter Publications, 2006).

¹⁴ Brown, *Vulnerability and young people* ; Dobson, “Complex needs” ; Power and Bergan, “Care and resistance,” 35.

¹⁵ Dobson, “Complex needs.”

¹⁶ Power and Bergan, “Care and resistance,” 35.

¹⁷ Sarah Louise Alden, “Welfare reform and street level bureaucrats in homeless services,” *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 35 (2015); Michael Lipsky, *Street-level bureaucracy, 30th anniversary edition: dilemmas of the individual in public service* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2010).

¹⁸ Brown, *Vulnerability and young people*.

¹⁹ Hilary Botein and Andrea Hetling, *Home Safe Home: Housing Solutions for Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence* (London: Rutgers University Press, 2016) ; Peter Dwyer et al., “Rights, responsibilities and refusals: homelessness policy and the exclusion of single homeless people with complex needs,” *Critical Social Policy*, 35 (2015) ; Silke Meyer, “Still blaming the victim of intimate partner violence? Women’s narratives of victim desistance and redemption when seeking support,” *Theoretical Criminology*, 20 (2016).

²⁰ Caroline Hunter and Judy Nixon, “Taking the blame and losing the home: women and anti-social behaviour,” *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 23 (2001) ; Judy Nixon and Caroline Hunter, “Disciplining women: anti-social behaviour and the governance of conduct,” in *Securing respect*, ed. Andrew Millie (Bristol: Policy Press, 2009) ; Suzie Scott, “Tackling anti-social behaviour: an evaluation of the Dundee Families Project” in *Housing, urban governance and antisocial behaviour*, ed. John Flint (Bristol: Policy Press, 2006).

²¹ Dobson, “Complex needs,” ; Power and Bergan, “Care and resistance,” 35.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alden, Sarah Louise, "Welfare reform and street level bureaucrats in homeless services," *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 35 (2015): 359-374.
- Braun, Virginia and Clarke, Victoria, *Successful qualitative research*. London: Sage, 2013.
- Botein, Hilary and Hetling, Andrea, *Home Safe Home: Housing Solutions for Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence*. London: Rutgers University Press, 2016.
- Brown, Kate, *Vulnerability & young people: care and social control in policy and practice*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2015.
- Brown, Kate, "Vulnerability and child sexual exploitation: towards an approach grounded in life experiences," *Critical Social Policy*, 39 (2019): 622-642.
- Brown, Kevin, J. "The developing habitus of the anti-social behaviour practitioner: from expansion in years of plenty to surviving the age of austerity," *Journal of Law and Society*, 9 (2013): 375-402.
- Burney, Elizabeth, *Making people behave: anti-social behaviour politics and policy*. Devon: Willan Publishing, 2005.
- Campbell, Jacqueline, Golten, Adam, Jackson, Rebecca and Evans, Richard, *Accessing and sustaining social tenancies: exploring barriers to homelessness prevention*. Wales: Shelter Cymru, 2016.
- Campbell, Mhairi, Thomson, Hilary, Fenton, Candida and Gibson, Marcia "Lone parents, health, wellbeing and welfare to work: a systematic review of qualitative studies," *BMC Public Health*, 16, no. 1 (2016). doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-2880-9.
- Damer, Seán, "'Engineers of the human machine': the social practice of council housing management in Dobson, Racheal, "Complex needs in homelessness practice: a review of 'new markets of vulnerability,'" *Housing Studies* (2019). doi: 10.1080/02673037.2018.1556784
- Glasgow, 1895 – 1939," *Urban Studies*, 37 (2000): 2007-2026.
- Dwyer, Peter, "Creeping conditionality in the UK: from welfare rights to conditional entitlements," *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 29 (2004): 265 – 287.
- Dwyer, Peter, Bowpitt, Graham, Sundin, Eva and Weinstein, Mark, "Rights, responsibilities and refusals: homelessness policy and the exclusion of single homeless people with complex needs," *Critical Social Policy*, 35 (2015): 3-23.
- Dwyer, Peter, Scullion, Lisa, Jones, Katy, McNeill, Jenny and Stewart, Alasdair B. R., "Work, welfare and wellbeing: the impacts of welfare conditionality on people with mental health impairments in the UK," *Social Policy and Administration*, 54 (2020): 311-326.
- Housing Act 1996, London: The Stationary Office, ch. 52.
- Hunter, Caroline and Nixon, Judy, "Taking the blame and losing the home: women and anti-social behaviour." *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 23 (2001): 395-410.
- Hunter, Caroline, Nixon, Judy and Sigrid, Shayer, *Neighbour nuisance, social landlords and the law*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing, 2000.
- Jones, Anwen, Pleace, Nicholas, Quilgards, D and Sanderson, D. *Addressing antisocial behaviour: an independent review of Shelter Inclusion Project*. London: Shelter Publications, 2006
- Katikireddi, Srinivasa Vittal, Molaodie, Oarabile, R. Gibson, Marcia, Dundas, Ruth and Craig, Peter, "Effects of restrictions to Income Support on health of lone mothers in the UK: A natural experiment study," *The Lancet Public Health*, 3 (2018): 333-340.
- Lipsky, Michael, *Street-level bureaucracy, 30th anniversary edition: dilemmas of the individual in public service*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2010.
- Lister, Diane, "Tenancy agreements: a mechanism for governing anti-social behaviour?" In *Housing, urban governance and antisocial behaviour*, edited by John Flint, 119-136. Bristol: Policy Press, 2006.
- McNeill, Jennifer, "Regulating social housing: expectations for behaviour of tenants." In *Social policies and social control: new perspectives on the 'not-so-big society,'* edited by Malcolm Harrison and Teela Sanders, 181-195. Bristol: Policy Press, 2014.
- Meyer, Silke, "Still blaming the victim of intimate partner violence? Women's narratives of victim desistance and redemption when seeking support," *Theoretical Criminology*, 20 (2016): 75-90.
- Nixon, Judy and Hunter, Caroline, "Disciplining women: anti-social behaviour and the governance of conduct." In *Securing Respect*, edited by Andrew Millie, 119-138. Bristol: Policy Press, 2009.
- Power, Emma, R. and Bergan, Tegan, L. "Care and resistance to neoliberal reform in social housing," *Housing, Theory and Society*, 35, no. 1 (2018): 426-224. doi: [10.1080/14036096.2018.1515112](https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2018.1515112)
- Pybus, Kate, Pickett, Kate E., Prady, Stephanie L., Lloyd, C. and Wilkinson, R., "Effects of restrictions to Income Support on health of lone mothers in the UK: A natural experiment study," *BJPsych Open*, 5, no. 19 (2019): 1-5. doi: 10.1192/bjo.2019.3 .

Reeves, Aaron and Lookstra, Rachel, ““Set up for fail?”: How welfare conditionality undermines citizenship for vulnerable groups,” *Social Policy and Society*, 16 (2017): 327 – 338.

Scott, Suzie, “Tackling anti-social behaviour: an evaluation of the Dundee Families Project.” In *Housing, urban governance and antisocial behaviour*, edited by John Flint, 199-218. Bristol: Policy Press, 2006

Shefer, Guy, Henderson, Clair, Frost-Gaskin, Mary and Pacietti, Richard, “Only making things worse: a qualitative study of the impact of wrongly removing disability benefits from people with mental illness,” *Community Mental Health Journal*, 52 (2016): 834-841.

Watts, Beth and Fitzpatrick, S. *Welfare conditionality*. London: Routledge, 2018.