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Abstract
The aim of this study is to understand how New Zealand SSCOs successfully advocate for decreasing the negative effects of the determinants of health, as they affect marginalised communities. Community organisations influence the social and political environment, and advocate for the most marginalised communities. However, advocacy in the community sector is not well understood, and this may disproportionately affect groups like the resource poor because community groups are one of their primary advocates. If advocacy is limited in the SSCO sector, marginalised groups may not ever be heard.

In light of this gap, a case study is used to explore advocacy in the social service community organisation (SSCO) sector in New Zealand. Armstrong and Bernstein’s New Social Movement Alternative (NSM-A) and selected concepts from Bourdieu’s field theory are applied to a single case study design with one embedded unit of analysis. Results from the larger case study of the community sector in New Zealand was drawn from 42 key informants, and 33 of the 42 interviews combined with a documentary analysis informed the embedded unit of analysis, the Family Centre.

Results indicate that the SSCO sector in New Zealand directly serves the needs of communities with complex needs. SSCOs in New Zealand use multiple strategies when they advocate and the nature of advocacy in the SSCO field, like all fields, is marked by power, which influences how they engage in advocacy. The most successful, or “dominant”, SSCOs are those that have credibility, a stable resource-level and a mission that corresponds with the policy or public agenda. Managing four relationships— with government, other community groups, the community and media—is important for increasing the success of SSCO advocacy.

Three primary characteristics of successful organisations are a key finding of this research, which are all linked to SSCOs managing relationships effectively. First, influential community groups are in “dominant” positions within their fields. Second,
effective organisations seek to influence multiple institutions. Third, successful groups manage relationships in two ways: they use credibility in one field to gain credibility in another \textit{and} they bring together individuals from different fields.

There are implications in three areas: practical, policy, and future research. Practical implications include recommendations for groups to move into a dominant position within their primary field, gain membership in multiple fields, and manage relationships in the ways described above. Policy implications are twofold; first, there are suggestions for clearer guidelines on advocacy from the New Zealand Charities Commission and second, a holistic approach to the community-government relationship is recommended. Five recommendations for future research are made. First, a relational theory is suggested and theoretical developments from this research are discussed. Second, an understanding how different subfields advocate is recommended. Third, more knowledge on indigenous organisations is needed. Fourth, more knowledge on Pacific organisations is also needed. Fifth, more research should be undertaken to understand what happens to the community voice in the process of advocacy.

Overall, it appears that gaining credibility and managing relationships effectively are key factors in predicting the success of SSCOs. These findings contribute to the limited amount of research on advocacy in community organisations and provide the foundations for developing a relational theoretical approach. It is hoped that these findings will increase practitioners, policy-makers, researchers, and public health advocates understanding about the social service community sector and the centrality of SSCO advocacy in improving the health of marginalised groups.
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Chapter 1
Introduction: Community organisations influencing the determinants of health

This research explores how social service community organisations (SSCOs) in New Zealand effectively advocate for improvements in the social and economic determinants of health, as they negatively affect marginalised communities. Four research questions guide this exploration, which are found in Figure 1-1. The first questions in each of the four sections of Figure 1-1 consider the larger SSCO sector in New Zealand and the second are used to investigate the Family Centre, an SSCO in New Zealand.

Figure 1-1: Sub-research questions

1. • What is the New Zealand SSCO sector?  
   • What is the Family Centre

2. • How do New Zealand SSCOs advocate?  
   • How does the Family Centre advocate?

3. • How do New Zealand SSCOs advocate effectively?  
   • How does the Family Centre advocate effectively?

4. • How are relationships managed to facilitate effective advocacy?  
   • How are relationships managed to facilitate effective advocacy in the Family Centre?

Each of these research questions is addressed in the literature reviews and the analysis of the results, in ways that are discussed below.

This exploration is conducted because community organisations play a vital role in shaping the social and political environment (Berry, 2005; Boris & Mosher-Williams, 1998; Carey & Barunack-Mayer, 2009; Frumkin, 2002; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Najam,
and they are one of the few groups that advocate for the most marginalised communities (Berry & Arons, 2003). If the advocacy activities of community organisations are limited or misunderstood then their ability to advocate may be affected, which could disproportionately have negative impacts on the most marginalised communities in society because they will have lost a primary advocacy outlet (Berry & Arons, 2003).

Based on a review of the literature, it appears that the advocacy work of community organisations is misunderstood and under-researched (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Boris & Mosher-Williams, 1998; Carey & Barunack-Mayer, 2009; J. C. Jenkins, 2006). In addition, scholars have argued that the strict rules placed on the advocacy activities of community organisations limits their ability to achieve their goals (G. D. Bass, Arons, Guinane, & Carter, 2007; Berry, 2005). If advocacy in the community sector were better understood, which is an aim of this research, these rules might be changed to allow for greater advocacy freedom in the community sector.

Overall, two major gaps in the literature are addressed through this theoretical approach. First, although there is a great deal of research on community organisations, as previously mentioned, limited information exists on the nature of advocacy carried out by community organisations (J. C. Jenkins, 2006). This may lead to inappropriate rules or guidelines placed on the advocacy activities of community organisations, which can affect marginalised groups disproportionately (Berry & Arons, 2003). Second, few broad relational theoretical approaches were found in the literature (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; W. R. Scott, Deschenes, Hopkins, Newman, & McLaughlin, 2006; Stone & Sandfort, 2009), and those that were identified do not use the approach applied in this research. Contrary to previous studies, the approach used in this research explains why groups advocate differently and how some are more successful than others are. As discussed in Chapter 4, a relational approach may be helpful for a number of reasons. For example, this approach can provide researchers with a structure they can use to detect the distribution of power, which can explain why certain types of organisations operate differently and why some are more successful than others are.
This research is a response to a gap in the literature on the role that community organisations play in influencing the social and political environment through advocacy. This role is described in this research and analysed using Armstrong and Bernstein’s (2008) New Social Movement Alternative (NSM-A), which is an application of Bourdieu’s field theory (Bourdieu, 2005b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008; Swartz, 1997). While neither of these has been applied directly to the question of advocacy, this study uses theoretical concepts taken from the NSM-A and field theory to understand how the community sector operates and explain the nature of advocacy. The relationships within the community sector and between community organisations and other sectors, such as government, are a primary focus of this research.

An exploratory single case study design with one embedded unit of analysis is used to investigate the advocacy role of community organisations. The study is exploratory in nature because, as previously mentioned, advocacy in community organisation is often misunderstood and under-researched (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Boris & Mosher-Williams, 1998; J. C. Jenkins, 2006). Consequently, in this research the application of a theoretical approach is explored, rather than being applied, in a descriptive or confirmatory way, as an existing framework that might have been used in previous studies. Instead, theoretical developments from this research may help to inform future research on the nature of advocacy in the community sector. The larger case study consists of 42 key informants who were interviewed in order to understand social service community organisations (SSCOs) in New Zealand and their role in advocacy. The embedded case study is the Family Centre, a SSCO in New Zealand that provides an exemplary example of an SSCO engaged in advocacy, which is demonstrated later in this thesis. The Family Centre is a relatively small organisation that is predominantly known for its community work with Māori and Pacific groups, its approach to family therapy, its poverty research and its advocacy work. Key informants were used to describe the Family Centre and understand how it has effectively advocated for the community.

The approach used in this research is unique and will contribute to the literature on community organisations and their advocacy role. This research aims to give practitioners a clearer understanding of what advocacy means, how community
organisations practice it, and why. It is hoped that this understanding will aid the advocacy efforts of community organisations and support the idea that it is important for these groups to have the space and resources to advocate for communities that lack political power. This chapter describes the research questions, the relationship of this research to the field of public health, a brief overview of the New Zealand context, and the structure of this thesis.

**Relationship to public health**

This research contributes to the field of public health through its analysis of how community organisations influence the effects of the social and economic determinants of health through advocacy, as they negatively affect marginalised communities. As argued above, if advocacy in the community sector is misunderstood, the most marginalised communities, more than any other, will be affected because community organisations are one of the only groups that advocate for them (Berry & Arons, 2003). In addition, a number of authors have suggested that upstream interventions, such as policy change can have the greatest impact on health outcomes (Catford, 2002; Graham, 2001; Howden-Chapman, 2005; M. Marmot, Ryff, & Blumpass, 1997; McKinlay, 1993; Minkler, 1999; Robson, 2004; Sen, 1999; Wilkinson & Marmot, 2003). In other words, reducing or taking away what could be the most effective approach for change, advocacy, may harm the most vulnerable.

The determinants of health are “the range of personal, social, economic and environmental factors which determine the health status of individuals or populations” (Nutbeam, 1998, 354). These factors can include stress, experiences in our early life, social exclusion, work, unemployment, level of social support, addiction, accessibility to food, and accessibility to transport (Wilkinson & Marmot, 2003). The range of factors that are addressed emphasise the need to take an ecological approach to health. The ecological model “emphasizes the interaction between, and interdependence of, factors within and across all levels of a health problem” (US Dept of Health and Human Services, 2005, 10). That is to say, health outcomes are affected by individual, interpersonal, institutional, community and public policy factors, such as income, social support, and access (McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, & Glanz, 1988).
Dahlgren and Whitehead’s (1991) model, found in Figure 1-2, illustrates the social and economic determinants of health.

Figure 1-2: Dahlgren and Whitehead’s model of the social and economic determinants of health

The model above further demonstrates the need for a multi-level ecological approach because, as Dahlgren and Whitehead (1991) argue, there are many factors and conditions that can impact health. For example, if an individual had positive individual factors, such as good genes and they did not smoke or drink, their health could still be poor. Their health may be poor due to environmental, socio-economic, or community factors, such as poverty, racism, sexism, and a lack of access to nutritious food. In this example, supporting activities that SSCOs practice, such as advocacy and engaging with the community, may be more helpful than focusing on individual factors.

Many international studies have demonstrated the affects of the determinants of health (Barker, 1991; Ben-Shlomo, White, & Marmot, 1996; Gordon-Larsen, Nelson, Page, & Popkin, 2006; B. Kennedy, Kawachi, Lochner, Jones, & Prothrow-Stitch, 1997; B. Kennedy, Kawachi, & Prothrow-Stith, 1996; Kreiger et al., 2002; Macintyre, 1997; M. G. Marmot et al., 1978; Sapolsky, 2005; Sen, 1999; Townsend, Phillimore, & Beattie,
1998; Wilkinson & Marmot, 2003; D. Williams & Jackson, 2005). For example, in their international analysis of high-to-low-income countries, Marmot et al (2008) argued that multiple factors, including access to universal health care, fair working conditions, and gender equality had a positive impact on health. They also argued that community groups and political empowerment are vital tools to creating a more healthy society and reducing health inequities. In other words, improving the quality of health care is not the only factor that is required to increase the well being of a society; there are many structural factors that need to be addressed as well.

Research completed in New Zealand also illustrates how the determinants of health affect communities as a whole (Ajwani, Blakely, Robson, Tobias, & Bonn, 2003; Blakely, Fawcett, Atkinson, Tobias, & Cheung, 2005; Cormack, Robson, Purdie, Ratima, & Brown, 2005; Fawcett et al., 2006; Howden-Chapman, 2005; Howden-Chapman & Tobias, 2000; Ministry of Health, 2002b; P. Reid & Robson, 2006; P. Reid, Robson, & Jones, 2000; The Māori Perspective Advisory Committee, 1988; Westbrooke, Baxter, & Hogan, 2001). For example, the effect of ethnicity on health is shown below, in Graph 1-1. This graph demonstrates that Māori men and women have a shorter lifespan, as compared to non-Māori men and women.
An important New Zealand document that articulates the determinants of health and their impact is the report entitled Reducing Inequalities in Health (Ministry of Health, 2002b). The authors develop an intervention framework that can be used to address the determinants of health that are linked with health disparities. They suggest four areas need to be targeted: structural, intermediary pathways, health and disability services, and impact. Figure 1-3 provides a visual representation of the model.

Source: (Ajwani et al., 2003)
Figure 1-3: Framework for reducing inequalities of health

**Structural** pathways include social, economic, cultural, and historical factors that fundamentally determine health:
- Economic and social policies in other sectors
  - Macroeconomic policies (e.g. taxation)
  - Education
  - Labour market (e.g. occupation, income)
  - Housing
- Power relationships (e.g. stratification, discrimination, racism)
- Treaty of Waitangi – governance, Māori as Crown partner

**Intermediary pathways:** The impact of social, economic, cultural, and historical factors on health status is mediated by various factors including:
- Behaviour/lifestyle
- Environmental – physical and psychosocial
- Access to material resources
- Control – internal, empowerment

**Impact:** The impact of disability and illness on socioeconomic position can be minimized through:
- Income support (e.g. sickness benefit, invalids benefit, ACC)
- Antidiscrimination legislation
- Deinstitutionalisation and community support
- Respite care/carer support

**Health and Disability Services** can
- Improve access – distribution, availability, acceptability, affordability
- Improve pathways through care for all groups
- Take a population health approach by:
  - Identifying population health needs
  - Matching services to identified population health needs
  - Health education

Source: (Ministry of Health, 2002b)
The authors place special emphasis on the structural component because the “most fundamental approach to reducing inequalities is to tackle their root cause” (Ministry of Health, 2002b, 20). Community organisations may operate at all four levels. First, community groups may advocate for progressive tax structures to ensure governments have the resources to redistribute to vulnerable members of society. Second, community organisations may address social factors through advocating for better and more affordable housing. Third, SSCOs can deliver health and disability services, which means they may have a direct impact on the services themselves. Finally, community organisations may minimise the impact of disability and illness through providing support services to people experiencing a poor health.

Although it is not articulated well in the literature, this paper argues that SSCOs highlight and address the very factors that are identified as determinants of health, namely inequities in socioeconomic status, gender, culture, the social and political environment, and age. There does not appear to be any literature that discusses the role of SSCOs in addressing the determinants of health. Nevertheless, many SSCOs, such as the Salvation Army, speak on behalf of and provide support to marginalised communities living in poverty. Their work may affect environmental, cultural, socio-economic, and social factors related to health. For example, food banks and shelters can fulfil the immediate needs of food and refuge, which have an impact on living conditions. In addition, volunteering may serve a social and cultural function. Finally, advocating may improve the health of the resource poor through creating legislation that allows for better access to nutritious food, warm housing, or equal educational opportunities. These are but a few examples of the work that SSCOs do, which can be linked to conditions that public health practitioners have identified as determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007). Therefore, this thesis argues that although they may not articulate it, SSCOs are working in ways that improve the conditions that are identified as determinants of health. This argument is illustrated further throughout the remaining chapters.

**Putting this research into context: New Zealand**

It is important to put this research in context because as in all countries, the social and political environment affects how community organisations advocate. This
research was conducted in New Zealand and four key aspects of the environment have that have been important influences on the community that groups work with and community organisations themselves: the role of tāngata whenua, the role of Pacific peoples, the structural changes that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s and the relationship between community organisations and the government. Each is briefly described below.

Although Asian, Middle Eastern and African immigrants have also had an influence on New Zealand culture (Tennant, O'Brien, & Sanders, 2008), an analysis of their influence is out of the scope of this thesis.

**Tāngata whenua and the Treaty of Waitangi**

Tāngata whenua is a Māori term, which means “people of the land”. Māori are indigenous to New Zealand and prior to colonisation, which grew steadily since the 1800s, the Māori people had long healthy lives (Durie, 1998; P. Reid & Cram, 2005). For example, as Reid and Cram (2005) discuss, Māori had life spans that were comparable to the Europeans at the time, and they engaged in activities that were vital to public health, such as food preservation and sanitation. Although the colonists brought some useful technologies, their greater impact came through the introduction of many diseases and the dehumanisation of the Māori people. As a result, the lifespan of most Māori decreased and the loss of land was significant (P. Reid & Cram, 2005). In order to manage the difficulties brought on by the colonists, many Māori tribes that inhabited New Zealand began to work together. One outcome of this was the New Zealand Declaration of Independence, which was signed by James Busby, a British politician, and the United Tribes of New Zealand (Belich, 2006 859). This document recognises the sovereignty of the United Tribes, but it has been largely ignored by the New Zealand government.

Five years later, the Treaty of Waitangi was signed. Although the Treaty has more recently been described as the founding document of New Zealand (Kingi, 2007), there is still a great deal of tension surrounding its implementation. The Treaty was signed by many, but not all, Māori Chiefs and the Queen (Orange, 1989). There were two versions written, one in Te Reo Māori and one in English. The chiefs signed the Te Reo Māori version and the Queen signed the English version, however the two versions
have different meanings (Durie, 1998; Orange, 1989). The Māori version suggests that the Queen would provide a government structure while ensuring that Māori retain tino rangatiratanga, or absolute sovereignty, and their land. On the other hand, the English text focuses on equal rights as opposed to sovereignty. Although the articles were meant to operate simultaneously, it is often argued that the Māori version, in particular, has not been upheld (Durie, 1998). Since the signing of the Treaty, many Māori have fought for the Te Reo version of the Treaty to be recognised (R. Walker, 2004). As a result, in 1975 the Waitangi Tribunal was put in place to investigate breaches of the Treaty by the Crown. In addition, the Treaty has been regarded as a foundation for good health in New Zealand (Dow, 1999).

The influence of Tāngata Whenua and the Treaty play a significant role in the health outcomes of New Zealanders. For example, the resilience and innovation of the Māori people have led to an increase in Māori health (Durie, 1998). On the other hand, it is also important to acknowledge how colonisation has affected Māori health. As illustrated in Graph 1-1, Māori health continues to suffer, and it appears that community organisations can play a key role in addressing these disparities. For example, Māori-led organisations, such as the Māori Women’s Welfare League have incorporated a Māori approach to housing, health, and education, and allowed a space for Māori women to get involved in government (Szaszy, 1993). In addition, as discussed later, the role of the indigenous population has helped to make the New Zealand community sector unique (Tennant et al., 2008). A thorough analysis of the role Māori organisations play in New Zealand is outside of the scope of this thesis because of this researchers background, which is discussed in Chapter 4. Nevertheless, these groups are introduced and their vital role is acknowledged.

**Pacific peoples in New Zealand**

Pacific peoples’ influence on New Zealand extends from the 19th century (Vasatha Krishnan, Schoeffel, & Warren, 1994). However, it was after World War II that migration began to rise steadily, and the influence of Pacific people became more prominent (J. Phillips, 2006; Tamasese, Waldegrave, & King, 2000). Groups primarily migrated from Samoa, the Cook Islands, Tonga, Niue, Fiji, and Tokelau. In the 1960s and 1970s, as demand for workers increased due to industrialisation, New Zealand
companies began looking for Pacific workers (Tamasese et al., 2000). By the 1970s “Pacific people living in New Zealand were making a significant contribution to the New Zealand economy through their participation in the workforce, while their remittances were making a major contributions to Pacific economies” (Tamasese et al., 2000, 28). By 2009, more than 60% of Pacific people living in New Zealand were born here (Tukuitonga, 2009), and they have continued to contribute to New Zealand society (Tennant et al., 2008). Nevertheless, similar to Māori people, Pacific people have felt the effects discrimination, the their associated health disparities (Blakely et al., 2005; Blakely, Tobias, Atkinson, & Yeh L-C, 2007). As a result, Pacific people have come together to form thriving community groups (Tennant et al., 2008) and “language nests” (Leckie, 1993) to support their communities. In other words, Pacific-led organisations have proven vital to the well being of Pacific peoples in New Zealand.

Structural changes

During the 1980s and 1990s successive governments in New Zealand enacted major structural reforms, which affected every aspect of the social and political environment. Having an awareness of the structural changes that occurred is important for understanding the current environment in which community organisations advocate, and a brief description of these changes is provided. Prior to the structural changes New Zealand had a strong welfare state. For example, in the 1930s under the First Labour Government, New Zealand began to incorporate aspects of universal social security and integrated social services a full decade before most European countries began expanding their welfare system to manage post-war reconstruction (Belgrave, 2004). The Social Security Act of 1938 gave New Zealand the status of having the “most comprehensive welfare state in the world” (Castles, Gerritsen, & Vowles, 1996b, 8), and prior to the 1980s, New Zealand was also considered to have one of the most equal income distributions in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (Castles & Shirley, 1996). These features were reflected in New Zealand’s goal of full employment (Kelsey, 1995), free higher education (J. Boston, 1999), income-based government subsidised housing, and a universal welfare system (Vasantha Krishnan & Jensen, 2005).
The New Zealand economy, however, gradually became less stable due to global and domestic events, including, but not limited to: England’s move to increase trade with Europe and reduce trade with New Zealand in 1960s (Kelsey, 1995), the changing New Zealand capital base in the 1970s (Kelsey, 1995), an increasing budget deficit in the early 1990s (J. Boston, 1999), and globalisation in the early 1990s (Kelsey, 1999). Political support for the “welfare state” began to dissipate beginning in the early 1980s (J. Boston, 1999). As a response to the lack of consensus in government on an anti-nuclear parliamentary bill sponsored by the Labour Party, National Prime Minister Robert Muldoon declared a snap election in 1984. However, this approach backfired and the Fourth Labour Government, led by David Lange, was elected into office at this time (Easton & Gerritsen, 1996). Roger Douglas, who strongly supported neo-liberal philosophies, became Minister of Finance, and a programme of structural change was soon put into place. The changes were influenced by the neo-liberal and free market principles that were being practiced in England by Margaret Thatcher and in the United States by Ronald Reagan. Neo-liberal principles are based on fiscal discipline, deregulation, trade liberalisation and privatisation (Kelsey, 1995), and they gradually were used to guide much of the government policy enacted in New Zealand during the 1980s and 1990s.

Labour Government leadership changed several times during the period of structural changes. The Labour Party became less unified (J. Boston & Uhr, 1996) and Lange grew dissatisfied with Roger Douglas and the structural changes that he was suggesting. After publicly stating his frustrations in 1989, Lange stepped down as Prime Minister and Geoffrey Palmer was chosen to lead the Labour Party as Prime Minister. In 1990 Palmer was quickly replaced by Mike Moore, who was Prime Minister for only a few short months. In other words, New Zealand had three different Prime Ministers in just over a year, which may have contributed to the Labour loss in the 1990 election. The National Party was elected into office in 1990 with Jim Bolger as Prime Minister, and Ruth Richardson as the Minister of Finance. There was a feeling that with the new leadership of Bolger and Richardson, the “big four” of politicians, Treasury, business, and the Reserve Bank were aligned (A Barry, 2002), which meant that free market principles would continue to have a major influence on government policy. Market
freedom was increasingly viewed as the litmus test for New Zealand’s progress and the
country’s credit rating was the focus of much discussion. Income support benefits were
cut and there was an increasing shift towards the view that welfare payments needed to
be substantially lower than the minimum wage in order to encourage people into paid
employment (A Barry, 1996).

Kelsey (1995) describes the fiscal changes of the 1980s and 1990s as occurring
in three major phases. The first phase began when decision-makers, or politicians,
adjusted the government’s revenue and expenditure. These changes included flattening
the tax system and beginning the implementation of the Goods and Services Tax (GST)
on consumption, which had a disproportionately negative effect on people with low
incomes who spend a greater proportion of their incomes on essential expenditures.
The second phase included a complete rethinking of the welfare state, the health
system, the education system and housing. People were encouraged to see the welfare
system not as a means of helping the poor, but as a burden placed on the taxpayer.
There was increasing privatisation of health care [see (Gauld, 2003) for details on
changes in the health system] and, to the disadvantage of poorer schools, aspects of
the education system, such as governance, were removed from central control. In
addition, housing was no longer viewed as a social entitlement. Finally, the last phase
included a focus on fiscal responsibility, which led to a transfer of the government’s
emphasis on social welfare support to the repayment of debt, increasing budget
surpluses, increasing privatisation and the implementation of lower taxation. Krishnan
(2005) and Kelsey (1995) detail the changes that were made to the tax system,
housing, welfare, and superannuation.

**Effects of structural changes on the populations that community groups work
with**

The structural changes led to both positive and negative outcomes in the social
and political environment. Overall, the focus on market principles and the structural
changes increased health inequalities (Ajwani et al., 2003; Blakely et al., 2005; Blakely
et al., 2007; Fawcett et al., 2006) and had a negative effect on the marginalised
communities that community organisations work with. The structural changes led to
further economic problems; for example, unemployment rose from 4–5% in the early
1980s to 11% in the early 1990s, the numbers of food banks increased (Vasantha Krishnan & Jensen, 2005), and inflation hit an all-time high when the GST was introduced in 1986 (Easton & Gerritsen, 1996). Krishnan and Jensen (2005) studied these effects and found that between 1989 and 2001 the most economically and resource deprived families saw their incomes drop by 23%, whereas the wealthiest saw an overall increase of 23%. Sole parents, families with three or more children, and Māori and Pacific families were all hit the hardest (Vasantha Krishnan & Jensen, 2005).

On the other hand, not all changes that were initiated during that period were harmful. There were gains in female political representation and an increasing effort to address environmental protection (Castles, Gerritsen, & Vowles, 1996a). Contracting allowed for “government to establish relationships with a wider range of organisations than had been the case previously” (O’Brien, Sanders, & Tennant, 2009, 27). For example, the National Government of the 1990s created client-oriented ministries to highlight the needs of particular communities that were not otherwise represented in the bureaucracy, including Pacific Island Affairs, Māori Development, and Youth Affairs (J. Boston, 1999). Although the Waitangi Tribunal was established in 1975, which treated the Treaty of Waitangi as a living document, legislation during this time was more likely to emphasise the Treaty than it previously had (Mulgan & Sanders, 1996). In terms of the community sector, Māori providers were given funding to manage Māori health the way that they felt was best (Tennant, Sanders, O’Brien, & Castle, 2006). Overall, some suggested that indigenous rights, environmental rights and women’s rights were advanced during the structural changes of the 1980s and 1990s (Castles et al., 1996a).

**Effects of structural changes on the community sector**

Community organisations were also directly affected by the structural changes. The neo-liberal model led to an increase in government contracts given to community organisations. As a result, community organisations began providing services that had previously been delivered by government agencies (O’Brien et al., 2009). Nevertheless, the contracting relationship that began in the 1980s led to a tense relationship between the government and community organisations (Tennant et al., 2008). Prior to the structural changes, the community sector predominantly received “grants-in-aid” from the government (O’Brien et al., 2009). According to analysts, the move from grants to
contracts was generally not viewed as a positive change. For example, Tennant et al. explained that “the shift from largely untied grants to contracts [left] many feeling that their agendas were increasingly shaped by state requirements rather than their own existing priorities” (Tennant et al., 2008, 26). Similarly, Nowland-Foreman argued that the move from grants to contracts signalled a “shift away from voluntary organisations being regarded as autonomous representatives of the community and ... toward convenient conduits for services to the community” (Nowland-Foreman, 1998, 113).

On the other hand, contracting also “opened up opportunities for newer organisations, including Māori service providers and those providing services to other cultural groups” (Tennant et al., 2008, 27). This change allowed for groups, like the Māori community, to be served in more culturally appropriate ways. According to some writers in the literature, this culture began to change when the Fifth Labour-led Government was elected in 1999 because the government began to acknowledge the important role that community organisations play in society (O'Brien et al., 2009). These changes are discussed below.

The relationship between community organisations and government

As previously mentioned, the current relationship between the government and the community sector is heavily influenced by the structural changes of the 1980s and 1990s. The elections in 1999 ushered in a Labour-led Government that was interested in reducing the tension that was created between the government and community sectors in the previous decades. As a result, it implemented six key initiatives (Cribb, 2006; O'Brien et al., 2009). First, a ministerial position was created under the Ministry of Social Welfare (now called the Ministry of Social Development), to manage the community-government sector relationship. This position was originally called the Minister Responsible for the Community and Voluntary Sector (O'Brien et al., 2009), and it was later changed to the Minister of the Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector (OCVS).

Second, in 2000, the government established the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party in order to better understand the relationship between the two sectors (O'Brien et al., 2009). The Working Party produced two reports, which essentially found “an overwhelming message of anger, burnout, profound mistrust and
cynicism” in the community sector towards the government (Community-Government Relationship Steering Group, 2002; Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party, 2001, 5).

Third, in 2001 the Statement of Government Intentions (SOGI) was signed by the Prime Minister and the Minister Responsible for the Community and Voluntary Sector. The vision of the SOGI was to create a “strong and respectful relationship between government and community, voluntary and iwi/Māori organisations” (Ministry of Social Development, 2001a, 1). However, as pointed out by Baxter, the SOGI was a “directive to chief executives [of government ministries] to take responsibility for action within their own agencies … not a formal accountability document” (Baxter, 2002, 12). In other words, no formal regulations came out of the SOGI. The lack of formal regulations may have been the cause of participant comments in recent studies, which suggested that there had been a general lack of follow through on the SOGI (Cook, Morrison, & ANGOA, 2009; Milligan et al., 2008). Cook et al. (2009) assessed the effectiveness of the SOGI through focus groups, key informant interviews, and an online survey. In general, the authors found that the language in the SOGI was unclear; so many government agencies did not feel that it applied to them. Similarly, the authors found that many participants who worked in the community sector outside of Wellington, the capital of New Zealand, had not heard of the SOGI or did not feel that it affected them.

The Ministry of Health (MOH) frequently contracts services out to community organisations. As a result, the fourth key initiative was written in 2002, the Framework for Relationships between the MOH and Health/Disability Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) (Ministry of Health, 2002a). The objective of the framework was to “build a strong and respectful relationship between the MOH and the health/disability NGOs that will provide a vehicle for improving the quality of health and disability services and health outcomes” (Ministry of Health, 2002a, 1). The most significant results of the framework were the establishment of an NGO desk in the MOH and the creation of an NGO Working Group with 12 elected representatives from health and disability NGOs. The NGO Working Group has since conducted multiple surveys to find out how the members of health and disability community groups feel they are being
treated by the MOH and the District Health Boards (DHBs)\(^1\) that often fund their work (Health and Disability NGO Working Group, 2007). In general, those who were surveyed felt that the relationship needs to be more equal and many felt that community groups are not adequately involved in policy development or service planning.

**Fifth**, the Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector (OCVS) was established in 2003 under the Ministry of Social Development to “raise the profile of the sector within government” (Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector, 2009b, 3). The OCVS works “across government with the aim of achieving excellent relationships between government agencies and community, voluntary and Māori organisations” (Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector, 2009b, 3). According to O’Brien et al., the OCVS “has led a number of important initiatives concerning funding, accountability, participation in policy, promoting generosity and volunteering” (O’Brien et al., 2009, 19). For example, the OCVS has recently worked on a report entitled *Building Better Government*, which addressed how community organisations and the government sector can work better together in order to support the community (Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector, 2009a).

**Finally**, in 2007 the Labour-led Government announced the Pathway to Partnership budget, which set aside funding that would go directly to community organisations that provide “essential services”, or services aimed at helping “vulnerable families, children, and young people” (Clark, 2008). The Pathway to Partnership funding has been viewed as a move towards a more grants-based funding model, which is preferred by most community groups (O’Brien et al., 2009). In late 2008 the more conservative National-led Government was elected into office, and the future of Pathway to Partnership became less clear. However, in 2009 the National-led Government put NZ$104 million of the Pathway-to-Partnership money into a Community Response Fund, and the remaining money went to departmental funding (O’Brien et al., 2009). As of this writing it appears that the continuation of the Pathway to Partnership funding is a positive sign for the community-government relationship.

---

\(^1\) District Health Boards (DHBs) are responsible for providing, or funding, the provision of health services in their designated area. As of this writing, there are 21 DHBs in New Zealand.
Structure of this thesis

This thesis is separated into eight chapters. In this chapter, the topic has been introduced and a context for the research provided. The connection to public health is explained here and throughout this thesis. A brief discussion of the social and political environment in New Zealand is also included in order to explain the context of community organisations in New Zealand.

The second chapter is the first of a two-part review of the literature. In chapter 2, the first research question is answered when the community sector is described through a review of the findings in the literature. Definitions and terms are established, and the primary roles and key characteristics of community organisations are identified. The different types of SSCOs are also described. The New Zealand literature is then reviewed to identify the roles, key characteristics, and different types of SSCOs, as they are found in New Zealand. Gaps in the literature are also identified.

In the third chapter, the literature on advocacy in the community sector is reviewed to provide insight into the second, third, and fourth research questions, or those that address the nature of advocacy in the community sector. Based on findings in the international literature, how community organisations advocate, how they advocate effectively, and how relationships are managed to facilitate advocacy are discussed in two major sections, which are followed by an analysis of the New Zealand literature. In the first section, the international and New Zealand literature is used to describe the “who”, “what”, “why” and “how” of advocacy. The second section is used to identify the factors that affect the advocacy efforts and strategy choices of community organisations. Chapter 3 ends with a discussion of the gaps in the literature.

In the fourth chapter, a theoretical framework and methodology for understanding advocacy in the community sector is presented. The New Social Movement Alternative (NSM-A) and field theory concepts that are applied to the community sector are identified and defined. These concepts are used to analyse the results and answer the four research questions listed in Figure 1-1. In addition, the exploratory case study design, primary sources of data, and participants are described. The data was analysed using thematic analysis, and this process is delineated. Finally, the possible limitations are considered.
The **fifth chapter** is the first of three results chapters. In Chapter 5, the larger case study is presented and the four research questions are answered according to participant accounts. The community sector is defined, key characteristics are identified, and the different types of SSCOs in New Zealand are described. In the second half of the chapter, the focus is on advocacy. The “who”, “what”, “why”, and “how” of advocacy is detailed, and the factors that affect a group’s advocacy efforts and strategy choice are identified.

The **sixth chapter** is the first of a two-part description of the embedded case study, the Family Centre. In Chapter 6, the story of the Family Centre is provided, beginning with its establishment in 1979 and continuing until 2009, when the interviews were concluded. The chapter is separated into two sections, the Family Centre’s founding, start up, and growth stages, and their movement into the maturity stage. The story of the Family Centre provides a context for their advocacy work, which is discussed in the following chapter.

The **seventh chapter** is the second half of the description of the Family Centre, in which their advocacy work is the focus. In Chapter 7, the “who”, “what”, “why” and “how” of the Family Centre’s influence is presented. Its influence across four fields: therapy, community development, research, and social policy, is elucidated. In addition, the Family Centre’s ability to affect three issues: culture, poverty, and gender, is explained. The factors that affected its effectiveness and strategy choice are described. Finally, the ways in which staff managed relationships is identified.

In the **eighth chapter**, all of the findings from previous chapters are pulled together. Each research question is answered through a theoretical analysis of the results, and a comparison of the results and the literature. The strengths and limitations of this research are discussed as well. The primary goal of this research is addressed in the final chapter, which is to understand how SSCOs in New Zealand advocate for improvements to what public health practitioners have identified as the social and economic determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007), as they negatively affect marginalised communities. Finally, the practical, policy, and future research implications are discussed.
Together, these eight chapters provide an in-depth analysis of advocacy in the community sector in New Zealand, and it is hoped that the findings of this research are ultimately used to support the advocacy efforts of community organisations and provide a sound empirical and theoretical basis for further research in this area.
Chapter 2
What is the community sector and what does it look like?: A review of the literature

This chapter reviews the research literature on the community sector in order to better understand how social service community organisations (SSCOs) advocate effectively. This is the first of two literature review chapters. Gaps in the literature are identified in each chapter. A goal of this thesis is to begin the process of closing these gaps. The aim of this chapter is to identify and describe the community sector, with a particular focus on the SSCO sector. The aim of the second chapter is to discuss the nature of advocacy in these organisations. In order to fulfil this chapter's aim, four areas are considered: definitions; the role of community organisations; key characteristics of community groups; and different types of SSCO s. These areas are discussed with reference to their treatment in the international literature and the New Zealand literature.

Defining the community sector

In the literature, the community sector is often defined by what it is not [i.e. (Frumkin, 2002; Powell & Steinberg, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993)]. For example, community organisations are not usually described as fitting in the for-profit or government sectors. Albeit, as the analysis on community organisations becomes deeper, the separation between these groups begins to get less clear. Nevertheless, the literature often treats the three sectors (for-profit, government, and community) as separate. For-profit organisations focus on making a profit, as opposed to making enough to provide a service. Government organisations are managed and run by government bodies, as opposed to just the members of community organisations or business people.

There are many terms that are used to describe community organisations. Common terms in the literature include nonprofit, community organisation, charitable organisation, non-governmental organisation (NGO), and voluntary organisation [i.e. (Frumkin, 2002; Powell & Steinberg, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993)]. Some writers
also talk about a broader “sector” and use terms such as the community sector, the third sector, the nonprofit sector, the independent sector, and civil society [i.e. (H. Anheier & Seibel, 1990; Frumkin, 2002)]. There is no agreement on which term to use, and many of these terms have been problematic at some point (H. Anheier, 2005; H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Tenbensel & Gauld, 2001). For example, the term “voluntary organisations” implies that these groups receive donations and contributions of time, however that is not always the case for some community groups and, conversely, for-profit organisations may receive these contributions as well (Steinberg & Powell, 2006b, 3). In general, it appears that the term nonprofit is used in most of the literature that describes community groups located in the United States [i.e. (Boris, 1999; Frumkin, 2002; Grønbjerg, 1992; Hansmann, 1980; Powell & Steinberg, 2006; E. Reid, 2000; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Weisbrod, 1988; Weitzman, Jalandoni, Lampkin, & Pollak, 2002)]; whereas NGO is used to identify community organisations based in countries outside of the United States, such as Bangladesh, Malawi, and Pakistan (Barber & Bowie, 2008; Boli & Thomas, 1997; M. Edwards & Hulme, 2002; Rahman, 2006).

A number of definitions also are used for community organisations [i.e. (H. Anheier, 2005; Blair, 1997; Kamat, 2003; Pearce, 1997)]. A rigorous definition is found in the international Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (CNP) (Salamon et al., 1999; Salamon, Sokolowski, & Associates, 2004). The researchers involved with the CNP created a structural operational definition that is based on their analysis of the literature and findings. Their definition has been used to describe the community sector in over 40 countries (Salamon et al., 1999; Salamon et al., 2004). There are five components of the structural operational definition that an organisation must possess in order to be classified as a community organisation. These include being: organised, private, self-governing, nonprofit-distributing, and non-compulsory. First, a group has to be organised, in other words they need “organizational permanence and regularity” (Salamon et al., 2004, 9). Second, a group has to be private, or operate outside of government. Third, a group cannot be profit-distributing, which means that they cannot distribute profits to “a set of directors, stockholders, or managers” (Salamon et al., 2004, 9). Fourth, a group has to be self-governing, or “have
their own mechanisms for internal governance” (Salamon et al., 2004. 10). Finally, a group has to be non-compulsory or voluntary.

**What definitions are used in this research?**

For the purposes of this research, the term “social service community organisation” (SSCO) is used to describe not-for-profit groups that provide social services to the community, such as community care or relief services (Statistics New Zealand, 2007, 56), and are not government run. In much of the nonprofit literature from the United States, social service organisations are also called Human Service Nonprofits (HSNPs) (National Center for Charitable Statistics [NCCS], 2005), however this term is not adopted in this research. In addition, the terms “community organisation”, “community sector”, and “community group” are used interchangeably in this research, which refer to all groups that can be classified as nonprofits, NGOs, or any organisation that is community-based.

As detailed in Figure 2-3, social service groups are distinguished from other community groups, such as health or environmental organisations. The categories are separated based on the actions of groups. For example, a group in the environmental category may focus on reducing pollution, whereas a group in the social services category may focus on child welfare. However, given the fluid and relational approach used in this thesis, outlined in Chapter 4, there is likely to be a great deal of overlap with some other types of organisations, especially those in the health category. Appendix D lists the categories that were used in the international Johns Hopkins study (Salamon & Anheier, 1996), which outlines the difference between SSCOs and other types of community groups.

International classification systems indicate that SSCOs are a sub-sector of the larger community sector (National Center for Charitable Statistics [NCCS], 2005; Salamon & Anheier, 1996). However, because researchers usually address the community sector as a whole and not individual sub-sectors [i.e. (Boris, 1999; Frumkin, 2002; Hansmann, 1980; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Weisbrod, 1975)], there are few studies that consider the role and key characteristics of SSCOs specifically (Frumkin & Andre-Clark, 2000; Grønbjerg, 2001). Therefore, similar to other researchers that focused their analyses on SSCOs and not the community sector as a whole (Alexander,
findings on the larger community sector are generalised to the SSCO sector. However, data on the larger community sector may include information on other groups, such as environmental or health community organisations. That being said, this gap in the literature may lead to a skewed description of SSCO. Nevertheless, the data on the larger community sector is described below and the limited data on the SSCO sector is mentioned when it relates to the topic.

In order to be defined as a community organisation for this research, a group must fulfil four criteria, which are drawn from the structural operational definition described above (Salamon et al., 2004). First, a group has to be organised. Second, a community group is not for-profit; therefore, an organisation’s leadership cannot distribute profits to shareholders. Third, must be non-government. This means that a group may contract with government, but should be separate from government; in other words, only members of an organisation can govern organisational activities. Fourth, an organisation should provide a service to the community. The range of services that qualify are broad, such as delivering social services, teaching classes, providing information, bringing people together, conducting research, and engaging in advocacy. This definition does not include all aspects of the structural operational definition because the CNP definition does not address the diversity of community organisations appropriately. For example, when this definition was applied to Māori organisations in New Zealand, the non-compulsory component of the definition was problematic (Tennant et al., 2006). Therefore, a more general definition has been applied.

This definition, like other definitions, is not perfect; however, its strength lies in its broad applicability. For example, this definition does not assume that the line between the nonprofit business sector and government sector is clear-cut. In other words, some community organisations will have characteristics that are often associated with the for-profit or government sector, such as business acumen or bureaucracy.

What is the role of community organisations?

Findings from the international Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (CNP) have demonstrated that community organisations have a major impact in the world. Up to this point in time, the CNP has gathered data on over 40 countries,
including the United States, New Zealand, Argentina, and Romania. Based on the most recent data, Anheier and Salamon (2006) found that the community sector is large enough to constitute the seventh largest economy in the world. The worldwide community sector includes 39.5 million full-time workers, or an average of 4.4% of the “economically active population” in the countries that have been studied (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006, 95). Of these full-time workers, CNP researchers estimate that on average, 40% are volunteers (Salamon et al., 2004). CNP researchers also discovered that the service delivery role occupies 64% of community organisations; whereas the cultural and advocacy role occupies 32% of organisations; these roles are defined more clearly below.

SSCOs are categorised as service organisations (Salamon, Sokolowski, & List, 2003), however, as shown in this research, they also engage in other activities, such as advocacy (Mosley, 2009). Recent findings indicate that SSCOs play an important role in society. Data on over 40 countries indicates that SSCOs employ 19% of the community sector workforce, which is the second highest of all other sub-sectors (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006). In addition, across all of the countries studied, SSCOs attract 27% of all volunteers, which is the highest of any other sub-sector (Salamon et al., 2003). Based on this data it can be concluded that SSCOs play a major role in the community sector and society in general.

Theories on why the community sector exists (Hansmann, 1980; Salamon, 1987; Salamon & Anheier, 1998, 241; Weisbrod, 1975, 1988) are not discussed because they predominantly focus on the service delivery role of community organisations. Although this role is important, it has already been addressed in many studies [i.e. (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Boris & Steuerle, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993)]. In addition, as previously mentioned, this thesis is used to address the paucity of research on advocacy in community groups, which is not the focus of the aforementioned theories. Instead, this research could be used for developing a theory that explains the nature of advocacy in community groups, as one does not currently exist.

Based on the nonprofit literature, it appears that there are two primary roles of community organisations: community groups provide services for people (instrumental role), and they allow communities to express themselves (expressive role). The
instrumental role involves the provision of services, such as the delivery of health and social services, and is the role most often referred to in the literature. However, as Seibel suggests, community organisations "are not only providers of goods and services" they are also involved in "social and political coordination" (Seibel, 1990, 46), which is encompassed by the expressive role. The expressive role involves giving space to groups who want to express themselves, and could include activities related to advocacy, religion, art or sport. Both of these roles are analysed below.

Frumkin’s (2002) model of the instrumental and expressive roles of community organisations, which is based on his review of the nonprofit literature in the United States, is used to describe the activities associated with each of these roles. Although his focus is on the larger community sector, these roles are common to SSCOs as well (Grønbjerg, 2001; Mosley, 2009). In his model, Frumkin further separated the instrumental and expressive roles of community organisations into two categories, the supply orientation and the demand orientation. He argues that demand side activities include those that the community demands, such as service delivery and civic political engagement. On the other hand, supply side activities include those that a group or individual want to supply to the community, because they feel there is a need. Frumkin’s model can be seen below in Figure 2-1.

Figure 2-1: The role of community organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental role</th>
<th>Supply side orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand orientation</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side orientation</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive role</td>
<td>Civil and political engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: (Frumkin, 2002)</td>
<td>Values and faith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instrumental and expressive roles, as seen through the demand side and supply side orientations, are analysed below. However, it is acknowledged that few community organisations are entirely instrumental or expressive, and few would fit perfectly into any
of the categories listed in Figure 2-1. Instead, each organisation would fit somewhere along a continuum ranging from instrumental to expressive (Frumkin, 2002).

**Instrumental role**

As illustrated in Figure 2-1, community groups can fulfil two instrumental roles. First, an instrumental role that community groups perform is service delivery, which is usually the focus of scholars that discuss the community sector (Clemens, 2006; Frumkin, 2002; Hansmann, 1980; Salamon, 1987; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Weisbrod, 1975). Many activities that fit into this category, such as supporting people with disabilities or providing mental health services to families, are funded by government contracts.

Over the past two decades, the service delivery role has been gaining the attention of analysts and politicians (H. Anheier, 2005; H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Frumkin, 2002; Najam, 2000; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). For example, Smith and Lipsky suggest that “government relies on nonprofits to provide social services” (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993, 4) and that “there is more contracting today than ever before” (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993, 7). Scholars have suggested that the increased attention to community groups is probably due to the appeal of community organisations to both sides of the political spectrum and the increase of neo-liberal policies, as seen in New Zealand, the United States and Great Britain (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Frumkin, 2002; Kelsey, 1995; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). A few writers have argued that people on the right end of the political spectrum generally advocate for the privatisation of services, or the contracting of service delivery to non-government groups, such as for-profit or community groups. On the other hand, people on the left side of the political spectrum value the most disadvantaged populations being able to get support through community organisations and government-provided support (Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). Also, as detailed in Chapter 1 and throughout this research, neo-liberal policies that were used to privatise government functions began gaining support from political and economic elites in countries such as New Zealand, Great Britain and the United States in the 1980s (J Boston, Dalziel, & St. John, 1999; Hall, 2006; Harvey, 2005; Kelsey, 1999). This trend appears to have led to an increase in government
contracts being given to community organisations that provide services (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Tennant et al., 2008).

Second, according to Frumkin (2002), another instrumental role community organisations perform is giving space to social entrepreneurs to fulfil their community related goals. Social entrepreneurs are “entrepreneurs with a social mission” (Dees, 1998, 3). They are associated with innovation and they “play the role of change agents” in society (Dees, 1998, 4; Frumkin, 2002). In social entrepreneurship the “entrepreneurial” (Frumkin, 2002, 144), or risk-taking side of the sector, is emphasised and social entrepreneurs support missions that contribute to the public good (Dees, 1998). On the other hand, some writers have criticised social entrepreneurs because they argue that the focus on the “entrepreneurial side” of service provision has forced organisations to value resources over the community (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004). Although activities that involve social entrepreneurs are diverse, the important point is that a committed leader is involved in an organisation and “supplies” activities that they think are needed in the community.

Expressive role

As illustrated in Figure 2-1, there are two types of expressive roles that community groups can fulfil. First, community organisations give space for the expression of faith and values. Frumkin (2002) argues that people can express their values by supporting a community organisation that is consistent with their beliefs. Research has shown how religious organisations play an important role in society through their support and provision of the social services (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006; Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001). Religiously affiliated community organisations can allow the community to express its faith and values. Religious activities can also bring people together and religious groups, like the Salvation Army, have participated in supporting marginalised communities. On the other hand, religious groups “have the potential to be exclusionary, or at least particularistic,” which is one reason why Frumkin argues “the move to embrace the expressive dimension of nonprofits has not been universally supported by all parts of the political spectrum” (Frumkin, 2002, 127).

Another expressive role community groups perform includes engaging in civic and political activities, which is the primary focus of this research. Advocacy related
activities are discussed in detail in Chapter 3; however, an introduction to these activities is included here. Civic and political activities can include advocacy and bringing people together in ways that foster social capital, which is described below. Frumkin (2002) argues that these activities fall on a continuum, depicted in Figure 2-2, ranging from the least partisan, or least politically aligned form of action, to the most partisan, or most politically aligned form of action.

![Figure 2-2: Range of political engagement in community organisations](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build social capital</th>
<th>Encourage civic engagement</th>
<th>Support political participation</th>
<th>Advocate for causes</th>
<th>Lobby for legislation</th>
<th>Finance campaigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least Partisan form of action</td>
<td>Most Partisan form of action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure above demonstrates that community organisations can engage in a range of civic and political activities, which can include building social capital and financing campaigns.

Social capital, in particular, has been connected to community organisations by multiple scholars (Fukuyama, 2001; Debra Minkoff, 1997; Putnam, 2000). There are many definitions of social capital (Bourdieu, 1997, 47; Fukuyama, 2001, 7; Spellerberg & Social Capital Team, 2001, 9) and all of them highlight the relational nature of the concept (Frumkin, 2002; Fukuyama, 2001; N. King, 2004; Putnam, 2000; Stolle, 2003). As described in Chapter 4, the definition of social capital that is used for this research is: “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1997, 51). Low levels of social capital have been linked to increased inequalities and increased mortality (Kawachi, Kennedy, Lochner, & Prothrow-Stitch, 1997). On the other hand, it has had its critics [i.e. (Bourdieu, 1997; Harriss, 2002; Wakefield & Poland, 2005)], who generally argue that social capital can create exclusionary practices and deny access to those that are not part of a given network (P. King & Waldegrave, 2003).

Scholars have linked the five other types of political activities depicted in Figure 2-2 with community organisations as well (Boris, 1999; E. Reid, 1999; Vernick, 1999).
First, Boris suggests that volunteers “enhance civic engagement and spread expertise” because people “learn about the needs of their communities and others, and act together to solve them” (Boris, 1999, 20.). Second, Reid (1999) describes how community organisations support political participation, which predominantly occurs through organising group action. According to Reid, engagement “builds personal efficacy” and a “sense that one is capable and influential” (Reid, 1999, 294). Third, as described in Chapter 3, community groups advocate in many ways for the community, including protesting, working with the media, and engaging with government representatives, which includes decision-makers and bureaucrats (Reid, 1999). Fourth, lobbying, an attempt to influence legislation (Vernick, 1999), is performed by community organisations (Reid, 1999); however, as described in Chapter 3, there are some limitations to it. Finally, although community groups can finance campaigns (Reid, 1999), tax-exempt organisations are restricted from electioneering, which involves providing direct opposition or support to specific candidates (Vernick, 1999).

**Summary**

Overall, it appears that community organisations can fulfil a range of roles; however, the service delivery role has received most of the attention in the literature. The limited amount of research on advocacy is problematic because the advocacy role is equally, if not more important. For example, the voices that are generally heard through community organisations are more likely to be from groups that have less power in society (Berry, 2005). Organisations outside of the community sector generally do not fight for the rights of people that have less power in society (Berry & Arons, 2003); therefore, if community organisations are unable to perform this task then inequalities may increase.

The role community organisations fulfil also provides support for the argument that these groups influence the social factors that have been identified as determinants of health. As previously mentioned, health outcomes are affected by individual, interpersonal, institutional, community and public policy factors (McLeroy et al., 1988), such as income, social support, and access. The instrumental role is likely to have an impact on the institutional and community level. For example, a community organisation may provide free or low-cost health services to families that cannot afford to pay for
services provided by a private organisation. Community groups may play an integral part in improving the health outcomes of these families. In addition, the expressive role may also influence public policy factors. For example, if a community organisation provided research or statistics that indicated there was an increase in women using refuges in Wellington, then they could argue for more financial support and robust policies that support these programs. As a result, these women may find more supports and lead longer and healthier lives.

**Key characteristics of most community organisations**

Community organisations are diverse and engage in a range of activities. However, a few general characteristics appear to be found in most community organisations, regardless of the communities they serve or the activities that they perform. Three key characteristics of community organisations are often identified in the nonprofit literature. First, all community organisations have the option of registering and claiming tax-exempt status (Salamon, 1997). Although not all organisations choose to register, this process is unique from other sectors, such as the for-profit business sector, which makes it an important characteristic to address in this section. Second, compared to the government and for-profit business sector, the community sector is structured to allow for a closer connection to the community (Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Third, analysts suggest that most community organisations often work with “marginalised communities” that have complex needs (Berry & Arons, 2003). Each of these characteristics is discussed below. The research mentioned below is focused on the larger community sector; however, findings from studies specifically on SSCOs indicate that SSCOs share these characteristics as well (Grønbjerg, 2001; Mosley, 2009).

**Community organisations have tax-exempt status**

Most of the literature on the community sector comes out of the United States; therefore, only the tax treatment of American organisations is discussed. However, it is common in many countries, including New Zealand (Tennant et al., 2006), for the government to provide a measure of tax-exempt status to community organisations (Salamon, 1997). There are 27 types of 501(c), or tax-exempt entities, in the United
States (Boris & Steuerle, 2006); however the two most common are 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organisations (National Center for Charitable Statistics [NCCS], 2009; Vernick, 1999). Organisations classified under 501(c)(3) status are called public charities and private foundations, and those under 501(c)(4) status are called social welfare organisations. All 501(c) organisations receive tax-exemptions, but only public charities and private foundations, or 501(c)(3) organisations, are eligible for tax deductible contributions by donors, which are highly valued by community organisations (Simon, Dale, & Chisolm, 2006). All of these organisations are simply labelled as “tax-exempt organisations” for the remainder of this thesis, except when 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) status is relevant to the argument being made, because the distinction between different types of tax-exempt organisations appears to be particular to the United States.

