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1. **OVERVIEW OF THE WFGU PROJECT**

**OVERALL PROJECT AIMS**

*Working From the Ground Up* (WFGU) is an Australian Research Council Linkage research project being undertaken by the University of Sydney, the University of New South Wales, Housing New South Wales, South East Sydney Illawarra Area Health Service (Health NSW), and TAFE NSW. The project is funded for the period 2008-2012.

WFGU aims to tackle issues of entrenched social exclusion and disadvantage in social housing neighbourhoods in Maroubra and Matraville, NSW, through community development initiatives. The research will identify and trial ways of working with communities that can bring about sustainable changes in social housing estates using an action research approach. It aims to generate new knowledge and models of community regeneration.

The project is a five year project conducted in three phases: Phase One: Engaging the Community, Phase Two: Developing and Trialling Initiatives and Phase Three: Consolidation and Sustainability.

**OVERARCHING RESEARCH APPROACH**

The research approach has been built on a number of assumptions based on prior research, including that:

1. Community renewal initiatives require time,
2. Positive action in social housing estates involves growth of community confidence and capacity,
3. Small-scale community activities are often the basis for the development of effective resident participation and service provider partnerships, and
4. Health and social services, education and economic opportunities in disadvantaged neighbourhoods need to be developed and provided locally.
Action research allows for the development of knowledge and understanding as part of practice and is particularly appropriate for research such as this, where the outcome is to bring about change and simultaneously develop an understanding of what informs change. The research methods prioritise community participation, with the action research model focused on involvement of social housing residents. Residents’ concerns and priorities regarding improvements in their communities will be documented and integrated with formal data to identify community priorities. This information will be systematically recorded and regularly shared with the community. As an action research project, each stage of the research is fed into the design, re-design, implementation and evaluation of the community renewal interventions.

The development and implementation of quantitative and qualitative tools to measure social change will be used to enable comprehensive monitoring of community development throughout the five-year cycle. These tools include:

1. indicators of social disadvantage,
2. indicators of social cohesion,
3. measures of resident participation,
4. maps of social networks,
5. measures of partnership strength, and
6. measures of neighbourhood ‘liveability’ or perceptions of the physical living environment.

**Guiding Research Questions**

1. What processes will best enable specific groups of residents in Australian social housing neighbourhoods (for example, residents with mental illnesses, residents with drug and substance abuse problems, frail aged residents, residents with poor literacy or communication skills) to participate in community development processes?

2. To what extent will resident participation in the prioritisation, design and implementation of community development initiatives contribute to building confidence and capacities, and increase social capital in social housing
neighbourhoods?

3. To what extent and how will resident relationships with local social service providers impact on social inclusion and social disadvantage?

4. What kinds of partnership strategies between service providers will have positive outcomes for residents?

5. To what extent and how will community development initiatives in social housing neighbourhoods ameliorate social disadvantage and enhance social inclusion?

**ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES FOR THE WHOLE PROJECT**

It is anticipated that the project will create opportunities for residents to actively participate in their communities and that partnerships will be developed between the communities and relevant government, non-government, and private organisations. It is hoped that these changes will enhance health and wellbeing and increase education and training opportunities for residents.

The project will also build detailed case studies of interventions based on field research and include the collection of qualitative and quantitative data from residents, service providers and local stakeholders.
2. MATRAVILLE AND MAROUBRA SOCIAL HOUSING NEIGHBOURHOODS

THE TWO LOCATIONS

In 2008, two areas in the south-eastern suburbs of Sydney, Maroubra and Matraville were selected as the focal points for the research. The two social housing neighbourhoods selected are commonly referred to as the Coral Sea Estate (in South Maroubra) and Soldier Settlement (in Matraville).

The Coral Sea estate was developed in the 1950s. It comprises approximately 1200 apartments, 60 townhouses, and 30 cottages, housing a total of 2115 people. The Soldier’s Settlement Estate was developed in the 1970s, and comprises approximately 250 townhouses, 230 apartments and 40 cottages, housing a total of 990 people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Townhouses</th>
<th>Cottages</th>
<th>Total residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coral Sea (Maroubra)</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Settlement (Matraville)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing NSW (2005)

SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEXES FOR AREAS

Both estates are located in the Eastern Suburbs of Sydney, in the Randwick Local Government Area. Demographic data for the Local Government Area (LGA) of Randwick as a whole tends to present it as a ‘well-off’ area. The LGA, for example, is in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} highest quintile of NSW Socio Economic Status (SES) groups and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Highest quintile of Health Area SES groups.
However, there are variations within the LGA. The Socio Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) provides a measure of relative disadvantage, taking into account attributes such as income, educational attainment, unemployment rates and workforce in unskilled occupations types. According to SEIFA, a score of 1,000 is considered an average score. The following table shows the SEIFA scores for the 12 suburbs in the Randwick LGA, ranked from lowest to highest.

2006 SEIFA INDEX OF DISADVANTAGE: RANDWICK CITY’S SMALL AREAS – SUBURBS (RANKED FROM GREATEST TO LEAST DISADVANTAGED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>SEIFA ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Coogee</td>
<td>941.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matraville</strong></td>
<td><strong>974.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Bay</td>
<td>995.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Perouse - Phillip Bay</td>
<td>1001.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maroubra</strong></td>
<td><strong>1010.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chifley</td>
<td>1018.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsford</td>
<td>1022.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabar</td>
<td>1027.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>1043.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick</td>
<td>1073.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coogee</td>
<td>1103.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovelly</td>
<td>1116.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick City</td>
<td>1045.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Socio Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA), 2006.

There are also variations within suburbs within the LGA. A more detailed review of ABS statistics reveals that there are a number of pockets within the suburbs in the Randwick LGA experiencing disadvantage. The Index of Relative Socio Economic Disadvantage (IRSED) is another measure which is especially useful in identifying geographic areas that are relatively disadvantaged. The SEIFA Index of disadvantage for Randwick LGA shows that the three largest concentrated pockets of disadvantage within the LGA are located in and around social housing estates. IRSED scores recorded in some of the collector districts of these social housing estates are as low as 600. An
area with an IRSED score of 600 or below is considered to be experiencing high levels of disadvantage (Randwick City Council: An Inclusive Randwick, Draft Report, 2009).

If we look at further analysis, Haksi-Leventhal’s (2009) analysis of concentration of disadvantage by Collection District states that:

- In **Maroubra 1738** people lived in one of the **most disadvantaged 5%** of 2006 SEIFA Collection Districts, and in
- In **Matraville 542** people lived in one of the **most disadvantaged 5%** of SEIFA Collection Districts.

### Demographic Information on Social Housing Residents in Maroubra and Matraville

Demographic data from Housing NSW and the ABS 2006 census collections which differentiates between public and private housing residents in the two suburbs was also analysed in order to provide baseline statistical information about the two communities. This data is presented below.

#### 1. Population Size and Age Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social Housing</th>
<th>Private Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maroubra</td>
<td>Matraville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age of persons</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 years</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing NSW

The data shows that:

- A quarter of social housing residents in both Maroubra and Matraville are aged 65 and over,
- Three per cent of social housing residents in both Maroubra and Matraville are aged 85 and over,
- Ten percent of social housing residents in Maroubra are children aged 12 and under, and
- Over fifteen per cent of social housing residents in Matraville are children aged 12 and under.

2. **Household Incomes and Unemployment Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social Housing</th>
<th>Private Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maroubra</td>
<td>Matraville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income (weekly)</td>
<td>$492</td>
<td>$492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (weekly)</td>
<td>$289</td>
<td>$336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median individual income (weekly)</td>
<td>$231</td>
<td>$234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median rent (weekly)</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median housing loan repayment (monthly)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing NSW

In 2006, households with incomes lower than $500 per week were regarded as *low income*. The data provided above show that:

- The median income for families, households and individuals in social housing in both Maroubra and Matraville was under $500 per week,
- According to Randwick Council’s analyses of household income by suburb in 2006, the weekly household income was under $500 in 2182 households in Maroubra and 670 households in Matraville,
- The unemployment rate for social housing residents in both Maroubra and Matraville was five times higher than the unemployment rate for private housing residents in both suburbs, and
- The unemployment rate in the Randwick LGA was 4.5 per cent which was lower than the NSW average.
### 3. Household Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social Housing</th>
<th>Private Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maroubra</td>
<td>Matraville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of persons per bedroom</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single person households</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent families with children &lt;15</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing NSW

In relation to households in the Maroubra/Matraville areas, the following observations can be made:

- The size of households in both Maroubra and Matraville is slightly smaller in social housing than those in private housing.
- Over half of the households in social housing in Maroubra and nearly half of the households in social housing in Matraville consist of one person, living alone, and
- Around one third of the households in social housing in both Maroubra and Matraville are sole parent families with children under 15 years of age.
4. **Indigenous People, People born Overseas and Language Spoken at Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social Housing</th>
<th>Private Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maroubra</td>
<td>Matraville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous persons</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas born</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English at home</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing NSW

The data suggests that:

- A significant proportion of social housing residents in Maroubra and Matraville are Indigenous,
- In contrast to this data, Randwick Council data shows that 4% of all Matraville residents are Indigenous, compared to 1.5% of all Maroubra residents,
- Over 30 percent of residents in Matraville and Maroubra were born overseas. This rate is similar for Randwick LGA overall, and
- There is a higher proportion of people who were born overseas and who speak a language other than English at home in social housing in Maroubra than in Matraville.

