Title: Resourcing the arts for youth well-being: Challenges in Aotearoa New Zealand

Dr Molly Mullen, University of Auckland, Faculty of Education and Social Work*

Amber Walls, University of Auckland, Faculty of Education and Social Work

Maria Ahmad, University of Auckland, Faculty of Education and Social Work

Professor Peter O'Connor, University of Auckland, Faculty of Education and Social Work

Abstract

Background

This paper synthesises findings from two research projects with organisations involved in arts for youth well-being. Since 2017, Aotearoa New Zealand's government has recognised the importance of the arts for well-being. However, the sector in Aotearoa has historically lacked recognition and support and this paper identifies a number of challenges that remain entrenched in the funding system.

Methods

Study One used an online survey to understand the approaches, aspirations and challenges of 19 organisations involved in youth arts for well-being. Study Two used ethnographic methods with three youth arts organisations to explore their experiences of the funding and policy context.

Results

Specific aspects of the funding system in Tāmaki Makaurau, Auckland, hinder the sustainable development of creatively rich, culturally responsive, inclusive and strengths-based practice that takes youth participation seriously.

Conclusions

New approaches to resourcing youth arts for well-being are needed to better support good practice and sector development.

Keywords Funding; New Zealand; policy; youth arts; youth well-being

Word count 6091

Introduction

Arts for health and well-being has historically been challenged by a lack of evidence, limiting the potential of the field to benefit from public investment and practice developments. Given the development of a substantial international evidence base, demonstrating positive impacts at individual, community and societal levels (All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing, 2017; Fancourt & Finn, 2019), it seems timely to consider, not just why arts for health and well-being should be funded, but also how, and the implications for different approaches. This article contributes to this topic by highlighting challenges arising from the funding context in Aotearoa New Zealand and recommending approaches to better support arts-for-youth-well-being.

Well-being and the arts in Aotearoa: Background

Well-being is a complex, culturally-located term. In western scholarship it is commonly understood as an individual, subjective state of contentment with one's life (Arts Council England, 2012), but also as contingent on social conditions (Thompson & Marks, 2008). In Aotearoa, public policy names multiple interrelated *wellbeings*, and emphasises the importance of environmental sustainability, social equity, inclusion, and cultural acceptance/expression to individual and collective well-beings (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2019). This partly reflects indigenous Māori understandings of well-being as holistic, collective and relational, and dependent on harmonious relationships between people's physical, social, spiritual and cultural worlds (Durie, 2007).

Following the September 2017 election, the Labour-led government placed well-being at the heart of its decision-making. The 2019 'Well-being Budget', centred around 'well-being indicators', encompassing personal, social, cultural, environmental and economic well-being (The Treasury, 2019, p. 3), and was praised for addressing key social determinants of health

and well-being (Anderson & Mossialos, 2019). The Prime Minister emphasised the importance of the arts to public well-being, people's sense of identity and social change (Ardern, 2018) Subsequent changes in cultural and local authority policy indicated that greater recognition and support for arts, health and well-being would be forthcoming (Creative New Zealand,2019; Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2019).

Since early 2017, prior to the election, a common interest in arts, health and well-being drove cross-sector organisation in Aotearoa and the formation of Te Ora Auha: Creative Wellbeing Alliance Aotearoa. This process exposed the fragmented nature of the sector, and alack of policy and funding support. (Te Ora Auha: Creative Wellbeing Alliance Aotearoa. n.d.). There was a need for research and advocacy to promote understanding of the sector and its needs to amidst the policy turn to well-being.

Youth well-being and the arts in Aotearoa

Youth well-being is a stated priority for government in Aotearoa. The 2019 Child and Youth Well-being Strategy provides a framework for cross-governmental action to achieve well-being and equity based on young people's priorities (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2019). Mental well-being is a priority, with many young people identifying poor mental health as their greatest issue of concern (Action Station and Ara Taiohi, 2018; Office of the Children's Commissioner, 2019). Young people in Aotearoa experience high levels of anxiety and depression, and the suicide rate amongst 15–19 year olds is amongst the highest in the world (Clark, 2020; Cunningham et al., 2018; Fleming et al., 2020). Rangatahi Māori, indigenous youth, disproportionally report poorer mental health and well-being than their peers (Deane et al., 2019; Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2019; Ministry of Health, 2018). Complex, systemic factors impact on youth well-being in Aotearoa, including

financial hardship, inequality, discrimination, and the legacy of colonisation (Deane et al., 2019)

. Policy and interventions based on western individualist conceptualisations of well-being have failed to address the needs of Māori and Pacific Peoples (Deane et al, 2019; Clark, 2020) and multiple studies identify the need for more empowering and culturally sustaining support services (Action Station & Ara Taiohi, 2018; Deane & Dutton, 2020; Office of the Children's Commissioner, 2019; Ware and Walsh-Tapiata, 2010).