Based on his analysis of the nonprofit literature in the United States, Frumkin (2002) argues that there are two primary rationales for the tax-exempt status of community organisations. First, he suggests that through tax-exemption, the government acknowledges that community organisations add “social value” to society (Frumkin, 2002, 93). Second, he suggests that tax-exemption promotes the sovereignty of community organisations as independent from government and other groups. In their review of the literature, Simon et al. (2006) also suggest that tax-exempt status serves an equity and regulatory function. The equity function is used to bring about a “degree of fairness or redistribution of resources and opportunities” (Simon et al., 2006, 267). The regulatory function is used for oversight and to ensure that community organisations fulfil their fiduciary responsibilities, namely the “duty of loyalty” and the “duty of care.”

Recently, researchers have begun to question aspects of tax-exempt status. For example, Frumkin points out that in the United States, many kinds of organisations receive tax-exempt status; however, “all needs are not equal and … some people find it galling to see a contribution to a puppet theatre treated the same as a donation to an AIDS hospice” (Frumkin, 2002, 92). Steinburg (2006a) concedes that tax-exemption may not be the most efficient way to provide support to the community sector, and offers a few suggestions to replace tax-exemption, such as tax credits. On the other
hand, it appears that groups value their tax-exempt status, which may be why other approaches have not been applied in the United States.

**Community organisations have a close connection with the community**

Historically, the strength of the community sector has been based on the connection with the community (Hall, 2006), and this has not changed with time (Berger & Neuhaus, 1996; Carey & Barunack-Mayer, 2009; Couto & Guthrie, 1999; Deschenes, McLaughlin, & O’Donoghue, 2006; Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Steinberg, 2006a). One way to understand this close connection with the community is through the concept of mediating structures. Community organisations act as mediating structures, which, according to Berger and Neuhaus (1996), are those institutions that stand between an individual and larger impersonal institutions, such as government. Mediating structures can play a “mediating” role “by constituting a vehicle by which personal beliefs and values could be transmitted into the mega-institutions” (Berger & Neuhaus, 1996, 148). Couto (1999) argues that mediating structures can foster social capital. In addition, Frumkin suggests that mediating structures protect individuals “against alienation and anomie” as well as contribute to the legitimacy of government because they join governmental action and the “values” of the people (Frumkin, 2002, 98).

The community was generally described as the most important stakeholder in the literature (Kumar, 1997; Ospina, Diaz, & O'Sullivan, 2002; S. Woodward & Marshall, 2004); however, SSCOs are accountable to other stakeholders as well. In addition to the community, these stakeholders can include members, clients, donors or funders (often government), the Board, and management (Barrett, 2001; Brown & Moore, 2001; Kumar, 1997). Managing stakeholders can be challenging because they may have conflicting needs (Brown & Moore, 2001; Moore, 2000). In fact, balancing the needs of “key stakeholders and political elites” while remaining “consistent with their original organizational missions and accountable to their internal bases of support”, which includes the community, was described as “one of the most fundamental challenges that nonprofit organizations face” (D Minkoff & Powell, 2006, 594). In their
comprehensive analysis, Bryson et al. (2002) have also argued that this skill is especially important for community organisations.

Community organisations work with “marginalised” communities that have complex needs

Salamon et al. suggest that SSCOs, more than any other sub-sector, are “most closely associated with the sector’s social justice mission” (Salamon et al., 2003, 31). Community organisations work with communities that are described as “left behind” (Frumkin, 2002), “marginalized” (Berry, 2005), “distressed”, “disorganized” (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993) and “disadvantaged” (Clemens, 2006). As a result, community organisations address complex issues, such as poverty (Berry, 2005; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). According to Smith and Lipsky, “workers in nonprofit service agencies increasingly ‘deliver’ the welfare state to citizens” (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993, 99). The ways in which community organisations address these complex needs is through the instrumental and expressive roles that are described above. For example, because community organisations often work with groups that have less power, they can act as bridges or mediating structures between the communities and more powerful groups, such as policymakers (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2002; Clemens, 2006; W. R. Scott et al., 2006).

Although most researchers agree that community organisations generally work on behalf of the poor (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Boris & Krehley, 2003), some researchers have suggested that community groups are working increasingly with privileged and educated communities (Skocpol, 1997). In her in-depth historical analysis of community organisations in the United States, Skocpol (1997, 211-215) pointed out that some of the most marginalised groups continue to be ignored. However, because she studied multiple organisations and did not focus on SSCOs, it is difficult to know if Skocpol’s statements ring true for groups that work in the social services. The few empirical studies that have highlighted the work of SSCOs suggest that these groups do indeed work for marginalised and less powerful communities (Donaldson, 2007; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006), and this is certainly the case for those that have been included in the case studies carried out for this research, which are reported on in later chapters.
Different types of SSCOs

As discussed in Chapter 4, this research applies a relational approach, which very few scholars have used to describe the community sector (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; W. R. Scott et al., 2006; Stone & Sandfort, 2009). Those that have, explain the different types of organisations that fit within the larger community sector category more clearly, because this approach can be used to explain how and why organisations operate differently. In light of this, different types of SSCOs are described in this thesis. Four types of community organisations appear to be associated with SSCOs, umbrella organisations, direct service delivery organisations, religiously affiliated organisations, and secular organisations. Each of these organisations has been shown to be involved in social services. Direct service delivery organisations, religious, and secular groups deliver social services directly to the community (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006; Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001; Frumkin, 2002). Similarly, umbrella organisations provide resources for and advocate with social service organisations (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Mosley, 2009; D.R. Young, 2001). Each of these types of SSCOs is described below.

Umbrella and direct service delivery organisations

Umbrella organisations within the community sector are “nonprofit associations whose members are themselves nonprofit organizations” (D.R. Young, 2001, 290). Umbrella organisations, also called peak bodies or peak associations, can have a diverse membership that includes SSCOs, such as the United Way of America, or they can have a membership that consists solely of SSCOs, such as the Australian Council of Social Services. There is currently no accurate count of umbrella organisations in the United States or New Zealand, but it appears that many community groups, including SSCOs, belong to umbrella organisations (Hodgkinson, Weitzman, Noga, & Gorski, 1993; Melville, 1999).

Umbrella organisations provide support to SSCOs primarily through networks and advocacy (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Melville, 1999; D.R. Young, 2001). In their review of the literature in the United States, Smith and Lipsky suggest that “peak associations have had a significant effect on the contracting process and social service spending” (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993, 178-179). However, they also note that “peak associations offer only a constrained advocacy” and that “they are limited by conflicting
demands on their constituents” (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993, 178-179). Leland’s (1999) review of the Australian literature in 1999 also suggests that umbrella organisations have had less of an impact on policy. On the other hand, in their more recent case study, Balassiano and Chandler (2009) found that umbrella organisations increasingly allow members to affect local, state, and national levels of government in the United States. In addition, Lewis (2005) suggests that umbrella organisations have also affected policy in the United Kingdom.

Unlike umbrella organisations, direct service delivery organisations provide services directly to the community. That is to say, their members are not organisations but families and individuals (Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). These are the common types of service delivery organisations that people imagine when they think of community organisations that deliver social services. For example, direct service delivery organisations provide services such as mental health support and education to the public.

**Religious and secular organisations**

Religious organisations deliver social services through congregation-based services or faith-based organisations (FBOs), also referred to as religiously affiliated organisations (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006; Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001; Ebaugh, Chafetz, & Pipes, 2005). Chaves and Tsitsos argue that “congregation-based social services are not an alternative to the world of secular nonprofit or government-supported social services; they are part of that world” (Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001, 660). Similarly, it was found that FBOs are usually formed in order to fulfil a social service function (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006). In addition, religious organisations that provide social services often foster social capital and engage in advocacy as well (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006; Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001; Wagner, 2008).

On the other hand, secular organisations are not affiliated with a church or religious body. These types of organisations provide services, but not in a way that invokes religion or spirituality, and secular organisations frequently work with religiously affiliated organisations (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006; Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001). Overall, in their review of the literature, Cadge and Wuthnow found that “research reveals differences between religious and secular nonprofit organizations in terms of structure
and in terms of service delivery and client satisfaction” (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006, 491). For example, in his large-scale study of religious and secular organisations in the United States, Weisbrod (1998) found that religiously affiliated organisations that served mentally handicapped people were more likely than secular organisations to employ nurses and dietitians, and customer satisfaction was also higher in religious organisations as well.

**Community organisations in New Zealand**

According to the most recent survey of community organisations in New Zealand, there are 97,000 community groups in operation (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). This data is based on registers of incorporated societies and charitable trusts, as well as a register of New Zealand businesses, which means that unincorporated societies were also counted. Including voluntary labour, the community sector as a whole contributed a net “value added” of NZ$7.0 billion or 4.9% of GDP in 2004 (Sanders, O'Brien, Tennant, Sokolowski, & Salamon, 2008). Another survey conducted in 2004 found that because of donated time and contributions, community organisations can add value to money (New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations & PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2004). For example, every dollar that was provided to a voluntary agency returned between $3 and $5 worth of services to the community (New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations & PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2004). Previously mentioned studies measured the entire community sector in New Zealand, but SSCOs in New Zealand contribute in many ways as well. The most recent data indicates that SSCOs supplied more money to the GDP (23%) and employed more people (30%) than any other sub-sector of community organisations in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). The remainder of this section discusses the community sector in New Zealand, following the same format as above.

**Role of community organisations in New Zealand**

Similar to findings in the international literature, there are two roles that community organisations appear to fulfil in New Zealand: the instrumental role and the expressive role (Cook et al., 2009; Milligan et al., 2008; O'Brien et al., 2009; Sanders et
al., 2008; Tennant et al., 2008). For example, community groups contribute to building social capital in society (Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009), which was identified as an expressive role in the international literature (Frumkin, 2002). Overall, community organisations in New Zealand provide services, they advocate, they allow people to express themselves, and they bring people together. As previously argued, these roles may have a direct impact on the factors identified as determinants of health.

**Key characteristics of community organisations in New Zealand**

As was found in the international literature, community organisations have three key characteristics: they can acquire tax-exempt status, they have a close connection with the community, and they work predominantly with marginalised communities (Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009; Tennant et al., 2006). Together, these three characteristics are what distinguish the community sector from the government and for-profit sectors.

**Tax-exempt status**

The legal treatment of community organisations has been detailed in the New Zealand literature (New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations & Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector, 2006; O’Brien et al., 2009; Tennant et al., 2006). For the purposes of this research, a brief summary based on Tennant et al.’s (2006) and O’Brien et al.’s (2009) analysis of the legal forms of community organisations in New Zealand is sufficient, and is provided next. To begin with, a group can choose to be incorporated or unincorporated. If they choose not to be incorporated, the leaders of the organisation are held personally liable for any debt that the group may incur. If they choose to incorporate, the organisation becomes a separate legal entity. According to the most recent data, approximately half of all eligible organisations choose to incorporate in New Zealand (Te Korowai Aroha Aotearoa Inc., Bradford, & Nowland-Foreman, 1999).

Once an organisation becomes incorporated, the members can choose to have one of many “legal personalities.” The two most common “legal personalities” in New Zealand are incorporated societies and charitable societies, also known as charitable trusts (Tennant et al., 2006, 18-19). The Registrar of Incorporated Societies, a
government agency, determines if an organisation qualifies as an incorporated society or a charitable society. Charitable societies have the most significant tax-exemptions. However, organisations in any legal form or status, including those which are not incorporated, can qualify for tax-exemptions. In order to qualify as a charity, an organisation must meet one or more of the following charitable purposes under the Charitable Trusts Act of 1957, which are: “the advancement of education; the advancement of religion; the relief of poverty, sickness, or disability; or any other purpose that is beneficial to the community” (Charities Commission, 2007, 3).

The community is the primary stakeholder in community organisations

Community organisations in New Zealand are often defined by their close connection with the community, which is why the government often contracts them to provide services (Cribb, 2006; O’Brien et al., 2009). However, as discussed above, community organisations need to manage the needs of multiple stakeholders (Cribb, 2006), not just the community’s. Cribb (2006) recently conducted a case study on four SSCOs, which consisted of 40 interviews, direct observation and documentary analysis. She found that SSCOs generally feel accountable to their clients, staff, the government, the organisation’s governing body, future clients, other community organisations, and the local community, in that order. The majority felt that they were accountable for the quality of care that is delivered to their clients because clients are the “reason they exist” (Cribb, 2006, 17).

The most important finding in Cribb’s (2006) study is her suggestion for how community groups should manage their relationship with the government. She suggested that community organisations should move from having “hard accountability” to “soft accountability” to government. In other words, the community and government sectors should have a more trusting relationship. In her book, she acknowledged that it is important for community organisations receiving government contracts to be accountable to government because they are providing services with public money. However, the author also suggested that stewardship theory, which assumes that both groups involved have the same goals, can be used to better describe the ideal community-government relationship than agency theory, which she suggests is used to guide government contracts. If stewardship theory was followed or mixed with agency
theory, then Cribb argues that community organisations would, more appropriately, have “soft accountability” to government.

**Community organisations work with marginalised communities**

It appears that community groups in New Zealand predominantly work with marginalised communities (O’Brien et al., 2009; Tennant et al., 2006), or as Milligan et al. stated, “disenfranchised and vulnerable groups” (Milligan et al., 2008, 16). This is also similar to the findings described in the international nonprofit literature (Berry & Arons, 2003).

**Different types of SSCOs in New Zealand**

A figure produced by the Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector (OCVS), depicted in Figure 2-3 below, illustrates the diversity that exists within the community sector in New Zealand. Community organisations operate in many sub-sectors, which cut across many populations and levels of government.
It is clear from Figure 2-3 that the community sector in New Zealand is diverse and caters to a range of communities, however, this figure is incomplete. For example, Māori, umbrella, and religious organisations are involved with social service provision (Statistics New Zealand, 2007); yet only religious organisations are mentioned in the figure above and there is no overlap between the religious and social service sub-sectors. The figure above follows the model outlined in the recent New Zealand Nonprofit Institutions Satellite Report (Statistics New Zealand, 2007), which separates groups based on their “primary” activity, but many other groups that fall under other sub-sectors, such as the “health” sub-sector are also involved in social service provision. Therefore, an updated figure should allow for overlap between the sub-sectors. The different types of SSCOs that were found in New Zealand literature are described below.

**Māori and non-Māori organisations**

Māori-led organisations play a very important role in New Zealand society. For example, some Māori organisations were described as providing “stewardship over the
affairs of iwi in perpetuity” (Tennant et al., 2006, 39). Māori community organisations are also active in the provision of social services (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). However, capturing their contributions has been challenging (Statistics New Zealand, 2007; Tennant et al., 2006). An attempt to understand their contribution was made by the Nonprofit Institutions Satellite Account (NPIS). The NPIS separated tāngata whenua governance, which includes iwi organisations mandated by whānau and hapū, from other Māori-led organisations (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). Groups that were not mandated by tāngata whenua governance were classified into the sub-sector that they focused on, such as the social services. However, the focus group that represented the tāngata whenua governance category noted that “the classification was based on a different worldview to that of Māori and that it failed to recognise the activities of indigenous peoples” (Statistics New Zealand, 2007, 63).

There have been attempts to better understand how volunteering is understood, from a Māori point of view (Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector, 2007; Robinson & Williams, 2001). These analyses are important for two reasons. First, understanding how Māori view volunteering can help government and the general public to appreciate the Māori contribution and measure it appropriately (Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector, 2007). Second, these analyses can affect the relationship with government and funding agencies. For example, Holland points out that the “difference between Māori and non-Māori volunteering can have implications for funding agencies, where the tendency is towards a one-size-fits-all approach, and for the strength of relationship between the government and Māori volunteers” (Holland, 2008, 38).

On the other hand, non-Māori organisations would include those that are not managed by Māori. These organisations would presumably not have the same knowledge of Māori cultural practices and would not incorporate Māori practices in the same way that groups run by Māori would.

**Umbrella and direct service delivery organisations**

Similar to findings in the international literature, umbrella organisations, sometimes called peak bodies, are “representative associations of nonprofit organisations” that perform “important functions such as providing information and other
resources for member organisations and representing members over shared issues” (O’Brien et al., 2009, 34). According to O’Brien et al., umbrella organisations are “important organisations within the nonprofit sector infrastructure” in New Zealand (O’Brien et al., 2009, 5). The findings from a recent report on the community sector in New Zealand, which was based on interviews and a literature review, indicate that umbrella organisations are important for the future of the community sector.

In terms of strengthening the sector, the most urgent task would seem to be the development of an umbrella organisation generally representing sector-wide interests, yet allowing for any sub-group within the sector to stand apart and represent their specific interests where necessary” (Holland, 2008, 16-17).

However it was found in another report that there was “limited external support from funding bodies for nonprofits to develop this capacity” (O’Brien et al., 2009, 35). Nevertheless, similar to findings in the international literature (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; D.R. Young, 2001), these organisations can play an important role in community sector advocacy through connecting with decision-makers and bureaucrats when groups are busy carrying out their daily activities with limited resources (O’Brien et al., 2009).

On the other hand, as previously mentioned, direct service-delivery organisations provide services to their members, which are made up of the community, not other organisations. These organisations are common in New Zealand (Sanders et al., 2008) and provide a range of social services, including support for families experiencing domestic violence and youth services (Statistics New Zealand, 2007, 56).

**Religious and secular organisations**

Religious organisations also provide social services in New Zealand (Lineham, 2004; Statistics New Zealand, 2007; Tennant et al., 2008). As was found in the international literature, religious organisations in New Zealand can be congregation based or faith based (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). In addition to the provision of services, religious groups in New Zealand are also known to foster social capital and engage in political activity (Lineham, 2004; Tennant et al., 2008).
Secular organisations provide social services as well, and, similar to religious organisations, they have existed in New Zealand for over 100 years (Tennant et al., 2008; Tennant et al., 2006). According to Tennant et al., the early formations of secular groups were aimed “largely at the establishment of order and respectable codes of conduct” (Tennant et al., 2008, 8). Overall, secular and religious organisations provide many of the same services, such as support to the homeless, youth and children.

**Brief comparative analysis**

The literature indicates that community organisations in New Zealand have both unique and common characteristics with those in other countries (Sanders et al., 2008; Tennant et al., 2008). As previously mentioned, the data suggests that similar to the groups discussed in the international literature, which is predominantly focused on the United States, community groups in New Zealand share similar corresponding roles, key characteristics and types of groups that can be classified as SSCOs. This may be explained by the Anglo-Saxon country cluster that New Zealand, the United States, and the United Kingdom share (Sanders et al., 2008, 12; Tennant et al., 2008, 36). The Anglo-Saxon cluster is characterised by a “large nonprofit sector, but the level of government support is considerably smaller, and has larger shares of fee income and private philanthropy” (Sanders et al., 2008, 41).

The research also suggests that New Zealand groups do not fit neatly into one category. According to the recent Johns Hopkins study, similar to the Anglo-Saxon cluster, there is a low level of government support. However, New Zealand groups also demonstrate high levels of volunteerism and engage in a great deal of expressive activities, statistics more similar to Nordic countries (Sanders et al., 2008). The Nordic cluster is characterised by a “high level of volunteer input… a high share of expressive activities” and, like the Anglo-Saxon cluster, a low level of government support (Sanders et al., 2008, 41). Countries in this cluster include Denmark, Norway and Sweden. On the other hand, as Sanders et al. describe (2008), the revenue structure of community groups in New Zealand indicates differences from both the Nordic and Anglo-Saxon clusters. For example, New Zealand organisations receive less government support and far more household philanthropic support than groups in both clusters.
There are also characteristics of New Zealand community organisations that make them quite distinctive. To begin with, the unique contribution of the Māori population makes New Zealand community groups different from those in other countries. In addition, the centralised state, small size of the country, and approachability of decision-makers and bureaucrats in New Zealand make creating partnerships a more common occurrence than what is often seen in other countries like the United States or the United Kingdom (O'Brien et al., 2009; Tennant et al., 2008). Overall, it appears that while SSCOs in New Zealand may share common characteristics with those in other countries, they are also unique. This finding suggests that the data from this research may be generalised to other comparable countries in this aspect where there is shared characteristics. However, it is also important to gather New Zealand specific data. SSCOs in New Zealand may provide a unique model that other countries can learn from, and not all international data can be used to explain New Zealand community groups. This research aims to better understand SSCOs in New Zealand and begins to address the gap in the international literature that is dominated by literature on community groups in the United States.

**Conclusion**

This review leads to two conclusions. First, a major gap in the literature is the lack of information on countries outside of the United States, which is addressed in this research through an exploratory case study on the community sector in New Zealand. Second, based on this literature review, it appears that findings from this study can be used to provide insights to countries that scholars have described as similar to New Zealand, like the United States and the United Kingdom (Sanders et al., 2008, 7).

This chapter reviews the international and New Zealand nonprofit literature, and defines and describes the community sector in five sections. To begin with, in the first section the definitions that are commonly used in the literature are described alongside the chosen definitions used in this research. In the second section, the different roles that community organisations play in society are analysed. It was found that community groups perform an instrumental, or service delivery and social entrepreneurship role, and expressive, or political engagement and cultural role, in society.
The first gap in the literature that is identified relates to how writers described the role of community groups. For example, the expressive role is especially important for this research because advocacy is described as an expressive activity; however the instrumental role has been given far more attention in the international and New Zealand literature. In addition, scholars suggest that community groups participate in building social capital. However, as discussed in Chapter 8, social capital can also contribute to the effectiveness of advocacy. In the next chapter, some findings are discussed that begin to address this gap. For example, the ways in which community groups use relationships with decision-makers and bureaucrats to carry out their advocacy is discussed by some scholars (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Rees, 1999; Reid, 1999; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). This is the only instance when particular relationships were described by scholars as an aide to the advocacy efforts of community groups; however, the term social capital was generally not used. On the other hand, as discussed in Chapter 8, social capital can also be used to increase effectiveness in other ways, such as developing relationships with groups in multiple institutions.

The third section describes the key characteristics of most community organisations, which can help to define and describe the community sector. These characteristics included tax-exempt status, a close connection to the community, and engaging in complex work with marginalised communities. These characteristics can be used to distinguish the community sector from other sectors.

The fourth section addresses the diversity that exists within the community sector. The contributions of umbrella, direct service delivery, religious, and secular organisations were highlighted because these groups can be classified as SSCOs. Although the diversity of the sector was often discussed in the literature, there was very little analysis of that diversity and how it may affect advocacy. For example, organisations may advocate in different ways, and they may be positioned differently within the community sector. Although power differentials were acknowledged in the literature, a broad analysis of the community sector and its diversity was not. In comparison with those studies, a broad analysis, like the one used in this research, can
be used to explain why certain types of organisations operate differently and why there is variation in how groups are treated.

The fifth section describes the New Zealand literature. Based on this review, it appears that organisations in New Zealand and the United States perform similar roles in society, namely instrumental and expressive roles. Findings in the New Zealand literature also suggest that community groups in New Zealand have similar characteristics to those in comparative countries, like the United States and the United Kingdom (Sanders et al., 2008). These characteristics include tax-exempt status, the community as the primary stakeholder in community organisations, and that community organisations predominantly work with marginalised groups. Next, the New Zealand literature is used to describe Māori, non-Māori, umbrella, direct service delivery, religious, and secular organisations, which are associated with SSCOs in New Zealand. The discussion of Māori and non-Māori organisations is unique to New Zealand, however the findings in the New Zealand literature on umbrella, direct service delivery, religious, and secular organisations are similar to those in the international literature.

Two conclusions can be drawn from this literature review. First, New Zealand data should be able to provide insights to other similar countries. This chapter describes the community sector as it exists in New Zealand and other countries, such as the United States, and it appears that there is some similarity. As a result, the findings from this study may be used to provide insights to countries that scholars have identified as similar to New Zealand, such as the United States or the United Kingdom (Sanders et al., 2008). Second, the primary gaps in the literature appear to be based on the method and approach of researchers, and these gaps are managed in this thesis. Most of the international literature has focused on the United States, and of these analyses, researchers do not take a broad relational approach. On the other hand, this research is on the community sector in New Zealand and applies a relational theoretical approach. The relational approach that is used in this research and its benefits are described in Chapter 4. Overall, this research is designed to address these gaps and contribute to the current understanding of the SSCO sector.
Chapter 3
Community organisations and advocacy: A review of the literature

The previous chapter defined and described the community sector, and identified gaps in the literature. Two primary roles were found in the literature: the instrumental role and the expressive role. This chapter describes one of the expressive roles in depth, civic and political engagement (Frumkin, 2002), with a particular focus on advocacy. The definition of advocacy that is used for this research is “the influence of groups in shaping social and political outcomes in government and society” (Reid, 2000, 6). This definition is used because the targets of advocacy include government, public opinion and society in general. That is to say, advocacy is more than lobbying, which involves influencing legislation only. Understanding how social service community organisations (SSCOs) advocate is central to better understanding the sector and may contribute to a general knowledge base that is used to produce more effective advocacy campaigns.

The primary aim of this research is to understand how SSCOs advocate effectively. In this chapter, this aim is fulfilled by discussing how three questions are addressed in the literature:

- How do SSCOs advocate?
- How do SSCOs advocate effectively?
- How are relationships managed to facilitate advocacy?

The discussion of these questions in this chapter is in five parts or sections. The first section lays out the foundation for understanding how SSCOs advocate, and describes some effective advocacy strategies. Four areas are covered: who SSCOs advocate for and who they target in their advocacy campaigns; what SSCOs advocate for; why SSCOs advocate; and how SSCOs advocate. This discussion further reveals how SSCOs address the determinants of health. The second section discusses the same four areas, based on findings in the New Zealand literature, in order to understand how
community organisations advocate in New Zealand. The third section describes factors that may have an effect on the advocacy efforts and strategy choices of SSCOs. The fourth section uses the New Zealand literature to understand which factors influence the advocacy efforts of community organisations in New Zealand. Finally, the last section identifies gaps in the literature and discusses the ways that they are addressed in this research.

The literature analysed in this chapter is drawn from three areas: the nonprofit literature, the interest group literature, and the social movement literature. This approach is common for many researchers investigating advocacy in the community sector (Berry & Arons, 2003; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Debra Minkoff, 2002; Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007, 2009; Salamon, 1995b). In fact, there have been recent attempts to synthesise these literatures (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; G. F. Davis, McAdam, Scott, & Zald, 2005; J. C. Jenkins, 2006). In their analysis of the literature, Andrews and Edwards (2004) argue that all three areas are essentially focused on the same phenomenon.

Overall, there is a substantial common ground in conceptual definitions of public interest groups, social movement organizations, and nonprofit advocacy organizations. Most of the divergence comes from differing research strategies and questions (Andrews & Edwards, 2004, 485).

In this chapter, I have endeavoured to focus on the nonprofit literature whenever possible, and more specifically the analyses of social service community organisations (SSCOs). However, there is very little research to draw from in this regard. Therefore, I will label the examples that refer to the social movement or interest group literature as such. Similarly, because there are so few studies on SSCOs, I will begin each section and sub-section with an analysis of the nonprofit literature and then highlight SSCO examples as they occur.

**Advocacy in community organisations**

Authors that have studied interest groups and social movements agree that advocacy in the United States “skyrocketed” after 1950 (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Cigler & Loomis, 1986; Porta & Diani, 2006; Schlozman & Tierney, 1986; Tarrow, 1998;
J. Walker, 1991). However, the data on community organisations is less clear. Although most nonprofit researchers agree the community sector has grown (Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Berry, 2005; Salamon et al., 2004), the level of advocacy in community organisations is not well understood. Kramer (1981) found that only 8% of the 20 United States-based agencies that he investigated were involved in advocacy. More recent findings on advocacy in the community sector as a whole have indicated that advocacy is a significant and common activity in community organisations (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003). For example, findings from a study of 1,738 nonprofit organisations in the United States indicate that approximately 75% of these organisations advocate (G. D. Bass et al., 2007). Although most authors suggest that advocacy could be much higher in the community sector if community groups were given more freedom to advocate (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007), it appears that political involvement is increasing in community organisations; or at least the ability and interest to capture it is increasing. The remainder of this section aims to answer the “who,” “what,” “why,” and “how” questions related to community organisation advocacy. of community organisations.

**Whom do community organisations advocate for and who are the targets of advocacy?**

Community organisations advocate for and with marginalised communities. As pointed out in Chapter 2, most researchers agree [i.e. (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Boris & Krehley, 2003; Frumkin & Galaskiewicz, 2004; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993)] that a key characteristic of community organisations, especially SSCOs (Donaldson, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008), is that they “are the only organizations that work on behalf of the poor, those without health insurance, immigrants, the disabled, and most other marginalized constituencies” (Berry, 2005, 568). These groups serve marginalised communities and advocate on behalf of marginalised communities. Some writers have discussed what it means to work “on behalf” of marginalised communities, as opposed to these communities advocating themselves (Cheadle, Senter, Solomon, Beery, & Schwartz, 2005; Donaldson, 2007, 154; Israel et al., 2003; Minkler, 2004; Minkler & Pies, 2005; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2005; W. R. Scott et al., 2006, 703; Stoeker, 2003).
Although this is a very important topic, it is not addressed in this research, where the focus is on how groups engage in effective advocacy activities.

On the other hand, the targets of advocacy are often decision-makers, bureaucrats, and the public. Advocacy directed at government was the most common target of advocacy that was discussed in the nonprofit literature [i.e. (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Donaldson, 2007; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Najam, 1999; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007, 2009)]. However, the public was also described as a target (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Reid, 2000). Through his analysis of the literature, Jenkins (2006) argues that there is a paucity of research on the advocacy that is directed at the public and it appears that he is correct. For example, studies that included the public as a target always included the government as a target as well (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Rees, 1999; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006; S. Vaughan & Arsneault, 2008).

Scott et al. (2006) provide a good example of how SSCOs target members of the government sector and the public through their advocacy in order to create change at multiple levels. In their case study of three organisations in Northern California, they describe how youth organisations have played a pivotal role in bringing about “new conceptions of youth” and have changed “the way public policy addresses youth’s needs” (W. R. Scott et al., 2006, 691). They argue that organisations advocating on issues to support youth have “reconceptualized” youth services because they “propose new ways to view young people, address youth issues, and work with youth in proactive ways that depart significantly from past policy responses to youth” (W. R. Scott et al., 2006, 692). According to the authors, advocates have also influenced policy, which they suggest is reflected through the creation of policies that support children such as the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and the Gang Prevention and Effective Deterrence Act of 2005. Overall, it appears that these changes are the result of “working to reform and restructure not one but several existing, interrelated, highly institutionalized fields, including education, social services, and juvenile justice” (W. R. Scott et al., 2006, 694). In order to create the change that Scott et al. (2006) described, multiple groups had to be targeted.
What issues do community organisations address through advocacy?

Given that SSCOs generally advocate on behalf of marginalised communities, the issues these organisations address through advocacy are considered. Some scholars suggest that community groups advocate for issues that support the community, such as social justice or food security (Hudson, 2002; Debra Minkoff, 2002). Yet few studies directly asked participants what issues they advocate for. When researchers did ask participants this question, they found that community organisations predominantly advocated for issues that support the community and group interests (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; McCarthy & Walker, 2004; Schmid et al., 2008).

Schmid et al. (2008) asked key informants from 96 SSCOs in Israel what issues they focus on in their advocacy efforts. Overall, participants said they focused their political activity on “ensuring the rights of special populations.” Although these issues were based on answers from a set of predetermined issues, in-depth interviews were also conducted to obtain detailed information on the political activity of organisations, which adds more support to their results. Overall, these finding indicate that SSCOs advocate for the rights of communities they represent.

Child and Grønbjerg (2007) surveyed a range of 523 community organisations in Indiana. They found that organisations focused their advocacy activity on “group interests” (23%) which included issues ranging from race and gender issues to the needs of senior citizens and veterans. The second focus of advocacy activity was health care (14%). Both of these issues relate directly to community needs. It appears that supporting the community remains the priority for community groups involved in the Child and Grønbjerg (2007) study.

McCarthy and Walker (2004) surveyed 211 religiously affiliated organisations in the United States. They separated these organisations into two groups: congregation-based organisations (CBOs) and individual membership organisations (IMOs). Both of these groups focused on issues that relate to supporting the homeless through advocating for housing and lending support. CBOs also focused on issues that relate to education reform and local autonomy as well as issues that relate to crime, drugs and police. In addition, IMOs also focused on voter registration and participation as well as
health care, workers rights and community services. In sum, the issues that community groups advocated for in the study predominantly related to supporting the community.

Based on the findings from these three studies, it can be concluded that community groups advocate for issues that are related to reducing the effects of the conditions that lead to determinants of health, as they negatively affect marginalised communities. The nonprofit literature does not treat these issues as determinants of health, but they clearly are. For example, the top issue that McCarthy and Walker (2004) found community groups advocated for was supporting homeless communities. Schmid et al. (2008) observed that the groups advocated for supporting the rights of special populations, or groups that have special needs. Child and Grønbjerg (2007) discovered that community organisations advocate for group interests, which included race, gender, and the needs of marginalised groups. All of these issues are related to marginalised communities and, as described earlier in the ecological model, the factors that influence their health.

**Why do community organisations advocate?**

The rationale given in the literature for why community organisations advocate and why they should advocate is directly linked with the “who” and “what” of advocacy. Put simply, researchers argue that because community organisations work with and represent the most marginalised groups in society, it is important that they have a strong advocacy voice (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Boris & Mosher-Williams, 1998; Donaldson, 2007; Frumkin, 2002; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Kramer, 1981; Mosley, 2009; Najam, 1999; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007; O’Neill, 1989; Salamon, 1995b). The argument found in the literature is summed up by Berry and Arons (2003). They argue that community organisations need to advocate because “we’ll have a fairer political system if the disadvantaged in society are adequately represented in public policymaking” (Berry & Arons, 2003, 150).

Similarly, some researchers have found that advocacy is directly linked to an organisation’s mission. In their large-scale study in the United States, Bass et al. (2007) found that community organisations generally advocate so that they can fulfil their mission and better serve their clientele. Other writers that have investigated SSCOs echoed this finding (Donaldson, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et
al., 2006). Najam takes this argument further and suggests that all community organisations are “by definition, advocates” (Najam, 1999, 156), therefore advocacy is a part of every organisation’s mission. He goes on to admit that advocacy may not be the “overarching theme” of community organisations, but that it guides the work of these groups. Other scholars do not take the strong stance that Najam does, but many think that advocacy should be more encouraged in the community sector (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003). In short, it appears that community organisations advocate so that they can meet the needs of their community and contribute to a more democratic environment.

How do community organisations advocate?

The primary forms of advocacy that were most often found in the literature are described in this section. However, strategies that were not discussed in the SSCO advocacy literature, such as monitoring legislation (Fox, 2001; Nownes & Freeman, 1998), are not included because the focus of this research is SSCOs. Specifically, six forms of advocacy are described: engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats; publishing research; working with the media; protesting; developing coalitions; and educating the public. In the majority of studies in the nonprofit, social movement, and interest group literature, it was noted that most community organisations incorporate multiple strategies into their advocacy agenda [i.e. (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; Rees, 1999; W. R. Scott et al., 2006)]. Therefore, these strategies should not be understood as mutually exclusive tactics, but as a toolbox that groups choose from. In addition, each of these strategies can be viewed as affecting a level in the ecological model, described earlier, which supports the influence community groups have on the determinants of health. For example, the aim of engaging with decision-makers is to impact public policy factors.

Engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats

The strategy that is discussed the most in the literature is engaging directly with decision-makers and high-level bureaucrats, such as the chief executive of a government ministry. Strategies that fall into this category include lobbying, or attempts
to influence legislation (Vernick, 1999), consulting with government representatives, serving on advisory boards, and engaging in litigation. Forming networks with bureaucrats and decision-makers has been described as a very effective strategy for influencing policy (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; Rees, 1999; Reid, 1999; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Other studies that specifically address advocacy in SSCOs also support these findings and suggest that engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats is very common amongst SSCOs (Donaldson, 2007; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006).

In fact, in their investigation of advocacy in youth service organisations, Scott et al. argued that gaining access to government representatives is a “clear indication of success” in SSCOs because this access indicates that community organisations are invited “into the halls of power” (W. R. Scott et al., 2006, 705). Scholars argue that the primary reason given for this effectiveness is that a group’s message would not be diluted or altered (Mosley, 2009). At any rate, this strategy may be more difficult for some groups that do not have sufficient resources or access (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; J. Walker, 1991), therefore it may not be used by all organisations.

It was found that community organisations are very strategic when engaging with government. Community groups often form networks with an array of government employees and then tap into these relationships when it is important. For example, in their large survey of interest groups in Washington DC, Leech and Baumgartner (1998) found that groups will collaborate with “friends” in the beginning stages of the policy process and later focus on their “foes” when trying to get a policy passed or defeated. This means that community groups need to maintain a variety of networks with multiple bureaucrats and decision-makers. Other studies also indicated that community groups form networks with a multitude of different groups in government (Andrews, 2001; Ganz, 2000; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; W. R. Scott et al., 2006).

**Developing coalitions**

Developing coalitions as a strategy consists of bringing groups together in order to show support for an issue. Community organisations often develop coalitions or partnerships with other groups to support their advocacy efforts (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Fox, 2001; Hudson, 2002; Hula, 1999; Kerlin &
Reid, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009; Rees, 1999). In fact, after surveying over 900 community groups in Minnesota, Galaskiewicz and Bielefeld (1998) found that organisations with few networks are more likely to fail. Developing coalitions is a very common advocacy tool amongst SSCOs as well (Donaldson, 2007; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006). In her study of 321 SSCOs, Mosley (2009) found that participating in coalitions is the most common strategy of SSCOs. She also argues that because collaborating with other groups can increase legitimacy with the public (Hudson, 2002; N. Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2000), it also helps establish relationships with government representatives. Other scholars have also argued that collaboration is useful because through these networks, groups are able to acquire more power, resources, and knowledge (Donaldson, 2007; Fox, 2001; Hudson, 2002; W. R. Scott et al., 2006).

According to writers in the nonprofit literature, coalitions can take many forms. Groups can partner with other community organisations of equal power (Hudson, 2002; W. R. Scott et al., 2006), umbrella organisations (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009), more powerful groups, such as researchers, think tanks or universities (Fox, 2001), decision-makers, bureaucrats, journalists, or foundations (Fox, 2001), business or religious groups (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006) and groups dedicated to advocacy or lobbying, such as social welfare organisations (Kerlin & Reid, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009). Through her study of 12 effective national organisations in the United States, Rees (1999) found that developing coalitions with "strange bedfellow' alliances," or groups that may seem to have different motives, was especially effective. Nicholson-Crotty (2009) and Gormley and Cymrot (2006) found that groups are more likely to form coalitions when the policy environment is "restrictive"; however, based on the literature described above, it appears that regardless of the policy environment, community groups commonly develop dense networks with other groups.

**Conducting research**

Another advocacy strategy that was described as effective is conducting and publishing research. Berry and Arons argue that "data and research are the coins of the realm" to influencing advocacy (Berry & Arons, 2003, 136). They suggest that research capacity is important for groups that are interested in influencing policy. Other scholars
have also found research to be an effective advocacy strategy amongst SSCOs (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006). Research was not mentioned as a strategy tool in Mosely’s (2009) study. However, she did include other strategies that may involve research, such as issuing policy reports and providing public education. Some writers also noted that although research is effective, it requires a great deal of skills and resources, and therefore may be difficult for some smaller organisations (Fox, 2001; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006).

Research can be used to inform decision-makers and bureaucrats. Berry and Arons argue that government officials have “very limited information-gathering capacity” (Berry & Arons, 2003, 155). This argument is supported by Fox (2001) as well. As a result, decision-makers and bureaucrats rely on other groups, like community organisations, to bring them data on the community. Investigations have been undertaken into how research can effectively be used to inform decision-makers and bureaucrats (Black, 2001; Carroll, Blewden, & Witten, 2008; Crewe & Young, 2002; P. Davis & Howden-Chapman, 1996; Dobbins, Rosenbaum, Plews, Law, & Fysh, 2007; Fafard, 2008; Majchrzak, 1984; Nutley, Walter, & Davies, 2007; Whitehead, 2004). Key findings from these studies indicate that using mixed methods (Whitehead, 2004), keeping research topical (Petticrew, 2004), utilising networks (Dobbins et al., 2007), including policymakers in research (Black, 2001), and increasing communication (Majchrzak, 1984) are effective methods for informing government.

Research can also be used to inform advocacy and specific types of research have been linked with this approach. For example, community-based participatory research (CBPR) “begins with a research topic of importance to the community and with the aim of combining knowledge and action for social change to improve community health and eliminate health disparities” (M Minkler & N Wallerstein, 2003, 4). CBPR brings members of the community into the research process. That is to say, the community is not only a participant, but also members of the research team (Barbara A. Israel, Eugenia Eng, Amy J. Schulz, & Edith A. Parker, 2005). There are different levels at which the community is involved in the research process. For example, they could define the problem, collect data, or analyse data. Findings from CBPR projects have generally been used to understand what issues need to be addressed in the community.
(Minkler, 2005). Overall, there are two ways that research can be used as an advocacy strategy: to inform government representatives and inform advocacy. It appears that community groups use both of these strategies, but they generally focus on informing government representatives.

**Working with the media**

Community organisations also utilise the media to bring attention to an issue and send messages to government representatives and the public (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Nownes & Freeman, 1998). It appears that although this is not the preferred strategy of SSCOs, they do use the media to advocate (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006). Other studies that focused on SSCOs did not address media tactics, which implies that these strategies may not be as central to SSCO advocacy efforts.

Based on their analysis of the interest group, social movement, and nonprofit literature, Andrews and Edwards (2004) found that going to the media could be especially useful for community organisations interested in raising awareness on an issue and influencing the policy agenda. They argued that “mass media is an important intermediary institution that shapes the agenda-setting process” (Andrews & Edwards, 2004, 493). Wallack and Dorfman (1996) supported this finding. Furthermore, based on their results from two case studies of community groups in the United States, Wallack and Dorfman (1996) argued that groups can effectively influence public policy through the media when they work to “frame for access” and “frame for content.” In other words, according to the authors, effective groups use the media to gain access to government representatives and to bring attention to the content or structural nature of an issue.

Admittedly, based on his review of the literature, Jenkins found that “media coverage is notoriously difficult to control” (J. C. Jenkins, 2006, 322) and others have found using the media to be resource intensive (Barker-Plummer, 2002). For example, Danielian and Page (1994) studied 893 television news stories involving interest groups between the years of 1969 and 1982. Overall, they found that the coverage of citizen action groups was based on an event, such as a protest or a demonstration, as opposed to the issue that the group was discussing. This was contrary to the coverage of business and corporate interest groups, which was often based on statements that
these groups made. In other words, the content of citizen group messages was rarely covered whereas the content of business group messages was often covered.

**Public education**

Public education includes any type of educational campaign. The primary aim of public education is to persuade people to take action; therefore, this strategy also involves mobilising citizens to write, call or visit decision-makers. Public education campaigns are a part of the advocacy repertoire of community organisations (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Fox, 2001; Kerlin & Reid, 2009; Debra Minkoff, 2002; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009; Rees, 1999), and more specifically SSCOs (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006). However, these tactics do not appear to be used by SSCO strategists as frequently as other tactics, such as engaging with decision-makers and participating in coalitions (Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008).

Similar to using the media and protesting, Andrews and Edwards (2004) found that using public education as an advocacy tool can help to bring attention to issues that are ignored or mischaracterised. Similar results were found in Rees’ (1999) study. In her investigation of 12 influential organisations in the United States, Rees (1999) found that groups focusing on public education campaigns as an advocacy tool were more likely to be interested in shaping public opinion, as opposed to reflecting public opinion, which suggests that some groups are more likely to use public education than others. The evidence from Andrews and Edwards’ (2004) literature review also proposes that this approach will not be used by all groups because it can be the most “labor and capital intensive of the technologies employed by advocacy organizations” (Andrews & Edwards, 2004, 495). Kerlin and Reid (2009) indirectly supported this finding when they found that public charities often rely on social welfare organisations to fund education campaigns. This suggests that specific groups, namely those with resources and an interest in shaping public opinion, may be more likely to engage in public education.

**Protesting**

Protesting is a strategy used by community organisations (McCarthy & Walker, 2004), interest groups (Nownes & Freeman, 1998), and social movements (Andrews &
Edwards, 2004) to bring attention to an issue (Andrews & Edwards, 2004). However, according to Mosley’s (2009) study of SSCOs, protesting is the strategy that is used least by SSCOs. This finding is supported by other studies that focus on these organisations (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Schmid et al., 2008). If future investigations continue to indicate that SSCOs limit their use of protesting as a strategy tool, it could be the result of what Mosley (2009) described as a trend of professionalisation amongst SSCOs; a trend that some writers argue is occurring across the community sector (Carey & Barunack-Mayer, 2009; Ebrahim, 2001; Frumkin, 2002; Kamat, 2003; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Professionalisation includes employing more “professional” staff, such as those with professional degrees or master’s degrees, and relying less on volunteers.

**Advocacy in New Zealand community organisations**

Research on community organisations in New Zealand is very limited (Cribb, 2006; Health and Disability NGO Working Group, 2007; Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009; Sanders et al., 2008; Statistics New Zealand, 2007), and only a few studies address advocacy (Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009). It is important to mention that these advocacy studies were not published in peer-reviewed journals. The Milligan (2008) study was published as a report by Lancaster University in the United Kingdom. Also, the O’Brien et al. (2009) study was published as a report by the Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector (OCVS), and is part of a larger international study led by Johns Hopkins University. A large-scale investigation is currently under way into the role that New Zealand community organisations play in political decision-making (Grey, Nickel, & Sedgwick, 2009); however, at the time of this writing the data is still being collected. Overall, although it is clear that there is limited research to draw from, the information that is available allows for a basic understanding of the “who,” “what,” “why,” and “how” questions of advocacy. Generally, it appears that the New Zealand findings correspond with the international literature.
Who do community organisations in New Zealand advocate for and who are their targets?

Milligan et al. (2008) surveyed 53 mental health and community safety organisations in Manchester, England and 30 in Auckland, New Zealand. They also interviewed 64 key informants from both sub-sectors in Manchester and 64 in Auckland as well. Mental health organisations qualify as an SSCO, but based on the New Zealand Standard Classification of Nonprofit Organisations (NZSCNPO), which is used to gather data on community groups (Statistics New Zealand, 2007), community safety organisations do not. However, since results from each sub-sector are not separated, they are discussed as a whole. Similar to the international data, in their study, Milligan et al. (2008) found that community groups generally worked with and advocated for “disenfranchised and vulnerable groups” (Milligan et al., 2008, 16). In their study, the government was usually discussed as the target of change; however, public awareness was also mentioned as a strategy that was utilised by community groups. Therefore, it appears that decision-makers, bureaucrats, and the public can be targets of advocacy activities in New Zealand. O’Brien et al.’s (2009) investigation of community groups in New Zealand, described below, supported these findings.

What issues do community organisations in New Zealand address through advocacy?

O’Brien et al. (2009) reviewed the New Zealand literature on community groups and interviewed 46 key informants that worked in community organisations, including SSCO’s and statutory organisations. They found that community groups have been involved in a range of health-related issues, such as “social housing, the development of the New Zealand Disability Strategy, and some aspects of the development of policy responses to family poverty and family violence, elder abuse and problem gambling as well as the establishment of Nga Kōhanga Reo” (O’Brien et al., 2009, 37). Participants in Milligan et al.’s (2008) research were not asked what issues they advocated for. Overall, it appears that community groups in New Zealand may advocate for issues related to group interests, which is similar to the international data. Based on these

---

2 Kōhanga reo are early childhood education facilities that promote and develop Māori language and culture.
findings, it can be concluded that New Zealand community organisations, similar to those in the United States, also advocate for reducing the effects of conditions that public health practitioners have identified as determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007), as they negatively affect marginalised communities.

**Why do community organisations in New Zealand advocate?**

Milligan et al. (2008) briefly broached the issue of why community groups advocate. They discovered that participants advocated when they saw social injustice. This topic was not addressed in the O’Brien et al. (2009) study. The findings from the former investigation are similar to those in the international literature.

**How do community organisations in New Zealand advocate?**

The Milligan et al. (2008) and O’Brien et al. (2009) studies include a discussion on the advocacy activities of community organisations, and similar to the international data, the results indicate that community groups engage in a range of activities. Milligan et al. (2008) found that 20 community groups in Auckland engaged with decision-makers, 19 lobbied the government, 15 campaigned for public awareness, and eight participated in protests. The authors suggested that community groups are more likely to use “sophisticated” methods that can be described as “manipulations of the system” as opposed to “traditional” forms of activism, such as lobbying and protesting. These “sophisticated” methods appear to fall in the category of engaging with government officials and require advocates to understand how the political system works. O’Brien et al.’s (2009) results support the findings of Milligan et al. (2008).

Research was also briefly mentioned in the O’Brien et al (2009) study, and participants suggested that the “formal” research capacity of organisations is often limited, presumably due to a lack of resources. In research conducted by Carroll et al. (2008) to understand how research is used in policy, the authors found that community organisations engage in research to effect policy change. The authors interviewed 31 participants in New Zealand, which revealed that university research done in collaboration with community organisations “strengthened the impact of research on the policy process and funding” (Carroll et al., 2008, 49). Although research was not the
focus of the O’Brien et al. (2009) and Milligan et al. (2008) investigations of community organisations, it appears that community groups do use research to advocate in New Zealand.

The results from O’Brien et al.’s (2009) study also indicated what types of strategies were more effective. When the authors asked community advocates to discuss successful advocacy strategies, they commonly identified working closely with government representatives.

Most people interviewed in this project emphasised that many of the most effective forms of influence involved careful behind the scenes relationship building and conveying information directly to those most able to influence policy and shape decision-making, rather than high profile media or public engagement (O’Brien et al., 2009, 36).

It appears that engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats is a common advocacy strategy in New Zealand, and although groups protest and use the media to advocate, participants felt that they are generally more effective when they worked with decision-makers and bureaucrats. This finding is similar to the international research discussed above, which suggests that although community groups use many advocacy strategies, the most common strategy is engaging with government representatives.

**What factors have an effect on the advocacy efforts and strategy choices of community organisations?**

Internationally, there appears to be a general consensus that advocacy is an important function of community organisations (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Frumkin, 2002; Kramer, 1981; Najam, 1999; O’Neill, 1989; Salamon, 1995b); however, not all community groups appear to advocate. For example, in their large-scale survey of interest groups, Nownes and Freeman found that groups were “active on only a fraction of the bills in which they were interested” (Nownes & Freeman, 1998, 94). In addition, those organisations that do engage in advocacy generally treat it as an “ancillary” activity (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007, 277; Hudson, 2002). For example, Child and Grønbjerg (2007) found that 25% of community organisations in Indiana advocate, but only 7% engage in “core advocacy,” which is defined as devoting substantial resources to advocacy efforts. All of the
organisations in these studies may have been more involved in advocacy if they had the opportunity. The aim of this section is to understand what factors would have facilitated or inhibited their advocacy efforts, and it is done in three parts.

What factors affect the amount of advocacy undertaken by community organisations?

The researchers who discuss advocacy activities in community organisations predominantly draw from resource mobilisation theory (McCarthy & Zald, 1977) and new-institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Resource mobilisation theorists argue that the more resources an organisation has, the more likely it is to be involved in advocacy activities. New-institutional theorists argue that the more institutionalised an organisation is, which can be measured by size, age, and professionalisation, the less likely it is to be involved in advocacy activities. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) call this effect institutional isomorphism, which they define as the tendency for organisations to behave like the more powerful organisations they interact with, and ultimately leads to all of them acting the same way. Together, these theories can be contradictory because although larger organisations often have more resources, they are also more likely to be institutionalised (Salamon, 1995b). Nevertheless, many scholars have drawn from each of these theories to guide their hypotheses [i.e. (Nicholson-Crotty, 2007; Schmid et al., 2008)]. That being said, four factors were discussed in the literature as they relate to advocacy efforts: organisational capacity, government funding, tax-exempt status, and the political environment.

This research does not include an analysis of how funding from the for-profit business sector affects advocacy because the level of business philanthropy in New Zealand is low (Sanders et al., 2008, 18); however, this source of funding has been shown to affect the community sector (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004; Galaskiewicz & Colman, 2006; Nickel & Eikenberry, 2009; Weisbrod, 2004). Overall, it appears that community organisations benefit from the additional resources acquired from businesses (Galaskiewicz & Colman, 2006). On the other hand, the primary disadvantage is a threat to the role and mission of community organisations, which is to serve the community (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004; Foster & Bradach, 2005; Nickel & Eikenberry, 2009; Weisbrod, 2004). This is an important topic and should be considered
for future research in regions where business philanthropy is significant, such as the United States (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004; Nickel & Eikenberry, 2009).

**Resources and organisational capacity**

The amount of resources, how resources are managed, and networks have all been shown to have an effect on advocacy activities (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Rees, 1999). First, Bass et al. (2007) suggested that an organisation’s resource-level, as measured by staff and budget size, is the strongest predictor of advocacy involvement. Similarly, the data that is specific to SSCOs indicates that advocacy in SSCOs is facilitated by an increase in resources (Donaldson, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008). In fact, in Schmid et al.’s (2008) study of SSCOs in Israel, the number of volunteers was *the* most significant predictor of advocacy involvement. In addition, Donaldson (2007), who studied 43 SSCOs in the United States, found that insufficient resources was a major barrier to involvement in advocacy activities.

Scholars have described many types of resources that can influence the effectiveness of advocacy. In their comprehensive analysis of the social movement, advocacy, and social theory literature (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Cress & Snow, 2000; Lin, 2001), Edwards and McCarthy (2004) created a resource typology that measures five resources: cultural, social-organisational, moral, human, and material. This study provides the most complete account of the multiplicity of resources that organisations utilise to advocate. The authors emphasised how the unequal distribution of resources affects organisations and how economically marginalised groups have managed to be effective by focusing on social-organisational resources. Their analysis concludes with a discussion of the different funders and how each of these sources affects upon its recipient.

Scholars have measured resource-levels through budget size (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Donaldson, 2007; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; Schmid et al., 2008; J. Walker, 1991), staff size (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007), number of volunteers (Mosley, 2009), expenditures (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Mosley, 2009), and age of an organisation (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Donaldson, 2007; Schmid et al., 2008). Across all of the elements that measured resources, an increase in resources led to an increase in
advocacy, with the exception of the age of an organisation and number of staff. Each of these factors is described below.

Age of the organisation was either not a significant predictor of advocacy (Schmid et al., 2008) or had an inverted-U effect (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Donaldson, 2007). Both Donaldson (2007) and Child and Grønbjerg (2007) found that community organisations in the United States established in the 1960s were more likely to advocate, whereas organisations founded prior to 1960 or in the late 1990s were less likely to advocate. The authors of both studies suggest that the increase of advocacy activity by organisations established in the 1960s could be due to the strong support of advocacy, in general, at this time. Based on these findings, it appears that the political environment is linked to the level of advocacy, which is discussed in a later section. Overall, it appears that age has a complex effect (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Donaldson, 2007); however, there is not enough data at this time to determine how age affects advocacy with any certainty.

The findings on the levels of staff were also mixed. Child and Grønbjerg (2007) found that an increase in staff leads to more advocacy. On the other hand, Berry and Arons (2003) found staff levels to be insignificantly related to advocacy levels; instead, they suggested that it is not the number of staff, but what they are doing. According to these authors, the most effective organisations were those that had a research capacity and staff that were responsible for government relations. The Berry and Arons (2003) research appears to have deconstructed the effect of staff numbers on a deeper level than the Child and Grønbjerg (2007) investigation, which suggests that the former study may be more accurate than the latter.

Second, as alluded to above, the way that staff, finances, and volunteers, are managed has also been shown to facilitate advocacy across all community organisations (Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Hudson, 2002; Rees, 1999), and SSCOs (Mosley, 2009). Two large-scale studies in the United States indicated that organisations with more resources devoted to advocacy activities were more likely to participate in public policy and be more effective in their efforts (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003). This is a major finding that was emphasised by the authors, and it suggests that groups who do not treat advocacy as an “ancillary”
activity are more likely to represent the needs of their clients. More specifically, Berry and Arons (2003) argue that organisations which focus their resources on research are much more effective because, as discussed earlier, government representatives rely on community groups to supply them with accurate data on the community.

The relationship between resource management and advocacy is also supported by other research regarding organisational support. Recent studies have indicated that organisational support for advocacy by the Board and organisational leader is linked with an increase of advocacy as well (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Donaldson, 2007; Kerlin & Reid, 2009). Indeed, Donaldson (2007) found that leadership support was the strongest predictor of advocacy involvement in 43 SSCOs. Although fewer researchers have measured this element of organisational capacity, scholars have demonstrated that it is an element of how groups manage their resources, and that it is linked to the facilitation of advocacy (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Donaldson, 2007; Kerlin & Reid, 2009).

Third, there is strong support in the literature for a link between networks and advocacy-related activities (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Baum, 1998; Ganz, 2000; Hudson, 2002; Kerlin & Reid, 2009; N. Phillips et al., 2000; Rees, 1999). This element of organisational capacity also appears to be a strong predictor of advocacy involvement in SSCOs (Donaldson, 2007; Mosley, 2009; C. Scott, 2006). Networks allow groups to form coalitions and they can provide resources, knowledge and power. In addition, according to scholars, networks with government representatives can allow community groups to have a more direct influence on policy (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Rees, 1999, 2001; Reid, 1999; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Overall, the literature indicates that networks can facilitate advocacy and make advocacy strategies more effective.

**Government funding**

Understanding how government funding affects advocacy is especially important for SSCOs because in comparison to other sub-sectors, a large percentage of their funding comes from government sources (Berry & Arons, 2003, 9; Grønbjerg, 1986; Salamon et al., 2003, 30; Weitzman et al., 2002, 170). Some scholars have argued that receipt of government contracts can lead to a reduction in the amount of advocacy (Kramer, 1981; Schmid et al., 2008; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Wolch, 1990), while
others have argued that it can increase political activity (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Donaldson, 2007; Grogan & Gusmano, 2009; Mosley, 2009; Salamon, 1995a; J. Walker, 1983) or have no significant effect (Chaves, Stephens, & Galaskiewicz, 2004).

The findings from SSCO studies are also mixed (Donaldson, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008). Mosley (2009) found that government funding can increase political opportunity. Donaldson (2007) also stated that government funding was slightly associated with an increase in advocacy. However, she also found that private funding was slightly more associated with advocacy, which essentially suggests that funding may facilitate advocacy regardless of the source. On the other hand, Schmid et al. discovered that the more dependent an organisation was on government funds, “the lower the scope and intensity of their political activity” (Schmid et al., 2008, 594). A closer inspection of the findings suggests that government funding has a more nuanced effect. More specifically, government funding appears to affect the advocacy strategies that are chosen by community organisations, a topic that is discussed below.

**Tax-exempt status**

As discussed in Chapter 2, organisations in the United States that are registered with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) have tax-exempt status. As a result of their tax-exempt status, legal restrictions are placed on the advocacy activities of 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organisations. Vernick (1999) provides a succinct summary of the rules and regulations that relate to the advocacy activities of these organisations. There are two types of 501(c)(3) organisations: public charities and private foundations. These groups cannot engage in electioneering, defined as activities that are aimed at influencing an election, and although these organisations can engage in lobbying, it is regulated. The government restricts 501(c)(3) organisations from “direct lobbying” and “grassroots lobbying.” Direct lobbying includes “any attempt to influence legislation through communication with legislators” (Vernick, 1999, 1426). Grassroots lobbying includes any attempt to influence the opinions of the public. On the other hand, 501(c)(4) organisations, or social welfare organisations, are able to engage in “relatively unlimited lobbying in areas related to its mission” (Vernick, 1999, 1427). There are fewer restrictions on 501(c)(4) organisations, but like 501(c)(3) organisations, these groups
cannot lobby with federal funds either. Groups that go beyond the allowable limit of advocacy activities will lose their tax-exempt status.

Tax-exempt status has recently been shown to create a barrier for community organisations interested in advocating (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry, 2005; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Kerlin & Reid, 2009; Salamon, 1995a). Tax-exempt status does not appear to have been investigated by these researchers, as it relates specifically to SSCO advocacy; however, because SSCOs make up a large percentage of these organisations (National Center for Charitable Statistics [NCCS], 2009), it is expected to affect their advocacy activities. According to the nonprofit research, this barrier to advocacy is the result of a lack of knowledge and real limitations placed on community groups that receive tax-exempt status. Large-scale studies have indicated that many community groups are unaware of the laws and therefore reduce their advocacy levels below that which is necessary because they are afraid of losing their tax-exempt status (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry, 2005; Salamon, 1995a).

Berry (2005) makes the strongest argument against limiting the advocacy activities of 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organisations. He argues that although the government “needs to protect the integrity of the tax deduction for charitable giving” (Berry, 2005, 576), there are few limitations placed on other interest groups, like business lobbies. Therefore, he contends that limiting the advocacy of public charities and social welfare organisations silences the more marginalised groups and allows the more powerful groups to continue influencing government representatives.

**Policy environment and political environment**

A few studies have also suggested that the policy and political environment may affect the advocacy activity of community organisations (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007; W. R. Scott et al., 2006). Scott et al. (2006) found that the most successful youth SSCOs were the groups that could adapt their advocacy strategies to the policy and political environment. For example, a few of the organisations in their case study realised that in order to change how youth were perceived, they must focus on a broader agenda. This new focus was a reaction to the policy and political environment, which encouraged them to address more issues, such as truancy and teenage pregnancy, because they were more politically salient.
Nicholson-Crotty (2007) and Child and Grønbjerg (2007) also found that organisations are more likely to become involved in advocacy if groups perceive that policy changes are threatening their ability to provide services. Child and Grønbjerg (2007) suggested that this threat is higher amongst groups that work in the health and environmental sub-sectors. As a result, these groups were more likely to engage in a wider variety of advocacy activities, as compared to groups in the art sub-sector. For example, in her large-scale study of tax-exempt organisations, Nicholson-Crotty (2007) found that groups were also more likely to engage in advocacy activities if they perceive the political environment, as measured by the number of political allies, would increase their ability to succeed.

**What factors affect the type of advocacy activities community groups undertake?**

Most scholars have focused on the factors that affect the amount of advocacy activities in which community groups engage, as described above; however, some writers also have investigated the factors that affect the type of activity that community organisations undertake (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; J. Walker, 1991). Based on findings from the literature, four key factors affect this choice: government funding, organisational capacity, the political environment, and tax-exempt H elector status (which is defined below). The first three factors listed have the most support in the literature. Similar to the findings in the previous section, all of these factors appear to work together to influence the advocacy activities of community groups.

Scholars who investigate this area often discuss how organisations choose between “inside” and “outside” strategies. Based on data from his large-scale study of national interest groups in the United States, Walker (1991) describes the difference between these two strategies well. Inside strategies may include legislative lobbying and engaging with government representatives; they are based “primarily upon close consultation with political and administrative leaders” (J. Walker, 1991, 9). Outside strategies can include working with the media and protesting; they are “based upon appeals to the public through the mass media” and “the broad-scale mobilisation of citizens at the ‘grassroots’” (J. Walker, 1991, 9). Granted, these strategies are not mutually exclusive (Mosley, 2009). In fact, researchers have indicated that many
organisations, regardless of the nature of the group, are using “inside” tactics (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006, 704). Therefore, although the factors described below may affect how an organisation chooses their strategy, it should be remembered that organisations employ multiple strategies, both “inside” and “outside”.

**Government funding**

As previously mentioned, the literature is mixed as to the effects of government funding on advocacy [i.e. (Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Wolch, 1990)]. Overall, it appears that government funding may increase advocacy in general, but it may decrease more aggressive forms of advocacy, such as lobbying (Nicholson-Crotty, 2009), i.e. advocacy directed at influencing legislation (Vernick, 1999), and the centrality of advocacy in an organisation (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007). In their large-scale study, Child and Grønbjerg (2007) found that organisations receiving high levels of government funding were more likely to engage in peripheral forms of advocacy, as opposed to core advocacy, which, according to the authors, means that they were less likely to devote resources to advocacy. Similarly, in her analysis of over 450 tax-exempt organisations, Nicholson-Crotty (2009) found that community groups were more likely to engage in “less aggressive” advocacy activities, such as forming an alliance with another community organisation or engaging in educational activities. Overall, these findings suggest that the relationship between government funding and advocacy needs to be investigated further.

**Political environment**

Based on the research, the political environment appears to have a strong effect on how organisations choose their advocacy strategies (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; J. Walker, 1991). In Gormley and Cymrot’s (2006) investigation of 50 child advocacy SSCOs, it was found that the presence of “enemies” in the political environment caused organisations to use more outside strategies and form coalitions with other groups. In their study they also found that the presence of “friends” or allies led to an increased use of research strategies. The authors were surprised to discover that an increase of friends did not lead to more “inside” strategies, but instead led to more “outside”
strategies. This finding runs contrary to Walker’s (1991) study, which found that groups who utilised more “inside” strategies were more likely to be ideologically aligned with government representatives. However, Gormley and Cymrot’s (2006) findings may also be linked to the phenomenon that was captured in Nicholson-Crotty (2007) and Child and Grønbjerg’s (2007) study, in which the authors found that a threat increases advocacy activities. Groups that felt more threatened were more likely to advocate and, as demonstrated by Gormley and Cymrot’s (2006) results, they may be more likely to work harder to form relationships with government representatives.

**Organisational Capacity**

Not only does organisational capacity facilitate advocacy, but it has also been shown to affect how an organisation chooses its strategy (Mosley, 2009; J. Walker, 1991). Specifically, organisations that are able to secure more funds and utilise volunteers strategically are more likely to incorporate “inside” strategies (J. Walker, 1991). In Mosley’s (2009) analysis, which focused on SSCOs, she found similar results.

**Tax-exempt H elector status**

Tax-exempt organisations in the United States, described earlier, can apply for the 501(h) election, which essentially means that they have more freedom to advocate (Berry, 2005; Vernick, 1999). Tax-exempt organisations that apply for H election status are able to manage their advocacy expenditures based on a sliding scale. For example, public charities with budgets of up to $500,000 can spend as much as 20% of their total expenditure on lobbying. On the other hand, an organisation with a budget between $1.5 million and $17 million can spend up to $225,000 plus an additional 5% of their budget on lobbying. Berry (2005) describes the simple process to become an H elector; however, he points out that few organisations apply for this option. He argues that the small number of H electors is due to the limited amount of information that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has given to tax-exempt organisations.

Apparently, tax-exempt organisations that become H electors advocate differently from non-H electors (Berry, 2005). In his recent large-scale analysis, Berry (2005) found that H electors are more likely than other tax-exempt organisations to engage in aggressive advocacy strategies, such as lobbying. Similarly, he found that
non-H electors are more likely to engage in less aggressive tactics, such as responding to requests from decision-makers and bureaucrats for information. Although this finding indicates that groups with more freedom will advocate more aggressively, no other studies have investigated this factor.

**Bringing the international literature together: How do relationships affect advocacy?**

This research takes a relational approach to understanding advocacy in community organisations; therefore, the four relationships that consistently appeared in the literature are discussed. The relationship between the community sector and the following groups appear to be influential: the community, community organisations, the media, and the government.

**Relationship with the community**

First, the relationship with the community brings legitimacy to the advocacy activities of community organisations. As discussed in Chapter 2, a key characteristic of community organisations is their close relationship with the community (Berger & Neuhaus, 1996; Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). When community groups are not perceived to have a close relationship with the communities that they serve, their legitimacy has been questioned (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004; Hudson, 2002; Kamat, 2003, 2004; Rahman, 2006; Zaidi, 1999).

**Relationship with the government**

Second, the relationship with the government primarily affects the advocacy activities of community organisations in two ways, through their tax-exempt status (Berry, 2005; Berry & Arons, 2003) and through government funding (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007). To begin with, although community groups with tax-exempt status are able to advocate, studies have indicated that groups often feel tax-exempt status is a barrier to advocacy (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003). Although Child and Grønbjerg (2007) included tax-exempt and non-tax-exempt organisations in their study of advocacy in community groups, they did not compare the advocacy levels of these groups, and it does not appear that other studies have either. Therefore, a thorough understanding of the effects tax-exempt status has on advocacy activities does not
currently appear to exist. Next, the results on how government funding affects advocacy are more mixed; however, it appears that government funding may limit more aggressive and core advocacy activities (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009).

**Relationship with other community organisations**

Third, the relationship with other community organisations is also related to the advocacy efforts of community groups. Based on the research discussed above, networking with other community organisations can increase the level of resources, power and knowledge in these groups (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; B. Bass, 1997; Baum, 1998; Ganz, 2000; Hudson, 2002; Kerlin & Reid, 2009; N. Phillips et al., 2000; Rees, 1999). Community organisations often struggle for resources (De Vita, Fleming, & Twombly, 2001) and an increase in resources can facilitate advocacy (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Schmid et al., 2008; J. Walker, 1991). In addition, due to time constraints (D Minkoff & Powell, 2006, 594), community groups may not be able to devote time to accruing information on issues relevant to their cause, but networks with other groups can allow for the dissemination of information (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Hudson, 2002). Thus, these networks can help groups stay better informed. Similarly, when community organisations come together on an issue, they can have more power if they advocate together as a united front (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Brilliant & Young, 2004).

**Relationship with the media**

Finally, the relationship with the media can be important for organisations that are interested in using the media to advocate. This form of advocacy may occur less frequently in SSCOs (Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008); nonetheless, many community groups take part in this activity. Since media coverage can be “notoriously difficult to control” (J. C. Jenkins, 2006, 322), developing a positive relationship with media outlets may be useful to organisations. For example, if groups are more familiar with particular media outlets, then they may be able to increase their ability to deliver a clear message.
What does the New Zealand literature say about the factors that affect advocacy activities in community organisations?

The Milligan et al. (2008) and O'Brien et al. (2009) studies briefly addressed factors that can affect the advocacy activities of community organisations in New Zealand. Similar to findings in the international literature, New Zealand researchers identified factors that influence the amount of advocacy activities and the type of advocacy activities undertaken by SSCOs. Although these two factors were not directly measured in New Zealand studies, as they were in the international studies, through their comments, participants indicated that some factors can affect advocacy, and these are described below. In addition, the relationships that influence advocacy efforts are put in a New Zealand context.

What factors affect the amount of advocacy undertaken by New Zealand community organisations?

Participant comments from research conducted in New Zealand are used in this section to describe the factors that affect the amount of advocacy activities undertaken by community groups. Overall, three factors appear to have this influence: government funding, tax-exempt status and resources.

Government funding

Similar to findings in the international literature (Weitzman et al., 2002), New Zealand SSCOs can be disproportionately affected by barriers placed on community organisations receiving government funding. For example, in New Zealand, the social services sector receives 50.6% of all government contracts, which is far more than any other sub-sector (Department of Internal Affairs, 2007, 17). As a result, restrictions on government funding can have a major effect on the social services sector, and, as indicated below, these restrictions appear to reduce the amount of advocacy undertaken by groups.

Although there are guidelines for government funding to community organisations, in which community advocacy is acknowledged, it appears that community organisations feel restrained from advocating when they accept government money (Milligan et al., 2008; O'Brien et al., 2009). The Guidelines for Funding with NGOs, published by Treasury (2003) and The Principles to Underpin Management by
Public Entities of Funding to NGOs, published by the Controller and Auditor-General (2006), are nonbinding guides that direct the relationship between government and community groups receiving government funding. Each of these publications acknowledges the advocacy role of community groups; however, participants in the Milligan (2008, 30-31) study indicated that the government often does not follow these regulations. In addition, the authors found that participants chose not to accept contracts with government because it may limit their “independence, run counter to their ethos, or disenfranchise their target groups” (Milligan et al., 2008, 37). Similarly, in O’Brien et al.’s (2009) study, participants suggested that the government limits the advocacy activities of community organisations receiving government funding.

Two recent events shaped how participants in the O’Brien et al. (2009) study viewed the relationship between community organisations and the government. The first event involved umbrella organisations. In the late 1990s three well-known umbrella organisations, the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCOSS), the New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations (NZFVWO), and the New Zealand Council of Social Services (NZCOSS), were threatened with a loss of government funding if they did not merge (Tennant et al., 2008). According to participants, they were threatened because one of the organisations had released critical reports of government policies; however, government sector representatives argued that these groups were threatened because the government wanted to “rationalise and achieve efficiencies across these organisations” (O’Brien et al., 2009, 39). According to participants in O’Brien et al.’s (2009) research, many in the sector viewed this as an attempt to silence the advocacy of community groups. In this case, it appears that the government may have attempted to limit the advocacy actions of organisations by threatening these groups with a loss of government funding.

The second event occurred in 2003, when the restrictions on advocacy changed for community organisations receiving government contracts (O’Brien et al., 2009). The restrictions on advocacy began when issues were raised by some Members of Parliament (MPs) regarding the Ministry of Health (MOH) funded organisations that were lobbying politicians on anti-smoking legislation. These MPs argued that the MOH was essentially paying for interest groups to lobby politicians. The outcome of this was
the Brazier and Hunn report, which stated that community organisations could not use government funding for advocacy because “one of [the Ministry’s] prime obligations is to be scrupulous in maintaining its political neutrality” (Brazier & Hunn, 2003, 3) and funding groups to lobby violates this obligation. The Brazier and Hunn report requires community organisations to specifically state the actions that will be included in the government contract as opposed to stating that “advocacy” is an activity. However, as found in the Milligan et al. (2008) study, this limits community sector advocacy because groups fear that activities which may be perceived as advocacy related could cause them to lose government funding.

**Tax-exempt status: Registration with the Charities Commission**

The legal identities that community groups can adopt in New Zealand are discussed in Chapter 2, and one of these identities is a charity. Participants in the Milligan et al. (2008) study suggested that the restrictions placed on community groups that are registered with the Charities Commission are unclear, which makes advocacy problematic for groups that do not want to lose their tax-exempt status, and therefore may reduce the amount of advocacy they undertake. According to section 5 (1) of the Charities Act 2005, community organisations that are registered with the Charities Commission are allowed to engage in advocacy so long as it is not their primary purpose (Charities Commission, 2006). Participants in the Milligan et al. (2008) study appeared to be aware of the guidelines; however, they felt confused about how to interpret them. Similarly, law scholars have also suggested that although “charities and politics share an intimate past” (Chevalier-Watts, 2009, 56), the advocacy limitations put in place by the Charities Commission are often unclear and unnecessarily reduce advocacy in the community sector (Chevalier-Watts, 2009; Gousmett, 2007). O’Brien et al. (2009) also acknowledged this tension.

**Resources**

Participants in the O’Brien et al. (2009) and Milligan et al. (2008) studies generally equated an increase in resources with an increase in advocacy. Based on participant comments, O’Brien et al. suggested that larger well-resourced groups are better able to “actively participate in the policy process” (O’Brien et al., 2009, 38)
because they are not as constrained by a lack of resources. Milligan et al. (2008) suggested that many community organisations must contend with limited resources. In their research, the link between resources and advocacy was made through the problems associated with government funding, which can limit advocacy, and the benefits of collaborating with other community organisations, which can enhance advocacy.

**How do New Zealand community organisations choose the type of advocacy they engage in?**

The Milligan et al. (2008) and O’Brien et al. (2009) research also provided information that is used to describe the factors that affect how community groups in New Zealand choose the type of advocacy activity they undertake. Two factors appear to affect these decisions: the social and political environment and the amount of resources a group has. Each of these factors is described below.

**Social and political environment**

Writers have suggested that New Zealand’s small population and its election process have allowed for a closer relationship between the community and government sectors (Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009), which may increase the use of “inside” strategies (J. Walker, 1991), defined above. For example, these two factors can encourage groups to utilise strategies that involve engaging directly with government representatives. To begin with, the mixed member proportional (MMP) election method, which was adopted in 1993 and put into practice in 1996, allows government parties to have proportional representation. It appears that proportional representation has allowed community groups to increase their influence on the policy agenda through their ability to partner with “minor” political parties (O’Brien et al., 2009, 35). In addition, participants in New Zealand studies felt that its small population gave community organisations greater access to politicians and public servants (Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009).

On the other hand, participants in the Milligan et al. (2008) and O’Brien (2009) studies still did not feel that they were meaningfully involved in the agenda-setting process and that they were usually consulted by politicians and public servants once the
policy had already been made. They were worried that their involvement was more “tokenistic” as opposed to meaningful. This finding was echoed by an online survey of 64 individuals that worked in health community organisations (Health and Disability NGO Working Group, 2007). In this survey, respondents said that they did not feel that public servants in the Ministry of Health involved them in policy development. To manage some of these issues, Milligan et al. (2008) recommended participating in “enabling partnerships” that, based on their results, allowed the community sector to be more meaningfully involved in the policy process. Generally, enabling partnerships are flexible, interactive, and most importantly, managed by all parties, therefore the government does not have all the power.

**Resources**

Based on participant comments, O’Brien et al. (2009) suggested that larger well-resourced organisations are more likely than smaller poorly resourced organisations to have access to media strategies and government representatives. The authors found that “larger groups tend to have media resources within their own agency and a greater ease of access to policy processes” and as a result “they are often recognised by government agencies as important voices” (O’Brien et al., 2009, 35). Milligan et al. (2008) did not discuss how resources affect the type of advocacy strategy undertaken by community groups.

**Bringing the New Zealand literature together: How do relationships affect advocacy?**

Four relationships were discussed in the New Zealand literature, which may affect advocacy; namely, the relationship with the community, government, other community organisations, and the media. First, the relationship with the government is described in detail because many New Zealand authors (Cook et al., 2009; Cribb, 2006; Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009) focused on this topic, and it is important to provide a context of the political environment in which community organisations work in New Zealand. Second, the relationship with the community is addressed. Third, the affect of other community organisations on the advocacy activities of community groups
is described. Finally, the relationship between community organisations and the media is discussed.

**The relationship with government**

Most of the New Zealand literature on the community sector focused on the relationship with the government (Cook et al., 2009; Cribb, 2006; Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009). Similar to the results found in the international literature, the government primarily affects the advocacy activities of community groups through the registration process and government contracting (Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009). It appears that both of these factors have the potential to limit advocacy, but government contracts seem to have created more frustration within the community sector (Cook et al., 2009; Health and Disability NGO Working Group, 2007; O’Brien et al., 2009) than has the registration process.

**The relationship with the community**

As previously mentioned in Chapter 2, the community appears to be the primary stakeholder in New Zealand community organisations (Cribb, 2006); therefore, the relationship between community groups and the community is important. In fact, this relationship appears to be the primary reason that the government contracts with these groups (Cribb, 2006; Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009).

**The relationship with other community organisations**

Milligan et al. (2008) suggested that in New Zealand partnerships are important for gathering knowledge, mutual support, resources, and skills transfer. O’Brien et al.’s (2009) investigation supported these findings. Forming networks with other community groups can enhance the advocacy activities of the community sector, which is similar to findings in the international literature.

**The relationship with the media**

Community organisations in New Zealand use the media to advocate (O’Brien et al., 2009). Based on participant comments, O’Brien et al. (2009) suggested that these strategies were not as effective as engaging directly with government representatives; however, groups do use this strategy. Beyond the fact that groups use the media to advocate, writers did not describe the relationship with the media in any further detail.
Gaps in the literature

In their analysis of the literature on advocacy in the community sector, Andrews and Edwards suggest that “the field of inquiry is hampered by what might be called a ‘tyranny of existing data’” (Andrews & Edwards, 2004, 486). They described three trends that emerged in the data, and these trends are supported by this review of the literature as well. First, almost all of the research, with the exception of a few studies (Hudson, 2002; Salamon, 1995b; Schmid et al., 2008), have highlighted community organisations in the United States [i.e. (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Kerlin & Reid, 2009; McCarthy & Walker, 2004; Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007, 2009)]. Second, many of the empirical studies on advocacy in the community sector are focused on national organisations [i.e. (Hudson, 2002; Kerlin & Reid, 2009; McCarthy & Walker, 2004; Rees, 1999; S. Vaughan & Arsneault, 2008)] and ignore the organisations that operate at the state and local level. Third, much of the data comes from secondary sources; i.e. data that was collected for other purposes [i.e. (McCarthy & Walker, 2004; Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007, 2009)]. Therefore, the majority of studies that are reviewed here are affected by these limitations.

Above all, the most consistent limitation in the literature appears to be the focus on community organisations in the United States. Outside of generalisability issues, this focus brings methodological limitations. The authors of most large investigations into community sector advocacy in the United States retrieved their sample size from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry, 2005; Berry & Arons, 2003; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007, 2009; Salamon et al., 1999; Salamon et al., 2004). In other words, these studies generally highlighted the advocacy of tax-exempt organisations. However, research has indicated that this data source can be problematic because small organisations are overlooked and some do not register (Grønbjerg, 1995, 2002; Reid & Krehley, 2001). Although the IRS data allows researchers to gather from a large and diverse sample, these problems may skew the results in favour of larger organisations and ignore the contribution of smaller ones. On the other hand, the recent work of Berry and Arons (2003) and Bass et al. (2007), who studied tax-exempt organisations, provides a major contribution to understanding
advocacy in community organisations. Their work is a valuable first step and signals a need for a more thorough accounting of advocacy in the community sector.

A major gap that directly relates to this research is the lack of data on SSCOs. Mosley states that “research on [SSCOs’] advocacy work is rare, and our understanding of the details of their involvement, though growing, is limited” (Mosley, 2009, 2). This lack of attention to SSCOs is problematic because, according to Mosley, these groups are “active players in the policy-making process” (Mosley, 2009, 15). SSCOs also cannot be lumped in with other community organisations. Unlike some other groups, the “primary purpose” of SSCOs is “service provision, not political involvement” (Mosley, 2009, 2). As a result, SSCOs may have a different relationship with the government. This relationship could affect their advocacy efforts and the effectiveness of their advocacy. However, not enough data currently exists to understand how SSCOs advocate as compared to other community organisations, such as environmental organisations. It is unclear why there is a lack of data on SSCOs, but it could be the approach that has been used in previous studies. As discussed in Chapter 4, a few studies have included an analysis on specific types of community groups. Instead, most researchers appear to prefer a large-scale analysis on a variety of nonprofit organisations. On the other hand, as indicated in this chapter, the research on community groups is increasing therefore it is probably only a matter of time until such a body of research emerges on specific types of community groups, such as the those discussed below.

Child and Grønbjerg’s (2007) large-scale analysis of community organisations in Indiana and Scott et al.’s (2006) case study of three youth organisations in California begin to address this gap through their relational approach. Child and Grønbjerg (2007) found that community organisations do indeed advocate differently according to the sub-sector that they work in. However, the results of their study also suggested that SSCOs do not frequently advocate, which is contrary to the findings of research focused on SSCO advocacy (Donaldson, 2007; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006). In addition, Scott et al. (2006) applied a relational approach to describe how youth organisations, in particular, influenced youth services and policy through advocacy in a case study of three organisations. Although the
research in this thesis is similar to the approach of the aforementioned study, it incorporates concepts that Scott et al. (2006) did not. Overall, based on the review of the literature, it appears that future research needs to investigate advocacy in relation to each sub-sector, and incorporate a relational approach in order to better understand the nature of advocacy in the community sector and the difference in ways it is practiced by different parts of the sector. This research aims to fulfil both of these needs through the theoretical approach described in the next chapter.

**Conclusion**

The review of the existing international and New Zealand literature on the nature of advocacy in the community sector was used to answer three questions: how do community organisations advocate; how do community organisations advocate effectively; and how are relationships managed to facilitate advocacy? These questions were answered in four parts. First, advocacy in the community sector was described. Researchers found community organisations advocate for marginalised groups and target government representatives and the public in their advocacy campaigns. Community organisations also appear to advocate for issues that relate to the needs of the community. These issues have been described by public health practitioners as the conditions that lead to the determinants of health by (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007). Based on this review of the literature, it can be concluded that SSCOs, specifically, advocate for improvements to the effects of what public health practitioners have identified as of the determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007), as they negatively affect marginalised communities. Writers in the nonprofit literature suggested that SSCOs advocate because they can give a voice to marginalised groups and create a more democratic environment. Finally, the five primary strategies that are usually described in the literature were discussed, namely engaging with government representatives, developing coalitions, conducting research, working with the media and protesting, and educating the public. How groups choose from these strategies is explained below.

Second, the New Zealand literature was analysed, and the comparative international literature was often similar in regards to the first section, especially in terms of the “who,” “what,” and “why” questions of advocacy. Participants in New Zealand
studies generally felt that the advocacy activities of community organisations in New Zealand operate in ways that are similar to findings in the literature on community groups in the United States and the United Kingdom. However, probably due to the limited New Zealand data, there was less discussion of the advocacy strategies that community organisations utilise. In the New Zealand literature, although networking and collaborating with other groups was described as useful, it was not described as a strategy; whereas the international literature discussed the frequent use of coalitions by SSCO. The use of research by community organisations was also discussed less in the New Zealand literature. However, findings in the comparative international literature and New Zealand literature indicate that engaging with government representatives is a common and effective advocacy strategy.

Third, the factors that affect the amount and type of advocacy activities undertaken by community organisations were described. It appears that four factors can facilitate or create a barrier to the amount of advocacy activities groups undertake, namely organisational capacity, government funding, tax-exempt status, and the policy and political environment. Organisational capacity, as measured by resources, the management of resources, and networks, were, for the most part, associated with an increase in the advocacy efforts of SSCO. The affect of government funding was more mixed and requires further research. However, it appears that government funding may lead to an increase in advocacy activities. Participants of various studies generally felt that tax-exempt status reduced the amount of advocacy activities groups performed, but at this time there has not been an investigation that compares advocacy in organisations that have a tax-exempt status to those that do not. Therefore, these findings are not conclusive. It was also discovered that the policy and political environment might encourage an organisation to advocate when their ability to provide services is threatened.

In addition to government funding, four other factors also appear to influence how SSCO choose the type of advocacy strategy they engage in: government funding; the political environment; organisational capacity; and H elector status. It appears that government funding may increase political activity but decrease the use of aggressive strategies, like lobbying, and the centrality of advocacy activities. Groups that have
“enemies” in the political environment were more likely to choose “outside” strategies, like protesting, but the influence of “friends” or allies is less certain. Allies may encourage groups to use research, but, contrary to the authors’ prediction, allies did not lead to the use of more “inside” strategies (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006). On the other hand, organisational capacity and a larger strategic repertoire were more clearly linked with choosing “inside” strategies, such as engaging directly with government representatives. A recent study also found that organisations with a tax-exempt status that chose to become H electors were more likely to use aggressive or “legislative” strategies, such as advocating for change in specific policies (Berry, 2005).

The four primary relationships that were discussed in the international literature include the relationship with the community, the relationship with the government, the relationship with other community organisations, and the relationship with the media. The relationship with the government was discussed the most by writers, probably because it is more complex than the others are. For example, the government can have power over community organisations but community groups also advocate for policy change, which can threaten their relationship with government. On the other hand, the relationship with the community and other community organisations was also given attention. It was found that the community gives SSCOs legitimacy and other community organisations can add to the knowledge, power, and resource base of groups. Nevertheless, government has power over SSCOs through funding and registration. Finally, the relationship with the media was discussed the least, but that may be because community organisations do not appear to be using the media as often as they engage with government representatives and participate in coalitions.

Fourth, the New Zealand literature was analysed. There was very little data to draw from in order to understand what factors affect the advocacy efforts of SSCOs in New Zealand; however, there was consistency with findings in the international literature. Overall, government funding, tax-exempt status, or registration with the Charities Commission, and available resources were found to either increase or decrease the amount of advocacy activities SSCOs engaged in. The discussion of how government funding affects advocacy was limited. Although participants suggested that government funding was a barrier to advocacy activities, there was not a deeper
analysis to understand if it influenced how organisations choose their strategy. Similar to organisations with tax-exempt status, groups in New Zealand that were registered with the Charities Commission felt that they had a limited ability to advocate. Finally, similar to findings in the international literature, resources were linked with an increase in advocacy.

Next, two factors, the social and political environment and the resources available to community groups, were linked with specific types of advocacy activities that New Zealand community organisations undertook. It appears that New Zealand’s small population and MMP electoral system makes government representatives more accessible to community groups; therefore, these organisations are more likely to utilise strategies that involve engaging with government representatives. Although this is common to findings in the international data, New Zealanders may choose to engage with government representatives more frequently than community groups in other similar countries, as indicated by a recent study that compared advocacy in the United Kingdom and New Zealand (Milligan et al., 2008). Finally, similar to findings in the international literature, resources were linked with “inside” advocacy strategies, like engaging with government representatives, but New Zealand studies also indicated that resources were linked with media strategies. Although media strategies were not directly linked to resource-levels in the international literature, some scholars suggested that using the media can be resource intensive (Barker-Plummer, 2002).

Four relationships were also discussed in the New Zealand literature, as they relate to advocacy activities: the relationship with government, the community, other community organisations, and the media. The relationship that community groups in New Zealand have with the government has similar implications to those found in the United States. However, the New Zealand literature may be able to contribute to knowledge in terms of how indigenous community groups work with the government, an issue apparently ignored in the international literature. Māori have been politically active for many years, at least since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 (Tennant et al., 2008), and although the relationship between Māori community organisations and the government is complex and not well understood, there is much to learn from further research. On the other hand, the relationship with other community organisations is well
documented in the international literature, which suggests that knowledge, power, and resources can be shared amongst groups. New Zealand research supports these findings. The relationship with the community was described as “primary” and the relationship with the media appears to be based on community groups using media outlets to advocate. Each of these findings is similar to those described in the international literature.

Overall, there is limited data on international advocacy in the community sector, which suggests that all current findings are preliminary. However, two primary gaps are especially problematic: the focus on the United States and the lack of attention to SSCOs. For example, although it is not fully addressed in this research, the lack of attention to the role indigenous community groups perform may be an issue that is addressed in New Zealand research, and findings could be shared with the international community. Moreover, the literature does not address the differences in advocacy activities between sub-sectors, and this is a major oversight. SSCOs may advocate in a way that is unique to other groups in the community sector, but their approach is not well understood. This issue is addressed by the theoretical approach used in this research, which is described in the next chapter. For example, relationships and resources may be managed differently through the advocacy activities of SSCOs. This research aims to address gaps in the literature through focusing on SSCOs, and analysing the ways in which they advocate in New Zealand, using a relational theoretical approach. The next chapter describes this theoretical approach in detail and how it is applied to the results.
Chapter 4
Methodology: A theoretical framework and the methods used for understanding advocacy in the community sector

The previous chapters discuss and analyse the nonprofit, interest group and social movement literature in order to understand how community organisations advocate effectively. Four specific questions are addressed in the literature review:

- What is the social service community organisation (SSCO) sector?
- How do SSCOs advocate?
- How do SSCOs advocate effectively?
- How are relationships managed to facilitate advocacy?

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, two major gaps in the literature are found, which make answering these questions difficult. First, although there is a great deal of research on community organisations, there is a limited amount of information on the nature of advocacy within the community sector (J. C. Jenkins, 2006).

Second, there are also very few broad relational approaches that have been used to describe community organisations (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; W. R. Scott et al., 2006; Stone & Sandfort, 2009), however, a relational approach may be useful. The community sector was described as diverse and different types of organisations were found in the literature; nonetheless, a broader relational analysis would explain why certain types of organisations operate differently and are treated differently by government. In addition, according to the literature review, power appears to affect how groups advocate. For example, community groups often feel they have to limit the amount and type of advocacy they engage in if they receive tax-exempt status or accept government contracts (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007). This demonstrates that government has power over community organisations and that it influences how community groups behave. Unlike findings discussed in the literature review, a relational analysis would explain the distribution of power, allowing
for a more thorough grasp of why groups advocate and why some are more successful. Furthermore, relational theorists assume that advocates influence their environment and that the environment has an effect on advocates’ decisions, and although this is implied in the literature review, it is not made explicit. Using a relational theory that allows for an analysis of the interdependence between the advocate and environment may allow for a deeper understanding of how change occurs and how community organisations advocate for change. In addition, the relational approach used in this research may help to explain why, as pointed out in Chapter 3, community organisation advocates appear to be interested in more than policy change. For example, in addition to government representatives, advocates target the public (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Rees, 1999; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006; S. Vaughan & Arsneault, 2008). Nevertheless, only a few researchers have used a relational approach (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; W. R. Scott et al., 2006; Stone & Sandfort, 2009). Ultimately, these gaps in the literature may limit the type of analysis currently available to understand advocacy in the community sector.

A relational theoretical approach applied to advocacy in the community sector can address these issues. Relational approaches, namely Armstrong and Bernstein’s New Social Movement Alternative (NSM-A), which draws on Bourdieu’s sociology, is applied to this research in two ways. First, these relational theoretical approaches are used to address gaps in the literature and explain why community groups or SSCOs choose to advocate in the way that they do and why some strategies are more effective than others are. Second, theoretical concepts, such as capital, are used to better understand the community sector and more specifically, how community organisations can effectively advocate for improvements to what public health practitioners have identified as the social and economic determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007). This chapter describes the NSM-A relational approach, as it is applied to the community sector, outlines the design of the study, and limitations. The theoretical concepts are explained and the methods that were taken are detailed.
Theoretical framework for understanding advocacy in the community sector

In this research, Armstrong and Bernstein’s (2008) New Social Movement Alternative (NSM-A) is applied to the community sector in order to investigate the nature of advocacy. Incorporating theoretical concepts from the social movement literature is appropriate for describing the nature of advocacy in community organisations because, as discussed in Chapter 3, many researchers studying advocacy in the community sector commonly draw from the social movement literature [i.e. (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Berry & Arons, 2003; Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007; Salamon, 1995b)].

Through the NSM-A, Armstrong and Bernstein have aimed to create a “research agenda that focuses on how power works across a variety of institutions; how activists interpret, negotiate, and understand power; and how and why activists choose strategies and goals" (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 93). The “research agenda” that the authors have created draws from Bourdieu’s approach to field theory (1977; 2005b; 1992) and is essentially an application of Bourdieu’s concepts. Nevertheless, the authors note that, similar to Fligstein (1991), they use the words “institution” and “field” interchangeably, an approach that is followed in this thesis. The remainder of this section is used to identify and describe the NSM-A and field theory concepts that are used in this research and to explain how they are applied to the community sector and advocacy. Four areas are discussed: the relational approach, the structure of the field, the actors involved, and strategies that are used to advocate and change the field.

Fields: A relational approach

Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) suggest that the social world is comprised of differentiated fields or, using their language, institutions. In the simplest of terms, fields can be identified and distinguished by their actions (Martin, 2003); in other words, there can be a sports field, a political field, an artistic field, a journalistic field, and so on. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) focus on how these institutions interact through analysing social movements and their influence on multiple institutions. In the context of this research, the key field that is investigated is the social services community organisation (SSCO) field. The structure of the SSCO field is analysed, focusing
primarily on the way in which members of community organisations move into other fields and influence them.

As previously mentioned, Armstrong and Bernstein’s (2008) perspective is heavily influenced by Bourdieu’s sociology, and his concepts are frequently used throughout this chapter and in later chapters. Bourdieu conceptualises modern society as consisting of multiple fields or “an array of relatively autonomous but structurally homologous fields of production, circulation, and consumption of various forms of cultural and material resources” (Swartz, 1997, 9). He defines a field as “a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 97). As discussed below, Bourdieu’s approach to field theory is unlike the approach of some field theorists (Martin, 2003), such as Lewin (1952) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983), and it provides a unique way to describe and study the community sector. This perspective ties in nicely with the analysis on the determinants of health in Chapter 1 because a relational approach allows a researcher to consider how multiple fields are influenced. For example, the SSCO field may have an effect on social, living and environmental factors. A SSCO that successfully advocates for an increase in the minimum wage might influence the amount time workers are able to spend with their family and friends, access to healthy food, and better working conditions, which may increase overall well-being.

**A unique approach**

Central to field theory is the interaction, or interconnected relationship, between the actors in a field and the field itself (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008), which is essential for understanding how change occurs in a field. The ability to understand this interaction is a primary reason a relational approach was chosen. Other theorists have suggested that understanding the relationship between actors and their environment may allow analysts to become more familiar with how the community sector operates (Lorgen, 1998; Tvedt, 2006). In sum, it appears that using relational theoretical concepts may allow researchers to describe community organisations more accurately, and help practitioners to recognise ways that groups can advocate more effectively.

The relational approach used in this research has not been used by other scholars to understand advocacy in the community sector. Although a few researchers
have used a relational approach for the same purpose (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Grønbjerg, 1992; C. Scott, 2006), their analysis is different because they incorporated DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983) approach to field theory, which is not used in this study. Unlike Bourdieu (2005b; 1992), DiMaggio and Powell (1983) do not perceive the field to be a battlefield or a “field of contestation” (Martin, 2003, 28), and they do not discuss capital. Instead, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) are interested in learning why institutions have similar characteristics. On the other hand, as described in the next section, this research is structured around concepts that explain conflict and struggle (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

**Structure of the field**

According to Bourdieu (1992), once the field of practice has been identified, a researcher must determine the structure of that field. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) argue that “classification systems” have consequences in an institution (i.e. the distribution of power), which ultimately determine the structure of that institution and reveal the “nature of domination” in society. This means that how a group is classified can affect their power and position in the field, which in turn can have an impact on the effectiveness of their advocacy efforts. Bourdieu describes this structure in more detail, as follows:

“… [P]ositions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 97).

In a later definition, he also asserts that “these position-takings … [are] aimed either at conserving or transforming the structure of relations of forces [within the field]” (Bourdieu, 2005a, 30). To put it another way, the approach used in this research not only focuses on the position of a group, but their relationship with groups in other positions and their relationship with power (or capital).

The relational approach that is used to describe the structure of the community sector in this research helps to explain why groups act the way that they do and can be
used to help leaders better understand how to advocate more effectively. This approach allows groups to analyse power and gives them insights into why certain advocacy strategies are superior to others. The field of power, the relationship to capital, dominant and subordinate positions, and subfields are described in more detail below to explain how the structure of the SSCO field is analysed in this research.

**The field of power**

In order to describe the “field of practice”, or SSCO field for this research, the community sector must be understood in relation to the broader field of power (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; R. Jenkins, 2002; Swartz, 1997). This step is important because “the basic structure and hierarchy of all other fields derives from the overarching *field of power*” (emphasis in original) (Peillon, 1998, 216). In other words, in his analysis of Bourdieu’s field theory, Peillon notes that, “the field of power determines the relative value of different kinds of capital” (Peillon, 1998, 219). Because each field is defined by its forms of capital, which are explained below, understanding this relationship is important. Bourdieu defines the field of power as:

“…the relations of force that obtain between the social positions which guarantee their occupants a quantum of social force, or of capital, such that they are able to enter into struggles over the monopoly of power, of which struggles over the definition of the legitimate form of power are crucial dimensions” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 229-230).

Bourdieu (1989) argues that the closer agents are to the field of power, the more they have in common with those in positions of power, and the more distant, the less they have in common with these groups. Those in the field of power are the “preeminent holders of the major varieties of capital” and in this field, they are “pitted against one another” because they want their capital to be recognised as the strongest (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008, 13).

The role of government in the “field of power” is considered throughout this research because, based on the findings discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the government has a major influence on the activities of the community field. The government influences the advocacy activities of community organisations through charity registration (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003) and government
contracts (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Groups that subscribe to the government’s culture are often rewarded through tax-exempt status or access to government contracts.

Bourdieu (1998) describes the power of government, which helps to shed light on its role in the “field of power”. He posits that the government brings into being an ideology that is understood to be the “universal” view. The government then perpetuates these ideas, ultimately creating a “universalisation” of requirements but not a “universalisation” of access, which results in a monopolisation by the few. This process was summarised by Bourdieu: “In short, there is a shift from a diffuse symbolic capital, resting solely on collective recognition, to an objectified symbolic capital, codified, delegated and guaranteed by the state, in a word bureaucratised” (emphasis in original) (Bourdieu, 1998, 50-51). The influence of government is clear and is addressed throughout this research. For example, the ways in which government influences the advocacy activities of community groups and regulates their advocacy and service behaviours has already been described.

**Fields are arenas of conflict and struggle over capital**

As previously mentioned, according to Bourdieu, fields are understood to be arenas of conflict and struggle. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) clearly support this assumption; however, Bourdieu’s analysis is the focus of this section because his theory is well developed around these concepts. Bourdieu describes a field as a “space of conflict and competition”, in which agents struggle to possess capital that gives them more power and ability to shape their field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 17-18). The preservation or transformation of the field is constantly in flux as agents struggle to differentiate themselves in order to maintain or improve their position in the field (Bourdieu, 2005a). This struggle leads to an ebb and flow of change that affects who has more control over the field. For example, as discussed in Chapter 3, many factors can affect the advocacy efforts of community organisations. Groups that possess a high number of factors that facilitate advocacy are more likely to be effective and, as a result, have more control over the field.

The struggle in the field is essentially over capital because fields are defined by capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 101; Peillon, 1998); therefore groups
predominantly struggle to get their form of capital recognised as the “strongest” in the field. For example, a law field would be organised around legal qualifications and positions of status, such as being law firm partners, Queen’s Counsel, etc., and individuals who have these will fight to retain the power and centrality of this capital. Members of a field fight for the ability to engage in the struggle because it allows them to have a voice in determining the very definition of capital within the field. Groups with less power have less influence over what is valued and this can lead to inequities. In other words, for Bourdieu, “social inequality is rooted in objective structures of unequal distribution of types of capital” (Swartz, 1997, 145). Bourdieu identifies four types of capital: economic, cultural, social, and symbolic, and each form of capital is described below.

**Economic capital**

According to Bourdieu, economic capital is “immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalised in the form of property rights” (Bourdieu, 1997, 47). In other words, economic capital is money or property (Swartz, 1997, 74). As discussed in Chapter 3, organisational capacity and, more specifically resources, can have a major influence on the effectiveness of advocacy strategies, which indicates that economic capital plays a role in the advocacy efforts of community groups. Economic capital can be linked with political capital, or a group’s public image, which can affect its ability to be politically influential. For example, those groups with more resources may have a more freedom to influence how they are viewed politically, and may, therefore, be in a better position to influence decision-makers.

**Cultural capital**

Drawing from Bourdieu, Swartz describes cultural capital as cultural goods and services (Swartz, 1997, 74). According to Bourdieu, there are three “states” of cultural capital: the embodied state, the objectified state and the institutionalised state. The embodied state comes in the form of “long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body”, which can be found in families that have had wealth for many generations (Bourdieu, 1997, 47). The objectified state comes in the form of “cultural goods (pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc.)”, such as ownership and “appropriate use” of
a painting (Bourdieu, 1997, 47). Finally, the institutionalised state can come in the form of educational qualifications, such as an academic degree. Each of these “states” relies on the other. For example, in order to use a cultural good “appropriately” one must have embodied cultural capital. An SSCO may acquire cultural capital through employing someone with religious or educational credentials, which are valued by some sectors of the community. This type of cultural capital can be linked to an organisation’s political capital because, generally speaking, in Western countries, those with religious credentials are likely to have a positive public image. As a result, they may be more likely to gain support for their ideas.

**Social capital**

According to Bourdieu, social capital is “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1997, 51). This form of capital can be found in acquaintances and networks (Swartz, 1997, 74). These networks can provide “each of its members with the backing of the collectively-owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word” (Bourdieu, 1997, 51). In other words, people can gain from these networks. For example, as discussed in Chapter 3, networks with the community, the government, other community organisations and the media can influence the effectiveness of advocacy campaigns. Organisations that have strong networks may have greater political capital because they can present their views to many groups.

**Symbolic capital**

According to Bourdieu, symbolic capital is “the form that one or another of these species [or capital] takes when it is grasped through categories of perception that recognises its specific logic, or if you prefer, misrecognise the arbitrariness of its possession and accumulation” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 119). In other words, symbolic capital could also be described as legitimised capital (Swartz, 1997, 74) or status (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008) that is in a form immediately recognisable by certain people who have been socialised or acculturated in a certain way. For example, a Catholic person would immediately recognise the symbolic significance (and capital)
of a Priest. Another way to understand symbolic capital is through political capital. For example, community groups that have well established names, like the Salvation Army, would hold symbolic capital.

Generally speaking, symbolic capital is owned by “the most venerable establishments within the field” rather than the “newcomers, challengers, or upstarts” (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008, 12); therefore accruing symbolic capital may take time. Symbolic capital can also take any form of capital that has already been described and can only be defined from the field that recognises it. For example, credibility in the SSCO field probably looks different from credibility in the for-profit business field. Honour and prestige are associated with symbolic capital and owners of symbolic capital are thought to hold a “practical de facto monopoly over institutions which … officially determine and guarantee the rank” of other groups in the field (Bourdieu, 1989, 21). In other words, owners of symbolic capital have a great deal of power or influence in their respective fields.

**Fields have dominant and subordinate positions**

As inferred above, each field contains spaces of dominant and subordinate positions. These positions are based on outcomes of the previously mentioned struggle for capital. Through the NSM-A, Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) argue that power can influence a group’s strategy and targets of change; however, it is through Bourdieu’s analyses that the effects of power are strongly linked with position and behaviour. Bourdieu describes how a group’s position will affect their position-takings, or behaviours, in the field (Bourdieu, 2005b). Groups distinguish themselves from others through the positions that they take or the strategy and goals they choose (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008, 14; Lane, 2006), and these choices reflect where they are in the field. As a result, the position-taking of groups allows for researchers to distinguish which groups are in dominant and subordinate positions. Groups that seek more change in a field are more likely to be in a subordinate position within that field, whereas groups in a dominant position will seek less change (Swartz, 1997). Understanding the position of an organisation is important because it could predict the effectiveness of an organisation’s advocacy activities.
Fields consist of subfields

Fields can also have subfields that exist within the larger field, which share a similarity to the larger field but also have their own institutional arrangements, sets of beliefs and assumptions, and “legitimate means” of doing things (Grenfell & James, 1998, 20). Although Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) do not describe this aspect of fields, or institutions, incorporating subfields into this research can be useful because it can help explain the diversity in the community sector, which has been identified by many scholars (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Boris & Steuerle, 2006; O’Brien et al., 2009). This diversity has made analysis difficult (Boris & Steuerle, 2006) and although authors have addressed it (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; National Center for Charitable Statistics [NCCS], 2005; Salamon & Anheier, 1996), none have explained it in detail. The classification systems that are frequently referred to in the literature (National Center for Charitable Statistics [NCCS], 2005; Salamon & Anheier, 1996) stop short of explaining how each sub-sector, or subfield, such as the health or social services sub-sector, uniquely operates, which can result in an incomplete analysis. For example, researchers have argued that tāngata whenua organisations were not accurately portrayed (Statistics New Zealand, 2007, 63; Tennant et al., 2006, 31) in a recent investigation that applied the International Classification of Nonprofit Organisations (ICNPO) (Salamon & Anheier, 1996).

On the other hand, Child and Grønbjerg (2007) who draw from DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) relational approach, contended that the community sector consists of fields, which affect how they operate. For example, Child and Grønbjerg (2007) found that environmental organisations were more likely to engage in advocacy than art organisations. Although this is a beginning step, the Child and Grønbjerg (2007) study does not address why these organisations advocate differently. Similarly, Scott et al. (2006), who also draw from DiMaggio and Powell (1983), performed a case study on three SSCOs, more specifically youth organisations, and their study begins to provide an in-depth analysis of SSCOs and, unlike the aforementioned studies, begins to address why and how organisations advocate differently. This research builds on the findings Child and Grønbjerg (2007) and Scott et al. (2006), and contributes to a deeper understanding of SSCOs in particular. Overall, it is hoped that future researchers
seeking to better understand the diversity of the community sector are able to use the approach taken in this thesis.

The use of subfields may also help to better understand how members of the community sector advocate and how they advocate effectively, which are the second and third research questions. Although various advocacy strategies were listed in the literature (Reid, 1999) less research existed on how community groups chose their strategy and how SSCOs, specifically, advocate. These gaps in the literature may exist because of the diversity found within the community sector, which could then be exacerbated by the use of theories that do not describe how the system and environment work together. The NSM-A and field theory can be used to address these issues through the use of subfields, positioning in the field, and capital.

**Actors are constituted, in part, by the institution(s) they challenge**

Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) argue that previous political process models and social movement models failed to make sense of many phenomena that looked like social movements but were often not classified as such. For example, previous models suggest that people engage in social movements because they are dominated and that actors are ultimately reacting against being dominated. However, the authors argue that many of the post-1960s social movements, such as the environmental movement, have been organised by individuals that are not necessarily economically marginalised. They contend that previous models could therefore not be used to understand some of the more current social movements. Instead, the authors suggest that “challengers or activists are more likely to succeed if they are structurally linked to the institution” because “true outsiders lack the knowledge needed to identify the vulnerabilities of particular institutions” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 85). Put more simply, “challengers are more likely to succeed if activists have a ‘feel for the game’” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 85). Their argument coincides nicely with this research because, based on findings discussed in the literature, advocacy is often conducted by community organisations that have networks with government representatives. In addition, based on Armstrong and Bernstein’s (2008) theory, it appears that community organisations advocating for policy change may be more successful if they employ individuals that previously or currently worked in the government sector.
Advocacy strategy

The relational approach used in this research is linked to certain assumptions about the strategy that community organisations choose. More specifically, Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) argue that firstly, groups will target multiple institutions, not just the government, in their advocacy efforts; secondly, advocates will incorporate instrumental and expressive goals; and thirdly, that relationships can be effectively used to influence change. Each of these three strategies is discussed below.

Targets: Multiple institutions

Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) suggest that groups will need to confront multiple institutions if they want to change complex issues, such as poverty. They refer to Williams’ (2004) work to point out that, ultimately, “meaning-systems” are the targets for change efforts. Meaning-systems are rarely ever reducible to one institution, such as the government; therefore, multiple institutions need to be targeted. Although Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) concede that government holds a great deal of power and is often a target of change, they argue that policy change does not always equate with societal change. For example, workplace discrimination is illegal, but racism still exists in society. Overall, the authors point out, “targeting multiple institutions, while difficult, may increase chances for social change” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 87).

Instrumental and expressive goals

The NSM-A authors state that institutions are “simultaneously material and symbolic” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 85), which leads advocates to demand changes in “meanings and resources” (emphasis added) (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 85). That is to say, institutions have concrete and symbolic effects on people; therefore, community groups seek policy and cultural change. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) describe these goals as instrumental and expressive. The authors explain that instrumental goals are aimed at changing policy, whereas expressive goals are aimed at building solidarity or changing an ideology. They suggest that it is not useful to separate instrumental and expressive goals because social movements are often interested in both goals for different reasons. For example, actors may not see success solely as a result of policy change. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008, 86) describe how
the elimination of sodomy laws did not change the perception of gay individuals and modifications made to welfare laws did not influence the stereotypes that people have of “welfare mothers”. In New Zealand, the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi was an instrumental goal; it does not appear to have been fully expressed, as evidenced by the racism and health disparities that still exist. An expressive goal might include ending racism and eliminating health disparities.

**Effective strategies: Relationships and knowledge**

A major focus of this research is to understand how community organisations can effectively influence change through advocacy; therefore, the ways that the authors of the NSM-A and field theory describe how groups can change a field are considered. To begin with, as Bourdieu points out, a field is ultimately a “flexibly structured and minimally formalised area of free play” (Bourdieu, 2005b, 130). For example, Bourdieu argues that “the bureaucratic game, which is doubtless one of the most strictly regulated of all, nonetheless includes an element of indeterminacy and uncertainty” (Bourdieu, 2005b, 130). This space of “indeterminacy and uncertainty” can result in change.

Agents always possess an objective element of freedom which they may or may not exploit, depending on their ‘subjective’ dispositions … This room for manoeuvre affords them a possibility of bargaining over – of negotiating the price of – their obedience or consent (Bourdieu, 2005b, 130).

In summary, agents can change a field. This change may be small or slow (Grenfell & James, 2004; Swartz, 1997) and subordinated groups may have few options available (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), however, even the dominated can create change (Klinenberg, 2005).

Based on the literature, two primary strategies are used to change a field. First, Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) and Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) emphasise the importance of relationships. Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) describe how groups can pair up with other groups, either within the same field or in a different field, to increase their capital. For example, the authors suggest that the “dominated dominants”, or groups that exist on the fringes of the “field of power”, can pool their capital. In relation to this research, umbrella organisations described in Chapter 2 could serve this
purpose. Armstrong and Bernstein also suggest that working with other groups and realising the “interconnectedness of struggles” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 86) increases success. Second, Bourdieu argues that groups with a “sense of the bureaucratic game”, or knowledge of how the government, or bureaucratic field, operates, are able to “bend the rules” (Bourdieu, 2005b, 118). This knowledge may be especially important for groups seeking policy change because as previously mentioned, the bureaucratic field is “one of the most strictly regulated of all” (Bourdieu, 2005b, 130). As discussed in Chapter 3, community organisations are often attempting to influence government policy, therefore, bureaucratic knowledge is especially relevant to this research.

In Chapter 3, the relationships that could affect the advocacy activities of community organisations were described as they were found in the literature, such as the relationship with other community organisations. However, no studies were found that provide an analysis of how groups can manage relationships to advocate more effectively. As highlighted above, NSM-A and field theorists highlight relationships and how they can work together. Analysing SSCO advocacy through this lens may help to uncover how SSCOs advocate and why, and it may help to explain why groups are more successful than others and how power affects the actions of SSCOs. In Chapter 8, the theoretical concepts described above are applied to the results of this research. For example, the four types of capital, described earlier, are analysed in relation to the SSCO field for a more thorough understanding of capital as it is discussed in this research. How an organisation is able to move into a dominant position and advocate more effectively are also discussed.

**Design of the study**

The first half of this chapter described and discussed the theoretical concepts that are used to analyse and structure this thesis. The aim of this section is to describe how the research was conducted and explain why. In order to accomplish this, the second half of this chapter is separated into four sections: first, the case study design is described; second, there is a description of the two sources of data, namely key informant interviews and documentary analysis; third, there is a description of the participants and discussion about who they are, why they were chosen, how they were
recruited, and what the interview process was; and fourth, there is an explanation of thematic analysis, which was used to analyse the data.

**Literature review**

A thorough literature review was conducted using the following databases: PubMed, Proquest, and Google Scholar. Search terms included community organisation, nonprofit, voluntary, and advocacy. In addition, specific journals, such as the Nonprofit and Community Sector Quarterly, were searched. A snowballing technique was also used to ensure that important and regularly cited studies were included. The New Zealand data was more difficult to find. The primary New Zealand documents came from research that was sponsored by the government, such as the recent Johns Hopkins study (O’Brien et al., 2009; Sanders et al., 2008). Other documents were found using New Zealand databases, such as CommunityNet Aotearoa and the Tāngata Whenua Community and Voluntary Sector Research Centre. Grey literature, or the literature that is not easily accessible through a search, was gathered by having informal conversations with individuals that worked in the community sector.

**Case study design**

This research used a single case study design with one embedded unit of analysis. The larger community sector was analysed as a case study, and the Family Centre as an embedded unit of analysis. The Family Centre was chosen for its unique experience as a relatively small community organisation that has had a long organisational lifecycle, in comparison to other smaller community organisations, and has had an effect on multiple institutions, including those concerned with social and economic policy. There are other therapy-based community organisations in New Zealand that address structural change, such as Wesley Community Action and Te Roopu Awhina. However, none of them appear to have the depth of the Family Centre. For example, the Family Centre is internationally known for developing a type of family therapy, and no other therapy-based community organisation in New Zealand has those credentials. In addition, Family Centre staff have been closely involved in policy change in a way that other therapy-based community groups have not. As Yin (2003) points out,
when choosing a single case study, it is important to choose one that embodies a very similar or unique experience because these cases can highlight a common or extraordinary situation. In addition, Stake suggests that an “unusual case helps illustrate matters we overlook in typical cases” (Stake, 1995, 4). The unique experience of the Family Centre can be used to highlight how advocacy can be successful.

This case study is classified as an intrinsic case study (2005), because the ultimate goal is to understand advocacy in community organisations using an exploratory approach. This study is labelled as exploratory, rather than explanatory or descriptive (Yin, 2003), because, based on the literature review in Chapters 2 and 3, advocacy in community organisations is often misunderstood and under-researched (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Boris & Mosher-Williams, 1998; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009). Consequently, this study explores the application of a theoretical approach rather than applying, in a descriptive or confirmatory way, an existing framework that might have been used in previous studies.

Compared to quantitative research, case studies, like all qualitative research methods, are valued for their ability to allow researchers to gain an in-depth understanding of the complexity that exists in the social world and encapsulate social meanings (Dew, 2007; Mays & Pope, 1995; Seale & Silverman, 1997). The case study design is chosen for two reasons. First, according to Yin, case studies investigate the “boundaries between phenomenon and context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2003, 10). It has already been demonstrated that advocacy is still not well understood within community organisations (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Boris & Mosher-Williams, 1998; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007). Therefore, the case study approach provides a practical method that is used to further explore the boundaries between the phenomenon (advocacy) and its context (community organisations in New Zealand). Second, as demonstrated by the authors of the NSM-A (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008), some researchers have found the case study approach to be useful when applying Bourdieu’s field theories and concepts into research (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008; D. Vaughan, 2008), which the current analysis does.
Sources of data

Two primary sources of data are used in this research: three groupings of key informant interviews are applied to the larger case study, and two groupings of key informant interviews and a documentary analysis are used to inform the findings of the embedded case study. The diversity of data allowed for the triangulation of results (Mays & Pope, 2000, 51). Triangulation is a process that is used to ensure validity in research (Mays & Pope, 2000; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2003) and multiple sources of data were chosen so that each source could be checked against the other to ensure accuracy. Each of these sources is described below.

Key informant interviews

Key informant interviews took place between 2008 and 2009. Ethical approval was given at the Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington, before participants were recruited. Participants that informed the larger case study were placed into three groups: individuals that worked at community organisations, individuals that performed research with community organisations, and members of the government sector that had experience working with community organisations. In reference to the embedded case study, the Family Centre, key informants represented two groups: participants who currently or previously had been employed by the Family Centre and individuals who were familiar with the Family Centre or had worked with its employees.

Interview questions were based on the theoretical concepts described in the first half of this chapter. Questions were written to obtain information that would support a better understanding of capital, the SSCO field, how the Family Centre operates in the SSCO field, and how SSCOs, like the Family Centre, interact with other fields. Interviews were semi-structured, which means that each participant was asked a similar set of questions, although participants and the interviewer also had the freedom to move off script if the participant had knowledge that could enhance the study. Due to the semi-structured nature of the interviews, they were viewed as “negotiated accomplishments” (Fontana & Frey, 2005, 716) because both the interviewer and participant contributed to the outcome. The interview schedule can be found in Appendix A.
Documentary analysis

A limited documentary analysis (Prior, 2003; J. Scott, 1990) was used to ensure that participant comments were accurate in the embedded case study. Relevant key documents written between 1981 and 2009, including research papers, books, web pages, and published journal articles, were obtained from Family Centre staff and analysed for key themes and findings. In other words, documents that related to topics discussed by participants, such as the New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project or Just Therapy, were included. Other documents, such as meeting minutes, were not made available. Documents were analysed to better understand the Family Centre’s story and answer the research questions. This approach was used only in the embedded case study because the larger case study included participants that represented many organisations and, as previously mentioned, the Family Centre represented an exemplary organisation. In addition, conducting a documentary analysis on each organisation would have been difficult given the time constraints inherent in this research.

Participants

There were 42 participants recruited for the key informant interviews. These interviews are the primary source of data because, as mentioned in Chapter 3, very little information exists on the community sector in New Zealand, especially the advocacy activities of the community sector. This section describes who these participants are, including the three groups they represented, why they were recruited, how they were recruited, and the step-by-step process of the interviews.

Who were the participants and why were they recruited

Of the 42 participants, 4 were Māori, 6 were Samoan and 32 were Pākehā or of European descent. They were located in various regions around New Zealand, including Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin; but the majority were situated in Wellington. Participants represented three groups: the community field (30), the research field (6), and the policy field (6). The term field is used as it is defined above. Table 4-1, below, depicts the number of participants by field.
Acquiring multiple perspectives is important for triangulation (Mays & Pope, 1995) and the application of theoretical concepts (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008; Bourdieu, 2005b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The community, research and policy fields, in particular, were chosen for their relationship to the community sector. Participants in every field had experience working in or with the community sector. In addition, research participants provided a research perspective and policy participants provided a policy perspective. A description of each field and the participants who had knowledge of the Family Centre is presented below.

Categorising participants required special attention. The majority of participants working in or with community organisations had worked in all three fields, either separately or simultaneously, which made categorising complex. When this became problematic, the participant’s perspective was analysed on an issue-by-issue basis. An example would be a participant who currently worked in the policy field but had experience working in the community field. When this occurred, the participant’s current employer was used to guide categorisation. Another issue arose when categorising individuals who were retired or no longer worked in or with community organisations, but had experience working with the Family Centre. When this happened, participants were placed in the field they had previously worked in to provide the appropriate context for their comments, which in this example would have been the community field. Overall, the ability for participants to operate in more than one field demonstrates the fluidity of fields. This characteristic of fields is consistent with the understanding of social fields underlying the field theory used in this study, and is, in fact, something exploited by successful advocates.

**Community field**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants placed in the community field included individuals who currently or previously worked in a community organisation. In other words, they had received payment for their work directly from a community organisation. For example, individuals who conducted research with a community group but had received payment from a grant and not directly from the organisation were not placed in this category. As shown in Table 4-1 above, there were 30 participants in this category: 4 Māori, 5 Samoan, and 21 Pākehā. All of the participants in this category were involved in the provision of social services or worked at organisations that supported SSCOs.

Research field
Participants placed in the research field included individuals who currently or previously had done research with a community organisation. This category includes individuals who received payment from a grant but not from a community organisation. The research that participants were involved in was usually related to advocacy around an issue. Categorising participants in this way may improve the analysis because, although the number of research participants is low, their voices may add another layer of depth to understanding how the community sector relates to other sectors. In the literature review, research was identified as an important way to advocate and Family Centre employees were heavily involved in research, therefore this category was included. There were 6 participants in the research field: all were Pākehā.

Policy field
Participants placed in the policy field consisted of individuals who currently worked for or in the government, which included public sector workers and elected officials; for example, Cabinet Ministers and Members of Parliament (MPs). These participants had worked directly with community organisations or funded their work; therefore, they could discuss the community-government relationship from a policy perspective. There were 6 participants in the policy field category, 5 Pākehā and 1 Samoan.

Participants with Family Centre knowledge
The Family Centre, briefly introduced in Chapter 1, was the embedded case study, therefore a majority of the participants (33 of the 42), had knowledge of the work
the Family Centre had done and were able to comment on it. All of the Māori (4) and Pacific (6) participants in the study discussed the Family Centre. Participants who did not comment on the Family Centre are located in the community field, except for one policy field participant who had extensive knowledge of the community-government relationship in New Zealand. The 9 participants who did not have knowledge of the Family Centre’s work were included because of their knowledge in other areas, such as advocacy or the community sector as a whole.

Participants who had knowledge of the Family Centre’s work were placed into two categories, internal and external. Internal participants included those who currently or previously had worked for the Family Centre; in other words, they had been paid employees of the Family Centre. The external participants included individuals who were aware of the Family Centre’s work or had worked with it on a project. Table 4-2 below depicts these categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants with Family Centre knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal participants provided an inside perspective of the Family Centre’s work and operations, and external participants provided an independent view of the Family Centre’s work.

**How were participants recruited?**

Participants were identified for recruitment through systemic non-probabilistic sampling. As defined by Mays and Pope, this is a sampling technique in which the aim “is not to establish a random or representative sample drawn from a population but rather to identify specific groups of people who either possess characteristics or live in circumstances relevant to the social phenomenon being studied” (Mays & Pope, 1995, 110). For the purposes of this research, this means that specific groups of people were
chosen because they had knowledge of community organisations in New Zealand or were familiar with the Family Centre. Some participants were suggested by Family Centre employees, which often included individuals who would be difficult to contact if Family Centre networks were not utilised, such as former Members of Parliament (MPs) or Māori and Pacific individuals. Participants who were not affiliated with the Family Centre were chosen for their different perspectives of the Family Centre’s work, their experience as an executive director of a community organisation, or their experience with advocacy. At the end of each interview, participants were always asked if they had any suggestions for other groups or individuals who were knowledgeable about community organisations and advocacy. Given the highly networked and relational environment of the community sector and the nature of networks in New Zealand, this was a useful approach to gathering participants who were known for their work in advocacy.

What were the steps of the interview process?

The interview process began once individuals were chosen as potential participants through the process described above. Once they were chosen, they were sent an email. Those who accepted the opportunity to be interviewed were phoned or emailed and a time and date was organised for the interview. Participants were then sent a copy of the interview questions (Appendix A) and both the ethics and consent forms (Appendix B). Interviews were conducted face-to-face or over the phone, and they were all audio-recorded. Phone interviews were done because some participants were not in the area. At the beginning of each interview the ethics form was discussed. Participants were not offered a transcript of the interview; however, although individuals who asked for a transcript received one, only comments from the Family Centre staff were incorporated into revised documents. Interviews ranged from approximately 30–90 minutes and the majority of interviews lasted approximately 60 minutes. As previously mentioned, interviews were semi-structured, therefore participants discussed the questions in the interview schedule, nevertheless, participants had the freedom to go into detail about relevant topics that they were familiar with. Once the interview was completed, participants were emailed the next day to thank them for their contribution. Based on the ethics form, in accordance with the University of Otago’s ethics
guidelines, participants who requested a copy of the research will be emailed or mailed future journal articles that relate to this study.

The data analysed using thematic analysis

Data was analysed using thematic analysis. According to Boyatizis, thematic analysis is “a process for encoding qualitative information” (Boyatizis, 1998, vi). He suggests that encoding requires an “explicit ‘code’” and that this code may be “a list of themes; a complex model with themes, indicators, or qualifications that are casually related; or something in between these two forms” (Boyatizis, 1998, vi-vii). Thematic analysis was chosen over discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1985) because the primary objective was to understand the structural and relational factors underpinning effective advocacy by community organisations, so an in-depth examination into how participants communicated was not essential.

To begin the thematic analysis, all documents, except for journal articles, and all interviews were transcribed and imported into the NVivo coding software. Codes were created using Boyatizis’s thematic analysis principles; therefore, theoretically informed themes and sub-themes were created based on what emerged from the data. A list of themes and sub-themes, which included topics such as the role of community organisations and problems with definitions, can be found in Appendix C. The data was analysed multiple times and theoretically informed general themes were identified. From those general themes, more specific themes were found and coded. For example, four general topics were discussed in every interview: background information on the community sector and its role, capital, structure of the SSCO field and the position of other groups, and how groups influence fields. Upon further analysis, more specific topics emerged from the general topics, such as what capital makes an organisation successful, and the different kinds of SSCOs that operate in New Zealand. When quotes from the data were used in the results section, they were coded using based on the general and specific topics that emerged. The SSCO community in New Zealand is small, which might make it possible for readers to identify the participant. Therefore, the quotes were not coded in further detail due to confidentiality issues. Boyatizis described three approaches to thematic analysis (Boyatizis, 1998, 44): the theory-driven approach, the prior-research-driven approach, and the data-driven approach. The
theory driven approach was used and the three steps of this approach are described below as they relate to this research.

According to Boyatzis (1998, 44), there are three major stages to theory-driven thematic analysis, which include deciding on a sample and design, developing the themes and codes, and validating and using the codes. First, the sample was chosen, which was explained above. Second, themes that emerged from the data were developed. The major themes—capital, field position, and changing the field—were based on theoretical concepts and sub-themes were based on participant comments, such as the service and advocacy roles of community organisations. Third, each code was validated, which consisted of referring back to the relevant theoretical concepts, determining their validity, and interpreting the results.

Limitations

Qualitative research has been criticised for being subject to researcher bias and lacking reproducibility (Boyatzis, 1998; Mays & Pope, 1995); in other words, “authenticity ... is often the issue in qualitative research” (Seale & Silverman, 1997, 379). Two major obstacles to qualitative research are identified below along with an explanation of how each was managed. First, Bourdieu’s three forms of researcher bias are analysed in relation to this research and second, issues associated with validity and reliability are discussed.

Researcher bias

Bourdieu discussed three researcher biases that may “blur the sociological gaze” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 272; Swartz, 1997). These three biases include the social origins of the researcher, the location of the researcher in the field, and the intellectual bias of the researcher. The first bias, the social origins of the researcher, may have an effect on this research. I am from California and moved to New Zealand to enrol in the public health doctoral programme at the University of Otago, Wellington School of Medicine. I am less familiar with some events that took place in New Zealand, including the structural changes that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s (described in Chapter 1), and cultural contexts, including the experiences of Māori and Pacific peoples living in New Zealand. This relative lack of familiarity may ultimately have an impact on this
research. I also come from a mental health educational background, which is how I became familiar with the Family Centre’s work.

In order to manage the social origins bias, I attempted to immerse myself in the New Zealand culture and rely on my supervisors, who were both raised in New Zealand, to correct me when I made a mistake regarding the cultural context or structural changes. I also relied on Māori supervision for assistance with understanding the cultural context. In addition, I read newspaper clippings on the Family Centre that were written during the 1980s and 1990s, which, in addition to government documents, videos and literature on the structural changes, helped me to immerse myself in the New Zealand culture. Based on my background, an American Pākehā, it is not appropriate for me to include a thorough analysis of Māori-led organisations because of my lack of knowledge of Māori culture. Further, this was clearly pointed out to me by a number of key advisors (both Māori and Pākehā) when the proposal for this thesis was developed.

Second, because of my position in the intellectual field, I am interested in “scholarly recognition… [and] intellectual ideas” (Swartz, 1997, 273). However, because I have worked in SSCOs in the past, I am also interested in providing practical support to organisations that advocate. Therefore, in addition to my experience in the SSCO field, I managed my location in the field through reflexivity and triangulation. Reflexivity is a “systemic and rigorous self-critical practice” (Swartz, 1997, 10) and as previously mentioned, triangulation incorporates multiple sources of data. In order to maintain a self-critical practice, I spoke with my supervisors, colleagues, and individuals in the SSCO field; I also read newspaper articles and unpublished papers written by individuals working in the SSCO field. It is hoped that these actions minimised the effect of my position on the findings presented in this thesis.

The third bias, the intellectual bias, is, according to Swartz (1997, 272-275), the most difficult bias to overcome. Swartz argues that through the intellectual bias, academics often believe their work is neutral and objective; however, they fail to understand how their beliefs are shaped by their own cultural field. I am a researcher conducting this project for the fulfilment of a doctoral degree; therefore, my intellectual bias may blur my “sociological gaze”. On the other hand, bias exists in research at
many levels, from choosing the topic to analysing the results and writing them for publication. In addition, participants may have been influenced by the fact that a researcher was interviewing them. For example, they may have overemphasised the importance of research. Although these biases were reduced as much as possible, as Swartz points out in his analysis of Bourdieu’s work, “reflexivity can only be carried out by degrees” and “the escape from social determination is always partial for Bourdieu, since reflexive practice itself takes place within socially determined conditions” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Swartz, 1997, 275-276). I managed my intellectual bias as a researcher through gaining multiple perspectives and utilising triangulation to ensure accuracy.

Validity and reliability
Analysts who have discussed case study methodologies have pointed out that case studies are undervalued and can have strong reliability and validity (Stake, 2005; Yin, 2003, xiii). In order to ensure rigour in this case study, reliability and three types of validity—construct validity, internal validity, and external validity—are considered below.

Construct validity
Construct validity involves “establishing correct operational measures for the concepts being studied” (Yin, 2003, 34). The operational measures, namely interviews and documents, were described above. Construct validity was managed through data collection. Participants were recruited through non-probabilistic sampling and triangulation was used to ensure accuracy through multiple sources of evidence (Mays & Pope, 1995; Yin, 2003). Family Centre employees were also given the Family Centre chapters to review and their comments were integrated into revised documents, which researchers suggests may improve validity (Mays & Pope, 1995; Seale & Silverman, 1997; Yin, 2003).

Internal validity
According to Yin (2003, 34) internal validity is not used to assess exploratory studies. This study is exploratory in nature because, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, advocacy is not well understood; therefore, an existing framework could not be applied. A relational theoretical approach, although used as a guide in previous studies
(Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008; Benson & Neveu, 2005; Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008; Gatrell, Popay, & Thomas, 2004; Grenfell & James, 2004; P. King, 1995; Naidoo, 2004; Peillon, 1998; Veenstra, 2007), appears to have been rarely used as a framework to guide an in-depth study of advocacy in the community sector (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; C. Scott, 2006; Stone & Sandfort, 2009). In addition, as previously mentioned, those studies that incorporated a relational approach drew from DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983), not Bourdieu’s (2005b; 1992), approach to field theory. No other studies were identified that applied the NSM-A (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008), which draws from Bourdieu (2005b; 1992). Therefore, the approach used in this study, which incorporates concepts such as capital, does not appear to have been used in previous studies that analyse the community sector.

**External validity**

The third form of validity, external validity, involves “establishing the domain to which a study’s findings can be generalised” (Yin, 2003, 34). External validity, or generalisability, could be limited because interviews took place only with participants in New Zealand. Nonetheless, based on the similarities between the New Zealand and international literature discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, it appears that the results can provide insights to countries outside of New Zealand.

Another limit to generalisability could occur because of the sample. Only low numbers of Māori, Pacific, policy, and research participants were included and members of the community were not included. Reasons are given for each of these limitations. The low numbers of Māori and Pacific participants is common in New Zealand research because both groups have been over-researched (Cram, 1997; L. T. Smith, 1999), and their small population, combined with pressures on their communities, make it difficult to conduct research with them. Members of the community were not interviewed because of time constraints. The number of policy field participants is low because they are less accessible. Similarly, the number of research field participants is low because many community field participants had experience conducting research; therefore, more research field participants were not obtained. Yin (2003) argues that external validity is increased through the use of theoretical concepts, and, as discussed in the first half of this chapter, this research applies the New Social
Movement Alternative (NSM-A) and selected field theory concepts to the community sector.

Reliability

Finally, through reliability, an analyst demonstrates “that the operations of a study … can be repeated, with the same results” (Yin, 2003, 34). Reliability could be limited by an omission of the step-by-step process that was taken in this study; however, this chapter describes the methodological process in detail.

Conclusion

The aim of this chapter is to describe the theoretical framework and explain the methodological process that was used to understand how SSCOs advocate effectively. To begin with the theoretical framework was described, which draws from NSM-A and field theory concepts. Four aspects of these theories are applied to advocacy activities in the community sector. First, the relational approach utilised in this research is explained and, more specifically, the concept of fields. Second, how a field is structured and the effects of this structure are presented. Capital is a primary focus of this section as the structure of a field is centred on it. Four different forms of capital are identified: economic, social, cultural, and symbolic. Using the first and second concepts to describe the community sector as a field with subfields may help to explain diversity and why groups act the way that they do, and can be used to help leaders better understand how to advocate more effectively. Third, based on the analysis of the NSM-A authors (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008), recent advocacy efforts may be better understood if actors are viewed as members of the fields or institutions that they challenge. Finally, three components of a group’s strategy are described. According to the theoretical concepts used in this research, organisations will often target multiple institutions, hold instrumental and expressive goals, and use relationships and knowledge to effectively influence change.

In the second half of the chapter the design of the study and its limitations are described. The first section describes the case study, which is an intrinsic single case study with one embedded unit of analysis. The social service community organisation (SSCO) sector is the larger case study and the embedded unit of analysis is the Family
This research is exploratory in nature because although some literature exists on advocacy in community organisations, this area is not well understood. Two sources of data informed the findings: key informant interviews and documentary analysis. The use of multiple perspectives represented by the key informants and documentary analysis increases validity and accuracy through triangulation.

Participants were described as were the three fields they represented. There are a total of 42 participants, 30 from the community field, 6 from the research field, and 6 from the policy field. Participants in each of these fields were chosen for their close relationship to the community sector, their relationship with the Family Centre, or their experience in community sector advocacy. Of the 42 participants, 33 had knowledge of the Family Centre, the embedded unit of analysis. Two groups of participants, those internal (8) and external (25) to the Family Centre, represented different perspectives.

A description of thematic analysis, also was provided which was used to analyse the data. Thematic analysis is essentially "a process for encoding qualitative information" (Boyatzis, 1998, vi). As discussed in the first half of this chapter, theoretical concepts are used as a framework to guide this research; therefore, they influence how the thematic analysis is conducted. More specifically, the three stages of a theory-driven thematic analysis, which include deciding on a sample and design, developing the themes and codes, and validating and using the codes, are described in relation to this research.

The final section of this chapter describes the possible limitations of this study and how these limitations were minimised. This section is divided into two categories, research bias, and issues associated with validity and reliability. Bourdieu’s three researcher biases are described. The social origins of the analyst, the field location of the analyst, and the intellectual bias of the analyst are identified. The effects of my social origins were managed through immersion, research, and supervision. The effects of my location in the field were reduced through reflexivity, triangulation, supervision, and discussions with colleagues. Similarly, my intellectual bias was minimised through gaining multiple perspectives and the use of triangulation.

Reliability and three forms of validity—construct, internal, and external validity—are considered for possible limitations. Issues associated with construct validity, such as
inappropriate measures, were managed through non-probabilistic sampling and triangulation. According to Yin (2003), because the study is exploratory in nature, internal validity is not assessed based on the lack of an existing framework. Problems associated with external validity, such as generalisability, were managed through the application of theoretical concepts. Finally, reliability issues that may occur, such as a lack of attention to the methodological process, were reduced through a detailed description of the steps taken in this study. The next chapter is the first of three results chapters, in which data that was collected on SSCOs in New Zealand is presented.
Chapter 5
The social service community organisation sector and advocacy: What the participants said

This is the first of three results chapters, in which data on the New Zealand social service community organisation (SSCO) sector is presented. In this chapter, evidence from key informants, representing three perspectives—the community field (30), the research field (6), and the policy field (6)—begins the analysis on the larger case study. The first half of the chapter describes the SSCO sector in New Zealand. The SSCO sector is defined and located in the wider space of institutions, such as the for-profit business and government sectors. Next, participant comments on the role, key characteristics, and different types of SSCOs are considered. The second half of the chapter addresses advocacy in the SSCO sector. Advocacy is defined and participant comments are used to describe who SSCOs advocate for, who they target, what they advocate for, why they advocate and how they advocate. Next, the various factors that influence the effectiveness and amount of advocacy that groups undertake are described, along with factors that affect their strategy choices; each factor is discussed with a particular emphasis on how relationships affect advocacy.

Defining the social service community sector
Throughout the interviews, it became clear that participants did not agree on the term that should be used to describe the community sector. Some community field participants said that expecting one name to encapsulate the diverse work that community organisations do was unrealistic. However, participants from all three fields used several common terms including voluntary organisation, non-governmental organisation (NGO), community organisation, tāngata whenua community and voluntary sector organisation, civil society organisation, the community sector, the third sector, and not-for-profit sector. The term NGO was primarily used in interviews, but that may have been because the researcher used this term in the interview process. One Māori participant suggested that instead of using any of the terms described above, she used her tribal affiliation because “we’re very clear that our vision is about Māori, and we
know where we belong, the NGO, or any connotation you want to put, even the voluntary sector, is not our vocabulary”. As previously mentioned in Chapter 2, for the purposes of this research, the term “social service community organisation” (SSCO) refers to community groups that provide social services. Similarly, “community organisation” or “community sector” are used to describe all groups that fit within the larger category of community groups.

**Locating the community organisation sector**

The community sector was further defined by participants through comparisons that were made with other sectors. When participants from each field described community organisations, many of them discussed how the community sector has a different role than the for-profit business and government sector, and that these different roles affect how each sector operates. The boundaries between these sectors were not always clear and participants suggested that boundaries can be “fuzzy.” Participants did, however, identify some overarching distinctions between the sectors. For example, participants suggested that the government has to be accountable to the population, and because of this accountability, government is “risk averse” or “conservative” in its actions. The government was described as slow to respond due to the bureaucracy and “red tape” that was in place to manage this accountability. On the other hand, community field participants suggested that community organisations are expected to follow their mission, which is specific to a community and not the entire population; therefore community groups can be more flexible and innovative in ways that allow for a faster response time than most government agencies.

In contrast to the government sector, the organisational structure of the community sector was described as “horizontal and not vertical” by a participant, which succinctly encapsulates how most participants described the structure of community organisations. Because of this difference, participants suggested that community organisations are able to work closely with the community. Participants in every field suggested that the close relationship with the community allows community organisations to better understand the needs of specific groups in ways that the government cannot. Community field participants also pointed out how community organisations are different than for-profit businesses. Although fewer participants
discussed the for-profit business sector, those who did suggested that the main
difference was in each sector’s goal. As participants explained, for-profit companies
work to gain a profit, whereas community organisations do not.

**What does the SSCO sector do?**

Given that participants felt the community sector is distinct from the government
and for-profit business sectors, the roles of SSCOs are considered. Participants
suggested that SSCOs play many roles in society that are important. Broadly speaking,
participants felt that community organisations are about “people trying to solve people’s
problems” and giving members of the community “the opportunity to belong”. Participants
suggested how community organisations fulfil each of these broad roles. Overall, they proposed that community organisations provide services and bring people
together to discuss and express what they want society to look like. An analysis of both
of these activities, and how they can work together, is presented below.

**SSCOs provide services**

When participants in all three fields were asked about the role of SSCOs, the
majority described the service role and contract fulfilment obligations. The services that
were described included mental health support, training and education services,
childcare, information services, community development support, and disability support
services. The feelings about service provision were a bit mixed. Some community field
participants stated that some groups provide services in order to keep their organisation
in operation because the contracts and fees from service provision free them from total
reliance on donations. Some community field participants expressed frustration with
reliance on service delivery and felt that “service delivery is very fraught” because
people can get “stuck” in the service delivery model, which is not the “fundamental
aspiration” of the SSCO sector. On the other hand, some participants also suggested
that service provision was an important way to stay connected to the community. The
biggest challenge that participants described in fulfilling this role was adhering to
government contracts. Overall, government contracts often made community workers
feel that they were not able to engage with the community in the way that they would
like to. Government contracts also affected advocacy, which is discussed below.
SSCOs advocate and bring people together

All of the community and research field participants and most of the policy field participants suggested that bringing people together and advocating on their behalf are also fundamental to the role that community organisations play in society. For example, one community field participant stated that the primary role of community organisations was to articulate “a vision of the world that we would like to live in”. Another community worker suggested that SSCOs are “advocates of … common dreams”. A community field participant highlighted the role of advocacy and why it is essential to community work. She suggested that because community organisations are “so close to the pulse of the community,” they were “in a better position to say what the community needs”. Another community field participant expressed the importance of this role by stating that community organisations are the “crucible of democracy” because they are “the place where people come together and share their dreams and negotiate common futures”. The advocacy role of community organisations is discussed in detail below.

Key characteristics of SSCOs

In their discussions about service provision and advocacy, participants in all fields revealed the key characteristics of community organisations. Two key characteristics were mentioned in the interviews. First, participants in all fields suggested that community organisations have a close relationship with the community. Second, participants suggested that SSCOs generally work with marginalised communities that are managing complex issues. Finally, participants discussed key characteristics of community organisations in New Zealand. Participant responses in relation to each of these key characteristics are presented below.

SSCOs have a close relationship with the community

All of the participants in each field described the close connection to the community as a major strength of the community sector, and one that distinguished it from the business and government sectors. Participants from every field suggested that because community organisations operate “where the rubber hits the road”, they are able to tailor services directly to the community that they are serving in a way that other institutions, such as government, could not. For example, a participant from the policy
field said that he “couldn’t imagine” how the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Health could run without the involvement of certain community organisations because community groups work at the “coalface,” which “gives them a huge amount of experience and information”. On the other hand, he suggested that governments tend to work with people once “things have gone wrong”. This policy field participant stated that because of the direct experience community organisations have with the community, they often managed “most of the early intervention-prevention stuff.”

This close relationship was illustrated by the service delivery practices that participants described, based on their knowledge of the community. These strategies were focused on prevention and equality, and minimising the need for the people to navigate through the system without assistance. Similarly, terms, such as “consumer driven” and “community controlled” were used by community field participants to highlight how “actual users of the service are a part of shaping the service.” A few groups put a substantial amount of work into obtaining feedback from the communities they worked with through members’ forums and consumer feedback surveys. For example, one community field participant described how his organisation had built a consumer advocacy group into its strategic plan, which was maintained through the budget to ensure that the consumer voice is a part of organisational planning. Some participants also discussed the importance of staying open to consumer feedback even when it was critical, because according to them, the service was for the consumer and the consumer should “own it”.

As community field participants discussed the community, most revealed that the close relationship with the community was the reason that they worked in the sector. For example, many community field participants said that they consider their work to be “more than a job” and choose to work in the community sector based on a “passion” for the community. Another community field participant, who had worked with the government and later made a decision to work in a community organisation, suggested that many people enter the community sector based on a lifestyle choice: “They don’t want big caseloads, and they want a bit more flexibility”. Many participants felt a sense of freedom and flexibility because of the flatter management structure in SSCOs, which allowed them to be close to the community and respond quickly to their needs.
SSCOs work with marginalised communities that are managing complex and challenging issues

When community field participants discussed the type of work that they did, it often involved working with groups that have less power in society, such as children, the poor, and the disabled. Community field participants stated that they took their responsibility “very seriously” because they “work with the vulnerable, so if you screw it up, it’s really bad”. In other words, any mistake in service delivery could potentially compound the struggle that families were already experiencing. Participants took their responsibility seriously by staying informed, educating themselves, and staying abreast of any news related to clients and members. Community field participants often said that they would acquire knowledge through speaking directly with the community and their networks with other groups. On the other hand, although most participants agreed that SSCOs work with marginalised communities, a few community field participants felt that the terms “at-risk” and “vulnerable” were “pejorative” because they are “slightly patronising”. Instead, one participant suggested that the focus should be on “relationship in a much bigger sense,” one that recognises how “we’re all linked in some way”.

Community and research field participant comments also revealed that SSCO clients are managing “messy” and “complex” issues, like poverty. Participants suggested that because these issues are complex, service provision needs to be equally complex. When this complexity was challenged, as it is when limits are placed on advocacy activities, participants expressed concern. For example, one community field participant stated that the government often tries to “tame” the community sector through rules and regulations. Instead, he preferred that community organisations remain “feral” because it allowed workers to respond more quickly to the needs of the community.

“The relatively special New Zealand context”

Participants also indicated that, in comparison to SSCOs in other countries, aspects of the political and social environment in New Zealand may make SSCOs operate differently. Many participants from all three fields suggested that the size of the country and the small population have a direct effect on how community organisations
function. Specifically, participants suggested that the small population can influence the relationship that community organisations have with decision-makers and bureaucrats, and the amount of business philanthropy. The way in which each of these factors influences community organisations is described below.

**Closer connections to decision-makers and bureaucrats**

Many participants in all fields suggested that the smaller population has allowed for increased access to decision-makers and bureaucrats, which means that community organisations may be able to have a greater influence on policy as compared to other countries. One research field participant described this distinction well: networks are “an important part of influencing social policy anywhere in the world, the thing is that New Zealand is so small … you can actually make an appointment with the Prime Minister”. Similarly, a few participants who worked in Wellington, the capital of New Zealand, also suggested that “NGOs working out of Wellington do understand government a hell of a lot better than NGOs working out of Auckland or Christchurch, purely because they are dealing with them all the time”.

**Low level of business philanthropy**

A few participants in the community field also described how the comparatively low level of business philanthropy in New Zealand could affect the longevity of community organisations and their ability to advocate. For example, one community field participant argued that New Zealand “will never ever have a big enough private philanthropic sector to fully fund advocacy”. This sentiment was echoed by a few other community field participants as well. Although most countries may never have the capacity for advocacy to be fully funded by philanthropy, participants emphasised that business philanthropy is especially low in New Zealand.

**Different types of SSCOs in New Zealand**

Participants described three different types of SSCOs that could have an effect on the activities carried out by a community organisation and the role it fulfils in society. Specifically, participants in all fields discussed the role of religiously affiliated organisations, umbrella organisations, and Māori organisations. Although participants did not mention them directly, by default these groupings would include their “opposite”.
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Therefore, non-Māori, direct service delivery, and secular organisations are other types of SSCOs that operate in New Zealand. However, because participants did not discuss them directly, these types of SSCOs are not described in this chapter. Nevertheless, they are mentioned in Chapters 2 and 8. Participants suggested that each type of SSCO could affect the way that an organisation is perceived, the community that they work with, and the types of activities that they do, including advocacy related activities. These three types of organisations are described below.

Participants also discussed Pacific organisations, but as there were not enough comments to identify themes, they are not included in this section. Particularly given the lack of literature, described in Chapters 2 and 3, this gap suggests that further research needs to be done on Pacific peoples’ community groups.

**Religiously affiliated organisations**

Participants were asked about the role of religiously affiliated organisations and how religion affects their activities. Most participants in every field felt that religiously based organisations carry a high level of “morality” and “credibility” that other community organisations may not acquire automatically. Participants in all fields felt that this credibility was especially strong with Māori and Pacific communities. On the other hand, a few participants from the community and policy fields added that others might “react adversely” to a religious affiliation, or feel that religious groups sit in a position of “judgement” against others. For example, another community field participant suggested that working with most “church communities” was an “absolute disaster”. According to him, “there’s a disconnect” because religious groups often did not understand the needs of the community he was working with. Possibly as a response to beliefs such as these, one community field participant, who worked at a religiously based organisation, said that when he speaks to the general public, he would “hesitate to use the word God because that comes with so much baggage”.

Participants also discussed how religious affiliation affected advocacy. Some participants in all three fields suggested that New Zealand is “quite secular” and that religious affiliation would not have a major influence on the effectiveness of advocacy campaigns. For example, one participant from the policy field stated that religious affiliation has no effect on policy decisions that he makes because ultimately he is
“interested in… meeting the need out there”. As a result, he was interested in what an organisation did and whether or not their programs worked. On the other hand, participants also mentioned that religious affiliation could help connect to communities, especially Māori and Pacific communities.

Consistent with community field participants in other SSCOs, all of the participants who worked at religiously affiliated organisations felt that advocacy is important. For example, one participant suggested that, as an organisation, they “have to stand outside of the tent, [and] say what needs to be said,” but that they try to do that, “in a considered and Christian way”.

**Umbrella organisations**

Umbrella organisations, also called peak bodies, were frequently discussed by participants in each field. One participant described the role of umbrella organisations in the following way:

> What [umbrella groups] do is they maximise our energy because the reality of many NGOs is we are grossly under-resourced compared to the public, or the commercial sector, and so everyone is doing a lot [and] having to fill a lot of roles, having to be generalists, and we just don't have the time or the energy, or the knowledge to be able to do some of that work. So, by coming together we can pool our knowledge, pool our resources, and free up some collective time for us to work on common issues.

Another participant suggested that umbrella organisations have “that intensity of interaction at the node” because they can “coordinate, facilitate, distribute, and disseminate” information. Groups like the Association of Non-Governmental Organisations of Aotearoa (ANGOA), the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS), and the Disabled Persons Assembly (DPA) are examples of well-known umbrella organisations in New Zealand that participants mentioned during interviews.

According to participants, resources and networks were the primary benefit of umbrella organisations. As mentioned above, community groups can utilise umbrella groups to “pool” their resources. In addition, community field participants suggested that umbrella organisations connect members of the community with decision-makers and
bureaucrats. For example, umbrella organisations may have networks with groups that range from Members of Parliament (MPs) to the community. As a result, umbrella groups often engaged in direct advocacy with policy-makers when other community workers were unable to because they did not have time.

On the other hand, tension existed around the need to have one united voice within the community sector, and umbrella groups were at the heart of this tension. Community field participants suggested that there was a push from the government to have a united voice, and some groups responded to this call, while others felt that the sector was so diverse that the search for a united voice was futile. Groups mentioned above, such as ANGOA, were identified by participants as having a strong voice, which suggests that these particular groups may be getting closer to the “united voice”. However, as this research indicates, community organisations are diverse and finding one voice that represents all the different groups would be a difficult task, and one that some community field participants felt was inappropriate.

**Māori organisations**

Many community field participants described Māori organisations; however, because only four participants were Māori, these findings are preliminary. Based on participant comments, two themes emerged: a continuum within which Māori organisations operate, and the integration of cultural practices and cultural knowledge into organisational activities. Both Māori and non-Māori community field participants described a continuum of organisations, with one end that incorporates Māori organisations that follow a mainstream “community sector” model, and the other end that incorporates what one Māori participant called “whānau, hapū, iwi” organisations. According to this participant, the “whānau, hapū, iwi” model “follow[s] a traditional Māori model” and relates to tribal structures.

Community field participants suggested that Māori organisations would generally incorporate cultural practices, cultural knowledge and “cultural proficiency” into their organisation. The centrality of family and whānau was described as important by almost all participants who discussed Māori organisations. For example, one Māori participant suggested that “one of the unwritten values is family first.” Overall, participants noted that Māori organisations represent an important and unique group in New Zealand;
however, they are still not well understood by the wider community sector. In order to accurately measure their contribution, far more research needs to be done, and this research needs to be conducted using Māori measurements; otherwise, many dimensions of their contribution will not be seen.

**What is advocacy?**

As previously discussed, advocacy was viewed by most participants as an “essential” and “legitimate” role of community organisations. When participants in the community field discussed advocacy they often described it in terms of informing a group, such as the public or government representatives, about an issue or a community in the hopes that change or transformation will occur. When community field participants described advocating strategies aimed at changing government policy, they often described taking information that was gathered through research and service delivery, and telling government employees “what works… and how it can work better". For participants, advocacy essentially involved sharing information and “providing a space where people could come together” so that “politicians and leaders of business and [the] community” better understood an issue or community, and could therefore make informed decisions.

**Whom do SSCOs advocate for and who are targets of advocacy?**

As discussed above, SSCOs work with and for marginalised communities, therefore it is not surprising that participants said that they also advocate for people who are “poor and vulnerable”. As one community field participant put it, “advocacy really is about winning ground for another person”. When community field participants described their advocacy work, they generally discussed campaigns that targeted decision-makers and bureaucrats in the hope of changing policy. However, participants also discussed targeting the public as well. For example, one participant recounted an education campaign that was aimed at changing the public’s opinion on how gambling affected the community. Overall, advocacy was generally aimed at “influencing the influencers,” which included “politicians, and leaders of business and [the] community”, and the public.
What do SSCOs advocate for?

When participants were asked about their experience with advocacy activities, they described advocating for issues based on the needs of the community. Community field participants would often refer to structural problems—such as poverty, living conditions, housing, health care, and community support—as opposed to individual deficits, when describing challenges that the community confronted. For example, one participant said, “homelessness is not a lifestyle choice”. She argued that properly serving clients involves shedding light on the causes and effects of poverty. Participants advocate for bringing attention to structural problems, such as poverty and homelessness. In conclusion, advocacy activities were primarily focused on reducing the effects of what scholars have previously identified as the conditions that lead to the determinants of health, as they negatively affect marginalised communities.

Why do SSCOs advocate?

Community field participants said that they advocated because they were interested in contributing to “social democracy” and changing perceptions so that “people understand the real effect of what’s happening in people’s lives”. They suggested that most community organisations engage in advocacy at some level because “NGOs are often about making things better for the community”. Many community field participants also suggested that advocacy was a component of service delivery and vice versa; therefore the two roles should not be separated. They said that service delivery informed advocacy, and advocacy was the mechanism for change. This belief is summarised by one participant:

Advocacy has validity because we’re service providers. Our service has legitimacy because of the commitment we’ve made to the community … So, I would never want to sell that we are an advocacy organisation or that we are a service organisation. This was practical service, which also fuelled our advocacy work.

Some participants in the community field went further and argued that “the fundamental aspiration is not to deliver services, it is to actually change … perceptions”, or to advocate, and that the groups who do not advocate are actually doing a disservice to their community. For example, one community field participant said, “food parcels are
fine, they meet the immediate need … but at the end of the day you need policy change”.

**How do SSCOs advocate?**

As participants described advocacy activities they were involved in, it became clear that they participated in a range of advocacy strategies. Almost all community field participants stated that there was value in drawing from a multiplicity of strategies. For example, one community field participant argued that because community organisations deal with “complex issues … the way to address [these issues] is similarly complex”, therefore there is not a “one size fits all” approach. Similarly, many participants also suggested that community organisations should use different approaches, such as writing submissions and discussing issues with other groups, in order to be more effective, because “it’s not enough to operate in one sphere”. A few community field participants also recommended thinking about solutions when advocating: “When you try and get into solutions it makes you a better critic because you realise how hard it is to create good policy or good service design or good taxation systems”. Four specific advocacy strategies were often discussed: research, engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats, utilising the media, and protesting. Each of these strategies is explored below.

*“Research is the engine room of the policy process”*

Almost every participant in each field discussed how doing research can create change through the information that is provided to the public and government representatives in government. For example, a policy field participant stated, “research is the engine room of the policy process” and he described how evidence-based research could influence policy because it often indicates that a problem is “systemic”. Similarly, a research field participant argued that doing research is “the only way that you can sustain a debate, if you’re going to work in this policy arena”. The majority of participants discussed how research could be used to “shape” or influence policy; however, some community field participants suggested that research could be used to inform advocacy as well. For example, participants talked about “action-reflection type research” and used research to understand and further “community driven solutions".
Community field participants also discussed how research can be used to “describe alternative strategies” and to share “information with the wider public”, including other community organisations, so that groups can work together to “contribute to social policy change.”

Some community and research field participants discussed several of the disadvantages that may accompany doing research. Some participants suggested that having a “sound research capacity” is expensive and could be resource intensive. One community field participant said that few resources were allocated to research because it “hasn’t been valued” in the community sector. Other research field participants explained how research should be used. A research field participant talked about the importance of putting research into “context” so that findings could be connected to the community and properly understood. Other research field participants suggested that researchers need to “know what [they’re] doing” because “there’s a cost to gathering information”, and “unless you are actually going to use it, then you shouldn’t actually be wasting people’s time”. Finally, a few participants argued that some communities, especially Māori and Pacific communities, have been harmed through research because either research was used incorrectly or important voices were ignored. It appears that research can have an effect, but that it must also be used ethically and responsibly.

Engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats

Participants in all fields usually suggested that speaking directly to government ministers, MPs, and public servants through meetings and advisory panels was the most effective advocacy strategy for most groups. Nevertheless, participants described two ways that community groups engage with government representatives. First, participants in the community field described how they had been involved in writing submissions to a Select Committee (Hughes & Calder, 2007). Second, a few community field participants were also asked to provide their opinion through reference and advisory groups, such as the Social Policy Reference Group (SPRG) which, according to them, informs members of the Ministry of Social Development.

---

3 The Select Committee is a group of MPs that accept public submissions on a Bill before it becomes an Act.
In order to influence policy “inside the tent”, which is how the majority of participants described successfully influencing policy change, participants suggested that community groups need to form relationships with government ministers, MPs and public servants. Often, being asked to participate in a reference group is based not only on quality of work but networks and relationships with government workers. For example, a policy field participant stated that the people chosen to be on the SPRG were “very acceptable to the Minister [of Social Development]”; in other words, they were “people that he would want to influence the Ministry and their thinking”. Community field participants fostered these relationships through sending information packets to government ministers and MPs, hosting parliamentary lunches, inviting government workers to debates and discussions, and requesting meetings with them.

**Media strategies**

The majority of participants also discussed the media and how using media strategies could be influential. Overall, every participant felt that groups without a close relationship with government were not listened to by decision-makers and were more likely to use the media as a tool to advocate. Community field participants described how they used the media, which included organising public events in order to get media attention, making press releases and doing interviews with newspapers, radio, and television. The most frequently mentioned media strategy involved CommVoices, a network of community organisations that contracted a public relations company as a group, so that they could “hit government [in the] same day” and do so in a “united” way. According to participants who were members of CommVoices, a media release would be sent to all major media outlets on any issue that related to the community sector, such as funding available to the sector or a change in how public housing is structured. Community field participants who had used media strategies cautioned that working with the media required a specific skill set because the media “loves conflict”, and therefore sometimes it could be difficult to “educate the public or promote really positive initiatives”. However, the majority of community field participants felt that “politics is about a popular vote, so media strategies work”.

