



power to
change

business in
community
hands

Research Institute Report No. 26

Measuring the impact of community businesses at neighbourhood level

October 2020

Richard Crawshaw, Rebecca Hamlyn, Steven Coutinho,
Alice Fitzpatrick and Joel Williams



Contents

About this report	3
Reporting conventions	4
Executive summary	5
Introduction	12
1. Research findings: Baseline figures	21
2. Research findings: Comparing areas over time	46
Bibliography	65
Appendix A: Description of the six community business areas	66
Appendix B: Summary of statistical difference baseline	68
Appendix C: Summary of statistical difference – year on year comparison	78

About this report

Power to Change commissioned Kantar in 2019 to conduct a ‘hyperlocal’ version of the national Community Life Survey in six operational areas around community businesses which have received funding and support. This study builds on similar projects conducted in 2017 and 2018, which tested a method of measuring impact at the local and community level using hyperlocal boosts to the national Community Life Survey

The Community Life Survey has been carried out annually in England since 2012 to provide Official Statistics on issues that are key to encouraging social action and empowering communities, including volunteering, giving, community engagement and well-being. A ‘hyperlocal’ boost survey was conducted in each of the operational areas, and for each of the operational areas a national comparison sample was identified from within the 2018–19 Community Life Survey dataset. The 2019 ‘hyperlocal’ version of the national Community Life Survey revisited two areas originally surveyed in 2017 survey. Chapter 2 of this report reports on changes in these areas compared to changes in the matched comparison samples between 2017 and 2019.

This report outlines the findings from the survey and details of the matching process across the different locations and dimensions of impact. The Technical Appendix (published alongside this report) contains further information about the methodology and the full dataset will be available in the UK Data Archive.

Kantar is an independent research organisation that works with more than 40 Governments around the world, as well as many leading universities, NGOs and corporations to build public value. They partner clients with teams that bring local expertise as well as global best practice. Their insight and advice helps clients to make better decisions and drive positive citizen outcomes.

With the longest continuous heritage of any social research company in Britain, Kantar’s public division (formerly TNS BMRB) has played a leading role in chronicling the changing social, political and business landscape of the UK. They undertake research that underpins decision-making by policy makers across national and local government at the highest level and provide knowledge which helps the private and third sectors plan and care for society.

Published by The Power to Change Trust (2020)
ISBN: 978-1-911324-31-7



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Reporting conventions

1. Row or column percentages may not sum to 100, due to rounding
2. Symbols that appear in tables:
 - = Less than 2 per cent, including none

Abbreviations in tables

- MCS: matched comparison sample
- CB: Community business sample

The report provides headline findings and highlights statistically significant differences at the 95 per cent level between the community business sample and the matched comparison sample.

Findings highlighted in green in the tables identify differences where the average response of the community business sample is significantly **higher** than the average response of the matched comparison sample at the 95 per cent level.

Findings highlighted in red in the tables identify differences where the average response of the community business sample is significantly **lower** than the average response of the matched comparison sample at the 95 per cent level.

Executive summary

Power to Change commissioned Kantar in 2019 to conduct a ‘hyperlocal’ version of the national Community Life Survey (CLS) in six operational areas centred around Community Businesses supported by Power to Change. Each area has a mean average population 1,500 people. The ‘Hyperlocal’ design builds on studies conducted in 2017 and 2018 which established a new way of measuring the social impact of community businesses on their local community (Willis et al., 2017; Coutinho et al., 2018). In summary, these studies found that the CLS offered a cost-effective approach to creating a baseline measure of community cohesion and social action in the local areas served by community businesses.

The wider research aims to measure the impact of community businesses in areas they operate in. The first chapter of this report serves as a baseline, providing a comparison between the operational areas and matched comparison samples from the CLS. Chapter two reports on changes over time in survey measures in two areas which have been revisited from the 2017 study (Bramley and Hillsborough) against changes within the respective comparison samples for these areas.

The six areas (and community businesses) included in the research were All Saints (All Saints Action Network), Bramley (Bramley Baths), Hillsborough (Burton Street Foundation), Wolverton (Future Wolverton), Campsea Ashe (Station House) and Bevendean (The Bevy).

More details on these areas, including the economic and socio-demographic profiles of each area, can be found in Appendix A.

Approach

Power to Change aims to create better places through Community Businesses. It works with Community Businesses to revive local assets, protect the services people rely on, and address local needs. To achieve this, Power to Change provides money, advice and support to help local people come together and take control through Community Businesses.

DCMS’s national CLS presented a good opportunity to generate robust, comparable data on the local areas served by community businesses as a means to understand their impact. The CLS is an annual, nationally-representative survey conducted on behalf of government. It provides official statistics on issues key to encouraging social action and empowering communities (DCMS, 2019).¹

¹ Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (2019), Community Life Survey 2018-19 Report. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/community-life-survey-2018-19>

This research replicated the method and measures of DCMS’s national Community Life Survey (CLS) though used an alternative branding; the survey was presented as the Neighbourhood Life Survey. All processes and measures were identical to CLS.

The community businesses selected for this study were known to have received a reasonable degree of funding and support from Power to Change. These businesses are not part of a targeted place-based programme, such as Empowering Places² and were located in areas where little previous research had been conducted by the Trust.

The operational area of each community business was defined with reference to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census Output Area (OA) geography. Operational area maps were agreed with individual community businesses. Within each operational area, we drew a systematic random sample of addresses from the Royal Mail Postcode Address File. At each address, we invited all adults aged 16 plus to complete the questionnaire, either online or on paper.

Fieldwork took place between 10 July and 31 October 2019. Further details are provided in the Technical Note, published alongside this report.

Key findings

Six community businesses were selected for this study, split across urban and rural areas in several regions of England.

Community business	Place	Type
Bramley Baths	Bramley, Leeds	Community owned leisure centre
Burton Street Foundation	Hillsborough, Sheffield	Community Hub
All Saints Action Network	All Saints, Wolverhampton	Community Hub
The Bevy	Bevendean, Brighton	Community Pub
Station House	Campsea Ashe, Suffolk	Community Hub
Future Wolverton	Wolverton, Milton Keynes	Community Hub

Eight key metrics were used as measures to compare community business operational areas and their matched comparison samples.

² More information on the Empowering Place programme is available here: <https://www.powertochange.org.uk/get-support/programmes/empowering-places/>

These metrics were:

- **Social isolation:** a range of measures designed to measure the strength of people's social networks.
- **Health and wellbeing:** including measures of self-reported health and subjective wellbeing (for example happiness and life satisfaction).
- **Employability:** a measure of people's current economic status.
- **Local environment:** a measure of people's satisfaction with the local area as a place to live.
- **Community cohesion:** this includes measures around feelings of belonging, trust, neighbourliness and the extent to which people from different backgrounds get on with each other and have diverse friendship groups.
- **Community pride and empowerment:** the extent to which people perceive their area as one in which people pull together to improve their neighbourhood and whether people felt that they, as individuals and communities, can have an influence on local decision-making.
- **Social action:** this includes measures such as the extent to which local people get involved in local activities and level of civic engagement in the community for example through civic participation or civic consultation.
- **Volunteering:** the proportion of people who have been involved in volunteering in their community, either formally or informally.

This section provides a summary of the results of these metrics by area. For full analysis, please refer to the main body of the report.

All Saints

On the whole, residents in All Saints operational area scored lower on several measures in comparison to its matched comparison sample. Compared with its matched comparison sample, residents of All Saints had lower levels of social support networks, neighbourliness and trust in their community: they had fewer people in their social networks they could count on, were less likely to chat to neighbours or to feel comfortable asking neighbours to help them out if they were ill, and were less likely to feel a sense of trust among people in their community. Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents of All Saints were slightly less likely to be in employment and were more likely to be dissatisfied with their local area as a place to live. All Saints residents were also less likely than the comparison sample to report an awareness of local people getting involved in social action projects in their community.

However, compared with the matched comparison sample, All Saints residents had more diversity in their friendship networks (in terms of religious and educational background), and were more likely to feel a sense of personal empowerment in their community in terms of having the capacity to influence local decision-making.

There were no differences between All Saints residents and their matched comparison sample in terms of community cohesion and sense of belonging, and propensity to get involved in civic engagement activities and volunteering.

Bramley Baths

Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents living in Bramley were more positive on some measures, being more likely to feel that they had supportive social networks, to feel in good health, and to feel satisfied with the amenities and services in their local area. Bramley residents were also more likely to have ethnically and religiously diverse friendship networks and were less likely to report being economically inactive.

However, in comparison to the matched comparison area, Bramley residents were less likely to feel a sense of community cohesion, trust and belonging: they were less likely to feel that the local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together, to feel that many people in their local area can be trusted, and to feel a sense of belonging to both their local neighbourhood and Great Britain as a whole. Bramley residents were also less likely to have been personally involved in helping out with a local issue, to be aware of other people in their community getting involved, and to have taken part in informal volunteering at least once a month.

Bramley was more closely matched to its comparison sample in terms of personal wellbeing, satisfaction with the local area, neighbourliness, community empowerment and civic participation.

Hillsborough

Compared with its matched comparison area, residents in Hillsborough reported lower levels of personal wellbeing across most domains, being less likely to rate themselves as feeling happy and satisfied with their life, and more likely to feel anxious. Compared with the comparison area, Hillsborough residents also felt a weaker sense of belonging to Great Britain more generally and were less likely to have been personally involved in a local social action project or to be aware of other people in their locality getting involved. Hillsborough residents were also less likely than the comparison sample to have taken part in formal volunteering at least once a month.

However, compared with the matched comparison sample, Hillsborough residents displayed higher levels of satisfaction with their local amenities and services. Hillsborough residents also held more ethnically diverse friendship groups and were more likely to feel a sense of personal empowerment in their community, in terms of having the capacity to influence local decision-making.

Hillsborough residents were closely matched to the comparison sample on a number of measures including access to social networks, self-reported health, community cohesion and trust, neighbourliness and civic participation.

Wolverton

Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents in Wolverton were less likely to be economically inactive and reported more ethnically and religiously diverse friendship groups. Wolverton residents were also more likely to report civic engagement across all domains (civic participation, civic consultation and civic activism) and to feel a sense of personal empowerment, being more likely to agree that when people get involved in their local community, they can have an influence.

On the other hand, compared to the matched comparison sample, Wolverton residents were less trusting of people in their local community and were less likely to trust neighbours to look after a set of keys for them.

More generally, however, Wolverton residents were closely matched to their comparison sample on several measures including social networks, health, personal wellbeing, area satisfaction, community cohesion and belonging, social action and volunteering.

Campsea Ashe

Compared to the matched comparison sample, Campsea Ashe residents were consistently more positive than their matched comparison sample on almost every survey measure.

Compared with the matched comparison samples, residents in Campsea Ashe were more likely to rate their health as 'good' and were less likely to give a 'low' rating for feeling that their life was worthwhile. Campsea Ashe residents were also more likely than their matched comparison sample to be satisfied with their local area as a place to live and with their local amenities and services. They were also more likely to feel a sense of cohesion, neighbourliness and trust within their local neighbourhood. While Campsea friendship groups were no more or less ethnically diverse, their friendship circles were more educationally mixed compared with the matched sample.

Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents in Campsea Ashe were especially likely to feel a sense of community empowerment and involvement, being more likely to agree that people in their neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood, that when people get involved in their local community they can have an influence, and also that they personally can influence decisions in their local area. Consistent with this community ethos, Campsea residents were more likely than their comparison sample to have been personally involved in helping out with a local issue or activity, to be aware of people in the local area getting involved in local social action projects, and to be civically engaged on a range of measures (civic participation, civic consultation and civic activism). Campsea residents were also more likely than their comparison sample to take part in both formal and informal volunteering on a regular basis.

There were only two domains where Campsea residents were matched to their comparison sample: levels of employment and sense of belonging.

Bevendean

On the whole, residents in Bevendean operational area scored lower on several measures in comparison to its matched comparison sample. In particular, Bevendean residents had lower levels of neighbourliness and trust, being less likely to chat to their neighbours, to feel comfortable asking them for favours or to help out, and also felt less trusting of people in their neighbourhood. Residents also had a weaker sense of belonging to the local neighbourhood. Residents in Bevendean also scored lower on personal wellbeing measures and were less likely to be in employment and more likely to be economically inactive.

On the other hand, compared with the matched comparison sample, Bevendean residents were more likely to feel that their local area was cohesive and to have more ethnically and religiously diverse friendship networks. Bevendean residents were also more likely to be involved in civic engagement (civic participation and civic consultation).

Bevendean residents were closely matched to the comparison sample on a number of measures including self-reported health, local area satisfaction, community empowerment, social action and volunteering.

Comparing areas over time

Two areas (Bramley and Hillsborough) have been revisited from the 2017 study. This section summaries the changes over time. For full analysis, please refer to chapter 2 of the report.

Using ‘difference-in difference’ analysis (see section 2.1), we can assess whether the direction and scale of change between these two time-points is the same for the operation area as for its comparison group. In this part of the report, we refer to differences in the direction and/or scale of change as ‘relative effects’. If the evidence shows a different pattern of results – whether positive or negative - then we may hypothesise that the community business is making a difference (either positive or negative) relative to its comparison group.

Bramley

In Bramley, there are indications of a positive impact of the community-based swimming pool (Bramley Baths) on various outcomes. By focussing on the relative effects, that is after taking into account differences over time in the comparison sample, the findings suggest that the Bramley Baths community business has had a positive impact on self-reported health; personal wellbeing; satisfaction with the local area; a sense of belonging within their neighbourhood; and levels of civic engagement.

Hillsborough

In Hillsborough, in general most differences between 2017 and 2019 were also reflected in the comparison sample, and therefore there was little indication of any impact, either positive or negative, of the community business on outcomes measured by the CLS. There were two negative effects in terms of increased levels of anxiety and a reduction in the proportion of people who were aware of local people getting involved in local issues. However, there was three indications of a positive impact. Firstly, the proportion of people who felt that local people pull together to improve their neighbourhood had increased markedly between 2017 and 2019, and the relative effect, once the changes in the comparison sample had been taken into account, was very significant. Secondly, the proportion of people who felt that comfortable asking a neighbour to collect shopping essentials if they were at home on their own had increased compared to the comparison sample. Thirdly, the proportion of Hillsborough residents who disagreed that when local people get involved, they can change the way their area is run decreased compared to the comparison sample.

Introduction

Background

Community businesses – owned and run by local communities themselves – aspire to transform their local areas through engaging local people as co-creators in delivering goods or services. As such, community businesses have the potential to save or regenerate businesses or assets that may otherwise fail. They seek to build high levels of community buy-in and support for ventures and develop innovative and often low-cost business models. Community business also seek to help strengthen local communities by involving local people in decision-making and enhancing social capital by, for example, providing vital meeting spaces and developing links between staff, volunteers and customers (Percy et al., 2016).

Community businesses are by their very nature, locally rooted and accountable to the local community. That means they often work in defined operational areas, sometimes as a square mile around their central asset, covering just one or two wards. The community businesses selected for the 2019 study represent a range of areas, from urban council estates to rural villages. They deliver different types of activities too – from community hubs, pubs, even a leisure centre, illustrating the diversity of community business activity.

Table 1: Sampled Community Businesses and the local area they work in

Community business	Local area	Type	2011 Census population	MSOA mean IMD decile
Bramley Baths	Bramley, Leeds	Community owned leisure centre	3,113	Fifth Most Deprived
Burton Street Foundation	Hillsborough, Sheffield	Community Hub	2,809	Third Most Deprived
All Saints Action Network	All Saints, Wolverhampton	Community Hub	4,943	Most Deprived
The Bevy	Bevendean, Brighton	Community Pub	5,228	Most Deprived
Station House	Campsea Ashe, Suffolk	Community Hub	2,535	Ninth Most Deprived
Future Wolverton	Wolverton, Milton Keynes	Community Hub	9,011	Fifth Most Deprived

Research background

As a place-based funder, Power to Change is interested in understanding whether community businesses improve places. In addition to its targeted place-based investment (through initiatives such as Empowering Places), the Trust provides funding and support directly to community businesses and via its delivery partners. This 2019 study offers a useful counter-point to the 2018 study, which focused exclusively on those areas participating in the Empowering Places programme. Instead, this study provides an opportunity to explore what happens in areas where there is an active community business and significant support for them, but no specific place-based intervention.