Internationally, several systematic evidence reviews indicate participation in the arts can address social determinants of well-being, and impact individual well-being (Arts Council of Ireland, 2016; Bungay & Villa-Burrows, 2013; Catterall et al., 1999; Cultural Learning Alliance, 2018; Leadbetter & O'Connor, 2013; Macpherson et al., 2016; McLellan et al., 2012). Aotearoa youth have proposed that access to activities, such as the arts, would help improve their mental health and well-being (Fleming et al., 2020). It is timely, then, to consider whether youth arts organisations are being supported and resourced to provide accessible, high-quality, culturally relevant programmes.

Resourcing arts for well-being

The effects of funding on socially engaged, participatory arts practices are far-reaching, with nuanced ethical, political, social and artistic implications (Balfour, 2009; Mullen, 2012, 2014, 2019). Issues specific to funding arts for health and well-being are briefly considered in some meta-analyses, literature reviews and case studies (See Bidwell, 2014; Daykin, 2019; Savage et al., 2017; Arts Council England, 2012). This literature highlights the limitations of funding that allows only for short-term interventions, which can put participants at risk, make it

difficult to retain experienced staff and undermine good partnerships/collaboration.) Other studies highlight the ways evaluation can serve funders above practitioners and participants (Daykin, 2019; Daykin et al, 2017; Tesch & Hansen, 2013), sometimes compeling programmes to emphasise individualised outcomes at the expense of socio-cultural, environmental, structural and systemic factors (Freebody & Goodwin, 2017; Freebody et al., 2019). Baxter (2017) argues that development funding for theatre-in-health in the Global South has historically priveled western models of arts and health over indigenous worldviews and practices.

This article builds on the aforementioned literature, presenting two studies that take a critical approach. Consistent with Hesse-Biber and Leavy's (2011) conception of critical research, both projects aimed to understand and amplify the experiences of arts practitioners and participants who typically have little opportunity to directly influence policy. Further, by focusing on the seemingly mundane matter of funding, both studies consider the ways power operates through the funding system to sustain inequities within the arts and society.

Methods

This article synthesises findings from two studies looking at youth arts and well-being in Auckland. To define this area of practice, both studies used an inclusive, locally-relevant definition of the arts as encompassing diverse forms of creative and cultural expression, including music, dance, theatre/drama, visual arts, literature, spoken word, craft/object making, digital and media arts, photography and film, mixed media, circus arts, street arts (graffiti art), Ngā Toi Māori, and the arts of Moana Oceania (the Pacific). Both studies focused specifically on arts practices which promote young people's active participation. Both studies included practices with explicit health or well-being goals, as well as those with a more general sense of artistic participation contributing to youth well-being. The sections below outline the design, methods and limitation of each study

Study One: Creative practice for youth well-being in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland

This survey-based study asked:

1. Which organisations are using arts to promote youth well-being in Auckland?

2. How do these organisations understand, execute and resource their work?

3. What are the key challenges and aspirations of these organisations?

An advisory group from arts, health and youth provided feedback on the research design and survey questions. Data were generated through an anonymous online questionnaire, completed by groups and organisations involved in supporting youth well-being through the arts. Participants were asked for quantitative and qualitative responses to questions about their organisation, practice, youth participation, understanding of creative youth well-being, aspirations, and challenges. This allowed for quantitative responses to be interpreted in relation to qualitative accounts and vice-versa. Ethics approval was granted on 17 May 2018 by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (Number: 020522). A full research report was published in 2019 (Critical Research Unit in Applied Theatre, 2019).

Potential participants were identified through an online search. Eligibility criteria were: groups or organisations using participatory arts practice with well-being goals involving youth aged 12–24 in the Auckland region. A total of 60 potential participants were invited by email to participate, subject to confirmation through meeting the eligibility criteria. Thirty organisations confirmed and were sent a link to the Qualtrix questionnaire, 19 were returned. Personal communications from some organisations who did not return the questionnaire explained that this was due to workload pressures, including fundraising.

<insert Table One here>

Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics. Qualitative data were analysed thematically, identifying patterns within sets of question answers as well as across

the whole data set (Braun et al., 2020). This approach resulted in good sample size and diversity but was limited to only including groups who had a web presence. Other limitations were the inclusion of just one perspective from each organisation and the absence of a youth/participant voice.

Study Two: Creating change: The economies of arts organisations working towards well-being for young people in Auckland

This collaborative, organisational ethnography asked:

1. What tensions are experienced by as arts organisations negotiate the funding and policy context to promote youth well-being in Auckland?
2. What methods of resourcing support the artistic and social aims of youth arts for well-being?
3. What new policy and funding supports are needed?