Participants in all fields also talked about how working with the media affected the relationship with government. The way messages are delivered and when they are
delivered could potentially create a tense relationship between government and an organisation. Some community field participants described the contracting process with government, which, according to them, usually requires groups to go to government with any issues before going to the media. One policy field participant suggested that this approach was important because he wanted an “opportunity to fix [the problem] before it ends up on morning report”, a programme on Radio New Zealand National. Community field participants had been involved in both approaches, going to government before and after they had released information to the media. In fact, one community field participant discussed how they used the threat of going to the media as a strategy to “embarrass [the government] into acting or convince them that there’s a big enough constituency behind an idea that they should respond”. Community field participants did not describe one approach as more effective. However, some participants said that decision-makers and public servants would not meet with them after they disclosed information to the media first, and this could potentially harm efforts to be influential while that government was still in control.

*Protests and sit-ins: “We shall not be moved”*

The final advocacy strategy that participants in all fields discussed was protesting. Although participants in all fields described these approaches, the majority of participants talked about how Māori communities and organisations have effectively used protests to advocate. For example, one Māori community field participant suggested that “the most typical way [Māori] have influenced the legislation … of this country [is] by walking our roads, the hikoi”, which is a protest march. Another Māori participant explained that the Māori Party, the Waitangi Tribunal, and a greater involvement in government policy overall, have come out of Māori-led land marches, hikoi, and sit-ins. Participants talked about the importance of coming together and acting collectively when protesting through marches and sit-ins. One policy field participant suggested that protesting “can be an effective tool" for “raising the voice of people who are marginalised”. Overall, participants did not discuss protests as often as the strategies that were already mentioned, but those that did said this strategy could be very effective when trying to get a message out to the public and decision-makers.
Factors that affect the amount and effectiveness of advocacy efforts

Participants were asked what successful advocacy looked like and what influenced its success or effectiveness. Most participants in all fields suggested that getting an issue on the political agenda in a way that accurately reflects the voice of the community was an indication of success. Community and research field participants also said that collaborative participation in the policy process before a policy passed is also considered success. In addition, some community field participants also talked about influencing public opinion, or getting an issue on what could be described as the public agenda. When participants were asked about what could affect the advocacy efforts of SSCOs, they described seven factors: the relationship with government; the relationship with the community; the relationship with other community organisations; credibility of the organisation; the amount of available resources; the size of the organisation; and the leadership style. Each of these factors is outlined below.

The relationship with government

Every single participant discussed the community-government relationship. The relationship with government was described as a “necessary evil” and a “delicate dance” that was often quite “tense”. Some community field participants, especially those working with Māori and Pacific communities, felt government did not respect them. For example, some community field participants said that they were treated like the “enemy” and were rarely asked to participate in conversations about policy until after the policy was already made. At the same time, a few community field participants said that the “tension between government and the NGO sector will always be there and is quite healthy” because “disagreement is a way to get different points of view on the table”.

Most community and research field participants argued that the government discouraged advocacy in the community sector. For example, one research field participant said that the government gives SSCOs “few opportunities to talk, and when they do talk it’s like walking on eggshells”. On the other hand, many of the same participants also conceded that a relationship with government is important for SSCOs that want to influence long-term change. As one community field participant stated, it is “natural and human” for policymakers to work with people they trust and many
participants found that decision-makers would often ask the opinion of groups which they trusted. A comment made by a community field participant that worked at a Māori organisation demonstrates both of these points.

Twenty years ago … you didn't have a voice at all. So, there were lots of protests to change that … Now we have a lot of say in there, but not the same autonomy … So you’re having to weigh up the two things, taking a bit from them, and trying to retain some of ours.

This quote illustrates how groups that developed a relationship with government had a “voice” that was heard by government representatives, but once they acquired that “voice” they had less “autonomy” to express themselves.

Although a close relationship with government can make SSCOs influential, almost every community field participant was cautious about getting too close to government. One community field participant suggested, “if you get too close to … government then the community organisation will fall over [because] you need to retain legitimacy in the eyes of your stakeholders”. Another community field participant supported this statement.

Individuals and organisations are sometimes perceived to be captured, and therefore they’re kind of discredited a bit … Some people don’t listen to them quite as much as they might’ve or maybe should. And it can be just perception, it doesn’t need to be real, perception can drive a lot.

Two participants also described a “double-edged sword” effect that can occur in the community-government relationship. The first, a research field participant, suggested, "the more influential you become, the more part of the establishment you become". The second, a community field participant, said:

There’s always the potential for co-option when you’re dealing with the State. You get invited into the corridors of power, and implicit in that [is] that you’ve got to behave, and implicit in that is that you have to side with the powerful, and ask meekly on behalf of the powerless. And that is a really big tension in NGO work, how do you manage that tension?
This comment eloquently describes the “delicate dance” between the two sectors, and what can happen to community groups that work closely with government.

In order to reduce some of the tension between the two sectors and remain influential, community and research field participants suggested that organisations should remain “politically neutral”. In other words, if SSCO employees were interested in fostering a relationship with government, they should engage in relationships across the political spectrum. The main argument against working with one political party was that it could influence future support that is given by either the community or other policymakers. For example, if there was a change in government, participants warned that community organisations who had worked closely with the previous government could be seen as “part of the opposition” by the current government and therefore ignored. There is the potential for a change in government every three years in New Zealand, which means that community workers who choose to work closely with one political party may be influential for only three years.

When participants discussed how the relationship with government could influence advocacy, they mentioned two ways that the government exerts power on community groups: through government contracts and the registration process. Almost every community field participant related to government in these ways, which, as is discussed in Chapter 3, is common for SSCOs. Both of these methods are described below, along with a brief discussion of why tension exists between the government and community sectors.

**Government contracts**

The majority of community field participants felt that government contracts inhibited advocacy. The strict advocacy rules that are detailed in the Brazier and Hunn (Brazier & Hunn, 2003) document, described in Chapter 3, left many participants feeling that their advocacy role was being ignored because funding advocacy activities through government contracts became strictly prohibited. As previously mentioned, a few participants also discussed an agreement that was made between community groups and government when a contract was signed. As discussed above, some community organisations agree to raise “issues of concern with [government] before [taking] them anywhere else”, such as the media. These agreements resulted in many community
field participants feeling that government was trying to buy loyalty, which created an environment of “you’re with us or against us”.

Community field participants suggested ways to avoid being controlled by government contracts. Many community field participants suggested that reducing the influence of having one funder, which is often the government, can be achieved by gathering funding from multiple sources and having “the will to stand up to a government at the threat of loss of funding.” Some participants also advised groups to have a strong mission or a “strong kaupapa” so that organisations have a “clear understanding of who [they] are” and not allow money to control them. One participant made sure advocacy activities were funded separately from service activities because they were “too easily hurt and damaged by the State”. A few other participants fought hard to keep advocacy in their government contracts and argued that advocacy “was always an aim of [the] organisation; so if government was going to fund … service delivery, it was going to fund the other [activities] as well”. Finally, a few participants said that they used different words when working with the government, such as “information and advice”, instead of “policy advocacy”, to avoid violating the guidelines suggested in the Brazier and Hunn report (2003), as described in Chapter 3.

**Should government contracts be used to fund advocacy activities?**

Participants were asked if government contracts should be used to fund advocacy activities. Community and policy field participants generally had different opinions. Overall, community field participants argued that it is the role of government to fund advocacy because “advocacy is a legitimate role of civil society and funding it is really just a recognition that wealthy groups already have access to power and marginalised groups have less”. Another community field participant suggested that advocacy should at the very least by “partially funded” by government because decision-makers need “full information on which to base [their] decisions”; and some of that information comes from community groups.

Community field participants also described what they thought the government funding of advocacy should look like. One community field participant emphasised a holistic approach:
Government should fund community organisations which it believes are adding value to the community … [and] be able to withdraw its funding if it loses faith in an organisation or believes the organisation is not doing the things they say they are doing.

Another participant suggested that government could put some funding towards “contracts and grants” and an equal proportion to “monitoring and evaluation for advocacy”. Another suggestion was to provide “bulk funding to peak bodies,” which were identified as umbrella organisations in Chapter 2. Finally, a research field participant suggested that the government should “set up systems where that process of advocacy can be embraced in an objective way” because “you’ve got to be able to see through the stuff that is pure demand [and] the stuff that’s really required.”

Policy field participants expressed less consistent views. For example, one policy field participant suggested that the question of whether or not government should play a role in funding advocacy is debatable. This participant invoked the model used by the Charities Commission, as described in Chapter 2, which is used to determine if an organisation is a charity. He stated that if an organisation’s mission is “pure advocacy,” it does not fall under the definition of a charity. On the other hand, he suggested that the government already supports advocacy in multiple ways, such as funding forums that allow multiple viewpoints to be expressed, including those that are opposed to government. Another policy field participant supported a limit to community sector advocacy as well. He suggested that community organisations that “have a strong ideological position” and are interested in working “outside of the tent,” should “cut out the middle man and go into politics”.

On the other hand, two other policy field participants supported advocacy by community organisations. One of these participants stated that she’s “always advocated for the right of all groups to be able to advocate politically … even against the current government, and even when the government is providing the funding and contracting”. The other policy field participant described her involvement with different community groups, which demonstrated her support for advocacy. Although she did not use the word advocacy, she did say, “NGOs can be very influential in the policies that we make” and that she wanted to change the perception that “government tend[s] to come in and take over” without listening to community organisations. The remaining policy field
participants did not directly address if and how much community organisations should be able to advocate when they are receiving money from the government.

**The registration process: the Charities Commission**

Without being prompted, most participants discussed how contracts limited advocacy, but a few participants also suggested that the Charities Commission, which is one of the primary avenues for community organisations to become registered, discouraged groups from advocating. A few community field participants suggested that limiting advocacy organisations’ access to charity status is harmful. These participants referred to the New Zealand branch of the Grey Power New Zealand Federation as an example of an organisation that was unable to acquire charity status because they are “pure advocacy”. Participants saw the action taken against the Grey Panthers not only as an attack against the organisation, but also as a loss to the community overall. As one participant pointed out, choosing not to give charity status to advocacy groups does not harm the groups with vast resources, but “it shuts up grassroots community type groups that are running on a shoe-string anyway”. A few community field participants also felt that the Charities Commission adds “bureaucracy” and paperwork to the sector, which gives busy community workers less time to engage in advocacy.

**Why does tension exist between the SSCO sector and government?**

While discussing the community-government relationship, participants mentioned reasons why there is tension between the SSCO sector and government. A few participants suggested that government is afraid to hear criticism; however, it appears that the tension could be due to the different values, beliefs and roles of each sector. Participants in each field often noted that government is accountable to the whole population, whereas community organisations are not. A research field participant described the relationship well. She suggested that government agencies have a “nervous” relationship with their government ministries because the government has financial constraints and all public funds must be accounted for. However, she also pointed out that community organisations are always going to need money—and at times, large sums of money—in order to fulfil their mission. As a result, she suggested
that government places “huge constraints” on community organisations to account for this money because they are nervous about handing it out in the first place.

Policy field participants also explained why they thought tension existed between the two sectors. One policy field participant said, “NGOs don’t think [government] gives them what they need [and NGOs] don’t think that [government] can trust the NGO to provide the service that we need, and so we put too many processes in place”. This suggests that there may be a lack of communication and a lack of trust between the two sectors. Another policy field participant suggested that there might be a lack of understanding and knowledge within government as to how the community sector operates, which may contribute to this tension as well: “Few members of Parliament … have got any background in the community sector and understand … how hard you have to work to achieve something. People think that the third sector is not worth very much and is really disorganised”.

The relationship with the community

Participants in every field suggested that the close relationship with the community was the most important relationship to foster. Participants argued that in order to be effective, the community needs to view an organisation as “legitimate” and “relevant” because community organisations “define themselves by community connectedness”. In fact, participants said community groups’ mission needs to “grow out of their lived experience” and connect with the community that they are working with.

The relationship with other community organisations

Community field participants also described relationships and networking with other community organisations as important. Since the community sector is “grossly under-resourced,” community field participants suggested that coming together as a “united front” and “working collectively” allowed organisations to “pool their knowledge,” “avoid duplication,” and gave them “more political muscle”. A few community field participants argued that it was also effective for groups to be “inventive” with their networks and form relationships with groups outside of their common alliances because “you may not think that these people have your concerns at heart, but if you don’t talk to
them, you’ll never find out”. Forming networks was described as “a bit of an art” that was about “being interested in someone else’s problem” and acknowledging the connectedness of everyone. Community field participants also suggested that a key to meeting people and forming networks effectively is having an awareness of who the stakeholders are and “figuring out who some of the potential allies are”. Finally, “putting your message out there … so people will come and find you” is another tool that community organisations can use to form networks.

**Credibility**

Participants in all fields said that credibility was an important part of being effective. Often, achieving credibility was linked to the combination of producing quality work and having networks with government representatives as well as the community. According to participants in all fields, certain approaches and characteristics increase credibility, including producing strong evidence-based research, being associated with the church, knowing your issue and community well, having “access to power and privilege”, being acknowledged by your peers through grants and awards, and having a working relationship with other credible groups or individuals, such as academics. When groups have credibility, participants suggested that they could be more influential in government because MPs and government ministers listen to them. For example, one policy field participant suggested that when a group is credible, “MPs use [their] writings … and the House [of Representatives] … refer[s] to them”. Finally, it also appeared that credibility took time; participants in all fields often described “building credibility” and would sometimes associate it with longevity.

**Resources**

Some participants in each field connected the level of resources to the level of independence and freedom that an organisation has to advocate. Participants stated, “autonomy often comes down to money” and “the more financial muscle you can flex, the better you can potentially hold government to ranks”. For example, a Māori community field participant stated that many Māori organisations do not engage in certain forms of advocacy, like research, because “one, [they] don’t have the capacity [and] two, they don’t have the resource”. On the other hand, every Māori participant who
was interviewed had been involved in advocacy, including research, but this may have been influenced by the sample. In addition, a few community field participants suggested that “advocacy does not need much money” but the majority of participants suggested that there were links between independence, advocacy, and resources.

**Size of the organisation**

Participants from each field described how the size of an organisation could influence how it is perceived, its effectiveness, and its relationship with policymakers. Participants explained the advantages and disadvantages of larger organisations. According to them, larger groups generally have more resources, which may allow them to engage differently with the community. For example, a participant who worked in a national organisation was able to reach many participants, collect data on them and input this data into a large database, which they effectively used as an advocacy tool. A few participants also linked the age of an organisation to its size. For example, community field participants suggested that larger organisations often have a “brand” that people already knew about and trusted, which made it easier to obtain resources and gain access to government representatives.

On the other hand, larger organisations may create a barrier to advocacy. Some community workers suggested that larger organisations have a problem with their own level of bureaucracy, which makes it difficult to get work done quickly and adapt to change. For example, a participant from a large community organisation suggested that “it’s hard to turn around a big ship” when describing how he was trying to adapt to a changing membership model. This bureaucracy could make it difficult for larger organisations to advocate based on the immediate needs of the community. This was supported by another community field participant who felt that the role of smaller organisations was important because, in contrast to some of the larger organisations, they could be “fresh … innovative … flexible, and grounded”. She suggested that smaller groups had a stronger connection to the needs of the community, which increased their ability to advocate authentically on behalf of the community.
Leadership

Participants in all fields described characteristics of good leaders, which they suggested could contribute to the longevity of an organisation and increase the effectiveness of advocacy. Community field participants suggested that good leaders had good communication skills, strategising skills, were flexible, courageous, passionate, and knew their community well. Community field participants emphasised the importance of relationships and said that effective leaders “bring people with them”. A few participants also highlighted the importance of “stickability” and “perseverance”. When good leaders have experience and are known for working with particular communities, they may be the “go-to person because they’ve been there for such a long time”. However, a participant also pointed out that the community sector “does not have a career structure” which makes it difficult for people to acquire that “stickability”. Finally, a few community field participants suggested good leaders have a “helicopter view”; in other words, leaders need to “identify the issues that are key” and define “where [they] can make a difference”.

One participant suggested that good leadership might look different in smaller and larger organisations.

The leadership of a big organisation is different to the leadership of a small organisation because when you’ve got a very big staff and systems to operate, that requires a certain skill set that doesn’t necessarily suggest a charismatic leader. On the other hand, smaller community groups, in order to get noticed, often rely on the vision and the ability of the particular leader.

In other words, effective leadership in a small organisation may come in the form of a charismatic leader, whereas effective leaders in a large organisation may have strong management skills. Other participants did not make this statement, but within the sample, participants who came from smaller organisations, such as the Family Centre, were often led by what participants identified as charismatic leaders.

Factors that affect strategy choice

A few community field participants described advocacy activities as if they existed on a type of spectrum or continuum. One community field participant suggested that “advocacy occurs at lots of levels,” namely “indirect” and “direct” advocacy. She
suggested that “indirect advocacy” could include publishing “a weekly bulletin” and using the media to deliver a message, whereas “direct advocacy” could include lobbying or speaking directly with decision-makers and bureaucrats. Another participant suggested that the continuum related directly to the relationship with government.

The ‘stroke and poke’ technique … [includes] the people who do the stroking, they’re inside the tent, they’re saying nice things and putting forward … useful propositions. And on the outside, you’ve got the people who are doing the poking, which are the irritating people, they’re the people that are yelling and screaming, and they create pressure inside. And then, you use the agent inside to advance the agenda.

He argued that there were generally organisations that worked either “inside the tent” or “outside the tent,” however, they essentially worked together to create change. Based on participant comments, it appears that two factors can affect an organisation’s choice to engage in “direct” techniques or “indirect” techniques: position in the power structure and the target of advocacy.

**Position in the power structure**

A few participants from each field suggested that the “nature of the group,” which is based on the issue they are advocating for and their position on that issue, can determine where an SSCO is located in the power structure. One policy field participant argued that certain organisations might be more effective when they protest, while others may be better at maintaining a close relationship with decision-makers and bureaucrats. Determining which organisations would be more effective at advocating on either end of the continuum was, according to her, dependent on “where [they’re] placed, what access to power and privilege [they] have and what access to money [they] have”. For example, Plunket, a provider of child health services, was described as an organisation that would not be effective if they were to operate as “radical street protestors”. Instead, Plunket workers were viewed as “very effective lobbyists”.

On the other hand, a few participants described groups that have been more effective using “indirect” strategies. For example, a policy field participant argued that the Auckland People’s Centre, which used to advocate for the resource poor and working class communities, was more effective when they used “radical” techniques,
such as protesting and working with the media. Another research field participant described further examples.

Some of the most influential moments in NGO time have been when they have opposed government and created a space for debate for an alternative point of view. Let me think … feminism, the environmental movement, anti-racism … and … the Springbok tour.

Some participants in each field suggested that determining the appropriate strategy for each group is predominantly based on timing and assessing the “current state of the political climate”.

**Target**

Many community field participants found it important to “speak into different contexts, and that’s certainly not just about targeting politicians”. In addition, different groups may require different strategies. For example, one community field participant suggested that if an organisation is interested in influencing “public opinion, you go to the media”. A few other participants who were interested in influencing public opinion supported this statement and often used the media to advocate. On the other hand, groups that were focused on advocating for policy change generally worked at engaging directly with government representatives. Although media strategies were also described as an effective tool for policy change, participants who were interested in influencing policy usually focused on decision-makers.

**Conclusion**

This chapter provided a description of the SSCO sector from the point of view of research participants, a description of how community organisations advocate, and a list of factors that affect advocacy efforts and facilitate advocacy, including a discussion of important relationships. The SSCO sector is defined and described in four major sections. First, the community sector is defined by participants and identified as unique from the for-profit business and government sectors. Participants suggested that the primary difference is the close connection that community organisations have with the community, which is reflected in the activities of community organisations. Second, there is a description of participant comments on the role of SSCOs, which included
service provision, bringing people together, and advocating with them. Third, the key characteristics of SSCOs were listed and explained. These characteristics included the close relationship that SSCOs have with the community and the marginalised communities that SSCOs serve, which means that SSCOs usually are managing complex issues. Two additional key characteristics were described as unique to New Zealand: a close relationship with government representatives and a low level of business philanthropy. Participants linked both of these characteristics to the small population in New Zealand. Finally, in the last section the description of the SSCO sector was used to identify and depict three different types of SSCOs in New Zealand: religious organisations, umbrella organisations and Māori organisations. Each of these SSCOs plays an important role in the SSCO sector and it appears that there still needs to be a deeper understanding of how each of these groups, especially Māori community organisations, contributes to SSCO advocacy efforts.

Next, based on interviews with participants, a background of SSCO advocacy, including how SSCOs advocate, was presented in four sub-sections. First, participants suggested that SSCOs advocate for marginalised communities and target government representatives and the public in their advocacy campaigns. Second, participant comments revealed that SSCOs generally advocate for issues that relate to the community’s needs. Third, participants mentioned that SSCOs advocate because they want to contribute to social democracy and change perceptions, with the ultimate goal of making “things better for the community”. Comments were made about the importance of advocacy, because, as one participant noted, change comes from structural change, not from delivering food parcels. Finally, participants pointed out that SSCOs can effectively advocate using four strategies: conducting and publishing research, engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats, speaking through the media, and protesting. The most common strategy appeared to be engaging with government representatives, but participants, especially policy field participants, felt that research was also a very effective advocacy strategy. These strategies are later described as a continuum, with one participant suggesting that approaches range from a “stroke” technique to a “poke” technique. That is to say, groups that do not have a close relationship with government may be more likely to engage in protesting, whereas those
working more closely with government may prefer to speak directly with decision-makers and bureaucrats.

Factors that affect the advocacy efforts and strategies of SSCOs were identified and described in order to further understand how SSCOs advocate effectively and, more specifically, how relationships are best managed to facilitate advocacy. Participants identified seven primary factors that can affect the advocacy efforts of SSCOs. First, participants suggested that the relationship with government appears to be complicated. Community and research field participants often felt that government discourages advocacy, but they also acknowledged that developing a relationship with government was necessary and important for groups that are interested in long-term change. Two primary ways that the government discourages advocacy were mentioned, through government contracts and the registration process. Second, participants stated that the relationship with the community brought legitimacy to SSCO advocacy. Third, according to participants, the relationship with other community organisations appears to help with resources and the political impact. Fourth, participants noted that effective groups produce quality work, have dense networks with “the influencers”, and hold “credibility” in the policy community. Fifth, community field participants generally felt that “the more financial muscle you can flex, the better you can potentially hold government to ranks”. Sixth, it was suggested that although larger organisations may have more resources, they also might advocate less frequently. This lack of involvement was usually linked with the higher levels of bureaucracy that may occur in larger organisations. On the other hand, participants often cited a few larger organisations, like the Salvation Army, as influential advocates. Finally, participants identified a few characteristics of effective advocacy leaders, including “stickability”, “perseverance”, flexibility, and good communication skills.

Finally, the last section of the chapter expanded on the previous section, which identified factors that affect the advocacy efforts in order to understand how SSCOs can effectively advocate. In the last section, factors that influence how SSCOs choose their strategy are listed and described. Two primary factors are identified: position in the political environment and the target of SSCO advocacy campaigns. First, participants suggested that some organisations might be more effective at protesting, while others
may be more effective at engaging closely with government representatives. Determining how a group fits into each category is based on their position in the political environment, which is found by assessing the issue the group is advocating for, and their position on that issue. Second, participant comments revealed that the target of a group’s advocacy campaign could also affect which strategy a group chooses. Generally, groups that are targeting government representatives engage directly with them and groups that are targeting the public focus on media strategies. However, participants often used a range of strategies. Overall, based on participant comments, it can be concluded that SSCOs in New Zealand appear to be important advocates in the policy process.
Chapter 6
The story of the Family Centre

This is the first results chapter of a two-part examination of the embedded case study, which sits in the larger case study of the community sector described in Chapter 5. This two-part examination considers the work, structure, and timeline of the Family Centre, a social service community organisation (SSCO) in Lower Hutt, New Zealand. Evidence from key informants representing individuals internal (8) and external (25) to the Family Centre and key documents are used in this chapter to better understand the Family Centre, while the next chapter describes the Family Centre’s advocacy work.

In the previous chapter, what New Zealand SSCOs do, their key characteristics, and different types of SSCOs in New Zealand are described. This chapter and the next chapter demonstrate that the data on the Family Centre is similar to the data on the larger community sector. Similar to participant comments described in the previous chapter, the Family Centre delivers services, advocates and brings people together. In Chapters 6 and 7, it is made clear that the Family Centre delivers services through therapy, community development, research, and education and training. Staff also advocate and bring people together, which is discussed in Chapter 7. In addition, similar to comments found in Chapter 5, according to internal and external participants, the Family Centre has a close relationship with the community, especially Māori and Pacific peoples, and it has worked with marginalised communities that are managing complex issues, such as poverty. Examples of this work are illustrated in Chapter 7. In this chapter, it is also explained that the Family Centre is a religiously affiliated organisation, which is one of the different types of SSCOs identified in Chapter 5.

This chapter is separated into two major sections, each of which is based on the Family Centre’s stage in Susan Kenny Stevens’ (2001) Nonprofit Lifecycle model. This model was chosen because unlike other organisational lifecycle models [i.e. (Quinn & Cameron, 1983)] the model is designed to focus on community organisations and not government or for-profit groups. In both sections, an initial look at the relationships the Family Centre has formed over the past 30 years is provided. First, the founding, start up, and growth stages are described, which, it is argued, occurred between the years
1979 to 1998. Second, the maturity stage is described, which, it is further argued, occurred between the years 1999 to 2008. The two time-frames are broadly separated by the advocacy approach the organisation took to influence social policy. As discussed in Chapter 7, throughout the first time-frame, the Family Centre primarily used “outside” tactics. Likewise, between 1999 and 2008 the Family Centre began increasing the use of “inside” tactics. The terms “outside” and “inside” are based on Walker’s (1991) descriptions, which are discussed in Chapter 3.

**The Family Centre: Founding, Start Up & Growth (1979–1998)**

This section describes how the Family Centre was founded and became established. Between the years of 1979 and 1998, although the Family Centre utilised “inside” strategies, such as “meeting with Government Ministers and serving on a range of official committees”, the Family Centre primarily used “outside” advocacy strategies, including protesting and getting their message out through the media. During this time, the Family Centre strongly opposed many government policies, such as decreasing superannuation and switching to market-based rents on state homes. Since a few Family Centre employees eventually became “persona non grata” in some government ministers’ offices, it expressed opposition through “outside” advocacy strategies such as protesting, press releases, and interviews with journalists.

In the first half of this chapter, the Family Centre’s experience from its founding through 1998 is discussed in relation to three developmental stages, described by Stevens (2001) as the founding stage, the start up stage, and the growth stage. The organisational structure was established during the growth stage and by 1998 the four components of the Family Centre were in place: the therapy unit; the Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU); the education and training unit; and the community development unit. These four components, along with the early stages of the Family Centre’s growth, are presented below.

**Founding the idea**

The first stage, *founding the idea*, involves thinking about the organisation’s purpose. It appears that the purpose of the Family Centre was germinating in the minds of the founders for a few years prior to the actual opening in 1979. During this time,
Charles Waldegrave, a key founding member who continues to lead the Pākehā section at the Family Centre, and a small group of local social workers would regularly gather to think about what type of organisation they felt was needed in the community to support struggling families. They met with other social workers and organisations to seek advice and to make sure that there was no “duplication of services”. At this point, they had developed an idea for an organisation, but they needed somewhere to house or base it. Charles is an Anglican priest and a psychologist, and his role as a priest at that time allowed him to utilise a building that the Anglican Church owned. This building has been used by the Family Centre from its founding until the present.

Start up stage

The Family Centre entered what can be described as the start up stage in early 1980 when it was founded and registered as a charity (Registrar of Incorporated Societies, 1980). At this point, they began refining its mission and establishing its niche in the community. The main activity of the organisation at this time was family therapy, which is broadly defined as therapy with more than one member of the family, such as parents, grandparents and a child (Minuchin, 1974). According to Family Centre employees present at the beginning stages of the organisation, a primary goal was a social justice one, to “throw light on dark places” and “expose that which is hidden”, such as the “marginalisation of different sectors of the population” (The Family Centre, 2003b, para. 2). The previous and current mission of the Family Centre is the eradication of “racism, sexism and poverty” (The Family Centre, 2003b, para. 2). The focus on culture, gender, and poverty began at this stage and it will be shown throughout Chapter 7 how the Family Centre consistently influenced and changed the perception of these issues.

The focus on culture, gender, and poverty stems from a theoretical approach that the Family Centre created called Just Therapy. This approach, described in Chapter 7, is integral to the underpinnings of all the work that the Family Centre has done, and continues to do. According to staff, Just Therapy is the “philosophical foundation of the Family Centre’s work”. There are many links to culture, gender, and poverty found in Just Therapy philosophies. For example, Family Centre staff stated that culture is “fundamental” and “primary” (Waldegrave, 2003b) to doing therapy with families. They
acknowledge the role that culture plays in people’s lives and work to give families “space for their voice, freedom from … discrimination” and the freedom to “reach the best that they can be.”

The growth stage

The next stage, the growth stage, lasted from approximately 1980 until 1998. Up to this point in time, the therapy unit was established; however by the end of the growth stage the other three components, the community development unit, the research unit, and the education and training unit, were in place. During this time the Family Centre staff changed, the current organisational model was created, and the founding principles were solidified. Four major events took place during the growth stage: the 1980 retreat; Warihi (Wally) Campbell was hired and eventually led the Māori section; Taimalieutu Kiwi Tamasese (known as Kiwi) was hired and eventually led the Pacific section; the organisation solidified its approach to spirituality; the three tikanga, or cultural, model was adopted; and it opened up the community development, research, and education units.

The 1980 retreat and the community development unit

The organisational changes that embody the current structure of the Family Centre were spearheaded during a retreat held in 1980. According to staff, the Family Centre has been taking bi-annual retreats since these the Family Centre was established in 1979. Staff said that the purpose of the retreats is to reflect on the past six months and consider what they had done well and what they could improve upon. The retreat of 1980, however, was unique because, as a Family Centre employee points out below, the organisation came to a major realisation that completely altered the way it works.

We were really good at helping people who were very low as a result of the structural burdens they carried like racism, sexism, heterosexism and poverty, and un-depressing them. But the sad realisation we had was that … they’d go out and they’d feel they had a good session at the Family Centre … but of course they’d go down again because we sent them straight back to the conditions that caused the problems they experienced in the first place. So … we realised that even when we’re doing family therapy we may actually be unintentionally adjusting them to oppressive conditions.
In addition to describing a pivotal moment in Family Centre history, this quote demonstrates why the Family Centre advocates and who it advocates for. It advocates because it wants to change the structures, or “oppressive conditions” that cause “racism, sexism, heterosexism, and poverty”. Similarly, it advocates on behalf of marginalised communities, those affected by “racism, sexism, heterosexism, and poverty”.

Ultimately, the 1980 retreat left Family Centre employees feeling that an unintended consequence of therapy could be to make “people happy in poverty” and ultimately silence “the voice of the poor” because “the major problems were external to the family”. This awareness led to the creation of the community development branch and the employment of key Māori and Pacific staff. Warihi Campbell was hired in 1981, and Kiwi Tamasese in 1982. Warihi and Kiwi are Māori and Pacific staff that were fundamental players in the development of the Family Centre and their contributions are highlighted below.

The three tikanga structure

After Warihi and Kiwi were hired, Family Centre staff began to think about how the different cultural sections should work together. The outcome was the three tikanga, or cultural, structure. The three tikanga structure consists of three sections led by Māori, Pacific and Pākehā staff (The Family Centre, 2000). According to Family Centre staff, the three tikanga structure was formally operating within the Family Centre by 1987. Warihi Campbell coordinated the Māori section, Kiwi Tamasese coordinated the Pacific section, and Betsan Martin, and later Charles Waldegrave, coordinated the Pākehā section. The Board eventually followed this three tikanga model as well. A visual representation of the three tikanga structure, which is based on data from this research, can be found below in Figure 6-1.
Figure 6-1: The three tikanga structure

As Figure 6-1 indicates, each section works independently, but can also come together in the centre, creating what was described by a former employee as a “central binding ..., [a] core”.

Participants with knowledge of the three tikanga structure said that each section manages their own activities. However, on an organisational level, the Pākehā section is accountable to both the Māori and Pacific people’s section; and the men are accountable to the women. A Family Centre employee explained that the accountability mechanism exists because it is not the “default position” of the dominant culture to understand how marginalised groups might feel. This argument is further described in the following passage:

“What we are seeking are partnerships of accountability which facilitate the responsibility of dominant groups to deconstruct their dominance .... Members of the dominant group need to conscientise themselves and each other so that the responsibility for the call to stop certain sorts of behaviours, or certain discriminating practices or policies is not left to the marginalised caucus” (Tamasese, Waldegrave, Tuhaka, & Campbell, 2003, 101).

A Family Centre employee described the model as a system of independence and interdependence. A major value of the model, according to internal and external participants, was the ability to obtain views from each tikanga. When groups work with
the Family Centre they usually consult with each tikanga⁴. For example, when the Family Centre engages in research with a university, such as in the case of this research, each tikanga is included in conversations around methodology, structure, aim, and all other aspects of the research.

A former Family Centre employee that was present during the formation of the three tikanga structure pointed out that while the Family Centre was forming its cultural structure, leaders within the Anglican Church were also deciding on how to operate from a Treaty of Waitangi base. She said that it is important to note that the Family Centre and Anglican Church may have influenced each other in how each acknowledged the Treaty of Waitangi. As a result, there are similarities and differences found in each approach. For example, the Anglican Church and the Family Centre both have sections that are independently led by Māori. On the other hand, the Family Centre started with a three tikanga approach that also includes a Pacific section. The Anglican Church started with a bicultural approach that is structured around Māori and Pākehā sections (Auckland Catholic Diocese Bicultural Desk, 2006), and eventually incorporated a three tikanga approach, more similar to the Family Centre’s structure (Bell, 1990 November 19). These differences are discussed in more detail below.

**How is the Family Centre’s cultural approach different?**

Participants described the three tikanga model that the Family Centre incorporated into its organisation as different⁵ from how other groups incorporated a Treaty-based model. Internal and external participants described two differences between the Family Centre’s approach and other groups’ approaches. First, unlike a bicultural approach, the Family Centre includes a Pacific peoples’ section. Second, as illustrated in Figure 6-1, the Family Centre staff practice coming together in the centre, as a unit. Internal and external participants suggested that there was a debate in New Zealand around the inclusion of a Pacific peoples’ section because they are not tāngata whenua. Members of the Family Centre, however, felt that it was important to include Pacific peoples’ voices, which staff called a commitment to “Justice for Pacific Nations’

---

⁴ I know this from personal experience. When I asked the Family Centre if I could do a case study on their organisation I needed to get approval from all three tikanga.

⁵ For example, participants suggested that some organisations operate within a “parallel bicultural structure” or have incorporated a kaumatua as an “on-site advisor” of sorts.
People‖ (The Family Centre, 2003b, para. 2). The commitment to Justice for Pacific Nations’ People was described as “very innovative” by participants and one internal participant suggested that Family Centre staff “invented” this wording.

This commitment to Pacific communities appears to stem from Just Therapy principles and the Family Centre’s work with the community. Their community development work gave them the knowledge that Pacific peoples, similar to Māori, experienced discrimination in New Zealand. For example, participants recalled how many Pacific peoples were encouraged to move to New Zealand to fill job vacancies, and were later told that they were “taking” jobs away from New Zealanders when jobs became scarce. A Samoan participant described this environment.

A lot of our people took jobs that nobody wanted at the time, cleaners and factory workers, and when times became hard … suddenly [people were saying] ‘these Islanders are taking our positions’.

Pacific peoples have a complex history in New Zealand, which has been described in the literature (Cook, Didham, & Khawaja, 1999; M. King, 2003; Tamasese et al., 2000), but is beyond the scope of this research to cover.

The second aspect of the Family Centre’s cultural approach, coming together in the centre, was described by a former employee as unique because it is “hard work” and “not everyone can do it”. For example, although some participants described how they had successfully worked in a three tikanga structure, an internal participant described another organisation that had unsuccessfully used this model. She suggested that this organisation was not only unsuccessful, but members actually felt damaged afterward. When asked what was unique about the Family Centre, she suggested that its ability to make it work was symbolic of a “deep friendship, [a] deep loyalty, [a] deep commitment to a certain purpose, and quite a spiritual bond”. Other employees supported this statement and described working at the Family Centre as an “extended family thing”.

Current and former employees suggest that coming together in the centre requires individuals to confront their own racism and sexism, which can be quite challenging. This confrontation occurs through caucusing, a unique approach that has been acknowledged by many domestically and internationally. For example, this
acknowledgement has come in the form of invitations for the Family Centre to educate groups within New Zealand and outside of the country, such as the United States. A Family Centre caucus is a process that involves all employees meeting in separate groups defined by either gender or cultural sections, and sometimes both. During this meeting the accountability mechanism described above is applied. If an individual or group feels offended by something that occurs within the organisation, they can initiate a caucusing process. For example, if a woman is offended, then the women will caucus together, separate from the men, to discuss the event, and the men will do the same. Upon completion, the group that was hurt will choose to talk about it or not. The offended group is given the authority and can manage the meeting in a way that makes them feel comfortable. Ultimately, the process was described by an employee as shifting from talking “person to person” to talking “people to people”.

**The Family Centre’s approach to spirituality**

The Family Centre is affiliated with the Anglican Church. Current and former Family Centre leaders, including Charles Waldegrave and Warihi Campbell are Anglican priests, and the Family Centre’s Trust Board or governance body includes members nominated by the church. For the leaders, spirituality is “about relationship” (Waldegrave, 2003b, 164), which Charles argues allows for the uptake of spirituality by individuals with other beliefs, including atheists (Waldegrave, 2003b). There are four relationships that they discuss; namely, the relationship between people and the environment, people and other people, people and their heritage, and people and the numinous (Waldegrave, 2003b). The numinous can be what some people call God, or it can be “nature, a poem, [or] some cool music” (Waldegrave, 2003b, 166).

The Family Centre’s approach to spirituality, which was developed during the growth stage, influences how it operates internally and externally. Employees are expected to participate in a form of what staff described as a “shared spirituality”. According to staff, this interaction can include anything from poetry, prayers, music and movement, really “anything that … took you out of the normal, functional, digital, rational sort of work that we all have to do”. Participants who had worked at the Family Centre suggested that spirituality provided “inspiration” to them and is “implicit in everything the Family Centre does”. Another former Family Centre employee stated that the “passion
and support” people find by working in the Family Centre “helps you to dust yourself off and keep going forward”. External participants also postulated that spirituality is at the base of the Family Centre’s passion.

Their external interactions are also influenced by their approach to spirituality. The Family Centre registered as Anglican Social Services and Hutt Valley Inc. in 1980 and continues to use that name for registration purposes. However, the organisation decided early on to use the name the “Family Centre” in the community because, according to an employee, Anglican Social Services is “just too religious for a lot of the secular work that [they] do”. He continued, “we just feel that the Family Centre is much more of a face in the community than Anglican Social Services”. Since it became established, Family Centre staff avoided being labelled as “too religious”. Internal participants said that they choose to carry out, what they described as their “sacred task”, in a subtle manner: “We are carrying out the spiritual view [but] we wouldn’t say it out loud”. A few external participants supported this stance, and said they did not think of the Family Centre as a religious organisation. On the other hand, most participants, including the aforementioned group, did not believe that religious affiliation was problematic. In fact, many external participants postulated that the Family Centre’s links to the Anglican Church gave them credibility in some communities, especially Māori and Pacific communities.

**The Family Centre Social Policy Research Unit (FCSPRU)**

During the early 1990s, the Family Centre Social Policy Research Unit (FCSPRU) was established. Although Family Centre employees were already doing their own research on a smaller scale (Jacobi, Coventry, & Waldegrave, 1983), they realised that they needed more funding to research the issues that they felt were fundamental to their communities. In addition, according to a former employee, staff realised that the research unit would be an important component of the Family Centre because it could be used to build upon the knowledge that they were growing and help the organisation “survive financially, when that sort of community development, therapy-type work, probably wasn’t going to be funded very well”. This awareness led to the establishment of a formal research unit within the organisation, the FCSPRU.
Education and Training Unit

The Family Centre also opened the Education and Training Unit in the 1990s. According to staff, this branch focuses on training and educating people in the areas of culture awareness, gender awareness, and Just Therapy philosophies. The Just Therapy approach was gaining attention at this time, and by the late 1980s, Family Centre employees began giving speeches and leading workshops domestically and internationally. They also began publishing journal articles and book chapters on their theoretical orientation (Waldegrave, 1984, 1985, 1990). In the early 1990s, Family Centre staff began to realise that they would need to house this component of their work in a more formalised manner, which led to the Education and Training Unit. Through this branch individuals and groups come to the Family Centre to learn, and Family Centre staff travel domestically and internationally to teach about their concepts and philosophies in other institutions.

The Family Centre’s three core leaders

Three key leaders are described because they were repeatedly mentioned by participants and appear to have shaped the Family Centre into the organisation that it is today. Many employees have worked at the Family Centre and supported the breakthrough work discussed in Chapter 7. However, Warihi, Kiwi and Charles were consistently described as being influential players within the organisation. Consequently, if a different group of people had been involved during the founding of the Family Centre, it may have become a different organisation. For example, other people may have chosen to focus on different issues. Therefore, it is important to understand the skills and networks each of these three people brought to the organisation, which are identified below.

Warihi (Wally) Campbell is of Māori descent and his iwi is Ngāti Porou. He came to the Family Centre through a local marae, the Kōkiri marae. One of the founding members reflects on this process:

Uncle Manāki took Wally by the hand and said, “We give you this taonga [treasure] and if you are good to him, look after him and keep him warm, we, the marae and
the Family Centre, will be knit together like the flax [of] the kete\(^6\), but if you do not look after him and keep him warm, we will come and take him away.”

After working at the Family Centre for a few years, Warihi became an Anglican priest. When he came to the Family Centre, he brought with him many networks into the Māori and Anglican community and, according to participants, the Family Centre benefited from these networks. His approach to working with the community incorporated stories, which he would use when speaking with Māori youth and families. Warihi was the Coordinator of the Māori Section at the Family Centre for 12 years, until 1999 when he stepped down from that position. However, he continued to work at the Family Centre for a number of years and now continues to stay in regular contact with Family Centre staff.

Taimalieutu Kiwi Tamasese is from the Pacific nation of Samoa. She comes from a family that took what she describes as a “community development approach” and she has always taken an institutional orientation towards community development. In other words, she looks at issues from a structural perspective. When Kiwi came to the Family Centre, she also brought with her a multitude of networks into Pacific communities. Participants also suggested that these networks gave the Family Centre a great deal of credibility. For example, one external participant suggested that Family Centre employees are perceived to be “tied into groups that most Pākehā groups aren’t”. Kiwi continues in her role as the Coordinator of the Pacific Section. She also continues to stay involved in researching, engaging in community development, and advising government ministers in areas of social policy. Furthermore, she also leads education and training symposiums on Just Therapy models.

Charles Waldegrave is one of the individuals who originally founded the Family Centre and conceived of its mission. He holds master’s degrees in both Psychology and Theology and suggests that his credentials and knowledge of Western culture and philosophy provide him with an awareness of where he came from. This awareness gave him confidence and the ability to, as he puts it, “take those arguments, and to really use them against the people that co-opt them for their own privilege”. The Family Centre as a unit also benefited from Charles’ philosophy and credentials. He continues

\(^6\) Woven flax basket.
to serve as Coordinator of the Pākehā Section, and leads the Family Centre Social Policy Research Unit (FCSPRU). Through his various roles, he engages in research, advises government ministers on social policy matters and trains and educates groups on Family Centre philosophies.

**Major Challenges: 1979–1998**

The major challenges that the Family Centre experienced between the years of 1979 and 1998 are described and discussed in relation to their occurrence during the founding, start up and growth stages of the lifecycle in order to offer a model to other groups experiencing similar difficulties. Based on participant comments, the Family Centre experienced three major challenges during this time: financial uncertainty, fulfilling difficult mission goals, and influencing policy with little access to government. These challenges reflect the Family Centre’s organisational stage because other organisations will often face these difficulties while getting established. Each of these is presented below.

**Financial uncertainty**

First, a few former Family Centre employees recalled how the early years were marked by financial uncertainty. One participant recalled going into “overdraft” and another participant stated that staff frequently paid for youth activities themselves. Many external participants also recalled financial constraints within their community organisations and, as discussed in Chapter 2 and 5, many community groups experience problems associated with resources. The financial stress was managed in the Family Centre through diversifying the organisation and opening up the FCSPRU.

**Fulfilling a difficult mission**

Second, a few participants also suggested that it can be difficult to manage an organisation with, as one external participant put it, “the ideals they have”. In other words, a few participants said that the Family Centre’s goal of social justice could be a difficult mission to fulfil because the organisation exists in a world that is not socially just. An internal participant pointed out that decision making and setting up structures, specifically around salary, succession, and “priority” of staff, can be difficult. For example, equal pay for all staff was initially a part of the organisational structure.
However, this policy was removed due to the difficult economic times that were occurring and the fact that individuals who brought in more money through their expertise, grants and other activities could demand a much higher salary at any other organisation. Ultimately, this challenge will persist because, as the Family Centre has pointed out, racism, sexism, and inequalities continue to exist. Nevertheless, on an organisational level, Family Centre employees work to manage these challenges primarily through ongoing communication and debate with one another.

Lack of access to government

Finally, the lack of access to the Fourth Labour Government and the National-led Government in the 1990s made it challenging for staff to influence policy. However, this distance also encouraged Family Centre staff to find creative approaches to get their message out to the public, bureaucrats, and decision-makers. For example, their approaches during this time often included working with the media and broadcasting their message in a way that made it difficult for government representatives to ignore. Although using the media can be challenging and the utilisation of “outside” tactics did not result in immediate change, Family Centre employees were able to get their message out to many individuals and organisations. This “outside” approach also helped them to form a reputation as an organisation that works directly with the community and fights for equality around the issues of poverty, gender, and culture.

The Family Centre: Maturity stage (1999–2008)

The focus of this section is the Family Centre’s more recent influence, which is marked by their increasing use of “inside” tactics beginning in 1999. As a Family Centre employee described it, the Family Centre “went from being protesters walking around with placards” to being “face-to-face discussants” that met with government ministers and policymakers. A summary of the methods used in both approaches is described by another internal participant:

If it’s a friendly government, we’d jump in and we’d help direct the reforms from inside, policy advice, or research …. [If it’s] a resistant government, then you use the political machinery, you bring the … issue to the media, you bring research that highlights that this is where government is at, this is where the issue is at, this is where we need to go.
The Family Centre began to utilise more “inside” tactics when the Labour-led Government was elected into office in 1999, which suggests that staff considered them to be a more “friendly government.”

The relationship with the newly elected government initiated the Family Centre’s movement into the maturity stage. According to Stevens (2001), the maturity stage is described as a point in time when organisations are well established and have a reputation for providing quality services. Once the Labour Party led the government after the 1999 election, an internal participant suggested that the Family Centre was “clearly, [one] of the favoured groups”. He continued to point out that the Family Centre was in this position because it “provided evidence of social and economic policy deficits”, areas that members of the Labour Party wanted to address. A relationship between the Family Centre and the government developed. In addition, many internal and external participants suggested that the views of the Family Centre coincided with Labour Party leaders.

The Family Centre’s movement into the maturity stage affected the Family Centre’s strategies. The tactics it used to influence social policy changed because they had a stronger voice in government. For example, in the early 2000s, the Family Centre became increasingly successful in obtaining research contracts, and staff began to have an influential voice in government through their presence on advisory committees. These changes signalled the beginning of the Family Centre’s focus on research and increased use of “inside” strategies to influence social policy, which are discussed in Chapter 7.

As Family Centre staff became “face-to-face discussants”, they began to develop an understanding for how government operated. For example, employees stated that the “pace of government is very slow” and policy is a “compromise”. In addition, internal participants also said they preferred to provide data to the government before going to the media because they understand that relationships with government representatives are important and going to the media first may harm these relationships. As discussed in Chapter 5, other external participants echoed this sentiment. Finally, internal and external participants suggested that through their research, described in Chapter 7, the
Family Centre presented data in a way that allowed government representatives to understand how an issue was affecting a larger population. The Family Centre’s use of quantitative data was described by an external participant as “very important” because of “the way that social policy is run in New Zealand”. An external policy field participant also said that the Family Centre gave him insight into how “systemic” an issue was.

Internal and external participants suggested that there are advantages and disadvantages to having a close relationship with government. However, a few Family Centre employees stated that they preferred to work with the government because they believe that is where groups can have the strongest influence. This was explained by a Family Centre employee:

When you get a government that’s more aligned …, I don’t think all NGOs share this view, our view is that we don’t want to be social justice heroes always on the periphery … a voice on the side of society. We think the much harder job and the job we’re more interested in doing is to be a mature integrated voice in society that actually brings about change. And the measure of effectiveness is … how the life of the people at the bottom has improved.

In general, participants also suggested that the advantage to having a close relationship with the government is resources and access. However, participants also noted the disadvantages, which can include limits placed on advocacy and community work. Participants’ general comments on the relationship with government are discussed in Chapter 5.

Major challenges: 1999–2008

Participants described two major challenges that the Family Centre confronted during the maturity stage. First, participants considered how the relationship with government affected their work. Second, they wondered how the Family Centre would manage succession. These challenges reflect the Family Centre’s position in the maturity stage because established organisations with credibility and a reputation for providing quality services are more likely to consider succession and managing a relationship with government. Each of these challenges is discussed below. Participant suggestions for successfully moving through these challenges are also considered.
Managing the relationship with government

Overall, participants suggested that the Family Centre’s relationship with the government had both positive and negative impacts on the organisation. To begin with, many internal and external participants suggested that the Family Centre staff were able to influence social policy more effectively because they were speaking directly to government representatives on a regular basis. Based on comments made by Family Centre employees, staff were also able to learn more about the policy process because they were on consultation and reference groups. This awareness gave employees valuable knowledge that was used to better influence policy.

On the other hand, participants suggested that Family Centre staff might have sacrificed their ability to speak out against the government because they had a closer relationship with the government than they did in the 1980s and 1990s. As previously mentioned in Chapter 5, one external participant suggested that a tension exists within many community organisations that are “invited [by government] into the corridors of power” because “they have to side with the powerful and ask meekly on behalf of the powerless”. Managing this tension was described as difficult by many participants and Family Centre employees appear to have experienced this tension first hand. Both internal and external participants also suggested that Family Centre staff would probably be less directly involved in social policy with the National-led Government that was elected in 2008 because staff may be seen as aligned with the previous government. However, it is unclear as of this writing how Family Centre staff will work with the National Party as interviews took place during late 2008 and early 2009, before any relationship could have been established.

Succession

The second challenge that Family Centre employees experienced dealt with succession. As of this writing, no succession plans have been developed within the Family Centre. However, employees stated that they discuss the subject “very openly” and are currently working on a plan. Family Centre staff stated that good succession planning needed to occur “around each of the cultural sections”. A Family Centre employee stated that succession issues were recently “brought into focus” because of
the passing away of a key Māori staff member, Flora Tuhaka, in 2005, who had herself succeeded Warihi as Coordinator of the Māori Section.

Participants described two challenges that are associated with succession. First, internal and external participants were unsure how the Family Centre could succeed without two leaders, Kiwi Tamasese and Charles Waldegrave. Nevertheless, Warihi Campbell’s contribution should not be diminished. If this study had taken place 10 years ago, it is assumed that Warihi would have been included in this section and other sections of the research. Second, internal participants were unsure how an established organisation like the Family Centre could make space for new perspectives, given that some employees had a long history within the organisation. Each of these components is outlined below.

Can the Family Centre survive without Kiwi and Charles?

A common conversation around succession that was brought up by internal and external participants was how the Family Centre would survive without Kiwi and Charles. Kiwi and Charles have been working at the Family Centre for almost 30 years and each of them has a vast network of groups that they work with. Therefore, it is not surprising that these two leaders were referred to by participants as the most influential Family Centre staff. As a result, a few internal and external participants suggested that if either of them were to quit the organisation tomorrow, the Family Centre would be “quite exposed” and the communities that rely on them would ultimately lose a valuable source of support.

Although it would be a difficult transition for Family Centre staff to continue with their mission and goals if Kiwi and Charles were to leave, other Family Centre employees would continue to do important work. Through the interviews, it became clear that other employees also work with families, have networks into the community, and provide important analyses through research, teaching, and community development. External participants who had worked with the Family Centre suggested that “behind” the better-known faces of the Family Centre are individuals who also “do the work” in less visible ways. In other words, the charisma and social networks that Kiwi and Charles contribute to the Family Centre are important elements to achieving
influence. However, without the organisational structures, skills and credibility contributed by other individuals, the organisation would probably be less influential in.

In addition, one internal participant also suggested that Kiwi and Charles have “got such strong personal reputations, that maybe that’s what they’ve chosen to leverage” off. For example, specific skills, such as working with the media, are difficult to acquire. If there is an individual within the organisation who has that skill, it is likely that they will often be the chosen individual for this task. For the Family Centre this person usually has been Charles Waldegrave. The result of using one person for most of the media work, however, is that people who are not familiar with the organisation will refer to this person as the “face of the Family Centre,” which is how one external participant described Charles Waldegrave.