5. **Internet Connection, Car Ownership and Volunteering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social Housing</th>
<th>Private Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maroubra</td>
<td>Matraville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet connection</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No motor vehicle in household</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary work</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing NSW
These indicators can be used as proxies for social disadvantage and/or social isolation. The data shows that:

- Under a third of residents in social housing in Maroubra and Matraville had the internet connected, compared to two thirds of residents in private housing,
- Social housing residents in Matraville had lower levels of internet connection than residents in Maroubra,
- Over half the social housing households in Maroubra had no motor vehicle and just under half the social housing households in Matraville had no motor vehicle,
- There are significantly lower rates of motor vehicle ownership in social housing households than private housing households in both Maroubra and Matraville, and
- Over seven per cent of social housing residents in both Maroubra and Matraville undertake voluntary work.
3. ENGAGING THE COMMUNITY:
ENGAGING RESIDENTS

LETTERBOX COMMUNICATION

To initiate relationships with residents, WFGU delivered an introductory letter to every social housing household in Maroubra and Matraville. These letters outlined the nature and scope of the project and provided contact details of the researchers. The letters were translated into Spanish, Russian and Mandarin, three of the major languages other than English spoken by residents. Letterbox communication continues to be an important means of communicating with residents, and all notices of events and project updates are hand delivered to residents’ letterboxes. As far as possible, these notices and updates are translated into the major community languages.

INITIAL KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Once the letters had been delivered to all households in Coral Sea and Soldier’s Settlement, a number of keen and interested residents made contact with the research team. Those residents who consented, participated in a key informant interview where local area and community issues were discussed. The recordings of these interviews have been kept as baseline data and were used to develop an understanding of some of the key social structures and networks already present within the community.

TENANT AND OTHER GROUPS

The WFGU team has met with and continues to support and respond to requests from a number of tenant and other community groups in the local area as part of the community engagement strategy. The team has attended meetings and events held by: the South Maroubra Tenants Action Group (SMTAG), Each and All Stronger Together Inc (EAST), Bringing Eastern Suburbs Together Tenants Council (BEST), Lexington Action Community (Lexact), and the Eastern Area Tenants Council.
PRESENCE IN PLACE

One very important element of engaging the community was to be physically present in the local area. The research team has been working from the Cottage in Matraville and also began working from the Portland Crescent community room in Maroubra, where residents are invited to “drop in” to talk to WFGU researchers about their ideas and concerns. Being present played a crucial part in developing initiatives with residents in the Soldier’s Settlement estate. Establishing a regular and ongoing presence in South Maroubra is also considered important for gaining trust and developing relationships with local residents in both estates.

COMMUNITY EVENTS

The research has been involved in running events for the community as well as participating in events organised by service providers and tenant groups, for example, local morning teas and an end of year Christmas party. Community feedback sessions about the household survey were also run.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

AIM

The aims of the household survey were to:

- measure social cohesion and neighbourhood attachment in the two social housing areas,
- gain an understanding of resident’s feeling of safety and ideas about the physical aspects of each area, and
- explore what residents liked and disliked about living in these two areas, what things they would like to see changed and how these changes might come about.

The information collected will provide baseline data for the whole research project. A second household survey will be implemented in the later stage of the research and the data collected will be compared to the initial survey.
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
The household survey was developed from an adapted version of Buckner's Neighbourhood Cohesion scale. Buckner's final Neighbourhood Cohesion scale included 18 question items. The scale was subsequently validated in a Canadian study, after reducing the scale to 17 items. In the UK, the scale has been further adapted for community studies of neighbourhoods and health and eight items from the scale have been used in the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) as a measure of 'neighbourhood attachment'. Neighbourhood surveys based on the Bruckner scale have been implemented in NSW housing estates by Judd and Randolph (2006). In Australia members of the WFGU researcher team have used this tool in community development projects in the New South Wales suburbs of Waterloo, Windale and Mildura.

The Maroubra/Matraville Neighbourhood Household Survey comprised:

- 18 statements about the neighbourhood - residents were asked whether they strongly agreed, agreed, felt neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each statement,
- Four additional statements about safety and the standard of maintenance - people were asked whether they strongly agreed, agreed, felt neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each statement, with room to provide additional comments as necessary,
- Four open ended questions about what people:
  - liked about the neighbourhood,
  - disliked about the neighbourhood,
  - thought needed to change, and
  - ideas about how change can happen.

IMPLEMENTATION
Due to confidentiality concerns, the research team was not given access to a list of public housing addresses in the two areas. Instead, the research team developed their own maps and lists of addresses of public housing residents in Matraville and South Maroubra by physically visiting each estate, viewing the dwellings and recording the addresses. These lists and maps were then used to implement the survey.
A number of fourth year social work students and the research team implemented the household survey over the course of a month. Weekends, mornings, afternoons and evenings were covered so as to capture the greatest number of responses. Interviewers included speakers of languages other than English, including speakers of Spanish, Russian and Mandarin.

The interviewers knocked on every door in each street in each location until a minimum response rate of 10% in each street was achieved. Some purposive sampling was undertaken to increase the number of responses from (a) males and (b) participants from whose speak languages other than English.

RESIDENTS WHO COMPLETED THE SURVEY
The household survey was undertaken with adult residents in 166 homes, 64 in Matraville and 132 in Maroubra. Of the survey participants:

- 132 (80%) were female.
- 34 (20%) were male.
- All were over the age of 18.
- 85 (51%) were aged 66 or over, approximating the proportion of residents in this age bracket residing in the two estates.
- 81 (49%) were aged 65 and under.
- 13 (7.8%) identified as Indigenous, slightly higher than the proportion of Indigenous residents in the two estates.
- 113 (68%) lived in sole person households, a proportion of the sample similar to the proportion of sole person households in the two estates.
- 51 (30.7%) were born in non-English speaking countries, slightly lower than the proportion of adults born in NES countries living in the two estates.
1. **Quantitative Data Relating to Neighbourhood, Safety and Maintenance of Buildings and Grounds**

Most people:
- Are attracted to living in their neighbourhood (72%),
- Feel loyal to the people in their area (73%),
- Want to work together to improve the neighbourhood (75%),
- Plan to continue living here (80%),
- Believe their neighbours would help in an emergency (82%), and
- Feel safe walking around during the day (87%) and at home at night (75%).

Many people:
- Rarely invite local people home (63%),
- Don’t feel safe walking around at night (63%),
- Don’t think buildings and grounds are well maintained (51%),
- Don’t visit their neighbours (49%), and
- Would like to move out of the area (39%).

2. **Responses to Statements about Neighbourhood, Safety and Maintenance by Suburb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Maroubra</th>
<th>Matraville</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attracted to neighbourhood</td>
<td>109 (68%)</td>
<td>52 (82%)</td>
<td>161 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel loyal to people</td>
<td>115 (72%)</td>
<td>47 (76%)</td>
<td>162 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to improve neighbourhood</td>
<td>116 (72%)</td>
<td>49 (80%)</td>
<td>165 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to continue living here</td>
<td>126 (78%)</td>
<td>52 (85%)</td>
<td>188 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours would help in an emergency</td>
<td>132 (81%)</td>
<td>51 (82%)</td>
<td>183 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Safe during the day</td>
<td>139 (85%)</td>
<td>58 (91%)</td>
<td>197 (87%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely invite local people home</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t feel safe walking around at night</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think buildings &amp; grounds not well maintained</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t visit neighbours</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to move out</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Qualitative data on living in the neighbourhoods**

The survey yielded a great deal of qualitative data from residents about their perceptions of the local area. A thematic analysis revealed patterns of responses, particularly in relation to what residents liked and disliked about their area. The themes that emerged, accompanied by illustrative quotes, are below.

**The top 5 things residents liked about their area**

1. **The beach**

   “A mellow working class suburb that’s near the beach.”

   “The surf club and I go almost every day to the beach.”

   “It’s close to the beach – I like walking along it.”

   “Nippers for the kids – it’s free.”

2. **Close to everything**

   “It is close to the beach, shops and the places I like to go.”

   “There are parks and its close to clubs – I like the area.”

   “It is relatively close to Prince of Wales (Hospital)...”

   “Good choices of schools”

   “Schools are great – a sense of community for children.”

3. **Neighbours**
“Older people next door is a nice thing – having a variety of ages – it's more like a community.”

“I like my neighbours on either side.”

“Most people are polite and friendly and you know they're in the same boat and don’t want ugliness.”

“Everyone minds their own business – you are free to do your own thing.”

“I can chat with people on the street.”

4. Social transport

“Buses good transport and access to service.”

“Transport is good.”

“Clean, cheap transport.”

“The bus service is good.”