Methods were selected to support various levels of participation, and to generate nuanced insights into the everyday practices and experiences of arts organisations in Auckland working with young people aged 16–25. Purposive sampling was used to ensure a cross-section of organisational types, funding models, geographical locations and practice frameworks. In line with institutional ethics, the Principal Investigator discussed the project and cultural considerations with each organisation, obtaining a letter of support prior to ethics approval (Number: 022238). A formal invitation to participate and an organisational consent form were then sent by a third party. Participants were: The Black Friars Theatre Company, a pan-Polynesian theatre collective; Crescendo, a youth music organisation; and Māpura Studios, an inclusive art studio (participants consented to being named). The research team conducted eight months of fieldwork, using: weekly participant observation, multiple ethnographic interviews, document analysis and focus groups. Consent was obtained from

individual participants prior to participation. Individual participants could choose to be identified or not.

<insert Table Two here>

Data analysis was iterative and abductive, continuously moving between data and theory, developing and redeveloping themes, patterns and interpretations (Kennedy, 2018). This study focused on the experiences of youth arts organisations and young artists, and its limitations included the exclusion of the perspectives of funders, which would have added another valuable layer of data. Another limitation was the inclusion of only Auckland organisations. Auckland is by far Aotearoa's largest city with a distinct demographic. The findings of our studies are, therefore, unlikely to capture some issues experienced by organisations in rural areas and smaller towns and cities.

Results

Key approaches

Study One participants reported that their practice aligned with a range of practice frameworks, including Creative Youth Development, Positive Youth Development, Community Arts, Community Cultural Development, Arts Education, Applied Theatre, Arts Therapies, Inclusive Arts, Art for Social Change, Devised Theatre, ngā toi Māori, arts of Moana Oceania (the Pacific nations and diaspora), and Social Practice. Across both studies, most participants combined two or more frameworks to create bespoke approaches, responding to both the issues and groups they worked with, and the wider cultural context.

Funding sources

The two studies provided evidence of where funding for arts for youth well-being is coming from and how it is distributed. In Study One, 11 of the 19 participant organisations received philanthropic funding, and six identified it as their main income source. Ten organisations reported being resourced by local authorities, with only three identifying it as their main income source. Seven organisations received funds from Creative New Zealand, and two named it as their main income source. Small numbers reported any income from government ministries: the Ministry of Social Development (1), the Ministry of Health (1), the Ministry of Youth Development (3), and the Ministry of Education (3). Two identified ministry funding as their main income source and, significantly, were two of the three respondents with the highest overall income. Six organisations selected 'other' for their main income source, reporting a range of methods including private donations, a government contract for service, and income from studio hire and class fees. A non-monetary economy included volunteering and help from friends and families.

Study Two participants had common income sources, but their approaches to resourcing their work varied. The Black Friars are a voluntary collective, describing their work as a way to give back to their communities. Their priority is covering the direct costs of projects and productions. The research focused on the Black Friar's three-year youth-leadership project. Funds were raised year-by-year. Over three years, financial and other support came from a university, a teacher training organisation and faith groups. In year three, they received small grants from Creative New Zealand (CNZ): CNZ Creative Communities and a local board. Crescendo is a limited company and charitable trust. Their main activity is ongoing mentorship of young people by creative industry professionals. Covering core staff and running costs is their priority. At the start of the research, Crescendo's main income source (85%) was from contestable charitable grants. They received some local authority and local board funding. When fieldwork concluded, Crescendo had adopted a social enterprise

model, generating 30% of its income through events and services. Māpura is a charitable trust with a privately rented venue. Māpura receives almost all its income from contestable charitable grants. Fees, charged for classes, cover a small proportion of running costs. Other methods for raising income observed in Study Two included crowdfunding, selling artworks and merchandise, and gala or auction events. Volunteering and other in-kind support were important across all organisations.

Challenges

In Study One we asked participants to describe the key challenges impacting on their ability to carry out their work. A total of 18 reported challenges related to funding. Study Two looked at the policy and funding-related challenges experienced by the three organisations. Across the two studies, common funding-related challenges were found. Many of these are likely to affect the wider NGO sector, but our focus is on three challenges with distinct implications for youth arts: scarcity, unsustainability and subversion of mission and values.

Scarcity

Study One and Study Two participants reported that funding overall was scarce, and that it was difficult to fund practices combining arts and well-being. For example, a Study One respondent observed '*dwindling levels of funding as more groups compete for $$ and the source/s are not able to match their previous granting levels*' (Survey Response, 2018). Another reported '*there is no dedicated funding to support both aspects [arts and health] together'* (Survey Response, 2018). The organisations in Study One that reported higher income tended to be from those that foregrounded the health and social outcomes of their practice. Those emphasising arts or youth development outcomes tended to have lower income.

