

## Logan Together Foundation Roadmap –Project scoping

**Project title:** Scale up and better integrate support for households to achieve financial stability and have effective pathways from crisis support to long term sustainability

**Strategic or Chapter-based project:** Child and Family chapter

### Short description:

A number of families in Logan live day to day and within a crisis environment. Their ability to budget and manage household income effectively maybe hampered by ongoing factors in their life including drugs and alcohol, mental health or wellbeing issues coupled with the day to day pressures of looking after children and themselves.

This strategy seeks to identify targeted and universal opportunities to support families manage their finances and build knowledge and ultimately pathways out of crisis. It also seeks to explore options to build employment and local business opportunities and pathways to connect families on low or no incomes with these (including incentives).

### What results does it help Logan Together to achieve?

#### Foundation Roadmap scoreboard outcome (life stage)

Across all life stage outcomes

#### Target

Reduce rental stress in Logan from 29.8% to 25.6%.

#### Indicators (how do we know the outcome is being achieved)

Households report a reduction in rental and housing stress

#### Why will it help achieve those results?

“Family income is a central factor in shaping individual and family life opportunities. It can be the consequence of factors like limited education, limited skills and poor health, and these serve to amplify individual and communal problems like mental illness, crime and child maltreatment. A recent study of a birth cohort in Quebec (Sequin et al., 2012) employed family income together with other indicators of poverty occurring in the first ten years of subjects’ lives. The researchers concluded that “having a low income is the basis of choice limitations that lead to poverty and social exclusion, thus limiting access to healthy foods, quality clothes, good housing, healthy neighbourhoods, and quality schools.” However, regardless of the choice of indicators, similar family characteristics were associated with the varyingly defined ‘poor’ households. The characteristics included non-European immigrant parents, single parenting, and low levels of maternal education.

In general, the research evidence is that family income is interwoven with the influence of other forms of disadvantage represented by the range of indicators included in the present study. A recent New Zealand study (Sengupta et al., 2012) illustrated the relationship of household income with varied aspects of subjective wellbeing. Consistent with earlier research including that undertaken in Australia (Jesuit Social Services, 2012), household income has been found to be positively associated with subjective quality of life and happiness, especially the former in circumstances where people earned less than the New Zealand median. The research emphasised the importance of people's perceived ability to meet everyday life necessities.

A contentious issue is whether it is the absolute material standard of living within an area that is the important ingredient for health and wellbeing or is it inequality per se that is bad for the health of an area or nation? There is considerable evidence supporting the latter of these two views with perhaps the best known proponent of the relative inequality position, R. G. Wilkinson (1998, 2000), arguing that the evidence strongly suggests that the health effects of income distribution "involve comparative social cognitive processes, rather than the direct effects of material standards" (Wilkinson, 1998). One of Wilkinson's collaborators (Marmot, 2003) argues that the meaning of a particular socio-economic position will depend on the society and the social environment in which an individual is located.

Still, while there is a clear relationship between poverty and developmental vulnerability among children, disentangling the effects of parenting from those of poverty is difficult, as ARACY points out, for there is a complex relationship between poverty and parenting. But ARACY (2015, pp. 25-26) argues that the following conclusions are well supported by the research evidence:

- The detrimental impact of poverty on cognitive development early in a child's life has a lasting legacy effect. Data from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) from the UK shows that poverty at birth and at age three can still have an adverse impact on cognitive ability at age seven.
- The impact of persistent poverty is worse for children's cognitive development than intermittent poverty.
- Low income has a twofold effect on children's cognitive ability. It has a direct effect on children regardless of anything their parents do, but it also has an indirect impact on parenting itself. For instance, poverty leads to a lack of resources available to poorer parents, preventing parental investment, which in turn has a negative impact upon cognitive development.
- Even after controlling for parenting investment, poverty still has a direct effect on child cognitive development, especially if the household is in poverty at birth and/or age three.
- The MCS shows that poor children experiencing good parenting do better than wealthier children experiencing poor parenting. For children experiencing no poverty and positive parenting, 73% are on-track in their development, and for those

experiencing no poverty and poor parenting only 42% are on-track. Yet of children experiencing persistent poverty and positive parenting 58% are on track. However, only 19% of children experiencing persistent poverty and poor parenting are on-track.

- Both poverty and parenting quality are important in affecting child development outcomes, however poor parenting has nearly twice the impact of persistent poverty, and positive parenting and a strong home learning environment can mediate its impacts.
- The authors of the Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) study conclude that “for all children, the quality of the home learning environment is more important for intellectual and social development than parental occupation, education or income.”

### Project details:

To be determined

### Data and scale:

There are consistently strong and statistically significant relationships between our perinatal risk factors and all of our family economy measures. The correlations for the three education measures (percentage leaving school with 10 or less years of schooling, no post-secondary qualifications, and unskilled workers) were especially strong, sometimes exceeding .8.