“A good bus service in recent times – that is good for older people.”

5. Shops

“You can walk to the shops.”

“A chemist that organises social events.”

“Three shopping centres are close by.”

“Randwick, Maroubra, Bondi Junction and Eastgardens (shopping centres) are all close.”

The top 5 things residents disliked about their area

1. The behaviour of young people

“Young people get away with everything.”

“Kids vandalise things- they’re idle and uncontrollable.”
“Night is not safe – young people come out and cause fights.”
“Young people intimidate older residents – they are scared for their lives.”
“Once the front door could be locked – now young people have kicked the glass in and walk through screaming.”
“Parent’s don’t look after their children.”
“The kids are terrible – they scream and run and throw things at the window – especially on weekends and after school.”

2. Crime and vandalism

“People walking around at night and breaking stuff.”
“I often go to my son’s to stay at night because I’m so scared.”
“After dark - bad things happen.”
“Police won’t do anything about the trouble makers in the area.”
“You hear people fighting at night – kids can hear this – it affects them.”

3. Few social contacts and connections

“There is minimal assistance for mental health patients.”
“When the block opened it was over 55’s and it worked very well. There are now more unstable people and it makes it much more difficult.”
“TAFE English classes – I can’t understand the teacher – so I don’t enjoy the course.”
“Group meetings do exist, but are not effective in dealing with people – so people get upset.”
“People keep to themselves completely.”
“Better off minding your own business and not talking to anyone.”
“There is bitchiness and gossip in the units – I keep to myself.”

4. Drug and alcohol use
“Too many druggies – you can hear them at night.”
“Move drug users out because they cause trouble.”
“The presence and threat of drug addicts.”
“The environment is not good – too many drugs.”
“I don’t like living in close proximity to drug users.”

5. Disputes between neighbours

“A minority spoil it for others.”
“Gossiping neighbours”
“Everyone is not able to use a hall – due to neighbour disputes.”
“Neighbourhood disputes are not investigated.”
“No support for neighbourhood troubles. People doing the wrong thing get away with it and people doing good things get no help.”
“No other families live here – it creates trouble with neighbours who are less tolerant of kids.”

THE THINGS PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO SEE CHANGED

Following is an outline of the points that residents suggested needed changing in the area.

1. More support for residents, families and individuals

“Something for older people – the equivalent of The Shack for older people.”
“Support for those with mental illness.”
“Pointless doing surveys because it won’t get past the front desk – nothing ever changes - Housing is important but Health more.”
“Playgroup at the park.”
“Gentle exercise classes for older people nearby.”
“More community based activities.”
“They’ve tried everything – nothing can help those people – it’s generational.”

2. More activities for young people and children

“Make kids see the area as theirs.”
“Look after the young people – get them services.”
“Give young people a brick wall to graffiti – but make it good.”
“More activities for young people because there is nothing for them to do.”
“A place for the kids to hang and for there to be support programs and workshops – including for parents.”
“Get in early before they become teenagers.”

3. Better maintenance and relationships with Housing

“Department of Housing is slow to do anything.”
“Things take forever to get fixed if they get fixed.”
“No conscience, no soul at Housing.”
“Department of Housing helps you if you’re in trouble.”
“Pull it all down, it’s falling to bits.”
“I feel neglected by the Department of Housing – had complaints for years and nothing happens.”

4. Less crime and vandalism

“Police try but they can’t do anything.”
“I am scared to go to shops.”
“Decrease crime – need more police patrolling.”
“Bus stops are always vandalised – people need to be punished or they can do what they want.”

5. Improved parks and social spaces

“Improve Coral Sea Park for the kids to get them off the streets.”
“Fix up communal areas.”
“It needs to be cleaned up – no rubbish in the street.”
“People need to look after the street more.”

SUGGESTIONS FOR BRINGING ABOUT CHANGE

Residents suggested the following ideas for bringing about change:

- More space and activities for children and young people,
- More security in and around buildings and streets,
- Changed policing practices,
- More community events and activities,
- Making the area look better and safer, and
- Housing changes the way it works with tenants.

WHAT PEOPLE WANTED CHANGED BY HOUSING

Residents proposed the following suggestions in order to improve the relationship with the Department of Housing:

- Higher quality maintenance work and repairs,
- Quicker response time,
- More communication and respect from Housing, and
- Less rubbish lying around the neighbourhood.
IDEAS ABOUT HOW CHANGE CAN HAPPEN

Many people did not answer this question, but comments by those who did respond included:

“Lexington Place needs cleaning up for the children.”

“Have a TAFE closer – Randwick and Central is a long trip on the bus – it would give young girls and the elderly something to do – education is important.”

“Anything to bring back community spirit.”

“Try to connect people to make people friendly with each other and not to be scared of each other.”

RESIDENT FEEDBACK SESSIONS

Three community feedback sessions were held with residents in late July 2009. The goal of these events was to inform residents of some of the preliminary findings from the survey and to get feedback from them about whether WFGU “got it right”.

Residents from the social housing neighbourhoods were letterboxed with a date-saver flyer in late June and again in July with details about the time and place of the events. Two events were scheduled in both Maroubra and Matraville at different times of day in order to try and maximise resident participation. The events were scheduled to be held at the Soldiers’ Settlement Cottage in Matraville and the Maroubra Sands Hotel. No residents attended the session scheduled at Maroubra Bay Public School (Schools as Communities Room). Details of events are outlined in the following table.
During the feedback sessions, residents were given the opportunity to respond to the presentation about the survey findings. Below is a summary of responses from residents who attended the sessions.

It must be noted that the views expressed came from a relatively small group of residents and that these opinions will not represent the views of the whole community (n=11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Venue</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Interpreters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 18th July 2009, Sands Hotel</td>
<td>7 residents attended.</td>
<td>Mandarin and Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 26th July 2009, Soldier’s Settlement Cottage</td>
<td>1 resident attended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 28th July 2009, Soldier’s Settlement Cottage</td>
<td>3 residents attended.</td>
<td>Spanish and Mandarin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area of concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of concern</th>
<th>Residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contractors</td>
<td>“They don’t do the work properly but they get paid.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoddy work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disrespect to tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fences are required around the flat blocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Particular issues with plumbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>“Recycling is a big problem”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy Management Allocations</td>
<td>Some flats are left vacant for months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flats (dual occupancy) are OK – but not when drug dealing occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and relationships with Housing</td>
<td>“All letters from Housing should be signed – not just signed with a position title”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need meetings between community residents and decision makers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>Local coordination of services for young people “moving out of service silos”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the young people who cause problems do not live in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people buying drugs from the flats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults supplying alcohol and drugs to kids.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people create fear among residents living in Matraville – particularly older residents who are scared of theft and graffiti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) women are isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like the community room in Messines Place to be opened for everyone to use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and vandalism</td>
<td>Police should have more freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Department of Housing spent a fortune on external painting – one day later walls are covered in black graffiti”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents don’t feel safe walking around at night or catching the bus at night.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue with “bra boys”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents raised the following areas as priorities for action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Safety     | “Not sure – but I’m scared.”  
Making buildings safer for residents, for example, putting security doors on main entrances.  
More Police patrols.  
Build fences to reduce washing being stolen. |
| Rubbish    | Emphasise recycling arrangements  
More Information about recycling in other languages. |
| Health     | More facilities for people with mental health problems, for example, open unused wards at hospitals.  
Help from community mental health services.  
Social workers and Aboriginal workers who can assist residents.  
Services to provide more support to people with a disability.  
Work with drug and alcohol issues.  
Positive parenting classes. |
| Housing    | Better relationship with Housing – “so there is a system of effective relationships between Housing and tenants.”  
More understanding, more respect for residents.  
Listen to residents’ requests.  
Housing to check in with elderly residents to make sure they are alright.  
Housing workers having more information about the ongoing issues – especially new Client Service Officers (CSOs).  
More liaison between Council and Housing, especially in relation to |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Maintenance, Rubbish and Nature Strips</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing staff to have training in communication, respect and cultural understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need system which links the Minister, permanent staff, Area Manager and local manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Housing to the Consumer Trader and Tenancy Tribunal (CTTT) when issues are not resolved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>'Place'</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“People to “think permanent” and appreciate what they have and see their places as homes, seeing selves as winners and show respect for homes”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop trust between neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media should print the truth about the area – not sensationalism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Social</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold social events in the local areas, for example, a Christmas lunch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly birthday party - everyone who has had a birthday in the last 3 months can come along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start a food club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open the community room in Messines Place for knitting groups, recipe swaps, computer training, accessing the internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident discussion group at the cottage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start English classes or computer classes for elderly residents in a local setting as some are too intimidated to go to TAFE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Political Participation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet with ministers who have the authority to make changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. ENGAGING YOUNG RESIDENTS

The focus of the initial stage of community engagement was on adult residents living in Maroubra and Matraville. However, concerns about the behaviour of young people and support for children raised by adult residents suggested that engaging young residents was a priority. The views of young people living in Matraville and Maroubra were collected through three distinct yet connected projects which are outlined below. Approval was sought and granted through the University of Sydney’s Human Research Ethics Committee to include young people aged 10 – 17 years in the overall research project.