Intense competition for a small pool of funding (both arts and philanthropic) was reported by all Study Two participants. In relation to a CNZ application, Michelle, Black Friars' Creative Director, reflected '*There will be "millions" of people applying for a very small pool that's allocated to the arts*' (Black Friars Focus Group, 2019). Discussing philanthropic grants, Cresendo's Chairperson described '*constantly scrambling around for little money*' (Crescendo Interview, 2019). The image of scrambling around for funding was also used by Māpura staff (Māpura Focus Group, 2019). Other Crescendo Staff speculated that the problem was not just scarcity of funds, but the need to better communicate and engage with funders (Cat, Operations Manager, Crescendo Interview, 2019; Marcus, CEO, Crescendo Interview, 2019).

The sense that available funds were depleting was strengthened by experiences of a funder suddenly reducing the amount of funding or announcing there were no funds available at all. Diana, CEO of Māpura, reported, '*that's twice now that's happened with our biggest funders, which really hurts. From $80,000 to $55,000 is a major drop*' (Māpura Interview 2019).

One participant in Study One identified government funding as particularly difficult to access. Across all three Study Two participants, government funding was experienced as almost entirely inaccessible. Māpura and Crescendo spent considerable time researching and/or preparing programmes for potential government funding. Challenges they described included the opacity of processes for accessing government funds, tight limits on what can be funded, funds being given in the form of a fixed amount per participant (which would not cover full running costs), and high administrative and regulatory burdens.

Unsustainable income

Most (18 of 19) organisations in Study One described the lack of sustainable funding as the main challenge they faced. Short-term and insecure funding adversely affected very different types of organisation – from informal groups to projects run by public agencies, groups with annual budgets of less than $1,000 to those with budgets of over $500,000. Respondents reported that the predominance of short-term grants made fundraising resource-intensive and time consuming, diverting resources away from core purpose and activities:

> [T]he time consuming nature of community trust applications: meeting application deadlines that do not align with our programme timeline…completing progress reports and final audit reporting. Sometimes this process is completed only to receive $1,000 worth of grant funding. (Survey Response, 2018)

It was evident that short-term funding was inhibiting long-term planning and investment in staff. A Study One participant explained how never knowing whether an annual government contract would be renewed prevented them from offering staff secure jobs and from planning ahead with their partners. Another reported: 'losing staff [including management] because contracts are short term and not well paid' (Study One, Survey Response, 2018). Insecure funding puts stress and strain on staff. The Studio Co-ordinator at Māpura commented: 'We rely heavily on staff good will, passion and altruism' (Interview, 2019). Study Two participants suggested full cost recovery was difficult with small grants, including covering professional-level fees for artists.

Short term funding also undermines long-term and systemic approaches. In Study Two, Alex, Māpura's Arts Administrator, described:

> …it will take a year to get the momentum to build a class up... By that stage your initial funding's used up and you've got to find the funding from somewhere else to keep that going...it's the benefits of the long term care and long term therapy

that are really key...the policies don't seem to actually allow for that long-term

benefit. (Alex, Māpura Interview, 2019)

Crescendo's Chairperson reported:

There's a horizon on the funding...even big commercial funders...they only will fund

you for a couple or three years. So, once you chew through that there's actually not a

lot left and then we're on our own. (Crescendo Interview, 2019)

Funding ongoing programmes was particularly difficult. For the Black Friars, for example, fundraising, while running the project on top of full-time work/study, was not sustainable and contributed to the decision to limit their youth leadership project to three years:

Yeah. Also, energy, as you say, resource-wise. Not just money, but resource-wise.

We're probably at the end of what we can sustain in this way at this time.

(Michelle, Black Friars, Focus Group, 2019)

The project could still make a difference, but longer projects are needed to address complex, systemic issues impacting youth well-being (J R McKenzie Trust & Centre for Social Impact, 2019).

Short-term funding affects the creative process. Tim, Arts Tutor at Māpura, explains the challenges of making short-term projects participant centred/led:

Shorter term exhibition projects tend to fit within the time frame allowed but not

be that responsive to Māpura artists' process. A lot of artists at Māpura perceive

time differently and operate on a different time scale and as much as we can we

like to have it [the process] driven by the artists. (Māpura Interview 2019)

Cat, Crescendo's Operations Manager, described the challenge of balancing the short-term outcomes for small grants with the long-term, youth-determined outcomes of their ongoing programme. Crescendo's mentors respond carefully to the needs and interests of their mentees. When outcomes and deadlines were set by funders,

> *Then it feels like we're moving away from our objective, or what our young people want.* (Cat, Crescendo Interview, 2019)

Subverted mission and values

The final challenge identified in our two studies is the subversion of organisations' mission and values by multiple aspects of the funding system. This issue is also prominent in literature on arts funding (Baxter, 2017; Mullen, 2019). To be clear, our research does not indicate intentional domination or coercion by funders. Instead, in both studies, there appears to be a subtle interplay between multiple aspects of the funding context and factors within organisations which can result in subtle shifts and accommodations to funder agendas. It is not possible to deal fully with this challenge here, so we focus on one aspect, how the deficit framing of youth by funders subverts organisation's strengths-based approaches.