Employment and income measures were also very strong for most indicators, as they were for SEIFA. Overall, the strongest relationships were between the two smoking measures and the family economy measures.

Rental stress and housing stress is high amongst Logan families. In some locations, over 34% of people cited rental stress as a major issue.

	Mortgage Stress		Rental Stress		Housing Stress	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Australia</b>	288,241	10.6	590,163	25.1	878,404	10.7
<b>Queensland</b>	53,478	10.0	134,827	25.6	188,305	11.4
<b>Greater Brisbane</b>	23,415	8.7	60,566	24.7	83,981	11.0
<b>Logan</b>	<b>4,598</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>8,603</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>13,204</b>	<b>13.9</b>
Bahrs Scrub – Wolffdene – Belivah	25	9.0	45	24.6	70	10.1
Beenleigh	119	12.7	494	34.5	613	19.0
Bethania – Waterford	110	11.3	284	28.5	394	12.1
Boronia Heights	156	14.4	291	31.9	447	17.6
Browns Plains – Berrinba	144	15.0	236	25.5	380	16.1
Cedar Vale – Cedar Grove – Woodhill	134	12.4	52	26.5	186	10.9
Chambers Flat – Stockleigh	60	13.2	66	30.5	127	12.1

Cornubia – Carbrook	118	8.6	102	26.3	220	8.2
Crestmead	250	16.9	399	29.5	649	18.7
Daisy Hill	84	8.3	150	26.4	233	10.1
Eagleby	187	17.3	713	34.9	900	19.9
Edens Landing – Holmview	87	9.4	260	32.9	348	16.0
Forestdale	31	8.2	4	7.7	35	4.6
Greenbank – New Beith	228	11.5	91	26.7	319	9.9
Heritage Park	77	9.5	83	24.2	160	10.6
Hillcrest	85	11.2	172	27.0	257	14.3
Jimboomba (East)	143	12.3	86	27.4	229	11.1
Jimboomba (West) and District	133	13.9	86	34.1	219	15.2
Kingston	194	14.1	591	29.2	785	16.6
Logan Central	89	19.7	382	35.9	471	21.7
Logan Reserve – Buccan	51	9.8	60	25.8	111	9.6
Logan Village	78	12.1	37	26.4	115	9.8
Loganholme	110	10.3	140	27.6	250	12.1
Loganlea	70	10.9	245	24.0	315	15.0
Marsden	216	16.5	498	34.3	715	20.4
Meadowbrook	33	8.4	115	28.4	148	14.6
Mount Warren Park	84	9.6	180	34.0	264	12.3
Munruben	41	7.7	25	29.5	65	7.5
North Maclean – South Maclean	77	17.3	40	24.0	117	12.5
Park Ridge – Park Ridge South	55	13.0	69	28.7	124	7.9
Regents Park	170	10.1	245	26.2	415	12.3
Rochedale South – Priestdale	193	8.0	307	24.2	500	9.0
Shailer Park	141	7.1	180	24.1	321	8.4
Slacks Creek	99	12.2	248	29.3	348	15.0
Springwood	104	7.9	222	24.5	326	9.9
Tamborine – Mundoolun – Cedar Creek – Yarrabilba	74	12.7	29	27.9	103	11.2
Tanah Merah	81	10.1	103	24.9	184	11.3
Underwood	108	12.6	116	24.2	224	12.3
Waterford West	110	14.4	265	32.8	375	16.6
Windaroo – Bannockburn	41	7.6	53	35.3	94	9.0
Woodridge	162	16.0	862	35.0	1,024	22.0

Logan experiences a number of suburbs with very low socio-economic disadvantage. A **low** score indicates relatively greater disadvantage and a lack of advantage in general. For example, an area could have a low score if there are (among other things) - many households with low incomes, or many people in unskilled occupations AND few households with high incomes, or few people in skilled occupations.

SA2_NAME_2011	Index of Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage		Index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage	
	Score	Decile (QLD)	Score	Decile (QLD)
Queensland	886	-	892	-
Brisbane	1048	10	1057	10
<b>Logan</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>7</b>
Logan SA2s	Score	Percentile (QLD)	Score	Percentile (QLD)
Logan Central	<b>770</b>	2	<b>786</b>	2
Woodridge	<b>797</b>	3	<b>805</b>	2
Kingston	<b>829</b>	3	<b>833</b>	3
Eagleby	<b>870</b>	6	<b>864</b>	5
Beenleigh	<b>883</b>	7	<b>875</b>	6
Slacks Creek	<b>900</b>	9	<b>892</b>	8

Partners:

Co-design:

Quick wins: