



[\[Home page of this section\]](#)

## A PAPER FROM *THE URBAN IMPERATIVE*

[\[Table of contents\]](#) [\[Buy the book\]](#) [\[PDF version\]](#)

# "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" and other social capital initiatives of Parks Victoria, Australia

**JOHN SENIOR AND MARDIE TOWNSEND**

*John Senior is Manager, Strategic Partnerships, Parks Victoria.  
Mardie Townsend is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Health and  
Social Development of Deakin University. Both are based in  
Melbourne. This paper is based on a presentation by Gerard  
O'Neill, General Manager, Metropolitan Parks and Bays, Policy and  
Strategy, Parks Victoria.*

Citation: This paper may be cited as: [Authors.] 2005. [Article title.] In Ted Trzyna, ed.,  
*The Urban Imperative*. California Institute of Public Affairs, Sacramento, California.

## 1. INTRODUCTION: PARKS VICTORIA

In the Australian state of Victoria, Parks Victoria is the state government's statutory organization uniquely responsible for the management of national (terrestrial and marine) and state parks and reserves, together with a variety of major urban parks and regional open space in Melbourne. It additionally is responsible for the management of recreational use of two bays adjacent to the metropolitan area. In all, Parks Victoria manages over 4 million hectares of land-based parks that attract some 36 million visits annually.

Having this diverse combination of responsibilities enables the organization to understand community aspirations and readily communicate the values and recreational opportunities of the protected areas to city dwellers as part of its urban park management activities.

Over recent years, Parks Victoria has progressively adopted a range of contemporary and innovative management techniques to better undertake its responsibilities into the future. These are not limited to traditional park and recreation responsibilities but embrace social capital considerations.

Parks Victoria recognizes that it has an important responsibility to ensure the areas managed contribute to the quality of life for all Victorians and meet the "Caring Communities" platform of the state government. A sustainable future for Parks Victoria is dependent on the organization's relevance to community needs and expectations and to its broader contribution.

In 2000, Parks Victoria introduced the slogan "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" as a seemingly logical statement that was immediately successful. A number of partnerships were developed with the health sector. In 2002, in conjunction with a number of other Australasian park agencies, it commissioned the Faculty of Health and Behavioural Science at Deakin University to undertake a literature review of the health benefits of contact with nature in a park context (Maller et al. 2002).

The results of that research and subsequent projects have revealed a range of opportunities for park management agencies to play a significant role in contributing to social capital, as well as in furthering their own park management interests. The principles involved are not unique to Victoria or Australia; to greater or lesser extents they will be valid internationally.

Very recently, Parks Victoria has embarked on a new "Community Partnerships" initiative which broadens the development of a social capital approach beyond the basic social values provided by parks in four key areas: internal capacity building, collaborative programs, building collective community consciousness, and social responsibility.

This paper uses these Parks Victoria initiatives as a case study, but also provides some global context for how they could be more widely applied.

## **2. NATURAL AND SOCIAL CAPITAL**

Australia is experiencing many of the same trends as other industrialized countries. It is undergoing significant urban development, both urban sprawl and consolidation, driven by a combination of increasing population and a lifestyle "dream." There are consequent threats to undeveloped land, including open space and natural areas, and an isolation from green space. As elsewhere, the national park estate has been driven by a "purist" nature conservation agenda with invariable interfaces with growing ecotourism and urban recreational desires. The strong environmental concerns of the late 20th century have been overtaken by the policies of recent governments, the self-interests of individuals, and international issues of terrorism and war.

In addition, with park and open-space responsibilities often fragmented and parochially managed, there is often a general absence of a coordinated approach to the needs of people for outdoor recreation and the relationship between remnant or restored vegetation and larger areas such as national and state parks. The associated social values are not fully appreciated or understood.

At the same time, we are universally experiencing a major decline in health standards due to the increasingly sedentary life and work

style (computers, television, fast foods) and yet a tendency towards aging populations as health treatments and associated care improve.

There is also the increasing gap between the "haves" and "have nots" that affects how people are able to afford to recreate.

Among all these issues we seem to have forgotten the original purpose of parks. As a consequence we are missing synergistic opportunities for parks and the community.

