

**The dynamic of social capital, health and economy:
volunteering social capital and civic engagement in South
Yorkshire coalfield communities**

GILBERTSON, Janet <<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3338-7590>> and MANNING, Julie

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/22952/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version


GILBERTSON, Janet and MANNING, Julie (2006). The dynamic of social capital, health and economy: volunteering social capital and civic engagement in South Yorkshire coalfield communities. Other. CRESR, Sheffield Hallam University.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

The dynamic of social capital, health and economy

Jan Gilbertson
Julie Manning



**Volunteering, social capital and civic engagement
in South Yorkshire coalfield communities**

The dynamic of social capital, health and economy

**Volunteering, social capital and civic engagement
in South Yorkshire coalfield communities**

Jan Gilbertson

Julie Manning

This report supplements two earlier studies which examined social capital within the South Yorkshire Coalfield areas of Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham. It is financed by the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) for these areas and utilises survey data collected as part of the earlier social capital studies. Thanks are due to the original Steering Group and, in particular, to Dr. Cathy Read who supported the development of this study, and helped the Centre for Regional and Economic Research (CRESR) at Sheffield Hallam University, secure additional funding for the project from Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster PCTs.

We also wish to thank the regeneration managers in each of the nine communities. Their assessments of the impact of Area Based Initiatives on the creation of social capital carried out for the earlier report (The dynamic of social capital health and economy: The impact of regeneration in South Yorkshire coalfield communities, 2005) greatly assisted the writing of chapter four: levels of participation in the nine communities.

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of members of the research team who worked with us on the earlier social capital report, particularly Geoff Green, who has provided advice and commented on drafts of this report, and Mike Grimsley. Mike originally developed the empowerment index and the notions of horizontal and vertical trust which figure towards the end of this report.

Finally thanks go to all those representatives who were interested in exploring how levels of participation might relate to particular aspects of social capital in the communities and who supported the development of this further study.

| | | | |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|
| Executive summary | 1 | 7. Trust and community participation | 23 |
| 1. Introduction and background | 5 | Measuring trust | |
| Introduction | | Trust and community participation | |
| Background | | 8. Social networks, reciprocal help and support and community participation | 25 |
| The 2000 and 2004 Surveys | | Measuring social networks and reciprocal help and support | |
| 2. The nine communities | 7 | Social networks, reciprocal help and support and community participation | |
| Contextualising the nine communities | | 9. Attitudes towards the area and community participation | 27 |
| 3. Community participation | 9 | Measuring attitudes towards the area | |
| Measuring community participation | | Attitudes towards the area and community participation | |
| Levels of community participation | | Who wants to move out of the area? and who is moving in? | |
| Levels of participation in different types of groups | | 10. Conclusions and potential policy implications | 29 |
| 4. Levels of participation in the nine communities | 11 | Appendices | 31 |
| Levels of participation in the nine communities | | | |
| Levels of participation in different types of groups | | | |
| Modelling levels of participation in the nine communities | | | |
| IMD scores and levels of participation | | | |
| 5. Who participates? | 17 | | |
| Who is participating? | | | |
| Who is participating in what? | | | |
| 6. Civic engagement, efficacy and community participation | 21 | | |
| Measuring civic engagement and efficacy | | | |
| Civic engagement, efficacy and community participation | | | |

1. Introduction and background

Chapter 1 describes the main aims of the report, provides background information and details of the 2000 and 2004 South Yorkshire social capital surveys from which the data has been analysed.

The main aim of the report is to explore the relationship between volunteering or community participation on the one hand and civic engagement, efficacy, trust, neighbourhood reciprocity and attitudes towards the area on the other.

The work builds on two earlier studies. In 2000, Sheffield Hallam University conducted a study of social capital in nine coalfield communities of the South Yorkshire Coalfield. In 2004, Sheffield Hallam University was commissioned to build upon the baseline established in 2000 by re-examining social capital in the nine communities.