To measure this, Power to Change commissioned Kantar to conduct a 'hyperlocal' version of the Community Life Survey (CLS) in each of six operational areas (see Section 1.6 and 1.7 for further details of the CLS). For each area, a comparison sample was drawn from the national CLS. The community businesses selected for this study were known to have received a reasonable degree of funding and support from Power to Change. These businesses were not part of a targeted place-based programme, such as Empowering Places³ and were located in areas where little previous research had been conducted by the Trust.

³ More information on the Empowering Place programme is available here: <https://www.powertochange.org.uk/get-support/programmes/empowering-places/>

Table 2: Sampled Community Businesses

Community business	Place	Region	Type	Comment
Bramley Baths	Bramley, Leeds	Yorkshire and Humber	Community owned leisure centre	Was included in the 2017 pilot study.
Burton Street Foundation	Hillsborough, Sheffield	Yorkshire and Humber	Community Hub	Was included in the 2017 pilot study.
All Saints Action Network	All Saints, Wolverhampton	West Midlands	Community Hub	West Midlands had not previously been represented in other Hyperlocal studies.
The Bevy	Bevendean, Brighton	South East	Community Pub	At the time of commissioning, The Bevy was the only community-owned pub on a council estate. Also, the South East had not previously been represented in other Hyperlocal studies.
Station House	Campsea Ashe, Suffolk	East of England	Community Hub Community business supporting disabled adults into employment	An active community hub in a rural area, offering interesting contrast to other community businesses included in this series of studies. Also, the East of England had not previously been represented in other Hyperlocal studies.
Future Wolverton	Wolverton, Milton Keynes	South East	Community Hub	South East had not previously been represented in other Hyperlocal studies.

Further information about these areas, including descriptions of the areas and community businesses, and socio-demographic indicators, can be found in Appendix A.

As per the CLS, invites were sent out to randomly selected households in the selected areas and not specifically to a sample of community business users. As this is a baseline survey, we were not evaluating the current impact of community businesses for four of the community businesses. It is intended that a follow-up survey using difference-in-difference analysis will be conducted in future years, to assess the impact these community businesses have on a range of outcomes. However, in two of the areas – Bramley and Hillsborough – baseline data already existed from a 2017 pilot of this approach. As such, this report contains difference-in-difference analysis for these areas (see section 2).

Background to the Community Life Survey (CLS)

Since 2012–13, the CLS has been carried out annually by Kantar on behalf of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), to provide official statistics on issues that are key to encouraging social action and empowering communities – including volunteering, giving, community engagement and wellbeing (Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, 2019).⁴

The key objectives of the survey are to:

- Provide robust, nationally representative data on behaviours and attitudes within communities to inform and direct policy and action in these areas.
- Provide data of value to all users, including public bodies, external stakeholders and the public.
- Underpin further research and debate on building stronger communities.

For more information, please refer to the CLS website⁵.

⁴ For more information on Official Statistics see: UK Statistics Authority. Available at <https://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/about-the-authority/uk-statistical-system/types-of-official-statistics/>

⁵ For more information on the Community Life Survey see: Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). Available at : <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/community-life-survey--2>

Summary of approach

For the purposes of this study, a separate survey based on the CLS national model was used to act as a sample boost targeted towards operational areas of the selected community businesses. This survey was branded as the Neighbourhood Life Survey, and this survey contained all the same measures and used identical methods to CLS.

Within each operational area, we drew a systematic random sample of addresses from the Royal Mail Postcode Address File and sent letters inviting all adults aged 16 plus at each address to complete the questionnaire, either online or on paper. Up to three reminder letters were sent, with two paper questionnaires included for a targeted subset of addresses in the second reminder.

We constructed comparison samples for each operational area from within the 2018–19 national CLS.

The ‘hyperlocal’ design builds on a pilot study conducted in 2017 to test a new way of measuring the social impact of community businesses on their local community (Willis et al., 2017). In summary, the pilot study found that the CLS offered a cost-effective approach to creating a baseline measure of community cohesion and social action in the local areas served by community businesses.

The 2017 report outlined several methodological recommendations for use in future. As a result, the following adaptations were implemented for this study:

- Each operational area was defined with reference to Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census Output Area (OA) geography rather than postcodes. While postcodes are tailored it means no direct population statistics are available to use as a test of the weighting method’s ability to work as a calibration mechanism.

Comparison areas were set out in advance (i.e. the 10 per cent most similar). This allowed the comparison samples to be pre-identified from the 2018–19 national CLS (and assessed for sufficiency). It also ensured a clear definition for future research purposes.

Sampling

For the purposes of the survey, each organisation’s operational area was defined with reference to ONS OA geography and was formed of a contiguous combination of whole OAs (the smallest unit in the ONS hierarchy). Maps of these operational areas were produced by Power to Change in conjunction with Kantar, and agreed with the individual community businesses.

Within each operational area, Kantar drew a systematic random sample of addresses from the Royal Mail Postcode Address File, aiming for 300 completed questionnaires and maximal geographical dispersion. The number of addresses sampled in each operational area was calculated via a statistical model of response probability, using data from the 2018–19 CLS. Table 1.2 shows how many addresses were sampled in each area.

Table 3: Address samples in each operational area

Operational area	Total sample of addresses
All Saints Action Network	1400
Bramley Baths	1065
Burton Street Foundation	1353
Future Wolverton	918
Station House	1015
The Bevy	1249*

*A reserve of 291 addresses were issued in addition to the original 958 addresses issued.

At each address, all adults aged 16 plus were invited to complete the questionnaire, either online or on paper.

Fieldwork and response

Fieldwork took place between the 10 July and 31 October 2019.

The standard model for the CLS is to send two reminders, each a fortnight apart, but with a third reminder in reserve. In the second reminder, two paper questionnaires are included for a targeted subset of addresses.⁶

A third reminder was issued for Future Wolverton and The Bevy to help boost response further. A reserve of 291 addresses were also issued for The Bevy and the standard two reminder cycle applied.

All respondents who completed the survey received a £10 voucher to thank them for their contribution.

The individual response rate⁷ achieved in each operational area ranged from 14.3%, to 19.0% as shown in Table 4: Response by area. As a benchmark comparison, the average response rate in CLS 2018/29 was approximately 19.6%.

Table 4: Response by area

Operational area	Online completions (% of completions)	Paper completions (% of completions)	Total completions	Individual Response Rate
All Saints Action Network	215 (60%)	141 (40%)	356	14.5%
Bramley Baths	292 (83%)	61 (17%)	353	19.0%
Burton Street Foundation	302 (70%)	129 (30%)	431	18.2%
Future Wolverton*	230 (78%)	66 (22%)	296	18.4%
Station House	250 (76%)	77 (24%)	327	18.4%
The Bevy**	217 (70%)	95 (30%)	312	14.3%

* Third reminders sent to a random subset of addresses

** 291 reserve addresses issued

⁶ Respondents were not asked about community businesses as part of the Community Life Survey

⁷ As opposed to household-level response rate

Identification of comparison samples

The comparison sample for each operational area was a subset of the 2018-19 Community Life Survey respondents who lived in the 10% of English neighbourhoods that are most similar to the operational area.

Kantar used lower level Super Output Areas (LSOAs) as a proxy for neighbourhoods. There are 32,844 LSOAs in England and each contain an average of six OAs. They are smaller than the operational areas (which ranged in size from 8 to 28 OAs) and somewhat more homogeneous. However, the use of LSOAs as proxy neighbourhoods - rather than larger aggregations - ensures that the 10% most similar neighbourhoods to each operational area are genuinely similar in absolute and not just relative terms. A similarity score was computed for each LSOA in England with reference to each operational area.

The profile of each LSOA was represented by a set of six Census-derived 'principal component' scores, each reflecting a different aspect of that LSOA. One of these principal components is strongly correlated with the neighbourhood's index of multiple deprivation, one is correlated with the proportion of accommodation units that are flats, one with the presence of students, one with the share of the population aged 65+, and two are correlated with different aspects of the ethnic mix.⁸

These 'principal component' scores were also computed for each operational area as a population-weighted combination of the relevant LSOA scores. Kantar then calculated - for each LSOA in England - a Euclidean distance score⁹ relative to each operational area. The lower this score is, the more similar that LSOA is to the particular operational area.

From this, a rank order of similarity was constructed, and the 10% most similar LSOAs for each operational area were identified and acted as the comparison sample.

⁸ A statistical technique called PCA was used to form uncorrelated linear combinations ('principal components') of 42 LSOA-level Census proportions (e.g. % of 16-24s with degree-level qualifications). The first principal component accounts for as much variance as possible across the 42 input variables. Successive components explain the - progressively smaller - residual variance and are all (by design) uncorrelated with each other. These principal components were then 'rotated' using the varimax algorithm which seeks to minimise the number of input variables that have high correlations with each of the first f factors (f is user-specified but should explain a high percentage of the total variance; f = 6 in this case, explaining 77% of the total variance). The varimax rotation method simplifies interpretation compared to other rotation methods and compared to the initial (un-rotated) principal components.

⁹ Euclidean distance score = $\sqrt{[(PC1x-PC1t)^2 + (PC2x-PC2t)^2 + (PC3x-PC3t)^2 + (PC4x-PC4t)^2 + (PC5x-PC5t)^2 + (PC6x-PC6t)^2]}$

... where PC1x is the principal component score 1 for LSOA x and PC1t is the principal component score 1 for operational area t (etc.).

Limitations

As with any research, there are limitations.

To measure impact, we would need the community businesses to have a reasonable effect and for a relatively close match to be identified in the comparison sample derived from the national sample. This comparison sample should be large enough to ensure that unusual effects within the sample zone can be detected, but not so large that the comparison sample's similarity to the target sample zone is lost.

The analysis assumes that controlling for differences in key census statistics, and indices of deprivation, is enough to eradicate systematic differences between sampled operational areas on the one hand and comparison sample areas on the other. What is left is then assumed to be the impact of the community businesses. In isolation, the strength of evidence is weaker than might be obtained from a randomised controlled trial (RCT)¹⁰ or difference-in-difference analysis¹¹.

This report also contains difference-in-difference analysis for two areas which were previously surveyed in 2017. This analysis examines difference-in-difference between the 2017 results and their matched comparison samples (MCS) and the 2019 results and their matched comparison samples.

The Technical Appendix (published alongside this report) provides for further information.

¹⁰ The implementation of such a design was not possible in this case as the businesses were already in place at the time of interview.

¹¹ Difference-in-Difference analysis is a statistical technique that calculates the effect of a treatment on an outcome by comparing the average change over time in the outcome variable of a treatment group, compared to the average change over time for a control group.

1. Research findings: Baseline figures

1.1 Social isolation

The local environment can have a significant impact on whether a person feels socially isolated. Research by Public Health England (2015) has highlighted that local services and initiatives can impact social isolation by bringing individuals together, even if this is not their primary aim. Many community businesses act as a hub for local people to come together, helping to foster social connections. However, at application, only 8 per cent of Power to Change grantees stated that their primary impact focus is to 'reduce social isolation' (n=80, January 2015 – Oct 2019).

Over the longer-term, we might expect to see an increase in social support networks and a decrease in loneliness in areas with strong community businesses.

The Community Life Survey (CLS) includes measures that capture strength of social support networks, including:

- Having people to call on for help
- Having people to socialise with
- Having people available to listen
- How often people chat to their neighbours
- Loneliness.

Generally, there were few differences between the operational areas and their matched comparison samples on these measures (see Table 5: Social Isolation). Where differences were observed, they did not follow a clear pattern.

- Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents living in Bramley were more likely to definitely agree that 'If I needed help, there are people who would be there for me' (76% vs. 69% in the matched comparison sample).
- Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents of All Saints had fewer people in their social networks they could count on and were less likely to chat to neighbours. All Saints residents were less likely to say they had at least two people they could count on to listen to them (60% vs. 73% in the comparison sample) and more likely to say they had no one to listen to them (10% vs. 4%). All Saints residents were also more likely than the matched comparison sample to say that they never chatted with their neighbours (25% vs. 14%).
- Residents in Bevendean were also less likely than their comparison sample to chat to neighbours, being less likely to chat to them on a weekly or monthly basis and more likely to say they never chat to them (28% vs. 9% in the matched comparison sample):

Table 5: Social Isolation

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
If I needed help there would be people there for me (FrndSat1/ ZFrndSat1)	Definitely agree	62%	67%	76%	69%	74%	71%	69%	69%	74%	70%	73%	70%
	Tend to agree	30%	27%	21%	28%	21%	24%	26%	27%	22%	27%	20%	25%
	Tend to disagree	5%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	6%	4%
	Definitely disagree	3%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Agree	92%	94%	97%	97%	95%	96%	95%	96%	96%	96%	93%	96%
	Disagree	8%	6%	3%	3%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	7%	4%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	353	1195	350	749	429	873	294	927	326	696	308	819
Is there anyone who you can really count on to listen to you? (Counton1)	Yes, more than one person	60%	73%	73%	69%	77%	72%	74%	74%	70%	71%	68%	73%
	Yes, one person	30%	23%	23%	27%	18%	24%	21%	23%	25%	25%	27%	24%
	No one	10%	4%	3%	4%	5%	4%	5%	3%	6%	4%	5%	4%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	215	720	292	624	300	656	230	766	249	558	213	560
How often do you chat to any of your neighbours, more than to just say hello? (SchatN)	On most days	21%	16%	19%	19%	23%	18%	15%	17%	19%	19%	17%	16%
	Once or twice a week	28%	32%	34%	35%	31%	36%	32%	34%	41%	38%	25%	34%
	Once or twice a month	14%	21%	19%	22%	21%	19%	19%	23%	19%	21%	14%	24%
	Less than once a month	13%	17%	16%	15%	15%	17%	19%	17%	14%	15%	16%	18%
	Never	25%	14%	11%	8%	10%	11%	15%	9%	6%	7%	28%	9%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	720	352	624	430	656	295	766	326	558	310	560
How often do you feel lonely? (LonOfT)	Never	22%	21%	24%	24%	19%	23%	24%	24%	26%	24%	18%	22%
	Hardly ever	22%	29%	32%	32%	26%	31%	27%	33%	31%	33%	22%	30%
	Occasionally	23%	25%	21%	21%	25%	24%	26%	20%	21%	22%	30%	25%
	Some of the time	22%	17%	19%	18%	21%	16%	18%	17%	17%	16%	21%	17%
	Often/always	10%	8%	5%	5%	9%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	10%	7%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	344	1159	351	744	420	870	290	919	327	693	305	809

1.2 Health and wellbeing

1.2.1 Self-reported health

The CLS measure self-reported health by asking two questions:

- Self-reported rating of general health
- Whether have a limiting long-term illness.

In general, there were few differences between operational and match comparison samples on these measures (see Table 6: Self-reported health). However, where differences existed, operational areas were associated with higher levels of self-reported health compared to the matched comparison samples.

- Compared with the matched comparison samples, residents in Campsea Ashe were more likely to rate their health as ‘good’ (59% vs. 43% in the comparison sample) and less likely to rate their health as fair (17% vs. 24%) or bad (2% vs. 5%).
- Residents in Bramley were similarly more likely to rate their health as ‘good’ (55% vs. 43% in the comparison sample) and less likely to rate their health as ‘fair’ (15% vs. 26%).