4.1 ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT

RATIONALE

The needs of adolescent young people had been identified as a very high priority by adults in the household survey. One of the most common responses of adults to describing what changes needed to be made in the two areas was the need to develop activities for young people. In response, the action research project was developed. The approach reflected the social work and community development literature on responding to the needs of disadvantaged young people, emphasising the importance of including young people as active participants in defining their needs and developing service responses. A social work student undertook the majority of work on this project.

CONTEXT

In addition to those comments made by residents in the household survey, there were a number of other events that had an impact on young people living in the area at the time. These included: The Shack Outreach Centre (referred to as the Shack) at Lexington Place closing and the local newspaper, the Southern Courier publishing a front page article about crime and young people in South Maroubra. There were eleven follow up articles published over the next two months which ranged from portraying young people as behaving in an “anti-social” manner to supporting the
Shack’s work with young people. In addition, there were two Channel 7 News reports about young people in South Maroubra. The News segment interviewed some older residents stating their fear of leaving their homes because of the young people. Overall the message was that the young people were ‘out-of-control’. In response, Lexington Place was identified as a police “hot-spot” for offending and crime, thus in need of a service response by the Police. The Police immediately funded the upgrade of the Police-Citizens Youth Club (PCYC) games bus and police staff from all over Sydney came to Coral Sea Park to run BBQs and touch football afternoons.

AIMS

Four research aims were developed during the initial stages of this project. These were to:

- involve young people in identifying relevant individual and community issues through participatory approaches,
- highlight ways that young people can influence the activities and service provision of the local youth service The Shack,
- develop approaches of engagement and consultation with young people to be used by other services in the area, and
- identify ways that young people can be involved in and influence, the WFGU project.

METHODOLOGY

A literature review was conducted to establish a repertoire of innovative participatory concepts for working with young people that had been applied in action research. The predominant theme arising from the literature emphasised the importance of using a range of creative, artistic and multi-media methods to engage young people in research rather than more traditional methods involving the written or verbal articulation of ideas. Creative, visual and multi-media methodologies were applied to the action research project. It was anticipated that interviews would then be conducted with the young people, using the creative process to trigger discussion between the young people and researchers. Young people were given the opportunity to participate in the research design and implementation by providing WFGU with their preferences.
for a creative activity by completing a ‘tick-a-box’ sheet with the various options of film/documentary making, photography, art, printmaking or hip-hop. The young people who completed the forms chose art and hip-hop.

IMPLEMENTATION

Developing Rapport with Young People and the Local Youth Service

The first stage of the project required developing rapport with the targeted group of young people – those seen to be “causing trouble”. The social work student participated in and observed activities held by The Shack and the PCYC. Considering the context of the closure of The Shack Outreach space in Lexington Place and subsequent changes from its centre-based service provision, there were minimal hours a week available to engage with young people living in the area which made the process of developing rapport slower than anticipated. Over nine to ten weeks, the student was able to create good rapport with approximately four young people, mostly girls and some connections with approximately ten to fifteen other young people from the area as well as Shack staff.

Participatory Sessions

Two sessions were held: an art and a hip hop workshop at The Shack during school holidays. However, a number of young people (particularly those with which the student had developed rapport) had been banned from the school holiday program. The result was that the numbers of young people from Maroubra and Matraville at both these sessions were low. Observational data was collected and recorded at this stage.

OUTCOMES

Although no formal interviews were undertaken, there were a number of positive outcomes for the research:
1. Rapport was developed and trust gained with a number of young people who were seen by many other service providers as too difficult to engage and work with. This allowed stage two – qualitative interviews with young people to run more effectively,
2. A partnership was developed with the local youth service and contacts were made with Police and the PCYC, and
3. A number of residents contacted WFGU and were interested to assist with any future projects the team planned to run with young people.

4.2 Qualitative Interviews with Local Young People

**AIM**

The aim of the interviews was to capture the views of young people living in the neighbourhoods of Matraville and South Maroubra and to ask them the same questions that were asked of adult residents in the household survey to add to the baseline data already collected. The interviews were also seen as an opportunity for young people to respond to adult residents’ perceptions of them.

**METHODOLOGY**

An interview schedule was developed with local youth services and aimed to reflect information gathered in the household survey. The questions for young people included: what they liked and disliked about living in the area, what they would like to see changed and perceptions about how these changes could happen. They were also asked about organised activities run by the local youth services.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**Engaging Young People**

Two social work students made continued efforts to engage with young people living in South Maroubra and Matraville. They did this by literally “hanging out” with the young people weekly at
events organised by *The Shack* and the *PCYC*. The researchers continued to negotiate with *The Shack* about how best to recruit young people to participate in qualitative interviews. This was again a time consuming process and a number of strategies attempting to interview young people were trialled. The researchers encountered a number of difficulties when trying to conduct the interviews including: getting consent forms signed, communication difficulties, and bad weather which impacted on interview attendance.

**The Interviews**

During this time the team were able to make contact with the *Kool Kids Club (KKC)* who were incredibly helpful in assisting in the recruitment of young people to interview. The two social work students were invited to attend KKC activities where they were provided with the opportunity to interview young people who had registered their interest in participating. KKC made sure that all parental/guardian consent forms were already signed so that the interview process ran smoothly. In total 14 young people living in South Maroubra and Matraville were interviewed for the research - ten from the *Kool Kids Club* and four from the *South Maroubra Outreach Program (SMOP)* at *The Shack*. Twelve\(^1\) of these interviews were analysed using NVivo 7, which is a computer software program used for organizing and managing qualitative data. The results of the interviews are discussed below:

**FINDINGS**

**Life in Maroubra and Matraville**

Apart from organised activities held by local service providers, all participants from the South Maroubra Outreach Program (SMOP) described their main activities as “hanging out” with their friends down at the park, the beach and Lexington Shops. They also described spending time with their families at home.

---

\(^1\) One young person lived out of the area (in La Perouse) and the second was omitted because of difficulties with the recording.
Young people from the Kool Kids Klub (KKC) talked about how their parents and relatives took them to organised activities, such as sport, dancing, singing and nippers, as well as spending time with them informally at BBQs and by going to the park.

What young people like about the local area

Young people responded similarly to adult residents when asked the question about what they liked about the area. They indicated that they too like the beach, the parks and the close proximity to the shops in Maroubra Junction and South Maroubra Shopping Village.

The young people also liked the area because of “connectedness”. They were close to most of their friends and family, which they described as being important to them as the following quote highlights: “I'm close to my friends house, and um, close to everyone. And like the beach, shops and everything. And my nan and my aunties and everything”. This was not indicated nearly as strongly in the adult survey responses.

Considering the young people were quite connected to both SMOP and KKC, it was anticipated that they would describe the activities provided by both services as something they liked about the area, and this was the case. All of the young people interviewed had positive comments about the service providers themselves and about the activities in which they participated.

What young people dislike about the area

The young people fell into two groups when answering this question. The younger of those interviewed were concerned about “bad kids” in the area and about being bullied by those kids as is described below:

“There's lots of kids that swear and do naughty stuff. And they're like really naughty and do mean things to you.”

On the other hand, the older of the young people were concerned about the stigma of living in the
area, what adult residents thought of them, and how the police responded to them in a negative way.

“I don’t like it how just because we live in Lexo, people are like oh youse live in Lexo and youse are Lexo rats and all that.”

Both groups of young people were unhappy about the closure of The Shack Outreach Centre in Lexington Place.

**Ideas for change**

The young people had ideas about what sort of changes they would like to see in the area, although they did find this a hard question to answer. The changes they wanted to see included:

- improved facilities, for example, playground equipment in the parks like a climbing wall or a pool or water park, putt putt golf or basketball court,
- improve the look of the area, for example, cleaning the grafitti off the walls,
- provide more activities for young people, particularly organised games in the park like cricket, athletics or football,
- re-open the Shack Outreach Centre in Lexington Place,
- improve the behaviour of the adult residents living in the area.

**FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS WITH YOUNG PEOPLE IN SCHOOLS**

**AIM**

The aim of the third research project with young people was to include the voices of those young people living in both Maroubra and Matraville who did not access the two youth services where initial recruitment for interviews occurred. WFGU also wanted to include young people who fell within different age categories than those represented in the initial interviews - ranging from
years 5 and 6 in Primary School to years 7 to 12 in High School. This section of the research took place in September 2010.

**METHODOLOGY**

Initial discussions were held with the Principals of two schools drawing students from the WFGU research sites. It was agreed that focus group discussions would be the most useful way to elicit information from young people due to the ability of participants in a focus group to bounce ideas off one another which is not possible in a one-to-one conventional interview (Denscombe, 1999).

The focus group questions included what young people like and dislike about living in the area, with a particular emphasis on what is important to them and what they feel needs to change. Questions that were of particular interest to the principals were also included: what are student’s goals and aspirations for the future, and how can schools respond to ensure students achieve these goals.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**Primary School:**

One-off focus groups were held with the students in years 5 and 6 during their *Personal Development, Health and Physical Education* class time. All students were included so as not to stigmatise students living in social housing. Each focus group consisted of approximately six students and was facilitated by a member of the research team. The groups were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. Butchers paper will also be used to aid in the discussion.