The 2000 survey interviewed 4219 residents across the nine communities and a response rate of 46 per cent was achieved. The 2004 survey interviewed 3771 residents across the same nine communities, of which 1071 were interviewed in both 2000 and 2004 (longitudinal element). The response rate in 2004 was 58 per cent overall and 55 per cent for the longitudinal element.

2. The Study areas

This study covers nine communities within the ex-coalfield area of South Yorkshire now covered by the South Yorkshire Objective 1 Programme funded by the European Union. Chapter 2 contextualises these communities.

The nine communities, three from each of three boroughs (Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham) were chosen in 2000 to reflect the diversity of the coalfield. Two areas (Darfield and Brinsworth) are classified as mixed, two (Kendray and Intake) are inner urban and five (Thurnscoe, Denaby, Moorends, Maltby and Rawmarsh) are pit villages.

Although the mixed areas are generally more prosperous, Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2004 scores indicate that all nine areas have more deprivation than the national average. Only Brinsworth has less deprivation, on average, than South Yorkshire as a whole.

The communities are also typified by high levels of unemployment, low average life expectancy, high levels of teenage pregnancies, high levels of premature deaths attributable to circulatory disease and low levels of educational attainment.

All nine communities have regeneration teams and are undergoing a range of Area Based Initiatives (ABIs).

3. Community participation

Chapter 3 explains how community participation was measured in the 2000 and 2004 surveys. The chapter then presents levels of participation and explores how levels have changed between 2000 and 2004.

Key findings from the 2004 survey include:

- 42 per cent of residents are involved with local organisations
- 39 per cent are participating with groups
- 15 per cent indicate they are participating with two or more types of groups
- Hobbies and social groups and sports groups are the most popular types of groups (16 per cent hobbies and social groups and 13 per cent sports groups)
- Five per cent take part in adult education groups

The findings appear to represent a significant increase in levels of participation between 2000 and 2004 as only 21 per cent of residents were involved in local groups in 2000. However, caution needs to be applied when interpreting these change figures. It is, perhaps, likely that responses in 2004 are being influenced by the addition of a second, more probing question about the types of groups residents are involved with.

4. Levels of participation in the nine communities

Chapter 4 explores levels of community participation in each of the nine communities and examines how these levels, potentially, relate to the initiatives and projects taking place in the community. The chapter ends by exploring the relationship between levels of deprivation and levels of participation.

Levels of participation are found to vary widely across the nine communities. Key findings include:

- *Residents from Rawmarsh are most likely to be involved with local organisations*
- *Darfield residents are most likely to be involved with two or more types of groups, hobbies or social groups, sports groups and groups for older people*
- *Residents from Moorends are most likely to have taken part in groups overall and participate in children's groups and health groups*
- *Rawmarsh residents are most likely to participate in religious groups*
- *Kendray residents are least likely to participate in all types of groups except for hobbies and/or social groups (for which Intake residents are least likely to participate) and community groups (for which Denaby residents are least likely to participate)*
- *There are no significant differences between the areas in levels of participation in adult education or political and trade union groups*

Contextual information collected from the nine regeneration managers provides insightful details about the types and levels of community based activities taking place. For many of the communities, this information is reflected in the survey findings.

Exploration of the relationship between levels of community participation and IMD scores indicate that:

- *Overall levels of participation are not related to IMD scores in the nine communities*
- *But, there is a negative relationship between IMD scores and participation in two or more types of groups, adult education groups, health groups and religious groups*

5. Who participates?

Chapter 5 aims to understand who within the nine communities is participating and what types of groups they are participating in.

The importance of exploring the different types of groups people are engaged with in addition to the standard general questions about participation is illustrated. Key findings include:

- *Women, the more educated, owner occupiers and private renters are the most likely to participate overall*
- *Women are more likely to participate in community, adult education, health and religious groups as well as in groups for children and older people. However, men are more likely to participate in hobbies or social groups and political or trade union groups*
- *Older people are more likely to be involved with groups for older people, religious groups and community groups but less likely to be involved with sports groups*
- *Those with higher levels of education are more likely to participate in all types of groups. This is particularly true for adult education groups, health related groups and political or trade union groups*

6. Civic engagement, efficacy and community participation

Chapter 6 describes how civic engagement and efficacy is measured and then explores the relationship between civic engagement, efficacy and participation.