**How can new staff enter an established organisation?**

Another succession challenge raised by internal participants was how new people and new ideas could be included into an organisation that had an established reputation and employed staff with long-standing and enduring friendships. This difficulty was described by a former Family Centre employee.

When you’ve got people of such standing, and now you’ve got new people how does that all work? [It] just changes [the] dynamics. They haven’t been through the painful learnings that other people had been through together.

New employees mentioned that it could be challenging to step into roles that were once inhabited by leaders with a well-known history of working with the community. It was suggested that there can be an expectation for new staff to “walk into the shoes of [their] predecessors”, which may not be their goal.

New staff can usher in a new generation with new perspectives and different forms of credibility. However, new staff may also have a different perspective on the direction of the organisation and the group’s previously chosen strategies. In order to assess how to bring in new perspectives, a Family Centre employee stated that it is important to determine the difference between Family Centre rituals and cultural section rituals: “If they’re cultural sections, then yes, they should change, along with every group that comes around, but if they’re Family Centre [rituals], there needs to be
continuity”. In other words, cultural rituals may change with time and should therefore change within the organisation, but if a ritual stems from the Family Centre’s fundamental goals, then these rituals should remain the same.

**How to manage challenges associated with succession**

Participants did not suggest any easy or uniform solutions to manage challenges associated with succession. One external participant explained that “the structure should be immortal” and to do that, groups need to continually be “refreshing … staff and … building a team around [them] endlessly”. However, other participants described the difficulties associated with determining what parts of the structure should continue, or be “immortal,” and what parts should change. Most participants agreed that succession planning was difficult because there are limits to the time and resources that community groups can devote to these matters. For example, one internal participant stated that they simply “don’t have any separate money to pull someone in to understudy”, and based on participant comments, a lack of resources is often at the root of not planning for succession. Instead, internal and external participants said that resources were primarily used for service provision.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has described the Family Centre and provides a context for its advocacy efforts, discussed in the next chapter. The Family Centre’s timeline is separated into two time-periods, which are broadly based on its primary advocacy tactics. During their first 20 years, the Family Centre was generally described as working primarily from the “outside” of government, and approaches to changing policy often included protesting and using the media to get out messages. However, beginning in 1999, the Family Centre “commanded a lot of respect” from government ministers and Members of Parliament (MPs); therefore, it was more influential in policy settings through “inside” strategies. The increased use of “inside” strategies marked the Family Centre’s entrance into the second time-period. It appears the Family Centre began to gain influence in the first time-period through being viewed as “experts” in their respective fields. During the maturity stage, they were able to increase their credibility and began to influence policy from the “inside”.
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During the first time-period, between the years 1979 to 1998, the Family Centre went through the first three stages of Stevens’ (2001) Nonprofit Lifecycle model: founding the idea, the start up stage, and the growth stage. During this time, the mission and goals of the organisation were identified and key staff members were hired. By the end of the growth stage, the current four components of the Family Centre were in place, the therapy unit, the community development unit, the education and training unit, and the Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU). Another key development was the three tikanga structure, which led to Māori, Pacific, and Pākeha sections that work independently and interdependently. Challenges that the Family Centre faced, including financial constraints, support the argument that the organisation was in the beginning stages of becoming established. Beginning in 1999, the Family Centre entered the maturity stage. The major challenges that it faced at this time included managing the relationship with government and creating a viable succession plan. These challenges are symbolic of an established organisation and, according to participants, are not easily solved.

Although these stages have been described as linear and exact, reality is far more fluid and flexible. For example, some of the Family Centre’s work that was completed in the growth stage, such as the New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP), which is discussed in the next chapter, could easily be described as the work of a “mature” organisation. However, this heuristic is useful for describing the context of the Family Centre’s advocacy efforts and helps to paint the picture of the Family Centre. The “outside” and “inside” advocacy strategies that have been referred to throughout this chapter are illustrated in Chapter 7, which explains why the Family Centre is often described as an “influential” organisation and how they achieved this recognition.
Chapter 7

The Family Centre's advocacy work and influence in New Zealand and internationally

This is the second part of a two-part examination into the Family Centre. In the previous chapter the Family Centre’s mission, structure, and timeline up to this point are described, while in this chapter, its influence and advocacy work is considered. Evidence from key informants internal (8) and external (25) to the Family Centre and key documents are used to describe how the Family Centre has advocated and managed relationships in order to facilitate advocacy. This chapter is separated into four sections, which correspond with the data presented in the second half of Chapter 5. In the first section of this chapter, the Family Centre’s advocacy work is presented. In the second and third sections, the factors that appear to have affected the advocacy work of the Family Centre are explained. Finally, in the fourth section, the ways in which Family Centre staff managed relationships to facilitate advocacy are identified.

This chapter is based on the findings illustrated in Figure 7-1, which shows the issues and fields related to the Family Centre's advocacy efforts. In this chapter, data is presented about how the Family Centre has influenced the perception of three issues (culture, poverty and gender) across four fields (therapy, community development, research, and social policy).

![Figure 7-1: The Family Centre's influence](image)

The Family Centre developed relationships in each of these fields, and these relationships are described below. The term field is used as it relates to field theory,
discussed in Chapter 4. The methods the Family Centre used to influence how poverty, gender, and culture are perceived in each of the four fields is examined below.

**Advocacy in the Family Centre**

This section of the chapter explains four aspects of the Family Centre’s advocacy activities. In the first sub-section, who the Family Centre advocates for and targets is described. In the second sub-section, what it advocates for is described, which is reflected in the three issues identified in Figure 7-1, namely culture, poverty and gender. In the third sub-section, why Family Centre employees advocate is explained. Finally, in the fourth sub-section the different strategies that the Family Centre has used to advocate in the four fields shown in Figure 7-1 is presented, which highlights how it has advocated. Overall, the data described in this section is similar to the data presented in Chapter 5.

**Who the Family Centre advocates for and targets**

Similar to the data described in Chapter 5 on the larger SSCO sector in New Zealand, the majority of internal and external participants suggested that the Family Centre advocates on behalf of marginalised communities affected by, as one internal participant put it, “racism, sexism, heterosexism, and poverty”. Many external participants also pointed out that the Family Centre is known for its close relationship with Māori and Pacific families, in particular, and that they serve these communities. Some external participants also stated that they advocate for residents of Lower Hutt, where the Family Centre is geographically based.

Also similar to participant comments found in Chapter 5, according to internal participants, the Family Centre is interested in targeting decision-makers, bureaucrats, and the public. However, because participants predominantly commented on the Family Centre’s influence on social policy and their relationship with decision-makers, it appears that its primary focus is on government representatives rather than the public. The advocacy activities that are targeted at government representatives include much of their research and social policy work and when they targeted the public, the Family Centre was usually doing work associated with therapy or community development.
What the Family Centre advocates for: Its influence across three issues

As depicted in Figure 7-1, the Family Centre influenced how culture, poverty, and gender are perceived across four fields (therapy, community development, research, and social policy). For example, one external community field participant suggested that specific Family Centre staff became the “go to” people for discussing cultural or poverty-related issues. As discussed in Chapter 6, these three issues have been the focus of the Family Centre’s work since its inception. The Family Centre’s mission is the eradication of “racism, sexism and poverty” (The Family Centre, 2003a, para. 2), which is heavily informed by Just Therapy. Therefore, all of its work is informed by this mission, and Just Therapy philosophies are a part of every project. The way in which culture, poverty, and gender can be seen in its work across the fields is presented below, along with a discussion of how the Family Centre addressed these issues together.

Culture

Family Centre staff argue that culture is “primary” and “fundamental” (Waldegrave, 2003b) to understanding an individual and community. In other words, as one internal participant stated, “We cannot just skip who and what we are; our cultures and the way we were brought up gives us [our] view of the world”. Almost every single external participant suggested that the Family Centre has been influential in describing how culture is perceived, which is directly connected to the Just Therapy principles described below.

Family Centre staff suggested that Just Therapy could be used to address culture in ways that mainstream and Western therapeutic models do not. For example, “Individual self worth is usually seen as a primary goal of therapy. However, people from communal and extended family cultures do not relate easily to concepts of ‘self’” (Waldegrave, 1990, 18). The Family Centre’s inclusion of spirituality into Just Therapy is also linked to culture. One Family Centre employee stated: “The separation of body and soul have a long history in Western thinking [and] that does not work very well for Māori and Pacific beliefs”. Many other participants who had worked with Māori and Pacific
peoples also stated that spirituality needs to be a part of interactions with these communities.

Their research, community development, and social policy work bring the Family Centre’s ideas of culture into other fields. Research it has conducted, such as Ole Taeao Afua (Tamasese, Peteru, & Waldegrave, 1997) and Pacific definitions of “volunteering” (Tamasese & Parsons, 2006), described below, provide tools that others can use to address cultural issues as they affect the social and economic wellbeing and physical and mental health of the members of different populations in New Zealand. Similarly, the work in Samoa, described below, can be used as a model for other groups interested in doing community development work in a way that prioritises culture. Finally, the protests and interactions with decision-makers and bureaucrats to influence social policy were informed by the Family Centre’s beliefs on culture.

**Poverty**

Family Centre staff view poverty through a structural lens. As described in Chapter 6, during their 1980 retreat, an employee pointed out that through therapy they were silencing the “voice of the poor” because “the major problems were external to the family”. As a result, the organisation created a socially just therapeutic approach, Just Therapy, and began getting more involved in advocacy through research, community development, and social policy change. Family Centre employees have worked to change the structures that exacerbate the causes of poverty. For example, through the New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP), described below, researchers assisted in pushing decision-makers to acknowledge the existence of poverty and opened up a rhetorical space to discuss it, so that policy could accurately reflect the needs of resource-poor communities. As illustrated below, participants stated that until that time, government discouraged people from discussing poverty.

**Gender**

Family Centre participants argued that no culture can avoid acknowledging the relationship between men and women (Tamasese & Laban, 2003); therefore gender issues affect everyone, regardless of culture or socioeconomic status (SES). The Family Centre addresses the influence of gender through discussing sexism, which is
best demonstrated by the process of caucusing because men are made accountable to women through this process (Tamasese & Waldegrave, 2003). Staff argued that it is important to listen to women’s stories during therapy and gather data on women when conducting research. For example the New Zealand Individual Deprivation Index (NZiDep) and NZPMP, described below, can be used to highlight the feminisation of poverty, which can be used to inform social policy.

**Weaving the issues together**

Participants suggested that the Family Centre has been most influential in its ability to weave each of these issues together. Due to their early experiences with analysing and discussing cultural issues, Family Centre staff eventually began to explore the ways in which culture affects gender and SES. This is recounted by a former Family Centre employee:

> One of the things the Family Centre is ahead on [sic] everyone else is to deal with, ‘OK, we’re going to respect culture, but what does that mean for culture and gender, and what does that mean when two cultures have an argument?’ All these things that when you’re actually trying to live this stuff you start dealing with as a whole, so they’ve been through a lot of issues that other people are starting to come across.

The Family Centre’s publications detail how it explored Western feminism and discovered that without creating some reorientation, it did not work well for many cultural groups (Tamasese & Laban, 2003). This reorientation occurred because, according to Family Centre staff, early incarnations of Western feminism did not explore issues around culture, class and religion. Family Centre staff felt that this was a limitation that ultimately “exacerbates the problem … and denies different stories of other cultures” (Tamasese & Laban, 2003, 210).

Another external participant suggested that the Family Centre has been able to link an analysis of culture and poverty, which can be used to influence social policy and service delivery.

All that social justice work was seen, and is to some extent still seen, as very significant, kind of, pioneering work around the nature of … not only who you work with, but the nature of how you work with minority groups, with tāngata
whenua, with low-income households, and engage with them in different ways, and then how you make the connections between the, kind of, individual service delivery work and the broader social policy questions.

The Family Centre has provided useful tools, such as Just Therapy and Fa’afaletui, described below, which internal and external participants have used to address how culture, poverty and gender work together. This approach appears to be a valuable contribution that external participants acknowledged and appreciated.

**Why the Family Centre advocates**

The data described in Chapter 5 illustrates that overall, SSCOs advocate to make “things better for the community” and to encourage “people [to] understand the real impact of what’s happening in people’s lives”. Family Centre staff echoed these sentiments. As explained in Chapter 6, they said that they advocate because they want to change the structures, or “oppressive conditions” that cause “racism, sexism, heterosexism, and poverty”. For example, internal participants frequently discussed the importance of social justice and throwing “light on dark places” or exposing “that which is hidden”, such as the “marginalisation of different sectors of the population” (The Family Centre, 2003b, para. 2).

**How the Family Centre advocates: Its influence across four fields**

Almost every participant said that the Family Centre has been “influential”, acquired a “reputation” or “developed a niche”. Some external participants also said staff had “stickability” and “staying power”. In order to understand the Family Centre’s influence, participants were asked to identify how the Family Centre was influential and why. The next four sub-sections are based on how participants responded to these questions. Participants identified four areas, described in this research as fields, which the Family Centre has influenced: therapy, community development, research, and social policy. As is common with most organisations, some parts of the Family Centre’s work are more influential than others. The focus of this research is on the most influential parts of the Family Centre’s work. The criterion for identifying this work was that it had to be identified and discussed by more than one participant, and it had to be suggested by key advisors or findings in key documents.
In the next four sub-sections, all four advocacy strategies described in Chapter 5 are mentioned. First, the Family Centre frequently engages with government representatives through reference groups and consultation meetings. This strategy is more frequently used beginning in 1999 once the Labour-led Government was elected into office because, as explained in Chapter 6, Family Centre staff had established a relationship with them. Second, the Family Centre used research to illustrate the needs of the community, and increased the use of this tactic once the Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU) was established in the 1990s. Six pieces of research are highlighted below. Third, staff often used the media to bring attention to an issue, such as the level of poverty in New Zealand, especially when they “couldn’t get a government to listen to” them. However, as one internal participant mentioned, this could be due to the media's focus on conflict: “when there's actually really good policy going through and you want to commentate on it, they don’t want to know that, they only want conflict”. This comment is supported by others described in Chapter 5. Finally, Family Centre employees also participated in protests around poverty and housing issues, but their involvement in this tactic is only found prior to 1999. Reasons for this decrease are explained below and throughout Chapter 6.

Therapy
The Family Centre advocates for a socially just approach to therapy. The organisation is well known for its principles associated with Just Therapy. Put succinctly, Just Therapy “indicates a ‘just’ approach within the therapy to the client group, one which takes into account their gender as well as cultural, social and economic context” (Waldegrave, 2003a, 7). Through Just Therapy, Family Centre staff also attempt to “demystify therapy” so that individuals with community experience or cultural knowledge are able to participate. According to staff, the Just Therapy philosophy is based upon their work as a therapeutic team with the community. The first publication on the Just Therapy model was disseminated in 1990 (Waldegrave, 1990); however, staff said the concepts underlying Just Therapy had been formulated over a number of years prior to its publication.

Since it was founded, the Family Centre has produced many therapy-related publications [i.e. (Bush, Collings, Tamasese, & Waldegrave, 2005; Waldegrave, 1984,
and, according to internal participants, has trained many therapists within the community, including some of the key people who were involved in setting up mental health services for youth and adolescents in New Zealand. An external participant who worked in therapy mentioned that she preferred to take her clients to the Family Centre whenever she had a family who was dealing with a “cultural or spiritual issue”. This comment suggests that the Family Centre has respect within the therapeutic community, especially when dealing with complex issues of culture. In addition, it has presented at many international and domestic conferences on its socially just therapeutic approach to culture, which further demonstrates that it is respected in the therapy community. More recently, staff also began teaching a Massey University course, in which Just Therapy is one of the main courses taught for the post-graduate diploma in discursive therapies (Massey University, 2008).

Based on participant comments, the Family Centre has influenced the field of therapy domestically and internationally through the relationships it has developed. For example, through therapy, it worked with therapists, the community and researchers. Internal participants described the Family Centre as the “first family therapy” organisation in New Zealand. According to internal and external participants familiar with mental health practices, members of the Family Centre are considered to be “pioneers” in the family therapy community. One internal participant described the benefit of creating a philosophical approach, “when you’re first known in something, the name sticks”. The Family Centre has been acknowledged through its receipt of awards, and requests to train groups and individuals. In 2007, the Family Centre was recognised by the American Family Therapy Academy (AFTA) for its “distinguished contribution to social justice” (The Family Centre, 2007, para. 1). A Family Centre employee also mentioned that it is still difficult to get indigenous approaches to therapy into the mainstream. However, the Just Therapy course, mentioned above, is an exception to that rule, and the Family Centre continues to push for indigenous approaches to be considered more broadly.
Community development

Although the Family Centre is involved with community development in many subtle ways, such as developing relationships with the community, participants focused on two primary community development projects that the Family Centre has been involved with. First, in the 1980s the Family Centre began working with local “street kids”. Second, the Family Centre has more recently expanded its community development work to Samoa, which participants described as a unique endeavour. Although community development work in other sections has been carried out, particularly in the area of violence prevention, it was not discussed by more than one participant; therefore it is not discussed here. However, one internal participant pointed out that “the primary focus of the Pākehā section has been on social policy research” and the Māori section has “created some innovative cultural approaches to community based violence prevention programmes”. In addition, after the interviews were conducted, the Family Centre was heavily involved in tsunami relief work in Samoa, which included working closely with therapists, other community organisations, community members in Samoa and community members around the world that contributed to the relief efforts.

Getting established: The “street kids”

The Family Centre began developing relationships within the community sector and establishing itself as a community development group through its work with “street kids.” The “street kids”, or homeless youth, were, according to a former Family Centre employee, “a bit of a phenomenon that nobody thought existed”. As a result, Family Centre staff decided to build relationships with the youth and get them involved in community development and politics. Benefits were described by a Family Centre employee:

They came out of homes where there was a lot of hurt … They became involved [in the community] and some of the hurt got put into a context. So it was moved away from just the personal blame, or personal agency level, onto [a] wider context, and I think, if there was anything that helped them, I think it was the loosening of the burden on them, and for them to see the wider forces that play.
Eventually the youth were participating in events coordinated by the Family Centre, including everything from attending protests to going out for fish and chips. Some youth also lived on Family Centre property that was donated to the organisation and overseen by staff. To this day, some of the youth remain in contact with some of the Family Centre employees who worked with them, which demonstrates the enduring relationships that were created. This work with the “street kids” was unique because, according to internal participants, at that time there were no other organisations that engaged with these youth and worked to understand their needs in the way the Family Centre did.

**Expanding: Samoa**

More recently, the Family Centre has begun carrying out community development projects in the Pacific nation of Samoa, which demonstrates its ability to engage in advocacy, or social transformation, in other countries. Through this community development work, the Family Centre has had an effect on society because it brought people together and built a research academy. This work was described as unique by internal participants because no other organisation was known to engage in a close relationship with another country in the same way that the Family Centre engages with Samoa. For example, Samoan employees frequently travel to Samoa and have dense networks within the community.

To begin with, members of the Family Centre in the Pacific section built a cultural restoration and research academy, Afeafe o Vaetoefaga Pacific Academy of Cultural Restoration, in the village of Nofoalii, Samoa. The academy was built to provide a space for Samoans to engage in cultural restoration, community development, and research. This was the first academy of its kind that was built with the Samoan community. Family Centre participants described the academy as a learning experience for everyone involved and they suggested that residents could now benefit from the access to a research facility. Samoan builders participated in the construction phase and there was an attempt to utilise primarily Samoan indigenous architectural techniques throughout the construction process.

Family Centre employees described two major outcomes of this work, which indicate that it has been influential. First, youth involved in this building process have
created a business in Samoa and are thriving as “lashers”. This indigenous building technique allows workers to construct buildings without using nails, and instead a coconut sennit (cord) is used to “tie” or lash buildings together. Second, in 2004 the same youth that were involved in the construction process were asked to come to New Zealand and work with New Zealand-born Samoan children as “cultural consultants” and teach them rituals of engagement. According to internal participants, these youth were hosted by local Māori groups in a cross-cultural hui. Samoan families that were involved made 100 mats for the iwi that hosted them, and youth learned culturally appropriate ways to engage with each other.

**Research**

The Family Centre has been recognised as an influential research organisation. Beginning in the early 2000s it increasingly began to focus on research and has won the bidding process for many contracts in that time, which allowed it to acquire a stable resource-level. Internal and external participants mentioned that some of the Family Centre’s primary funders, such as the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (FRST) and the Health Research Council (HRC), are considered to be prestigious funding sources in New Zealand, which demonstrates that the Family Centre is recognised as a quality research organisation.

Participants discussed five pieces of influential research, which are presented in chronological order. First, the Family Centre established itself in the research community with the New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP) (Stephens, Waldegrave, & Frater, 1995). Participants mentioned the NZPMP more frequently than any other piece of research and, as described below, the effects it has had on policy are clear. The four other projects participants discussed were Ole Taeao Afua (Tamasese et al., 1997; Tamasese, Peteru, Waldegrave, & Bush, 2005), the New Zealand Index of Socioeconomic Deprivation for individuals (NZiDep) (Salmond, Crampton, King, & Waldegrave, 2006), research to find culturally appropriate definitions of “volunteering” or “cultural obligations” in Pacific communities (Tamasese & Parsons, 2006), which had not yet been published at time of writing, and Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society (EWAS) (Koopman-Boyden & Waldegrave, 2009). The cultural audit of the Lottery Board (Tamasese et al., 2000) is another piece of research that was only mentioned by
one participant; however, it is discussed below because it has been influential. Following this discussion is also a brief analysis as to why participants did not mention the cultural audit. The influence of the early work, like the NZPMP, is clear; however, the influence of the more recent projects is less visible. Nevertheless, the recent work is included because participants postulated that the projects would be influential.

**The New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP)**

The NZPMP was discussed by almost every participant and is the first of many collaborations with a university, in this case, the Family Centre worked with Bob Stephens from Victoria University of Wellington. At the time of the NZPMP's first publication (Stephens et al., 1995), there was not an established poverty line in New Zealand. As a result, this was a main goal of the poverty research. To establish the poverty line, the authors took a qualitative (micro) and quantitative (macro) approach (Waldegrave, Stuart, & Stephens, 1996) to measuring poverty. According to participants, the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was considered unique by researchers. However, not all researchers agreed with this method, and a discussion of the NZPMP methodology was conducted in the *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (Easton, 1997; Stephens, Waldegrave, & Frater, 1997). On the other hand, this approach appears to be valued by the government because it was eventually adopted for use in the annual Social Report by the Ministry of Social Development in 2001 (Ministry of Social Development, 2001b).

The quantitative component of the NZPMP included an analysis of data from the Household Expenditure and Income Survey (HEIS)\(^7\), which is conducted by Statistics New Zealand and surveys a random sample of the New Zealand population. The qualitative component of the NZPMP included focus groups and interviews, which were conducted all over the country. Internal participants that worked on the NZPMP said they chose to conduct focus groups and interviews because they viewed participants of the qualitative component as experts that brought their own expertise and knowledge to the study. The focus groups consisted of the following families: Māori; Samoan; Pākehā, low income; single parent; low wage earner; and Pākehā, middle income. In the focus groups, participants were asked how much money they would spend on
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\(^7\) Now called the Household Economic Survey (HES).
various needs, including food, housing and energy. The different focus group samples were chosen because they allowed the researchers to look at the special needs of each of these groups. For example, results from the Samoan focus group indicated that they needed more money for food and church donations; whereas the Māori focus group suggested that Māori families spent more money on clothing and extended family purposes.

The final results indicated that the poverty threshold should be drawn “at 60% of median equivalent, disposable household income … after adjusting for housing costs” (emphasis in original) (Waldegrave, Stephens, & King, 2003, 199). Due to the methodological approach, however, the 60% threshold is not fixed. Waldegrave et al. explain that “this ‘relative’ measure of poverty emerged from an ‘absolute’ assessment of minimum adequate budgets by the low-income householders in the focus group” (Waldegrave, Stephens et al., 2003, 199). In other words, if substantial changes or economic shifts occur, the budget estimates produced by focus groups may change and indicate a different minimum adequate income and different percentage of the median household income. Family Centre employees pointed out that this approach was useful because it could appropriately capture the effects of changing social and economic conditions.

In addition to the influence of the Family Centre’s methodology, participants identified other ways in which the NZPMP had been influential. To begin with, in the early to mid-1990s, participants recalled feeling that they could not discuss poverty, because it was not meant to exist in New Zealand. Two external research participants recalled this environment:

Through the 90s, for example, the word ‘poverty’ wasn’t even used in official discourse.

I remember the days when you couldn’t mention the ‘P’ word, “you can call it anything else you like, but don’t call it poverty”.

Simply focusing on poverty was considered to be important and influential at the time. One internal participant suggested that the Family Centre was “one of the very early groups to … identify poverty as an issue in New Zealand.” For example, Family Centre
staff received extensive media coverage for its work on the NZPMP [i.e. (Morrison, 1992 March 13; Post, 1992 November 26)], which allowed it to bring attention to the level of poverty in New Zealand. Internal and external participants suggested that the findings and approach of the NZPMP started a conversation about poverty in New Zealand that did not exist at the government level during this time.

Furthermore, internal and external participants said that the NZPMP had a direct influence on social policy as well. Internal participants stated that the NZPMP has achieved its goal of providing a transparent New Zealand poverty line and had a visible effect on policy, which is supported by independent assessments as well (Foundation for Research Science and Technology, 2002; Gray, 2004). As previously mentioned, Family Centre staff noted that the government incorporated the poverty measurement into the annual Social Report in 2001. The Social Report, compiled by the Ministry of Social Development, provides the government with information about many dimensions of the social and economic wellbeing of New Zealanders. Findings from the Social Report can influence how decision-makers create policy. An internal participant also recalled that the poverty data provided the evidence base for two of the seven pledges concerning housing and economic policies that Labour Party leader and future Prime Minister Helen Clark made during the 1999 election campaign that resulted in the election of the Fifth Labour Government. Overall, it appears that the NZPMP has been influential on many levels.

**Ole Taeao Afua**

Ole Taeao Afua was not discussed as much as the NZPMP, but it was also described as influential by some internal and external participants. This research involved working with therapists, the community, and other community organisations. The aim of the research was to “develop a culturally appropriate research method to investigate Samoan perspectives on mental health issues … [and] to apply this … in the treatment of Samoan people with mental health problems” (Tamasese et al., 2005, 300). During interviews, mental health was discussed with participants in culturally appropriate ways. For example, researchers focused on the family and community, not the individual, and incorporated spirituality into the interviews. Furthermore, breaches of
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8 Translated as “A New Morning”.
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tapu, which is roughly translated as that which is forbidden to the ordinary, and sa, or sacred, were considered in discussions of mental illness with participants.

When participants discussed Ole Taeao Afua, they pointed to the influence of a specific result within the research, a method called Fa’afaletui. According to the authors, this method can be used in therapy and research settings with Samoan people. Fa’afaletui is a tool that is used to gain multiple perspectives when any key decision needs to be made.

In Samoan culture there are three perspectives. The perspective of the person at the top of the mountain, the perspective of the person at the top of the tree, and the perspective of the person in the canoe who is closer to the school of fish. In any big problem the three perspectives are equally necessary. The person fishing in the canoe may not have the long view of the person at the top of the tree, but they are closer to the school of fish. This research represents the culmination of all three perspectives, as it sought a range of views both long and short, from women and men and from the elders and those who work in the health field (Tamasese et al., 2005, 301).

Meetings are conducted with various groups, such as the male leaders and the female leaders. Within each of the meetings, people discuss their perspectives and ultimately it is decided how the different perspectives will be woven together to come to a final decision.

Internal and external participants suggested that Ole Taeao Afua has been influential. Prior to this research, internal and external participants who worked in therapy and research noted that there were few publications with culturally appropriate methods to work with Samoan communities at this time. This finding suggests that prior to the publication of Ole Taeao Afua, Samoan therapy clients and Samoan research participants were most likely treated with Western methods. Problems with applying Western approaches to Pacific and Māori communities are discussed below. A few participants said that they regularly use the Fa’afaletui method for both research and therapy, and that they have found it to be useful.

**New Zealand Index of Socioeconomic Deprivation for individuals (NZiDep)**

Many internal and external participants suggested that the New Zealand Index of Socioeconomic Deprivation for individuals (NZiDep) (Salmond et al., 2006) has been
influential in social policy because it is included in government surveys. That is to say, the Family Centre successfully advocated for poverty awareness in government. The aim of the NZiDep was to create a simple indexing tool to measure individual deprivation that would be appropriate for different ethnic groups in New Zealand. The NZiDep was developed from the census-based small-area index, the New Zealand Deprivation Index (NZDep). The NZDep can be used to measure the levels of deprivation within a given area whereas the NZiDep measures the levels of individual deprivation. Similar to the NZPMP, the NZiDep was a collaboration of Family Centre and university staff, this time the project was led by Clare Salmond and Peter Crampton from the University of Otago.

In order to identify deprivation indicators for this study, a survey of 975 individuals in New Zealand was carried out, with equal numbers of Māori, Pacific, and non-Māori and non-Pacific (i.e. mostly Pākehā or European) participants. The survey responses were analysed to identify the smallest number of deprivation indicators that were needed to be included in a questionnaire to obtain a measure of an individual respondent’s level of deprivation. The result of this analysis was the NZiDep, which provides a measure of an individual’s level of deprivation on the basis of their responses to eight questions about whether or not they either have certain things, or do not because they cannot afford them. For example, there are questions about adequate food intake and shelter. A level 1 deprivation includes those who are least deprived and a level 5 includes those who are the most deprived.

The results of the NZiDep indicated that in the level 5 deprivation category, which accounted for 7.8% of respondents, Māori (28.8%) and Pacific peoples (12.5%) were over-represented, and non-Māori, non-Pacific (mainly Pākehā) were under-represented (4.7%). On the other hand, in the level 1 deprivation group (least deprived), which accounted for 50.7% of all respondents, non-Māori and non-Pacific (mainly Pākehā) (54.4%), were over-represented, while Māori (31.0%) and Pacific peoples were under-represented (29.5%) (Salmond et al., 2006).

**Pacific perspectives on cultural obligations and volunteering**

The Pacific perspectives research on cultural obligations and volunteering (Tamasese & Parsons, 2006) was discussed by one external participant and two Family
Centre employees and involved work with the community and other community organisations. The research into Pacific perspectives on volunteering had not yet been published at the time of this writing, but staff said that it should be published in the near future. Therefore, the description of the study is based on participant comments. The research was contracted by the Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector (OCVS), which is overseen by the Ministry of Social Development (MSD). The Pacific perspectives research included case studies of six major Pacific communities in New Zealand, namely Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island Māori, Fijian, Niuean, and Tokelauan communities. These case studies were conducted using the Fa’afaletui method that was previously described. The data collection process resulted in over 1,200 interviews, and each interview was conducted in the native language of each community.

According to participants, this project contained three components: a literature review, focus groups, and the Projects of Pride. Findings from the focus groups and Projects of Pride are based on the data gathered from the case studies of six Pacific communities in New Zealand. The Projects of Pride consisted of one project that was chosen by each Pacific nation included in the case study, not the researchers. This component highlighted the work that each group was proud of within their community. For example, one Project of Pride focused on a Tokelauan community that built a meeting place to maintain their traditions and their cultures because they did not have a meeting place when they arrived in New Zealand.

Participants suggested that many findings of the research would be described in the upcoming report. A Family Centre employee described one of the key findings, stating that, in the Pacific community, when an individual does something good for another, “it’s not set in a chronological order … it’s reciprocal and it assumes that people belong … just by them doing good does not mean that they then expect somebody else to do good, but that in a world that everybody belongs, good will be done for each other anyway”.

Internal participants suggested that this investigation would be influential because no other research has been published on this topic in New Zealand, or elsewhere. A report, entitled Mahi Aroha (Ratcliff, Raihania, Walker, & Office for the Community & Voluntary Sector, 2007), addressed Māori perspectives and definitions of
“volunteering”. However, a comprehensive document that addresses definitions and perspectives of volunteering from a Pacific perspective has not yet been published. Also, an external participant pointed out that gathering data on the six Pacific nations in New Zealand is a difficult and complex task, one that the Family Centre was able to fulfil due to its credibility and networks. An external participant hoped that this research would influence how the government related to Pacific staff. For example, she suggested that Pacific staff might need extra time or resources to participate in family functions. Overall, this report can be described as influential because it contributes to knowledge of Pacific people in New Zealand.

**Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society (EWAS)**

Some internal participants also suggested that the Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society (EWAS) (Koopman-Boyden & Waldegrave, 2009) investigation, which is a collaboration with the University of Waikato, will be influential. This research was discussed by current and former Family Centre employees. At the time of the interviews, only the working papers of EWAS had been released (Waldegrave, 2006) and the investigation is at the beginning stages; therefore participants who were not directly involved in the research were unable to discuss its findings. However, participants were familiar with the aim of the research and postulated that findings from the EWAS investigation will influence social policy as it relates to populations over the age of 40. Employees of the Family Centre were able to describe the findings of the EWAS investigation, which may help to discern its influence, and these findings are outlined below.

This investigation is being conducted in partnership with the Population Studies Centre of the University of Waikato and is funded by Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (FRST). The aim of the overall project is “to investigate the level of wellbeing of older people and the determinants of this wellbeing” (Waldegrave & Koopman-Boyden, 2009, 207). The EWAS research has a “clear focus on the social dimensions of ageing and wellbeing” (P. King & Waldegrave, 2009, 9) and includes an understanding of the role culture, poverty and gender play in ageing. The authors have gathered quantitative and qualitative data through large-scale surveys and case studies. As of this writing, only data from the age group 65–84 had been analysed and the
results reported (Koopman-Boyden & Waldegrave, 2009). Ten domains were assessed to measure the level of wellbeing in this age group, including health, education, work and retirement, economic standards of living, rights and entitlements, leisure and recreation, living arrangements, safety, social connectedness, culture and religion.

Overall, it was found that 87.8% of New Zealanders between the ages of 65-84 felt satisfied with their life. A Family Centre employee discussed these findings in more detail:

This high level of wellbeing is associated with having a good income, being healthy, being able to access amenities like shops and public transport and owning your own home. Likewise, involvement in community organisations and leisure and recreational activities, along with a positive expectation of financial, family and health care security were all associated with life satisfaction. The negative experience of being forced into retirement, having long periods outside of the workforce, and going without essential items and services all detracted from life satisfaction.

The Family Centre’s work could be described as influential if the government were to adopt policies that reflect these findings. Similarly, community groups may also incorporate these findings into the ways that they interact with the community.

At the time of this writing, however, the effects of the EWAS investigation are unclear because this research is still in progress. A few internal participants suggested that this research might take years until it has an influence on social policy, but there was a general agreement that it will be influential. A former Family Centre employee also suggested that EWAS will be influential and that it “is quite a major piece of work”. Another internal employee suggested that although there are other groups doing “ageing research”, the Family Centre is able to provide a unique perspective because “of the ways they’ve integrated culture” that other groups do not.

**Less-discussed research: The Cultural Audit of the Lottery Grants Board**

While the cultural audit of the Lottery Grants Board (Tamasese et al., 2000) was only discussed by one participant, it has influenced government policy. The Lottery Grants Board is a government body that is monitored by the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) and allocates grant money for “developmental or preventative projects, welfare and support services, or projects that help to improve the wellbeing of people in
the community” (Department of Internal Affairs, 2010). According to one of the authors, the DIA made a request for this research in order to understand how the Lottery Board could be more responsive to Pacific peoples’ needs. The Family Centre was successful in tendering for the contract and they chose to approach the research as a cultural audit of the Lottery Grants Board.

Their results indicated that “Pacific people in New Zealand are considerably under-represented among those receiving funding from the Lottery [G]rants [B]oard” (Tamasese et al., 2000, 12). The authors suggested that the most appropriate way to increase the number of Pacific populations receiving grants would be to establish a “Provider Development Fund”. According to the authors, this fund should “increase the capacity of Pacific groups to access Lottery funds and fund the direct provision of services by Pacific groups to their people” (Tamasese et al., 2000, 12). The authors also developed a monitoring tool to measure the effectiveness of any changes that were made.

The cultural audit has influenced how the Lottery Grants Board funds community development and other projects led by Pacific communities. The Pacific Provider Development Fund was incorporated into the structure of the Lottery Grants Board in 2001 and the effectiveness of this fund continues to be monitored (Kāhui Tautoko Consulting Ltd, 2008). It is unclear why participants not currently employed by the Family Centre did not discuss this research. It is possible that this is simply due to the sample; the participants that were interviewed may have been unaware of the cultural audit research and/or those who did know of it were among those who did not respond to interview requests.

**Influencing social policy**

There is a marked difference in the Family Centre’s approach to influencing social policy after 1999. As discussed in Chapter 6, the Family Centre primarily used “outside” strategies to influence policy between 1979 and 1998 because it was not given an opportunity to work from the “inside”. The Family Centre primarily disagreed with the neo-liberal structural changes of the 1980s and 1990s, including the reduction in benefit payments, switching to market-based rents on state houses, and reductions in superannuation, which harmed the most disadvantaged communities. However, in 1999
the Labour Party won a majority of the seats in Parliament and the Family Centre had an opportunity to work with a government that supported, or was sympathetic to, at least some of its aims, such as the reintroduction of income related rents for state house tenants. This change led to an increase in the use of “inside” strategies. The “inside” and “outside” approaches are presented below. The terms “inside” and “outside” are adapted from Walker’s (1991) description of each, which are outlined in Chapter 3.

**Using primarily “outside” strategies**

Between the years of 1979 and 1998, the Family Centre advocated for social policy change through research (described above), community work (described above), protests and contact with media. Although it continues to incorporate research and community work, its high level of involvement with protests and the media at this time demonstrates how the Family Centre was, as employees described, “working from the outside”. Although it attempted to work with the government, the primary way that the Family Centre influenced social policy was through avenues that did not require a direct relationship with government representatives. The Family Centre took this approach because at that stage, it was not invited to advise government ministers or policymakers during the decision-making process. However, Family Centre staff wanted to let decision-makers know that it strongly disagreed with their policies. As a result, staff protested, conducted research that was, according to an employee, “impossible to argue against”, and brought this research to the media.

Three protests were mentioned by participants who had worked in the Family Centre during these “early years”. Each protest is described and the outcome of the Family Centre’s social policy work is discussed at the end of this section. The protest mentioned by the most participants was the Hikoi of Hope, which occurred in 1998. According to participants involved, the Hikoi of Hope was a protest against the social and economic changes that were being implemented by the National-led Government, that were discussed in Chapter 1. The protest involved people walking from the northern end of the North Island and the southern end of the South Island, to converge on the capital, Wellington.

The Family Centre was very involved in the Hikoi of Hope. The New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP) was referred to in the protest, and one external
participant suggested that the Hikoi of Hope was developed out of the Family Centre’s poverty-related work. The Family Centre was also involved in the Hikoi of Hope through its affiliation with the Anglican Church. The protest was organised by the Anglican Church and it has been described as “the biggest single protest of the Christian Church in New Zealand” (Roberts, 2005, 5). A few internal and external participants suggested Charles Waldegrave was known as an advocate for the poor within the Anglican Church.

He [Charles Waldegrave] would be seen as a real leading advocate within the Church, and able to articulate a spirituality around poverty that probably no one else did in New Zealand.

Through Charles Waldegrave, the Family Centre became involved in the Hikoi of Hope, and other employees participated in the protest as well.

Groups involved in the second and third protests sought to bring awareness to the lack of affordable housing and the problem with market-related rents\(^9\) in state houses. Another aim of the second protest was to bring attention to the selling of rail-workers’ homes. To show their disagreement with these structural changes, Family Centre staff brought their families to camp out at the Wellington Railway Station. The outcome of this protest is discussed below.

The third protest that participants discussed involved utilising the media to create awareness of a special day called New Zealand Housing Day on the 1st of July. In the early 1980s, the Family Centre co-founded an organisation called the New Zealand Housing Network (NZHN) with a small number of other community groups. Members of the NZHN utilised their networks to participate in a media blitz that involved many organisations ringing Radio New Zealand, a public radio station in New Zealand, and other media outlets. These groups proceeded to ask the media how they were going to celebrate New Zealand Housing Day, which, until that day, did not exist. In the following years, a Family Centre participant said that the media began ringing up the Family
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\(^9\) Market-related rents are determined by prices found in the market as opposed to the income of the renter. Market-based rents are problematic because renters usually end up paying more than they would under an income-based rent, which places the rent as a percentage of the renter’s income.
Centre and other organisations asking them what they were going to do to celebrate New Zealand Housing Day.

As previously mentioned, the Family Centre increasingly began utilising the media to get information to the public at this time. Staff learned how to speak with the media and how to get the attention of the media. Eventually, the media began to come to Family Centre employees for their views and opinions. For example, an internal participant recalled a media outlet calling him the night before the then Prime Minister Jenny Shipley was going to announce that the government was going to lower the level of superannuation. The Family Centre had data from its poverty work prepared to point out the ways in which this policy change would be harmful, and Shipley was not ready to respond to these comments.

Internal and external participants suggested that the Family Centre's approach at this time influenced social policy. Participants suggested that the NZPMP, discussed earlier, and the Family Centre's protests, like the Hikoi of Hope (Roberts, 2005), contributed to the election results in 1999. When the Labour Party gained a majority of the seats in 1999, policies that the Family Centre had been fighting for, including a return to income-based rents (Hallinan, Robinson, & Scobie, 2006) and an increase in the level of superannuation for a couple back to a level that was no lower than 65% of the average wage of a single person (Clark, 2002), were put into place.

**Increasing the use of “inside” strategies**

Beginning in 1999 the Family Centre continued to advocate through research; however, they also began advocating through advisory and reference groups. When participants were asked about how the Family Centre has been influential over the past 10 years, they usually discussed social policy. The networks and credibility the Family Centre had acquired over time led to consultations with government. For example, two Family Centre employees were members of the Strategic Policy Reference Group (SPRG), which, according to policy participants, provided advice on social policy issues to the Ministry of Social Development (MSD). In fact, an external policy field participant suggested that specific Family Centre staff “formed” the previous prime minister’s “impression of the MSD” and could explain the aims of the SPRG to her; therefore, they were valued members of this reference group. Other external participants in this study
were not aware of the SPRG until recently, which indicates that Family Centre had credibility with the government that other groups did not. In addition, a few internal and external participants mentioned that biennial meetings took place in the 2000s between Christian leaders, including Family Centre staff, and the prime minister. Indeed, participants said that these meetings were set up, in part, by Family Centre staff. Overall, the Family Centre was perceived by many participants as an organisation that has had, as one external participant working in government described it, “a massive influence over welfare and related policy over the last nine years”.

**Working for Families:** A policy that participants frequently mentioned in relationship to the Family Centre was the Working for Families package, which was, according to members of the SPRG, structured, in part, by the SPRG. According to Family Centre participants, this social welfare package was initially based on data from the NZPMP and the MSD's Living Standards research (Ministry of Social Development, 2000). At the time of this writing, Working for Families is controversial and has elicited both support (Johnson, 2005) and attacks (Child Poverty Action Group, 2009b) within the population for reasons that are explained below. The Working for Families package is a social welfare package that was put in place by the Labour-led Government to help families that are earning below a specified level of income (Working for Families, 2009). The package includes four different tax credits. However, the in-work tax credit has received the most attention, and was viewed by some external participants as “discriminatory”. These participants and other groups that are against the in-work tax credit argued that because only those who were employed were able to receive it, the “the most vulnerable” were not able to benefit from it (Child Poverty Action Group, 2009a, 2009b).

On the other hand, an external participant who also advised the MSD on the Working for Families package through its involvement with the SPRG suggested that the thinking behind the in-work tax credit is to get the struggling groups “up to the next level”. A Family Centre employee also supported the Working for Families package. He stated that the Working for Families package is “the biggest redistribution of income downwards in three decades”. He considered that “although it didn't lift every child out
of poverty”; ultimately, “this is as good as it gets in a democracy, in terms of one policy intervention, [because] … there is compromise”.

**What factors affect the amount and effectiveness of the Family Centre’s advocacy efforts?**

In this section, the seven factors described in Chapter 5 as affecting advocacy efforts, are applied to the Family Centre. These factors include the relationship with government, the relationship with the community, the relationship with community organisations, credibility, resources, size, and leadership. Overall, the amount of advocacy that the Family Centre undertook does not appear to have changed a great deal, but the type of advocacy that it engaged in did, and this may be associated with the factors described in this section. Altogether, it appears that most of these factors can be linked to the Family Centre’s decreased use of “outside” strategies and increased use of “inside” strategies, which occurred after the 1999 election.

**Relationship with government**

The Family Centre’s relationship with government has already been described. Overall, as mentioned above, the Family Centre increased its use of “inside” tactics and decreased their use of in “outside” tactics after the 1999 election. According to many internal and external participants, the Family Centre has been able to influence social policy more directly once it developed a closer relationship with government through their participation in reference groups and consultation meetings. On the other hand, as described in Chapter 6, some external participants felt that through this close relationship, the Family Centre sacrificed its ability to speak out on social policy issues that it disagreed with and may be less influential with the National-led Government, elected into office in 2008.

Participants did not speak directly to the influence of government contracts and registration of the Family Centre as a charity; however, their comments provided insight into their effects. According to internal participants, the Family Centre has retained government contracts since the 1980s. For example, therapy and community development work—such as referrals for domestic violence and family therapy—have been funded through government contracts. In addition, some of the research
conducted by the Family Centre has been funded by the government, such as the
cultural audit of the Lottery Grants Board (Tamasese et al., 2000) and Pacific definitions
of “volunteering” (Tamasese & Parsons, 2006). It does not appear that accepting
government contracts reduced the Family Centre’s ability to advocate. On the other
hand, it is difficult to conclude how accepting government funding affected the Family
Centre’s strategy choice, because although staff increased their use of “inside”
strategies after 1999, the organisation has been receiving contracts since the 1980s.
This could mean that it was not government contracts that led to an increase in “inside”
strategies, but something else, such as the relationship with government. Similarly,
being registered as a charity also does not seem to have had a major effect on the
Family Centre’s advocacy activities. The Family Centre has been a registered charity
since 1980 (Registrar of Incorporated Societies, 1980) and has used both “inside” and
“outside” tactics since this time. This suggests that charity status does not stop the
organisation from advocating, nor does it appear to have stopped it from incorporating a
range of tactics.

**Relationship with the community**

The Family Centre’s relationship with the community was most often discussed in
terms of their close relationship with Māori and Pacific peoples. Based on participant
comments, it appears that this relationship legitimated the work the organisation did. For
example, many external policy and community field participants suggested that a major
strength of the Family Centre is its ability to connect with Māori and Pacific families.
These networks gave a few policy field participants the impression that staff understood
the needs of these communities, which, according to them, is extremely important. In
fact, one policy field participant argued, “if you’re working in the families and young
people area, with vulnerable people, and you haven’t got a handle on the situation of
Māori or Pacific [populations], you’re pretty much irrelevant … because that’s where
most of the need is”. This policy field participant felt that the Family Centre did have a
“handle on the situation of Māori [and] Pacific” peoples.
**Relationship with community organisations**

Unlike the relationships with the community and government, participants were not directly asked about the Family Centre’s relationship with community organisations. Possibly because of this, participants did not discuss the Family Centre’s relationship with other community organisations often, except to say that it had access to Māori and Pacific groups that others did not. The effects of this relationship are similar to those found from the relationship with the community described above, which was essentially an increase in its legitimacy as an SSCO.

**Credibility**

Some external participants in the community, research and policy fields described the Family Centre as an organisation with “credibility”. According to participant comments, it appears that the Family Centre obtained credibility through its networks and ability to produce influential work. One external policy field participant described the source of its credibility:

> They are perceived to be a strong organisation, they’re strong because of their leadership and their evidence base, and they’re well networked into government, across government agencies and the NGO sector.

Based on this comment and others made by participants, it appears that once the Family Centre was viewed as credible by more groups, especially government, it was able to increase the use of “inside” strategies and influence social policy directly.

**Resources**

According to internal participants, the Family Centre increased its resource-level once it began conducting research more frequently, beginning in the 1990s. Around the same time as the organisation saw an increase in resources, it began to advocate in more visible ways. For example, it gained a great deal of media attention for its work on the NZPMP [i.e. (Morrison, 1992 March 13; Post, 1992 November 26)]. Eventually, once the Family Centre obtained a stable resource-level, it also began to engage more directly with government representatives, which coincided with the election in 1999.
**Size**

Participants did not discuss the Family Centre’s size often; although one external policy field participants suggested that for “a modestly sized organisation, they certainly punch above their weight”. He clarified this statement by pointing out that it has been influential. This sentiment implies that generally, smaller organisations are less influential, which coincides with comments described in Chapter 5; however, according to this participant, the Family Centre appears to be an exception.

**Leadership**

The three core leaders, Warihi Campbell, Taimalieutu Kiwi Tamasese, and Charles Waldegrave, are described in Chapter 6. If three different leaders were involved in the founding of the Family Centre, it may have been a different organisation; therefore, the influence of these leaders appears to have affected the advocacy direction of the Family Centre. It is difficult to know if different leaders would have resulted in an increase or decrease of advocacy activities; however, many external participants felt that the Family Centre had a group of strong leaders directing the organisation, which may have increased its effectiveness.

**What factors affect the Family Centre’s strategy choice?**

When participants described the Family Centre’s advocacy work, it became clear that one of the two factors described in Chapter 5 played a significant role in its strategy choice; i.e. the Family Centre’s position in the power structure. Although it appears that the target of its advocacy campaigns may have had an effect on how it chose its strategy—for example, staff chose to focus on producing publications and presenting at conferences to reach therapists—the overwhelming focus of participants was the Family Centre’s position in the power structure. As previously mentioned, once the Family Centre gained networks into government, it began using more “inside” strategies, such as engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats, which allowed it to access social policy more directly. When it was not as connected to the power structure, Family Centre staff said it was more likely to use “outside” strategies, such as protesting, because it could not get access to decision-makers.
How relationships were managed in the Family Centre

According to participants, the Family Centre is known for having networks with a variety of groups, especially Māori and Pacific communities. An external participant stated that the Family Centre “knows impoverished families and they know the Mayor, and it’s quite difficult to get that breadth”. Based on participant comments, it can be concluded that the Family Centre managed these relationships in two specific ways: it brought groups together from multiple fields and used credibility in one field to develop relationships in another. Each of these approaches is described below and examples are given from their work in each field.

Using credibility in one field to develop relationships in another

The most common way that the Family Centre managed relationships was to use credibility and knowledge that they had earned in one field to develop relationships, and ultimately gain credibility, in other fields. This approach can be seen in its work across each of the four fields. The therapeutic work helped Family Centre employees understand how to influence social policy and was the impetus for their involvement in the social policy field.

It was studying [therapy] that really gave [us] the smarts for understanding structural things in the community. What motivates community, and how does this political system work, and where do you make interventions that are effective?

External participants also suggested that the Family Centre’s work in community development gave it credibility within policy circles. For example, an external participant that worked in government recalled why the Family Centre won the grant for investigating Pacific perspectives of volunteering. She said that the Family Centre “seemed the ideal people to do [this] research” because of its “close [ties] to the community”.

The Family Centre’s combination of knowledge, credibility and networks that it had developed through working with the community and conducting research gave it access to members of the social policy field. A former Family Centre employee explained why she felt the Family Centre was influential:
The combination of their skills, their ability to think and act strategically, their ability to engage with the intellectual and research end as well as the community speaks to a wide spectrum that they can pull together to bring about influence.

Another external participant that worked in government suggested that the Family Centre has been influential because of its “leadership ... evidence base” and its networks “into government, across government agencies and the NGO sector”. These comments demonstrate that by combining its credibility in the research and community fields, the Family Centre was able to successfully engage government representatives.

**Bringing people from different fields together**

Family Centre employees have brought together individuals that operate in different fields. This is significant because people that are brought in from different fields essentially bring their credentials from their respective fields, and it appears that they can ultimately increase the effectiveness of advocacy. This approach is most visible through the research that they have conducted. The New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP) (Stephens et al., 1995) brought together a University researcher (Robert Stephens, Victoria University of Wellington), an individual who worked in the business sector (Paul Frater, Business and Economic Research Ltd.), and an individual from a community organisation (Charles Waldegrave, the Family Centre). Internal and external participants suggested that through utilising business terms and business knowledge, the authors of the NZPMP were able to define poverty not as a social, but as an economic problem and to provide empirical evidence that poverty existed in New Zealand. Incorporating a member of an academic field added credibility because he brought a breadth of international knowledge that contributed to a robust methodology and results that were internationally comparable. Charles contributed through his knowledge of and networks into the community, and his experience with the Family Centre. Together, participants suggested that these three different perspectives made the NZPMP effective.

A similar trend is found in most recent research in which the Family Centre has been involved. University researchers (Clare Salmond and Peter Crampton, University of Otago) conducted research alongside members of the Family Centre on the NZiDep
(Salmond et al., 2006). Multiple researchers from the University of Waikato, such as Peggy Koopman-Boyden, worked with the Family Centre to produce the first half of the EWAS research (Koopman-Boyden & Waldegrave, 2009). In addition, the more recent NZPMP publications were also supported by Bob Stephens at Victoria University of Wellington (Waldegrave, 1998; Waldegrave & Stephens, 2000; Waldegrave, Stephens et al., 2003). The Family Centre’s ability to maintain vast networks and collaborate with multiple groups is a major reason that participants felt it was successful.