Table 6: Self-reported health

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
How is your health in general? (Ghealth)	Very good	24%	19%	24%	25%	19%	26%	24%	27%	21%	26%	26%	23%
	Good	39%	46%	55%	43%	46%	44%	50%	42%	59%	43%	43%	46%
	Fair	27%	28%	15%	26%	24%	22%	22%	23%	17%	24%	24%	26%
	Bad	8%	5%	5%	5%	8%	6%	3%	6%	2%	5%	6%	4%
	or very bad?	2%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	-	-	-	-	2%	-
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	215	727	292	626	302	660	230	771	250	559	216	564

1.2.2 Personal wellbeing

Subjective wellbeing is based on the four harmonised measures developed by the Office for National Statistics:¹²

- Rating of life satisfaction: scale 0 (not at all satisfied) to 10 (completely satisfied)
- Rating of happiness yesterday: scale 0 (not at all happy) to 10 (completely happy)
- Rating of anxious yesterday: scale 0 (not at all anxious) to 10 (completely anxious)
- Rating of anxious yesterday: scale 0 (not at all anxious) to 10 (completely anxious)

These questions allow people to assess their life overall, as well as providing an indication of their day-to-day feelings. The 2017-18 national CLS highlighted that national levels of personal wellbeing have remained consistent over the previous year (average ratings of 7.1 out of 10 for life satisfaction, 7.1 out of 10 for happiness yesterday, 3.4 out of 10 for anxiety yesterday and 7.3 out of 10 for feeling that what you do in life is worthwhile) (DCMS, 2018).

Where differences existed, operational areas were generally associated with lower levels of personal wellbeing compared with their matched comparison sample (see Table 7: Personal Wellbeing). In particular, Hillsborough residents reported lower levels of personal wellbeing across most domains.

- Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents of Hillsborough were less likely to give a rating of ‘very high’ for their life satisfaction (15% vs. 23%), happiness yesterday (21% vs. 32%), and feeling that life was worthwhile (21% vs. 30%). Conversely, they were more likely to give a ‘medium’ score on each of these measures.
- Residents of Hillsborough were also more anxious than residents in the matched comparison sample, being less likely to give a rating of ‘very low’ for anxiety yesterday (23% vs. 33%) and more likely to give a ‘medium’ rating (24% vs. 17%).

Other operational area differences are noted below. In general, where differences are noted (and with the exception of Campsea), these match the same trend for Hillsborough, with operational areas displaying lower wellbeing scores on average compared with the matched comparison samples.

- Residents of All Saints were less likely to give a ‘high’ rating for anxiety yesterday (24% vs. 30% in the matched comparison sample).

¹²For more information on Office of National Statistics well-being measures see: Government Statistic Service. Available at: <https://gss.civilservice.gov.uk/guidances/harmonisation/0-harmonised-principles/personal-well-being/#questions-input>

- Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents of Bevendean were more likely to give a ‘high’ rating for their anxiety yesterday (33% vs. 26%) and less likely to give a ‘very high’ rating for feeling that their life was worthwhile living (20% vs. 27%).
- Residents of Campsea Ashe were less likely to give a ‘low’ rating for feeling that their life was worthwhile compared to the matched comparison sample (4% vs. 10%).

Table 7: Personal Wellbeing

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
How satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays (ZWellB1)	Low	14%	14%	11%	11%	15%	13%	11%	10%	7%	11%	13%	12%
	Medium	26%	26%	17%	18%	26%	18%	21%	19%	19%	17%	30%	25%
	High	40%	41%	51%	47%	45%	46%	46%	49%	47%	48%	41%	42%
	Very high	20%	20%	21%	24%	15%	23%	21%	22%	27%	24%	17%	21%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	341	1151	349	741	417	857	287	914	326	687	304	799
How happy did you feel yesterday (ZWellB2)	Low	14%	14%	11%	11%	15%	13%	11%	10%	7%	11%	13%	12%
	Medium	21%	20%	18%	18%	25%	18%	20%	19%	18%	18%	28%	22%
	High	33%	38%	39%	40%	38%	37%	37%	41%	39%	37%	35%	37%
	Very high	28%	27%	31%	30%	21%	32%	29%	27%	34%	32%	21%	26%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	343	1150	347	741	421	863	287	914	324	687	307	799
How anxious did you feel yesterday (ZWellB3)	Very low	33%	29%	34%	32%	23%	33%	30%	32%	33%	31%	25%	30%
	Low	22%	22%	23%	27%	21%	23%	20%	22%	27%	26%	22%	23%
	Medium	21%	18%	21%	16%	24%	17%	20%	19%	18%	16%	20%	20%
	High	24%	30%	22%	25%	31%	26%	29%	28%	23%	26%	33%	26%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	340	1144	346	737	419	859	287	910	326	683	305	801
To what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile (ZWellB4)	Low	13%	13%	9%	10%	14%	11%	11%	8%	4%	10%	14%	11%
	Medium	24%	22%	20%	18%	26%	18%	19%	19%	16%	17%	26%	21%
	High	40%	39%	45%	43%	39%	41%	43%	45%	48%	42%	40%	41%
	Very high	24%	26%	27%	29%	21%	30%	27%	28%	32%	31%	20%	27%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	341	1147	347	737	419	855	288	913	325	684	304	800

1.3 Employability

Power to Change aims to boost opportunities for employment, either directly or indirectly, by accelerating the growth of community businesses. Some community businesses offer opportunities to work for the business directly, while others offer practical help by building transferable skills which young people can take into education, training and employment. Volunteering as part of a community business can also help build transferable skills and improve employability.

A number of areas showed differences in economic status compared with their matched comparison sample. In general, compared with the matched comparison samples, residents were less likely to be in employment and more likely to be economically inactive (See Table 8: Whether in employment).

- In Bevendean, residents were less likely to be in employment (52% vs. 65% in the matched comparison sample) and more likely to be economically inactive (44% vs. 34%).
- Residents in Bramley were less likely to be economically inactive compared to the matched comparison sample (22% vs. 38%) and were more likely to be in employment (75% vs 61%).
- Wolverton were also less likely to be economically inactive compared to the matched comparison sample (27% vs. 36%).

Table 8: Whether in employment

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Respondent economic status 3 categories (DVILO3a)	In Employment	58%	62%	75%	61%	65%	65%	67%	63%	58%	63%	52%	65%
	Unemployed	5%	3%	3%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	4%	-
	Economically Inactive	37%	35%	22%	38%	33%	34%	27%	36%	40%	37%	44%	34%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	215	728	292	626	302	660	230	773	250	560	217	564

1.4 Local environment

1.4.1 Satisfaction with local area

The CLS captures several measures relating to satisfaction with the local area, including:

- Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live
- Whether the area has got better or worse to live in over the last two years

Generally, there was little variation between the operational areas and their matched comparison samples on the first measure. Where there were differences, these were mixed, with some operational areas more satisfied, and other areas more dissatisfied than their matched comparison samples (see Table 9: Satisfaction with the local area).

- In All Saints, residents were less likely to feel satisfied with their local area as a place to live (50% vs. 58% of residents in the matched comparison sample) and more likely to feel dissatisfied (25% vs. 17%).
- In Campsea Ashe, residents were more likely to be satisfied with their local area as a place to live, (86% vs. 78% in the matched comparison sample).

The findings for perceptions of whether or not their local area has got better or worse over the past two years are more difficult to interpret as, in all operational areas except All Saints, there were higher proportions of people who said that they had lived in the area for less than two years. The differences that existed were as follows:

- Residents of Hillsborough were less likely to state that their area has got worse to live in over the last 2 years (16% vs. 24% in the comparison sample).
- Residents in Wolverton were more likely to think the area had got better to live in (18% vs. 11%) and were less likely to state that not much had changed in the area (49% vs. 60%).
- In Bevendean, residents were less likely to state that the area had got worse to live in (21% vs. 28% in the comparison sample) or that the area had not changed much (48% vs. 55%).

Table 9: Satisfaction with the local area

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Satisfaction with local area as a place to live (Slocsat/ Zslocsat)	Very satisfied	11%	16%	14%	34%	29%	24%	16%	27%	45%	33%	20%	16%
	Fairly satisfied	39%	42%	59%	45%	51%	50%	59%	52%	41%	46%	42%	47%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	25%	26%	19%	14%	13%	17%	16%	15%	9%	14%	23%	23%
	Fairly dissatisfied	17%	12%	7%	5%	5%	7%	6%	5%	5%	5%	11%	11%
	Very dissatisfied	8%	5%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	4%	3%
	Very/fairly satisfied	50%	58%	73%	79%	80%	74%	75%	79%	86%	78%	62%	63%
	Fairly/very dissatisfied	25%	17%	8%	7%	8%	9%	9%	6%	5%	7%	15%	14%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	354	1181	353	744	431	868	296	921	325	692	311	814
Do you think that over the past two years your area has...? (BetWors)	Got better to live in	9%	12%	9%	10%	12%	11%	18%	11%	14%	9%	14%	10%
	Got worse to live in	32%	32%	19%	23%	16%	24%	20%	23%	18%	22%	21%	28%
	Not changed much (hasn't got better or worse)	46%	49%	63%	63%	62%	58%	49%	60%	58%	63%	48%	55%
	Have not lived here long enough to say	13%	7%	9%	4%	11%	6%	12%	6%	10%	6%	17%	7%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	354	1198	352	747	429	869	296	926	327	694	311	820

1.4.2 Access to services

The area people live in and the availability of local services such as shops, schools, community centres and pubs and amenities can influence life satisfaction and wellbeing. A lack of access to basic services can lead to poorer quality of life and social isolation, especially for older people and those dependent on public transport to access services. At application, 21 per cent of Power to Change grantees stated that their primary impact focus is to provide 'better access to service' (n=205, January 2015 – Oct 2019).

A common ambition of community businesses is the delivery of positive social, economic and environmental benefits for the whole community, and helping to regenerate communities and, in many cases, provide vital services and amenities required locally.

The CLS measures levels of satisfaction with local services and amenities.

In general, residents in Bramley, Hillsborough, and Campsea Ashe were more likely to state that they were satisfied with the amenities and services in their area, compared with their matched comparison samples (See Table 10: Access to services).

- Compared with the matched comparison sample, Bramley residents were more likely to say they were satisfied with the local services and amenities (80% vs. 73%), and less likely to say they were dissatisfied (6% vs. 12% respectively).
- In Hillsborough, residents were more also likely to feel satisfied with the local services and amenities (87% vs. 74% in the matched comparison sample). A similar pattern was noted in Campsea Ashe (78% were satisfied vs. 70% in the matched comparison sample).

Table 10: Access to services

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Generally how satisfied are you with the local services and amenities (SatAsset/ ZSarAsset)	Very satisfied	20%	20%	27%	25%	44%	23%	26%	26%	22%	22%	27%	20%
	Fairly satisfied	45%	47%	53%	48%	43%	51%	50%	51%	56%	48%	43%	47%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	21%	23%	15%	16%	8%	18%	19%	15%	13%	19%	18%	21%
	Fairly dissatisfied	9%	7%	5%	9%	3%	6%	-	-	7%	8%	8%	8%
	Very dissatisfied	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	3%	4%	3%
	Satisfied	66%	67%	80%	73%	87%	74%	77%	77%	78%	70%	71%	67%
	Dissatisfied	13%	10%	6%	12%	5%	8%	5%	8%	9%	11%	12%	11%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	353	1196	351	747	429	872	295	926	327	696	311	820

1.5 Community Cohesion

The Power to Change Annual Grantee Survey (2019) reported that 90 per cent of the community businesses it had funded by 2018 considered that they had an impact on community cohesion. Many community businesses strive to provide a space in which local people come together, regardless of religious, ethnic and social backgrounds. Community businesses aim to promote community integration and a sense of shared identity and purpose.

The CLS carries a broad range of community cohesion measures, including:

- Extent to which people feel that people from different backgrounds get on well in their local area
- Strength of feelings of belonging in their neighbourhood
- Levels of trust in their neighbourhood
- Diversity of friendship groups
- Level of neighbourliness

In the CLS, 'local area' is defined as a '15-20-minute walking distance from your home', while 'neighbourhood' is defined as 'within a few minutes walking distance from your home'.

1.5.1 Perceptions of community cohesion

The key community cohesion measure in the CLS captures the extent to which people agree or disagree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together.

On the whole, there were few differences on this measure between operational areas and matched comparison samples, though Bevendean and Campsea Ashe residents were somewhat more positive and Bramley residents somewhat less positive on this measure (see Table 11: Perceptions of community cohesion):

- Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents in Bramley were less likely to agree (73% vs. 83%) and more likely to disagree (27% vs. 17%) that the local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together.
- On the other hand, compared with the matched comparison sample, residents in Bevendean were more likely to agree (81% vs. 71%) and less likely to disagree (19% vs. 29%) that the local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together
- Compared to the matched comparison sample, residents in Campsea Ashe were more likely to 'definitely agree' with this statement (22% vs. 16%).

Table 11: Perceptions of community cohesion

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together? (STogeth/ ZStogeth)	Definitely agree	13%	13%	9%	15%	12%	12%	16%	14%	22%	16%	18%	9%
	Tend to agree	56%	62%	64%	68%	68%	68%	69%	68%	59%	68%	63%	62%
	Tend to disagree	24%	20%	23%	15%	16%	18%	13%	16%	17%	14%	15%	24%
	Definitely disagree	7%	5%	4%	-	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	4%	4%
	Agree	70%	75%	73%	83%	80%	79%	85%	82%	81%	84%	81%	71%
	Disagree	30%	25%	27%	17%	20%	21%	15%	18%	19%	16%	19%	29%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	350	1166	342	728	421	848	292	904	322	674	305	806

1.5.2 Feeling of belonging to local area

There was little variation between the operational areas and their matched comparison samples overall. However, some variation was observed in Bramley and Bevendean, which indicated that residents in these areas had a weaker sense of belonging to their immediate neighbourhood (See Table 12: Feelings of belonging to the area).

- Residents in Bramley were less likely than their matched comparison sample to feel a sense of very or fairly strong belonging to their immediate neighbourhood (55% vs. 66%), and more likely to feel a ‘not very strong’ sense of belonging (34% vs. 26%). The pattern of findings was very similar in Bevendean.

Residents in Bramley and Hillsborough also felt a weaker sense of belonging to Great Britain more generally.

- Bramley residents and Hillsborough residents were less likely than their matched comparison samples to feel a strong sense of belonging to Great Britain (74% vs. 85% and 74% vs. 88% respectively).

Table 12: Feelings of belonging to the area

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
How strongly do you feel you belong to: Your immediate neighbourhood (SBeNeigh/ ZSBeNeigh)	Very strongly	17%	14%	16%	17%	16%	16%	18%	18%	19%	19%	13%	14%
	Fairly strongly	41%	38%	39%	48%	44%	47%	37%	45%	51%	48%	31%	42%
	Not very strongly	29%	34%	34%	26%	30%	27%	35%	29%	22%	25%	38%	33%
	Not at all strongly	14%	14%	11%	8%	9%	10%	10%	7%	9%	8%	18%	11%
	Very / fairly strongly	57%	52%	55%	66%	61%	63%	56%	64%	69%	67%	44%	56%
	Not very strongly	29%	34%	34%	26%	30%	27%	35%	29%	22%	25%	38%	33%
	Not at all strongly	14%	14%	11%	8%	9%	10%	10%	7%	9%	8%	18%	11%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	350	1196	342	748	421	874	292	927	322	697	305	822
How strongly do you feel you belong to Great Britain? (SBeGB2/ ZSBeGB2)	Very strongly	41%	41%	41%	48%	42%	47%	39%	48%	47%	46%	39%	46%
	Fairly strongly	38%	38%	33%	37%	33%	41%	42%	37%	38%	40%	40%	37%
	Not very strongly	15%	15%	21%	12%	18%	10%	14%	13%	13%	12%	16%	14%
	Not at all strongly	7%	5%	5%	-	8%	2%	5%	3%	3%	-	6%	3%
	Strongly	79%	80%	74%	85%	74%	88%	81%	85%	85%	86%	78%	83%
	Not strongly	21%	20%	26%	15%	26%	12%	19%	15%	15%	14%	22%	17%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	215	725	288	626	301	660	229	773	250	559	217	562

1.5.3 Levels of trust

There was some variation in level of trust between operational areas and their matched comparison samples (see Table 13: Levels of trust).