Through the use of an index, civic engagement and efficacy are found to be strongly related to participation. When the individual components of the index are considered separately, feeling informed about local affairs is more strongly associated with participation than either of the other two components (feeling satisfied with the amount of control over decisions that affect personal life and feeling able to influence decisions that affect the neighbourhood).

The chapter concludes by raising questions about the relationship between feeling informed about local affairs and participation.

7. Trust and community participation

Chapter 7 describes how trust is measured and then explores the relationship between trust and community participation.

Horizontal trust, or bonding social capital, is found to have more influence on overall participation than vertical trust, or linking social capital.

Different types of social capital may influence the type of participation. Those with high horizontal trust are more likely to be involved with:

- *Hobbies and social groups*
- *Sports groups*
- *Community groups*
- *Groups for children*

Those with high vertical trust are more likely to be involved with:

- *Adult education groups*
- *Religious groups*

8. Social networks, reciprocal help and support and community participation

Chapter 8 describes how social networks and reciprocal help and support (or reciprocity) are measured and then explores the relationship between social networks, reciprocity and community participation.

Of the three reciprocity questions explored (do neighbours help each other, if you needed a lift urgently could you ask someone and have you done a favour for a neighbour) only having done a favour is strongly related to levels of participation. Those who have done a favour are more likely to participate.

Social networks appear to be more strongly related to levels of participation. Both indicators (knowing people in the area and agreeing with the statement that people from different backgrounds in the area get on) are positively related to participation.

9. Attitudes towards the area and community participation

Chapter 9 explores the relationship between attitudes towards the local area and levels of participation. It also considers which cohorts of people want to move out of the area and which are moving into the area.

A concerning relationship is found when participation levels for those who want to move out of the area are analysed. Residents who want to move out of the area are more likely to be involved with organisations, participate generally in groups and participate in adult education groups.

Those who want to move are:

- *Younger*
- *Private and social renters*
- *More educated*
- *But, work status is not a significant predictor of wanting to move*

However, the picture is relatively encouraging as the characteristics of in-movers are not dissimilar to those wanting to move out. Residents who have moved into the area within the last year are:

- *Younger*
- *Social or, in particular, private renters*
- *On balance, more educated*
- *More likely to participate in adult education groups*

10. Conclusions and key messages

Chapter 10, summarises the report and in light of the findings from the report suggests a number of key messages for the community and voluntary sector operating in these areas.

Introduction

This report aims to explore the relationship between volunteering on the one hand and civic engagement, efficacy, trust, neighbourhood reciprocity and attitudes towards the local area on the other.

The report outlines how volunteering, civic engagement, trust and social capital have been operationalised. It then highlights the statistical relationships that exist between each of these components of social capital and participation.

Finally the report highlights possible policy implications of these relationships.

Background

In June 2004 Sheffield Hallam University was commissioned to re-examine social capital in nine coalfield communities of the South Yorkshire coalfield. The study, reported in *'The dynamic of social capital, health and economy'*¹, builds upon a baseline established in 2000.

Both these studies reflected a determination by public authorities to reinvest in the ex-coalfield communities of South Yorkshire and the need to evaluate how successful the intervention by the local and health authorities to replenish social capital had been.

Findings from the studies suggested that: social capital contributes to health and prosperity; investment in social capital is a vital part of any regeneration programme; investment in social capital can enhance levels of human capital and help people into work; social capital is an asset which must be replenished to promote economic regeneration and neighbourhood sustainability; social capital encourages participation in the labour market through better mental health, a key factor behind high rates of long term illness; community safety is improved by increased levels of social capital.

During the launch event for the 'The dynamic of social capital, health and economy'² report, the question of what levels of community participation were like in each of the nine communities and how these related to social capital in the areas was raised. This aspect of the data had not been fully explored partly because of limitations on time and resource but evidence from area managers operating in the nine localities had suggested that successful regeneration was influenced by the degree of community engagement.

