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1 INTRODUCTION

This feasibility study sets out the scope and design for a Multi-Year Research Project (MYRP), focusing on the role of housing, housing policies and programs in how we understand, and where appropriate address, the challenges presented by spatial concentrations of disadvantage. Our proposal brings together a team of researchers from UNSW, the University of Queensland and Swinburne University under the Directorship of Professor Hal Pawson at the AHURI UNSW-UWS Research Centre.

The partnership involves AHURI colleagues who, collectively, offer a breadth and depth of housing and urban research expertise, and who share a strong commitment to critical thinking at the research-policy interface. There are strong existing links between the three universities as demonstrated by recent and ongoing collaboration on a number of AHURI Research Projects, and the MYRP presents an excellent opportunity to build housing research capacity-building across the Centres. The partnership is further strengthened through a number of international experts (Galster, Williams and Lawless) who will provide input and critical review at key stages of the MYRP.

Three overarching issues structure our scope for this MYRP. These are:

1. How concentrations of social disadvantage have been conceptualised and how this relates to our broader understanding of the operation and impacts of housing and urban systems.
2. The impacts of spatial disadvantage, and the importance of housing and place in mediating the incidence and experience of residents of disadvantaged areas.
3. How policy, practitioners and communities can respond to spatial disadvantage in ‘best for people, best for place’ terms.

Our research program has been designed across three research streams corresponding to these issues, with the strong interrelations and links between them maximised through a multi-methods approach and the opportunity for triangulation at key stages of the research. The research streams are:

- Research stream A: Conceptualising spatial disadvantage. This involves a background review of international literature and preparation of a ‘critical perspectives’ paper series; development of a typology of spatial disadvantage for Australian cities and regions capturing the dynamic nature of localities, and an audit of the spatial impacts of housing and non-housing policy settings and programs in creating, accentuating and addressing disadvantage.

- Research stream B: Living in areas of social disadvantage utilises a mixed-methods approach to establish an in-depth understanding of resident experiences of living in disadvantaged localities. This involves the use of postal surveys, interviews and focus-groups across a selection of case study geographies, exploring how individual/household level disadvantage relates to/reflects (or not) locational disadvantage.

- Research stream C: Community, practice and policy in place drills down and focuses in on individual case study areas offering the opportunity to explore particular issues of community, policy and or practitioner interest within the wider guiding framework of the MYRP.

The structure and content of this proposal responds to the sections identified in the brief, is informed by participation in the initial Investigative Panel, and captures (we hope) the substantive debate and informed considerations that have taken place across the team.
2 KEY FEATURES OF SPATIAL CONCENTRATIONS OF SOCIAL DISADVANTAGE

2.1 The importance of space and place: spatial disadvantage

Patterns of social inequality and their spatial manifestation are arguably the most poignant marker of the outcomes and limitations of neoliberal policy frameworks. The increased reach of the forces of globalisation, economic restructuring and the transformed nature of labour market dynamics act to sift and sort opportunities and constraints for households, shaping and reinforcing spatial outcomes. Disparities between rich and poor in many advanced economies have become ever more distorted and transitions have resulted in more complex social-spatial patterning in our towns and cities (Badcock 1997; O’Connor et al. 2001; Gleeson 2005). Emergence of these patterns has been paralleled by a longstanding academic interest in issues of socio-spatial polarisation, highlighting the changing aspects of the way our urban areas are structured (Badcock 1984; Forster 1995; Vinson 2004; Randolph 2006; Baum & Gleeson 2010).

Whilst social inequality demonstrates a pervasive trajectory, it can be argued that interest in the role of housing, ‘place’ and neighbourhood have taken on increased primacy, both in terms of understanding the genesis of and solutions to spatial disadvantage. The geographies of the haves and have nots appear to have become more pronounced, reinforced through the operation of housing markets (Bassett & Short 1980). In a market-led housing system (Hulse et al. 2010), policy settings have been complicit through further complicating the ‘basket of goods’ nature of the home to accommodate a raft of consumption, investment and wealth concerns. Housing as a site and focus of welfare transitions (Smith 2009) has had ‘a profound … effect on the spatial distribution of outcomes mediated principally through housing and economic policy’ (Lee 2010). Such shifts highlight the need for a greater understanding of the function of housing and its relationship across space in understanding socio-spatial polarisation.

The structural neglect of social housing funding in recent times has further reinforced the dichotomy between tenure classes. The effects of residualisation, leading to concentrations of those with a range of complex and high needs within the tenure, presents a reality visually identifiable to policymakers and reinforced statistically: where asset holdings are concentrated in large housing estates, the associations between poverty and place become both a political and a policy issue (Badcock 1996; Winter & Stone 1998; Peel 2003). As Fitzpatrick and Stephens (2007) note in the UK context, housing policy is caught in a contradictory bind: housing those most in need but seeking to reduce concentrations of poverty.

In the Australian context, associations between public housing and disadvantage provide a focus for policy interest: addressing concentrations—particularly on large estates—is a key aspect of the housing reform directions agreed through the NAHA, and was identified as one of the criteria for expenditure under the Nation Building and Jobs Economic Stimulus Plan (NBJESP). To date, housing renewal intervention, including deconcentration and mixed tenure redevelopment—such as Kensington (Vic) and Bonnyrigg (NSW)—has essentially been something done to public housing and public housing tenants.

However, because of the much greater significance played by the private rented sector in the provision of housing for those on low incomes, large proportions of the lowest income groups in Australian cities live in private housing. From the Henderson Report onwards, the relationship between social disadvantage and the private rental
market has been a pronounced feature of the Australian housing system (Commission of Inquiry into Poverty 1975; Winter & Stone 1998) and this has resulted in specific spatial outcomes with neighbourhoods of disadvantage evident across tenures (Wulff & Evans 1999; Randolph et al. 2010). The geographies of social-spatial polarisation have also shifted over time. As Randolph and Holloway (2004) have shown, the locations of social disadvantage have shifted decisively outwards in Australian cities over the last 20 to 30 years. What was once largely seen as an inner city issue is now also a problem of middle and outer suburban areas (Yates et al. 2006; Randolph & Freestone 2008; Hulse & Saugeres 2008).

Despite this, housing and urban policy frameworks in Australia have remained essentially silent in places where those concentrations are cross-tenure or predominantly housed within the private sector. One consequence arising from this lack of a whole-of-housing system perspective has been a limited recognition of the importance of space and place, and the role and function of localities in their broader housing and labour market contexts. The establishment of the Social Inclusion Unit (SIU) and release of a new social inclusion strategy sets important markers in terms of better cross-government coordination and identification of place-based disadvantage. Although the Australian Government’s (2009) social inclusion priority to focus on ‘particular locations, neighbourhoods and communities to ensure programs and services are getting to the right places’ is an important step, it can be argued that this has not yet stimulated a more critical engagement and understanding of the spatiality of drivers, impacts and outcomes affecting exclusion and how they are mediated by place.