- Residents in most areas were less trusting compared with their matched comparison samples. In the following areas, residents were less likely than their matched comparison samples to feel that ‘many people’ in their neighbourhood can be trusted: All Saints (10% vs. 19%); Bramley (35% vs. 46%); Wolverton (27% vs. 41%); and Bevendean (15% vs. 24%).
- On the other hand, residents in Campsea Ashe were more likely to have a ‘very high’ rating of trust in people in general (12% vs. 8% in the matched comparison sample).

Table 13: Levels of trust

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Trust in people living in neighbourhood (Strust)	Many of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted,	10%	19%	35%	46%	31%	32%	27%	41%	52%	48%	15%	24%
	Some of the people can be trusted,	38%	36%	38%	32%	43%	39%	44%	37%	34%	32%	37%	36%
	A few of the people can be trusted,	44%	38%	24%	19%	21%	25%	24%	19%	13%	18%	38%	36%
	None of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted?	8%	6%	2%	3%	5%	4%	4%	3%	-	-	10%	4%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	355	1190	350	744	425	865	295	921	326	693	307	821
Trust in people in general (ZStrustgen2)	Low	32%	29%	17%	17%	19%	19%	24%	18%	11%	16%	27%	25%
	Medium	40%	41%	34%	33%	43%	37%	34%	34%	30%	31%	41%	40%
	High	24%	27%	41%	42%	32%	38%	36%	43%	47%	46%	29%	31%
	Very high	3%	3%	7%	8%	6%	6%	6%	6%	12%	8%	3%	4%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1193	348	746	428	873	292	927	326	693	309	830

1.5.4 Diversity of friendship groups

Diversity of friendship groups can also have an impact on community cohesion. The CLS covers a range of measures on friendship diversity, including the proportion of friends that are the same:

- Ethnic group
- Faith group
- Age group
- Educational level.

On the whole, where differences were observed, residents had more ethnically, and religiously diverse friendship groups compared with their matched comparison samples (see Table 12: Feelings of belonging to the area).

- Compared with their matched comparison samples, residents of Bramley (39% vs. 50%), Hillsborough (36% vs. 44%), Wolverton (20% vs. 41%) and Bevendean (25 % vs. 43%) were less likely to state that their friends were all from the same ethnic group as themselves.
- Compared with their matched comparison samples, residents in Bramley (25% vs. 33%), Wolverton (12% vs. 31%) and Bevendean (19% vs. 32%) were also less likely to state that their friends were all from the same religious group as themselves. A similar trend towards more religious diversity was also noted in All Saints, where residents were more likely to say that ‘less than half’ of their friends were from the same religious group (33% vs. 23%).

In terms of diversity of friendships by age, there were no differences between the operational areas and their matched comparison samples.

In terms of diversity of friendships by education, Campsea Ashe and All Saints residents held more diverse friendship groups compared with their comparison samples.

- In Campsea Ashe, residents were more likely to report that their friendship groups were not all of the same education level (87% compared to 80% in the matched comparison sample).
- In All Saints, residents were more likely than the matched comparison sample to say that less than half of their friendship group were the same education level as them (24% vs. 15%) and less likely to say more than half of their friendship group were the same education level as them (31% vs 41%).

Table 14: Diversity of friendship group

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Proportion of friends the same: Ethnic group as you (Srace/ZSRace)	All the same,	24%	24%	39%	50%	36%	44%	20%	41%	46%	52%	25%	43%
	More than a half,	30%	44%	51%	41%	51%	44%	58%	46%	44%	40%	45%	39%
	About a half,	27%	16%	5%	4%	8%	6%	15%	6%	4%	4%	16%	9%
	Less than a half?	18%	15%	5%	5%	5%	6%	7%	7%	5%	4%	14%	8%
	All the same	24%	24%	39%	50%	36%	44%	20%	41%	46%	52%	25%	43%
	Not all the same	76%	76%	61%	50%	64%	56%	80%	59%	53%	48%	75%	56%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	212	724	288	621	302	653	229	767	248	557	213	560
Proportion of friends the same: Religious group as you (Sfaith/Zsfaith)	All the same,	19%	25%	25%	33%	29%	32%	12%	31%	25%	32%	19%	32%
	More than a half,	23%	33%	42%	37%	43%	37%	45%	38%	43%	38%	41%	36%
	About a half,	24%	16%	11%	16%	13%	15%	18%	15%	14%	13%	14%	14%
	Less than a half?	33%	23%	17%	11%	12%	13%	23%	14%	14%	13%	22%	16%
	Not part of any faith group	-	-	5%	3%	3%	4%	2%	-	3%	4%	4%	3%
	All the same	19%	25%	25%	33%	29%	32%	12%	31%	25%	32%	19%	32%
	Not all the same	79%	72%	70%	64%	68%	65%	86%	67%	72%	64%	77%	66%
Unweighted base (all respondents)	212	705	280	600	293	625	228	740	240	534	206	546	
What proportion of your friends have a similar level of education (Seduc/Zseduc)	All the same	18%	19%	19%	20%	17%	19%	17%	20%	13%	20%	23%	22%
	More than a half	31%	41%	43%	45%	41%	44%	42%	44%	49%	49%	41%	43%
	About a half	26%	26%	28%	23%	25%	23%	23%	23%	27%	23%	24%	24%
	Or less than a half	24%	15%	10%	12%	17%	14%	17%	13%	10%	8%	13%	11%
	All the same	18%	19%	19%	20%	17%	19%	17%	20%	13%	20%	23%	22%
	Not all the same	82%	81%	81%	80%	83%	81%	83%	80%	87%	80%	77%	78%
Unweighted base (all respondents)	210	709	287	613	298	645	226	759	249	547	207	555	

1.5.5 Neighbourliness

Neighbourliness is measured in the CLS by the extent to which people agree or disagree that they 'often borrow and exchange favours with neighbours', and how comfortable people would feel asking their neighbour to keep a set of their home keys for emergencies and asking a neighbour to collect a few shopping essentials if they were ill and at home on their own.

Looking across these measures, Bevendean stood out as having lower levels of neighbourliness compared with its matched comparison sample.

- Compared with its matched comparison sample, Bevendean residents were less likely to agree that they borrow things and exchange favours with neighbours (24% vs. 33%), and were also less likely to feel comfortable asking their neighbours to keep a set of keys for them (42% vs. 53%) or to help them out if they were ill (33% vs. 47%).

When compared to their matched comparison samples, Wolverton and All Saints residents had lower levels of neighbourliness, while Campsea residents had higher levels of neighbourliness, although these patterns were only observed a more limited set of measures.

- Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents in Wolverton felt less comfortable asking neighbours to keep a set of keys for them (51% vs. 64%).
- Compared with the matched comparison sample, residents in All Saints felt less comfortable asking neighbours to help them with shopping if they were ill (36% vs. 46%). They were also less comfortable neighbours to keep a set of keys for them (38% vs 49%).
- On the other hand, Campsea residents were more to agree that they exchange favours with neighbours (47% vs. 39% in the matched comparison sample).

Table 15: Neighbourliness

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Whether agree or disagree that I borrow things and exchange favours with my neighbours (sFavN/ZsFavN)	Definitely agree	7%	9%	10%	10%	7%	6%	10%	10%	12%	11%	6%	9%
	Tend to agree	21%	21%	26%	28%	26%	25%	19%	26%	34%	27%	18%	24%
	Tend to disagree	23%	23%	26%	29%	26%	28%	30%	27%	23%	29%	20%	24%
	Definitely disagree	49%	47%	38%	33%	41%	41%	41%	36%	30%	33%	56%	43%
	Agree	28%	31%	35%	38%	33%	31%	29%	36%	47%	39%	24%	33%
	Disagree	72%	69%	65%	62%	67%	69%	71%	64%	53%	61%	76%	67%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	353	1196	351	749	428	871	294	928	326	696	307	818
How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to keep a set of keys to your home for emergencies (NComfort1/ZNComfort1)	Very comfortable	14%	23%	33%	38%	25%	30%	23%	34%	44%	39%	22%	24%
	Fairly comfortable	24%	26%	31%	30%	31%	28%	28%	30%	30%	30%	21%	29%
	Fairly uncomfortable	20%	21%	17%	16%	21%	21%	22%	18%	12%	16%	21%	19%
	Very uncomfortable	42%	30%	19%	16%	24%	21%	27%	18%	14%	15%	37%	28%
	Comfortable	38%	49%	64%	68%	56%	58%	51%	64%	74%	69%	42%	53%
	Uncomfortable	62%	51%	36%	32%	44%	42%	49%	36%	26%	31%	58%	47%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	354	1195	348	749	427	873	294	925	325	697	306	819
How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to collect a few shopping essentials if you were ill and at home on your own (NComfort3/ZNComfort3)	Very comfortable	15%	20%	19%	26%	18%	19%	13%	24%	34%	25%	15%	19%
	Fairly comfortable	21%	26%	27%	28%	29%	28%	31%	26%	29%	32%	19%	28%
	Fairly uncomfortable	24%	23%	29%	25%	23%	27%	30%	27%	21%	26%	22%	25%
	Very uncomfortable	40%	31%	25%	20%	30%	26%	27%	23%	16%	17%	44%	28%
	Comfortable	36%	46%	45%	55%	47%	47%	44%	50%	63%	57%	33%	47%
	Uncomfortable	64%	54%	55%	45%	53%	53%	56%	50%	37%	43%	67%	53%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	355	1193	349	749	429	874	295	927	326	695	307	817

1.6 Community Pride and empowerment

Research suggests that empowerment can help people exert some control in their local area, which in turn can improve local wellbeing (Hothy et al., 2007). The CLS captures a number of measures relating to community pride and empowerment, including;

- Whether local people pull together to improve the neighbourhood
- Influence on decisions affecting the area
- Importance of being able to influence decisions in the local area
- Whether involvement in the local community leads to changes in decision-making
- Whether local people would like to be more involved in the council decisions in the local area

On the whole, where differences were observed, residents in operational areas were more likely than their matched comparison samples to feel a sense of community empowerment, and this was especially the case in Campsea Ashe.

- Compared with the matched comparisons sample, residents in Campsea Ashe were more likely to agree that people in their neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood (73% vs. 63% in the matched comparison sample). They were also more likely to agree that they personally can influence decisions in their local area (32% vs. 21%) and that when people get involved in their local community they can have an influence (59% vs. 49%).
- Wolverton residents were also more likely to agree that when people get involved in their local community they can have an influence (60% vs. 51% in the matched comparisons sample) and to feel that they personally can influence local decision-making (33% vs. 23%). On this latter measure, a greater sense of personal empowerment was also observed in All Saints and Hillsborough.
- Compared to their matched comparison sample, residents in Hillsborough were less likely to say that it was very/quite important to personally feel like they can influence decisions in their local area (48% vs 57%) and more likely to say that it was not very/not at all important (52% vs 43%).
- A similar trend was also observed in Bevendean, where residents were also less likely to say that it was very/quite important to personally feel that they can influence decisions in their local area compared to their matched comparison sample (43% vs 51%), and more likely to say it was not very/not at all important (57% vs 49%).

There were no differences between the operational areas and matched comparison samples in relation to whether people would like to be more involved in council decision-making in their local area.

Table 16: Community pride and empowerment

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Whether agree or disagree that: People in this neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood (Spull/ZSpull)	Definitely agree	12%	8%	9%	12%	8%	9%	12%	11%	23%	14%	7%	8%
	Tend to agree	32%	36%	43%	47%	45%	42%	44%	45%	50%	49%	35%	39%
	Tend to disagree	31%	34%	35%	33%	32%	38%	31%	34%	21%	31%	38%	38%
	Definitely disagree	25%	21%	13%	7%	15%	11%	12%	10%	7%	7%	20%	15%
	Nothing needs improving	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Agree	44%	45%	52%	59%	53%	51%	56%	56%	73%	63%	42%	47%
	Disagree	56%	55%	48%	41%	47%	49%	44%	44%	27%	37%	58%	53%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	355	1185	345	739	420	862	295	918	320	684	303	814
Agreement that: You can influence decisions affecting your local area (PAffLoc/Z PAffLoc)	Definitely agree	5%	4%	-	-	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%	2%	-	-
	Tend to agree	25%	19%	19%	22%	25%	19%	29%	21%	29%	19%	23%	19%
	Tend to disagree	39%	43%	54%	48%	46%	50%	47%	51%	49%	49%	40%	46%
	Definitely disagree	30%	34%	25%	28%	28%	29%	21%	26%	19%	30%	35%	33%
	Definitely / tend to agree	30%	23%	21%	24%	27%	21%	33%	23%	32%	21%	25%	21%
	Tend to / definitely disagree	70%	77%	79%	76%	73%	79%	67%	77%	68%	79%	75%	79%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	345	1178	346	741	422	854	291	916	327	686	306	810

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
How important is it for you personally to feel that you can influence decisions in your local area? (Pinfl/ ZPinfl)	Very important,	12%	13%	7%	11%	10%	13%	15%	12%	18%	14%	12%	11%
	Quite important,	38%	36%	45%	46%	37%	44%	37%	45%	45%	44%	31%	40%
	Not very important,	40%	34%	38%	34%	38%	32%	36%	34%	30%	33%	41%	34%
	Not at all important?	10%	17%	10%	10%	14%	11%	11%	9%	7%	9%	16%	15%
	Very/quite important	50%	50%	52%	57%	48%	57%	53%	57%	63%	59%	43%	51%
	Not very/not at all important	50%	50%	48%	43%	52%	43%	47%	43%	37%	41%	57%	49%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	346	1184	347	745	428	624	293	864	324	920	306	694
Do you agree or disagree: when people get involved in their local area they can change the way the area is run (LocAtt/ ZLocAtt)	Definitely agree	17%	15%	10%	13%	10%	11%	20%	13%	18%	12%	12%	13%
	Tend to agree	33%	30%	42%	37%	35%	38%	40%	39%	41%	37%	35%	34%
	Neither agree nor disagree	33%	38%	35%	37%	42%	37%	31%	36%	30%	38%	36%	37%
	Tend to disagree	9%	10%	10%	11%	9%	11%	6%	8%	10%	11%	11%	9%
	Definitely disagree	7%	6%	3%	2%	5%	4%	3%	4%	-	-	7%	7%
	Agree	50%	46%	52%	50%	44%	49%	60%	51%	59%	49%	47%	47%
	Disagree	16%	16%	13%	13%	14%	14%	9%	12%	11%	13%	18%	16%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	354	1190	346	745	423	869	293	921	327	693	308	814

1.7. Social Action

In the CLS, social action is defined as a community project, event or activity which local people proactively get together to initiate or support on an unpaid basis. It is distinct from other forms of giving time in that it is driven and led by local people rather than through an existing group (as in formal volunteering) and tends to focus on a community need rather than the needs of an individual (as in informal volunteering). Examples can include:

- Setting up a new service/amenity
- Stopping the closure of a service/amenity
- Stopping something happening in the local area
- Running a local service on a voluntary basis
- Helping to organise a street party or community even.

Social action is measure in two ways:

- Involvement in local activates
- Awareness of others being involved in local activities.

When compared with their matched comparison samples, residents in Bramley and Hillsborough were less likely to have been personally involved in helping out with a local issue/activity (8% vs. 13% and 7% vs. 13%, respectively), while residents in Campsea Ashe were more likely to have been involved (25% vs. 16%).

In All Saints, Bramley and Hillsborough, residents were less likely to report being aware of people in the local area getting involved in local issues/activities (11% vs. 21%, 28% vs.38%,17% vs. 30%, respectively). On the other hand, residents of Campsea Ashe were more likely to report being aware of people in the local area getting involved in local issues/activities (52% vs. 34% in the matched comparison sample).

Table 17: Social Action

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Whether been personally involved in helping out with local issue/activity (ZLocInv1)	No	88%	90%	92%	87%	93%	87%	86%	87%	75%	84%	85%	90%
	Yes	12%	10%	8%	13%	7%	13%	14%	13%	25%	16%	15%	10%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	349	1184	348	739	426	865	292	916	326	688	307	809
Whether aware of local people getting involved in a local issue/activity (ZLocPeop1)	No	89%	79%	72%	62%	83%	70%	60%	68%	48%	66%	73%	76%
	Yes	11%	21%	28%	38%	17%	30%	40%	32%	52%	34%	27%	24%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	212	728	292	626	299	654	228	761	248	558	214	557

1.7.1 Civic Engagement

The CLS includes three key measures that aim to measure involvement in civic engagement in the last 12 months.