There was general consensus at the launch that further investigation of the levels of community participation would be worthwhile, and that the data collected as part of the social capital surveys, presented a great opportunity to explore the relationship between volunteering and social capital in the nine communities.

Given current debates around citizenship, social capital and social and community cohesion, such analysis is likely to be extremely timely and will potentially have important implications for policy makers. The Home Office have made a 'commitment to increase voluntary and community sector activity under PSA (Public Service Agreement) 8 ("To increase voluntary and community sector activity, including increasing community participation, by 5% by 2006") and PSA6 ("To increase voluntary and community engagement, especially among those at risk of social exclusion"). These PSAs cover the period 2003/04 to 2007/08³. 2005 has also been designated the UK Year of the Volunteer.

The 2000 and 2004 surveys

As already mentioned two surveys were undertaken for the earlier social capital studies. They represent 'the largest such surveys ever undertaken in England' (John McIvor, Chief Executive, Rotherham Primary Care Trust, 2005).

Full details about the sample statistics for both surveys are provided in the *'The dynamic of social capital, health and economy'* report. In summary:

¹ Gilbertson, J, Green, G, Grimsley, G and Manning, J (2005) *The dynamic of social capital health and economy: the impact of regeneration in South Yorkshire coalfield communities*, Sheffield Hallam University.

² Green, G, Grimsley, M and Suokas (2000) *Social capital health and economy in South Yorkshire coalfield communities*, Sheffield Hallam University.

³ (Home Office (2005) *Voluntary and Community: The State of the Sector Panel: Progress Autumn 2005* [online] last accessed on 16 December 2005 at www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/sosp.html).

- *The first survey (2000), interviewed 4219 residents across the nine communities*
- *In 2000, an overall response rate of 46 per cent was achieved*
- *The second survey (2004) interviewed 3771 residents across the nine communities, of which 1071 respondents were interviewed in both surveys – this is known as the ‘longitudinal’ or ‘panel’ element and enabled a robust assessment of changes in social capital and its determinants between 2000 and 2004.*
- *In 2004, the response rate was 58 per cent overall and 55 per cent for the longitudinal element*

2




Figure 2.1:
South Yorkshire Coalfield Communities, 1981

Contextualising the nine communities

This study covers nine communities within the ex-coalfield area of South Yorkshire now covered by the South Yorkshire Objective 1 Programme funded by the European Union. The 2005 report *'The dynamic of social capital, health and economy'* provided a full overview of the areas together with nine individual community profiles. Within this report a summary of the overview is presented in order to provide context to the findings.

Following a convention developed by Sheffield Hallam University and adopted by the UK Government Task Force, 'pit village' defines a ward where over 25 per cent of males worked in mining. 'Coalfield communities' defines a ward where between 10 and 20 per cent of males worked in mining. The map shows how the mining communities were distributed across the 65 South Yorkshire electoral wards in 1981. Thurnscoe, one of our study areas, had the highest proportion of males working in mining; two-thirds of all resident men worked in the mines. Taken as a whole, coal mining engendered high levels of solidarity in the work place and high levels of community spirit in the villages and towns which housed its workforce.

The nine communities, three from each of three boroughs (Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham) were originally selected in 2000 by the Social Capital Steering Group. They were chosen to reflect the diversity of the Coalfield using a schema developed by a Barnsley MBC representative. Deprived areas could either be 'inner urban' or 'pit villages'. Mixed areas are generally more prosperous.