Equally, recent re-engagement in urban policy through Infrastructure Australia, the Major Cities Unit and release of the policy discussion paper Our Cities (Australian Government 2010) leans heavily on frameworks focused on improving the efficiency and productivity of urban areas without the necessary connections being made to social equity and spatial justice issues. We would argue that such connections are fundamental to establishing a more strategic, joined-up approach. The various metropolitan strategies in our cities similarly offer little, beyond the assumed benefits of consolidation and densification, to address the complex issues faced by some areas of spatial disadvantage. Therefore, whilst the current policy context places both social inclusion and cities firmly on the agenda, there is a pressing need for better synergies across government, not least through a more considered understanding of the inherently spatial nature of government policies.

Our proposed approach in the MYRP seeks to respond to this gap.
3 KEY ISSUES SHAPING ACADEMIC AND POLICY INTEREST

3.1 Social disadvantage: from poverty to exclusion

‘Social disadvantage’ encompasses myriad factors, experiences and outcomes which shape an individual or household’s absolute and relative wellbeing. These can be understood in terms of equity concerns regarding access to housing, health, education and employment opportunities, and disproportionate exposure to harm from discrimination, crime and stigma. Often, the dimensions experienced are multiple, cumulative and entrenched: persistent, compounded and resistant to traditional policy solutions (Room 1995a, 1995b). In areas of extreme disadvantage, places are described as developing their own ‘pathologies’; and Vinson (2009) has used the metaphor of a ‘web of disadvantage’ to highlight the risk of becoming ‘trapped’ in disadvantaged communities. A recasting of urban poverty and welfare distribution politics into concepts of social inclusion and exclusion has acted to transfer concerns regarding systematic inequities towards the relational experience of individuals, households, groups and places to those inequities. When concentrated in the context of place, exclusion takes on explicit spatial characteristics, with people shut out from the labour market and disconnected from opportunity (Katz 2004; Lee 2010).

3.2 Concentrations defined by place, but shaped across different spatial scales

At the heart of this MYRP is an interest in space and place; we are fundamentally concerned with the potential impacts of, and responses to, spatial concentrations of social disadvantage rather than disadvantage per se. Questions of scale, boundaries, composition—all complex considerations in themselves—come into play. In policy and program terms, there are geographies, in terms of drivers, intervention and delivery, that need to be worked with. As seen in the UK with the arrival of the Social Exclusion Unit and National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (NSNR) in the late 1990s, the ‘neighbourhood’ appears the logical scale of enquiry and response at first sight. The flagship neighbourhood renewal program, New Deal Communities (NDC), focused on the ‘worst estates’ (both public and cross-tenure) within tightly defined boundaries. Although plans focused on the neighbourhood level, strategies had to take into account broader economic and housing market contexts, with drivers across a range of spatial scales.

This ‘rescaling’ of housing renewal policy increasingly shaped housing policy in England and the USA during the 2000s, particularly through the Housing Market Renewal (UK) and HOPE VI (USA) programs. A key observation across these often controversial initiatives—and emphasised in the final report for the NSNR evaluation (DCLG 2010)—is that it is necessary to understand local housing markets, economic function and population mobility in spatial terms in order to develop appropriate responses. This highlights the importance of reworking our understanding and representation of disadvantaged areas and the need to develop a more nuanced spatial typology that captures the diversity across lower and mixed income geographies.

3.3 Neighbourhood effects, neighbourhood thresholds

Everything is related to everything else, but near things are more related than distant things. (Tobler 1970)
A focus on place, and *concentrations in place*, has stimulated a great degree of academic interest in whether geography, proximity and association compound or mitigate disadvantage (Darcy & Gwyther 2009). Studies have considered compositional factors, whether ‘thresholds’ can be identified beyond which point neighbourhood effects act to compound negative externalities and impact on wellbeing, opportunities and house prices (Buck 2001; Galster 2002; McColloch 2001; Groenhart 2010). Researchers have looked at impacts on educational and health outcomes, social capital and cohesion, correlations with crime rates, antisocial behaviour and house prices, and whether it is better to be disadvantaged in a deprived area or disadvantaged in a more prosperous area (see Galster 2009, 2010 for comprehensive reviews across this literature). There has also been interest in the impacts on and outcomes for less disadvantaged households living in deprived areas. Through longitudinal studies of relocation programs such as Gautreaux and Moving to Opportunity (MTO) in the USA, the prospects of those moving from disadvantaged to ‘better’ neighbourhoods have also been tracked (Briggs 1997; Popkin et al. 2002; Rosenbaum et al. 2002). The strength of these collective works is not in its resolution as to whether neighbourhood effects occur or at which point a tipping point takes hold, but rather in the diversity and difference demonstrated among cases.

Different localities demonstrate a heterogeneity of context, neighbourhood effects and outcomes.

### 3.4 Social mix/tenure mix

Extensive academic debate has also questioned the perceived policy orthodoxy of social/tenure mix being the solution to addressing concentrations of social disadvantage, particularly on public housing estates (Arthurson 2008). This has provided a challenge to assumptions tied to the ‘social mix fix’ (Randolph 2006). Whilst our research will retain a critical perspective in this regard, it is also acknowledged that policy and practitioner rationale behind interest and enrolment of tenure mix principles accommodates a wide range of objectives beyond seeking to build social capital or provide ‘role model’ neighbours. In this regard, social aims are accompanied with financial, asset renewal, development and environmental sustainability objectives (Wood 2003). Arguably those seeking to bring about change on the ground are likely to be as aware of the complexities, limitations and challenges of mix policy as their critics. We would nevertheless concur with Galster that ‘social mix planning should be approached with a substantial dose of circumspection, sensitivity to contextual nuance, and modest expectations (2009 p.29).

We want the MYRP to contribute to building a more nuanced understanding, and facilitate implementation for households, communities, policymakers and practitioners alike, of *best for people, best for place* outcomes.
4 SCOPE OF MYRP

Although the MYRP offers the opportunity to explore complex issues such as concentrations of disadvantage, inevitably it cannot cover all issues worthy of attention with appropriate depth. Scoping has drawn upon insight from the Investigative Panel process and report (AHURI 2010).

Our discussion in the previous section also points to core conceptual, methodological and policy-focused considerations within this broad framework that we think highlight key research and policy gaps, particularly in the Australian context. These flow from recognition that:

**Spatial disadvantage is not a tenure-specific concern**
The MYRP will incorporate a focus on localities with a high proportion of social housing and estate renewal activity, however it is vital that the social spatial dynamics of disadvantage are conceptualised and understood within a whole-of-housing system framework.

**Geography and scale matters**
Policy is inherently spatial, and housing and ‘place’ act as anchors around which drivers and impacts across a variety of spatial scales are mediated. We need a better spatial understanding of the role (exacerbating/mitigating) of housing policy and programs on concentrations of disadvantage.

**Not all disadvantaged areas are the same**
A more nuanced understanding of differences between disadvantaged localities is required. SEIFA scores on their own fail to highlight the different roles and functions that lower income/lower value areas play in their wider spatial, housing market and economic contexts. Not all deprived areas are the same. Nor are they all problematic. We need to understand (and work with) this diversity better.

