

October 12<sup>th</sup> Presentation – Anthropology Department

## **Visualizing Community: An Ethnographic Approach to Social Network Analysis in Glen Innes**

**Christina Bava & Kathryn Scott**

Social networks form a vital part of community life and provide forums for the exchange of information, experience and support. Social engagement, in turn, can lead to increased community capacity to respond to change, and initiate collective action to address social equity issues. Based on previous research in the area, Glen Innes was identified as a suburb with strong community networks. Despite this, community and church leaders often struggle to engage residents in a meaningful way, for example through participation in community events or collective action. Little evidence exists of how the existing networks function, interact and engage people in community life. The aim of our research was therefore to explore these networks and produce a visual model of the types of networks that exist, and the types of information and support that is exchanged within and between these groups. The types of social infrastructure that social networks make use of were also examined.

The project aimed to explore methods of mapping social networks in a way that has meaning and relevance for residents of Glen Innes, and in a way that can contribute to our understanding of social relationships as an aspect of community capacity in an urban renewal context. An ethnographic approach was used to examine how people link with each other in Glen Innes and the types of information, knowledge and support people exchange through these networks as part of their daily lives.

In this paper, we examine the literature on social network mapping, with a focus on network mapping as an aspect of ethnography. Social networking in Glen Innes, Auckland is then examined and reflections drawn. Finally, we consider the lessons that can be taken from this mapping exercise in the Glen Innes context.

This project is part of a broader research programme, Learning Sustainability, a six year FRST funded programme, aimed at examining different forms of settlements in relation to environmental, economic, and social performance. The research is led by Opus International Consultants, with Landcare Research and the University of Auckland as project partners. Part of this programme involved exploring social sustainability (or 'liveability') issues in certain case study areas, one of which is Glen Innes. This study of social networking in Glen Innes is part of this case study. ....

(GI – liveability plan and visioning proj – identified sense of belonging and connectedness as key priority – networking considered central to this, we are trying to contribute to understanding what is working well and where the gaps are – I'll do this section next wk]

Earlier research for this programme examined public and professional discourses of liveability as expressed during the consultation process in the development of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan (Scott & Shaw, 2005). While Auckland City Council focused on "revitalisation" of Glen Innes and accommodating growth through higher density (essentially issues of urban form), submissions from residents focused on concerns about safety, health and education, affordable housing, adequate recreational facilities, a strong local economy offering employment, and a strong sense of community (essentially socio-economic issues). Council and residents identified that Glen Innes has many local networks, the existence of which are commonly viewed as a means to develop community capacity for collaborative action.

### **Lit review**

Social mapping techniques have also been usefully employed in urban planning research. For example, Burdett et al (2004) use mapping techniques to link population statistics with spatial distribution of streets, open spaces, commercial and social facilities and amenities as a way to examine the social implications of housing density and urban neighbourhoods in London. Health research aimed at understanding the social environment in specific locations in order to target interventions have used social mapping to collate information about social values and practices (e.g. Hoffman et al 2004). The following literature review is drawn mainly from anthropology and sociology literature ???.....

### **[drop in condensed lit review]**

Current urban planning strategies are guided by the concept that social inclusion/engagement are a vital aspect of settlement 'liveability' (what makes a place good to live in). This can be situated within a renewed enthusiasm in the literature and in policy for identifying social indicators as a part of broader sustainable development initiatives (Wong, 2002, Innes & Booher, 2000, Sawicki, 2002). The intention has been to consider social and economic aspects of sustainability together with environmental aspects in the development of strategic and policy plans.

The concept of liveability is linked to the emergence of new urbanism in planning (in turn linked to concepts of sustainable development). New urbanism is based on the principles of compact urban form (known as urban intensification in New Zealand) and enhancing 'community', with an underlying assumption that alterations to urban form will lead to improved social outcomes (Dixon and Dubuis, 2003, Godschalk, 2004, Southworth & Parthasarathy, 1997). Compact, mixed use, pedestrian-friendly developments are intended to provide public spaces for people to interact, reduced reliance on cars and facilitate improved efficiency and uptake of alternative transport systems.

In a review of urban intensification trends, Williams (1999:168) sums up that "higher density settlements are argued to be more socially sustainable because local facilities and services can be maintained, due to high population densities, and therefore accessibility to goods and services is more equitably distributed"... "high density urban living is seen as a prerequisite for vitality, vibrancy, cultural activities and social interaction" (in Arbury, 2004).