When asked about their aspirations for youth well-being through the arts, most Study One respondents stated that they aimed for individual outcomes for participants, such as self-confidence, self-esteem, resilience, increased aspirations, independence and self-determination. Just three respondents stated they primarily aimed for social or systemic change. However, in some cases, a focus on individual outcomes was expressed along with a commitment to positive youth development or social justice. Further, respondents articulated individualised goals even when the practice framework they identified would suggest a strengths-based or activist approach. We propose that organisations have become used to articulating the impact of their work at an individual level for the purpose of funding, which

means they can inadvertently align with a deficit approach, even when it does not reflect their core values.

Study Two participants expressed discomfort with having to explain the impact of arts participation on youth to funders in ways that problematised youth. Much philanthropic funding targets particular groups of youth, for example, Māori and Pasifika[1]. There are reasons for doing so, particularly addressing inequitable access and outcomes for those groups. But, this approach can suggest these groups are lacking somehow or problematic. As Marcus, Crescendo's CEO explains, this conflicts with an inclusive, strengths-based approach to youth development:

> *Funders ask for specific details, like are you working with low income families? Sometimes it's a lot of stereotypes. But the way that we answer that is by saying that problem is not just a problem for 'that group'...I don't like labels. I love that we're an all-inclusive environment. But, it has been difficult getting over the line for some funders*. (Crescendo Interview, 2019)

Māpura's staff explain how funding frames disabled artists as in need of help to participate or integrate in society. This conflicts with their view that ableist attitudes and practices are the main problem. Tim explains:

> *We sometimes have conflict with our artists having to use the funding that's allotted to them for general socialisation and being adjusted to be part of the community. To be what is considered valuable, functioning members of society, when what they are is already intensely valuable. People that come here are generally not trying to modify their behaviour*. (Māpura Interview, 2019)

---

[1] Pasifika is a collective term used by some to describe peoples from Sāmoa, Tonga, the Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau, Tuvalu, and other smaller Pacific nations, living in Aotearoa NZ.
https://pasifika.tki.org.nz/LEAP/Pasifika-in-New-Zealand

For the Black Friars, representing the value of their work to funders in terms of individual impact disregards the young people's views and ignores Polynesian conceptions of success:

> *Bayley: We can't put on paper the impact that we have in Sione's life, or something like that.*
>
> *Billy: I think it also goes against how we work, as well. We don't want to capture Sione's life. [Laughs] You know what I mean? We don't want to have our young people scrutinised where they're held up to an idea of success that isn't created by them or by us.* (Black Friars Focus Group, 2019)

The Black Friars did not engage with some funders because of how they represented Pasifika youth. Other Study Two organisations tried to diplomatically explain their inclusive, strengths-based approaches to funders. They also engaged in the tactic of aligning applications with funders' approaches but continuing to deliver according to their own values,

> *We do deliver the work, but not the way you made us apply for it. Yes, we did deliver the mental health and well-being outcomes. It's never a problem of achieving the result, the problem is being bound by the way they want us to achieve it.* (Cat, Crescendo Focus Group, 2019)

Dicussion and conclusions

By synthesising two research studies, we identify three challenges related to resourcing arts for youth well-being in Aotearoa: *scarcity* – lack of funding for arts and well-being; *unsustainable income* – the prevalence of short-term, insecure funding; and *subverted mission and values* – the subtle ways funding undermines strengths-based, culturally responsive and participant-centred approaches. These challenges exist in spite of a growing body of evidence for why governments and other donors should invest in arts for well-being and the relatively favourable local policy context.

Scarcity of funding to resource arts for youth well-being means organisations and groups face a continual struggle to secure even very small grants. This issue also arises in a report prepared for the Ministry of Social Development, which finds most Creative Spaces[2] could not raise adequate funding to meet the full demand for their services (Ministry of Social Development, 2019). A counter-argument, considered earlier, is that funds are available, but arts organisations need better fundraising capability. Capacity and capability are issues for under-resourced and overstretched organisations. But, arts-based approaches to well-being are a hard sell to Aotearoa funders. In spite of the policy context, at the time of writing very few funders in Aotearoa explicitly fund arts for health or well-being. There is just one philanthropic fund focused on creative approaches to youth development – in fact, many philanthropic trusts exclude the arts entirely. Until 2019, when CNZ added Community Arts to its list of art forms eligible for its Arts Grants, the only arts-funding option was a small Creative Communities grant. In 2019, CNZ administered one round of youth-arts grants, but this scheme was put on hold in 2020. It seems unsurprising, then, that it would be difficult for applicants to secure funding for arts-based approaches to youth well-being.