**High School:**

One-off focus groups were held with all students from years 7 to 12 who live in either Mataville or South Maroubra. Students were not identified on the basis of whether or not they lived in social housing, but by the suburb that they live in to alleviate any stigma attached to participating in the research. The focus groups consisted of approximately six students and were facilitated by a
member of the research team. The groups were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. Butchers paper was used to aid in the discussion.

The research methodology received the Department of Education and Training approval via the State Education Research Approval Process (SERAP).

**Young People who participated in the Focus Groups:**
A total of 49 young people participated in the focus groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Matraville</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Maroubra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in suburb nearby</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(only recruited from the 2 suburbs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in two homes, at least one of which was Matraville or Maroubra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

**Top 5 Things Primary Students Like About Living in the Area:**

1. People in the area
2. Friends
3. School
4. Shops
5. Parks

“People are ‘heaps nice’”

“All the people are friendly”

“All my neighbours are nice”

“My friends and having them close to me”

In contrast to the household survey and interviews with teenagers, the primary school students did not identify ‘the beach’ as an aspect of the area that they liked. When questioned about this, many of the primary school students said they found the beach ‘scary’, because of sharks, rips, or because they could not swim.

**TOP 5 THINGS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS LIKE ABOUT LIVING IN THE AREA:**

1. The beach
2. Good public transport and proximity to the city/airport
3. Shops
4. Parks, especially the skate park at Maroubra
5. Neighbours

**TOP 5 THINGS PRIMARY STUDENTS DON’T LIKE ABOUT THE AREA:**

1. Noise – especially outside houses and late at night
2. Violence against people or property
3. Graffiti
4. Rubbish
5. Busy streets and subsequent difficulties in crossing busy roads

“I hate People screaming at night”

“I hate people fighting”

“People drag race in the street”
Teens are smashing bottles in the park. Egging people’s houses and vandalising things. Teenagers bullying old people and young kids.

Top 5 Things High School Students Don’t Like About the Area:

1. The environment, particularly the look of suburbs and the shopping centre at Lexington Place.
2. Drugs and alcohol
3. Crime and vandalism
4. Bad schools
5. They don’t feel safe at night

Things Youths Do In and Out of School:

Primary Students were involved in a range of activities at school and out of school:

- AFL, Soccer, Rugby, netball, Nippers, tennis and gymnastics, language classes, Brownies and cubs, dancing, Oztag, Touch.
- Some participated in sports which were not necessarily organised like surfing, skateboarding and riding bikes.
- Some mentioned swimming at the pool, the beach and having swimming lessons.

High School students had ‘dropped’ the organised sports & other organised activities they had been involved in primary school:

- Many said they were bored.
- They went to friends’ houses, hung around the area, some played informal sport – eg soccer at Hampton Park
• Did not go to the movies often as it is too expensive
• Only 2 high school students had part-time jobs
• Sports and extracurricular activities at school are limited
• Many supported local football teams – the Roosters and CDFC.

PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE (FROM PRIMARY STUDENTS):
• Fix up the playgrounds and the parks
• Provide more local jobs
• More activities for teenagers
• Make the roads safer
• Help and support for the homeless
• Stop domestic violence and neighbours fighting
• Extend services like Nippers and Kool Kids
• More sporting teams & sports clinics
• More community events

PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE (HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS)
• A place for young people and more free activities for young people.
• Improve the environment: fix up the streetscapes, parks, playgrounds, the school buildings
• Free bus passes for all students (to get to TAFE, to travel on the weekend, to get to school).
• More part-time work opportunities.

GOALS AND ASPIRATIONS
As discussed above, the focus groups included questions about students’ goals and aspirations for the future, and suggestions about how the school could respond to ensure students achieve these goals. These responses are relevant to groups and organisations outside the school, as some of the suggestions relate to how the community can assist children and young people achieve their goals.
CAREER ASPIRATIONS MENTIONED BY PRIMARY STUDENTS INCLUDED:
Pre-school teacher, School principal, Journalist, Pet shop owner, Vet, Petrol station owner, Actor, Join the Army/ Airforce, Professional sports person: netball, volley ball, soccer, rugby union, rugby league.

ASSISTANCE FROM THE SCHOOL OR COMMUNITY TO HELP PRIMARY STUDENTS TO ACHIEVE THEIR ASPIRATIONS:
Analysis of responses suggested that the primary school students needed more Information about pathways from school to work, particularly about TAFE and University.

The primary students made the following suggestions:
- A chance to be ‘principal for the day’
- Have a pet day & have a vet to come in to talk
- More books in the library about different careers
- Ask professional sports people to speak at school
- Have drama classes at school
- Provide more computer lessons
- More opportunities to be decision-makers

CAREER ASPIRATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS:
Sports professionals, Forensic scientists, Zoologist, Real estate agent, Building and carpentry trades, Nutritionist, ‘Go to uni’– science, medicine, journalism, vet science, Creative Arts/Music professions.

ASSISTANCE FROM THE SCHOOL OR COMMUNITY TO HELP HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ACHIEVE THEIR ASPIRATIONS:
- Help establishing good ‘connections’ to help them find work.
- Scholarships in order to participate in higher level sports development.
- Better access to advice about careers (the inadequacy of school career advisor system was highlighted by many students)
- Career mentors for students to assist them reach their goals.

FEEDBACK TO THE SCHOOLS, YOUNG PEOPLE AND SERVICE PROVIDERS:
A feedback session to the primary school students and teachers on the results of the focus groups was held in late 2010. Students and Teachers provided further comments on the results, mainly
reconfirming that the findings reflected their views, but also discussing strategies for further action in and out of school.

The findings of the high school focus groups have been sent to the principal, for distribution to the students.

The findings of the primary and high school focus groups have been presented for discussion to workers in the Matraville and Maroubra area at a Youth Roundtable.
5. ENGAGING SERVICE PROVIDERS

MAPPING SERVICE PROVISION

An extensive mapping exercise of service providers who are located in, or outreach to, the two research areas was undertaken. Contact details of these service providers were captured in an Excel document and used as the basis for future contact and subsequent interviews with local service providers. The list was distributed to WFGU Advisory Group members who were asked to “fill in the gaps” where they identified service providers who they knew were missing from the list.

LETTERS OF INTRODUCTION

Once local service providers working in the area were known, a letter of introduction outlining the research and its aims was sent out. All organisations were invited to contact the research team if they wished to be part of the research in any way or to start the process of working together.

KEY INFORMANT MEETINGS

Meetings were held with a number of key stakeholder service providers working in the two areas. The meetings provided an opportunity for the researchers to gain an understanding about each organisation. The researchers asked service providers about:

- the nature of their service,
- their target group,
- the client eligibility for service,
- the nature of contact they have with social housing residents in Coral Sea and Soldiers Settlement housing estates,
- their perceptions of the areas of need or development in Maroubra and Matraville,
- their perceptions of major issues or key needs of social housing residents,
- their perceptions of interagency/intersectoral and partnership work,
Their perceptions of service user involvement, consumer participation, consumer consultation, and
Information about their contact with resident groups.
The meetings also provided an opportunity for the research team to present initial findings from
the household survey and gave organisations the chance to respond to the issues raised in the
survey. A list of all the service providers WFGU consulted in Phase One is included in the
Appendices.

SERVICE PROVIDER FEEDBACK SESSIONS

In addition to the individual meetings held with service providers and local organisations, four
formalised feedback sessions were held where non government organisations (NGOs), local
schools, health and housing workers were invited to hear feedback about the household survey
and to also contribute to the research by providing their ideas on areas of priority and need for
their clients/school community. The sessions were held in late September to November 2009 at
various times and venues according to the group invited.

- The first session was held with Housing Staff at the Maroubra Housing Office in September
  2009.
- **Service providers**: all service providers working in the local area across government and
  non-government organisations were invited to a session at the Cottage, Matraville.
- **Schools**: staff at all primary and secondary schools (including government, private and
  catholic schools) were invited to a session at the Sands Hotel, Maroubra.
- **South Eastern Sydney and Illawarra Area Health Service (SESIAHS)**: Health Promotion and
  related staff were invited to attend a session at the Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick.