When parks were first designed in the 19th century, city officials had a strong belief in the possible health advantages that would result from open space . It was hoped that parks would reduce disease, crime, and social unrest, as well as providing "green lungs" for the city and areas for recreation . At this time it was also believed that exposure to nature fostered psychological well-being, reduced the stress associated with urban living, and promoted physical health . These assumptions were used as justification for providing parks and other natural areas in cities, and preserving wilderness areas outside of cities for public use .

In the last few hundred years, however, there has been an extraordinary disengagement of humans from the natural environment, due mostly to an enormous shift of people away from rural areas into cities. Here, contact with nature is often only available via parks. Never have humans spent so little time in physical contact with animals and plants, and the consequences of this are only beginning to be explored . Modern society by its very essence insulates people from outdoor environmental stimuli and regular contact with nature . Detrimental effects on humans of this isolation from nature have been asserted by researchers who believe that too much artificial stimulation and an existence spent in purely human environments may cause exhaustion, or produce a loss of vitality and health

It is internationally accepted that sustainable communities exist where the three capitals, economic, environmental, and social, co-exist and are in balance. It is well recognized that parks and open spaces are major contributors to the environmental capital of a society.

In the last twenty years, there has also been recognition that parks and open space can contribute greatly to a society's economic capital. In Australia, the nature-based tourism industry is worth over a billion Australian dollars a year and many parks such as the internationally renowned Phillip Island Penguin Parade contribute as much as A\$100 million a year to Australia's economy.

But do parks contribute to *social* capital? Social capital is a relatively new and very useful concept. Social commentator Eva Cox popularized it in Australia with her 1995 Boyer Lecture, one of a prestigious series sponsored by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. According to Cox (1995), social capital is "the processes between people which establish networks, norms, social trust and facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit." She goes on to say that "these processes are also known as social fabric or glue" and "we increase social capital by working together voluntarily in egalitarian organizations." Clearly, using this

definition, parks can play a significant role in establishing and supporting social capital.

### 3. NATURE AND HUMAN HEALTH

Although parks have not entirely lost their connection with health, the modern emphasis is almost exclusively on their use as a venue for leisure and sport or conservation protection. Although the physical activity opportunities provided by parks have been promoted, little if any recognition has been given to the other potential health benefits offered by access to nature through parks. Aside from leisure and sport purposes, parks in cities tend to be viewed as optional amenities rather than as necessary components of urban infrastructure (Kaplan and Kaplan 1989).

Why the benefits of parks, understood by early landscape designers, park engineers, and public health campaigners, have been overlooked in recent decades is a mystery. Research on the benefits of nature carried out over the last two decades indicates that they were right. Data so far have shown that access to "green nature" can reduce crime (Kuo 2001), foster psychological well-being, reduce stress, boost immunity, enhance productivity, promote healing in psychiatric patients, and aid community cohesion and identity (Lewis 1990).

Another factor likely to have contributed to human health problems over recent decades is (according to Putnam 1995) loss of social capital, which is defined by Putnam et al. (1993: 167) as "features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions." Though there are variations in the way it is defined, the concept of social capital is generally accepted as including the level of connectedness or civic engagement within a community, the trust members feel toward others, and the security they feel living within the community (Flower 1997; Putnam 1993; Kawachi and Kennedy 1997; Bourdieu 1985). Rutter (1995) has proposed that the rapidly increasing psychopathology in modern industrialized societies is most likely due to factors including family conflict and break up, as well as increased individualism. This proposed association underscores the need to promote connectedness and civic engagement within such societies.

The role of social capital as a key determinant of health has been highlighted by recent research (Kawachi et al. 1997; Runyan et al. 1998; Leeder and Dominello 1999). Despite this recognition of the importance of social capital for health, Putnam (1995) observes that social connectedness and civic engagement – key aspects of social capital – are in decline.

It is not surprising, therefore, that recent research supports the proposal that social capital may explain differences in mortality and morbidity within and between groups (Runyan et al 1998; Kawachi and Kennedy 1997). For example, a study of the connection between social capital and the presence of emotional and behavioral problems found that, independent of other factors, children from families high in social capital had fewer problems than children from families low in social capital (Runyan et al. 1998). In another study, researchers found a significant relationship between community disinvestment in social capital and mortality (Kawachi

and Kennedy 1997).