**Experiences of disadvantage are diverse**
Differences in the functional roles of disadvantaged areas are accompanied by commensurate diversity in how individuals, households and communities relate to housing market ‘positions’, and experience and negotiate exclusion in the context of home and place (Allen 2008). Greater insight is required into the behavioural aspects of disadvantage from a diversity of individuals and households living in disadvantaged areas.

**Social exclusion is a question of justice**
Social exclusion agendas (in housing policy terms) to date have often viewed housing and locality in terms of ‘access’, ‘inserting people’ and reconnecting with restructured labour markets. These objectives remain important, but the economic downturn in many countries highlights the need for on-going stewardship and support in vulnerable disadvantaged communities. We would also strongly argue that there is also a need to recover and re-engage concepts of spatial justice (Soja 2010). As well as exclusion being countered by reconnecting with the ‘productive’ city, it also needs to be about social equity and enabling the ‘Just City’ (Fainstein 2010).

**We need to know what policies have worked**
Diversity across and within deprived localities necessitates a range of policy and practitioner responses and responsibilities that are varied, integrated and attuned to the dynamic nature of urban systems and functions. We need to know what policies have worked (and have not), and progress ways in which more integrated
consideration across housing, planning, infrastructure and inclusion agendas in our cities can be fostered.

In order to explore these issues, our program of research is structured along three inter-related research streams:

- **Research stream A:** Conceptualising spatial disadvantage. This involves a background review of international literature and preparation of a ‘critical perspectives’ paper series; development of a typology of spatial disadvantage and the spatial mapping of housing and non-housing policy settings and programs in creating, accentuating and addressing disadvantage.

- **Research stream B:** Living in areas of social disadvantage aims to establish an in-depth understanding of resident experiences of living in disadvantaged localities. A survey across a selection of case study geographies will explore how individual/household level disadvantage relates to/reflects (or not) locational disadvantage. Follow-up interviews and focus groups will be undertaken with a selection of survey respondents.

- **Research stream C:** Community, practice and policy in place focuses in on individual case study areas offering the opportunity to explore particular issues of community, policy and or practitioner interest within the wider guiding framework of the MYRP.

A detailed overview of the research methods is outlined in Section 5. While some issues and questions will be broadly addressed within one research stream, in most cases, insight from research across multiple research streams, and project components within streams, will be drawn upon. As outlined in detail in Section 5, a multi-methods approach has been developed including spatial data analysis, a large-scale survey and a breadth of qualitative techniques. In research stream C, a range of mixed methods and innovatory techniques—reflecting the diversity of issues to be explored—will be used.

Table 1 identifies more specific research questions related to the three research streams and the methods proposed to investigate them.

Figure 1 provides an overview of how the research streams and the work strands within them relate to the overall program.

### 4.1 Scope considerations

#### 4.1.1 Indigenous households and communities

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians are deeply affected by the impacts of concentrations of social disadvantage and it is a national policy priority to close the gap on Indigenous disadvantage (COAG 2008). Disadvantage among Indigenous Australians is strongly associated with place, not only remote locations or discrete communities but also in urban settings, where many Indigenous households live in housing estates, on the fringes of towns or in other lower cost areas of the private market. We recognise that there will be many distinctive factors associated with forms of Indigenous social disadvantage, including the legacy of historical alienation and racism, profound economic disadvantage and cultural damage. As well, appreciation of cultural factors that are tied to Indigenous concepts of family/kinship, land and home and their geographies of community and association must inform both our understanding of and responses to Indigenous spatial disadvantage.

It is our considered view that the interface between urban disadvantage and Indigeneity requires specialised methodologies and comprehensive engagement that
would not be feasible within the context and resources of this MYRP. We understand that a second MYRP will be announced later this year dedicated to research on Indigenous housing issues. We have set aside $12,000 in our budget to scope the potential for a joint partnership project if/once that MYRP is established. Notwithstanding this, the research team will ensure that any of the MYRP research that implicates Indigenous residents, Indigenous service providers and other Indigenous organisations (such as community working parties or local assemblies) is inclusive of their interests and that their participation in the research process is culturally appropriate and respectful of cultural values and knowledge. Within its team, the MYRP can draw upon the expertise of Paul Memmott (UQ) and Vivienne Milligan (UNSW), both experienced researchers in this field who have links with Indigenous researchers and community leaders.

4.1.2 Homelessness

The team acknowledges the explicit links between homelessness and spatial disadvantage, and the importance of this agenda within the housing reform agenda and in terms of broader cross Department commitment. Consideration of these issues will be incorporated in all aspects of the research undertaken, where relevant. Flexibility provided in the development of the case study research provides an avenue for inclusion with the MYRP program, particularly in terms of local prevention and support services/provision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Strand</th>
<th>Methodology (including data sources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A: Conceptualising spatial disadvantage | → How have concentrations of social disadvantage been conceptualised in urban systems?  
→ How can we understand and capture the heterogeneity of disadvantaged areas?  
→ Is place a determining variable in how concentrations of social deprivation are conceptualised and formed?  
→ How do housing policies, programs and expenditures contribute to concentrations of social disadvantage? | A1     | → Review of academic/policy/practice literature.  
→ Input/comment from international experts on critical perspectives paper series. |
|        |                                                                                   | A2     | → Development of a spatial typology of disadvantaged localities.                                      |
|        |                                                                                   | A3     | → Audit of spatial impact and outcomes of housing (and non-housing) policy/expenditures.               |
| B: Living in areas of social disadvantage | → How do individual/household levels of disadvantage relate to different ‘types’ of disadvantaged area?  
→ What is the contribution of housing/place in the experience of disadvantage and how do local residents perceive it?  
→ When does the concentration of social disadvantage become a problem, for whom, and when? | B1     | → Selection of case study areas, covering the different ‘types’ in the spatial typology.               |
|        |                                                                                   | B2     | → Postal survey of residents across 6–8 case study areas.                                             |
|        |                                                                                   | B3/C1  | → ‘Locality testing’:  
→ Focus groups or in-depth interviews with a small sample of survey respondents.  
→ ‘Groundtruthing’ of spatial typology findings with local experts/practitioners. |
| C: Community, policy and practice in place | → What interventions are best suited to meeting a range of economic and social goals in areas of high social disadvantage?  
→ How are these shaped by the functional role of the locality and its broader spatial context?  
→ How can housing policy and programs relate to other government actions in addressing concentrations of social disadvantage? | C2     | → Mixed methods according to topic focus and context, including: stakeholder interviews; focus groups; action research and other participatory frameworks; housing historical and house biographies; policy/lay/ practitioner workshops; expert/lay deliberation, scenario building. |
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5 RESEARCH METHOD

5.1 Research stream A: Conceptualising spatial disadvantage

Research stream A provides the conceptual framework within which the remainder of the program will be positioned. Split into three connected and complementary work strands, it will involve:

- A review of the international literature on social and spatial disadvantage.
- Development of a typology of spatial disadvantage across major Australian cities, capturing the dynamic nature of localities. This is underpinned by a multivariate analysis grounded in the importance of mobility and analysis of the exacerbating/mitigating role of housing market processes in shaping spatial disadvantage.
- An investigation of the spatial impacts of various housing and non-housing policy settings and programs in creating, accentuating and addressing disadvantage.