- **Civic participation:** engagement in democratic processes, both in person and online, including signing a petition or attending a public meeting or rally (does not include voting)
- **Civic consultation:** taking part in consultations about local services both in person and online
- **Civic activism:** involvement in decision-making about local services or in the provision of these services (for example, being a school governor or a magistrate), both in person and online.

Residents in the operational areas of Wolverton, Campsea Ashe and Bevendean were more likely to be involved in civic engagement across a range of measures.

- Compared with their comparison samples, residents in Wolverton, Campsea Ashe and Bevendean were more likely to report civic participation in the last 12 months (45% vs. 35%, 53% vs. 34% and 44% vs. 30%, respectively).
- Residents of Wolverton, Campsea Ashe and Bevendean were also more likely than their matched comparison samples to report participation in a civic consultation in the past 12 months (27% vs. 18%, 39% vs. 16% and 19% vs. 13%, respectively).

- Residents of Wolverton and Campsea Ashe were also more likely than their matched comparison samples to have reported civic activism in the past 12 months (9% vs. 4% and 11% vs. 7%, respectively).

Table 18: Civic Engagement

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Civic participation in last 12 months (Zcivpar1)	No	76%	73%	60%	66%	60%	64%	55%	65%	47%	66%	56%	70%
	Yes	24%	27%	40%	34%	40%	36%	45%	35%	53%	34%	44%	30%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822
Any Civic consultation in past 12 months (Zpconsul1)	No	90%	87%	84%	84%	82%	83%	73%	82%	61%	84%	81%	87%
	Yes	10%	13%	16%	16%	18%	17%	27%	18%	39%	16%	19%	13%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	607	312	822
Any civic activism activities in past 12 months (ZCivact2)	No	97%	96%	93%	93%	94%	94%	91%	96%	89%	93%	94%	96%
	Yes	3%	4%	7%	7%	6%	6%	9%	4%	11%	7%	6%	4%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822
Any civic activism in the past 12 months (ZCivren)	No	97%	95%	92%	92%	94%	93%	90%	94%	87%	91%	93%	95%
	Yes	3%	5%	8%	8%	6%	7%	10%	6%	13%	9%	7%	5%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822

1.8 Volunteering

The CLS measures both formal and informal volunteering:

- Formal volunteering is defined as unpaid help given as part of a group, club or organisation to benefit others or the environment. Two measures are used: (i) formal volunteering at least one a month; (ii) formal volunteering at least once in the last 12 months.
- Informal volunteering is defined as giving unpaid help as an individual to someone who is not a relative. Two measures are used: (i) informal volunteering at least once a month; (ii) informal volunteering at least once in the last 12 months.

In all six operational areas, informal volunteering was more prevalent than formal volunteering, which follows the national trend (DCMS,2019).

With the exception of Campsea Ashe, there was little variation compared to the matched comparison sample (see Table 19: Volunteering).

- In Campsea Ashe, residents were more likely than their matched comparison sample to take part in formal volunteering at least once a month (34% vs. 23%), at least once in the last 12 months (48% vs. 39%) and to take part in informal volunteering at least once a last month (32% vs. 24%). Similar differences were observed when these measures were combined: Campsea residents were more likely to take part in either form of volunteering at least once a month (48% vs. 38%) and at least once in the last 12 months (73% vs. 66%).
- Compared to the comparison group, Hillsborough residents were less likely to have taken part in formal volunteering at least once a month (16% vs. 21% in the comparison group).
- In Bramley, residents were less likely to have taken part in informal volunteering at least once a month (32% vs. 40% in the matched comparison sample).

Table 19: Volunteering

		All Saints		Bramley		Hillsborough		Wolverton		Campsea Ashe		Bevendean	
		CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS	CB	MCS
Formal volunteering at least once a month (Zformon)	No	89%	84%	82%	77%	84%	79%	77%	80%	66%	77%	84%	83%
	Yes	11%	16%	18%	23%	16%	21%	23%	20%	34%	23%	16%	17%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822
Formal volunteering in last 12 months (Zforvol)	No	80%	74%	67%	62%	71%	65%	63%	66%	52%	61%	75%	71%
	Yes	20%	26%	33%	38%	29%	35%	37%	34%	48%	39%	25%	29%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822
Informal help at least once a month (ZIHlpmon)	No	74%	75%	77%	74%	71%	71%	77%	75%	68%	76%	72%	74%
	Yes	26%	25%	23%	26%	29%	29%	23%	25%	32%	24%	28%	26%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822
Formal or informal volunteering at least once a month (Zinform)	No	71%	67%	68%	60%	64%	60%	62%	63%	52%	62%	65%	66%
	Yes	29%	33%	32%	40%	36%	40%	38%	37%	48%	38%	35%	34%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822
Formal or informal volunteering in the last 12 months (Zinffor)	No	51%	46%	39%	36%	40%	36%	36%	39%	27%	34%	45%	45%
	Yes	49%	54%	61%	64%	60%	64%	64%	61%	73%	66%	55%	55%
	Unweighted base (all respondents)	356	1201	353	749	431	875	296	928	327	697	312	822

2. Research findings: Comparing areas over time

2.1 Summary of approach

In this chapter we provide data from the two operational areas included in both the 2017 and 2019 analysis and their comparison groups at the two time-points; these areas are Bramley and Hillsborough.

Consequently, we can assess whether the direction and scale of change between these two time-points is the same for the operational area (which we refer to here for simplicity as [area x]) as for its comparison group. The principal assumption is that both the direction and scale of change will be the same. However, if the evidence shows a different pattern of results— whether positive or negative - then we may hypothesise that the community business at the heart of [area x] is making a difference relative to its comparison group. The data is insufficient to prove this - differences in the direction and scale of change may be due to other unique factors in [area x] – but it is at least suggestive of impact.

Throughout this section of the report, we refer to differences in the direction and/or scale of change as ‘relative effects’. For example, in section 3.6.1 we estimate that the share of the adult population of Bramley that is satisfied with their neighbourhood has increased by 9.9 percentage points between 2017 and 2019 but we also estimate that the share of the comparison group that is satisfied with their neighbourhood has decreased by 4 percentage points over the same timeframe. Therefore, the relative effect for Bramley over its comparison group would be $+9.9+4 = +13.9$ percentage points (denoted in this chapter as +13.9pp).

In other words, if we take the comparison sample as a reference point, we would expect to see a small decrease in area satisfaction, but in fact there has been a sizeable increase in Bramley. This provides an indication that Bramley Baths has had a positive impact on local area satisfaction.

Because the samples from both the two operational areas and their respective comparison groups are imperfect¹³, we urge caution in the interpretation of relative effects. It should be noted that we have only highlighted effects which are unusually large and unlikely to be due to the ‘noise’ introduced by sampling and survey method.

¹³. The samples for all operational areas are subject to standard limitations of random probability surveying. The matched comparison samples are based on the 10% most similar neighbourhoods.

2.2 Sampling

The matched comparison samples used for the 2019 operational areas were a subset of the 2018-19 Community Life Survey respondents. For details of how the identification of the matched comparison samples was conducted, see section 1.10.

The matched comparison samples used for the 2017 operational areas were a subset of the 2017-18 Community Life Survey respondents. Details of how the identification of the matched comparison samples were conducted can be found in the 2017 feasibility study (Willis et al., 2017).

2.3 Social isolation

The Community Life Survey (CLS) includes several measures that capture strength of social support networks (see Section 1.1 for more details). Table 20: Social Isolation ‘difference in difference’ shows the changes over time between 2017 and 2019 in both the operational areas and their matched comparison samples. Although there have been some changes over time in Bramley on social support measures, there is little evidence that these are different from the changes we would expect to see based on the changes over time in the matched comparison sample.

Table 20: Social Isolation ‘difference in difference’

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
How often do you chat to any of your neighbours, more than to just say hello? (SchatN)	On most days	13.7%	15.8%	19.1%	19.3%	1.9pp	14.5%	16.7%	23.0%	17.6%	7.6pp
	Once or twice a week	31.4%	41.1%	34.3%	35.0%	9.0pp	32.6%	35.1%	30.8%	35.6%	-2.3pp
	Once or twice a month	25.3%	19.5%	19.4%	22.0%	-8.4pp	20.0%	20.4%	20.7%	19.3%	1.8pp
	Less than once a month	19.6%	15.8%	15.8%	15.3%	-3.3pp	18.3%	16.5%	15.0%	16.7%	-3.5pp
	Never	10.0%	7.8%	11.4%	8.4%	0.8pp	14.6%	11.3%	10.5%	10.9%	-3.7pp
How often do you feel lonely? (LonOf)	Often/always	4.9%	3.9%	4.5%	5.5%	-1.9pp	8.4%	6.2%	9.0%	6.2%	0.7pp
	Some of the time	16.5%	9.7%	18.6%	18.2%	-6.3pp	14.1%	16.2%	21.3%	15.6%	7.8pp
	Occasionally	23.6%	25.4%	21.2%	20.5%	2.6pp	22.6%	23.0%	24.7%	24.1%	1.0pp
	Hardly ever	31.5%	33.8%	31.5%	31.6%	2.2pp	32.4%	29.3%	25.9%	30.8%	-8.0pp
		23.7%	27.2%	24.1%	24.2%	3.5pp	22.5%	25.3%	19.1%	23.4%	-1.6pp

2.4 Health and wellbeing

2.4.1 Self-reported health

The CLS measures self-reported health (see section 1.2.1 for further details) and changes in survey measures between 2017 and 2019 are shown below for both the operational areas and the matched comparison samples (see Table 21: Self-reported health ‘difference in difference’).

In Bramley, where the business is based on a community- run swimming pool, the proportion who rate their health as ‘good’ has increased between 2017 and 2019 from 45pp to 55pp, and there has been a corresponding fall over this time in the proportion who rate their health as fair (from 24pp to 15pp). In the comparison sample, the proportion who rate their health as ‘good’ is much more stable, and so there has been an overall relative positive effect of +12.8pp. This provides an indication that Bramley Baths has had a positive impact on self-reported health. There are no significant relative effects on this measure for Hillsborough.

Table 21: Self-reported health ‘difference in difference’

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
How is your health in general? (Ghealth)	Very good	26.8%	28.3%	23.6%	24.8%	0.2pp	25.1%	26.1%	19.2%	25.5%	-5.3pp
	Good	44.7%	45.2%	55.4%	43.2%	12.8pp	45.5%	43.0%	46.4%	44.3%	-0.2pp
	Fair	24.0%	21.5%	15.0%	26.1%	-13.6pp	22.6%	25.6%	23.5%	22.3%	4.3pp
	Bad	2.5%	4.5%	5.3%	4.6%	2.7pp	5.5%	4.1%	7.8%	6.0%	0.4pp
	or very bad?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.0%	-	-

2.4.2 Personal wellbeing

Subjective wellbeing is based on the four harmonised measures developed by the Office for National Statistics (see section 1.2.2 for further details).

In Bramley, there was indicative evidence of a positive impact of the community business on residents’ wellbeing (see Table 22: Personal Wellbeing ‘difference in difference’). In 2019, Bramley residents were more likely to give a very high rating for feeling happy (30.7pp up from 23.1pp in 2017) and were less likely to give a very low rating for feeling that their life is worthwhile (8.8pp, down from 11.1pp).

Based on the comparison sample differences over time, we would expect changes for both these measures in the other direction (in the comparison sample the proportion who give a very high rating for feeling happy has decreased slightly, and the proportion who give a very low rating for feeling that life is worthwhile has increased). Therefore, the relative effect on both of these measures is positive which provides an indication of a positive impact in Bramley Baths on levels of wellbeing.

In Hillsborough, however, there was some evidence of a negative impact. Hillsborough residents were less likely to give a very low rating for anxiety in 2019 (23.1pp, down from 30.2pp in 2017) which indicates that levels of anxiety have somewhat increased in this area. In the comparison sample, the proportion who give a very low anxiety rating has slightly increased (from 30.1pp in 2017 to 33.4pp in 2019) which means that the relative effect over time for Hillsborough is negative (-10.4pp).

Table 22: Personal Wellbeing 'difference in difference'

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
How happy did you feel yesterday (ZWellB2)	Low	14.7%	9.1%	11.9%	12.9%	-6.6pp	14.7%	15.8%	16.5%	14.1%	3.4pp
	Medium	18.8%	19.0%	18.2%	17.7%	0.8pp	20.3%	20.2%	24.6%	17.5%	7.0pp
	High	43.5%	39.9%	39.3%	39.6%	-4.0pp	38.7%	36.0%	37.5%	36.5%	-1.8pp
	Very high	23.1%	32.0%	30.7%	29.8%	9.7pp	26.4%	28.1%	21.4%	31.8%	-8.7pp
How anxious did you feel yesterday (ZWellB3)	Very low	29.1%	34.2%	34.4%	31.9%	7.6pp	30.2%	30.1%	23.1%	33.4%	-10.4pp
	Low	25.6%	23.2%	22.8%	26.7%	-6.3pp	21.7%	23.9%	21.1%	23.3%	0.1pp
	Medium	17.2%	18.2%	20.7%	16.1%	5.6pp	21.1%	18.7%	24.4%	17.0%	5.0pp
	High	28.2%	24.5%	22.2%	25.4%	-6.9pp	27.0%	27.3%	31.4%	26.3%	5.4pp
To what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile (ZWellB4)	Very low	11.1%	5.7%	8.8%	10.3%	-6.9pp	12.3%	10.9%	13.6%	11.1%	1.1pp
	Low	20.7%	16.0%	19.7%	17.9%	-2.9pp	19.0%	18.7%	25.9%	18.1%	7.5pp
	Medium	40.0%	45.8%	44.6%	42.7%	7.7pp	39.9%	42.1%	39.1%	41.2%	0.2pp
	High	28.2%	32.5%	26.9%	29.2%	2.1pp	28.8%	28.2%	21.3%	29.6%	-8.8pp

2.5. Employability

Power to Change aims to boost opportunities for employment, either directly or indirectly, by accelerating the growth of community businesses. Some community businesses offer opportunity to work for the business directly, while others offer practical help by building transferable skills which young people can take into education, training and employment. Volunteering as part of a community business can also help build transferable skills and improve employability.

For example, Burton Street Foundation in Hillsborough specialises in providing support for people with learning disabilities. They work with almost 250 adults and 50 children every week, with needs ranging from moderate learning difficulties, to profound and multiple learning disabilities. In 2015 Power to Change provided funding, which was used to refurbish the Bamforth Building. This doubled the capacity for community events and helped them launch the 'Enterprise 100' project, to get 100 adults with learning difficulties into employment.

Between 2017 and 2019, the rate of employment in Bramley increased between 2017 and 2019 from 70.4pp to 75.2pppp, while in the matched comparison sample the rate of employment decreased over this same time period (from 65.0pp to 61.2pp). While this indicates a positive relative effect, this effect is not significant. In Hillsborough the employment rates remained stable across both the operational area and the comparison samples. Overall therefore, the findings indicate that the community businesses have had no positive impact on local employment rates (see Table 23: Whether in employment 'difference in difference').

Table 23: Whether in employment 'difference in difference'

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Respondent economic status 3 categories (DVILO3a)	In Employment	70.4%	65.0%	75.2%	61.2%	8.6pp	65.1%	63.3%	64.7%	64.9%	-
	Unemployed	3.9%	-	3.1%	-	-	2.5%	3.3%	-	-	-
	Economically Inactive	25.7%	34.7%	21.7%	37.6%	-6.9pp	32.4%	33.4%	33.4%	33.6%	-

2.6 Local environment

2.6.1 Satisfaction with local area

The CLS captures measures satisfaction with the local area (see section 1.4.1 for further details).