A number of related issues arise from the lack of sustainable funding options in Aotearoa. As highlighted repeatedly in literature on participatory/community arts and funding, repeatedly applying for multiple short-term grants amplifies the administrative burden on organisations (Mullen, 2014, 2019). When combined with an inability to achieve full-cost recovery through grants, staff can be compelled to work beyond their paid hours just to maintain the status quo. Further, when experiencing ongoing strain, uncertainty and stretched resources, arts organisations are less able to experiment creatively or develop new work (Balfour, 2009).

---

[2] In NZ, 'Creative spaces are organisations and places where people who experience barriers to participation can make art, or participate in artistic activities such as theatre, dance, circus, music, film and creative writing' (see https://artsaccess.org.nz/creative%20spaces).

Long-term funding is needed to enable career and practice progression for artists, overall sector-development, and to support stronger outcomes. Bidwell (2014) proposes that stable access to services, with experienced, consistent staff are important to young people for whom participation in the arts is a lifeline. However, short-term, uncertain funding makes staff retention and development difficult (O'Connor & O'Connor, 2019). Studies One and Two indicate many youth arts organisations in Auckland use bespoke approaches to respond to the needs, contexts and cultural backgrounds of their young participants. The necessary expertise can be developed only through sustained experience. Some evidence shows short-term interventions can benefit individual youth well-being; however, longer-term approaches are widely viewed as more effective (Macpherson et al., 2016). Long time frames and less prescriptive funding models enable the establishment of safe, inclusive, participant-centred, culturally and contextually responsive creative processes (Baxter, 2017; Mullen, 2019).

Youth well-being in Aotearoa is impacted by complex systemic and structural factors, including economic inequality, poverty, discrimination and the legacy of colonialism (Deane & Dutton, 2020). Knowing this, organisations like the Black Friars, Crescendo and Māpura set out to counter prejudiced attitudes and structural inequities affecting young people in Auckland. Addressing these issues, however, requires a sustained and concerted approach, which it is currently not possible to fully resource. In part, this is because health policies that problematise youth, conceptualise health and well-being as an individual responsibility, and emphasise clinical practice approaches are still influential (Deane et al., 2019). Reviews of philanthropy literature indicate that resourcing long-term planning and operation is important, particularly when addressing entrenched social issues and inequities (J R McKenzie Trust & Centre for Social Impact, 2019). A handful of funders have adjusted their models and timeframes, but these are the exception.

In conclusion, we propose the following opportunities for change to support a flourishing arts-for-youth-well-being sector in Aotearoa. These changes are intended to alleviate some of the workload pressures and other burdens that undermine the capacity of youth arts organisations to sustain, expand and improve their well-being-focused work. These recommendations are informed by what is known about good practice in arts, health and well-being, but also in philanthropy (J R McKenzie & Centre for Social Impact, 2019)... First, we recommend more funders offer core, unrestricted funding; to '*invest in the "what" and let [the] organisations you fund determine the "how"*' (Esmee Fairbairn Foundation, 2019, cited in J R McKenzie & Centre for Social Impact, 2019, p. 21). This would see a move a way from project-based funding and, in line with recommendations from the funding sector itself, would include more long-term, funding. Second, funders can promote equitable cultural well-being by developing models that are '*responsive to the cultural practices, aspirations and sovereignty of indigenous communities*' (J R McKenzie Trust & Centre for Social Impact, 2019, p. 27). This might include pariticpatory grant-making, more relational and face to face approaches and alternatives to contestable grants. We also recommend that funders address the precarity and underpay of work in this sector by committing to providing full funding for salaries, acknowledging volunteer time as matched funding, and addressing salary pay parity. Importantly, these changes would not require *more* funding, but allow more effective use of existing funds. We are recommending, however, that given the overall policy 'turn to well-being', and the evidence for how the arts can contribute to multiple policy objectives, a new collaborative, cross-sector fund for arts and youth well-being should be formed. Finally, to support sustainable sector development, researchers, practitioners, funders and policy makers could collaborate to establish platforms for knowledge, evidence and practice sharing.

These changes are significant, but not radical. They build on work already being done within Aotearoa's philanthropic sector and local authorities and could significantly enhance the capability of groups/organistions to support youth well-being via the arts.

References

Action Station & Ara Taiohi. (2018). *Ngā Kōrero Hauora o Ngā Taiohi. A community-powered report on conversations with 1,000 young people about wellbeing.* New Zealand Government.

All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts Health and Well-being. (2017). *Creative health: The artsfor health and wellbeing.* https://www.culturehealthandwellbeing.org.uk/appg-inquiry/Publications/Creative_Health_Inquiry_Report_2017_-_Second_Edition.pdf

Anderson, M., & Mossialos, E. (2019). Beyond gross domestic product for New Zealand's wellbeing budget. *The Lancet Public Health, 4*(7). https://doi-org.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30109-4

Ardern, J. (2018, May 17). *Recognising the importance of our arts, culture and heritage.* https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/recognising-importance-our-arts-culture-and-heritage

Arts Council of England. (2012). *Be creative be well.* https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Be_Creative_Be_Well.pdf

Arts Council of Ireland. (2016). *Arts and cultural participation among children and young people – Insights from the Growing Up in Ireland study.* http://www.artscouncil.ie/uploadedFiles/Arts-and-cultural-particiption-GUI.pdf

Balfour, M. (2009). The politics of intention: Looking for a theatre of little changes. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *14*(3), 347–359.