Concepts of social participation, social engagement and social inclusion then, are the current short-hand for “community” aspects of social sustainability in social planning. These terms refer to the values and practices of purposeful social interaction which allow for societal cooperation, conflict and pluralism to be intrinsic parts of a civil society (Kearns and Forrest, 2000). The goal of high levels of social inclusion in urban planning is underpinned by an assumption that in places where many community networks exist and participation in civic activities is strong, then the community is well placed to fulfill people’s need for social interaction and to work co-operatively to address socioeconomic issues at a local level.

Increased decentralisation of decision making and devolution of authority to the local level is based on the rationale that local people are best placed to identify what the problems are and how to solve them (Austin, 2004). Citizen participation in local government planning processes are increasingly being mandated for. In some contexts, mandating for public participation in local planning processes has been found to result in stronger local plans (Burby, May, Berke, Dalton, French and Kaiser, 1997) and greater local government attention to citizen involvement (Brody, Godschlak and Burby, 2003). Participatory processes that seek to encourage a “sense of ownership” of plans have been suggested as a means of building community capacity and “strengthening a community’s ability to solve problems through collective action” (Talen, 2000:180). Community visioning is a tool increasingly being employed to engage community in local government processes (e.g. Cuthill, 2004).

Similarly, programmes targeting health and well-being issues are increasingly adopting community development approaches aimed at empowering communities towards self-reliance through grassroots or ‘bottom-up’ approaches, collective analysis and knowledge sharing (Munford and Walsh-Tapiata, 1999, Kretman and McKnight, 1993).

Critics have aligned this devolution of responsibility to a local level with a New Right agenda of privatisation by removing costs from the public purse through voluntary activity and sponsorship (Chapman & Larkham, 1999, Brigden, 2004), often placing a burden on communities which lack the capacity to fully engage in such processes.

Community capacity at a local level is a key feature of social engagement. Social relationships have ‘capacity’, that is, they have spaciousness and potency to accomplish things (Corsín Jimenéz, 2003). An understanding of social networks therefore needs to move beyond identifying networks towards examining who is engaged in which types of networks, how the networks function and how networks link to each other. An understanding of what social networks require to build capacity is also vital. This project seeks to examine the types of social infrastructure, knowledge, skills and other resources that social networks in Glen Innes make use of and the extent to which these resources are shared between networks.

## **Research approach**

In this project, social networks are being mapped, based on ethnographic research in Glen Innes. The 'bottom up' approach of ethnography, whereby the participants are the experts (Ellen, 1984, Bernard, 1988) is particularly suited to the exploration of 'liveability' issues of relevance to participants, in this case, social relationships. This analysis at a micro level will enable exploration of broader issues of social engagement and community capacity.

Social mapping is an established adjunct to ethnographic methods and is explored more fully in this paper. [link to ethnog – Veronica's stuff on places being dynamic, continually shaped by people's values, beliefs, practices, policy, social structures, etc. our task in envmtal anthro to reveal these aspects that ultimately influence way places are shaped and formed – dump in stuff from book chapter - KS]

[  
No of ple interviewed, time frame, qu asked]

### **Glen Innes Context**

Glen Innes is a suburb in East Auckland which has alarmingly disparate socioeconomic indicators relative to the rest of Auckland, particularly in comparison to adjacent suburbs (Glendowie, St Heliers, Remuera and St Johns). Census data from 2001 indicates that Glen Innes and Point England rate in the highest decile of deprivation in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). Glen Innes is characterised by a predominance of state housing, accounting for around 60 percent of housing in Glen Innes (and up to 90% in some streets). It is an ethnically diverse suburb, with a considerably higher Māori and Pacific population than in the Auckland City as a whole. Affiliation to family, church and community are strong. However, despite the existence of many church and community groups, community-based workers and community leaders often struggle to engage residents in collective action. This has significance when considering the capacity of the community to engage meaningfully in planning processes and to be “part of the solution” to local issues.

Glen Innes has been the recipient of numerous research and urban renewal projects since its establishment in the 1950s, with little evidence of real change. Council has recently developed the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan in consultation with local stakeholders. The Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan process aimed at providing a framework to guide the growth and revitalisation of Glen Innes (Auckland City, 2004b:5).