In Bramley, overall satisfaction in the local area as a place to live has increased from 63.1pp in 2017 to 73.0pp in 2019 while in the comparison area this proportion has decreased slightly (from 82.5pp in 2017 to 78.5pp in 2019) and therefore there the relative positive effect (+13.9pp) provides indicative evidence of a positive impact of Bramley Baths on area-based satisfaction (see Table 24: Satisfaction with the local area). The overall satisfaction ratings have remained relatively stable in both Hillsborough and its matched comparison sample and therefore there is no indication of any impact of the Hillsborough community-based on space on local area satisfaction.

Table 24: Satisfaction with the local area ‘difference in difference’

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Satisfaction with local area as a place to live (Slocsat/ Zslocsat)	Very satisfied	12.8%	33.8%	14.3%	33.7%	1.7pp	27.1%	24.6%	28.9%	24.2%	2.4pp
	Fairly satisfied	50.4%	48.7%	58.7%	44.8%	12.3pp	52.6%	49.3%	50.6%	49.8%	-2.5pp
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	25.3%	10.2%	18.7%	14.1%	-10.5pp	12.7%	19.1%	12.9%	17.5%	1.9pp
	Fairly dissatisfied	8.5%	6.0%	6.9%	5.0%	-0.5pp	3.8%	5.2%	5.3%	7.3%	-0.6pp
	Very dissatisfied	3.1%	-	-	-	-	3.9%	-	2.2%	-	-1.2pp
	Very/fairly satisfied	63.1%	82.5%	73.0%	78.5%	13.9pp	79.6%	73.9%	79.5%	73.9%	-0.1pp
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	25.3%	10.2%	18.7%	14.1%	-10.5pp	12.7%	19.1%	12.9%	17.5%	1.9pp
	Fairly/very dissatisfied	11.6%	7.3%	8.2%	7.4%	-3.4pp	7.7%	7.0%	7.5%	8.6%	-1.8pp

2.6.2 Access to services

A common ambition of community businesses is the delivery of positive social, economic and environmental benefits for the whole community, to help regenerate communities and, in many cases, provide vital services and amenities required locally (see section 1.4.2 for further details).

On this measure, the proportion who were overall satisfied with local amenities remained very similar between 2017 and 2019 in the two operational areas, and a similar was pattern was observed in each of the two comparison samples. There was therefore no significant relative effect in either area which indicates that the community businesses have had no impact on satisfaction with local services and amenities over this time period (Table 25: Access to services).

Table 25: Access to services ‘difference in difference’

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Generally how satisfied are you with the local services and amenities (SatAsset/ ZSatAsset)	Very satisfied	22.8%	22.9%	26.9%	24.7%	2.4pp	47.7%	22.9%	43.6%	23.1%	-4.3pp
	Fairly satisfied	60.1%	50.7%	52.9%	48.0%	-4.6pp	40.2%	54.6%	43.3%	51.1%	6.5pp
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	12.4%	18.2%	14.5%	15.6%	4.8pp	5.7%	17.1%	8.0%	17.5%	1.8pp
	Fairly dissatisfied	3.8%	5.3%	5.3%	8.6%	-1.8pp	3.9%	3.6%	2.6%	6.0%	-3.6pp
	Very dissatisfied	-	-	-	-	-	2.5%	1.9%	2.5%	2.2%	-0.4pp
	Satisfied	83.0%	73.5%	79.8%	72.7%	-2.2pp	87.9%	77.4%	86.9%	74.3%	2.2pp
	Dissatisfied	4.7%	8.2%	5.6%	11.7%	-2.5pp	6.4%	5.5%	5.1%	8.2%	-4.0pp

2.7 Community Cohesion

Community businesses aim to promote community integration and a sense of shared identity and purpose (see section 2.5.1 for further details).

2.7.1 Perceptions of community cohesion

The key community cohesion measure in the CLS captures the extent to which people agree or disagree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together.

In both the comparison and operational areas, the proportion who agree or disagree with this statement has remained very similar between 2017 and 2019 and therefore there is no indication of any impact of community business on perceptions of community cohesion (Table 26: Perceptions of community cohesion difference in difference).

Table 26: Perceptions of community cohesion difference in difference

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?	Definitely agree	8.2%	17.6%	8.6%	15.2%	2.8pp	11.8%	12.4%	12.4%	11.6%	1.5pp
	Tend to agree	65.3%	68.8%	64.3%	67.7%	0.2pp	66.0%	69.6%	68.0%	67.8%	3.8pp
	Tend to disagree	22.9%	11.5%	23.2%	15.1%	-3.3pp	15.6%	15.0%	15.7%	17.9%	-2.9pp
	Definitely disagree	3.6%	1.9%	3.8%	1.7%	0.3pp	6.6%	3.0%	4.0%	2.8%	-2.4pp
	Too few to say	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(STogether/ZSTogether)	Agree	73.5%	86.6%	73.0%	83.1%	3.0pp	77.7%	82.0%	80.4%	79.4%	5.3pp
	Disagree	26.5%	13.4%	27.0%	16.9%	-3.0pp	22.3%	18.0%	19.6%	20.6%	-5.3pp

2.7.2 Feeling of belonging to local area

In the comparison sample for Bramley, a feeling of belonging ‘very strongly’ to the local neighbourhood decreased from 23.1pp to 17.4pp between 2017 and 2019, while there was a small increase in this measure in Bramley (from 13.2pp to 15.7pp), a net relative effect of +8.2pp. This provides indicative evidence of an impact of Bramley Baths on positive feelings of belonging over this time period. For Hillsborough there was no significant differences on this measure, once the changes in the comparison sample had been taken into account. (Table 27: Feelings of belonging to the area).

Table 27: Feelings of belonging to the area

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
How strongly do you feel you belong to: Your immediate neighbourhood (SBeNeigh/ ZSBeNeigh)	Very strongly	13.2%	23.1%	15.7%	17.4%	8.2pp	12.5%	16.2%	16.4%	16.2%	3.9pp
	Fairly strongly	44.6%	45.2%	39.3%	48.1%	-8.2pp	44.6%	43.9%	44.1%	46.5%	-3.0pp
	Not very strongly	29.8%	24.8%	34.2%	26.4%	2.8pp	31.2%	30.4%	30.0%	26.8%	2.4pp
	Not at all strongly	12.4%	6.9%	10.8%	8.1%	-2.8pp	11.7%	9.4%	9.5%	10.4%	-3.3pp
	Very / fairly strongly	57.8%	68.2%	55.0%	65.5%	0.0pp	57.1%	60.2%	60.5%	62.7%	0.9pp
	Not at all strongly	12.4%	6.9%	10.8%	8.1%	-2.8pp	11.7%	9.4%	9.5%	10.4%	-3.3pp
How strongly do you feel you belong to Great Britain? (SBeGB2/ ZSBeGB2)	Very strongly	51.2%	55.8%	40.5%	48.4%	-3.4pp	44.4%	50.5%	41.6%	46.9%	0.9pp
	Fairly strongly	32.9%	32.1%	33.0%	36.9%	-4.7pp	37.4%	34.4%	32.9%	41.2%	-11.4pp
	Not very strongly	13.2%	9.3%	21.4%	12.2%	5.2pp	13.6%	11.4%	17.6%	9.9%	5.5pp
	Not at all strongly	2.7%	2.9%	5.1%	2.5%	2.9pp	4.6%	3.8%	7.9%	2.1%	5.0pp
	Strongly	84.1%	87.8%	73.6%	85.4%	-8.1pp	81.8%	84.9%	74.5%	88.1%	-10.5pp
	Not strongly	15.9%	12.2%	26.4%	14.6%	8.1pp	18.2%	15.1%	25.5%	11.9%	10.5pp

2.7.3 Levels of trust

Between 2017 and 2019, the proportion in Bramley who felt that many people in their neighbourhood can be trusted remained relatively stable (Table 28: Levels of trust difference in difference). Although there was a fall in the proportion who felt this in the matched comparison sample (from 57.3pp in 2017 to 45.7pp in 2019) the relative positive effect in Bramley was not significant. The proportion who thought many people could be trusted remained stable in both Hillsborough and its comparison sample. Therefore overall, there is no indication of any positive impact of the two community businesses on levels of neighbourhood trust between 2017 and 2019.

Table 28: Levels of trust difference in difference

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Trust in people living in neighbourhood (STrust)	Many of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted	37.1%	57.3%	35.0%	45.7%	9.5pp	29.1%	33.3%	30.7%	32.0%	2.9pp
	Some of the people can be trusted,	35.8%	27.8%	38.5%	32.4%	-1.9pp	38.8%	37.3%	42.8%	38.8%	2.4pp
	A few of the people can be trusted,	23.7%	13.6%	24.1%	18.7%	-4.6pp	22.9%	26.4%	21.3%	25.1%	-0.3pp
	None of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted	3.4%	1.2%	2.3%	2.9%	-2.8pp	9.0%	2.9%	4.9%	3.6%	-4.8pp
	Just moved here	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

2.7.4 Diversity of friendship group

Diversity of friendship groups can also have an impact on community cohesion. The CLS covers a range of measures on friendship diversity, including the extent to which people have diverse friendship networks in terms of ethnicity, faith, age and education (see section 1.5.4 for further details).

There were no significant relative effects over time when comparing the differences in Bramley and Hillsborough with the differences in their respective comparison samples (Table 29: Diversity of friendship group difference in difference). Therefore, there is no indication that either of the community businesses have had any impact between 2017 and 2019 in terms of composition and diversity of residents' friendship groups.

Table 29: Diversity of friendship group difference in difference

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Proportion of friends the same: Ethnic group as you (Srace/ ZSpace)	All the same,	36.5%	45.0%	39.3%	49.6%	-1.8pp	34.3%	47.2%	35.9%	43.8%	4.9pp
	More than a half,	51.2%	46.4%	50.9%	41.3%	4.8pp	51.7%	41.4%	50.6%	43.9%	-3.6pp
	About a half,	7.1%	3.9%	4.9%	4.4%	-2.7pp	7.2%	5.1%	4.4%	8.2%	-0.1pp
	Less than a half?	5.2%	4.4%	4.9%	4.7%	-0.6pp	6.2%	5.5%	5.3%	5.5%	-0.9pp
	All the same	36.5%	45.0%	39.3%	49.6%	-1.8pp	34.3%	47.2%	35.9%	43.8%	4.9pp
	Not all the same	63.5%	54.7%	60.7%	50.4%	1.5pp	65.1%	52.0%	64.1%	55.6%	-4.5pp
Proportion of friends the same: Religious group as you (Sfaith/ ZFaith)	All the same,	22.2%	30.2%	25.4%	33.1%	0.3pp	32.3%	33.1%	29.0%	31.9%	-2.1pp
	More than a half,	47.0%	38.2%	42.1%	36.8%	-3.6pp	42.8%	34.4%	43.0%	36.7%	-2.1pp
	About a half,	15.4%	15.0%	10.9%	15.6%	-5.1pp	10.0%	12.0%	13.2%	15.2%	0.0pp
	Less than a half?	14.3%	12.0%	16.8%	11.4%	3.1pp	13.3%	15.8%	12.2%	12.7%	1.9pp
	Not part of any faith group	-	-	4.8%	3.0%	-	-	-	2.7%	3.6%	-
	All the same	22.2%	30.2%	25.4%	33.1%	0.3pp	32.3%	33.1%	29.0%	31.9%	-2.1pp
Not all the same	76.7%	65.2%	69.8%	63.8%	-5.6pp	66.1%	62.1%	68.4%	64.6%	-0.2pp	
Proportion of friends the same: Age group as you (Sage/Zage)	All the same,	13.8%	13.1%	14.5%	17.6%	-3.9pp	18.9%	18.1%	15.1%	16.6%	-2.4pp
	More than a half,	52.8%	51.2%	53.4%	48.2%	3.7pp	45.2%	47.0%	46.3%	48.3%	-0.3pp
	About a half,	26.2%	25.4%	21.9%	22.8%	-1.7pp	22.7%	26.1%	27.1%	26.2%	4.3pp
	Or less than a half?	7.1%	10.2%	10.2%	11.4%	1.9pp	13.2%	8.9%	11.5%	8.8%	-1.6pp
	All the same	13.8%	13.1%	14.5%	17.6%	-3.9pp	18.9%	18.1%	15.1%	16.6%	-2.4pp
	Not all the same	86.2%	86.9%	85.5%	82.4%	3.9pp	81.1%	81.9%	84.9%	83.4%	2.4pp

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
What proportion of your friends have a similar level of education (Seduc/ Zseduc)	All the same	22.2%	17.2%	19.5%	19.6%	-5.1pp	17.8%	20.4%	17.4%	19.2%	0.8pp
	More than a half	42.1%	47.4%	43.1%	45.2%	3.2pp	47.2%	44.4%	41.3%	44.0%	-5.6pp
	About a half	26.3%	24.4%	27.8%	23.5%	2.5pp	24.8%	26.3%	24.7%	22.5%	3.6pp
	Or less than a half	9.4%	11.0%	9.6%	11.7%	-0.5pp	10.2%	9.0%	16.6%	14.2%	1.2pp
	All the same	22.2%	17.2%	19.5%	19.6%	-5.1pp	17.8%	20.4%	17.4%	19.2%	0.8pp
	Not all the same	77.8%	82.8%	80.5%	80.4%	5.1pp	82.2%	79.6%	82.6%	80.8%	-0.8pp

2.7.5 Neighbourliness

There are several survey questions in CLS which aim to measure the level of neighbourliness in communities (see section 1.5.5 for further details).

Residents in Hillsborough in 2019 were more likely to feel comfortable asking a neighbour to collect shopping essentials if they were ill and at home on their own (37.0pp in 2017 and 47.0pp in 2019) while this proportion had decreased in the comparison area over this time period (from 51.1pp to 47.4pp) which provides a net relative effect of +13.7pp (Table 30: Neighbourliness difference in difference). This provides an indication of a positive impact of the Hillsborough community business on levels of neighbourliness. However, it should be noted that on the other neighbourliness measures there were no significant differences between residents in Hillsborough and residents in the comparison sample, once the changes in the comparison sample had been taken into account.

In Bramley there was little movement over time on these measures which is consistent with the findings across the two time points for its matched comparison area.

Table 30: Neighbourliness difference in difference

		Bramley					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Whether agree or disagree that: I borrow things and exchange favours with my neighbours (sFavN/ ZsFavN)	Definitely agree	10.3%	12.7%	9.5%	9.8%	2.2pp	5.1%	8.4%	6.6%	6.4%	3.5pp
	Tend to agree	26.0%	30.8%	25.7%	28.0%	2.5pp	24.5%	26.3%	26.4%	24.5%	3.6pp
	Tend to disagree	27.9%	27.0%	26.3%	28.8%	-3.3pp	24.9%	28.6%	25.9%	28.5%	1.2pp
	Definitely disagree	35.8%	29.5%	38.5%	33.4%	-1.3pp	45.4%	36.6%	41.1%	40.6%	-8.3pp
	Agree	36.3%	43.5%	35.3%	37.8%	4.7pp	29.7%	34.8%	32.9%	30.9%	7.1pp
	Disagree	63.7%	56.5%	64.7%	62.2%	-4.7pp	70.3%	65.2%	67.1%	69.1%	-7.1pp
How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to keep a set of keys to your home for emergencies (NComfort1/Z NComfort1)	Very comfortable	35.0%	43.2%	32.6%	38.1%	2.6pp	23.8%	30.8%	24.6%	30.2%	1.4pp
	Fairly comfortable	28.6%	29.7%	31.4%	30.2%	2.3pp	30.2%	30.5%	31.0%	27.9%	3.4pp
	Fairly uncomfortable	17.3%	14.2%	16.7%	16.0%	-2.4pp	20.8%	18.7%	20.7%	20.8%	-2.3pp
	Very uncomfortable	19.1%	12.9%	19.3%	15.7%	-2.5pp	25.2%	20.1%	23.7%	21.0%	-2.5pp
	Comfortable	63.7%	72.9%	64.0%	68.3%	4.9pp	54.0%	61.3%	55.6%	58.1%	4.7pp
	Uncomfortable	36.3%	27.1%	36.0%	31.7%	-4.9pp	46.0%	38.7%	44.4%	41.9%	-4.7pp
How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to collect a few shopping essentials if you were ill and at home on your own (NComfort3/Z NComfort3)	Very comfortable	20.0%	27.7%	18.8%	26.5%	0.1pp	18.7%	21.9%	18.3%	19.2%	2.2pp
	Fairly comfortable	28.2%	32.8%	26.5%	28.4%	2.7pp	18.3%	29.2%	28.8%	28.2%	11.5pp
	Fairly uncomfortable	27.8%	23.9%	29.2%	25.0%	0.2pp	30.7%	23.7%	22.6%	26.9%	-11.3pp
	Very uncomfortable	24.0%	15.6%	25.5%	20.1%	-3.0pp	32.3%	25.2%	30.4%	25.7%	-2.4pp
	Comfortable	48.2%	60.5%	45.4%	54.8%	2.8pp	37.0%	51.1%	47.0%	47.4%	13.7pp
	Uncomfortable	51.8%	39.5%	54.6%	45.2%	-2.8pp	63.0%	48.9%	53.0%	52.6%	-13.7pp

2.8 Community Pride and empowerment

The CLS captures a number of measures relating to community pride and empowerment (see section 1.6 for further details).