Baxter, V. (2017). Aesthetics, instrumentalism and ethics in health and wellbeing. In K. Low & V. Baxter (Eds.), *Applied theatre: Performing health and wellbeing* (pp. 41–74). Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Bidwell, S. (2014). *The arts in health: Evidence from the international literature*. https://cdn-flightdec.userfirst.co.nz/uploads/sites/creativewellbeingnz/files/Images/2019/files_2019/Bidwell_arts_in_health_evidence_from_the_international_literature.pdf

Braun, V., Clarke, V., Boulton, E., Davey, L., & McEvoy, C. (2020). The online survey as a qualitative research tool. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 1–14. https://doi:10.1080/13645579.2020.1805550

Bungay, H., & Vella-Burrows, T. (2013). The effects of participating in creative activities on the health and well-being of children and young people: A rapid review of the literature. *Perspectives in Public Health, 133*, 44–52.

Catterall, J., Chapleau, R., & Iwanaga. J. (1999). *Involvement in the arts and human development: General involvement in music, theatre, arts*. Imagination Project UCLA, School of Education and Information Studies.

Clark, T. (2020). *Youth19 Rangatahi Smart Survey, Initial Findings: Hauora Hinengaro / Emotional and Mental Health*. The Youth19 Research Group, The University of Auckland and Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Creative New Zealand. (2019, June 26). *Statement of intent: TAUĀKĪ WHAKAMAUNGA ATU 2019-2029*. https://www.creativenz.govt.nz/assets/paperclip/publication_documents/documents/728/original/soi_web_final.pdf?1564003819

Critical Research Unit in Applied Theatre. (2019). Creative practice for youth wellbeing in Aotearoa New Zealand. https://creativewellbeingnz.org/research-report-release--creative-practice-for-youth-wellbeing-in-aotearoa%7Cnew-zealand--mapping-the-ecosystem-in-t%C4%81maki-makaurau%7Cauckland

Cultural Learning Alliance. (2018, May 19). *New evidence briefing: The arts, health and wellbeing*. https://culturallearningalliance.org.uk/new-evidence-briefing-arts-health-and-wellbeing/

Cunningham, R., Kvalsvig, A., Peterson, D., Kuehl, S., Gibb, S., McKenzie, S., Thornley, L., Every-Palmer, S., (2018). *Stocktake report for the Mental Health and Addiction Inquiry*. University of Otago.

Daykin, N. (2019). *Arts, health and well-being. A critical perspective on research, policy and practice*. Routledge.

Daykin, N., Gray, K., McCree, M., & Willis, J. (2017). Creative and credible evaluation for arts, health and well-being: Opportunities and challenges of co-production. *Arts and Health: An International Journal for Research, Policy and Practice*, *8*, 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/17533015.2016.1206948

Deane, K., & Dutton, H. (2020). *The factors that influence positive youth development and wellbeing. Key concepts, contemporary international debates and a review of the issues for Aotearoa New Zealand research, policy and practice*. Ara Taiohi.

Deane, K., Dutton, H., & Kerekere, E. (2019). *Ngā tikanga whānaketanga – He arotake tuhinga. A review of Aotearoa New Zealand youth development research*. https:// https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/100869

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. (2019). *Child and youth wellbeing strategy 2019.* https://childyouthwellbeing.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2019-08/child-youth-wellbeing-strategy-2019.pdf

Durie, M. (2007). The Wunderly Oration 2007, Indigenous responses to health and disease: Principles, goals and pathways. *Internal Medicine Journal*, *38*(5), 368–373.

Fancourt, D., & Finn, S. (2019). *Health evidence network synthesis report: What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A scoping review* (Report no. 67), World Health Organization. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/329834/9789289054553-eng.pdf

Fleming, T., Ball, J., Kang, K., Sutcliffe, K., Lambert, M., Peiris-John, R., & Clark, T. (2020). *Youth19: Youth Voice Brief. The Youth19 Research Group.* https:// https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5bdbb75ccef37259122e59aa/t/5f3394a2654885030c051243/1597215912482/Youth19+Youth+Voice+Brief.pdf

Freebody, K., & Goodwin, S. (2017). Applied theatre evaluations as technologies of government: A critical exploration of key logics in the field. *Applied Theatre Research, 5*(1), 23–35. https://doi:10.1386/atr.5.1.23_1

Freebody, K., Mullen, M., Walls, A., & O'Connor, P. (2019). Who is responsible? Neoliberal discourses of well-being in Australia and New Zealand. *Drama Australia Journal, 42*(2), 139–153. https://doi:10.1080/14452294.2019.1572432

Hesse-Biber, S., & Leavy, P. (2011). *The practice of qualitative research*. SAGE Publications.