Figure 2.2: **Study areas**

| Area | Type | Ward 2004 | Borough |
|------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Darfield | Mixed | Darfield | Barnsley |
| Kendray | Inner urban | Stairfoot | Barnsley |
| Thurnscoe | Pit village | Dearne North | Barnsley |
| Denaby | Pit village | Conisbrough & Denaby | Doncaster |
| Intake | Inner urban | Town Moor | Doncaster |
| Moorends | Pit village | Stainforth & Moorends | Doncaster |
| Brinsworth | Mixed | Brinsworth & Catcliffe | Rotherham |
| Maltby | Pit village | Maltby | Rotherham |
| Rawmarsh | Inner/pit | Rawmarsh | Rotherham |





Figure 2.3:
Index of Multiple deprivation 2000

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 (IMD 2004) is a measure of multiple deprivations at the small area level produced by the Social Disadvantaged Research Centre (SDRC) for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). The Index is a Super Output Area (SOA) level measure of multiple deprivations and is made up of seven SOA level domain indices. The seven domains relate to income deprivation, employment deprivation, health deprivation and disability, education, skills and training deprivation, barriers to housing and services, living environment deprivation and crime. Higher scores indicate more deprived areas.

IMD scores can be used to place our nine communities within a wide socio-economic context. Figure 2.4, indicates current levels of deprivation in the nine communities and compares this to national average. In 2004 all nine of our communities have higher levels of deprivation than a national average. The relative position of the nine study areas to each other is similar to 2000. Denaby and Kendray remain the two most deprived areas. For example, Denaby has an IMD score of 66 compared with a national average of 22 and an average across the nine areas of 40. Brinsworth is the least deprived area and has less deprivation, on average, than South Yorkshire as a whole. However, it should be noted that the IMD score reveals higher levels of deprivation in Brinsworth compared with the national average.



The earlier social capital report also found that the nine communities were, generally, typified by high levels of unemployment, low average life expectancy, high levels of teenage pregnancies, high levels of premature deaths attributable to circulatory disease and low levels of educational attainment.

All nine communities have regeneration teams and are undergoing a range of Area Based Initiatives (ABIs). Initiatives and projects common to the nine communities include; Single Regeneration Budget, Sure Start Plus, Health Action Zones, Sports Action Zones, Youth Inclusion Programme, Communities against drugs, Drug Action teams and Youth Music Action Zones.

3

This chapter aims to explain how community participation is measured in this study, present levels of participation found and explore how levels have changed between 2000 and 2004.

Measuring community participation

Levels of community participation were measured using two survey questions. The first question taken from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) harmonised questionnaire was asked in both the 2000 and 2004 surveys:

'Have you been involved in any local organisation(s) or activities over the last 3 years?'

In 2004 a second question, again taken from the ONS harmonised questions, was added to gain more detailed understanding of community participation in our areas:


'Which of these categories on this card best describes any groups you have taken part in over the last 3 years?'

- Hobbies/social clubs
- Sports/exercise groups, including taking part, coaching or going to watch
- Local community or neighbourhood groups
- Groups for children or young people
- Adult education groups
- Groups for older people
- Environmental groups
- Health, disability and welfare groups
- Political groups
- Trade Union groups
- Religious groups, including going to a place of worship or belonging to a religious based group
- Other group (please specify)

Levels of community participation

In 2004, 42 per cent of residents indicated they had been involved with local organisations in the last three years and 39 per cent had taken part in groups (see Figure 3.1). Fifteen per cent also indicate they had been involved with two or more types of groups.

These figures represent a significant increase from 2000 when only 21 per cent of the sample indicated they had been involved with local organisations. This rise is reflected in the responses from the longitudinal element of the survey with an increase from 27 per cent to 57 per cent over the four year period.



These findings appear to indicate that participation levels have increased substantially across the nine communities. However, caution needs to be applied when interpreting these change figures. At the national level, in 2000, 21 per cent⁴ of respondents were involved with local organisations, a similar proportion as that found in the South Yorkshire coalfields at the time. Although the national question used in the General Household Survey (GHS) is not identical to the one asked within our survey⁵, it provides the best benchmark available.

Have levels of involvement increased substantially in these nine communities to a level that is well above comparable national figures? Or is the question in our survey picking up something different in 2004? Perhaps more likely, responses in 2004 are being influenced by the addition of the second

⁴ General Household Survey – Social Capital Module 2000.