In parallel to this consultation process, community members undertook a visioning process in 2004 and 2005 led by a local community development project, Ka Mau Te Wero - Rising to the Challenge. A Random Household Survey was also conducted.. Key priorities for Glen Innes were identified, including enhancing community leadership, harnessing Glen Innes pride, strengthening community well-being, and working together. The overall aim of the visioning project is to broker the best possible deal for the community based on these priorities (pers. comm, T. Liew, Sept. 2005).

### **Social Networks in Glen Innes**

We estimate that there are currently more than 160 active groups in Glen Innes. What is not well understood is how these groups connect, communicate, and exchange information. We

aim to highlight where networking is working well in Glen Innes, the positive spin-offs that are resulting and where improvements could be made.

There are varying levels of social networks relevant to residents including:

1. family/household
2. neighbourhood, including informal networks between friends and families
3. cultural and community spaces – marae, churches, town centre, shops, library, reserves and parks, recreation centre
4. locally-provided social services - education, health, housing, social welfare, CAB, refugee and migrant services
5. networking groups – KMTW, CAYAD, Eastside Youth Network, GI Health Project, HIPPY
6. Policy and funding - government – local government – Parks, library, community partnerships. Govt agencies - WINZ, HNZC, central government and charity/NGO/Corporate sponsorship

There are a range of cultural, spiritual and community organizations that are situated in Glen Innes which play a very important linking role in the community, including:

- Ruapotaka Marae – an urban marae which is centrally located and used as a venue by a range of cultural and community groups. Kaitataki-a-rohe role, a long-standing resident of GI, is important in providing informal assistance for residents (e.g. help with dealing with WINZ or HNZC).
- Churches – there are 18 church/faith centres listed in the Glen Innes directory, all of which are situated in the Eastern Suburbs and 8 within Glen Innes. Pacific churches have a strong presence in Glen Innes.
- HIPPY – Home Intervention Programme for Parents and Youngsters – currently working with approximately 80 families on pre-school education, and functions as an important networking node.
- Te Waipuna Puawai Mercy Oasis – based in Panmure, Sisters of Mercy provide courses, housing **advocacy, what else ????????**
- Citizens Advice Bureau – provide information to the public, and provide counseling, budgeting advice **???** **and other support as necessary.**
- GI Library – runs the Akozone Programme which assists school students with their homework and special projects, and provides a comfortable and welcoming space for community meetings and workshops (talking, eating and socializing are encouraged).
- Maori and Pacific health providers in Glen Innes, who provide health promotion and health services - Ngati Whatua o Orakei Health, Langa Fonua, Health Star Pacific, Hapai Te Hauora and Langimalie
- Other health providers – Plunket, .....

[not sure where this is going, but want to point out first that there are already orgns that link people well, here are a few example]

### **Formal GI Networks**

There are a number of groups in Glen Innes that are specifically aimed at networking. All these networks hold regular meetings, and are aimed at linking government agencies,

service providers, community groups and residents, identifying community issues and developing collaborative actions to address these issues. Some of these networks focus on specific issues (e.g. youth, health) and others which are more broadly focused on the Glen Innes community.

- Ka Mau Te Wero - a community development group aimed at facilitating collaborative activities in GI.
- Glen Innes Networking Meeting – linking local community groups, social service providers, business association, local government and a range of government agencies, providing a space for people to present activities they are engaged and develop collaborations. **No? of ple on database**
- GI Health Project – aimed at linking health workers and build collaborative initiatives related to health
- Eastern Suburbs church networking group – Church leaders meet monthly to discuss community issues and to build relationships.
- Tamaki Achievement Pathways - a coalition of 11 GI schools aimed at improving student achievement and linking education facilities in GI.
- Principals meeting – principals of GI schools meet monthly
- Campus Korero – aimed at developing collaboration between the community and the University of Auckland Tamaki campus, situated in Glen Innes.

The Community visioning project led by KMTW led to several networking groups being established in Glen Innes, including:

- Eastside Youth Network
- Drug and Alcohol Networking group
- Community Wellbeing Network
- Pacific Providers Network
- Stakeholders network

The first four networks listed meet monthly and like other networking groups, are aimed at building relationships between stakeholders and developing a structured plan of collaborative action. The stakeholders meeting meets quarterly and is aimed at engaging broader support for local community initiatives from government agencies, NGO's, and beyond.