Given the combination of these two factors – disengagement from nature, or diminished access to "natural capital," defined by Pretty (1998) as the goods and services provided by nature; and declining social capital, it is not surprising that in industrialized countries chronic disease has increasingly replaced acute infectious disease as the major cause of disability and death, and that the WHO Global Burden of Disease study (Murray and Lopez 1996) indicates that by the year 2020 this will be true for every region in the world, with cardiovascular disease and poor mental health as the two biggest contributors. These types of afflictions are often long-term and are potentially much more expensive in terms of health care requirements and cost to the community. Current theories of disease have become more complex, moving from single-cause explanations to ones in which multiple behavioral, environmental, biological, and genetic factors combine over time, resulting in one or more of a number of different diseases.

Yet despite the burgeoning chronic health problems in industrialized nations, and despite the trend away from single-cause explanations of illness and disease, little if any attention has been paid to the potential for the "symbiotic" relationship between social capital and natural capital to be exploited as both a preventive measure and a restorative solution to the diseases prominent in modern society.

Other research has demonstrated the importance of contact with natural environments for human health and well-being (Frumkin 2001; Wilson 2001). Yet, despite its potential health benefits, increasing urbanization results in diminishing contact between humans and natural environments, and health is being deleteriously affected. An example of this is in urban consolidation where infrastructure considerations are driving a vertical development agenda. Singapore is one of the few cities placing increasing importance on greening its urban environment.

These two strands of research into health determinants appear to merge in anecdotal evidence that suggests engagement in civic environmentalism (through volunteers and groups such as "Friends of Parks") has spin-off health benefits, relating to a combination of exposure to natural environments and increased social capital. This link is supported by Furnass (1996) who defines the components of well-being as including: satisfactory human relationships; meaningful occupation; and opportunities for contact with nature, creative expression, and making a positive contribution to human society. However, data are needed to verify this claim.

In many fields of research, including ecology, biology, psychology, and psychiatry, there have been recent attempts to understand the human relationship with nature and how humans might benefit from nature in terms of health and well-being. The research indicates that, contrary to popular thinking, humans may be dependent on nature for psychological, emotional, and spiritual needs that are difficult to satisfy by other means.

Australia spends 8.5 percent of its gross domestic product on health (Ross et al. 1999) and while, by international standards, Australians enjoy good health, it is also true that some experience

poorer health than others (AIHW 2000). Obesity in Australia is reaching epidemic proportions and, as elsewhere in the world, cardiovascular disease and mental illness are growing. There are increasing rates of family breakdown, social cohesion is being challenged, and health care costs are rising rapidly. At the same time, environmental degradation is posing major problems in Australia.

The above information summarizes the findings of Deakin University's literature review on health benefits of nature in park contexts (Maller et al. 2002).

This research demonstrated that natural environments have been found to offer low-cost preventive and remedial opportunities for public health. These findings have led to further research and have major implications for park management. The research underway focuses, among other things, on: the health impacts of highrise living; the health and well-being benefits of "Friends Group" membership; and the value of natural experiences as an intervention in treatment of depression.

#### **4. THE "HEALTHY PARKS, HEALTHY PEOPLE" INITIATIVE**

In 2000, Parks Victoria successfully introduced the slogan "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" to promote its activities. Having a unique combination of responsibilities enabled the organization, as part of its urban park management activities, to market the values and recreational opportunities of the protected areas within the metropolitan area to the city dwellers who comprise 3.5 million of the state's 5 million population.

While support for the principle of land being set aside for parks is widespread in Western societies, the rhetoric is not always realized in practice when commercial pressure occurs. The importance of parks is only top-of-mind when the integrity of a well-known park is threatened. So the challenge for Parks Victoria, as for many park agencies, is how to heighten people's sense of the value of parks. The provision of information and experiential opportunities are obvious, but both need to be cleverly crafted.

However, it is well documented that people need encouragement to recognize relatively easy options that will contribute to their own well-being. Along with the obvious virtues of open space for physical pursuits, parks are refuges from urban stress and places for families to get together for picnics, for people to enjoy a variety of outdoor activities, and for children to safely explore the magic of the natural environment.

Going to a park can be a great adjunct to both traditional and natural health therapies, as almost everyone's physical and mental well-being can be improved by visiting a park. To encourage Victorians to visit parks, to inspire them to play a role in their care, and to provide "healthy" places for body, mind, and spirit, Parks Victoria developed a comprehensive integrated program focusing on health.