5.1.1 Work strand A1: International academic, policy and practice review

There are a number of complex, challenging and often contradictory conceptual issues that have shaped academic and policy interest in the drivers, outcomes and potential means of addressing concentrations of social disadvantage. Some of these were discussed in the preceding section and it will be necessary to critically revisit them in the early stages of the MYRP.

The team will prepare a literature, policy and practice review on socio-spatial disadvantage from an Australian and international perspective. This will result in a background paper that sets out the basis and development of our conceptual understanding regarding the processes that lead to spatial disadvantage, the ways in which concentrations of disadvantage develop and change over time, and the role that housing plays. Members of the team already have a comprehensive understanding of this literature and there are thorough, up-to-date reviews drawing together this knowledge (see Galster 2009, 2010). In addition to the review, a series of short conceptual ‘critical perspectives’ papers will be prepared. The aim of these will be to stimulate debate on core issues, and a team of leading scholars from the US, the UK and Europe have been invited to provide input.

5.1.2 Work strand A2: Developing a typology of spatial disadvantage

Central to our proposed approach will be to progress how such debates are framed, and how the research and policy communities might respond, through developing a spatial typology of disadvantaged areas in Australia. A more sophisticated engagement with spatial context and the dynamics of place confirms that not all disadvantaged areas are the same, nor are they necessarily problematic. Lower and mixed income/value neighbourhoods perform a variety of roles within their broader spatial contexts. They are also home to a diversity of households with quite different ‘positions’ within the housing system (Allen 2008). This diversity needs to be acknowledged, and these different drivers and contexts necessarily flow through to different policy responses.

The first stage in our approach recognises the importance of mobility, its impact on housing markets, and the fundamental role this plays in the creation of social spatial polarisation in our cities (Randolph and Holloway, 2004; Baum, 2008). Between 2001 and 2006, 6.6 million Australians—about one third of the population—changed their place of residence. These moves can have both significant impacts on the sending and receiving localities, and on the functional relationships between them. This
interest consolidates recent work by several members of the research team (Randolph et al. 2010; Pinnegar 2009; Burke & Wulff 2009; Hulse et al. 2010; Wulff & Reynolds 2010).

Research by Bailey and Livingstone (2007), Robson et al (2008), Ferrari and Rae (2011) and reports published by DCLG (2009) offer important starting points. The Robson et al. (2008)/DCLG (2009) research focuses on building a better understanding of in- and out-migration flows from the bottom 20 per cent ‘Lower Super Output Areas’ in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). Key to their interest has been whether people moving into neighbourhoods differed from those moving out, and what types of neighbourhood they were moving from and to. They identified four types of deprived neighbourhood (transit, escalator, improver, isolate), defined in terms of mobility characteristics, housing market/functional context and potential policy responses.

Table 2: Types of deprived neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Potential policy response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalator</td>
<td>Neighbourhoods which are part of an onward and upward progression through housing/labour markets.</td>
<td>Policies to identify the needs of ‘stayer households’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improver</td>
<td>Most in-movers come from less deprived areas and most out-movers are going to a similarly deprived area.</td>
<td>Need to address risks of displacement (e.g. links with affordable housing strategies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate</td>
<td>Localities isolated from wider housing markets. Where flows do occur they are to/from similarly deprived areas.</td>
<td>Integrated policy support and interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>These localities provide (relatively) affordable accommodation for households starting out.</td>
<td>Policies to identify the needs of stayer households.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robson et al. 2008

Figure 2: Patterns of flows between neighbourhoods

Source: Robson et al. 2008

---

1 The DCLG reports are the policy ‘adaptation’ of the Robson et al. (2008) work
2 A comparable resource to SEIFA
The analysis highlights different forms of connectivity between and across different area types, with areas of similarity remaining more closely connected. Importantly, all types were spread across the bottom quintile of Census output areas and across different neighbourhood tenure profiles. Given an interest in the influence that proximity might exert, nearest neighbour relationships were also explored in detail.

Creating a typology of spatial disadvantage in Australia

In order to develop a typology of spatial disadvantage that is specific to the Australian context, we propose to build upon the Robson et al. (2008) approach as a starting point. We will then extend this through a multivariate analysis of spatial datasets, incorporating an understanding of local housing market characteristics in particular, to help stress-test and nuance the spatial geographies which emerge. We expect the ‘types’ that are identified in the Australian analysis will be influenced by distinctive characteristics of our housing system—the significant role of the private rented sector, the relative tightness of housing markets in supply/demand terms (Hulse & Burke 2010) and compared to the post-industrial urban restructuring seen in many cities in the USA, UK and Europe, the relative absence of substantive ‘shocks’ to our metropolitan cities.

An initial typology based upon mobility analysis

The first stage involves a simple analysis of the 2006 SEIFA index for metropolitan and regional areas of Australia (identified by ABS Standard Census Geographies)

---

Coverage of metropolitan and regional centres is important not only in terms of exploring the spatial extent of disadvantage across the urban hierarchy, but also in order to further understanding of the...
using the methodology employed by Randolph and Holloway (2004). This identified CDs at or beyond the 1st standard deviation below the mean score for each State/Territory (approximately 15% of all CDs) as being those in greatest disadvantage.

We then consider the profiles of locations that people moved from and where they moved to between 2001 and 2006 in the first run of our analysis, and then return to and update this component following release of 2006–11 data from the 2011 Census (mid- to late-2012). Whilst secondary datasets such as HILDA and the SIH provide a useful benchmark for understanding general household mobility patterns over time, only Census data enables disaggregation at the spatial level we are looking at.

An initial typology of deprived locations will emerge. The aim will be to derive a robust number of ‘types’ (perhaps 4–5) which capture differences within the functional roles of disadvantaged localities.

**Multivariate analysis: labour market function and housing market dynamics**

We will then augment this initial typology through a) an understanding of the characteristics of those doing the moving and b) the potential influence and impacts of local housing market characteristics and dynamics in shaping those patterns. Given the need to bring together a number of datasets for this stage in the analysis, we intend to focus on the capital cities of our respective states (Melbourne, Brisbane and Sydney) and their commuter hinterlands.

In terms of a), Robson et al. acknowledge that a weakness in their research is a lack of contextual information characterising the patterns of movement. In the Australian context we can extend the analysis by characterising those active movers by employment (occupation and labour market engagement) and age structure. This enables comparisons to be made between the structure of the flows and the profiles of the sending and receiving locations. It will also contribute to analysis of the ‘staying’ population thus further extending the research and forming the basis for potential discussions on differential policy approaches.