**Conclusion**

This chapter illustrates how an SSCO in New Zealand, the Family Centre, has advocated and describes how participants felt it was effective. The chapter is separated into four sections. The first section answers four questions: who the Family Centre advocates for, who it targets, what it advocates for, why it advocates, and how it advocates. Participants suggested that the Family Centre advocates for marginalised communities, especially those affected by “racism, sexism, heterosexism, and poverty”. It usually targets government representatives, but also targets the public, as found in its therapy advocacy. It advocates for influencing how three issues are perceived: culture, poverty and gender. External participants found the Family Centre to be most effective at weaving these three issues together to influence change. Internal participants suggested that it advocates primarily for reasons of social justice and the “eradication of racism, sexism, and poverty” (The Family Centre, 2003b, para. 2). Participants described how the Family Centre used four advocacy strategies—engaging with government representatives, conducting research, using the media, and protesting—to influence four fields (therapy, community development, research, and social policy). Its work in each of the four fields is described in detail to demonstrate their work in each area. The highlights of this section are summarised by Figure 7.1, which depicts the Family Centre’s influence.

The second and third sections describe the factors that influenced the Family Centre’s advocacy efforts. Seven factors that affected the amount and effectiveness of their advocacy are outlined: the relationship with government, the relationship with the community, the relationship with other community organisations, credibility, access to resources, size and leadership. Overall, the relationship with government appears to
have had the greatest influence on the Family Centre’s effectiveness. Although the amount of their advocacy activities does not appear to have increased, its strategies have changed. After the 1999 election, the Family Centre decreased its use of “outside” strategies, like protesting, and increased their use of “inside” strategies, such as engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats. This change reflects the Family Centre’s position in the power structure, which is the primary factor that affected employees’ strategy choices.

The fourth section discusses two ways that the Family Centre has managed relationships, which has facilitated its advocacy efforts. Most often, it has used credibility in one field to develop relationships, and ultimately credibility, in another. This approach is most clearly seen in how it was able to enter into the social policy field. External participants who worked in government suggested that the credibility the Family Centre had acquired through their community development and therapeutic projects, combined with its credibility in the research field, earned it respect in the social policy field when it had a government that supported its vision. The other approach involves bringing together groups that operate in different fields, which is clearly illustrated by its research. For example, internal and external participants suggested that the New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP) has been successful it brought together representatives of the business, research, and the community sectors. These three perspectives added credibility and knowledge that led to policy change.

Overall, this chapter has described data that supports the conclusion that the Family Centre has influenced three issues (culture, poverty, and gender) across four fields (therapy, community development, research, and social policy) through its use of networks, expertise, credibility, and the way it managed relationships; however, the next chapter describes how it has been effective. The next chapter also provides an analysis of the results described in this chapter and the previous results chapters, and presents an outline of the overall thesis and major findings.
Chapter 8
Discussion: An analysis of the community field in New Zealand and advocacy in the community field

This chapter analyses the findings, describes strengths and limitations, provides implications and concludes the thesis. The previous chapters have demonstrated that community organisations play a vital role in shaping the social and political environment (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Berry & Arons, 2003; Frumkin, 2002; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993) and that, more specifically, SSCOs influence the determinants of health, as they negatively affect marginalised communities. Chapters 2 and 3 explain how, according to previous research, community organisations fulfil this role; whereas Chapters 5, 6, and 7 identify how participants suggested SSCOs in New Zealand fulfil this role. The methodology, found in Chapter 4, identified the participants who informed this research, which represented different perspectives. For example, the larger case study of the community sector consisted of participants in the community (30), research (6), and policy (6) field, whereas the embedded case study included participants internal (8) and external (25) to the Family Centre. Chapter 4 also defines the theoretical concepts, how they are used to fill gaps in the research, and presents an outline of the structure that guided this research.

The primary goal of this research is to understand how social service community organisations (SSCOs) in New Zealand advocate for reducing the effects of conditions that public health practitioners have identified as determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007), as they negatively affect economically marginalised communities, and to provide insights to SSCOs in similar jurisdictions. Overall, this research reveals that the primary way SSCOs in New Zealand advocate effectively is through successfully managing relationships. This finding is based on data that was collected to answer four questions.

- What is the New Zealand SSCO sector?
- How do New Zealand SSCOs advocate?
- How do New Zealand SSCOs advocate effectively?
- How are relationships managed to facilitate advocacy?

Each of these questions is answered in the beginning four sections of this chapter through an analysis of the results and a comparison between the results and literature. The final three sections address the strengths and limitations of this research, the primary research question and the implications of this research. Findings that relate to the Family Centre case study are integrated throughout this chapter; therefore, instead of addressing these issues in separate headings, the research questions that are Family Centre specific are woven through each section. Although the research findings are based on New Zealand data, because of the similarities between the international and New Zealand literature and data from this study, the findings in this research may shed light on SSCOs in similar countries, like the United Kingdom.

**Research question 1: What is the New Zealand SSCO sector?**

The first research question is used as a means to understand the community sector and, more specifically, the social service community organisation (SSCO) sector. In order to fulfil this goal, this section is separated into two sub-sections. First, the results discussed in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 are compared with the literature, in which similarities and differences are found. The literature is woven in to provide a context for participant statements. Second, these results are analysed through a relational theoretical lens.

**How do the results compare with the literature?**

Four areas of similarities and differences between participant statements and the literature were found, and each is discussed in this section. First, the terms and definitions that were found in the literature and used by participants are described. Second, there is a discussion of the primary roles of the community sector. Third, the key characteristics that are found in the majority of community organisations are identified and participant statements are compared to the findings in the literature. Finally, participants’ and scholars’ views on different types of community organisations are considered. Each section of the literature review and the results are compared and contrasted below.
**Terms and definitions**

Similar to findings in the literature (Frumkin, 2002; Powell & Steinberg, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993), participants struggled to find one term to describe the community sector in New Zealand. In addition, participants and scholars also shared similar ideas about the definition of the community sector. Participants and scholars suggested that the community sector was not-for-profit (H. Anheier, 2005; Salamon, 1999) and had a close relationship with the community (Berger & Neuhaus, 1996; Couto & Guthrie, 1999; Frumkin, 2002; Hall, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Steinberg, 2006a). In fact, for both sources, prioritising the relationship with the community was central. For example, similar to the literature, participants also suggested that unlike other sectors, community organisations were primarily driven by their mission (Moore, 2000), which was based on the needs of the community, and that they provided these needs in a unique way (Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993) because of their “horizontal” structure. Unlike some scholars (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Salamon, 1999), however, participants did not define the sector as non-compulsory. In the literature, this portion of the definition was problematic for some groups, such as Māori communities (Statistics New Zealand, 2007, 63), which may be why participants did not discuss it.

**The role of the community sector**

Participants describing the SSCO sector and the Family Centre, and scholars in the literature discussed what researchers call instrumental and expressive activities (Frumkin, 2002; Hansmann, 1980; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Weisbrod, 1975); although participants were much more likely to mention expressive roles, more specifically, advocacy, when defining the role of the sector. Community field participants suggested that a primary role of the community sector is articulating “a vision of the world that we would like to live in” and to act as “advocates of … common dreams”. Participants also discussed how the delivery of services and advocacy are intertwined, however only a few writers also mentioned this in the literature (Boris & Steuerle, 2006; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; S. Vaughan & Arsneault, 2008). Both participants and scholars also suggested that community organisations bring people together, except in the literature
this was identified as building social capital (Debra Minkoff, 1997; Stolle, 2003), a term not used by participants.

**Key characteristics**

Three key characteristics of the community sector were described in the literature and by participants: the close connection with the community; the “messy” work associated with complex issues; and the ability for groups to claim tax-exempt status. Participants also suggested that each of these is found in the Family Centre. First, there was a great deal of discussion in the literature on the close connection that community groups have with the community (Berger & Neuhaus, 1996; Carey & Barunack-Mayer, 2009; Couto & Guthrie, 1999; Deschenes et al., 2006; Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Steinberg, 2006a). All of the participants in every field also discussed the close relationship with the community as a defining characteristic of the community sector. This relationship was illustrated by the service delivery practices that participants described which were based on knowledge of the community.

Second, working with marginalised groups that have complex needs was described as a characteristic of most community organisations in the literature (Berry, 2005; Clemens, 2006; Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Participants also supported arguments that groups in the community sector work with communities that are facing challenging issues with complex social and economic challenges, such as poverty. These challenges have been found to have a detrimental effect on the health of those facing them. However, unlike the literature, a few community participants argued that terms such as “at-risk” and “vulnerable” were “pejorative”. Instead, these participants preferred to describe the structural nature of the problems the community faced. In addition, participants described enjoying the “messy” qualities of the community sector, which was also not found in the literature.

Third, the ability of community organisations to claim tax-exempt status was a unique characteristic that was used in the literature to distinguish the community sector from other sectors (Simon et al., 2006; Tennant et al., 2006). Participants did not discuss charitable or tax-exempt status in detail, but this may be because they were not asked about it. They only described tax-exempt and charitable status in relation to how
the government controlled the community sector. This control was exhibited through limiting the advocacy of community organisations, which is described in detail below.

**Key characteristics of New Zealand organisations**

Participants in all three fields also suggested that there are two key characteristics of New Zealand community organisations which make them distinctive. They said that because the population is small, business philanthropy is especially low in New Zealand and community groups have more access to decision-makers. Recent research in New Zealand supported both statements (Milligan et al., 2008; O'Brien et al., 2009; Sanders et al., 2008). However, based on findings from Sanders et al. (2008), the level of philanthropy in New Zealand requires a deeper analysis. Overall, compared to similar countries, New Zealand’s philanthropy levels are high, but this statistic is due to the high level of philanthropy that comes from households and other community groups. On the other hand, business philanthropy is low. Participants did not make this distinction, and, instead, focused on the low level of business philanthropy. The second characteristic identified by participants, the close relationship with government representatives, was supported by the literature as well (Milligan et al., 2008; O'Brien et al., 2009). Although participants did not discuss the political structure, researchers also found that the mixed member proportional (MMP) system contributed to this close relationship (O'Brien et al., 2009).

**Different types of SSCOs**

Participants identified three different types of SSCOs: Māori, umbrella, and religious organisations. However, a deeper analysis of their statements suggests that each has an “opposite” side. Therefore, it appears that at least six types of SSCOs exist in New Zealand: Māori organisations, non-Māori organisations, religiously affiliated organisations, secular organisations, umbrella organisations, and direct service providers. All six of these organisations share the key characteristics of all SSCOs, such as a close relationship with the community, but they also appear to have distinctive characteristics. The first type, Māori organisations, are described by scholars as important but difficult to classify (Statistics New Zealand, 2007, 63; Tennant, 2004), and this was consistent with the views of the participants. Two themes emerged from the
results on Māori organisations. First, a continuum exists within Māori organisations. One end of the continuum incorporates Māori organisations that follow a mainstream “community sector” model and the other end incorporates what one Māori participant called “whānau, hapū, iwi” organisations. Second, all Māori organisations incorporate cultural practices and cultural knowledge. Several other studies have described Māori organisations as groups within the community sector (Statistics New Zealand, 2007, 63; Tennant, 2004), and in each of these, investigators have suggested that more research is needed in this area. While this research contributes to this area, much more research needs to be conducted using Māori-focused methods and measurements. On the other hand, non-Māori organisations are those that may have “cultural awareness”, but not the “cultural proficiency” that Māori organisations do.

Participants described religiously affiliated organisations, like the Family Centre, in a way that suggested these groups have a unique role in the community sector. This unique role, as described in the literature, is that they deliver services and advocate, but they do so in a way that reflects members’ faith (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006; Frumkin, 2002; Lineham, 2004). Most participants in each field suggested that “credibility” can be attached to religious organisations, but a few also suggested that these groups might elicit concerns of “judgement” from those who do not hold similar religious beliefs. These concerns were supported by the literature as well (Frumkin, 2002). On the other hand, participants and scholars generally focused on the contributions of religiously affiliated organisations, which includes the support that they provide through the provision of social services (Cadge & Wuthnow, 2006; Lineham, 2004). Different from religiously affiliated organisations, secular organisations are not affiliated with a religious body, such as a church. They perform a similar role and display similar key characteristics, described above, but they are not associated with a religious group.

Participants described umbrella organisations as those that are able to connect different groups within the community sector and provide support to groups’ advocacy efforts. Umbrella organisations were not mentioned frequently in the literature; however, when they were (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Holland, 2008; Lewis, 2005; O’Brien et al., 2009; Sawer, 1996), researchers supported the aforementioned statements. Both participants and researchers suggested that umbrella organisations save time because
they bring groups together (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Holland, 2008), and increase the success of advocacy because they serve as a “united front” against decision-makers (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009). On the other hand, participants mentioned that a tension existed around the need to have one united voice, which they argued could be difficult in such a diverse sector, whereas the literature did not discuss this tension. For the purposes of this research, the community that umbrella organisations serve is SSCOs, whereas direct service providers, umbrella organisations “opposite”, serve the individuals and families directly through service provision.

Analysis of the results

In this section, participant statements and documentary evidence, described in chapters 5, 6, and 7, and summarised above, are analysed using the NSM-A and some field theory concepts. These statements are separated into two sections. In the first section, the community field is defined, identified as unique, and “entry level” capital is described. In the second section, the different types of SSCOs are identified as subfields of the SSCO field.

Defining the community field

Based on the results of this research and the literature review, it appears that the community sector operates as a field that consists of a network of positions that sit in relation to each other. These positions are determined by the amount of capital that members have, which is affected by how community organisations manage relationships. Groups within the community field struggle to acquire capital and to have their capital recognised as valuable. What is called “entry level” capital in this research is a form of capital that is common across all SSCOs, which reflects the role and key characteristics described above. Therefore, in order to gain entry into the SSCO field, one must acquire this form of capital. The “entry level” capital that all community field participants had was a connection with the community and a service delivery component that was in line with the needs of the community. These forms of capital reflect the instrumental and expressive roles and also highlight a key characteristic of SSCOs, which is a close relationship with the community. The requirement for a service delivery component also reflects the fact that community groups work with complex
issues, another key characteristic of SSCOs, because these services need to be in line with the needs of the community, which are themselves complex. While it does not appear that New Zealand SSCOs must have access to decision-makers and low levels of business philanthropy in order to enter into the SSCO community field, these were, nonetheless, common characteristics of these groups.

It appears that the community field is a unique field, different from others such as the government, for-profit, and other fields. Participants identified two components of the SSCO field that make it unique: tax-exempt status and a “horizontal” structure. Although not a requirement for entry into the SSCO field, tax-exempt status is a key characteristic of community organisations that distinguishes the community sector or community field from other fields, like the government or for-profit sector. Similarly, although the three aforementioned sectors are involved in the provision of services, they do not deliver them in the same way as community organisations do. As noted earlier, participants and writers suggested that community groups provide services in a unique way, which can be linked to their “horizontal” structure.

The community field consists of many subfields

The structure of the community field is such that it can be separated into multiple subfields. Many types of groups and organisations can be described as members of the community field. For example, six different types of SSCOs are identified in this research: Māori, non-Māori, religiously affiliated, secular, umbrella, and direct service organisations. These various groups share the roles and characteristics of the community field described above, such as “entry level” capital; however, they also have their own unique institutional arrangements, sets of beliefs and assumptions, and “legitimate means” of doing things, which suggests the presence of subfields (Grenfell & James, 1998, 20). For example, most, if not all, Māori organisations have “cultural proficiency” that non-Māori groups may not. Umbrella organisations have many networks with multiple groups that most direct service providers do not. Similarly, religiously-affiliated organisations, like the Family Centre, incorporate spirituality into their mission and daily activities, while most secular organisations do not.

Figure 2-3, found on page 42, can be used as a visual representation of some of the possible subfields that are found in the community field. As illustrated in Figure 2-3,
subfields are part of the larger community field, but they also have unique characteristics that separate them from other organisations. Some of these unique characteristics are presented above. The International Classification of Nonprofit Organisations (ICNPO) (Salamon & Anheier, 1996), which is used to identify the subsectors depicted in Figure 2-3, and the United States’ National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (National Center for Charitable Statistics [NCCS], 2005), are commonly used classification systems. Each of these can be used as a starting point to delineate the subfields within the community sector field. However, if this figure more accurately reflected the findings of this research, some of the sub-sectors, or subfields would overlap and there would be more subfields, such as Māori and umbrella organisations.

**Research question 2: How do New Zealand SSCOs advocate?**

The second research question is used as a means to understand how community organisations and, more specifically, social service community organisations (SSCOs) advocate. In order to answer this question, this section is separated into two sections. First, the results are compared to the literature, and similarities and differences between the two are discussed. Second, the results of participant statements and documentary analysis, presented in chapters 5, 6 and 7, are analysed using NSM-A and concepts from field theory.

**How do the results compare with the literature?**

There were similarities and differences between how participants and scholars explained how community groups advocate. In order to understand advocacy in the community sector these similarities and differences are described in five parts. The first section considers who groups advocate for and target in their advocacy activities. The second section outlines what issues community organisations predominantly advocate for. The third section discusses the reasons why community groups advocate. The fourth section discusses how community organisations advocate. The fifth section identifies the factors that affect the type of advocacy strategy a group chooses. Overall,
it appears that a key aspect of advocacy in the SSCO sector is managing multiple relationships, and that the relationship with the community is especially important.

**Whom do community organisations advocate for and who are their targets?**

Both the literature and participants suggested that community organisations advocate for marginalised communities (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Studies that focused on SSCOs, specifically, also supported this finding (Donaldson, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006). For example, in this research on SSCOs, key informants that described the Family Centre noted that they serve those affected by “racism, sexism, heterosexism, and poverty”. Participants describing SSCOs and the Family Centre, and scholars in the literature agreed that community groups target decision-makers, bureaucrats, and the public.

**What do community organisations advocate for?**

Participants often referred to structural problems, such as poverty, living conditions and housing, when they discussed the issues they wanted to highlight through advocacy. According to participants, the Family Centre, in particular, advocates for the eradication of “racism, sexism and poverty” (The Family Centre, 2003b, para. 2), as outlined in Figure 7-1, found on page 172. Studies that asked participants what they advocated for also described “group interests” that included human rights (Schmid et al., 2008), poverty (McCarthy & Walker, 2004), and race and gender issues (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007).

**Why do community organisations advocate?**

Community field participants said that they advocate because they are interested in changing social policy, contributing to “social democracy”, and changing perceptions. They said that they wanted to bring attention to an issue so that “people [could] understand the real effect of what’s happening in people’s lives” and because “food parcels are fine … but at the end of the day you need policy change”. The last comment highlights an unsaid focus of SSCOs, which is acting on the determinants of health. Participants generally felt that structural and societal changes are more effective than focusing on individual lifestyle factors. Previous research supports these findings and
links advocacy to an organisation’s mission (G. D. Bass et al., 2007). In other words, if an SSCO’s mission is to serve children living in poverty, then it will be a priority for them to advocate for those children so that their situation improves; thus fulfilling the organisation’s mission of serving children. The results of this research demonstrate this connection. For example, the Family Centre’s mission is the eradication of “racism, sexism, and poverty” (The Family Centre, 2003b, para. 2). As outlined in Chapters 6 and 7, in order to fulfil this mission, Family Centre employees bring attention to groups experiencing these injustices through advocacy.

**How do community organisations advocate?**

Participants and researchers agreed that most community organisations incorporated a range of strategies into their advocacy activities, such as engaging with decision-makers and working with the media (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Mosley, 2009; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; C. Scott, 2006). More specifically, in the literature, six advocacy strategies were described: engaging with government representatives, or decision-makers and bureaucrats; publishing research; working with the media; protesting; developing coalitions; and public education. Participants only discussed four of these strategies directly: engaging with government representatives, publishing research, working with the media, and protesting. In addition, participants also described activities that involved developing coalitions and carrying out public education, but they did not use these terms. One participant described how groups may work together through adopting different approaches. For example, some may “stroke” decision-makers and create change from the “inside”, whereas others may “poke” decision-makers from the “outside” and put pressure on them to create change.

**Engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats**

Engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats was the most commonly discussed strategy amongst participants and researchers in the literature [i.e. (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Mosley, 2009; Reid, 1999; W. R. Scott et al., 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993)]. This was the preferred strategy for Family Centre staff because, as one internal participant stated, they wanted to be more than “social justice heroes always on
the periphery” and engaging with government representatives can be effective. Participants and writers in the literature found this approach to be successful because they could give their message directly to decision-makers without it being altered. Research and community field participants would engage with decision-makers through submissions and reference groups, which was common in the literature as well (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Nownes & Freeman, 1998). In addition, participants suggested that because the population is small, this strategy is very common in New Zealand, a view which is supported by the New Zealand literature (Milligan et al., 2008; O’Brien et al., 2009). However, as discussed below, this relationship could also be problematic.

**Conducting research**

Almost every community field participant, including members of the Family Centre, and *every* research field participant, suggested that disseminating research to government representatives and the public was a primary way they advocate. On the other hand, a few participants and researchers identified barriers to using research for advocacy (Fox, 2001; Gormley & Cymrot, 2006), specifically a lack of adequate resources that they felt are required to conduct research. Nevertheless, almost every policy field participant valued this form of advocacy because it allowed them to see if an issue was “systemic”. Other studies also found research to be common amongst SSCOs (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Schmid et al., 2008; W. R. Scott et al., 2006) and highly effective, in general (Berry & Arons, 2003). Still, as illustrated by the Family Centre’s challenges in getting the government to acknowledge their work on the New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP) (Stephens et al., 1995) in the 1990s, it appears that research is not enough to change advocacy. Instead, networks with decision-makers may also be important. This finding is discussed in more detail below.

Two types of research were described in the literature: research that informs government representatives (Black, 2001; Crewe & Young, 2002; Fafard, 2008; Nutley et al., 2007) and research that informs advocacy (B. A. Israel, Eugenia Eng, A. J. Schulz, & E. A. Parker, 2005; M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein, 2003). Participants did not distinguish between the two types but described them, and most focused on informing government representatives. For example, a few participants gathered data on the
community and published it to demonstrate the needs of their community. In addition, the Family Centre’s work on the NZPMP (Stephens et al., 1995), the New Zealand Index of Socioeconomic Deprivation for individuals (NZiDep) (Salmond et al., 2006), and the cultural audit of the Lottery Grants Board (Tamasese et al., 2000) is used to inform government representatives. A few community field participants also describe gathering data to inform advocacy. One participant gathered data on the public in order to understand how to direct their advocacy activities. Other participants talked about “action-reflection type research” and using research to understand “community driven solutions”. For example, the Family Centre’s work on Ole Taeao Afua (Tamasese et al., 2005) is used to inform advocacy. In addition, their work on the Pacific perspectives of cultural obligations (Tamasese & Parsons, 2006) and Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society (EWAS) (Koopman-Boyden & Waldegrave, 2009) can fit into both categories. The Family Centre uses both projects to inform government representatives interested in creating social policy that reflects the needs of Pacific peoples or older groups, and to inform advocacy by letting groups know the needs of the community.

**Working with the media**

Similar to scholars, community and research field participants suggested that working with media can be an effective (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; Wallack & Dorfman, 1996) but challenging (Danielian & Page, 1994; J. C. Jenkins, 2006). For example, one community field participant stated that “politics is about a popular vote, so media strategies work”; whereas others said that the media “loves conflict” which made it difficult for groups to get their message out to the public. Statements by members of the Family Centre suggest that this could be a reason for the Family Centre using the media less frequently after 1999, when a government was formed that had similar views on issues of social and economic justice. One participant internal to the Family Centre noted that when he wanted to use the media to make positive statements about a government policy it was more difficult. When participants used the media, they usually discussed sending out press releases through CommVoices, an organisation that manages media work for a group of community groups, and speaking directly to media outlets, such as newspapers and the radio.
Although many participants were aware of groups like CommVoices, not all of them engaged in media strategies and it appears that engaging with government representatives and conducting research were more preferred. Other studies that focused on SSCOs supported this finding (Donaldson, 2007; Schmid et al., 2008). Although this was not discussed in the literature, in addition to the reasons described above, the preference to engage with government representatives and conduct research could be because of the way media strategies can negatively affect the relationship with government. Some community field participants described feeling pressured by government to speak with them before going to the media. Indeed, when asked about the media, a policy field participant supported this finding and said he asked groups to speak with him first, before speaking to the media.

**Protests and sit-ins**

Similar to the findings in the literature, although participants in all fields mentioned protests, they were discussed less frequently (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Nownes & Freeman, 1998). Studies on SSCOs, in particular, found that protesting was rarely used (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008). In the interviews, when participants mentioned protesting, it was in relation to bringing attention to an issue, especially when groups were trying to get an issue on the policy agenda. For example, the Family Centre protested to get housing policies changed, which was eventually successful when the Labour Party formed a government in 1999. The protest that was mentioned the most by participants was the Hikoi of Hope, which the Family Centre was deeply involved with.

The majority of participants discussed protesting and sit-ins as a strategy that has been successfully utilised by Māori groups. For example, a community field participant pointed out the Māori Party, the Waitangi Tribunal and greater involvement in government policy came out of Māori Land Marches, hikoi and sit-ins. This link between Māori and protests can also be found in the literature (Tennant et al., 2008; R. Walker, 2004).

**Developing coalitions**
One of the most common advocacy strategies described in the literature was developing coalitions [i.e. (Hudson, 2002; Mosley, 2009; Rees, 1999; Schmid et al., 2008)]. As discussed in the literature, these strategies appeared to help with limited resources and increasing the effectiveness of advocacy efforts (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Hudson, 2002). Although participants did not use the term “developing coalitions”, research and community field participants often mentioned working with other community organisations, especially through umbrella groups. For example, CommVoices, defined earlier, could be identified as a coalition to the extent that it involves groups coming together and sending out press releases on issues that they find important. In addition, although participants were not asked directly about this strategy, many participants linked the Family Centre with Māori and Pacific groups that most Pākehā groups did not have access to, and these linkages can be described as a coalition as well.

**Public education**

Another strategy that was mentioned in the literature [i.e. (Kerlin & Reid, 2009; Rees, 1999)] is public education; however, compared to engaging with government representatives, researchers suggested that this strategy is used less frequently (Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008). Participants did not use the term “public education”, but they did state that SSCOs target the public in their advocacy activities. In the literature, it was noted these strategies were useful for *shaping* public opinion (Rees, 1999) and participants did use the media to influence government representatives and the public, which, according to some scholars, can be used to “shape” (Wallack & Dorfman, 1996), or inform the public. Therefore, it appears that New Zealand SSCOs participate in public education through media campaigns, but they may not describe these activities as such and they may not use these strategies as frequently as other tactics, such as engaging with government representatives.

**Factors that affect the type of advocacy groups undertake**

In the literature, researchers often described groups’ advocacy tactics in terms of “inside” and “outside” tactics (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; Mosley, 2009; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; J. Walker, 1991). Walker describes “inside” strategies as those which
are based on “close consultation with political and administrative leaders” (J. Walker, 1991, 9), and can include engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats. In contrast, “outside” strategies are based on “appeals to the public through the mass media” (J. Walker, 1991, 9), and include protesting and media strategies. Scholars argued that although most organisations used “inside” tactics (Nownes & Freeman, 1998), four factors, in particular, affected how an organisation chose its advocacy strategies: government funding (Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009), the political environment (Gormley & Cymrot, 2006; J. Walker, 1991), organisational capacity (Mosley, 2009; J. Walker, 1991), and tax-exempt elector status (Berry, 2005). Participants also suggested that the target of advocacy campaigns could affect what strategy was chosen.

As discussed above, based on participant statements, a group’s position in the field, which is determined by their issue of concern and resource-level, appears to influence its strategy choice. This finding provides support for the studies that argued government funding, the political environment, and organisational capacity are influential factors. As discussed in detail below, government funding may lead to an increase in resources but a decrease in more “aggressive” forms of advocacy, such as lobbying (Nicholson-Crotty, 2009); i.e. advocacy directed at influencing legislation (Vernick, 1999), and the centrality of advocacy in an organisation (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007). This decrease appears to be linked with the position of a group to government, which becomes closer as government funding increases. Studies that measured the political environment were mixed. To their surprise, Gormley and Cymrot (2006) found that groups whose issues did not correspond with those on the policy agenda, or as they described it, groups that had more “enemies” in the political environment, both inside and outside the centres of power, were more likely to use “inside” strategies; whereas Walker (1991) found the opposite to be true. On the other hand, Gormley and Cymrot (2006) did not measure the degree of closeness. Overall, participants, including members of the Family Centre, were more likely to engage in close consultation with decision-makers and bureaucrats when the political environment was in their favour, which appears to support Walker’s (1991) findings.
Both studies mentioned in the literature review that measured organisational capacity found that those with more resources were more likely to incorporate “inside” strategies (Mosley, 2009; J. Walker, 1991), and this finding is generally supported by participant statements. Although a few participants said that the larger groups with more resources were less likely to advocate, participants in every field suggested that those who managed their resources for advocacy, i.e. they met more frequently with decision-makers and bureaucrats, were often from groups that were larger and had a more stable resource capacity.

A few dissimilarities existed between findings in the literature and participant statements. First, participants did not discuss tax-exempt elector status because this is not available in New Zealand. Second, a few community field participants suggested that the target of advocacy campaigns could affect which strategies community groups chose, a factor that was not measured in the studies discussed in Chapter 3. For example, participants who wanted to affect policy were more likely to meet with decision-makers and bureaucrats, whereas those interested in influencing the public found it more effective to use media strategies. Of course, although participants stated that they used the media to affect government representatives as well, as previously mentioned, they said it was more effective to go straight to decision-makers when working to influence policy.

Analysis of the results

As described above, the community field is an arena of conflict and struggle. Using field theory to describe advocacy in the community sector is useful because advocacy makes this struggle visible. For example, through advocacy, community organisations struggle to influence a field, such as the social policy field, in order to get their capital recognised, and that may put them in conflict with other groups in that field, like decision-makers. In order to analyse how community organisations advocate, the nature of advocacy is discussed in four sections, which reflect the “who”, “what”, “why” and “how” of advocacy in SSCOs and how they choose their strategy. First, based on an analysis of participant comments, this section discusses the expressive and instrumental goals. Second, the multiple groups that community organisations target when advocating is discussed, using the Family Centre as an example. Third, the way
in which actors are constituted by the fields they challenge is analysed, as are the effects of this relationship. Fourth, how participants choose their advocacy strategy is discussed.

**Expressive and instrumental goals**

The expressive and instrumental goals reflect who community organisations target in their advocacy campaigns and why they advocate. First, according to Armstrong and Bernstein (2008), instrumental goals are aimed at changing policy while expressive goals are linked with “symbolic” or “cultural” change in society. Participants said that they target decision-makers and bureaucrats, which suggests that they have instrumental goals, and they target the public, which can be identified as an expressive goal. For example, community field participants said that it is important to “speak into different contexts” because “it’s not just about targeting politicians” and “it’s not enough to operate in one sphere”. Although policy change is a goal, it is not the only goal of SSCOs. Second, when community participants described their advocacy activities, they mentioned reasons why they advocate. Community and research field participants said that they wanted to change policy, which is an instrumental goal. However, most of the time participants said they were interested in “social democracy”, “making things better for the community”, and changing “perceptions”. All of these are more in line with expressive goals, which are applied to efforts aimed at cultural and societal change.

**Participants took a multi-institutional approach**

Based on the findings, it appears that participants took a multi-institutional approach, which reflects what SSCOs in New Zealand advocate for and how these groups advocate. First, community field participants noted that they advocate for improving the conditions of groups experiencing complex challenges, such as poverty. When applying the findings of Armstrong and Bernstein (2008), these comments suggest that community groups must target multiple institutions because the perception of issues like poverty and racism exist in multiple “meaning-systems” (R. H. Williams, 2004). Indeed, participants often did advocate in what Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) describe as multiple institutions. Second, a “multiple institutions” approach describes how SSCOs in New Zealand advocate. For example, as mentioned above, most
organisations in this research and other investigations (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; Mosley, 2009; Nownes & Freeman, 1998; C. Scott, 2006) incorporate multiple strategies into their repertoire. A community field participant argued that community organisations deal with complex issues ... [therefore] the way to address [these issues] is similarly complex”.

The results of the embedded case study of the Family Centre provide the best summary of both these points. As illustrated in Figure 7-1, found on page 172, the Family Centre influenced four fields, or institutions: therapy, community development, research, and social policy. It operated in multiple institutions because it was influencing how three complex issues are perceived, namely culture, poverty and gender. Family Centre employees appeared to manage relationships so they could influence the “meaning-systems” that are attached to each of these three issues. Based on its actions, the Family Centre was, on some level, aware of the need to operate in multiple institutions in order to affect how these issues were perceived. For example, employees understand that racism will not end by changing the law because it operates at a deeper level that requires the transformation of multiple institutions.

**Actors are constituted, in part, by the field(s) they challenge**

The characteristics of the actors, or individuals and organisations involved in advocacy, are a reflection of how community groups advocate. Based on participant statements, community field participants were members of the fields that they were seeking to influence, which Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) argue is often how change is created. Groups would not have been able to use some of the strategies described above, such as engaging with government representatives and conducting research, if they were not members of these fields. Although community groups are clearly not policy-makers and some that conduct research do not have employees with a PhD or other research-oriented degree, they are still members of social policy and research fields. The groups that frequently engaged with government representatives were those that had credibility with them. In addition, those that produced research that was considered effective had developed a positive reputation as producers of research. The Family Centre provides a nice example of both of these instances. According to participants, many of the Family Centre employees have credibility with government
representatives, especially the previous Labour-led Government, and although not all of the employees hold research degrees, they are respected in research communities.

Gaining membership in the fields that community groups challenge not only gives them access to their targets, but this relationship allows them to better understand the groups they are targeting. Advocates can use this knowledge to advocate more effectively. An example of this is found below in the discussion on bureaucratic knowledge.

**Position in the field affects position taking in advocacy**

Based on the results of this study, a SSCOs position in the SSCO field will have an effect on their position taking, or how they choose their advocacy strategy. For example, groups in dominant positions (described below) held a large amount of capital and were more likely to consult with government representatives on reference groups and in private meetings. Although all participants said that they engaged with decision-makers and bureaucrats, not every participant consulted closely with them. The Family Centre's movement into the maturity stage following the formation of a Labour-led Government after the 1999 election demonstrates this trend. Organisations that were in more subordinate positions were not invited to participate in close consultation with government representatives; therefore, they were more likely to participate in protests and media campaigns.

Another example of how position affects position taking is provided by the Family Centre’s experience in the therapy field. As described in Chapter 7, Family Centre employees advocate for a socially just approach to therapy. The Family Centre currently occupies a dominant position in this field, as demonstrated by their awards and recognition mentioned in Chapter 7. However, before it occupied this position, the Family Centre frequently worked with families and published many journal articles to bring attention to their approach. Once it moved into a more dominant position, its strategies changed. More recently, it has not published as many therapy-related articles because many groups in the therapy field are already aware of its ideas, nor has it conducted therapy with as many families. Instead, it has focused on educating and training groups interested in their approach.
Research question 3: How do SSCO\text{s} in New Zealand advocate effectively?

In order to describe how SSCO\text{s} in New Zealand advocate effectively, this section is separated into two parts. First, the literature and results are compared. The different factors that affect advocacy efforts are summarised. Second, the results are analysed. Overall, it appears that specific forms of capital, which are directly linked to the factors that have an effect on advocacy efforts, influence the effectiveness of SSCO advocacy. Relationships are discussed in detail later, but the next two sub-sections below begin to outline the effects of managing relationships effectively.

How do the results compare with the literature?

This section compares the results in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 with findings in the literature review, discussed in Chapter 3. Participant statements and scholars’ findings are analysed together to understand the factors that can have an effect on the advocacy activities of community organisations. This analysis is separated into two sub-sections. First, the studies that analysed how resources and organisational capacity are linked to advocacy are compared to what participants said about the effect of resources, size of an organisation, and leadership. Second, the findings in the literature on the effects of the policy and political environment are compared with participant statements on credibility. Government funding and tax-exempt status also influence the effectiveness of advocacy, but they are discussed in the next section because the relationship with government is addressed.

Resources and organisational capacity

Based on researchers’ findings and participant statements, it appears that resource-levels usually increase the involvement of groups in advocacy activities, but effectiveness is associated with how resources and relationships are managed. In the literature, resources and organisational capacity are the most discussed factors that can influence the effectiveness of a group’s advocacy activities [i.e. (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Donaldson, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Schmid et al., 2008)]. Resource-levels are generally associated with an increase in advocacy activities. Participants who discussed the effects of resources on advocacy generally supported these findings.
However, the relationship between size and advocacy is complex, and this is discussed next.

As suggested by previous studies (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003), when resource-levels, as measured by staff size, are deconstructed, advocacy is not positively correlated with the resources themselves, but with how they are managed. This means that larger organisations with more resources are more likely to advocate only if they direct resources towards advocacy activities, such as research or establishing a relationship with decision-makers and bureaucrats. Participant statements also reveal the mixed effects of size. Although they stated that larger organisations have access to more resources, participants suggested that bureaucracy could have a negative effect on advocacy. Community field participants argued that large organisations generally have more levels of bureaucracy, which made it difficult to advocate based on the community’s immediate needs.

Similar to Berry and Arons (2003) and Bass et al. (2007), community field participants mentioned the importance of prioritising advocacy. In addition, they connected leadership to an increase in advocacy. Groups, like the Family Centre, with “stickability” and “perseverance”, had leaders who gave precedence to advocacy. Overall, participant statements suggest that resource-levels are important, but in order to advocate effectively there must be a close connection with the community and a strong leader that prioritises advocacy. These findings are supported by the literature (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Donaldson, 2007; Kerlin & Reid, 2009).

Networks were identified as very important to researchers (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Hudson, 2002; Rees, 1999) and to participants in each field, because they could greatly increase effectiveness. Strong networks with the community, other community organisations, and government representatives, in particular, were often linked to successful advocacy. Participants suggested that it was important to cultivate networks with all of these groups and the studies cited above [i.e. (Hudson, 2002; Rees, 1999)] support these suggestions. Therefore, it appears that groups should spend time fostering networks to increase the effectiveness of their advocacy activities. The relationship between community organisations and other groups, including decision-makers and other SSCOs, is discussed in more detail below.
Policy and political environment

The political environment can influence the effectiveness of a group’s advocacy activities. A few scholars suggested that when the political environment is antagonistic, which can be caused by government policies or regulations, community organisations are more likely to advocate (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007). Participants did not discuss the political environment per se, but they did describe how organisations acquire credibility, which can be linked to the political environment because it has an effect on which organisations have credibility with government. According to the results of this research, community organisations that are perceived as credible by decision-makers are more likely to have an opportunity to engage directly with decision-makers and influence policy. This link is illustrated in depth by the Family Centre’s experience. As discussed throughout Chapters 6 and 7, once the political environment was more amenable to their views, Family Centre employees were invited to consult more frequently with government representatives and were therefore able to influence social policy more directly.

Although participants did not link credibility to an increase in advocacy activities, they did link it with effectiveness. In addition, participants in every field suggested that community groups gain credibility when they produce good work and have strong networks, especially with decision-makers and bureaucrats. One policy field participant explained the effect of position and networks, which are influenced by the political environment:

Credibility comes in different ways, and the more dispossessed and vulnerable, and radical people are, the more difficult it is to have that kind of influence. So it depends where you’re placed, what access to power and privilege you have, and what access to money you have.

According to this participant, community organisations that are perceived as “radical” by decision-makers are less likely to be effective. Overall, it appears that feeling threatened in the political environment may lead to an increase in advocacy activities (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Nicholson-Crotty, 2007), but it may not lead to an increase in credibility or effectiveness.
Analysis of the results

Based on the results, it appears that groups which are members of multiple institutions and are in dominant positions, defined as those which focus on issues in the policy or public agenda and have a stable resource-level, are more likely to be successful. Successful groups hold symbolic capital and are able to manage relationships with the community, decision-makers, funders, and other community groups effectively. As discussed in Chapter 5, participants in each field usually defined success, or effectiveness, as getting an issue on the policy agenda. Participants in the community and research field expanded on this statement. These participants suggested that another measure of success is achieving collaborative participation in the policy process before a policy is passed, such as consultation on reference groups. Community field participants also described success as influencing public opinion, which was less discussed by policy field participants.

According to field theory, in order to achieve any definition of success, organisations must have capital, which will then place them in a dominant position within their own primary field (Bourdieu, 2005b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). After analysing the results, four forms of capital were identified in the interviews: economic capital, cultural capital, social capital, and symbolic capital. The analysis below is separated into five sections. The first section discusses the dominant and subordinate positions in the SSCO field, and the remaining four sections identify and discuss the forms of capital mentioned above, as they relate to SSCOs in New Zealand.

Dominant and subordinate positions

Based on the results of this study it appears that a community organisation’s effectiveness is directly connected to its position of influence in the SSCO field, and this position is directly connected with organisational capacity and the political environment, as described above. Based on participant statements and documentary analysis, it appears that the organisations in dominant positions are those that have symbolic capital, evidenced by credibility, stable resource-levels and a mission that is ideologically aligned with the policy or public agenda. Symbolic capital is defined below, but how symbolic capital is manifested in the SSCO field is discussed here. In this case, the policy agenda includes issues that decision-makers are discussing and the public
agenda includes issues that are important to the public. Examples of dominant organisations that were frequently mentioned by participants include the Salvation Army, Barnardos, New Zealand Council of Social Services (NZCOSS), and the New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations (NZFVWO). At the time of the interviews, each of these organisations had a stable resource-level, relative to other community organisations, and was addressing issues on the policy or public agenda. Groups can work to get an issue on the policy or public agenda but, as described in the Family Centre’s story, this can take time.

The position of dominant and subordinate organisations is illustrated by the story of the Family Centre, described in Chapter 6, because the organisation has been in both positions. When the Family Centre was established, and until it began its work on the New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP) (Stephens et al., 1995) in the early 1990s, it was in more of a subordinate position. Although it was addressing issues that were important to the local community, such as working with “street kids”, these issues were not receiving longstanding attention in the media or by decision-makers. At this time, the Family Centre had not established strong relationships with the media or decision-makers. Participants noted that at this time, decision-makers were not discussing poverty in public forums. Family Centre staff had a difficult time gaining access to decision-makers, which made getting their issues on the policy agenda difficult. Also at this time, internal participants noted the Family Centre’s financial struggles.

After the launch of the NZPMP in 1992, the Family Centre began to gain recognition through the media [i.e. (Morrison, 1992 March 13; Post, 1992 November 26)] and its resource-levels increased due to research grants. Family Centre staff were increasingly viewed as experts in their respective fields. These steps initiated its move away from a subordinate position, but it was not until 1999, when the Labour-led Government was formed, that the Family Centre moved into a dominant position within the SSCO field. At this time, the Family Centre had acquired a stable resource-level through the establishment of its Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU) and an increase in research grants and contracts. In addition, because Family Centre employees were more ideologically aligned with the Labour-led government, it was better able to get their
issues on the policy agenda, which increased its political saliency. By the 2000s, the Family Centre had established itself as an organisation that had powerful relationships with government representatives, the community, the media, funders, and other community groups. Overall, three characteristics appear to be linked with organisations in dominant positions: credibility, a stable resource-level and a mission that corresponds with the policy or public agenda.

**Social capital**

Compared to cultural and economic capital, social capital, or acquaintances and networks (Swartz, 1997, 74), appears to be the most important form of capital for SSCOs. Social capital reflects an aspect of organisational capacity described above, more specifically, the capacity for an organisation to develop networks. Participants described relationships with the community, other community organisations, and decision-makers as important predictors of success. Participants in every field stated that it is important for community organisations to be perceived as legitimate and credible, and each of these descriptors was often linked to a relationship with the community. For example, the Family Centre was described as adept at forming networks, especially with Māori and Pacific communities. One external participant that worked in the community field noted the Family Centre’s range of networks: “They know impoverished families and they know the Mayor, and it’s quite difficult to get that breadth”. Overall, based on the results of this study, it appears that relationships, especially with the community, have a major influence on the success of an organisation. These relationships are described in more detail in a section below.

**Cultural capital**

Participants described characteristics and qualifications that exist within a successful organisation, which in this research is identified as cultural capital, or cultural goods and services (Swartz, 1997, 74). This form of capital reflects another form of organisational capacity described above, leadership. Strong communication skills, flexibility, experience, an ability to manage multiple stakeholders, and knowledge of funding opportunities were described as characteristics of employees at a successful organisation. Participants suggested that a good leader was one that had these skills
and was able to use them to develop relationships and guide the organisation in a way that supported the mission. These skills and qualifications were found in the Family Centre. For example, Family Centre staff had earned multiple credentials from recognised institutions, such as university degrees. Family Centre employees were also recognised leaders in their communities, and they were described as strong communicators that worked collaboratively and strategically.

**Economic capital**

A majority of participants in every field also linked resource-level, or economic capital (Swartz, 1997, 74), with success. Economic capital is very clearly connected to the availability of resources, as discussed above. Participants suggested that community organisations with a sufficient amount of resource have more freedom and can therefore advocate on any issue that is important to them. For example, if an SSCO with a high resource-level felt contained by regulations associated with government contracts, they could discontinue that contract and advocate more freely. Although the majority of participants stated that access to resources led to more autonomy to advocate, a few community field participants argued that “advocacy does not need money” and, as previously mentioned, larger organisations with more resources do not advocate as frequently as smaller ones.

**Symbolic capital**

Symbolic capital, or legitimised capital (Swartz, 1997, 74), was identified in participants’ description of the Family Centre. Multiple participants suggested that Family Centre staff had “credibility”, a “reputation”, or that it had “developed a niche” within the therapeutic community. That is to say, symbolic capital appears to be linked with the discussion above on credibility and the political environment. Family Centre staff received prestigious awards, such as the Queen’s Service Order (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 1981) and the American Family Therapy Academy (AFTA) award (The Family Centre, 2007). These statements and awards indicate that the Family Centre, as an organisation, has symbolic capital. Their symbolic capital comes from a combination of the Family Centre’s skills, qualifications and networks with the community and government representatives. Together, these forms of capital were
used by Family Centre employees to give them “stickability” or “staying power”. For example, one community field participant suggested that specific Family Centre staff became the “go to” people for discussing cultural or poverty-related issues. Other participants in each field supported this statement, especially when issues of culture were discussed.

**Formula for symbolic capital**

As indicated above, the four forms of capital are connected in many ways. The findings from this research indicate that symbolic capital may be formed through a formula illustrated below. According to these statements, when participants spoke about attributes classified as symbolic capital, they always spoke of elements linked to social and cultural capital as well. In addition, although participants did not mention a form of economic capital when they discussed groups with “credibility”, acquiring social and cultural capital may necessitate money. For example, developing networks with decision-makers requires that groups be in a certain position within the community, a position that groups living in poverty would probably not be in. To put it another way:

*Symbolic capital = social capital + cultural capital + economic capital*

Some participants’ descriptions of the Family Centre explain the combination of cultural and social capital well. A policy field participant that is external to the Family Centre made the first statement below and the second statement, is made by a former Family Centre employee.

They are perceived to be a strong organisation. They’re strong because of their leadership and their evidence base, and they’re well networked into government, across government agencies and the NGO sector.

The combination of their skills, their ability to think and act strategically, their ability to engage with the intellectual and research end as well as the community speaks [to] kind of, a wide spectrum that they can pull together to bring about influence.

This combination was repeated by many participants when asked why the Family Centre was successful. Again, the first statement alludes to the political environment.
According to this participant, one of the reasons the Family Centre is “strong” relates to its networks into government, which, as previously discussed, are dependent on whether its mission aligns with government policy and their resource-level. In addition, both statements refer to the credibility that the Family Centre had acquired in their respective fields.

**Bureaucratic knowledge**

Bureaucratic knowledge is a form of symbolic capital associated with the policy field, which Bourdieu described as a “strength” that allows its holder to “bend the rules” (Bourdieu, 2005b, 118). Groups that develop relationships with decision-makers, a form of social capital that is described in the sub-section on organisational capacity, can acquire bureaucratic knowledge because they are able to adopt the culture of the policy field. Participants in all fields suggested that members of the Family Centre understood how government operated, which implies that the organisation had bureaucratic knowledge. Family Centre staff also made statements to this effect. For example, employees stated that the “pace of government is very slow” and policy is a “compromise”. Family Centre leaders used this knowledge to influence social policy, in two ways. First, Family Centre employees were able to “speak the language” of decision-makers. Second, members of the organisation knew when to use the media.

First, participants suggested that Family Centre staff presented data in a way that allowed government representatives to better understand how an issue was affecting the larger population. For example, staff used quantitative data in their analyses, and as an external participant argued, “the way that social policy is run in New Zealand, that’s very important”. In addition, another external participant that worked in government stated that the Family Centre’s research had been useful to him because it gave him insight into how “systemic” a problem was. Community field participants also suggested that Family Centre staff used language to frame an issue in a way that would encourage policymakers to listen. For example, because the poverty research included an individual familiar with the economic field, the researchers were able to frame poverty *not* as a social problem but as an economic problem, and external participants suggested that policymakers began to react to this reframing.
Second, Family Centre staff would often provide data to the government before going to the media, and this was valued by government workers. For example, an external participant that worked in government stated that they valued this approach because if they had advanced knowledge of an issue, then they could be “given the opportunity to fix it”. In addition, a few community field participants said their government contracts stipulated that they bring information to the government before bringing it to the media.

**Research question 4: How can relationships be managed to facilitate effective advocacy?**

This section is an extension of the previous analysis. Understanding how relationships are managed to facilitate advocacy highlights a broad approach that community organisations can take to increase the effectiveness of their advocacy activities. In the same format as above, this section is separated into two parts. First, the results and the literature are compared in order to find similarities and differences. Second, the results are analysed using the NSM-A and field theory concepts. As scholars in the literature did not appear to describe how SSCOs manage relationships, this discussion takes place with reference to information from participants and documentary analysis in the second section’s sub-section, entitled analysis of results.

**How do the results compare with the literature?**

According to findings described in the literature and participant statements, four relationships can affect the advocacy activities of community organisations, namely relationships with the community, other community organisations, the media, and the government. Although these relationships are mentioned above, each is briefly described below in reference to how the relationship can influence a group’s success in their advocacy endeavours. Participants also commented on each of these relationships. Similarities and differences between participants’ statements and researchers’ findings are discussed below.

**Relationship with the community**

As previously mentioned, the relationship with the community has been described as a key characteristic of community organisations [i.e. (Berger & Neuhaus,
1996; Couto & Guthrie, 1999; Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Similar to the literature, participants in every field stated that the relationship with the community defines the community sector. According to scholars in the literature, the relationship with the community affects groups in two ways. First, it legitimates community organisations (Berry, 2005; Frumkin, 2002; J. C. Jenkins, 2006; Reid, 2000); second, it determines which issues community groups will focus on in their advocacy efforts (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; McCarthy & Walker, 2004; Schmid et al., 2008). Participants in every field echoed these findings and suggested that the relationship with the community is the most important relationship to foster in order to be successful.

**Relationship with the government**

The relationship with government affects the community sector in two major ways: tax-exempt registration (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003) and government contracts (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Mosley, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009). Each of these can restrain advocacy, more specifically forceful forms of advocacy (Nicholson-Crotty, 2009), and this possible limitation is discussed below. Scholars in the literature [i.e. (Boris & Steuerle, 1999; Frumkin, 2002; Najam, 2000; Salamon & Anheier, 1998; S. R. Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; D. R. Young, 1999)] and participants frequently mentioned the community sector’s relationship with government.

This relationship was described as “tense” by many community and research field participants, which is why determining the appropriate level of closeness with government was difficult for most of them. This tension was acknowledged in the literature as well (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003). One community field participant described this tension well:

> There’s always the potential for co-option when you’re dealing with the state. You get invited into the corridors of power, and implicit in that are that you’ve got to behave, and implicit in that is that you have to side with the powerful, and ask meekly on behalf of the powerless. And that is a really big tension in NGO work, how do you manage that tension?

Along with a lack of resources, managing this tension was the most discussed challenge to advocacy that participants in the community field mentioned. A few
community and research field participants postulated why tension existed between community organisations and government. They generally agreed that it is because each of these sectors have different roles, and do not understand each other. To put it another way, using field theory terms, both groups operate in different fields, have a different habitus, and value different forms of capital. On the other hand, as described throughout this thesis, community organisations can influence policy. In other sections throughout this chapter, it has been shown that the groups that are effective in this way, like the Family Centre, are successful because they acquire capital that is valued by government and they are allowed to enter into the policy field, which gives them bureaucratic knowledge. These skills can then be transferred into successful advocacy.

**Government funding**

Government funding is especially important to consider in research on SSCOs because, more so than any other type of community group in the United States (Berry & Arons, 2003, 9; Weitzman et al., 2002, 170) and New Zealand (Department of Internal Affairs, 2007, 17), government contracts make up a bulk of a SSCO’s revenue. Similar to resources, the effect of government contracts on advocacy activities is multi-dimensional. Many recent studies found that an increase in government contracts led to an increase in advocacy activities (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Mosley, 2009). However, when some of these findings are investigated further, it appears that groups receiving government funding are less likely to engage in aggressive advocacy activities (Nicholson-Crotty, 2009) or prioritise advocacy (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007).

Most of the community field participants who were interviewed, including Family Centre employees, accepted government contracts and continued to advocate; however, they also felt restrained in their advocacy, which supports the aforementioned findings in the literature. These participants generally felt that they could not advocate directly against government policy. In addition, when participants were asked if government contracts should be used to fund advocacy, community and research field participants said that it should. For example, one community field participant pointed out that “advocacy is a legitimate role of civil society and funding it is really just a recognition that wealthy groups already have access to power and marginalised groups
have less”. The views of policy field participants were more mixed; some supported funding advocacy while others did not.