The first challenge was to develop a genuine and effective positioning in line with Parks Victoria's core values. The positioning needed to trigger a perception in the minds of the public of an

organization that exemplified the qualities and attributes of custodianship, environmental protection, and a contribution to a civil society. The clear and simple slogan "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" was developed, implying that the environmental health of parks results in a healthy community and that spending active recreation time in a well cared-for park environment can lead to greater health and fitness of both individuals and society.

The first stage was to develop broad-based awareness. An eight-week radio and print promotion program was launched, with activities supported by editorials in the national press. A festival showcased statewide park and recreational opportunities and displays from community and recreational groups celebrating the benefits of outdoor recreation. The displays involved entertainment, music, environment displays, tree-planting, boating, bike hire, fishing, and fitness assessments – a fun experience!

The second element of the campaign related to partnerships forged with several peak health bodies. These alliances gave extra credibility to the campaign by legitimizing the link between a healthy park system and a healthy society through the imprimatur of the medical profession. Support was sought and obtained from the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, Asthma Victoria, the National Heart Foundation, and Arthritis Victoria. Colorful posters and brochures have been designed and distributed to general practitioners' offices statewide, and more recently (in conjunction with Maternal and Child Health Services and the Australian Breastfeeding Association) a congratulations card is provided to the mother of each new baby. These advise patients and mothers on the benefits of the natural environment and where to get more information about healthy activities in parks.

Finally, all existing Parks Victoria brochures and promotional programs are now themed "Healthy Parks, Healthy People," including stands at three major annual exhibitions and major events like "The World's Greatest Pram Stroll" – an initiative to encourage young mothers to meet and mix in a pleasant environment and hopefully establish a great habit! These events provide very high levels of exposure to themes sympathetic to the campaign. "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" has a prominent section on the Parks Victoria Web site (Parks Victoria). Victoria has made the electronic and other collateral freely available to other park agencies.

A significant contributor to the success of the campaign to date has been its endorsement by Parks Victoria staff, in particular its championing by regional communication staff. Vital to the overall impact of the campaign has been the fact that it has been integrated into a wide range of activities, including staff awards, the Parks Victoria internal Web, everyday stationery and report covers, and rebadging of signage and existing sponsorship and media communications.

A partnership has been established with a national television program "Postcards," which features an actual park ranger as a presenter and highlights park venues and visitor opportunities. Each segment is tagged with the "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" message and the Parks Victoria's telephone information center number. The series was so successful it was placed in the popular

time slot of 7.30 p.m. Saturday, and has received even higher ratings.

The campaign has been awarded the Victorian State prize for the Australian Marketing Institute's Public Sector - Best Marketing Campaign 2001, the national Banksia Award for Communication 2002 and the Parks & Leisure Australia National Innovation Award in 2002.

So how effective is the campaign? Attributing success to any specific marketing campaign is difficult as many factors can influence the level of understanding and impact. The press component reached 85 percent of all Victorians aged 14 and over at an average frequency of 5.6 – that is, on average, each of the individuals reached by the campaign were exposed to the message more than five times. The radio component reached almost 60 percent of all adult Victorians at an average frequency of 12.6.

Parks Victoria cannot compel, only encourage, Victorians to take advantage of the myriad of opportunities to improve their physical and mental health, in some of the most beautiful places in the world. If more people are now more aware of those opportunities and place a higher value on parks, then the campaign has been, and remains, a core part of Parks Victoria's management strategies.

## **5. GOING A STEP FURTHER: "LINKING PEOPLE AND SPACES"**

Within the greater Melbourne area, open space responsibility resides with 31 municipal councils and a number of individual organizations, including Parks Victoria. As the only entity with metropolitan wide responsibilities (37 parks covering 6,200 hectares) the state government charged Parks Victoria with preparing a strategy and vision for continued growth and improvement of Melbourne's open space network. This report, *Linking People and Spaces* (Parks Victoria 2002) was prepared in parallel with a Metropolitan Strategy (by the Department of Infrastructure). It takes into account the population growth predictions (numeric and spatial) for the next 20 years and demographic indicators of significance.