In looking at b) housing market dynamics, we are interested in whether (and how) the changing affordability of dwelling prices/rents translates into mobility decisions. Recognising the importance of local and submarket housing characteristics, this will analyse the major changes in affordability and accessibility across the three metropolitan areas. It will involve analysis of price and rent changes relative to wider housing market performance and assessment of the role of price and rent differentials in driving changes in mobility and occupancy for various types of household. We will look at these dynamics over the last 30 years to provide a longitudinal analysis and understanding of the trajectory of local level change.

This multivariate approach highlights excellent synergies, both conceptually and empirically, across the research partners’ interests, and builds upon recent and ongoing AHURI and ARC research projects undertaken by team members (Burke & Wulff 2009; Hulse et al. 2010). Through this second stage of analysis, a ‘refined’ typology will be developed, with the final methodology designed to ensure that it is replicable and can be updated over time.

The potential validity (and value) of the spatial typology will be ‘groundtruthed’ with local policy officials, experts, stakeholders as part of work strand B3/C1 (does it align with their knowledge of how the locality ‘works?’).

relationships and interactions between concentrations of disadvantage across the entirety of the country (Marshall et al., 2002).
The objective is to develop a typology that captures the dynamics of localities, differentiates between various ‘types’ of disadvantaged area. This will be important for ensuring appropriate policy interventions can be made where needed, and that they are targeted effectively.

5.1.3 Work strand A3: Understanding the spatial impacts of housing and non-housing policy settings

The third step in this conceptualisation stage is to gain an improved understanding of the spatial impacts of housing and non-housing policy settings, both in terms of how they act to accentuate and encourage market-led dynamics, but also where they seek to mitigate the negative effects of market operation.

This is a complex task, both conceptually and empirically, particularly in a predominantly market-led housing system (Hulse et al. 2010) where housing-specific levers are few and often subservient to broader macroeconomic goals. We aim to conduct a spatial policy audit through mapping the location, nature and scale of housing and housing/place-impacting policy and programs at a sub-metropolitan level. We are interested in ‘following the money’ to build up a better understanding of how those flows can be seen to shape submarkets and the housing function within them.

Our interest spans levers at the Commonwealth (CRA, NRAS, NBJESP, FHOG, tax/subsidy frameworks) and State (SHA/CHP holdings, expenditure, local stamp duty structures) level, focused on the Metropolitan area/commuter hinterlands of Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne. As part of this feasibility study, we acknowledge that this stage of our analysis is challenging, and the success of this research component will be heavily dependent upon access to available data at the appropriate spatial scale. However, the benefits of building up a composite picture of policy expenditures and subsidies across subregional geographies are substantial, not least in articulating the importance of spatial considerations in an integrated policy context.

We are encouraged to pursue this innovative approach in the MYRP given that, in part, it extends methods developed by the team for previous research (Yates et al. 2006) which analysed the social housing waiting list and CRA recipient data at postcode level (see also Burke & Wulff 2009). Most components initially identified for analysis (see Table 2 below) have been used previously by team members, and requests have been opened to negotiate access to these data for the MYRP. The first stage of work strand A3 will be to extend this analysis, and is likely to involve a range of different approaches in order to maximise how these data can be collated, analysed and understood.

Table 3: Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commonwealth Rent Assistance</th>
<th>Geographies of CRA</th>
<th>FaHCSIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics/profiles of recipients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and affordable housing: asset geographies, allocation policies</td>
<td>Location of stock (estate/non-estate), percentage of total stock at different spatial scales</td>
<td>State Housing Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churn/sustained tenancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wait list geographies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profiles/needs of households allocated tenancies across different areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Research stream B: Living in areas of social disadvantage

Research stream B will use a mixed-methods approach to establish an in-depth understanding of the experience of living in areas of social disadvantage. Conceptually, it follows from research stream A and acknowledges that there are a range of different households, experiencing different degrees of exclusion, living in disadvantaged areas of various different ‘types’. The following work strands are involved:

- Selection of 6–8 case study areas (work strand B1) across the range of disadvantaged locality ‘types’ developed in work strand A2. Collectively these case studies provide the geographical focus for the more in-depth research to be undertaken in research stream B and research stream C.
- A postal survey across the case study areas (work strand B2), exploring relationships between individual and household levels of exclusion/disadvantage and ‘place’ disadvantage.

A third work strand straddles research streams B and C. Work strand B3/C1 involves the triangulation of insight from both the spatial typology/broader conceptual analysis.
of research stream A and in-depth qualitative follow-up from the household localities in each of our localities.\(^4\)

**5.2.1 Work strand B1: Selecting the case study geographies**

**Why use case studies?**

- Enables the research process/focus to reflect the heterogeneity of disadvantaged localities and commensurate heterogeneity of neighbourhood effects, responses and outcomes.
- Allows for a range of issues core to the overarching aims of the MYRP to be explored from the bottom-up and within the context of place as a key site for housing policy and research.
- Highlights the challenges, difficulties and contradictions of the evidence base and helps negotiate the realities of policy and program ‘translation’ on the ground.
- Encourages and enables the use of mixed, innovative and participatory methods in response to the specific nature of case study focus and circumstances.
- Provides flexibility to incorporate insight from complementary research activity by the team or made available to the team e.g. data from Building Stronger Communities (NSW) or the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (Vic).

There will be 6–8 case study geographies identified. The scale of the identified geographies used for this type of research clearly has a substantive impact not only in terms of any definitions of concentration, but also in terms of consistency across datasets, jurisdictions and institutional frameworks. Our approach will therefore be to select localities based foremost on ‘type’ at a **pragmatically comparable scale**: defining geographies provides the basis for critically interrogating drivers and impacts operating across a multitude of spatial scales, rather than delimiting ‘fixed’ territories for enquiry. Members of the MYRP Policy Advisory Group will be involved in the selection, and the process will take into account a number of considerations.

First and foremost, across the case study areas—and reflective of the typology approach—the aim is to capture a range of localities with different functional, market and broader spatial contexts. Within these, it is likely that the selected areas will include inner, middle and outer ring metropolitan locations across metropolitan/commuter hinterland Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne and, where feasible, 1–2 regional centres.\(^5\) They will also reflect a mix of localities with high concentrations of public housing (including on large estates within the case study areas), areas with mixed tenure or predominantly private sector stock. At least two of the case studies will be localities where recent interventions have been made to address disadvantage through housing or non-housing policy measures and programs, allowing an assessment of the approaches taken, their impact and outcomes. Finally, there is a responsibility on the research community to take into account whether an area has been over-researched.

**5.2.2 Work strand B2: Survey**

The aim of the survey is to enable insight into how levels of household disadvantage relate to/reflect (or not) **locational** disadvantage across our study sites. Key interests here will be to understand the role that housing and housing systems play in mediating this relationship. By helping triangulate our understanding of different

---

\(^4\) This will be covered under research stream C in this proposal.