The key issues raised by service providers through meetings and feedback sessions are outlined
below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key area</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Young people and crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young people versus older people and the lack of trust between</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Falls prevention and health in older people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of support for residents experiencing mental health concerns/illness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents facing drug and alcohol issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime and safety</th>
<th>Graffiti around the local area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young people and crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Violence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Racism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues for CALD communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability of the research</th>
<th>Sustainability? What do we leave the community with at the end of the Australian Research Council (ARC) project contract?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>After the loss of Eastside Advocacy Service residents are feeling the strain and require something to address that need.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Service providers identified priorities for action which are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Priority Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Find ways to assist the most disadvantaged young people who are at high levels of risk. More activities for young people. Photovoice project for young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Aim to improve the skills of the community leaders. Empowerment of residents is a key goal. Community needs to know it can be involved through engagement and participatory democracy. Residents need to know their rights and have the skills for community democracy to work. Northcott in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sydney have a great model to follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Run a program for young people at risk through schools or establish other parenting programs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative work practices</td>
<td>May see more opportunities for community development with Housing workers as their roles change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect up with the Aboriginal Health workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“People need assistance to make changes, but all the agencies need to work together, for example, Health, Housing, Local Government and youth workers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Local community based projects looking at the high need areas, for example, mental health, drug and alcohol issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy projects around mental illness and accommodation needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SERVICE PROVIDER SURVEY**

**AIM**

A service provider survey was developed in an attempt to achieve an understanding of the collaborative practices of local services, their response to the local environment and their thoughts about working in the two local areas. WFGU was also interested in gaining an understanding of worker perspectives on what sorts of things needed to change in the area – for both residents and workers.

**METHODODOLOGY**

A survey based on that implemented in the households across the two estates was developed. The survey hoped to capture service providers’ sense of belonging in the community, as well as their perceptions of the community and the local service environment. As such, the Buckner Scale statements used in the household resident survey were modified as questions for service providers and contained a list of 18 statements about working in Maroubra and Matraville and for each one, participants were asked to indicate if they; strongly agreed, agreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Examples of the statements included were:

- I feel like I belong as a worker in this area,
- The relationships I have with other workers in the area mean a lot to me and my work,
- If I needed advice about something I could go to another service provider in the area,
- I think I agree with most service providers in the area about what is important, and
- I would be willing to work together with other service providers on something to improve the area.

Participants were then asked to describe what they like and dislike about working in the local service environment, what they would like to see changed in the local service environment, and suggestions about how these changes might be brought about. Participants were then asked the same qualitative questions about the actual locality. This involved the repetition of very similar
questions and in the analysis stage it became clear that survey respondents felt that they had ‘already answered’ many of the questions. As a result, many respondents did not complete the set of questions on the locality, having answered the questions on the perceptions of the service environment. A number of demographic questions about the participant’s work circumstances were also included.

IMPLEMENTATION

The survey was sent to all service providers who worked in the local area and were listed in the service provider map created at the start of the project. Participants were invited to pass the survey on to other workers they knew in the area. WFGU Advisory Group members also distributed the survey to their colleagues who they knew worked in Maroubra and Matraville. It was made clear to participants that the survey was anonymous, and they were not asked to provide any information that would allow themselves or the organisation they worked for to be identified. Participants were asked to answer the survey from their own perspective which may or may not have reflected the views of their organisation.

PEOPLE WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE SERVICE PROVIDER SURVEY:

There were 24 respondents from 18 service organisations.
Participants included service providers from hospitals and health centres; local, state and non-government agencies; and community and neighbourhood centres.
Service providers experience working in the area ranged from 6 months to 10 years.

FINDINGS

SOCIAL COHESION:

Overall, the findings indicate that most service providers in the area were very willing to work with others to improve the area and many service providers have a sense of belonging to the area and perceive service provider relationships as supportive. There was less consensus about the extent to which relationships between service providers could be characterised in terms of ‘loyalty’ and ‘friendliness’. In addition, the questions that related to plans to continuing working in the area reflected the possibility of changes in employment. Both of these latter points reflect the key differences involved in identifying with a ‘worker’ community and a ‘resident community’.
### SOCIAL COHESION – RESPONSES TO BUCKNER STATEMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall I am very attracted to working in this area</td>
<td>Many agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel like I belong, as a worker, in this area.</td>
<td>Many agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I visit other service providers in their offices.</td>
<td>Most agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The relationships I have with other workers in the area mean a lot to me and my work.</td>
<td>Many agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Given the opportunity, I would like to leave this area and work somewhere else.</td>
<td>Many neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If service providers in this area were planning something I’d think of it as something we were doing rather than something “they” were doing.</td>
<td>Many agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If I needed advice about something I could go to another service provider in the area.</td>
<td>Most agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I think I agree with most service providers in the area about what is important.</td>
<td>Most agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe that other service providers would help me in an emergency.</td>
<td>Most agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel loyal to the service providers in the area.</td>
<td>Many not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I get support from other service providers.</td>
<td>Most agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would be willing to work together with other service providers on something to improve the area.</td>
<td>Most strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I plan to continue to work in this area for a number of years.</td>
<td>Half strongly agree, Half not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I like to think of myself as similar to other workers in the area.</td>
<td>Many agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I rarely invite service providers in the area to my office to meet.</td>
<td>Many disagree Some agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A strong feeling of friendliness exists amongst service providers in the area.</td>
<td>Many neither agree or disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I regularly chat to workers from other services in the area.</td>
<td>Most agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Working in this area gives me a sense of attachment or commitment to the area.</td>
<td>Many agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITATIVE DATA ON WORKING IN THE NEIGHBOURHOODS

THE TOP FIVE THINGS SERVICE PROVIDERS LIKED ABOUT THE AREA:

1. SHOPS

“Good shopping centres”
“Lots of shops”
“Variety of little eateries/coffee shops”

2. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

“Proximity to beaches even though we don’t use it much”
“Nice looking area- lots of trees”
“Temperature and the climate of the area”

3. TRANSPORT

“Ability to drive and park at work”
“Easy roads to drive on”
“Good transport”

4. THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

“Strong sense of community and commitment of residents to improve the area.”
“Cultural diversity”
“Multicultural people”
“Diverse and multicultural population”

5. LOCAL SERVICES

“Staff and service providers in the area”
“A good proportion of service providers serving the community, with a strong commitment to improve the area”
TOP THREE THINGS SERVICE PROVIDERS DISLIKED ABOUT THE AREA & SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE:

1. STATE OF HOUSING AND ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

   “Large areas of Department of Housing”
   “Department of Housing requirements for clients”
   “The condition of many of the Housing NSW properties”
   “Unkempt property”
   “Lack of affordable housing”

   SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE:
   “Better distribution of Department of Housing complexes”
   “More consistent guidelines for housing clients in relation to home modifications”
   “Housing NSW to improve their properties and to maintain the common gardens”
   “Some attempt to ensure affordable rental other than Housing NSW”

2. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ISSUES

   “Busy traffic during peak hour”
   “Difficult to get up and down Randwick City”
   “Parking tickets”
   “Cost of buses”
   “No train between the south and this area”

   SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE
   “Better and more direct transport to south” (St George/Sutherland Shire)
   “Speed cameras in school zones”
3. CRIME AND SAFETY

“Pubs and gambling venues and associated alcohol related violence”

“Crime”

“Violence, unsafe areas, police ridden, thefts”

“Lack of respect for people and property”

“Uncontrolled children”

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

“Shorter hotel trading hours”

“More positive police interaction with services and community”

QUALITATIVE RESPONSES ABOUT THE LOCAL SERVICE ENVIRONMENT

Services providers identified a number of issues as priorities for change in the local service environment. These included: funding arrangements; developing partnerships and collaboration between services; enhanced community involvement and participation; and increased government leadership.

1. FUNDING:

ISSUES

“Lack of funding and long waiting lists for services”

“This area is seen as affluent but has extreme areas of disadvantage which are ignored and not adequately funded”

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

“Equity in the distribution of funds and resources to service providers in the area”

“More access to services, more funding for equipment”

“Improved service delivery in the South Ward”

“Great need for family support worker to be employed at Koolora”

“Funding from DOCS needs to be increased to the neighbourhood centres.”
2. **Partnerships and Collaboration:**

**Issues**

“Services can be territorial and obstructive to collaboration.”

“Although we talk about partnership, there seems to be little joint projects”

“Getting agencies to work more effectively and of course funding”

“Sometimes service providers have been in the community for so long that they think they own the people and the place. Not healthy and not constructive for community development”

**Suggestions for Change**

“More service collaboration”

“The service providers need to work more closely together. Better use of resources, better planning. A community development interagency would be good. In this community it needs to be chaired independently”

“More interagency projects”

“DOH and Police to be in the mix”

“Joint ventures between a variety of agencies, services providers etc”

“Organising a project that could include a few services within the area”

“Service Providers to meet regularly”

3. **Enhanced Community Participation:**

**Issues**

“Token consultation ... lack of sustainability”

“DOCS reviews are tokenistic and meaningless for CSGP funding” (community services grants program)

**Suggestions for Change**

“More community minded DOH”

“Community involvement, community activities – gardens, joint projects with recycling and sustainability”

“Active multicultural community involvement”

“More of a link with the community”
“More of community involvement type programs”

“Consultation – using models that work – e.g. Northcott project, art, music, sense of belonging, harmony project, gratitude and kindness”

“Assessment of the needs of the community then prioritise what is best”

“Council and governments start listening to community services about what is happening to the less fortunate and not just coming in and deciding what we need”

4. LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP:

A number of service providers suggested that local government had a role to play in enhancing the local service provision environment:

“Maybe local council could support this process to begin with”