The key principles of the strategy are partnerships, equity of access, diversity, flexibility, and sustainability. It identifies the benefits of open space under headings of conservation (including that many of the state's rarest flora and fauna species are found with the metropolitan area), urban lifestyle, and economic and health/well-being. The strategy sets out a coordinated, consistent approach to future urban open space planning and provides a logical connection to protected area values and issues.

The report was prepared through a community consultation process and subsequently released as a government-endorsed direction. The process and the future implementation provide continued opportunities to re-emphasize the relevance of urban open space and its linkages to protected areas (a number of which exist around the urban fringe) for habitat corridors.

### ***Volunteers***

In Victoria alone, there are more than a hundred "Friends of Parks" groups spread across the state, with thousands of members as well as additional volunteers who participate in community group park-related activities. An estimated 100,000 hours is contributed annually to Parks Victoria activities through such voluntary work.

As mentioned above, it seems obvious that members of groups involved in "civic environmentalism" are likely to receive a number of health and well-being benefits from their volunteer work with the natural environment, including: a sense of achievement and ownership; the opportunity to learn from, and socialize with, other members of the community, enhancing both social capital and "human capital," defined by Pretty (1998) as "the status of individuals"; multiple physical health benefits; and the opportunity to have access to plants and animals.

Anecdotal evidence from a pilot study indicates there are significant health and well-being benefits flowing from civic environmentalism. The findings of this study suggest that park volunteers not only work to restore the environment, but in the process they experience improved physical health as a result of increased physical activity, improved mental health through an increased opportunity for time spent in a natural environment, and an increased level of social connectedness and trust through interacting with others in their local community.

In the face of burgeoning health care costs, and the apparent declining physical, mental and social well-being of Australians, Australia's planners and policy-makers are being forced to "think outside the square," as traditional approaches to health promotion, health education, and health care are fighting a losing battle. There may be value in exploring in more depth the health and well-being benefits of civic environmentalism, and testing the efficacy of a "lifestyle prescription" based on membership of a park volunteer group.

### ***Community partnerships***

Social capital, according to Australian social commentator Eva Cox, in her 1995 Boyer Lecture, is "the processes between people that establish networks, norms, social trust and facilitates co-ordination and co-operation of mutual benefit." Cox also states that "these processes are also known as social fabric or glue" and "we increase social capital by working together voluntarily in egalitarian organisations". By their very nature, parks contribute to social capital though the:

- Care and protection of the natural resource assets;
- Provision of safe and accessible open space in which sub-groups from a wide spectrum of society congregate to enjoy leisure activities;
- Support and encouragement for activities of volunteer and interest groups;
- Provision of recreational opportunities that encompass a wide range of interests; and
- Supporting regional employment and the local economy.

Under the broad initiative of "Community Partnerships," Parks Victoria is now striving to respond to its social responsibilities in four key areas:

- Internal capacity building: Development of tools, skills, and cultural norms to enable the organization to effectively engage with the community;
- Collaborative programs: Practical partnering programs that provide meaningful, rewarding, and mutually beneficial opportunities for park users, volunteers, interest groups, and the general community;
- Building collective community conscience: Building awareness, understanding, and ownership within the whole community of the broader importance of parks and open space; and
- Social responsibility: Using the "business" of park management and park resources to build the skills, opportunities, and outlook of specific local communities.

Each of these key areas is described below.

#### Internal capacity-building

Internal capacity building is regarded as the first stage for any organization wishing to undertake genuine community development. Encouraging an organizational culture that demonstrates community development principles through its leadership and management style, and providing the tools, processes, and support for staff to effectively participate in building social capital are key action areas.

The term "social capital" may be new to many, but the activity of using local resources, building local ownership through participation, engaging local networks, and honoring local processes is one which park management staff has traditionally used in working with communities. Acknowledging the value of the existing relationships, networks and partnerships through which staff currently engage is part of building social capital within the organizational culture.

Parks Victoria is developing definitions and principles to underpin the spectrum of partnership types and guide staff to implement collaborative programs.

#### Collaborative programs

In this area, Parks Victoria has traditionally delivered a range of projects and programs which enable the participation of the broader community in park management.

A new direction however, is to engage volunteers to deliver high-priority projects for the whole park system while balancing the needs and interests of park visitors, volunteers, or community groups. In particular, the organization will seek opportunities to build the capacity of the park community through skills development and supporting community engagement through effective decision-making, listening, and networking.