Community and social support workers recognize the importance of networking and many of these meetings are very well attended. Most start with a round of introductions and short relaying of what activities and services participants are involved in. Common community issues of concern are identified and important links made between participants. Glen Innes is well known as a community that is difficult to break into for social service providers, especially if one is new and has no previous contacts in the area. Networking meetings therefore provide an extremely valuable important entry point for new workers:

*I found [the GI networking meeting] a really good meeting for initial contact in the community...and I found that every time I went, I made useful contacts, and it was really good in the beginning (Community Worker).*

Participants in these networking meetings valued the links that they made and maintained through these meetings, and saw this as the key function of the groups:

*We have a network meeting every month and we go along to that and liaise with people and ask them what's going on and what's happening and they will tell you what projects they've got coming up so that's a good way of keeping in touch.*  
(Community Worker)

A number of long-term workers and volunteers in Glen Innes reported feeling 'networked out', and although they were supportive of the idea of networking meetings, particularly for the introduction of new workers and services to Glen Innes, they struggled to justify continuing attendance. As this quote from one social service provider implies, attendance could be justified if referrals to your service were forthcoming:

*I used to attend those monthly meetings and they were interesting. It was good to see what other services there were and stuff. Eventually I found it just became quite repetitive like there wasn't anything that I didn't already, there weren't any new organisations or services that I didn't already know of and because [our organization] is so established in the community, most people are setting out to look for us or to find out what it is that we do, what can resources can we provide for them. It's just been one of those things and we're inundated [with work].*

For some, they were not funded in their roles to attend such meetings and literally came with their sandwiches during their own lunchtimes. Pacific providers and church leaders seldom attend networking meetings, and other people working in Glen Innes often expressed considerable frustration at this. A competitive funding environment, heavy case-loads and lack of buy-in from management limited attendance, participation and collaborative action.

Nevertheless, some local collaborative projects have emerged out of networking meetings. For example, the Te Awhi Tangata programme, a collaboration between Green Prescription, Ngati Whatua o Orakei Health and the Glen Innes Health Project. Te Awhi Tangata is a programme which supports healthy lifestyles in Glen Innes, providing weekly physical activity sessions, health and wellness support and learning forums. This emerged out of a GI Health Project networking meeting in which a smoke-cessation worker commented that some of her clients who had successfully stopped smoking were now considering starting again because they had put on so much weight. A Green Prescription worker from Sport Auckland responded that she could provide some physical activity advice and support for these women, and Te Awhi Tangata grew from there. The Glen Innes Health Project coordinator played a key linking role, facilitating ongoing meetings and strategic planning for the initiative. Without this paid appointment, it is doubtful this initiative would have got off the ground.

What worked well in this instance were some clear guiding principles. These included:

- a structured approach to strategic planning, goal setting and project implementation;
- a focus on sustainability by ensuring that there was at least one agency that was prepared to take a lead role in the initiative;

- clear communication and written guidelines and an MOU between partners;
- and an action reflection approach, with critical reflection on the processes, practices and philosophies on which the project was based (Mathur, Strang, and Scott, 2004).

While this project was successful in engaging residents in the programme, many community projects have failed to get off the ground because of lack of resources, inability of agencies to commit time and resources, and most importantly, lack of community engagement. For example, regular calls are made for parenting programmes in Glen Innes but few have successfully engaged residents in programmes. Participants at networking meetings commonly make the point that they are happy to 'support' programmes, they are unable to play a significant part in programmes because they are not funded to do so. A small number of community volunteers and interested residents attended networking meetings, but these people tended to be extremely overcommitted to community work already, and often struggled to get more residents engaged in their areas of interest.

Parenting prog recently est by Sal Army, GI health project, N Whatua etc.....

Another issue that hinders effective networking in Glen Innes is the short term nature of many projects. This means that many people establish good connections then leave the community and take that knowledge with them.