\(^5\) Whilst fieldwork and budgetary practicalities have shaped this decision, selection of themes/areas for in-depth study will be designed to ensure transferable lessons across all jurisdictions.
functional roles in different areas, it will be useful to determine the extent to which resident decisions to move into or remain within particular localities are motivated by positive housing choices rather than constraint. Such choices might reflect an appreciation that the area provides low-cost housing or access to important social support or cultural facilities.

Given the need for disaggregated data at a local spatial scale, use of existing secondary databases (such as HILDA, ABS GSS and HES) is not feasible, although this project complements and strongly builds upon quantitative research using GSS underway by Stone, Reynolds and Hulse6. Detailed design of the survey will take place at the time of case study selection.

At this stage (and as costed) we envisage that a mix of quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered on socio-demographic background, attitudes, behaviours, aspirations and levels of mobility, and that the survey will be administered by post7.

→ While response rates for postal surveys tend to be low (around 15%), members of the research team have extensive experience of using this method successfully (including for NRV3, see Burke & Pinnegar 2007) with communities living in areas of high disadvantage. Respondents will also be invited to complete the survey online via partner AHURI Centres’ websites.

→ We will aim to achieve 300–400 responses per location to improve statistical significance at the local spatial scale. This indicates that around 12,000 surveys will need to be sent out to achieve total returns of around 2500.

→ We are interested in the experiences, behaviours and housing/labour market positions of all households. As such, a random sample post-out across case study areas would be adopted.

Responses from the survey will allow a multivariate analysis of responses of the kind used by Randolph et al. (2010) in their analysis of the dimensions of social exclusion in western Sydney. Here, data were collected on a range of dimensions of expressed social exclusion and were analysed to identify respondents with different degrees of multiple disadvantage/exclusion, including those experiencing no demonstrable level of disadvantage8. Such a method provides an assessment of the intensity of disadvantage and will allow the experience of disadvantage to be more clearly assessed, quantified and triangulated against the functional roles of each case study identified by the spatial typology analysis.

The research team is very mindful that areas where the survey will be administered are likely to include a high proportion of households where English is not the primary language used in the home. Although the postal survey method precludes use of extensive translation, the team will consider use of short introductions inviting participation in the survey in the key language groups as identified through ABS community profile data or as officially identified in the dissemination policies of respective LGAs.

Comparative analysis of dimensions of social exclusion experienced at the household level across different ‘types’ of disadvantaged area across the case study areas will be undertaken. Findings will also be disaggregated to each locality for specific

6 See http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/p40559/
7 We have investigated a range of possible survey methodologies in arriving at this proposal (face-to-face, telephone, web-based and online panel surveys), but on cost grounds the postal approach is favoured.
8 This is important, because it is clear that many household living in areas classified by broader statistics as being ‘disadvantaged’ do not experience such disadvantages.
application in each of the community/practice/policy studies (work strand C2). The survey will also include a mechanism for recruiting participants for focus groups or in-depth interviews to be conducted in each of the case studies (work strand B3/C1). The research team has a strong background in survey development and an interest in building capacity and resources for the wider housing community. Our approach in developing the survey in this context will be a) to collect sufficient information to meet MYRP requirements, and b) to act as a pilot for a repeatable ‘Housing Australia Survey’: a potential future AHURI flagship.

5.3 Research stream C: Community, practice and policy in place

Research stream C of the MYRP program drills down and focuses on our individual case study areas. Two work strands are identified:

- Local triangulation (work strand B3/C1) involving the groundtruthing of insight from our spatial analysis and follow-up focus groups and/or interviews with survey (work strand A2) respondents.
- Case studies (work strand C2), offering the opportunity to explore particular issues of community, policy and or practitioner interest within the wider guiding framework of the MYRP.

5.3.1 Work strand B3/C1: Groundtruthing: talking to the locals

This work strand bridges research streams B and C. It involves talking to ‘locals’ to determine the value of both the spatial typology developed as well as the key issues/themes pertinent to our understanding of the case study area and its residents from the survey. Two components of this locality testing will be consistent across each of the case study areas:

- The first is a roundtable workshop\(^9\) with an invited panel of 9–12 stakeholders: council officers, real estate professionals, community workers, non-profit providers, housing officers, chambers of commerce, etc. The aim will be to present findings, to discuss the extent to which findings fit participant perceptions of place, and to explore policy and practice options. Additional insights into the dynamics and structure of the areas will be derived and included in research outputs.
- The second is a follow-up to the residents’ survey through either a focus group or five in-depth interviews. This will provide the opportunity to build up housing narratives, pathways and ‘house’ biographies.

Together this local triangulation provides important feedback conceptually and methodologically for core elements of the MYRP.

5.3.2 Work strand C2: Community, practice and policy case studies

Whilst each of our case study areas will share insight from the survey (work strand B2) and work strand B3/C1, our research design is intended to enable each of the areas to hone in on a specific issue pertinent to the MYRP agenda and to particular drivers, issues or policy, practitioner and community in those localities. Therefore the thrust of interest in each of the sites will vary intentionally, focusing on how issues/themes are shaped and negotiated ‘on the ground’. The approach allows for a place-based assessment of a range of issues that shape policy interest. While retaining a critical perspective, this element of the MYRP is focused on how the

\(^{9}\) We understand that such a ‘groundtruthing’ exercise provided confidence in the use of the typology as a strong platform for more locally specific analysis in the Robson et al. study (Robson, per.comm 2010).
research process can facilitate the sharing of practice lessons and ‘best for people, best for place’ outcomes. We envisage that in a number of our study areas, there may be interventions/activities planned or underway.

There will also be variation in terms of participant focus and the mix of methods used, with a strong commitment to maximising participatory approaches and utilising a range of innovative methods. The approach in all case study areas will, however, be shaped by the conceptual frame established by preceding streams. It is neither possible nor appropriate to identify specific case studies at this time, however, a number of hypothetical examples can be suggested:

- **Area A** is a lower income/lower value cross-tenure middle suburb locality. The function and role of the locality as an entry market is of significant interest across government. However, there are challenges of coordinating the different role and responsibilities of the different agencies focused on that place. Local policymakers want to better understand how an integrated approach to the stewardship of this area can be best facilitated.

- **Area B** is an area undergoing significant change, both through market-led displacement but also through the extensive redevelopment of public housing estates and transition to a more diversified, dispersed community housing sector. What are the spatial implications of these changing residential patterns for strategic and operational considerations for support agencies and non-profits? How are they responding?

- **Area C** contains a large public housing estate where major renewal involving deconcentration through densification has been announced. A particular focus of interest may be to consider how the different parties involved in, or affected by, renewal activity engage with the concepts defining the processes involved. How are ‘mix’ and ‘relocation’ negotiated?

Case study reports will draw upon their locality’s survey data, groundtruthing exercise and material gathered tied to their specific focus.
6 PROJECT MILESTONES, TIMEFRAME AND BUDGET

6.1 Timeframe and milestones

The MYRP is scheduled for completion in early 2014. The first milestone will be the submission of a detailed project plan to AHURI and the Policy Advisory Group. Written outputs associated with each research stream/work strand, and complemented by policy/practitioner workshops where appropriate, will provide a series of deliverables over the lifetime of the project.