⁵ General household survey – social capital module 2000 question asks: 'Have you been involved in any local organisations on a voluntary basis over the last three years (i.e. work for which you are not paid, except for expenses)?'

participation question which, through probing deeper into the types of groups people have taken part in, provides a better understanding to the respondents of what is meant by community participation. Indeed, 95 per cent of those who said they had taken part in local groups also indicated they had been involved with local organisations. This could actually suggest that the level of participation in our nine communities may have been under reported in 2000.

Due to the risk of a potential difference in respondents' understanding of the question in 2000 and 2004, this report therefore restricts its analysis to the 2004 survey.

Levels of participation in different types of groups

As noted above, the 2004 survey introduces a new question which gathers information about the type of group(s) residents are involved with. Figure 3.2 presents the levels of participation in 11 different types of groups. Perhaps unsurprisingly, hobbies/social and sports groups are the most popular types of groups; 16 per cent of residents have taken part in hobbies/social groups and 13 per cent in sports groups.




4

This chapter will explore levels of community participation in each of the nine communities, examine how these levels, potentially, relate to the initiatives and projects taking place in the respective areas and how levels compare with averages for the nine communities combined. The chapter ends by exploring the relationship between levels of deprivation and levels of participation.

Levels of participation in the nine communities

Overall levels of participation vary widely across the nine communities (see Figure 4.1). For example, 53 per cent of residents in Rawmarsh are involved with local organisations, some 26 percentage points higher than for Kendray (27 per cent).



Levels of participation in different types of groups

The work undertaken for the earlier social capital report involved collecting contextual information from local regeneration managers about the impact of ABIs on social capital formation. This information, together with area profile data (see Gilbertson et al, 2005) contains insightful details about the types and levels of community based activities taking place. Here we re-consider this information in the light of findings on the levels of participation in different types of groups.

Barnsley


Darfield

Levels of participation in Darfield are thought to be improving:

'Things are moving forward in terms of community involvement and the development of projects based on community consultation' (Darfield Regeneration Manager, 2005)

Specific initiatives include a family support strategy and a recently built, large (£1.5m), health centre which opened in April 2004.

These comments and initiatives seem to be reflected in the survey findings. Darfield has relatively high levels of participation (see Figures 4.1 and 4.2) and has the highest proportion of residents involved in two or more groups (23 per cent), hobbies and social groups (22 per cent), groups for older people (eight per cent), environmental groups (two per cent) and religious groups (eight per cent). The area also has above average levels of participation in organisations, sports groups, groups for children, adult education and health groups.



Kendray

Participation in Kendray is being actively encouraged:


'A key principle of the Kendray Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder is to ensure community engagement at all levels' (Kendray Regeneration Manager, 2005).

Numerous initiatives and projects have been, or are, taking place including a football complex which opened in 2000, the development of a range of outdoor play and recreational facilities, Neighbourhood Wardens scheme and Sure Start.

In contrast, the survey findings indicate that Kendray has the overall lowest proportion of resident's actively participating compared with the other eight communities (see Figures 4.1 and 4.3). Specifically, Kendray has the lowest proportion of residents involved with organisations (27 per cent), groups (18 per cent), two or more types of groups (seven per cent), hobbies and social groups (14 per cent), sports groups (six per cent), groups for children (three per cent), adult education groups (two per cent), groups for older people (one per cent), environmental groups (zero per cent), health groups (one per cent) and religious groups (two per cent).

However, these findings are, perhaps, to some extent explained by the general recognition that although Kendray has made substantial improvements it still has some way to go:

'Although it is generally felt that significant positive changes have taken place in the neighbourhood, it should be noted that there is still a long way to go in Kendray' (Kendray Regeneration Manager, 2005)




Thurnscoe

Thurnscoe has a wide range of initiatives taking place including Sure Start and a Sports Development worker. In addition, it has a Healthy Action Zone (HAZ) initiative called 'Heart Health Community Development Project' which works with the community to improve heart health through physical activity. However, engaging residents in community activities has been challenging:

'It is however difficult to get the community to accept they are part of the solution.' (Thurnscoe Regeneration Manager, 2005)

The survey results for Thurnscoe are quite mixed (see Figures 4.1 and 4.4). Thurnscoe has the highest level of partici-

pation in children's groups (12 per cent), which is perhaps a reflection of the activities being undertaken in the area by Sure Start. The community also has relatively high levels of participation in groups overall (27 per cent) and in particular in hobbies and social groups (19 per cent), community groups (9 per cent) and groups for older people (5 per cent). However, levels of participation in health groups and sports groups – which perhaps could have been improved by the activities of the sports development worker and the HAZ initiative – is only around the average level for the nine communities.