*There's a lot of stuff that happens, but they come in and throw money into the area for 12 months and then they get up and walk away, and they leave these projects, so they don't set it up to sustain they set up for them. When they come in, they're not working for the community and then they come in and do something and that's okay for 12 months, and then after a year they decide that's coming up and we'll move on to another area. It just fall and dies, so all that work in the year pretty much dies because it's not sustainable. The systems aren't set up to sustain and that's what needs to happen.*

People who get the most out of networking meetings tend to be those who are willing to overlook difficult personality issues and keep focused on the task at hand. Verbal confrontation do occur at times, and this can be a major deterrent to some people attending, particularly local government and other government agency people who can come under fire:

*I prefer to attend the [networking meetings] rather than my staff. You don't know what to expect sometimes and I can recall going to one meeting where there were residents...and I actually felt for my colleagues because it felt like they were being attacked. I was quite relieved that they didn't have problems [that I would have to front up to] because that felt wrong... I had the thought that if this was how it was going to be then I wasn't interested in going because my understanding was that it was different organisations getting together to talk about where they could help rather than just to be the face of the organisation that people want to attack [who is this??].*

As this community worker explained, networking occurs between a range of agencies in the course of working in the community and some strong links exist:

*[Working in the community] it's like being an octopus, the tentacles go out. You're involved with graffiti, you're involved with young kids at school, you're involved with young people who wander the streets, you're involved with the Police and Salvation Army, the food bank, Citizens Advice Bureau, [they] sort of all intermingle (Community Worker).*

Networking is also a significant part of many social service workers roles. For example, this ??? provider explained:

*Our programme co-ordinator will work with those women so we identify if they need childcare, if they need transport, what are some of the social issues. Most of them come for social issues first and to get all that managed and then they move on to something like education opportunities and so [our programme co-ordinator] will liaise with WINZ to make sure they're on the right benefit, if they're not we have a budgeting service which will make sure they will get the maximum entitlement and we'll help to complete all the paperwork because again WINZ is a situation where women don't want to go in and ask and they're ashamed to go in there or they've had really bad experiences with WINZ so having to go back and ask can you please help me to do this study is really hard for them so [our co-ordinator] will help to complete all the paperwork. She'll arrange appointments, sometimes we bring the WINZ case managers out to us or we will physically take the woman to the interview and advocate and support on their behalf... We do that for a couple of times and then, the women are really empowered and they say "oh no I can do this, I'll go and see WINZ myself" and we just double check that they have or remind them.*

Informal networking between soc service providers

People working in Glen Innes commonly stated that in order to gain trust and respect in the community, social service providers and community volunteers need to be seen - at networking meeting and around the community. Yet this 'community' of social service providers and active community volunteers clearly do not represent all residents of Glen Innes, and some small players carry on regardless, having sufficient mana in their own network or community. For example, a prominent person in a local lobby group is seldom seen at community meetings, and is often criticized for this, but continues to speak out publicly and garner support from many people in the community.

*So down here used to be really bad because [it is isolated] when I started ...Now I'm here it's a lot more busy because of who I am. We have a breakfast club, I have eggs and assorted things and fruit, before you start at nine come in and have a chat before we start work so people do that... and this is where a lot of the projects are hatched in those kinds of meetings, just informal (Community Worker) – impt pt is she is paid for this facilitation role, wdn't happen otherwise]*

Such informal networks enable people to build relationships and establish a rapport that enables effective networking. A lot of the communication that needs to take place, especially in the case of advice or referrals requires impromptu contact which can only be initiated if relationships have previously been established between the parties. This kind of networking creates the strongest connections which enable the most efficient service to be brought to the community. This is because community or other workers in the area can call upon their contacts for support or advice when necessary (even if they are at unorthodox times of the day). If the relationships are strong then people will be more willing to attend or assist:

*Community development is built solidly, squarely on relationships. For me the people who signed up to do those workshops signed up because of the relationships we've developed. We told them at the workshops and they came to a previous funding workshop I did here for [our organization] and so they were all drawn to the workshop because of relationships. Not "yeah something interesting it might help us" but really were there because "we have a relationship with you so I couldn't possibly [not attend]" (Community Worker).*

Weekly community workshops are also being organized by KMTW and the GI Health Project. This started as some workshops on community governance, aimed at assisting community groups to consider governance issues and successfully make funding applications. Attendees are local residents, who enjoyed these workshops and called for more weekly workshops – and now workshops on a range of community issues are being run, including for example, parenting, work placement skills, and various health issues.