There was indicative evidence that the community business in Hillsborough has had a positive impact on the extent to which residents rate the level of community empowerment, that is the extent to which communities work together to have more of say in local decision-making. The proportion of people in Hillsborough who agree that people in the neighbourhood pull together has increased markedly from 38.9pp in 2017 to 53.3pp in 2019, whereas in the matched comparison sample the proportion who agreed with this decreased (from 55.1pp in 2017 to 50.9pp in 2019). Overall, this provides a very strong positive relative effect of +18.6pp. (Table 31: Community Pride and Empowerment ‘difference in difference’).

Consistent with this general finding, the proportion of Hillsborough residents who disagreed that when local people get involved, they can change the way their area is run decreased from 21.6pp in 2017 to 13.8pp in 2019, while these proportions remained very similar in the matched comparison sample (12.2pp in 2017, 14.4pp in 2019). This results in a relative effect of -9.9pp which again provides an indication of a positive impact on perceptions of community empowerment.

For Bramley there were no significant differences on these measures, once the changes in the comparison sample had been taken into account.

Table 31: Community Pride and Empowerment ‘difference in difference’

		Bramley Baths					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Whether agree or disagree that: People in this neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood (Spull)	Definitely agree	9.5%	16.8%	9.1%	12.4%	4.0pp	2.3%	9.6%	8.0%	8.7%	6.6pp
	Tend to agree	47.3%	52.3%	43.1%	47.0%	1.0pp	36.6%	45.6%	45.3%	42.2%	12.1pp
	Tend to disagree	27.6%	23.3%	34.6%	33.2%	-3.0pp	43.5%	32.0%	31.9%	37.7%	-17.4pp
	Definitely disagree	15.5%	7.3%	13.2%	7.4%	-2.3pp	17.6%	12.9%	14.8%	11.4%	-1.3pp
To what extent would you agree or disagree that people in this neighbourhood pull together (Zspull)	Agree	56.9%	69.1%	52.2%	59.4%	5.0pp	38.9%	55.1%	53.3%	50.9%	18.6pp
	Disagree	43.1%	30.6%	47.8%	40.6%	-5.2pp	61.1%	44.9%	46.7%	49.1%	-18.6pp
Agreement that: You can influence decisions affecting your local area (PAffLoc/ ZPAffLoc)	Definitely agree	4.2%	2.7%	2.2%	1.4%	-0.7pp	2.2%	2.8%	2.4%	1.8%	1.2pp
	Tend to agree	20.9%	25.1%	18.7%	22.4%	0.5pp	18.4%	18.7%	24.5%	19.4%	5.5pp
	Tend to disagree	50.8%	50.1%	54.2%	48.3%	5.1pp	50.8%	51.0%	45.6%	50.2%	-4.4pp
	Definitely disagree	24.1%	22.1%	24.9%	27.9%	-5.0pp	28.7%	27.5%	27.5%	28.6%	-2.3pp
	definitely / tend to agree	25.1%	27.8%	20.9%	23.7%	-0.1pp	20.6%	21.6%	26.9%	21.2%	6.7pp
	tend to / definitely disagree	74.9%	72.2%	79.1%	76.3%	0.1pp	79.4%	78.4%	73.1%	78.8%	-6.7pp

		Bramley Baths					Hillsborough				
How important is it for you personally to feel that you can influence decisions in your local area? (Pinfl/ZPinfl)	Very important,	8.9%	15.5%	7.1%	10.9%	2.7pp	7.2%	11.5%	10.3%	12.8%	1.8pp
	Quite important,	44.8%	45.0%	45.2%	45.6%	-0.2pp	35.4%	42.2%	37.2%	43.9%	0.2pp
	Not very important,	35.0%	32.4%	37.8%	33.7%	1.5pp	39.5%	34.3%	38.1%	32.5%	0.4pp
	Not at all important?	11.3%	7.1%	9.9%	9.8%	-4.1pp	17.9%	11.9%	14.4%	10.8%	-2.4pp
	very/quite important	53.7%	60.5%	52.3%	56.5%	2.6pp	42.5%	53.8%	47.5%	56.7%	2.0pp
	not very/not at all important	46.3%	39.5%	47.7%	43.5%	-2.6pp	57.5%	46.2%	52.5%	43.3%	-2.0pp
Do you agree or disagree: when people get involved in their local area they can change the way the area is run (LocAtt/ZLocAtt)	Definitely agree	11.2%	16.4%	10.5%	12.6%	2.9pp	8.3%	13.4%	9.6%	11.2%	3.5pp
	Tend to agree	39.7%	39.0%	41.5%	37.0%	3.8pp	31.9%	34.4%	34.6%	37.6%	-0.4pp
	Neither agree nor disagree	35.7%	33.9%	35.1%	37.4%	-4.1pp	38.3%	40.0%	42.0%	36.9%	6.8pp
	Tend to disagree	8.5%	8.0%	9.8%	10.5%	-1.2pp	14.0%	8.4%	8.9%	10.8%	-7.6pp
	Definitely disagree	4.8%	2.7%	3.1%	2.4%	-1.4pp	7.5%	3.8%	5.0%	3.6%	-2.3pp
	Agree	51.0%	55.4%	52.0%	49.7%	6.7pp	40.2%	47.8%	44.2%	48.8%	3.1pp
	Disagree	13.4%	10.7%	12.9%	12.9%	-2.6pp	21.6%	12.2%	13.8%	14.4%	-9.9pp
Generally speaking, would you like to be more involved in the decisions your Council makes that affect your local area? (PCSat)	Yes	53.6%	55.0%	57.2%	49.3%	9.3pp	53.9%	52.0%	47.6%	53.4%	-7.7pp
	No	44.4%	41.6%	39.9%	47.9%	-10.9pp	42.0%	45.5%	50.6%	43.3%	10.8pp
	Depends on the issue	2.0%	3.5%	2.9%	2.8%	1.6pp	4.0%	2.5%	-	-	-

2.9 Social Action

In the CLS, social action is defined as a community project, event or activity which local people proactively get together to initiate or support on an unpaid basis. In the CLS, social action is measured in terms of the extent to which people either get involved personally or are aware of other people in their neighbourhood getting involved (see section 1.7 for further details).

The CLS also includes three measures of civic engagement:

- **Civic participation:** engagement in democratic processes, both in person and online, including signing a petition or attending a public meeting or rally (does not include voting)
- **Civic consultation:** taking part in consultations about local services both in person and online
- **Civic activism:** involvement in decision-making about local services or in the provision of these services (for example, being a school governor or a magistrate), both in person and online.

In Bramley there is some indicative evidence of a positive impact of the community business on rates of civic consultation and civic participation (Table 32: Social Action ‘difference in difference’). While the increase between 2017 and 2019 in the rates of both civic consultation (from 14.1pp to 16.3pp) and civic participation (from 34.7pp to 40.2pp) are small, the relative effect is greater as there were decreases on these measures in the matched comparison samples. This provides a net positive relative effect of +14.4pp for civic consultation and +14.8 for civic participation.

In Hillsborough on the other hand, the findings are more negative. The proportion of people who say that they are aware of local people getting involved in a local issue has decreased from 29.6pp in 2019 to 17.1pp in 2017 while this proportion remained unchanged in the matched comparison sample. This produces a negative relative effect of -13.2pp on this measure.

Table 32: Social Action ‘difference in difference’

		Bramley Baths					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Any civic activism activities in past 12 months (ZCivact2)	No	94.1%	91.7%	93.0%	93.3%	-2.6pp	95.6%	95.9%	94.4%	94.2%	0.5pp
	Yes	5.9%	8.3%	7.0%	6.7%	2.6pp	4.4%	4.1%	5.6%	5.8%	-0.5pp
Any civic activism in the past 12 months (ZCivren)	No	93.4%	89.6%	92.4%	91.6%	-3.0pp	95.0%	94.6%	94.4%	93.0%	0.9pp
	Yes	6.6%	10.4%	7.6%	8.4%	3.0pp	5.0%	5.4%	5.6%	7.0%	-0.9pp
Any Civic consultation in past 12 months (Zpconsul1)	No	85.9%	71.9%	83.7%	84.0%	-14.4pp	86.5%	86.2%	82.1%	82.9%	-1.1pp
	Yes	14.1%	28.1%	16.3%	16.0%	14.4pp	13.5%	13.8%	17.9%	17.1%	1.1pp
Civic participation in last 12 months (Zcivpar1)	No	65.3%	56.8%	59.8%	66.2%	-14.8pp	61.2%	63.5%	60.0%	64.4%	-2.1pp
	Yes	34.7%	43.2%	40.2%	33.8%	14.8pp	38.8%	36.5%	40.0%	35.6%	2.1pp
Whether been personally involved in helping out with local issue/activity (ZLocInv1)	No	88.9%	80.4%	91.8%	86.7%	-3.3pp	91.6%	89.9%	93.4%	86.8%	4.9pp
	Yes	11.1%	19.6%	8.2%	13.3%	3.3pp	8.4%	10.1%	6.6%	13.2%	-4.9pp
Whether aware of local people getting involved in a local issue/activity (ZLocPeop1)	No	71.6%	54.0%	72.1%	61.9%	-7.4pp	70.4%	70.8%	82.9%	70.1%	13.2pp
	Yes	28.4%	46.0%	27.9%	38.1%	7.4pp	29.6%	29.2%	17.1%	29.9%	-13.2pp

2.10 Volunteering

The rates of formal and informal volunteering (see section 1.8 for a definition of volunteering types) in both 2017 and 2019 are shown in Table 33: Volunteering ‘difference in difference’, which shows the figures over time for both the two operational areas and their matched comparison samples.

In both Hillsborough and Bramley there are increases between 2017 and 2019 in the rates of informal volunteering (from 21.8pp to 32.0pp in Bramley, and from 14.1pp to 36.5pp in Hillsborough). However, as these increases are matched with similarly high increases in the matched comparison samples the relative effect is minimal. As such, despite these increases in rates of informal volunteering, there is no evidence that the community businesses have had any impact on rates of volunteering once the differences in the matched comparison samples are accounted for.

Table 33: Volunteering ‘difference in difference’

		Bramley Baths					Hillsborough				
		CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID	CB17	MCS17	CB19	MCS19	DID
Formal volunteering at least once a month (Zformon)	No	78.2%	73.2%	81.7%	77.0%	-0.2pp	85.9%	83.8%	84.2%	78.6%	3.5pp
	Yes	21.8%	26.8%	18.3%	23.0%	0.2pp	14.1%	16.2%	15.8%	21.4%	-3.5pp
Formal volunteering in last 12 months (Zforvol)	No	65.1%	53.8%	67.1%	62.5%	-6.7pp	74.9%	71.1%	70.6%	64.6%	2.3pp
	Yes	34.9%	46.2%	32.9%	37.5%	6.7pp	25.1%	28.9%	29.4%	35.4%	-2.3pp
Informal help at least once a month (Zihlpmon)	No	77.0%	70.6%	77.1%	73.5%	-2.8pp	74.9%	74.7%	71.0%	71.5%	-0.6pp
	Yes	23.0%	29.4%	22.9%	26.5%	2.8pp	25.1%	25.3%	29.0%	28.5%	0.6pp
Informal help in last 12 months (Zinfol)	No	52.9%	46.6%	50.5%	49.0%	-4.9pp	54.0%	49.5%	47.1%	47.3%	-4.7pp
	Yes	47.1%	53.4%	49.5%	51.0%	4.9pp	46.0%	50.5%	52.9%	52.7%	4.7pp
Formal or informal volunteering at least once a month (Zinform)	No	78.2%	73.2%	68.0%	60.0%	3.0pp	85.9%	83.8%	63.5%	60.2%	1.1pp
	Yes	21.8%	26.8%	32.0%	40.0%	-3.0pp	14.1%	16.2%	36.5%	39.8%	-1.1pp
Formal or informal volunteering in the last 12 (Zinffor)	No	41.5%	32.9%	39.5%	36.0%	-5.1pp	47.0%	40.1%	39.6%	35.9%	-3.3pp
	Yes	58.5%	67.1%	60.5%	64.0%	5.1pp	53.0%	59.9%	60.4%	64.1%	3.3pp

Bibliography

Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport. (2019), Community Life Survey: 2018-19 Report. [online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/820610/Community_Life_Survey_2018-19_report.pdf

Government Statistics Service. (2018), Personal Well-being. [online]. Available at: <https://gss.civilservice.gov.uk/guidances/harmonisation/0-harmonised-principles/personal-well-being/#questions-input->

Hothy, M., Bacon, N., Brophy, B. and Mulgan, G. (2007), Neighbourliness + Empowerment = Wellbeing: Is there a formula for happy communities. London: The Young Foundation. [online]. Available at: https://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/N_E_W_web.pdf

Percy, C., Swersky, A., Hull, D. and Medley-Hallam, J. (2016), The community business market in 2015. London: Power to Change. [online]. Available at: https://www.socialfinance.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/ptc-state-of-the-market-2015-research-report-tagged_aw-rev1.pdf

Power to Change (2017) Annual report 2017. London: Power to Change. [online]. Available at: https://www.powertochange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/PTC_Annual_Report_2017_pdf.pdf

Public Health England and The National Health Service. (2015), A guide to community-centred approaches for health and wellbeing. [online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/417515/A_guide_to_community-centred_approaches_for_health_and_wellbeing_full_report.pdf

UK Statistics Authority. (2018), Types of Official Statistics. [online]. Available at: <https://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/about-the-authority/uk-statistical-system/types-of-official-statistics/>

Willis, D., Coutinho, S., Fitzpatrick, A. and Williams., J. (2017), The impact of community business on local communities: A feasibility study to test new measures based on the Community Life Survey. London: Power to Change. [online]. Available at: <https://www.powertochange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Hyperlocal-Boost-Report-FINAL-DIGITAL.pdf>

Appendix A: Description of the six community business areas

Bramley Baths

Bramley Baths is the only remaining Edwardian bath house in Leeds and is a Grade II listed building. It first opened as a pool and public bath house in 1904. After a period under local authority management where it struggled to make money, the local community took over the baths in 2013. Bramley Baths is now run as a public gym, swimming pool, steam room and is also a space for community events, meetings and fitness classes, providing the local community with a wealth of amenities. As of 2019, the Baths was generating a profit and had over 40 staff, all paid the Living Wage.

In 2018, Power to Change provided a grant to Bramley Baths to introduce new sustainable technologies for a more efficient future. This involved, amongst other things, installing new filters, pumps, heat exchanges and an air handling unit.

Burton Street Foundation

Established in 1995 after the local community came together to bring a former school building back to life, the Burton Street Foundation is a community benefit society in Sheffield. It specialises in providing support for people with learning disabilities. They work with almost 250 adults and 50 children every week, with needs ranging from moderate learning difficulties, to profound and multiple learning disabilities.