Parks Victoria is now working more closely with its major stakeholders to build solid relationships or establish structured partnership agreements. Gamecon, the peak body supporting recreational game hunting, has partnered with Parks Victoria to undertake pest animal species management in one of Victoria's major national parks. This collaborative program was supported by shared decision-making, a skills-building program, and memoranda of understanding between Parks Victoria and the range of community groups involved.

#### Building a collective community consciousness

Developing a broader understanding in the community of the value of parks beyond green open space is best demonstrated by the "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" program described above.

By promoting the connection, internally and externally, between a healthy park system and the health of the community, Parks Victoria is demonstrating the integral role parks play in supporting a truly civic society.

#### Social responsibility

Beyond the role that parks physically contribute to social capital, Parks Victoria has a responsibility to use the business of managing parks to benefit the broader community. Parks Victoria is exploring ways to use its networks, influences, and resources to build local employment and economic opportunities, to support the local community through access to resources or services, or to use its reputation and status to promote causes or affiliations.

A specific example of social responsibility is Parks Victoria's indigenous programs. Providing opportunities for indigenous people to reconnect traditional links with the land through employment, consultation, networking, and skill-building in co-management arrangements demonstrate how park management can be used to enhance the social capital of the indigenous community.

A second example is through Parks Victoria's pro-active participation in the establishment of the Mornington Peninsula Westernport Biosphere Reserve. UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme offers a vehicle for engaging local communities, in partnership with government and business, to build a sustainable community in a defined geographic area. Parks Victoria has supported this project through resources, services, and building credibility of the project in government, business, and the community.

The Mornington Peninsula Westernport area has a population exceeding 250,000 and is part of the metropolitan area of Melbourne. A successful application was made to UNESCO in 2002 for biosphere reserve designation supported by various levels of government. Most importantly, it had widespread support from the local community and such subgroups within the community as tourism operators, business groups, farmers, and environmental groups.

Parks Victoria can expect to be a beneficiary of the programs that

occur in the transition zone – the area outside the parks where the bulk of the population of the biosphere reserve live and work. It is such activities that will be the key to the success of the biosphere reserve, and which are expected to provide mutual benefits to Parks Victoria and the local community.

The importance of the biosphere reserve to Parks Victoria is also that it signals acceptance of a new way of working, which may be applied in other management contexts. In particular, this refers to "place-based" delivery of services, which rely on a horizontal application of government expertise and resources. It is also a vehicle for community interaction with governments in which the community leads the way and takes greater responsibility for the area. The international recognition of the unique values and character of the area heightened a sense of "pride of place" within the community. The area of the biosphere reserve is a natural bioregion and the program will enhance current bioregional projects. All these aspects of the biosphere reserve project are expected to assist in the long-term protection of the environmental values within the boundaries of the park and the sustainable growth of the social and economic values in the transition zone.

The economic benefits to the area underpin social benefits. It has been estimated the economic benefits of biosphere reserve designation to the Mornington Westernport area will run into millions of dollars. The imprimatur of UNESCO elevates the value of goods and services that comply with biosphere reserve criteria for sustainability. The development of a community which recognizes the economic and social benefits of protecting and enhancing natural resources of the area will create a community living in greater harmony with the environment upon which it depends.

By supporting such projects, Parks Victoria contributes to the growth of social capital, and in turn reaps the associated benefits of further growth and protection of the park system.

## **6. CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT**

By developing an understanding of the interrelationship of the three capitals – environmental, economic, and social – agencies will be able to broaden the role of protected area management beyond the traditional mandate and realize a purpose benefiting all facets of society.

From Parks Victoria's experience it is evident that by taking a wider perspective, protected area management agencies can take advantage of a diverse range of opportunities (such as those illustrated here) to assist with their particular challenges and to generate a greater sense of appreciation and recognition within the broader community. By including a social capital approach and adopting more comprehensive environmental and economic views, protected area management bodies can attract an increased constituency of support that will be of potential benefit in political, resource and financial terms.

