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Stand by Me
Can Citizen Advocacy promote reciprocal relationships?

5th International SRV Conference
Canberra, ACT, Australia
Deborah Espiner, Frances Hartnett & Ana Maria de Vos

Citizen Advocacy Auckland
Overview of presentation

- Background to Citizen Advocacy Auckland
- Citizen Advocacy and Social Role Valorization
- Remaining true to the essence of Citizen Advocacy principles
- Reciprocity through a Social Role Valorization lens and applying to Citizen Advocacy relationships
- Examples of reciprocity in Citizen Advocacy
- Christie’s and Niharika’s story: a 4 minute DVD
Brief background:
Citizen Advocacy Auckland Inc

- Founded in 1990
- Only programme in New Zealand
- Celebrated 20 years November 2010
- Founders were parents and professionals influenced by work of Dr Wolfensberger
  - Fran, Toronto, Canada, 1970s
  - Patricia O’ Brien completing PhD (Melbourne)
  - Marilyn Craig, parent
Background (continued)

- Social Role Valorization theory foundation of Certificate, Diploma and Degree programmes (Auckland University)
- Dr Wolfensberger, John O’Brien, Michael Kendrick
- Board members trained as PASSING team leaders, facilitated PASSING workshops and evaluations
- C. A. Coordinators and Board members- CAPE training, C.A. conferences, SRV international conferences
- Links with key leaders in Australia (evaluations and C.A. programmes).
Key principles of Citizen Advocacy

- Advocate independence (loyalty to protégé)
- Programme independence
- Clarity of staff function
- Balanced orientation (to advocate independence loyalty to protégés needs)
- Diversity of needs and roles
- Avoid social over protection
- Positive imagery
Findings Internal Review

- 2009

**Key findings:** Need to

- Recruit more non-service aligned protégés
- Find protégé and match with advocate
- Move to more instrumental roles
- Review Coordinator and Board roles
Fewer protégés referred by services

- Service based referrals

Addressing this

- Seeking out non-service referred protégés
- Annual plan (2010) commitment not to take service referrals
- Coordinator is out in community seeking people in need of advocacy
- Board members and their networks identify people
Advocate recruitment

• Identifying advocates before protégés

Addressing this

• Identify protégé first
• Advocates not receiving a choice of protégé
• Advocates
  – in a wider variety of instrumental and expressive roles
  – prepared to undertake high demand vigorous advocacy
  – In crisis advocacy roles
Need to move to more instrumental roles

- Pre-dominance of ‘friendship’ roles

*Addressing this*

- Focus on protégé led recruitment- find person match advocate based on skill set.
  - Instrumental
  - Expressive
  - Crisis

- Training focuses on the needs of the protégé (before more general around principles of CA)
Roles: 31st August 2011
Total Matches = 44

- Instrumental: 9
- Expressive: 9
- Instrumental and expressive: 24
- Crisis: 2

Total Matches = 44
Review Coordinator and Board roles

- Board meetings had more focus on administration than on the needs of the protégé

**Addressing this**

- Profiles of protégés are discussed at Board meetings - built into agenda
- New Board members undertake mandatory orientation
- Board members more involved in identifying potential protégé
- Coordinator to remain independent of the advocate role.
Can CA promote reciprocal relationships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA Nov. 2009 Internal Review</th>
<th>Matches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to be long term</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-matched</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-existing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wounds society inflicts on people who are perceived negatively (Wolfensberger, 1998)

- Isolation, segregation, mass grouping.
- Rejection perhaps by family, neighbours, community, society, service workers.
- Removal from one’s physical environment.
- Broken social relationships - social and relationship discontinuity.
- Loss of natural free relationships for artificial paid ones.
- Involuntary material poverty.
- Impoverishment of experience.
- Loss of control, autonomy, freedom.
Wounds (Wolfensberger, 1998).

- Dehumanization.
- Exclusion from the knowledge of and participation in those things that give quality to life
- Having ones life wasted
- Brutalization- death-making
- Awareness source of anguish to, loved ones
- Personal insecurity, dislike of oneself.
- Resentment of more privileged
- Receiving additional labels
Reciprocal relationship

- Mutual relationship
  - Both parties benefit
  - Both parties give up something to get something from the other

- Values the benefits of diversity, dialogue and shared learning

- Complementary relationship
Reciprocity demonstrated in DVD
Gavin & Gunalan
Reciprocity demonstrated in DVD
Barbara & Alison
Reciprocity demonstrated in DVD
Neemia & Jocelyn
Reciprocity demonstrated in DVD Christie & Niharaka

- One story
- Listen for the reciprocity
- Share examples of reciprocity from the story of this relationship