“Randwick Council leadership”

“Randwick Council could discuss these issues with the people on local election day”

QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS WITH HOUSING WORKERS

Through regular meetings with staff at the Maroubra Housing Office, it became clear that the client services team were undertaking capacity building and community development projects with local residents that were not captured in the research data sets. In order to document these local initiatives, interviews were held with Maroubra Housing staff. The interviews will be undertaken every six months to capture and document changes in the two local areas. The first set of interviews has been held and analysis is being undertaken.
6. ENGAGING LOCAL BUSINESSES

In addition to making contact with residents, the research team have also contacted the key local businesses in the area to let them know about the project and invite them to participate. The shopping centres at South Maroubra, Lexington Place and Duffy’s Corner are the local shops used by residents in the neighbourhoods and retailers are assisting the project through the distribution of information and marketing of events. The proprietor of the Sands Hotel at South Maroubra has supported the project through provision of a venue for community meetings and participation in feedback sessions. The WFGU team is pleased at the level of community support and involvement and will continue to encourage community participation in the project.
### Future Directions

#### Priorities for Action

The following table outlines the priorities for action which were identified at the completion of Phase One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority for action</th>
<th>Potential projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More support for residents</strong></td>
<td>Basic computer classes for older people which are linked to employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved support for people with mental health disorders and illness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gentle exercise for elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved support for people with drug and alcohol dependency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural, educational and social supports for CALD residents with few supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports for Aboriginal women and children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot advocacy project for residents with health and mental health concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English classes for elderly residents which are related to employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities for children and young people</strong></td>
<td>Activities, for example, cooking, art, performing art or music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graffiti Wall project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local support programs and workshops for young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local coordination of supports for young people at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies for creating safe places for children and young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playgroup in the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance and relationship with Housing</strong></td>
<td>New approaches to tenant feedback about standards of maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breaking down barriers between Housing and tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local pilot service improvement project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New models for resident participation with local office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less crime and vandalism</strong></td>
<td>Community Safety Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved amenities to reduce crime, for example, upgrading fencing and lighting in the flat entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Options for decreasing crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved parks and public spaces</strong></td>
<td>Child-friendly play areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean-up campaigns, for example the provision of skip bins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building a playground in Matraville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More community events and activities</strong></td>
<td>Knitting, recipe swap, craft or reading groups for older people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start a food co-op.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal discussion groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low cost resident outings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Improve education by engaging with governments and politicians, for example, improve opportunities for volunteer training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information day or educational project for mums with young children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach conflict resolution and mediation skills for dealing with difficult people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHASE TWO: DEVELOPING AND TRIALLING COMMUNITY BASED INITIATIVES**

Based on the evidence gathered in phase one of the research, local community based initiatives are being developed and trialled in both the areas of Maroubra and Matraville. Particular focus will be on the following target groups:

- elderly residents,
- young people,
- people living with a mental illness/health concerns,
- young families,
- Indigenous families, and
- residents from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse backgrounds.

The development of these community projects will be documented and reported in the Phase Two Report. The second household survey will be undertaken in 2011.
NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

The WFGU team have also engaged with service providers from further afield through attending and presenting at various conferences. These include:


Baldry, E 2010, 'Crime Free Housing' Sydney Institute of Criminology Seminar, University of NSW, Kensington, NSW, Australia.
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APPENDIX 1: SEIFA INDEX

SEIFA (Socio-economic Indexes for Areas) is a suite of indexes that ranks geographic areas across Australia in terms of their socio-economic characteristics. The SEIFA indexes are created by combining information collected in the five-yearly Census of Population and Housing (called the Census throughout this paper). There are four different indexes, each representing a slightly different concept. These concepts are abstract and difficult to measure, so the indexes aim to capture these abstract concepts by combining information that is related to the concept. For example, the Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage uses information such as low income and low education as markers of relative socio-economic disadvantage.

The SEIFA indexes are rankings. Each index ranks different geographic areas of Australia according to a 'score' that is created for the area based on characteristics of people, families and dwellings within that area.

For all of the indexes, relative disadvantage is associated with a low number.

The four indexes in SEIFA 2006 are:

- **Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage**: focuses primarily on disadvantage, and is derived from Census variables like low income, low educational attainment, unemployment, and dwellings without motor vehicles.

- **Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage**: is a continuum of advantage (high values) to disadvantage (low values), and is derived from Census variables related to both advantage and disadvantage.

- **Index of Economic Resources**: focuses on financial aspects of advantage and disadvantage, using Census variables relating to residents' incomes, housing expenditure and assets.

- **Index of Education and Occupation**: includes Census variables relating to the educational attainment, employment and vocational skills.

Source:


Fourteen different disadvantage factors were measured for each of 647 postcode areas in Victoria and 587 postcodes areas in New South Wales. The factors measured:

- Unemployment,
- Long Term Unemployment,
- Low Income,
- Early School Leaving,
- Non-completion of Year 12 schooling,
- Unskilled Workers,
- Low Birth Weight,
- Confirmed Cases of Child Abuse,
- Psychiatric Hospital Admission,
- Criminal Offence Convictions,
- Serious Child Injuries, Imprisonment,
- Mortality, and
- Disability Support Pension or Sickness Benefits.

According to this measurement of disadvantage, the local government areas of Maroubra and Matraville scored in the following way:

- Maroubra (Post code: 2035), quintile score 14 (NSW),
- Matraville (Postcode: 2034), quintile score 13 (NSW).

Appendix 3: Letter to Service Providers

Dear Service Provider,

We are writing to introduce you to a new research project; Working From the Ground Up: a participatory approach to community regeneration in social housing neighbourhoods. The research project, funded by the Australian Research Council, will be run by staff and students from the University of Sydney and the University of New South Wales. The project’s collaborating partners include: Central Sydney Housing Services Division (Housing NSW), TAFE, (Department of Employment Education and Training) and the South Eastern Area Health Service (NSW Health).

Working from the Ground Up aims to work with residents, partner organisations, and local services to develop initiatives and explore approaches which are successful in ameliorating disadvantage in social housing areas. It also aims to produce new information towards meeting the challenges of urban renewal and community renewal in these social housing neighbourhoods. Two areas will be the focus of the research: the Coral Sea Neighbourhood in Matraville and Soldier’s Settlement in Maroubra. From February 2009, two part-time project workers will be based at ‘the cottage’ (in Somme Way) and the Shack Outreach Centre (in Lexington place).

The project will run until December 2012 and will utilise an action research approach to identify, trial, and evaluate community renewal interventions in these two neighbourhoods. We anticipate that during various stages of the project we will have contact with your service, either to gain your input or advice, or to let you know of new initiatives being implemented.

If you would like any further information at this stage, please feel free to contact the project team on Ph: 9351 6434, mb: 0434 545 756, email: participation@edfac.usyd.edu.au or you can visit the project’s website: http://www-faculty.edfac.usyd.edu.au/projects/wfgu/

We look forward to working with you in the future.

Warmest Regards,

Cherie Toivonen
Senior Research Officer
Faculty of Education and Social Work
The University of Sydney NSW 2006
APPENDIX 4: WFGU INITIAL INTRODUCTORY FLYER TEXT

Working from the Ground Up: What is this project about?

Who are we? We are a group of researchers and students from the University of Sydney.

What will we be doing? We would like to work with residents in Maroubra and Matraville to:

- Find out what is important to you.
- Find the best ways to support you to reach your goals.
- Find the best ways to measure changes in your community.

We will also document what we find so it can be used to help people in other areas to do similar work.

What is our approach?

We believe that:

- The best way to support residents is to work with them.
- Residents are the experts in their neighbourhoods.
- All residents should have a say.

What will happen first? We will talk to as many of you as we can in the coming months about your lives in Maroubra and Matraville, and what you want to see happen in your community.

What happens after that? We will work with you to do things like:

- Hold activities and events.
- Encourage residents to work together.
- Seek new social services.
- Keep discussing new ideas and possibilities.

Who is running the project? The project is a partnership between:

- The University of Sydney.
- The University of New South Wales.
- NSW TAFE.
- NSW Health.
- Housing NSW.

Who else will be involved? We want to work with as many people and organisations as possible. We are keen to work with anyone who wants to help make sure that Maroubra and Matraville are great places to live.

How can we be contacted? You can contact us via email at participation@edfac.usyd.edu.au or via the telephone on 02 9351 6434.
RESIDENT SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

Hello. I’m .......... and I’m working with the University of Sydney and University of New South Wales Working From the Ground Up project team on the Estate. You’ve probably received a letter about the project. (Explain through Participant Information Sheet and Flyer).

Your unit has been selected at random to participate in our survey. All the information will be kept confidential by the University project team. You do not need to tell us your name. If we could have about 20 minutes of your time to answer a few questions that would greatly assist us in our work.

(yes to this =consent)

PART 1: NEIGHBOURHOOD

I’m going to read a list of statements to you and for each one I’d like you to say how strongly you agree or disagree with it. The instructions are on this card (PRESENT CARD ‘A’). If you strongly agree then say “STRONGLY AGREE”; if you simply agree with the statement then say “AGREE”, and so on down to “STRONGLY DISAGREE”. I’d appreciate, wherever possible, if you’d only use the middle one “NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE” when you really can’t decide.