To do so will require a commitment to:

- Internal capacity building;
- Learning from, and working collaboratively with, others (and developing systems to facilitate this);
- Encouraging innovative thinking;
- Communicating to urban communities (e.g., through a partnership approach with sister urban park management bodies) to demonstrate the value of parks beyond an environmental resource to include the economic benefits of nature-based tourism and the significant role parks play in the physical, mental, spiritual, and social well-being of society;
- Engaging the community and providing meaningful, rewarding, and mutually beneficial opportunities to participate in the planning, use, and care of parks, thereby building community capabilities and custodianship; and
- Adequately resourcing such initiatives.

It is hoped that this paper will assist others in progressing the World Parks Congress Recommendation on cities and protected areas.

*Parks Victoria is willing to provide more detail on any of the activities outlined above. Contact John Senior, jsenior@Parks.vic.gov.au.*

## 7. REFERENCES

AIHW (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare). 2000. *Australia's Health 2000: The Seventh Biennial Health Report of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare*. AIHW, Canberra.

Axelrod, L. J., and P. Suedfeld. 1995. Technology, capitalism, and Christianity: Are they really the three horsemen of the eco-collapse? *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 15: 183-195.

Beck, A., and A. Katcher. 1996. *Between Pets and People: The importance of animal companionship*. Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Beck, A., L. Seraydarian, and F. Hunter. 1986. Use of animals in the rehabilitation of psychiatric inpatients. *Psychological Reports* 58: 63-66.

Bourdieu, P. 1985. The forms of social capital. In J. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, 241-248. Greenwood Press, New York.

Cowen, E.L. 1999. In sickness and in health: Primary prevention's vows revisited. In D. Cicchetti and S.L. Toth (eds.), *Developmental Approaches to Prevention and Intervention*. University of Rochester Press, Rochester, New York.

Cox, E. *A Truly Civil Society*. ABC Books, Sydney. Posted at <http://www.ldb.org/boyer12.htm>. Her thesis was elaborated in Creating a more civil society: Community level indicators of social capital just policy. *Journal of Australian Social Policy*, Issue 19 (2000).

- Flower, J. 1997. Beyond economics: Healthy communities and healthy economies. *National Civic Review* 86 (1).
- Friedmann, E., and S.A. Thomas. 1995. Pet ownership, social support, and one-year survival after acute myocardial infarction in the cardiac arrhythmia suppression trial (CAST). *American Journal of Cardiology* 76: 1213-1217.
- Frumkin, H. 2001. Beyond toxicity: Human health and the natural environment. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 20: 234-240.
- Furnass, B. 1996. Introduction. In: *Survival, Health and Well-being into the Twenty First Century: Proceedings of a conference held at The Australian National University, November 30 - December 1, 1995*, B. Furnass, et al., eds., 5-6. Nature & Society Forum, Canberra.
- Gullone, E. 2000. The biophilia hypothesis and life in the 21st century: Increasing mental health or increasing pathology? *Journal of Happiness Studies* 1, 293-321.
- Hamilton-Smith, E., and D. Mercer. 1991. *Urban Parks and Their Visitors*. The Parks Division, Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, Melbourne.
- House, J. S., K.R. Landis, and D. Umberson. 1988. Social relationships and health. *Science* 241: 540-544.
- Kaplan, R. 1990. The psychological benefits of nearby nature. In: *Role of Horticulture in Human Well-being and Social Development: A National Symposium*, D. Relf, ed. Timber Press, Arlington, Virginia.
- Kaplan, R., and S. Kaplan. 1989. *The Experience of Nature: A psychological perspective*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York.
- Katcher, A., and A. Beck. 1987. Health and caring for living things. *Anthrozoos* 1: 175-183.
- Katcher, A. H., and A.M. Beck. 1983. *New Perspectives on Our Lives with Companion Animals*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Kawachi, I., and B.P. Kennedy. 1997. Health and social cohesion: why care about income inequality? *British Medical Journal* 314, 1037-1040.
- Kawachi, I., B. Kennedy, and K. Lochner. 1997. Long live community: Social capital as public health. *The American Prospect* 35: 56-59.
- Kuo, F. E. 2001. Coping with poverty: Impacts of environment and attention in the inner city. *Environment and Behavior* 33: 5-34.
- Leeder, S. and A. Dominello. 1999. Social capital and its relevance

to health and family policy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 23: 424-429.