*A lot of the collaboration and networking in the community is done in an informal way. That in some ways is the most meaningful and long lasting. [Like] when you see people at Pak 'N' save, or at the bank, and meet up for a coffee and at events in the community. You need to be a constant presence at events and be seen around. People take a long time to get to know [and trust] you (Community Worker).*

A number of people involved in social service provision in Glen Innes have worked in more than one position in the community, some shifting from one role or agency to another. Some of these people have personal links to Glen Innes also, having lived there or having family or friends there. Long term engagement in the area means these people tend to be very valuable for the community.

With the Church example there was the feeling that they were perceived as ultimately trying to draw people to the Church. Other groups also reported the difficulties of affiliation with networking:

*I think it probably would be perfect if we were in the town centre and we were offered a space actually. Can't really afford the rent. We we're sharing the rent with someone but there's also a political thing. If we rent in with them it might be seen the perception that we are working with them and that's a religious group and we really want to be not seen [as affiliated with them] and much as we [are] trying*

*to educate people that we are not a Maori group, the perception still persists that we're a Maori group and so we don't want another baggage on top of that.*

A number of people involved in social service provision in Glen Innes have worked in more than one position in the community, some shifting from one role or agency to another. Some of these people have personal links to Glen Innes also, having lived there or having family or friends there. Long term engagement in the area means these people tend to be very valuable for the community.

Succession planning is important in any governance or leadership process to ensure that major gaps are not created when a person steps out of a role. Community capacity building and engaging people in collective action are other important aspects. As a community worker explained, some people are more willing than others to foster new people into their work,

*... when you get people like that [community leader] with a lot of passion, they don't always have the model of working where they emerge any new leaders or build capacities in anybody else so they've all got a lot of information and so on and the knowledge just sits with them. If they go, of course there's a huge gap for a while because we can see and they're reluctant to share that knowledge or they're very selective of who they share it with so its not passed on so they feel they're indispensable and maybe that is accurate. For a while they might be indispensable but people soon build it up but then there's that perception so there's a tension between really appreciating the good work they do but that's just a content level and the good work will be done for as long as they are there, as long as they have the energy and the time and their health to do it. ....So that is my question, for a community I may be doing wonderful work but that happens as long as I'm here so that's not empowering to the community so what you need to need to do is you need to pass it on and build up capacity so people are slowly starting to pick it up for themselves and that's how you empower the community (Community worker).*

### **Conclusions of this section....**

Networking crazy – but struggle to engage residents in sustainable and meaningful way.

Schools and health providers in competition for clients – inhibits collaboration – key point  
Funding is output oriented not network oriented

Best networking/linking takes place by people well established in GI – succession planning needed to ensure continuity and not just relying on these key people

### **Social infrastructure**

A number of people interviewed spoke about the need for improved community facilities, parks and reserves in Glen Innes, and related this directly to creating opportunities for people to meet, socialize, and to share support and information.....

## GI Youth networks

Youth issues have been identified as a priority area by both community groups and residents, and people often express concern that there is *'nothing to do'* for youth in Glen Innes. Lack of local job opportunities and low level of educational achievements are also seen as major concerns, together with petty crime, graffiti, youth gangs and general anti-social behaviour associated with many young people in Glen Innes.

There are a number of programmes and networks targeting young people in Glen Innes. Programmes are offered by the NZ Police (Community Approach, GI Young Women's Group), NGOs (KMTW, Tamaki Pathways Trust, Island Leaders at Heart, Salvation Army, Brothers in Arms), and at Ruapotaka Marae (Kapa haka, after-school and holiday programmes). Auckland City Council is a key provider of services and facilities for youth, responsible for management of parks and reserves, the library. The Community Partnerships division of Council is responsible for Community Action on Youth and Drugs (CAYAD) and workers from this division also facilitate the Eastside Youth Network and the GI Drug and Alcohol Networking Group. Residents have a strong expectation that Council urgently need to provide improved facilities and services for youth.

Churches play a major role in many young people's lives, and link wider family and ethnic groups.

Families and extended whanau obviously are the central network in which youth exist, and in many cases, strong familial ties means that youth and teen parents are well supported. However, social service providers regularly lament the very poor parenting skills in many families in Glen Innes. There is wide-spread call for parenting programmes, though until recently few have managed to gain sustainable funding, agency support and a groundswell of community involvement. Currently, a parenting programme is being provided by a group of providers including Salvation Army, Sport Auckland, Plunket, Ngati Whatua o Orakei Health, Glen Innes Library and the GI Health Project. This programme is led by the Salvation Army, and given the range of agency support, it stands a good chance of continuing into the future.