QUESTION 1: First I’m going to ask you some questions about your neighbourhood.

(prompt only if necessary; ‘NEIGHBOURHOOD’= the local area you live in)

(prompt only if necessary; ‘NEIGHBOURS’= the people who live around you in your neighbourhood, not just next door)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I visit my neighbours in their homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Given the opportunity, I would like to move out of this neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I’d think of it as something “we” were doing rather than something “they” were doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I borrow things from my neighbours.

12. I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood.

13. I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years.

14. I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood.

15. I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit.

16. A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood.

17. I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood.

18. Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community.

**QUESTION 2:** Now for some questions about safety and maintenance on the estate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I’m alone at home during the night I feel safe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the night.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The buildings and grounds in this neighbourhood are very well maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there anything else you would like to add here?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3

We would like to know the things you like and dislike about your area.

(i) First the things you like:

(ii) Now the things you dislike:

(iii) What things would you like to see change in your area?

(iv) What suggestions do you have about how these changes might be brought about?
PART 3: BACKGROUND DETAILS

Before I finish, I need a few details about you and your household to help us put together the total picture. Just to say it again, these details are confidential and will only be used for statistical purposes:

1. First, in which country were you born? ..............................................................

(IF OVERSEAS) What year did you come to Australia? .............

(IF AUSTRALIA)

2. Are you an Australian Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?     ☐Yes ☐No

3. How long have you lived in Matraville/Maroubra? ............ years ..........months

4. How many people live in your home? .......... people

5. Which of the categories on this card best describes your household? No..........  

(HAND OVER CARD ‘B’ – POINT TO CATEGORY)

6. Which of the age groups on this card are you in? No.......... 

(POINT TO CATEGORIES ON BOTTOM OF CARD ‘C’) 

7. Would you like to receive an invitation to an event where we will provide feedback about the results of this survey?

8. Are there any other ways you would like to be involved in the project?

9. INTERVIEWER TO NOTE GENDER  Male   Female

Thank you very much for time. If you have any questions about the survey after we leave you are welcome to ring any member of the research team (our details are in the introductory letter)
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR RESIDENTS

PROMPT QUESTIONS

1. What are the most positive things about your community and where you live?

2. What are the things you would like to see changed?

3. What sorts of services do you use?

4. Are there gaps in the services provided?

5. Would you be interested in becoming involved in this project?

6. What is your vision of your community in ten years?
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE GUIDE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

- What do you like about living here?
- What do you dislike about living here?
- What kind of things would you want to change in this area?
- What kind of activities do you have here?
- What kind of activities and services would you like to participate in here?
# Appendix 8: Pro Forma: Meetings with Service Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Service:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility for Services:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact with Public Housing Residents?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CORAL SEA?

SOLIDER SETTLEMENT?

PERCEPTIONS OF AREAS OF NEED OR DEVELOPMENT IN MAROUBRA/MATRAVILLE?

PERCEPTIONS OF MAJOR ISSUES OR KEY NEEDS OF PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS:

WHO ARE THE KEY ORGANISATIONS/INDIVIDUALS’ SERVICE PROVIDERS INVOLVED WITH YOUR TARGET GROUP?

INTERAGENCY/INTERSECTORAL AND PARTNERSHIP WORK:

WHICH ORGANISATIONS AND AGENCIES DO YOU WORK MOST CLOSELY WITH?

SERVICE USER INVOLVEMENT
CONSUMER PARTICIPATION?

DESCRIBE

CONSUMER CONSULTATION?

DESCRIBE

CONTACT WITH RESIDENT GROUPS?

WFGU:

WOULD LIKE TO BE INVOLVED IN WFGU ACTIVITIES OR PROJECTS IN THE FUTURE?
APPENDIX 9: SERVICE PROVIDER SURVEY

WORKING FROM THE GROUND UP: A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH TO COMMUNITY REGENERATION IN SOCIAL HOUSING NEIGHBOURHOODS

PRACTITIONER SURVEY

THE PROJECT

WFGU is a five year study funded by the Australian Research Council which is being conducted by the University of Sydney and the University of New South Wales in partnership with; Housing NSW, South East Sydney Illawarra Area Health Service (Health NSW), and TAFE NSW.

The project aims to tackle the issue of entrenched social exclusion and disadvantage in social housing neighbourhoods in Maroubra and Matraville, NSW. The research will identify and trial ways of working with communities that can bring about sustainable changes in social housing estates using an action research approach. It aims to generate new knowledge and models of community regeneration. In addition, tools will be developed that will gauge the impact of these initiatives as they will identify changes in; social networks, resident participation, social disadvantage, social cohesion, and service partnership strengths.

It is anticipated that the project will create opportunities for residents to actively participate in their communities and that partnerships will be developed between the communities and relevant government, non government, and private organisations, as well as business. It is hoped that these changes will enhance health and wellbeing and increase education and training opportunities for residents.

PRACTITIONER SURVEY

You have been chosen to complete this survey as you work in the local area. The survey attempts to gain an understanding of service provision in Maroubra and Matraville.

Participation in the survey is voluntary and you may discontinue at any time.

This survey is anonymous, and you are not asked to provide any information that would allow you to be identified as an individual or for your organisation to be identified.

We ask that you answer this survey from your own perspective. This may or may not reflect the views of your agency/service/organisation.

Would you be happy to complete the survey? (yes =consent)
**Question 1:** This is a list of statements about working in Maroubra and Matraville and for each one I would like you to indicate if you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree or strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall I am very attracted to working in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel like I belong, as a worker, in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I visit other service providers in their offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The relationships I have with other workers in the area mean a lot to me, and my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Given the opportunity, I would like to leave this area and work elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If service providers in this area were planning something I’d think of it as something “we” were doing rather than something “they” were doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If I needed advice about something I could go to another service provider in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I think I agree with most service providers in the area about what is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe that other service providers would help me in an emergency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel loyal to the service providers in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I get support from other service providers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I would be willing to work together with other service providers on something to improve the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I plan to continue to work in this area for a number of years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I like to think of myself as similar to other workers in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I rarely invite service providers in the area to my office to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>A strong feeling of friendliness exists amongst service providers in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I regularly chat to workers from other services in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Working in this area gives me a sense of attachment or commitment to the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: We would like to know the things you like and dislike about the local service environment

(i) First the things you like:

(ii) Now the things you dislike:

(iii) What things would you like to see change in the local service environment?

(iv) What suggestions do you have about how these changes might be brought about?
Question 3: We would like to know the things you like and dislike about the area.

(iii) First the things you like:

(iv) Now the things you dislike:

(iii) What things would you like to see change in the area?

(iv) What suggestions do you have about how these changes might be brought about?
PART 3: BACKGROUND DETAILS

We would like to collect a few broad details about you and your organisation to help us put together the total picture. These details are confidential and will only be used so as not to identify you or your organisation.

1. What type of organisation do you work for? ..........................................................

2. How long have you worked in your current position? ..............................................

3. How long have you worked in Matraville/Maroubra? ..............................................

4. Do you live in the local area? ...................................................................................

5. Please describe your role..........................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................

6. Is your position: paid ☐ voluntary ☐ other (please describe) ☐

7. What is your professional background (and if appropriate your qualifications)............

...........................................................................................................................................

8. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

Thank you very much for time. If you have any questions about the survey, please feel free to ring the WFGU team on 02 9351 6434 or 0434 545 756 or contact us via email: participation@edfac.usyd.edu.au
APPENDIX 10: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HOUSING STAFF

WORKING FROM THE GROUND UP: A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH TO COMMUNITY REGENERATION IN SOCIAL HOUSING NEIGHBOURHOODS

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SERVICE PROVIDERS

PROMPT QUESTIONS

1. What contact do you currently have with residents?

2. What services/activities do you provide to residents?

3. What do you see as the strengths of residents living in the community?

4. What are the priorities for you as a service provider?

5. What are the service/program gaps?

6. What ways have you found useful to encourage residents to become more involved in the life of the community?

7. Can you give us one example of your work with the residents that you think worked well?
APPENDIX 11: LIST OF SERVICE PROVIDERS

Below is a list of service providers and organisations informed about the project via key informant meetings, and survey feedback sessions.

- NSW Department of Community Services:
- NSW Department of Corrective Services
- Maroubra Police – Eastern Beaches Local Area Command
- Randwick Council
- The Shack Youth Services
- SESIAHS Mental Health Services
- SESIAHS Community Health Services
- The Junction Neighbourhood Centre
- Sydney Multicultural Services
- Randwick Waverly Community Transport
- Kooloora Community Centre
- Ted Noffs Foundation
- Kingsford Legal Service
- Bridge Housing Limited
- Aboriginal Housing Office
- Better Futures Project
- Centrelink
- South Sydney High School
- Soldiers Settlement Social School
- Schools as Communities, Maroubra Bay Social School
- Matraville High School