Lewis, C. A. 1990. Effects of plants and gardening in creating interpersonal and community well-being. In: *Role of Horticulture in Human Well-being and Social Development: A National Symposium*, D. Reif, ed. Timber Press, Arlington, Virginia.

Maller, C., M. Townsend, P. Brown, and L. St Leger. 2002. *Healthy Parks Healthy People: The health benefits of contact with nature in a park context: A review of current literature*. Social and Mental Health Priority Area Occasional Paper Series, Vol. 1. Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, Deakin University, Burwood, Australia. [http://www.hbs.deakin.edu.au/HealthSci/Research/Health\\_Policy/pv\\_report1.pdf](http://www.hbs.deakin.edu.au/HealthSci/Research/Health_Policy/pv_report1.pdf).  
[http://www.hbs.deakin.edu.au/HealthSci/Research/Health\\_Policy/pv\\_ann\\_biblio1.pdf](http://www.hbs.deakin.edu.au/HealthSci/Research/Health_Policy/pv_ann_biblio1.pdf).

Murray, C.J.L., and A.D. Lopez. 1996. *The Global Burden of Disease: A comprehensive assessment of mortality and disability, injuries, and risk factors in 1990 and projected to 2020*. World Bank, Harvard School of Public Health, and World Health Organization, Geneva

Parks Victoria. "ParkWeb." <http://parkweb.vic.gov.au>.

Parks Victoria. 2002, *Linking People and Spaces*. Parks Victoria, Melbourne.

Parsons, R. 1991. The potential influences of environmental perception on human health. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 11: 1-23.

Parsons, R., L.G. Tassinary, R.S. Ulrich, M.R. Hebl, and M. Grossman-Alexander. 1998. The view from the road: Implications for stress recovery and immunization. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 18: 113-140.

Pretty, J. 1998. Sustainable development for local economies: Basic principles. <http://www2.essex.ac.uk/ces/CoreResearch/loceconsd.htm>

Putnam, R. D. 1995. Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6: 65-78.

Putnam, R. D., R. Leonardi, and R.Y. Nanetti. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Rohde, C. L. E., and A.D. Kendle. 1994. *Report to English Nature: Human well-being, natural landscapes, and wildlife in urban areas: A review*. University of Reading, Department of Horticulture and Landscape; and Research Institute for the Care of the Elderly, Bath, U.K.

Rohde, C. L. E., and A.D. Kendle. 1997. Nature for people. In: *Urban Nature Conservation: Landscape management in the urban*

*countryside*, A.D. Kendle and S. Forbes, eds., 319-335. Spon, London.

Ross, B., J. Snasdell-Taylor, Y. Cass, and S. Azmi. 1999. *Health Financing in Australia: The Objectives and Players*. Occasional Papers: Health Financing Series, Vol. 1. Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care, Canberra.

Roszak, T., M.E. Gomes, and A.D. Kanner. 1995. *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, healing the mind*. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco.

Runyan, D. K., et al. 1998. Children who prosper in unfavourable environments: The relationship to social capital. *Pediatrics* 101: 12-19.

Rutter, M., and D.J. Smith, eds. 1995. *Psychosocial Disorders in Young People: Time trends and their causes*. Wiley, Chichester.

Stilgoe, J. R. 2001. Gone barefoot lately? *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 20: 243-244.

Tennessen, C. M., and B. Cimprich. 1995. Views to nature: Effects on attention. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 15: 77-85.

Ulrich, R. S. 1993. Biophilia, biophobia, and natural landscapes. In: *The Biophilia Hypothesis*, S.R. Kellert and E.O. Wilson, eds., 73-137. Island, Washington, D.C.

Ulrich, R. S., R.F. Simons, B.D. Losito, E. Fiorito, M.A. Miles, and M. Zelson. 1991. Stress recovery during exposure to natural and urban environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 11: 231-248.

Wilson, E. O. 1984. *Biophilia*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Wilson, E. O. 2001. The ecological footprint. *Vital Speeches* 67: 274-281.

---

This paper copyright © Deakin University and Parks Victoria 2005.

Reproduction of this paper for educational or other noncommercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this paper for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission from the copyright holder.

Web site hosted by the California Institute of Public Affairs,  
an IUCN member since 1980

[Home page](#) / [Site map](#) / [Copyright & caveats](#)

The [copyright notice](#) applies to the entire contents of this Web site.