Drug and alcohol issues are huge for many families, for parents as well as young people. Parents tell social service workers that they are also concerned that they often do not know what their young people are doing and where they are. There are urgent pleas for support in this area. There were some evidence that community development approaches being applied by HNZA and other government agencies were contributing to collaborative approaches to social issues. For example, a community worker explained:

*I went to a home where a teenager had gone berserk and punched holes in the wall and the lady was a solo parent. She was petrified to ask for help. She thought she would get kicked out [of her state house] because her kid had gone berserk and smashed the walls... she was finally convinced that no you won't get kicked out and she wasn't kicked out but she was told that something has to be done for her son. She had to get help for him and I know for a fact now that that boy is quite a happy chappy. He did go back to school, he's not going to be an academic but he got*

*enough qualifications that he can go out in the world and be a labourer or something (Community worker).*

The majority of the resources targeted at young people in Glen Innes are aimed at 'at risk' youth. Arguably, most young people in Glen Innes could be categorized as 'at risk' given the alarming socioeconomic indicators for the suburb. However, there are no workers employed to work specifically on community youth development, and residents who are actively involved in community work are already overloaded.

Social service providers, local residents and government agencies regularly express frustration that there is an urgent need for youth issues to be addressed in Glen Innes, yet no-one is funded to establish programmes for youth unless they are already categorized as 'at risk' and have been identified as needing intervention of some sort. The Eastside Youth Network is aimed at youth development strategies, but people involved are not funded in their roles with a range of agencies and community groups to actually work on specific programmes. 'We are here to support, not provide programmes' is the common statement. While it is not suggested that top-down programmes be developed and 'done to' youth of Glen Innes, there is an urgent need for resources for collaborative projects providing opportunities for youth. As one community worker noted:

*These kids aren't going anywhere, all these other kids can set off to Remuera, Epsom, wherever they want, and at the end of the day [Glen Innes] kids still stay. here is an underlying thing in the area, these kids wake up and the first thing they see is people drinking and it's like 8 in the morning, and people don't understand this, you see people fighting all the time, they don't understand that, this is all just normal life. So the things that show in our kids aren't necessarily normal, but for our kids it is normal, but [we need] to make people see that there's a bigger side outside GI (community worker).*

A volunteer community worker commented on the limited experiences that some young people in Glen Innes have:

*I took a group of kids over the harbour bridge and I'm driving along and all of a sudden these arms came round my neck, this girl had never been over the harbour bridge in her life and she was petrified when she suddenly realised that we were up there on the road....Now I couldn't believe that kids in this day and age had never been over the harbour bridge. It was a shock to me because I was lucky enough to have a car and I could take my kids over the harbour bridge or we could get on the bus. She was 11 years old. There are kids, like this guy who takes these kids in, they have never, ever been on camp, they have never ever been in the bush, they don't know what its like to light a fire to cook a meal. They know what its like to light a fire to destroy but not to cook a meal and it's a completely different experience for them (community volunteer).*

Glen Innes residents and social service providers expressed concern that funding and projects that were established were too often not sustained, with funding being withdrawn just as results become visible.

Lack of places for youth to go was a regular complaint in Glen Innes. Youth at a liveable community planning workshop in 2000 said that they needed job opportunities, places to go, and community facilities such as a skate park for Glen Innes. A skate park was discussed for Talbot Park during planning but neighbours were opposed due to concerns about noise.

## **Stuff to follow up with**

What brings ple into networks?

What succession planning happening? How? Gaps?

What images do ple use related to networking, connectedness?

Vertical vs horizontal connections.

Community-based governance – netwkg key

What info exchanged? What not?

Who is part of diff networks? who isn't? – impt that paid ple mainly part of formal networks

Links betw networks?

Can frame this re Krebs and Holley patterns

### **1. common attributes, goals, governance**

almost all participants paid workers

all committed to GI community

almost all have no capacity to implement progs, actions.