They also have many facilities which are open to the wider community. These include office and meeting spaces, functions and events spaces, a fully stocked bar, a gym, and a sports hall. Regular events include film screenings, toddler groups, bistros, dances, markets, and more. Burton Street employs around 150 local people, and their fully accessible site is used by around 2500 people each week.

All Saints Action Network

All Saints Action Network (ASAN) is a community business whose vision is to improve the quality of life for all people who live and work in All Saints area of Wolverhampton.

ASAN was established in 1995 with the purpose to improve quality of life, to support community businesses and are accountable to over 600 households. It operates out of a local community centre, from which it provides a range of services including serviced offices, meeting spaces, a hall and kitchen, among others. ASAN also operates a number of projects, including a community recycling business, a nursery and a tool library.

The Bevy

Based on the Moulsecoombe and Bevendean estates in Brighton, the Bevendean Community Pub, better known today as 'The Bevy', was reopened by local

campaigners who saw beyond its previous bad reputation when it was closed down by the police. In initial meetings, local people said the Bevy should be more than a pub, given the area has so few community spaces. So they came together and raised £50,000 from over 700 local people – the most shareholders of any co-op pub in the UK. At the first AGM, it was agreed that 7pp of committee members must come from the local area, with deep roots in the community.

The Bevy has 700 local shareholders and a management team of residents with deep roots and knowledge on the estate, including: a community development worker, local vicar, small business owner, carpenter, chef and charity director. The Bevy provides space for everyone, from friends and families who need a space to meet up, to the estate's elderly residents who come together for a Friday lunch club. Over 70 different groups use the pub each year.

Station House

Located half an hour by car from Ipswich, Station House serves a community dealing with the challenges of isolation. While the social challenges of rural communities are less visible than urban ones and deprivation less obvious, they are equally inhibitory to creating vibrant and dynamic places to live.

The Station House was built in 1859. It was taken over by the local community in 2013, when Station House Community Connections was formed to address local challenges. Forty-five members of the community came together to form a charitable Community Benefit Society and, with help from a Power to Change grant, restore the Station building so it could provide much needed services to local social and business communities and generate a sustainable income.

The Station House's café, events space and computers all facilitate ways of bringing people in this rural community together. The building also includes a specific health and social care room. Hiring the room to healthcare practitioners is intended to improve access to healthcare services for the local community.

Future Wolverton

With the help of a Power to Change grant, Future Wolverton purchased the Grade II listed Old School House, so it can provide community space for hire and provide a cafe run by students from the nearby Slated Row School. Additionally, an attached residential property was purchased, to be turned into a Guest house for visitors, with three rooms to hire and a shared kitchen/living space. The Guest House will provide students with an opportunity to acquire independent living skills, as well as providing a much needed resource to people who work in Milton Keynes during the week. The facilities are run in conjunction with staff and students from Slated Row School. Working in the Old School will eventually provide more than 150 students with experience needed to acquire future employment, as well as involving them in the local community.

Appendix B: Summary of statistical difference baseline

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevendean
Social Isolation	To what extent do you agree or disagree that if I needed help, there are people who would be there for me (FrndSat1/ZfrdnSat1)	Definitely agree		+				
		Tend to agree		-				
		Tend to disagree						
		Definitely disagree						
		Agree						
		Disagree						
	Is there anyone who you can really count on to listen to you when you need to talk (Counton1)	Yes, one person		-				
		Yes, More than one person				-		
		No one		+				
	How often do you chat to any of your neighbours, more than to just say hello (SchatN)	One most days						
		Once or twice a week						-
		Once or twice a month		-				-
		Less than once a month		-				
		Never		+				+
	How often do you feel lonely? (Lonoft)	Never						
		Hardly Ever		-				-
		Occasionally						
		Some of the time				+		
		Often/Always						

Health and wellbeing	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevendean	
	How is your health in general? (Ghealth)	Very good							
		Good		+			+		
		Fair		-			-		
		Bad					-		
		Very bad							
	How satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays (ZWellB1)	Low							
		Medium			+				
		High							
		Very High			-				
How happy did you feel yesterday (ZWellB2)	Low								
	Medium			+					
	High								
	Very High			-					
How anxious did you feel yesterday (ZWellB3)	Very Low				-				
	Low								
	Medium			+					
	High	-					+		

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevedean
Health and wellbeing	To what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile (ZWellB4)	Low					-	
		Medium			+			
		High						
		Very High			-			-
Employability	Respondent economic status 3 categories (DVILO3a)	In employment		+				-
		Unemployed				+		
		Economically inactive		-		-		+
Local environment	Satisfaction with local area as a place to live (Slocsats/ Zslocsats)	Very satisfied	-	-		-	+	
		Fairly Satisfied		+				
		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied			-		-	
		Fairly dissatisfied	+					
		Very dissatisfied						
		Very/Fairly satisfied	-				+	
		Very/Fairly dissatisfied	+					
	Do you think that over the past two years your area has...? (BetWors)	Got better to live in				+		
		Got worse to live in			-			-
		Not changed				-		-
Have not lived here long enough to say			+	+	+	+	+	

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevendean
Local environment	Generally how satisfied are you with the local services and amenities (SatAsset/ ZSatAsset)	Very satisfied			+			+
		Fairly satisfied			-		+	
		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied			-		-	
		Fairly dissatisfied			-			
		Very dissatisfied						
		Satisfied		+	+		+	
		Dissatisfied		-				
Community Cohesion	To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together? (Stogeth/ Zstogeth)	Definitely agree		-			+	+
		Tend to agree					-	
		Tend to disagree		+				-
		Definitely disagree						
		Agree		-				+
		Disagree		+				-
	How strongly do you feel you belong to: Your immediate neighbourhood (SBeNeigh / ZSBeNeigh)	Very strongly						
		Fairly strongly		-		-		-
		Not very strongly		+				
		Not at all						+
		Very/fairly strongly		-				-
		Not at all strongly		+				

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevendean
	Community Cohesion	How strongly do you feel you belong to Great Britain? (SBeGB2/ ZSBeGB2)	Very strongly					
Fairly strongly					-			
Not very strongly				+	+			
Not at all strongly					+			
Strongly				-	-			
Not strongly				+	+			
Trust in people living in neighbourhood (Strust)		Many of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted	-	-		-		-
		Some of the people can be trusted				+		
		A few of the people can be trusted						
		None of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted?						+
Trust in people in general (ZStrustgen2)		Low						
		Medium						
	High							
	Very high					+		

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevendean
	Community Cohesion	Proportion of friends the same: Ethnic group as you (Srace/ ZSRace)	All the same,		-	-	-	
More than a half,			-	+		+		
About a half,			+			+		+
Less than a half?								
All the same				-	-	-		-
Not all the same				+	+	+		+
Proportion of friends the same: Religious group as you (Sfaith/ Zsfaith)		All the same,		-		-		-
		More than a half,	-					
		About a half,	+					
		Less than a half?	+			+		
		All the same,		-		-		-
		Not all the same				+		+
What proportion of your friends have a similar level of education (Seduc/ Zseduc)		All the same,					-	
		More than a half,	-					
		About a half,						
		Less than a half?	+					
		All the same,					-	
		Not all the same					+	

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevedean	
	Community Cohesion	Whether agree or disagree that: I borrow things and exchange favours with my neighbours (sFavN/ ZSFavN)	Definitely agree						
Tend to agree						-	+		
Tend to disagree									
Definitely disagree								+	
Agree							+	-	
Disagree							-	+	
How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to keep a set of keys to your home for emergencies (NComfort1/ ZNComfort1)		Very comfortable	-				-		
		Fairly comfortable							-
		Fairly uncomfortable							
		Very uncomfortable	+				+		+
		Comfortable	-				-		-
		Uncomfortable	+				+		+
How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to collect a few shopping essentials if you were ill and at home on your own (NComfort3/ ZNComfort3)		Very comfortable		-			-	+	
		Fairly comfortable							-
		Fairly uncomfortable							
		Very uncomfortable							+
		Comfortable	-						-
		Uncomfortable	+						+

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevendean
	Community Cohesion	Whether agree or disagree that: People in this neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood (Spull/ Zspull)	Definitely agree					+
Tend to agree								
Tend to disagree							-	
Definitely disagree				+				
Agree							+	
Disagree							-	
Agreement that: You can influence decisions affecting your local area (PAffLoc/ ZPAffLoc)		Definitely agree						
		Tend to agree				+	+	
		Tend to disagree						
		Definitely disagree					-	
		Agree	+		+	+	+	
		Disagree	-		-	-	-	
How important is it for you personally to feel that you can influence decisions in your local area? (Pinfl/ ZPinfl)		Very important		-				
		Quite important			-	-		-
		Not very important						
		Not at all important	-					
		Very/quite important					-	-
		Not very/not at all important					+	+

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevedean
Social Action	Whether been personally involved in helping out with local issue/activity (ZLocInv1)	No		+	+		-	
		Yes		-	-		+	
	Whether aware of local people getting involved in a local issue/activity (ZLocPeop1)	No	+	+	+		-	
		Yes	-	-	-		+	
	Civic participation in last 12 months (Zcivpar1)	No				-	-	-
		Yes				+	+	+
	Any Civic consultation in past 12 months (Zpconsul1)	No				-	-	-
		Yes				+	+	+
	Any civic activism in the past 12 months (Zcivren)	No					-	
		Yes					+	
	Any civic activism activities in past 12 months (ZCivact2)	No				-	-	
		Yes				+	+	

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	All Saints Action Network, Wolverton	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	Future Wolverton, Wolverton	Station House, Campsea Ashe	The Bevy, Bevendean
Volunteering	Formal volunteering at least once a month (Zformon)	No			+		-	
		Yes			-		+	
	Formal volunteering in last 12 months (Zforvol)	No					-	
		Yes					+	
	Informal help at least once a month (ZIHlpmon)	No					-	
		Yes					+	
	Formal or informal volunteering at least once a month (Zinform)	No		+		-		
		Yes		-		+		
	Formal or informal volunteering in the last 12 months (Zinformor)	No					-	
							+	

Appendix C: Summary of statistical difference – year on year comparison

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough
Social Isolation	How often do you chat to any of your neighbours, more than to just say hello (SchatN)	One most days		
		Once or twice a week		
		Once or twice a month	-	
		Less than once a month		
		Never		
	How often do you feel lonely? (Lonoft)	Often/Always		
		Some of the time		+
		Occasionally		
		Hardly Ever		
		Never		
Health and wellbeing	How is your health in general? (Ghealth)	Very good		
		Good	+	
		Fair	-	
		Bad		
		Very bad		
	How happy did you feel yesterday (ZWellB2)	Low		
		Medium		
		High		
		Very High	+	

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough
Health and wellbeing	How anxious did you feel yesterday (ZWellB3)	Very Low		-
		Low		
		Medium		
		High		
	To what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile (ZWellB4)	Low	-	
		Medium		
		High		
		Very High		
Employability	Respondent economic status 3 categories (DVIL03a)	In employment		
		Unemployed		
		Economically inactive		
Local environment	Satisfaction with local area as a place to live (Slocsats/ Zslocsats)	Very satisfied		
		Fairly Satisfied	+	
		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	-	
		Fairly dissatisfied		
		Very dissatisfied		
		Very/Fairly satisfied	+	
		Very/Fairly dissatisfied		

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough
Local environment	Generally how satisfied are you with the local services and amenities (SatAsset/ ZSatAsset)	Very satisfied		
		Fairly satisfied		
		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		
		Fairly dissatisfied		
		Very dissatisfied		
		Satisfied		
		Dissatisfied		
Community Cohesion	To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together? (Stogeth/Zstogeth)	Definitely agree		
		Tend to agree		
		Tend to disagree		
		Definitely disagree		
	Agree ('definitely' or 'tend to') that local area is place where people from different backgrounds get on well together ()	Agree		
		Disagree		
	How strongly do you feel you belong to: Your immediate neighbourhood (SBeNeigh)	Very strongly	+	
		Fairly strongly		
		Not very strongly		
		Not at all		

Community Cohesion	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough
	Trust in people living in neighbourhood (Strust)	Many of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted		
		Some of the people can be trusted		
		A few of the people can be trusted		
		None of the people in your neighbourhood can be trusted?		
	Proportion of friends the same: Ethnic group as you (Srace/ZSrace)	All the same,		
		More than a half,		
		About a half,		
		Less than a half?		
		All the same,		
Not all the same				
Proportion of friends the same: Religious group as you (Sfaith)	All the same,			
	More than a half,			
	About a half,			
	Less than a half?			
	All the same,			
	Not all the same			

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough
Community Cohesion	What proportion of your friends have a similar level of education (Seduc/ZSeduc)	All the same,		
		More than a half,		
		About a half,		
		Less than a half?		
		All the same,		
		Not all the same		
	Whether agree or disagree that: I borrow things and exchange favours with my neighbours (sFavN/ ZSFavN)	Definitely agree		
		Tend to agree		
		Tend to disagree		
		Definitely disagree		
		Agree		
		Disagree		
	How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to keep a set of keys to your home for emergencies (NComfort1/Z NComfort1)	Very comfortable		
		Fairly comfortable		
		Fairly uncomfortable		
		Very uncomfortable		
		Comfortable		
		Uncomfortable		
		Very comfortable		

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough
Community Cohesion	How comfortable would you be asking a neighbour to collect a few shopping essentials if you were ill and at home on your own (NComfort3/Z NComfort3)	Very comfortable		
		Fairly comfortable		+
		Fairly uncomfortable		-
		Very uncomfortable		
		Comfortable		+
		Uncomfortable		-
Community pride/empowerment	Whether agree or disagree that: People in this neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood (Spull/Zspull)	Definitely agree		+
		Tend to agree		+
		Tend to disagree		-
		Definitely disagree		
		Agree		+
		Disagree		-
	Agreement that: You can influence decisions affecting your local area (PAffLoc/ZPAffLoc)	Definitely agree		
		Tend to agree		
		Tend to disagree		
		Definitely disagree		
		Agree		
		Disagree		

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	
Community pride/empowerment	How important is it for you personally to feel that you can influence decisions in your local area? (Pinfl/ZPinfl)	Very important			
		Quite important			
		Not very important			
		Not at all important			
		very/quite important			
		not very/not at all important			
	Do you agree or disagree: when people get involved in their local area they can change the way the area is run (LocAtt/ZLocAtt)	Definitely agree			
		Tend to agree			
		Neither agree nor disagree			
		Tend to disagree		-	
		Definitely disagree			
		Agree			
		Disagree		-	
	Generally speaking, would you like to be more involved in the decisions your Council makes that affect your local area? (Pcsat)	Yes			
		No			
		Depends on the issue			
	Social Action	Any civic activism activities in past 12 months (ZCivact2)	No		
			Yes		

	Question Label (Variable)	Values	Bramley Baths, Leeds	Burton Street Foundation, Hillsborough	
Social Action	Any civic activism in the past 12 months (Zcivren)	No			
		Yes			
	Any Civic consultation in past 12 months (Zpconsul1)	No	-		
		Yes	+		
	Civic participation in last 12 months (Zcivpar1)	No	-		
		Yes	+		
	Whether been personally involved in helping out with local issue/activity (ZLocinv1)	No			
		Yes			
	Whether aware of local people getting involved in a local issue/activity (ZLocPeop1)	No		+	
		Yes		-	
	Volunteering	Formal volunteering at least once a month (Zformon)	No		
			Yes		
Formal volunteering in last 12 months (Zforvol)		No			
		Yes			
Informal help at least once a month (ZIHlpmon)		No			
		Yes			
Informal help in last 12 months (Zinfvol)		No			
		Yes			
Formal or informal volunteering at least once a month (Zinform)		No			
		Yes			

Power to Change

The Clarence Centre
6 St George's Circus
London SE1 6FE

020 3857 7270

info@powertochange.org.uk

powertochange.org.uk

 [@peoplesbiz](https://twitter.com/peoplesbiz)

Registered charity no. 1159982

ISBN 978-1-911324-31-7