A key determinant shaping the timings outlined relates to accessing 2011 Census data. We expect these data to be made available in Q3 2012, and therefore the spatial typology work (work strand A2) will be staged. Research team meetings (and aligned with this, workshops/seminars) will be timetabled to ensure input into deliverables from across the partnership at key stages in the project.

The schedule for delivery of outputs is outlined in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Key work strand outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYRP Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3/C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 COLLABORATIONS

Under the Directorship of Professor Hal Pawson, the MYRP will be led by a group at UNSW which will provide high level housing and urban expertise and full time research capacity. The teams at UQ and Swinburne provide a similar mix of lead and associated researchers with extensive housing research experience. The collaboration brings researchers who have:

- Been involved in two AHURI National Research Ventures (NRV).
- Worked successfully together on previous AHURI projects, including delivery of the major empirical research underpinning NRV3.
- Established strong track records in research related to spatial disadvantage, including on social inclusion/exclusion, housing market dynamics, housing affordability, housing and employment.
- Substantial knowledge of housing and social policy analysis alongside a shared commitment to building an evidence-base at the research/policy interface.

The benefits of collaboration are further underpinned by the diversity of research skills and interests, a shared commitment to multi-method and participatory approaches to research, and the value of ‘local’ experience in Australia’s three largest Metropolitan areas. Our respective AHURI Centres benefit from being part of wider Centres/institutes within their universities and enjoy excellent links with researchers in associated disciplines. For example, researchers from the Social Policy and Research Centre (SPRC) at UNSW will contribute to a number of envisaged research tasks in research streams B and C.

The partnership will also draw upon the input and advice of a number of international experts, in this field. Collectively, they offer a breadth of expertise on key concepts and research challenges tied to understanding and addressing spatial disadvantage. They will play a vital role in developing the research approach, and will contribute to high level reviews and final reporting. It is intended to retain some flexibility as to how the contributions of each of our international experts are best utilised. For example, it might be that one takes an active role in contributing to written reports. Another might contribute to methodological development; another may attend and lead one of the policy workshops.

The Panel opens up opportunity for academic papers and international grant applications exploring comparative experience. Sharing findings with international researchers will raise AHURI’s profile and give local findings international coverage. Three experts have been invited to join the MYRP team:

Table 5: Expert advisory panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise relevant to the MYRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. George Galster</td>
<td>Wayne State University, USA</td>
<td>Neighbourhood dynamics, effects, thresholds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Peter Williams</td>
<td>University of Cambridge, UK</td>
<td>Housing market dynamics, mortgage markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable homeownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Paul Lawless</td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam University, UK</td>
<td>Area based intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead investigator New Deal for Communities evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the MYRP will be critically grounded and advance theoretical debates tied to conceptualising, and analysing outcomes of spatial disadvantage, the partnership has an excellent track record and commitment to the delivery of policy-oriented outputs. Arguably, the subject area for the MYRP very much captures the tension arising from observations that policy is as much an ideas-based enterprise as it is an evidence-based one (Smith, 2009). Our aim is to provide a robust evidence-base that acknowledges the challenges shaping the policy design and implementation process.

Our approach promotes a framework where policy and practitioner engagement is ongoing, and structured to enable the formal sharing of practice but also opportunity for more exploratory debate, for example through deliberative/scenario building techniques. MYRP activity will build upon the strong engagement each of the three centres has with their respective state housing authorities and planning departments, housing associations, tenant advocacy groups, and peak bodies (see Table 6).

Table 6: Building on existing engagement with government agencies, community housing providers and other stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNSW</strong></td>
<td>UNSW researchers are currently working with Housing NSW on several programs where aims to address concentrations of disadvantage are central, including: evaluation of the Building Stronger Communities Initiative; a longitudinal panel study of Bonnyrigg resident experiences and outcomes through estate renewal; and community engagement in Redfern Waterloo. Two senior members of the Department's Strategic Projects Division—with extensive 'on the ground' experience of designing and implementing renewal—are Visiting Fellows at City Futures Research Centre and this active relationship will be enhanced through MYRP activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swinburne</strong></td>
<td>Swinburne's Housing Management and Policy course requires constant liaison with all jurisdictions. Burke runs an annual professional development program for senior staff of the Victorian DHS on Housing Economics and Policy and is negotiating the same for Housing SA. Hulse and Stone act as sounding boards to various housing agencies, including FaHCSIA, on private rental and social inclusion issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UQ</strong></td>
<td>University of Queensland researchers are working with the QLD Department of Communities to evaluate local service integration initiatives in the area of homelessness and have undertaken several studies and evaluation for the state government on sustaining tenancies in public housing, local homelessness programs and local partnership arrangements between housing and health services. Jones is a member of the Queensland Housing Assistance forum, an advisory body to the Minister of Communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These synergies will be complemented by the Policy Advisory Group, with members drawn from all states/territories who represent the breadth of policy interest in these issues. This will involve colleagues from other State Housing Authorities, AHURI, HHPWRG, HMAC and FaHCSIA. Reflecting our research framework, we will also seek engagement and interest across wider urban, planning, infrastructure and social inclusion policy areas. We have received early indicative support for an advisory role from the Australian Social Inclusion Unit, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, to be confirmed once the tender is finalised. The Policy Advisory Group will comprise up to 16 members. The PAG’s terms of reference, to be finalised during project...
initiation, will combine the procedural requirements of a traditional AHURI User Group with the more strategic and critical contribution expected of an Investigative Panel.

Ensuring efficient and effective input from all interested parties, coupled with the importance of bringing the core project team together on a regular basis, presents something of a challenge and risks consuming a disproportionate amount of the resources available for the MYRP. As such, Policy Advisory Group (PAG) input and involvement will be aligned to project team meetings. Not all 16 members of the PAG would attend all meetings; rather a number would be invited/would nominate themselves for particular meetings. We aim to rotate the location of the project team meetings, and so geographical considerations will come into play. All members of the PAG would be made party to the prepared inputs/outputs of those meetings and, where appropriate, could contribute and comment electronically. Where workshops are scheduled as part of these meetings, then all members of the PAG will be invited to participate.

Thus the schedule for a project team meeting (not aligned to a workshop) might have a series of sessions on the day. The first session may involve core project team members only; the second would bring in 4–6 of the PAG, and the third may involve a videoconferencing hook-up with one or more of our international experts.

The case study research will involve close engagement with local communities, and establishing appropriate participatory frameworks will therefore be crucial. Where in-depth and action research with residents is planned, we would seek to work closely with tenant advocacy and support groups. As discussed in the next section, dissemination activity will also ensure engagement with policy and practitioners at the national and state level.
9 DISSEMINATION

Research findings will be presented at AHURI Research Seminars where opportunities present throughout the course of the project. The National Housing Conferences 2012 and 2013 will also be used as opportunities to disseminate the research. We envisage a range of written, workshop and conference outputs, targeted across a range of policy, academic and community audiences. A full list of proposed reports is provided in Section 5.