Governance? ACC heavily involved

### **2. Diversity**

ethnic diversity (few migrant grps, some Pac)

orgsns – health, ed, comm. Dvpt

govt – HNZC, ACC

few policy, movers and shakers

### **3. several paths btwe nodes?**

Look at this visually

4. **some nodes more prominent** – yes, KMTW etc

5. **short links betw nodes?**

## References

- Agar, M. 1996. *The Professional Stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography (2nd ed)*. New York, Academic Press.
- Arbury, J. 2004. *What contribution has the 'compact city' made to the search for urban sustainability?* Working Paper, prepared for Objective 1. Learning to be Sustainable: Tool for adapting the shape of existing cities and settlements.
- Austin, D. 2004, Partnerships, not Projects! Improving the environment through collaborative research and action. *Human Organization*, vol 63, 419-430.
- Auckland City, 2004. *Glen Innes Into The Future*. Auckland, Auckland City Council.
- Bernard, H. 1988. *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Newbury Park, Sage.
- Brody, S., Godschalk, D., and Burby, R., 2003. Mandating Citizen Participation in Plan Making: Six strategic planning choices. *Journal of American Planning Association*, 69, 245-264.
- Burby, R., May, P., Berke, P., Dalton, L., French, S., and Kaiser, E. 1997 *Making government plans: State experiments in managing land use*. Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press.
- Burdett, R., Travers, T., Czischke, D., Rode, P., and Moser, B., 2004. *Density and Urban Neighbourhoods in London: Summary Report*. Enterprise LSE Cities, London.
- Chapman, D. and Larkham, P., 1999. Urban design, urban quality and the quality of life: reviewing the Department of the Environment's Urban Design campaign. *Journal of Urban Design*, 4, 211-233.
- Brigden, 2004 ???
- Corsín Jimenéz, A. 2003. On space as a capacity. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol 9, 137-153.
- Cuthill, M. 2004. Community visioning: facilitating informed citizen participation in local area planning on the Gold Coast. *Urban Policy and Research*. Vol 22, 427-445.
- Dixon, J. and Dubuis, A., 2003. Urban intensification in Auckland, New Zealand: a challenge for New Urbanism. *Housing Studies*, 18 (3), 353-368.
- Ellen, R. (ed.) 1984, *Ethnographic Research: A guide to general conduct*. London, Academic Press.

Godschalk, D., 2004. Land Use Planning Challenges: Coping with conflicts in visions of sustainable development and liveable communities. *Journal of American Planning Association* 70, 5-13.

Hoffman, O, Zaba, B., Wolff, B., Sanga, E., Maboko, L., Mmbando, D., von Sonnenburg, F., Hoelscher, M. 2004. Methodological lessons from a cohort study of high risk women in Tanzaniz, *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 80, 69-73 Suppl 2.

Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. E., 2000. Indicators for sustainable communities: a strategy building on complexity theory and distributed intelligence. *Planning Theory and Practice* 1, 173-186.

Kearns, A. and Forrest, R., 2000. Social cohesion and multilevel urban governance. *Urban Studies* 37, 995-1017.

Kretman, J.P. and McKnight, J.L. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. Chicago, ACTA Publications.

Marcus, G. 2004. The passion of anthropology in the U.S., circa 2004, *Anthropological Quarterly*, ??? 673-695.

Munford, R. and Walsh-Tapiata, W. 1999. *Strategies for Change: Community development in Aotearoa/NZ*. School of Social Policy and Social Work, Massey University.

Sawicki, D.S., 2002. Improving Community Indicator Systems: Injecting more social science into the folk movement, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3, 13-32.

Scott, K. and Shaw, A. 2005. Local community perceptions of liveability. Draft report prepared for Learning Sustainability programme.

Southworth, M. & Parthasarathy B., 1997. The suburban public realm II: Eurourbanism, New Urbanism and the implications for urban design in the American Metropolis. *Journal of Urban Design*, 2, 9-26.

Statistics New Zealand, 2001, *New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings 2001*, [www.stats.govt.nz/census2001.htm](http://www.stats.govt.nz/census2001.htm)

Talen, E., 2000. The problem with community in planning. *Journal of Planning Literature* 15, 171-183.

Williams, K., 1999. Urban intensification policies in England: problems and contradictions. *Land Use Policy*, 16 (3): 167-178.

Wong, C., 2002. Comment: The Crossroads of Community Indicators. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 3 (2), 259-260.