Doncaster

Denaby

Denaby has a Sure Start initiative and has recently built and opened a new leisure centre and skate park:


'...the Dearne Valley Leisure Centre has had a positive impact on the leisure infrastructure' (Denaby Regeneration Manager, 2005)

In addition, Denaby Development Trust hosts a monthly public meeting with increasing attendance from both individuals and groups engaged in their community.

'Denaby has more individuals and groups involved and engaged in their communities. This is reflected in the fact that the Denaby Main Forum public meeting now hosts reports from 29 groups.' (Denaby Regeneration Manager, 2005)

Although it should be remembered that the survey question may not capture the activities of the 29 groups, the perceived increased levels of participation do not appear to be reflected in the survey findings (see Figures 4.1 and 4.5). Compared with the other eight communities, Denaby has the lowest proportion of residents participating in community groups (four per cent) and below average levels of participation in two or more groups (10 per cent), hobbies and social groups (15 per cent), sports groups (10 per cent), children's groups (six per cent), adult education (three per


cent), environmental groups (zero per cent), health groups (two per cent), political groups (zero per cent), trade union groups (zero per cent) and religious groups (three per cent).



Intake

Initiatives taking place in Intake include a 'well-established' Sure Start project. In addition, the area has a recently developed Community Social Enterprise centre that has a number of community projects based within in it and which provides support and guidance to local residents and community and voluntary groups.

However, the survey found that Intake, generally, has below average levels of participation (see Figures 4.1 and 4.6). This is particularly true for participation in hobbies and social groups which has the lowest levels of the nine communities (11 per cent). Only two of the measures indicate slightly higher levels of participation than the average: community groups (nine per cent) which perhaps could be an outcome of the Community Social Enterprise Centre and health groups (four per cent).




Moorends

The Thorne Moorends Regeneration team are positive about the increased levels of community participation and the level of work being directed at this outcome:

'The staff have worked to engage the community on a variety of levels; holding capacity building events, promoting training and development, encouraging volunteering. Strengthening community and voluntary groups by sharing funding information and promoting sustainability. I believe that with the continued work of Feb - Dec 04 the Thorne Moorends Regeneration Partnership Board will be able to build upon their work and encourage increased participation from the community.' (Thorne Moorends Regeneration Manager, 2005).

Moorends has a Sure Start initiative which has a purpose built, £1m, centre being built on the old infant school site. Moorends Bungalow project also offers a children's breakfast club (children's group).

The survey results confirm the perceptions of the Regeneration team and reveal that Moorends has relatively high levels of participation (see Figures 4.1 and 4.7). In particular they have the highest proportion of residents participating in community groups (12 per cent) and groups for children (12 per cent).



Rotherham


Brinsworth

Brinsworth is less deprived than other areas in the study. For example its unemployment rate is better than the national average. Consequently, it has not been subjected to the same level of ABI intensity as the other eight areas and as a result little has changed in between 2000 to 2004. However:

'an effective community development worker has helped the number of people participating in community groups and activities. The Community Partnership gained Pioneer Areas funding which is beginning to make an impact as much of their effort is going into community engagement activities - health events, galas, entertainment evenings etc. the (Comprehensive) school is being more pro-active regarding community participation and engagement in it's activities' (Brinsworth Regeneration Manager, 2005).

In addition, the area has had a 'Heart Health Development Worker' initiative in the area for the three years running up to April 2003. This initiative looked at lifestyles with the aim of improving heart health.