9.1 Written outputs

As part of the conceptualisation research stream (A), we will—in conjunction with our panel of international experts—prepare a series of critical perspectives papers. Policy, practice and community-facing publications will also be integral to the program and a number of articles for publication in national and international journals will result from the research, alongside the AHURI Final Reports and Positioning Papers.

9.2 Workshops: policy, practice, community and public events

We will report on progress and findings from MYRP activity throughout the project. Team members will present work at national/international housing/urban academic conferences and major policy and practitioner events including the 7th National Housing Conference in October 2012 and the 8th National Housing Conference in late 2013. At key stages of the program, workshops outside of NSW, VIC, QLD will facilitate shared debate and insight across the policy and practitioner community in all jurisdictions. We will maximise events targeted at local stakeholders and communities, particularly those involved in the research process.

9.3 Final dissemination series and international symposium

It is envisaged that a final series of presentations/workshops will be held at the end of the MYRP in early 2014. Additionally, we propose holding an international symposium to discuss our findings in February–March 2014. There is significant potential to collaborate with our international expert panel members in this regard.


## 10 RESEARCH STAFF

The project team has been built around teams of key researchers in three AHURI centres.

### Table 7: Core team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Role/Stream Co-Lead</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Expertise relevant to MYRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hal Pawson        | UNSW        | Directorial oversight, conceptual leadership | → social housing reform  
→ allocation policies  
→ stock transfer and tenure diversification  
→ tenant satisfaction and choice  
→ cost effectiveness of housing policies and programs | → social spatial disadvantage, social exclusion  
→ urban/suburban renewal  
→ urban governance |
| Bill Randolph     | UNSW        | Stream co-lead      | → housing market dynamics  
→ social spatial disadvantage  
→ housing affordability, low income homeownership  
→ private rented sector | → critical analysis of housing tenure  
→ outcomes of homeownership  
→ links between housing and economic participation  
→ social cohesion, social inclusion |
| Terry Burke       | Swin.       | Stream co-lead      | → social housing policy and management  
→ community planning | → metropolitan planning  
→ housing market dynamics  
→ lower income/lower value housing policy  
→ area based renewal |
| Kath Hulse        | Swin.       | Stream co-lead      | → social housing policy and management  
→ community planning | → housing market dynamics  
→ lower income/lower value housing policy  
→ area based renewal |
| Andrew Jones      | UQ          | Stream co-lead      | → social housing policy and management  
→ community planning | → metropolitan planning  
→ housing market dynamics  
→ lower income/lower value housing policy  
→ area based renewal |
| Simon Pinnegar    | UNSW        | Stream co-lead      | → mobility, housing and labour markets  
→ social capital, social cohesion | → metropolitan planning  
→ housing market dynamics  
→ lower income/lower value housing policy  
→ area based renewal |
| Wendy Stone       | Swin.       | Stream co-lead      | → Affordable housing/planning  
→ Place and neighbourhood issues | → metropolitan planning  
→ housing market dynamics  
→ lower income/lower value housing policy  
→ area based renewal |
| Gethin Davison    | UNSW        | Stream co-lead      | → Affordable housing/planning  
→ Place and neighbourhood issues | → metropolitan planning  
→ housing market dynamics  
→ lower income/lower value housing policy  
→ area based renewal |

Together the team provides:

- Dedicated leadership under the direction of Professor Pawson, with strategic, management and research support provided by highly-experienced senior researchers across the three Centres. Before relocating to UNSW, Hal led the Housing & Urban Society Research Group at Heriot-Watt University since 2002.
- A supporting team of mid- and early-career housing, urban and social policy researchers, again across the three Centres, with the breadth/depth of research
expertise and skills to undertake the full range of activity indicated in this feasibility study. UNSW, Swinburne and UQ have a strong track-record in supporting capacity building within their respective Centres, and the partnership will provide invaluable learning opportunities across a range of research methods and within policy, practitioner and community environments.

- Strategic, critical input into the research process and its outcomes from an invited group of internationally-acclaimed housing researchers (Galster, Williams, Lawless).
- PhD training and broader learning and teaching opportunities. A recently commenced Doctoral student at Swinburne is looking at the role of public housing in the formation of disadvantaged localities in regional NSW, and if this bid is successful, this will be aligned to the broader MYRP program. We will also seek to secure two AHURI postgraduate top-ups (one at UNSW, one at UQ) to work on related research projects.

Members of the core research team are assigned leadership/co-leadership roles against each of the three research streams, but will contribute across all. Jurisdictional leads are identified for case study work in research stream C. The team comprises a mix of full-time researchers (Pawson, Pinnegar, Stone, Davison) and colleagues with teaching and/or senior administrative responsibilities (Randolph, Burke, Hulse, Jones).

Table 8: Supporting team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise/skills relevant to MYRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Judd</td>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>urban design, renewal, community participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivienne Milligan</td>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>affordable housing, diversification of social housing sector, Indigenous housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilan Wiesel</td>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>literature/policy review, qualitative fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Easthope</td>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>survey methodologies, qualitative fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Tice</td>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>housing market dynamics, spatial data analysis, GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Patulny</td>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>social capital, social mix policy, civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Groenhart</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>quantitative analysis, housing markets, planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Spinney</td>
<td>Swin.</td>
<td>homelessness, social inclusion, qualitative fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lise Saugeres</td>
<td>Swin.</td>
<td>gender, public housing, social disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Reynolds</td>
<td>Swin.</td>
<td>spatial data analysis, housing market analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Corcoran</td>
<td>UQ</td>
<td>quantitative geographical methods, urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence of research expertise relevant to the issue of concentrations of disadvantage for both core and supporting team members is presented in individual CVs, alongside a list of current/proposed research involving team members in the appendices.
11 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Key lessons from previous NRV engagement by members of the research team highlights the importance of having a strong leadership team where continual collaboration across work streams is fostered through regular face-to-face meetings at key stages of the project. The team will be led by the nominated Director, Prof Hal Pawson. He will have overall responsibility for the carriage of the program of research and will be the principle point of contact with AHURI and the Policy Advisory Group.

Pawson will coordinate the senior project team members and the International Advisory Panel, and will manage the regular team meetings. These will be held every 4–6 months or at significant stages of the program and will be conducted by a mix of face-to-face meetings for the Australian team members and teleconferencing with colleagues overseas. The management task will have administrative support from City Futures Research Centre.

Each of the research streams will be co-led by two nominated senior researcher reporting to the Director to ensure continuity and coordination with individual team members, and these ‘stream teams’ will hold regular meetings (face-to-face, teleconference) to ensure timely delivery of their outputs. Many in the research team will contribute across a number of research streams. This approach to project management provides a flexible and adaptable structure to ensure continuity in delivery and will support closer alignment with project timelines and goals.

Contingency arrangements will be put in place with a degree of flexibility built into the latter stages, particularly in work strand C2 where the case studies will involve the use of different methodologies.
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