J R McKenzie Trust & Centre for Social Impact. (2019). *The philanthropic landscape: A review of trends and contemporary practices.* https://www.centreforsocialimpact.org.nz/media/1679/the-philanthropic-landscape.pdf

Kennedy, B. (2018). Deduction, induction, and abduction. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative data collection* (pp. 49–64). SAGE Publications. https://doi:10.4135/9781526416070

Leadbetter, C., & O'Connor, N. (2013). *Healthy attendance? The impact of cultural engagement and sports participation on health and satisfaction with life in Scotland.* Scottish Government. https://www2.gov.scot/Publications/Recent

Macpherson, H., Hart, A., & Heaver, B. (2016). Building resilience through group visual arts activities: Findings from a scoping study with young people who experience mental health complexities and/or learning difficulties. *Journal of Social Work, 16*(5), 541–560. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017315581772

McLellan, R., Galton, M., Steward, S., & Page, C. (2012). *The impact of creative initiatives on wellbeing: A literature review*. Creativity, Culture and Education. https://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/publication/the-impact-of-creative-initiatives-on-wellbeing-a-literature-review/

Ministry of Health. (2018). *He Ara Oranga: Report of the Government inquiry into mental health and addiction*. https://mentalhealth.inquiry.govt.nz/assets/Summary-reports/He-Ara-Oranga.pdf

Ministry of Social Development. (2019). *Understanding the value of creative spaces.* https://cdn-flightdec.userfirst.co.nz/uploads/sites/artsaccess/files/images/1_2019/files_2019/Creative_spaces_survey_report_FINAL.pdf

Mullen, M. (2012). Taking care and playing it safe: Tensions in the management of funding relationships. *Journal of Arts & Communities, 4*(3), 181–198. https://doi.org/10.1386/jaac.4.3.181_1

Mullen, M. (2019). *Applied theatre: Economies*. Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

O'Connor, P. & O'Connor, B. (2019). Waiting on a miracle: The precarious state of the everyday in applied theatre. M. Mullen, M. (Ed.), *Applied theatre: Economies* (pp. 135–151). Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Office of the Children's Commissioner. (2019). *What makes a good life?* https://www.occ.org.nz/assets/Uploads/What-makes-a-good-life-report-OCC-OT-2019-WEB2.pdf

Parliamentary Counsel Office. (2019). *Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Act 2019*. https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2019/0017/latest/whole.html

Savage, C., Hynds, A. S., Dallas-Katoa, W. & Goldsmith, L. (2017). *Evaluation for Ōtautahi Creative Spaces Trust.* https://cdn-flightdec.userfirst.co.nz/uploads/sites/artsaccess/files/images/1_2018

Te Ora Auaha: Creative Wellbeing Alliance Aotearoa. (n.d.). https://creativewellbeingnz.org/about?src=nav

Tesch, L., & Hansen, E. C. (2013). Evaluating effectiveness of arts and health programmes in primary health care: A descriptive review. *Arts & Health*, *5*(1), 19–38. https://doi:10.1080/17533015.2012.693512

The Treasury. (2019). *The wellbeing budget 2019.* Wellington. https://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/wellbeing-budget/wellbeing-budget-2019

Thompson, S., & Marks, N. (2008). *Five ways to wellbeing*. New Economics Foundation. Retrieved from https://neweconomics.org/2008/10/five-ways-to-wellbeing-the-evidence

Ware, F., & Walsh-Tapiata, W. (2010). Youth development Māori style. *Youth Studies Australia*, *29*(4), 18–29.

Type of group/organisation	Number
District Health Board	1
Mental health promotion	1
Arts therapy and play services	1
Youth development	2
Disability arts	3
Arts centres	3
Theatre/performance	4
Artist collectives	2
Community arts education	1
Alternative education provider	1

Table One. Breakdown of Participants in Study One.

Organisation	Sampling frame		Data gathered
	Role of the participants	**No of participants**	**Instruments for data collection**
The Black Friars	Adults in organising role	8	90 minute focus group & ongoing observations
	Adults in supporting roles	5	45 minute interview
	Young artists (16-24yrs)	4	90 minute focus group
Crescendo	Adults in organising role	7	30-90 minute interview & ongoing observations 90 minute focus group (4 participants)
	Adults in supporting roles	2	45 minute interview
	Young artists (16-24 yrs)	5	90 minute focus group
Māpura	Adults in organising role	6	30-90 minute individual interview & ongoing observation 90 minute focus group (3 participants)
	Adults in supporting roles	3	45 minute interview
	Young artists (16-24 ysr)	2	30 minute focus group

Table Two. Breakdown of Participants in Study Two.