**Tax-exempt status**

According to findings described in the literature, tax-exempt, or charitable, status can also limit the advocacy activities of community organisations (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Child & Grønbjerg, 2007), which silences the marginalised groups in society. Although participants did not discuss tax-exempt status as frequently as government contracts, similar to findings in the literature, community field participants said they felt restrained in their advocacy activities because losing their tax-exempt status could harm the organisation. One participant described how placing limitations on tax-exempt organisations exacerbates inequities: “It doesn’t shut up private lobby groups … it shuts up grassroots community type groups that are running on a shoe-string anyway”. This sentiment was echoed by others in the literature (Berry, 2005; Berry & Arons, 2003). On the other hand, all of the SSCOs that were interviewed engaged in some form of advocacy and almost every single one was a registered charity, including the Family Centre. Overall, it appears that, similar to government contracts, tax-exempt status may not reduce advocacy overall, but it may reduce more forceful types of advocacy, such as advocating directly against a specific social policy.

**Relationship with other community organisations**

According to findings described in the literature, developing relationships with other community organisations allows groups to share resources, share knowledge, and increase the effectiveness of their advocacy activities (Balassiano & Chandler, 2009; G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Hudson, 2002; Rees, 1999). Only community and research field participants discussed this relationship, which may indicate policy field participants’ lack of knowledge; nevertheless, those that did supported these findings. For example, community field participants stated that groups could “pool their resources” and come together as a “united front” when they were advocating for similar issues. In addition, community field participants also suggested that it could be effective for groups to be “inventive” with their networks and seek out relationships with other groups outside of their common alliances.
Relationship with the media

According to results discussed in the literature, the relationship with the media can be useful (Andrews & Edwards, 2004; Wallack & Dorfman, 1996) but challenging (Barker-Plummer, 2002; Danielian & Page, 1994; J. C. Jenkins, 2006). For example, as previously mentioned, a community field participant that is employed by the Family Centre and has experience working with the media, suggested that media strategies can be effective, but that the media “loves conflict”, which can make this tactic challenging to use. Other community field participants echoed this sentiment.

Unlike scholars in the literature, participants discussed how using media strategies could influence the relationship with government. Community field participants said that government representatives preferred, and in some cases required, that community groups speak to them before going to the media. This often put groups in a difficult position, yet the majority, including Family Centre staff, abided by this preference. Those that chose to go to the media first were not reliant solely on government contracts as their source of revenue, which may have made them more comfortable with speaking to the media. However, some of these participants said it was difficult to meet with government representatives afterwards. Overall, participants did not say whether or not going to the media before the government was more effective, however they usually chose to speak with the government first.

Analysis of the results

In this section, the four relationships described above are analysed using the NSM-A and field theory concepts. Based on the results, it appears that each of these four relationships influences the effectiveness of an SSCO’s advocacy activities. Although scholars in the literature discussed these relationships, how community groups manage these relationships was not discussed, much less how to manage them in order to advocate more effectively. The next section is separated into two sub-sections. First, there is an analysis of where the SSCO sector sits in relation to the field of power, which is directly linked to the relationship with government. Second, the ways that SSCOs, specifically the Family Centre, manage relationships and do so in a way that increases their success, is discussed.
The SSCO field in relation to the broader field of power

The position of the community field in relation to the broader field of power appears to be directly linked with the community-government relationship. The field of power is the broader field that affects the field of practice (the community field) through determining “the relative value of different kinds of capital” (Peillon, 1998). Based on the literature review and participant statements, it appears that the government dominates the “field of power”. This is concluded because, especially over the past 30 years, the government has affected the “value of different kinds of capital” in the community field through government contracts (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993) and registration status (Berry & Arons, 2003). For example, groups that hold government contracts often feel they have to become more “professionalised” (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993, 103). Participants echoed these sentiments. For example, one community field participant said there is a push to become “like government agencies”.

Since the 1980s, it appears that community organisations have begun to move closer to the field of power. This move is evidenced by two trends. First, as discussed by participants and scholars (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993), since the 1980s government has increased its control over the activities of community organisations. For example, participants noted that government has more control over funding through contracts as opposed to grants, and contracts have been increasing. Government contracts began to increase due to the neo-liberal policies of the 1980s (Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993), spearheaded by the practices of Thatcher in the United Kingdom and Reagan in the United States (Harvey, 2005). As described in the introduction, these policies led to massive structural changes in New Zealand, which were characterised by privatisation and fiscal responsibility (Kelsey, 1995). Second, participants and scholars argued that government increasingly has begun to acknowledge the important role that community groups play in society (H Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Frumkin, 2002). In New Zealand, this has been acknowledged by the creation of the Office of the Community and Voluntary Services (OCVS) and the signing of the Statement of Government Intentions (SOGI), described in Chapter 1. As for the future relationship between the current Government in New Zealand and community organisations, it appears uncertain at the time of this writing.
Two ways relationships are managed

In this section, the results of the Family Centre case study are used to describe how relationships were managed to advocate more effectively. To begin with, in order to influence a field, a group must be a member of that field. As illustrated in Figure 7-1, found on page 172, the Family Centre can be described as a member of four fields which it influenced; namely therapy, community development, research, and social policy. Its ability to retain membership in each of these fields simultaneously allowed it to manage relationships in a way that facilitated advocacy; two ways are identified. First, Family Centre staff used credibility in one field to develop relationships and credibility in another. Second, the organisation brought together groups from different fields. According to internal and external participants, the Family Centre’s ability to gain credibility amongst many groups and bring together a variety of people from diverse sectors allowed it to be an effective advocacy organisation.

Based on the results of this research it appears that the Family Centre’s membership in each of the four fields, illustrated in Figure 7-1, is directly related to its relationship with the community, other community organisations, government, and the media. Its relationship with the community affects its ability to be viewed as a legitimate community organisation, which affects its membership in each of the four fields described in Chapter 7. The Family Centre’s relationship with government influenced its ability to influence social policy directly. Its employees’ relationships with other community organisations is linked back to the community because, according to participant statements, they had networks with Māori and Pacific groups that most Pākehā groups did not; therefore these relationships affected all four fields as well. Finally, the relationship with the media affected the Family Centre’s ability to share information with the public and effectively influence the social policy and community development fields.

Using credibility from one field to develop relationships in another

The most common way that the Family Centre managed relationships was to use credibility and knowledge that it had earned in one field to develop relationships, and ultimately credibility, in other fields. This is most clearly illustrated by its work in the social policy field. External participants, most notably policy field participants, suggested
that the Family Centre’s combination of credibility, knowledge, and networks made the organisation effective. This combination is a result of its work in the therapy, research, and community development fields. For example, through its work in therapy and community development, participants stated that the Family Centre became known as an organisation with strong ties to the community. The awareness that staff gleaned from their work with the community led them to increase their work in the research field, which drew heavily on their community networks. Ultimately, its membership in the research, therapy, and community development fields, along with the networks that they developed with members of the policy field, allowed the organisation to successfully influence the social policy field.

**Bringing together individuals from multiple fields**

Family Centre employees have brought together individuals that operate in different fields. This is significant because these individuals essentially bring their credentials from their respective fields, which appears to influence the effectiveness of advocacy. This approach is most visible through the research that the organisation has conducted. For example, the Ole Taeao Afua (Tamasese et al., 1997) research included therapists, community development workers and researchers. The New Zealand Poverty Measurement Project (NZPMP) (Stephens et al., 1995) brought together a university researcher, an individual who worked in the business sector, and an individual from a community organisation. Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society (EWAS) (Koopman-Boyden & Waldegrave, 2009) combined the knowledge of university researchers, community development workers and therapists. These three examples show that Family Centre employees often work with groups in multiple fields and, according to participants, their ability to bring together individuals with different backgrounds has allowed the organisation to be more effective.

**Summary of the findings on each research question**

The first research question, what is the New Zealand SSCO sector, considered the definition, role, key characteristics, and different types of SSCOs in New Zealand. Overall, it appears that the SSCO sector is a field that consists of capital, defined above, and subfields, and it performs a role that serves the needs of the community.
SSCOs are community organisations that have a close relationship with the community, a service, civic, and advocacy role, an ability to claim tax-exempt status, and a capacity to manage complex issues. Together, these aspects of the SSCO sector make it unique, and they form the SSCO field’s “entry capital”, which is a connection with the community and a service delivery component that is in line with the needs of the community. As previously mentioned, the different types of SSCOs identified in the literature review and results appear to be subfields within the larger SSCO field and they include: Māori, non-Māori, religiously affiliated, secular, umbrella, and direct service subfields.

The second research question, how do New Zealand SSCOs advocate, addresses the “who”, “what”, “why”, and “how” of advocacy and explains the factors that affect the type of advocacy groups engage in. In general, it appears that SSCOs in New Zealand use multiple strategies when they advocate and that the nature of advocacy in the SSCO field, like all fields, is marked by power, which influences how they engage in advocacy. SSCOs in New Zealand advocate for marginalised groups in a way that other members of other sectors, like government, do not, which suggests that limiting their advocacy role harms the communities that are suffering the most. SSCOs are interested in targeting the public and government representatives because they have instrumental and expressive goals. In other words, because SSCO advocacy is focused on complex issues, such as poverty, they need to target multiple institutions because these issues exist across “meaning systems” (R. H. Williams, 2004). Employees of SSCOs advocate because they want to contribute to social democracy and influence the perception of the communities they work with, but that does not necessarily mean that employees are themselves marginalised. In fact, it appears that individuals working in SSCOs are often members of the fields they are challenging. For example, some of the groups that were described as effective by participants could be described as members of the social policy field because of the capital that they had acquired with members of this field. There are six general strategies that most SSCOs draw from when advocating: engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats, publishing research, working with the media, protesting, developing coalitions, and educating the public. The most successful groups incorporated multiple strategies because, as previously mentioned, they
targeted multiple institutions, and this approach required the use of many different strategies. The position of a group determines the type of strategies that they choose. Specifically, government funding, the political environment, organisational capacity, and the target of advocacy appear to have the greatest influence on how the type of strategy that is chosen.

The third research question, how do SSCOs in New Zealand advocate effectively, analyses the factors and forms of capital that influence the success of SSCOs advocacy campaigns. Overall, the most successful SSCOs are those that have credibility, a stable resource-level and a mission that is ideologically aligned with the policy or public agenda. Resources, organisational capacity, the policy and political environment, and the relationship with government are the factors that have the greatest influence on SSCOs’ effectiveness. To put it in theoretical terms, four forms of capital—economic, social, cultural, and symbolic—have an effect on the position of an SSCO in the SSCO field. For example, groups that hold symbolic capital, such as bureaucratic knowledge, are in dominant positions within the SSCO field.

The fourth research question, how are relationships managed to facilitate effective advocacy, assesses four relationships: the relationship with government, other community organisations, the community, and the media. Overall, managing these four relationships is important for increasing the success of SSCOs' advocacy work, and these relationships are managed in two ways. First, groups use credibility from one field to develop relationships in another, and second, they bring together individuals from multiple fields, which allows groups to pool their credentials and increase their success. The relationship with government can increase a group’s success, and is affected by government funding and tax-exempt status, and each of these can limit the type of advocacy SSCOs undertake. The relationship with the community is important for groups in retaining their legitimacy. The relationship with other community organisations can help SSCOs increase their networks, organisational capacity, and resource-level. Finally, the relationship with the media can be used to increase an organisation’s success through applying media strategies as an advocacy tool.
Assessment of the strengths and limitations

The limitations of this study and how these limitations were managed are described in Chapter 4. Four specific areas are discussed in order to assess the strengths and limitations of this study. First, the effects of using the NSM-A and selected field theory concepts is discussed. Second, issues associated with validity and reliability are summarised. Third, the effects of researcher bias are considered. Finally, case study specific criteria are considered in the context of this research.

Using the NSM-A and selected field theory concepts

Using the NSM-A and selected field theory concepts appears to have strengthened this research and five strengths are identified. First, using the NSM-A as a guide allows researchers to understand “how power works across a variety of institutions” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 93). For example, this factor made it possible to describe the overall structure of the SSCO field, which helped to identify dominant and subordinate positions and explain why groups are in their respective positions, why some are more successful than others are, and why some groups are treated differently. Second, this approach can be used to describe how activists “negotiate” and “understand” power (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 93), which allowed for an explanation of why and how advocates develop relationships in the SSCO field. Third, the NSM-A can be applied in order to analyse “how and why activists choose strategies and goals” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, 93), which helped to assess why certain strategies were more successful than others are. Fourth, this approach made it possible to understand the diversity that exists within the community sector, which is expressed through subfields. For example, organisations that do not fit into pre-formulated categories, such as tāngata whenua groups, could have their own subfield based on how they operate and not on how outside groups define them. Finally, describing society as an environment that consists of multiple fields was used in this research to understand how groups move into other fields and explains what is happening during this process. Overall, it appears that community groups operate in multiple fields when they advocate and this approach allows researchers to understand how groups move in and out of these fields.
While many of the participants who were interviewed belonged to more than one of the fields considered in this research, each was treated as belonging to only one. So for example, a participant who had capital in both the community and policy fields, but whose primary contribution of knowledge and information was from the perspective of the community field, was treated, for the purposes of the interview, as a member of the community field only. Details on how this methodological challenge was managed are found in Chapter 4.

**Validity and reliability**

As discussed in Chapter 4, construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability are used to assess the strength of research. First, construct validity was strengthened through gathering multiple participant perspectives and data from a documentary analysis. In addition, key informants from the Family Centre were invited to read and comment on drafts in order to ensure accuracy. Construct validity does not appear to have been damaged from gathering data from participants through face-to-face and phone interviews. Second, according to Yin (2003, 34), internal validity is not used to assess descriptive or exploratory studies, and because this study is exploratory in nature, internal validity is not considered. Third, based on the similarity between participant comments and findings discussed in the international literature, it appears that this research can provide insights not only for SSCOs in New Zealand, but also for SSCOs in similar countries, such as Australia. On the other hand, due to the low number of Māori, Pacific, and policy field participants, and the exclusion of community members, these findings may not accurately reflect the views of these groups. Efforts were made to include Māori, Pacific, and policy field participants, but as discussed in Chapter 4, these groups were difficult to recruit. Finally, reliability was strengthened by following a case study protocol for a theory-driven approach, as outlined by Boyatizis (1998). Overall, based on the aforementioned four measures, the major limitation of this study is the lack of generalisability to Māori, Pacific, policy field, and general community participants; therefore, caution is required when applying findings from this research to these groups.
**Researcher bias**

Three researcher biases were considered: the social origins of the researcher; the location of the researcher; and the intellectual bias of the researcher (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 272). Each of these biases is fully addressed in Chapter 4, and implications of these biases are summarised here. Firstly, my social origins were managed through consulting with my supervisors and immersing myself in New Zealand culture, therefore this bias appears to be limited. Secondly, the effects of my position in the intellectual field were managed through reflexivity, triangulation, supervision, and discussions with colleagues, and this bias appears to be limited as well. However, many participants emphasised the importance of research as an advocacy tool, which may have been influenced by the fact that they were interviewed by a researcher. Finally, the most challenging bias, my intellectual bias, was also managed through reflexivity, triangulation, supervision, and discussions with my supervisor and colleagues. I agree with Bourdieu that researchers can never retain absolute reflexivity; however, I endeavoured to be reflexive to the best of my ability. In light of this goal, my intellectual bias was limited as much as possible.

**Case study specific criteria**

Yin (2003, 160-166) lists four components of an “exemplary” case study. According to him, an “exemplary” case study is significant, “complete”, considers alternative perspectives, and must display sufficient evidence. Each of these four components is discussed below.

**Significance**

Yin (2003) suggests that significance can be measured by the degree to which a case study is unusual or of general interest, and the level of which the case study is nationally important. This case study can be described as significant. First, it meets the criteria for an “unusual” analysis. The community sector is a unique sector of society (H. Anheier, 2005; Frumkin, 2002; Hansmann, 1980; Salamon, 1987; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Weisbrod, 1975). Community organisations play a unique role in society and this research describes this unique role. In addition, the embedded case study, the Family Centre, also qualifies as “unusual”. The Family Centre appears to be a unique
organisation in New Zealand, and this was supported by three themes identified in participant statements. First, according to participants, given the size of the Family Centre, it has had a disproportionate effect on therapy, research, policy, and community development. Second, the organisation operates in multiple fields, and unlike many groups, has been able to work closely with decision-makers in the policy field. Third, the Family Centre has experienced multiple stages of the organisational lifecycle, which allowed for a full description of how an organisation moves from a subordinate to a dominant position. Stake suggests that an “unusual case helps illustrate matters we overlook in typical cases” (Stake, 1995, 4). The unique experience of the Family Centre is used here to illustrate how advocacy can be successful.

Second, this case study is also nationally important. Advocacy is an important part of a social democracy (Fraser, 1992; S. Vaughan & Arsneault, 2008; Walton, 2007) and community organisations often work with and advocate for groups that have less power in society (Berry, 2005; Berry & Arons, 2003; Clemens, 2006; Frumkin, 2002; S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Understanding how community organisations advocate for improvements to conditions that public health practitioners have identified as determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007), and how they bring attention to the needs of less powerful groups, is important knowledge for decision-makers and practitioners. The work of community groups can affect health inequalities, and as Woodward and Kawachi (2000) have already argued, health inequalities should be addressed for four reasons: inequalities are unfair, inequalities affect everyone (Wilkinson, 2005), inequalities are largely avoidable, and cost-effective interventions exist.

**Completeness**

Completeness can be assessed by the degree to which the data collection process was exhaustive and the collection of evidence was complete, and this research aimed to be as complete as possible. Interviews were gathered through non-probabilistic sampling. However, as previously mentioned, some perspectives are missing from this research. Specifically, the number of Māori, Pacific, policy field, and research field participants was limited. In addition, members of the community were not consulted. The explanation for these low numbers is described above. As previously
mentioned, these low numbers mean that findings from this research may not provide a community point of view, a representative view of members of the policy field, or a complete perspective of Māori or Pacific organisations. Instead, Pākehā perspectives may be overrepresented. On the other hand, efforts were made to gather as much data as possible in the given time-period and policy field participants were chosen for their seniority, which more accurately reflects the policy decisions that are enacted. There are 42 participants in this study and every piece of Family Centre research that was mentioned was analysed. Given the context of this research, it is described as complete.

**Alternative perspectives**

An exemplary case study should also consider alternative perspectives, which were included within the data and throughout the analysis of data. The single case study was comprised of three perspectives in order to ensure alternative perspectives were represented. These different perspectives included members of the community field, the research field, and the policy field. In addition, two perspectives, those internal and external to the Family Centre, were gathered and a documentary analysis was conducted to inform the embedded case study. These multiple perspectives were used to ensure accuracy. Finally, as previously mentioned, the effects of researcher bias are limited through immersion and supervision.

**Sufficient evidence**

An exemplary case study should also have sufficient evidence, and it appears that this research has sufficient evidence to provide initial recommendations for and theoretical developments on SSCOs advocating in New Zealand. As previously mentioned, three sources of evidence were used to inform the single case study and the embedded case study. The single case study consisted of perspectives from the community field, the research field, and the policy field. Similarly, the embedded case study included perspectives from those internal and external to the Family Centre, and a documentary analysis.
How can New Zealand SSCOs effectively advocate for improvements to the social and economic determinants of health?

The four research questions answered above were created in order to fulfil the primary aim of this research, which is to understand how SSCOs in New Zealand effectively advocate for improvements to what public health practitioners have identified as the social and economic determinants of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007), as they negatively affect marginalised communities. Taking into consideration the strengths and limitations of this research, it is suggested that three factors are associated with the ability of SSCOs to effectively advocate, and each of them stems from SSCOs managing relationships effectively. Each factor is important and builds upon the other. First, successful organisations are in dominant positions within the community field. Second, influential groups seek to influence multiple institutions. Third, effective community organisations manage relationships to facilitate advocacy. Each of these factors is outlined below.

Effective organisations are in dominant positions

Dominant organisations are defined above as those that hold symbolic capital, as evidenced by their credibility, stable resource-level and a mission that corresponds with the policy or public agenda. In other words, influential groups manage relationships with the community, government representatives, other community organisations, funders (which, in the case of SSCOs, is often government), and the media effectively. Organisations like the Family Centre were in dominant positions and once in this position within the social policy field, the Family Centre was able to, as one policy field participant put it, have a “massive influence over welfare and related policy”. As described in Chapter 6, prior to moving into this dominant position, the Family Centre had a difficult time influencing policy. However, once the organisation acquired credibility, a stable resource-level and had ideological alignment with the policy agenda, it was much more influential.
Effective organisations seek to influence multiple institutions

In order to change “meaning-systems” (R. H. Williams, 2004), an organisation has to target multiple institutions (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008), which requires developing and fostering relationships in multiple fields. To begin with, in order to change an institution, or field, one has to be a member of that field (Bourdieu, 2005b), and that necessitates relationship building. The Family Centre operated and developed relationships within four fields (therapy, community development, research, and social policy), and was able to influence each of them. As discussed in Chapter 7, the organisation was clearly a member of these fields because it was recognised by its peers in each of them. It appears that organisations interested in affecting complex issues, like poverty, will need to operate within and change how these issues are perceived by groups in multiple institutions. For example, simply changing policy will not eliminate racism or sexism; although policy can be implemented to affect these issues, changes need to be made on a societal level.

Effective organisations manage relationships to facilitate advocacy in two ways

Once an organisation is in a dominant position and is not only a member of multiple institutions, but has sought change within these institutions, it is able to manage relationships in two ways that are associated with effectiveness. As previously mentioned, the Family Centre used credibility in one field to develop relationships and credibility in another, and it brought together individuals from different fields. According to participants, each of these relationships, defined above, played a significant role in the Family Centre’s success.

Implications

The previous sections have answered the research questions and considered the strengths and weaknesses of this research. In light of the previous sections, this section describes the implications of the results and the above analysis. There are implications in three areas; namely, practical suggestions for SSCOs, policy, and future research implications.
Practical implications for SSCOs

This research is intended to aid the advocacy efforts of community organisations in New Zealand and elsewhere, and to support the idea that it is important for these groups to have the space and resources to advocate for communities with a lack of political power. Therefore, the first three implications are directed at SSCOs seeking to influence complex issues, such as poverty and mental health. Overall, all three issues are linked to the recommendation that SSCOs should focus on developing and managing relationships effectively. First, organisations are made aware of the characteristics embodied by groups in dominant positions. Second, SSCOs are encouraged to gain membership in multiple institutions. Third, community groups are provided with an example of how to manage relationships for effectiveness. Although some of these recommendations may be difficult to fulfil, it appears that organisations able to do so will be more effective.

Move to a dominant position and acquire symbolic capital

The four forms of capital identified above—social, cultural, economic, and symbolic capital—are linked to developing relationships. For example, effective leadership skills, a form of cultural capital, are connected with developing relationships within an organisation and with other groups outside of the organisation. Based on conclusions drawn from the literature review and participant statements, groups that are able to acquire these forms of capital will be more successful. More specifically, organisations that can move into dominant positions and earn symbolic capital will be influential. Credibility, stable resource-levels and a mission that corresponds with the policy or public agenda appear to be especially important for groups that are advocating. As previously mentioned, in order to achieve this, groups must foster relationships with multiple groups, including decision-makers and the community.

As previously mentioned, it also appears that symbolic capital is achieved through an accumulation of cultural, social, and economic capital. The Family Centre’s experience provides a good example of symbolic capital. Participants described the Family Centre as an organisation with “credibility” and a positive “reputation” in the community. When asked why it was influential, people often described members’ skills (cultural capital) and networks (social capital). In addition, as previously mentioned, the
Family Centre’s ability to acquire these skills and networks appears to be related to resource-level (economic capital).

**Gain membership in multiple institutions**

Organisations appear to be more successful at influencing the treatment of complex social and economic issues, like poverty, if they gain membership in multiple institutions (which hinges on relationship development), and seek to change these institutions. For example, as detailed in Chapter 7, the Family Centre has influenced how to work with groups from Māori and Pacific cultures in research, therapy, and community development fields. It also contributed to discussions with government representatives about how to construct policy in a way that considers the needs of Māori and Pacific peoples. In addition, Family Centre staff developed relationships with groups in each of the aforementioned fields, which helped the organisation to gain entry into these fields. Overall, it appears that the Family Centre has been more influential because of its membership in multiple institutions.

**Manage relationships for effectiveness**

Drawing on the findings discussed in the previous sub-sections, SSCOs can manage relationships in two ways, which will help them to facilitate advocacy. They can use credibility in one field to acquire credibility in another and they can bring together groups that operate in different institutions. Based on the findings from the Family Centre embedded case study, each of these approaches can increase effectiveness.

**Policy implications**

Throughout this research, many voices have been presented which argued for the ability of community organisations to have the freedom to advocate [i.e. (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003; Salamon, 1995a)]. More than any other type of organisation, community groups, and especially SSCOs (Mosley, 2009), work with marginalised groups, and silencing them only harms the most disenfranchised (Berry & Arons, 2003). However, similar to organisations in the United States, tax-exempt organisations in New Zealand are limited by how much they are able to advocate. Two recommendations are made below. First, the Charities Commission should create clear guidelines that outline the amount of advocacy that community groups can perform.
Second, government funding should take a more holistic approach, which would alter the community-government relationship.

**Clear guidelines and H elector tax-exempt status**

To begin with, this research suggests that the Charities Commission should consider making clearer guidelines on the advocacy that is allowable by community groups in New Zealand because the vagueness of the current Charities Act often leaves community groups confused as to how much they can advocate (Chevalier-Watts, 2009; Gousmett, 2007; Milligan et al., 2008). A possible solution to this problem is to incorporate an H elector option that is similar to the one that is used in the United States. Regardless of whether or not they receive government funding, tax-exempt organisations that become H electors are allowed to spend a percentage of their expenditures on advocacy activities. All tax-exempt organisations are eligible and the amount of advocacy they can engage in would be based on a sliding scale. For example, an organisation with a budget up to $500,000 that becomes an H elector can spend 20% of their budget on lobbying (Berry, 2005). Although this would not solve the problem entirely, it could be used as a starting point from which guidelines are developed. This would begin to make the threshold of allowable advocacy clearer and allow organisations to prioritise advocacy because they could set aside funds that are specifically for advocating.

**Adopt a holistic approach and the community-government relationship**

A holistic community-government relationship that may increase the effectiveness of SSCOs is described by Cribb (2006), which consists of “soft accountability” that is guided by stewardship theory. As described in Chapter 3, Cribb argues that in contrast to “hard accountability”, a community organisation that has “soft accountability” to government would develop a more trusting relationship with government representatives; a relationship that is characterised by “responsiveness” and not “control”. Similarly, as opposed to applying agency theory, in which it is assumed that community groups are self-serving and economically driven, she posits that stewardship theory is more appropriate. For example, a stewardship theorist would argue that community groups are intrinsically driven and identify with the organisation’s
mission. This description coincides with participant statements and findings in the literature [i.e. (Brown & Moore, 2001; D Minkoff & Powell, 2006)], which suggests that stewardship theory is appropriate for analysing the community-government relationship. A relationship that embodies stewardship theory and a “soft accountability” approach would necessarily provide more holistic funding. Overall, if this example were put into action, government contracts would have fewer limitations than they currently do and could more freely be used to fund advocacy activities.

**Future research implications**

Through this investigation, it is clear that further research on community organisations, and specifically the nature of how they advocate, is needed. Four areas of future research are recommended: first, a relational theory is suggested; second, an understanding of how different subfields advocate is recommended; third, more knowledge on indigenous organisations is needed; fourth, researchers should work to understand what happens to the community voice in the process of advocacy.

**Develop a relational theory on advocacy in the community sector**

Although there are theories that analyse social movements (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008) and there are discussions of different types of advocacy that community organisations undertake (Reid, 1999), currently no theory exists that explains advocacy in community organisations. Scott et al. (2006) have begun this discussion in the relational approach that they take to understanding advocacy in youth organisations. However, future research should also prioritise capital and, if possible, consider habitus, which, is the “structuring mechanism that operates from within agents” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 18) or the “socialised subjectivity” of a field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, 126). Overall, it is recommended that future research should aim to create a theory of advocacy in community organisations, one that utilises a relational approach. This research contributes to this goal because it analyses the SSCO sector in New Zealand using a relational approach and, as presented below in Models 8-1, 8-2, 8-3, and 8-4, provides the groundwork for further developments.

Three primary theoretical developments from this research can be applied to future research in creating a relational theory for analysing the community sector. First,
this research indicates that the SSCO sector can be described as a field with subfields. As previously mentioned, organisations in a subfield share similar characteristics, but they also behave in a way that distinguishes them from other organisations in the field. Using subfields can make this distinction measurable and observable. Model 8-1, below, provides a model of the SSCO field and includes six subfields identified in this research. It is not to scale because some subfields, like the Māori subfields should be smaller and have more overlap with the direct services subfield. Nevertheless, it illustrates that subfields share attributes with each other, as indicated by the overlap, and have unique attributes as well, as demonstrated by their unique space. However, regardless of their differences, all of these groups exist within the larger SSCO field because they each have a close connection with the community, engage in “messy” work that consists of dealing with complex issues, and have the ability to claim tax-exempt status.
Using the model above as a starting point for analysing the SSCO field and other fields in the community sector may help researchers more accurately and thoroughly describe and understand the community sector.

Second, this research develops a relational theory that can be used to analyse the nature of SSCO advocacy. Model 8-2, below, depicts this development. This model indicates that there are dominant and subordinate organisations in the SSCO field that advocate for improvements to the determinants of health, as they negatively affect marginalised communities. SSCOs generally use one or more of the six strategies identified below, and, based on this research, engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats, disseminating research, and developing coalitions are especially effective. These groups have instrumental and expressive goals, which means that they influence members of the social policy field, such as decision-makers, and members of the public field, such as informed or uninformed groups. The SSCO-specific public field is simply the field or subfield that an SSCO operates in, such as the therapy or community development subfield. Dominant SSCOs are members of the fields that they are seeking to influence, which makes them more successful. The fields and subfields overlap to illustrate the multiple field memberships of groups that have been identified in this research.
Model 8-2: The nature of advocacy in the SSCO field

- Engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats*
  - Disseminating research*
  - Developing coalitions*
  - Media strategies
    - Protests
    - Public education

SSCO field

Dominant SSCO
Subordinate SSCO

Strategy

Expressive Goals

- Informed and uninformed public
- Community and business leaders
- Dominant SSCO

Instrumental Goals

- Decision-makers
- Government bureaucrats
- Community and business leaders
- Dominant SSCO

SSCO-specific public field

Social policy field
Using this figure as a *starting point* to explain the nature of advocacy in the SSCO sector may help future researchers to continue developing a relational theory and aid SSCO\text{s} interested in advocating effectively.

Third, findings from this research can also be used to develop a relational theory of how community organisations manage relationships effectively. Models 8-3 and 8-4, below, depict two ways that SSCO\text{s} can manage relationships, based on how the Family Centre has operated. Model 8-3 provides a model for groups that use credibility in one field to develop credibility in another. SSCO\text{s} can take the capital that they acquire from other fields that they have credibility in and use it to advocate more effectively. For example, capital from the SSCO field is used to acquire a form of capital, called capital A, from hypothetical field A. This newly acquired capital is then pooled with the SSCO capital, which increases the overall amount of capital that a group has, and ultimately increases the effectiveness of their advocacy.
Next, Model 8-4 illustrates how individuals that operate in fields outside of the SSCO field can work with groups inside the SSCO field. Together, these groups and individuals can pool their capital from their respective fields, which can result in more effective advocacy. For example, an individual from Field A can contribute their capital, called capital A, to an advocacy activity. Similar to Model 8-3, all of this capital is then pooled with the SSCO capital, which increases the effectiveness of advocacy.
Model 8-4: Bringing together individuals from multiple fields for effective advocacy

These models can be used as a starting point to further develop a relational approach that explains the different ways that SSCOs manage relationships to improve the effectiveness of their advocacy activities.
Understand how different subfields advocate

It is also suggested that future research consider how organisations advocate in different branches of the community sector. Using a subfield approach to examine the advocacy activities of a range of organisations would shed light on this subject. For example, researchers could consider how sports organisations or art organisations advocate, and how their tactics compare to the tactics utilised by SSCOs or health service community organisations. Child and Grønbjerg (2007) have begun this discussion and future research should begin here. However, future analysts should also investigate the tactics that these different groups use, in order to get a more complete picture of their activities. In addition, this approach could be used to compare and contrast how tax-exempt and non-tax-exempt organisations advocate. However, this would also require further research on non-tax-exempt organisations because, as mentioned in Chapter 3, most of the research on advocacy in the community sector is based on tax-exempt organisations in the United States (G. D. Bass et al., 2007; Berry & Arons, 2003).

Develop an understanding of indigenous organisations in New Zealand

There needs to be a much stronger understanding of indigenous and organisations, and the different ways that they advocate. There have been analyses of Māori advocacy (R. Walker, 2004); however, as found in recent attempts to include these groups (Statistics New Zealand, 2007; Tennant et al., 2006), there continues to be uncertainty as to how Māori organisations operate. Future research should use indigenous measures in order to accurately portray their contribution. In the past, researchers in New Zealand have put Māori and iwi-based organisations into categories that work better for Western cultures (Statistics New Zealand, 2007), and this may be a disservice to Māori groups because it does not provide a full picture of their work.

Develop an understanding of Pacific organisations in New Zealand

There needs to be a much stronger understanding of Pacific organisations, and the different ways they advocate. There does not appear to be any literature that discusses Pacific organisations, and, in a recent report that measured the contribution of the community sector in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2007),Pacific organisations were not put into separate categories as was done for some iwi-based
organisations. Similar to the argument made above, measuring Pacific organisations should take a relational approach that incorporates subfields, which would allow for Pacific organisations to be measured using Pacific tools and ultimately measure their contribution more accurately.

**Understand what happens to the community voice**
Practitioners need to understand what happens to the community voice throughout the advocacy process. This is especially important given that community groups often work with the economically marginalised (Berry & Arons, 2003). Researchers should consider if the community voice is getting diluted or altered. For example, as previously mentioned, the source of funding may affect advocacy activities. If recent investigations are correct, and organisations that accept government contracts do not prioritise advocacy (Child & Grønbjerg, 2007; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009), then researchers should consider how this may affect the community. In regions where business philanthropy is significant, like the United States, researchers should also consider how money from the private sector affects the community that community groups serve. Eikenberry and Kluver (2004) and Nickel and Eikenberry (2009) have begun this investigation. One way to measure the community’s voice is to consider how much an organisation involves the community in their advocacy activities; in her study, Donaldson (2007) presents such a measure. Another way would be to survey the community directly.

**Conclusion**
The aim of this chapter is to analyse the findings of this research in order to understand how SSCOs can advocate effectively for improvements to the social and economic determinants of health, as they negatively affect marginalised communities. It is important that SSCOs are given the freedom to advocate because it appears that they generally advocate for marginalised communities that may not otherwise have an opportunity to get their voice heard. If these community groups are silenced, then the most marginalised are likely to suffer further and the health disparities discussed in Chapter 1 will continue to grow. It is hoped that the findings from this research can be used to help SSCOs that are interested in advocacy and provide them with information
that increases the effectiveness of their advocacy activities. Overall, findings from this research suggest that the most effective way SSCOs in New Zealand advocate for complex issues is through moving to a dominant position and managing relationships effectively. This argument is made in three parts.

First, SSCOs advocate for complex issues that require a similarly complex approach, which is based on developing credibility and relationships with multiple groups. As suggested in Chapter 1, these complex issues are described as the determinants of health. Although community organisations do not state that the focus of their advocacy is to reduce the effects of the determinants of health, as they negatively affect marginalised communities, they clearly do. SSCOs advocate for improvements to the conditions that lead to poverty, racism, and sexism, which have been identified as determinants of health by public health practitioners (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2007). These issues are complex in that they affect many aspects of people’s lives and exist in “meaning-systems” (R. H. Williams, 2004) that span multiple fields. For example, poverty does not only affect access to adequate shelter, it also affects access to adequate nutrition, education, employment, and other areas. Therefore, successful SSCOs must develop credibility and relationships in multiple fields to affect all or most of these “meaning systems”. Knowledge of these “meaning systems” can be acquired through working within them and gaining credibility as a group that understands how they operate. The Family Centre’s approach to advocacy provides an example of how an SSCO successfully advocated for change in how some of the determinants of health, such as culture, poverty, and gender, are perceived. Based on the results of this research, it appears that the Family Centre was effective because it gained credibility and developed relationships in four fields (therapy, community development, research, and policy), and managed these relationships successfully.

Second, an analysis of participant comments suggests that groups in dominant positions have credibility, an adequate resource-level and advocate for issues that correspond with the policy or public agenda. In order to become a “dominant” organisation, the results suggest that SSCOs should gain credibility in their respective field and be effective at managing their relationships with the community, government,
funders (which usually includes the government), other community organisations, and the media. Findings from this research indicate that the community is often prioritised in successful community groups. The results suggest that groups which can gain a level of expertise in their field and manage these five relationships are more likely to have credibility, an adequate resource-level, and advocate for issues that are on the policy or public agenda, and therefore be in more dominant positions.

Finally, it appears that successful groups manage relationships in two specific ways. First, groups used credibility from one field to develop relationships in another. For example, Family Centre staff took their credibility in the therapy and community development fields to develop relationships with groups in the research and policy fields. Eventually, because the Family Centre fostered the relationships in the latter two fields, it developed credibility in research and policy fields as well. Second, effective groups can bring together individuals from multiple groups in order to advocate for issues that exist in numerous “meaning-systems” (R. H. Williams, 2004) and span multiple fields. For example, members of the Family Centre had relationships with individuals in different fields, including research, community, and economic fields. The organisation used its relationships with these individuals to bring them together on one project, like the NZPMP, and these individuals brought capital from their respective fields with them, which Family Centre staff were able to draw from in order to advocate effectively.

These findings and improving SSCO advocacy are important because SSCOs play a vital role in the social and political environment. More specifically, the role that SSCOs play as advocates supporting marginalised communities is of primary importance, because, as previously mentioned (Berry & Arons, 2003), it appears that few people are advocating for these groups. As previously mentioned, if SSCOs have a limited capacity to advocate for these groups, then they may not have an opportunity to be heard at all, which could further exacerbate their difficult circumstances.

Implications from this research can be used to improve the success and knowledge of SSCO advocacy through practical, policy, and future research recommendations. In the practical implications, it is suggested that SSCOs should move to a dominant position, acquire symbolic capital, gain membership in multiple
institutions, and manage relationships for effectiveness. There are two policy recommendations: government should provide clear advocacy guidelines to tax-exempt organisations, such as those outlined by the H elector status guidelines, and adopt a holistic approach to the community-government relationship. Finally, five suggestions are given for future research: develop a relational theory on advocacy in the community sector, understand how different subfields advocate, develop an understanding of indigenous organisations in New Zealand, develop an understanding of Pacific organisations in New Zealand, and understand what happens to the community voice. Theoretical developments are provided in this thesis in order to begin the groundwork for a relational theory. It is hoped that this research will increase the understanding of advocacy in the community sector and ultimately allow community groups to continue advocating for marginalised groups, as it appears that SSCOs are one of the only groups that advocate in this way.
Appendix A: Interview schedule

Interview schedule for participants with general knowledge of community organisations

1. What is the role of NGOs in New Zealand? Should the role of NGOs be more service-oriented or more advocacy-oriented?
   a. How might NGOs and government work at gaining autonomy from government and donors, which many feel is needed, to provide holistic services and properly advocate for their communities?

2. What makes an NGO influential in the realm of social change? What qualities and/or resources are valuable for an NGO to have that would enable them to create or encourage social change?
   a. In that context, what sort of balance do you see between, structural factors and personal attributes in the facilitation of social policy reform?
      i. Institutional or organisational factors i.e.: social networks (community and political), connection with the Anglican Church
      ii. Personal attributes i.e.: Pacific and Māori cultural expertise, education, leadership skills, management skills, communication skills
   b. How much of the influence is due to the leadership and how much is the organisation itself?
      i. What qualities should a good leader possess?
   c. How do you define success and influence? What would it look like?
   d. What NGOs are influential in bringing the community voice to the policymakers?

3. What strategies successfully allow NGOs to achieve recognition within policy circles (i.e. research, creating networks)?
   a. What are the pros and cons of working both ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ the tent?
   b. How do relationships with government change as government changes (i.e. recent election)
   c. How can NGOs use the media in a way that is helpful to them, and increases their chances of influencing social policy?

4. How can NGOs create networks and form relationships with those influential groups and people?
   a. How can NGOs prevent these relationships from stifling their ability to advocate for the community that they represent?
   b. How do you and your organisation stay true to your mission?

5. How can NGOs & govt manage the following issues that are discussed in the literature:
   a. Retaining staff in a competitive environment
   b. Longevity – staying in the field for a long time
   c. Maintain community involvement when there is a great push towards professionalisation and simply a lack of time

6. Do Māori and Pacific organisations often have a branch devoted to advocacy?
a. Do they lobby/advocate differently
b. What Māori and Pacific organisations are known for influencing policy?
c. Is NGO an appropriate term for ‘by Māori, for Māori’ organisations?
7. What do you think of NGOs involvement with the business sector? Is this useful or harmful?
8. What is the future of NGOs? Where are they going? Will they move more towards advocacy? Will they have more of an opportunity to advocate? Will they become more bureaucratic? Will their strategies look different? Will they continue to provide those services that can’t or won’t be met by the public sector?
Interview schedule for participants with Family Centre knowledge

1. What projects or work of the Family Centre are you familiar with?
   a. What research projects have you heard about?
   b. What sorts of influence on social policy are you familiar with?
   c. During what time frame are you familiar with the Family Centre (80s, 90s, 00’s)... would you like to speak to a specific research project or can you speak about your perception of their overall work?

9. What makes an NGO influential in the realm of social change? What qualities and/or resources are valuable for an NGO to have that would enable them to create or encourage social change?
   a. In that context, what sort of balance do you see between, structural factors and personal attributes in the facilitation of social policy reform?
      i. Institutional or organisational factors i.e.: social networks (community and political), connection with the Anglican Church
      ii. Personal attributes i.e.: Pacific and Māori cultural expertise, education, leadership skills, management skills, communication skills
   b. In addition to influencing social policy, do you think they have had an influence on the way that issues are perceived?
   c. How do you define success and influence? What would it look like?
   d. Do you think there is a connection between the size of an NGO and its success?
   e. What other NGOs are influential in bringing the community voice to the policymakers?

10. What strategies has the Family Centre adopted as an NGO to achieve recognition within policy circles?
    a. How is their relationship with policy-makers and government perceived by the NGO community?
    b. Their relationship with government has changed in the past and will probably continue to change given the results of the election. How do you think this change will affect their ability to influence social policy?
    c. Are NGOs more or less influential when they work closely with government? What are the pros and cons of working outside of government and within it?

11. The literature suggests that NGOs can have some weaknesses. How is the Family Centre perceived to manage the following:
    a. Maintaining independence and keeping the focus on the needs of the communities.
       i. What communities are they perceived to work for? Who are they accountable to?
       ii. What communities/structures/groups do they challenge?
       iii. Are they perceived to base their goals on the community? How do/don’t they?
iv. Are they perceived to be independent?

12. As you know, the Family Centre is officially known as Anglican Social Services. How does spirituality and being associated with the Anglican Church inform and influence the perception of the Family Centre?
   a. How does this affect their ability to influence social policy? Work with the community?
   b. Definition of spirituality: it is “essentially about relationship”

13. They have done a lot of work with Māori and Pacific communities – how is this viewed in the NGO community? Is bringing Māori and Pacific needs into the forefront seen as a focus of theirs? How has it affected their ability to influence change and social policy?

14. How have they used the media? Has this helped or hurt them in their pursuance of social policy change?

15. The Family Centre has done a lot of work with Universities. How is this work perceived by those in the NGO community? How has it affected their ability to influence change and social policy?

16. What do you see as their strengths and weaknesses as an organisation? What would the Family Centre look like without Charles or Kiwi?
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Information Sheet for Participants

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

Please note this has been approved by the Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington

What is the Aim of the Project?
- To provide practical knowledge to NGOs and community groups that are interested in advocacy and influencing political and community change.

- To understand the role of NGOs in New Zealand and how different relationships (i.e. with government, donors, others in the sector) may affect their choice of strategies and ability to influence social policy change.

Who are we interested in speaking to?
- Individuals who have worked at the Family Centre, with the Family Centre, or who have knowledge of their work (including critical observers). This will include Family Centre employees, policymakers, those in the NGO sector, donors, and university researchers.

What will you be asked to do?
- You will be asked to participate in an open-ended face-to-face or phone interview lasting for about 60-minutes.

- Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project or refuse to answer any questions without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

Can Participants Change their mind and withdraw from the Project?
- You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What Data or Information will be collected and What Use will be made of it?
- I will ask questions around the Family Centre’s history, their interaction and relationship with other institutions (i.e. other NGOs, universities, the state), and the Family Centre’s strategies.

- Interviews will be audio-recorded and translated verbatim for analysis.
• The material that we obtain will be made anonymous, to ensure that you are not identified. Your identity will be confidential to the project staff. Transcribed material will not contain identifying information such as respondents’ names. Broad terms such as senior policy analyst or Family Centre commentator will be used.

• The results may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant. Participants will have a right to review transcript and quotes before any data is published as well.

• Should you wish, we would be very happy to send you the results of the project.

• The data collected will be securely stored. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except, as required by the University’s research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend, which will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

• This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the Department Public Health is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

• In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What if Participants have any Questions?

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

Nicole Hermanson or Louise Signal
Department of Public Health Department of Public Health
Telephone: (04) 385-5541 ext 4638 Telephone: (04) 385-5541 ext 6477
Email herni136@student.otago.ac.nz Email louise.signal@otago.ac.nz

This research has been approved by the Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington. If you have any concerns about any aspect of the research please contact the Department on 04 3855541 ex 6040.
On behalf of the community: A case study of the Family Centre influencing change

Consent form for participants

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;
3. The audio-tapes will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed;
4. There will be use of an open questioning technique;
5. I do not have to answer any questions that give me discomfort, and the audio tape can be stopped at any time;
6. I may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to myself of any kind.
7. I may have access to the conclusions and any publications if I request them;
8. The results of the project may be published and available in the library but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.
9. I understand that reasonable precautions have been taken to protect data transmitted by email but that the security of the information cannot be guaranteed.
10. This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
I agree to take part in this project.

........................................................................................................
(Signature of participant) .................................................. (Date)

........................................................................................................
(Name of participant)

I would like a copy of the findings of the research to be sent to me after the research is completed. (Please tick the box that applies to you)

□ YES  □ NO

In order to send you a copy of the research could you please record your details below.

Name: ..............................................................................

Address: .................................................................

.....................................................................................
.....................................................................................
Appendix C: Codes

Codes on larger community field

- The community sector
  - Context
    - 1980s and 1990s
    - After 1999
  - Role of community organisations
  - Beliefs within community organisations
    - Actions that support beliefs
  - Staff characteristics
  - Organisational characteristics
    - Characteristics specific to New Zealand
  - Organisational lifecycle
  - Perceptions of the community sector by those OUTSIDE the sector
  - Problems with definitions
  - Who community organisations serve (accountability?)

- General – capital used for advocacy
  - What makes organisations influential
    - Networks (social)
    - Skills (cultural)
    - Organisational structures (cultural)
    - Good leadership (cultural)
    - How to get funding (cultural)
    - How to avoid control by donors (cultural)
    - Managing multiple stakeholders (cultural/social)
    - Credibility (symbolic)
  - How to achieve longevity (symbolic)

- General – structure of the field and position of groups
  - Comparison with other sectors
  - Relationships
    - With the community
    - With other community organisations
    - With the media
    - With government
      - Pros and cons of relationship
  - Different KINDS of orgs
    - Umbrella
    - Māori
    - Pacific
    - Religiously affiliated
  - Challenges of community organisations
    - Resources
    - Managing relationship with government
  - Future of community orgs
• General – influencing fields
  o Goals of advocacy
  o Who organisations advocate for/target
  o What do they advocate for
  o Why do they advocate
  o How do they advocate
    ▪ Research
      • Role of research in advocacy
    ▪ Engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats
    ▪ Media
    ▪ Protests
    ▪ What affects strategy choice?
      • Government contracts
      • Charities registration
      • Resources
      • Size
      • Credibility
      • Target
      • Stage of advocacy
  o Advocacy “inside” and “outside the tent”
  o Outcomes of advocacy – general
  o How relationships are managed
    ▪ Linking up with actors
    ▪ Bringing multiple groups together
Family Centre codes

- Family Centre – habitus and story
  - Context – New Zealand
    - Pre 1999
    - Post 1999
  - Family Centre starting up
  - Organisational stages/lifecycle
    - Pre 1999
    - Post 1999
  - Family Centre’s beliefs and philosophies
    - Organisational structure representing beliefs
  - Family Centre’s future

- Family Centre – capital used for advocacy
  - Cultural goods and services
  - Economic resources
  - Social networks
  - Symbolic or signs of a reputation in:
    - Research
    - Therapy
    - Social policy
    - Community development

- Family Centre field – position in the field
  - Relationships
    - With the community
    - With therapists
    - With government
    - With researchers
    - With media
  - Family Centre is unique – how?
  - Family Centre organisational challenges
    - Early years
    - Managing the relationship with government
      - Benefits and challenges of working with government
    - Succession
      - Is the Family Centre more than Charles or Kiwi?
      - New staff

- Family Centre – influencing fields
  - Family Centre goals
  - Who do they advocate for/target
  - What do they advocate for
  - Why do they advocate
  - How they advocate - Family Centre advocacy strategies
    - Research
    - Protests
    - Media
- Engaging with decision-makers and bureaucrats
  - Working for families
- How they choose their strategy
  - Effects of advocacy – was it influential?
  - How do they use relationships
    - Linking up with actors
    - Sense of bureaucratic game
### Appendix D: Different types of community groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICNPO Group</th>
<th>Nonprofit organizations in New Zealand</th>
<th>Organizations not likely to be part of the nonprofit sector in New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Culture and recreation| - Many arts groups, especially at a local level (e.g., arts societies, spinners and weavers groups, film societies) and also some of the most prestigious national cultural groups e.g., in ballet, opera, etc.  
- Most sports groups, especially at the club level  
- Many museums and galleries, often smaller ones; not owned by local government or commercial operations  
- Some local community newspapers and radio stations  
- Service clubs (e.g., Lions, Rotary)  
- The large proportion of arts activities undertaken by individual artists and commercial enterprises  
- Commercial sports businesses and franchises  
- Museums and galleries owned by the local government  
- Most high profile newspapers, radio and TV broadcasters, which are commercial or state owned |                                                                                                                                         |
| 2. Education and research| - A few elementary (known as primary) and secondary schools  
- Many, often smaller, tertiary education providers  
- Most informal and small adult or community education  
- Some research, which is undertaken by nonprofit bodies, mostly in medicine and social sciences  
- Most early childhood services (see discussion re: kindergartens; Statistics New Zealand 2005a)  
- Public elementary and secondary schools (which comprise the majority of educational institutions in New Zealand)  
- Public universities and most polytechnics  
- The three Wananga, which are not institutionally separate from government  
- Adult or community education provided through evening programs run by public schools (unless there is a separate nonprofit entity through which funds are channeled)  
- Most of the research which is undertaken by universities, government bodies, and private firms |                                                                                                                                         |
| 3. Health                | - A small number of union and community health services, and all Primary Health Care Organizations (PHOs)  
- A few church and other private hospitals which are nonprofit  
- Most palliative care services  
- A large number of mostly smaller and non-residential mental health services, including iwi providers  
- Some rest homes and aged care  
- Most primary care services provided through General Practitioners  
- Public hospitals, which dominate the health field  
- Private hospitals that make a profit  
- Public mental health services  
- For-profit rest homes and some aged care hospitals providing care for older people  
- Some emergency health services |                                                                                                                                         |
| 4. Social services, and emergency/relief | • Most providers of social services, including iwi providers (nonprofit organizations are especially significant providers in disability services, in family services and in community services for older people)  
• Nonprofit employment services  
• Nonprofit emergency services  
• Some support services for children provided by nonprofit organisations | • Government and commercial providers of social services (e.g., most statutory child protection services, commercial home help services)  
• Government and commercial employment services  
• Emergency services that are set up by local government |
| 5. Environmental /animal protection | • Most environment and animal protection groups | • Government agencies with environmental responsibilities |
| 6. Development and housing | • Limited direct housing provision, especially social housing  
• Neighborhood centers and houses and most community development projects (except those provided by local government)  
• Employment and training groups, e.g., industry training organisations | • Public housing, including local government housing  
• Private landlords, who together with public housing provide almost all rental housing  
• Community development workers employed by local or (to a lesser extent) central government |
| 7. Civic and advocacy groups | • Advocacy groups representing particular and local interests  
• Political parties  
• Legal aid services, such as community law centers | • Commercial legal practices, which provide not only almost all legal services but also the bulk of legal aid |
| 8. Philanthropic and other intermediaries | • Volunteer promotion and brokerage groups, such as volunteer centers  
• Philanthropic trusts and foundations (including family trusts, community trusts, gaming trusts, etc.) | • Government funding agencies (which are the dominant funders of nonprofit organizations)  
• Corporate social responsibility programs (which are very small as a proportion of total funding to nonprofit organizations) |
| 9. International organizations, aid and relief | • Most overseas aid and development organizations | • New Zealand Agency for International Development  
• Defense forces  
• Private consultants and contractors |

Source: (Tennant et al., 2006)
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