Such comments and reports seem to be borne out by the survey findings (see Figure 4.1 and 4.8). In general Brinsworth has high levels of community participation. In particular the area has the highest levels of participation in sports groups (20 per cent), adult education (eight per cent), health groups (five per cent) and trade union groups (two per cent). All other individual group indicators are at an average level for the nine communities or higher.



Maltby

Amongst a wide range of projects Maltby has a Sure Start initiative, Neighbourhood Nurseries and a Mental Health Awareness Project. The area has also experienced tangible improvements such as new community and sports facilities. Although the council and other statutory services are beginning to encourage community involvement in service delivery and neighbourhood management, community participation has been hindered by vacancies in key positions:

'Between 2000 and 2004 key positions have remained vacant for substantial periods of time (Community devel-




opment worker, Community Planning Officer, etc) which has impacted on delivery" (Maltby Regeneration Manager, 2005).

The survey results appear to validate these views since they indicate that Maltby has average to low levels of community participation (see Figures 4.1 and 4.9).

Rawmarsh

Initiatives taking place in Rawmarsh include the Rawmarsh Sure Start Programme and the 'High Street Centre' – a training and conference centre located within the local Methodist church

Rawmarsh has relatively high levels of community participation (see Figure 4.1 and 4.10). Indeed, Rawmarsh has the highest proportion of residents involved with local organisations (53 per cent) and the second highest participation in religious groups (six per cent). Perhaps the high levels of participation in religious groups partly reflects the activities of the High Street Centre which is located within a religious building (the question asks about residents participation in Religious groups, including going to a place of worship or belonging to a religious based group).



Modelling levels of participation in the nine communities

Although wide variations in community participation across the nine communities have been identified, it is important to understand the extent to which the underlying characteristics of the population may influence, or be associated with, participation. For example, older people may be more likely to participate – therefore an area with substantially higher proportion of older people might result in higher levels of participation in that area.

Further analysis of findings which goes beyond simple exploration of the data is, therefore, needed. Logistic regression techniques can be used to unpick the extent to which

different factors help to explain why one group of residents is more likely to participate in for example, sports groups, than another. This technique is useful as it allows a number of underlying explanatory variables – such as age – to be taken into account when calculating the extent to which other factors, for example education, may be associated with participation.

Results can be presented as a series of odds ratios (ORs). ORs reflect the probability of a person being in one group rather than another after all other factors incorporated in the analysis have been taken into account. For example, an odds ratio of two means that a person with a known attribute – say they are female – is, on average, twice as likely to participate than a male, after all other factors (such as age and education) have been taken into account. Hence odds ratios can be adjusted for other factors.


Full ORs tables are not presented in the main body of the report, but are included in the appendices. Appendix 1.1 presents ORs for those who are involved with local organisations, have taken part in group(s) and have taken part with two or more types of groups by the study areas. It also indicates the levels of likelihood of participation across different types of groups across the nine study areas. The ORs have been adjusted for age, sex, educational attainment, tenure, mobility, work status and if at least one child lives in the household.

- Residents from Rawmarsh have the highest odds of being involved with local organisations, over two and a half times more likely than residents from Kendray.
- Darfield residents are more likely to be involved with two or more types of groups, hobbies or social groups, sports groups and groups for older people compared with the other areas.
- Residents from Moorends are most likely to have taken part in groups overall and participate in children's groups and health groups.
- Rawmarsh residents have the highest odds of participating in religious groups.
- Kendray residents are least likely to participate in all types of groups except for hobbies and/or social groups (for which Intake residents have the lowest likelihood of participation) and community groups (for which Denaby residents have the lowest likelihood of participation).
- There are no significant differences between the areas in levels of participation in adult education or political and trade union groups.

IMD scores and levels of participation


Although the nine communities (with the exception of Brinsworth) could be defined as deprived areas, chapter 2 illustrated the wide variation in levels of deprivation. Here we explore the relationship between deprivation (as measured by IMD 2004) and levels of participation.

Overall levels of participation (involvement with local organisations and participation in groups) are not related to IMD scores in the nine communities. However, as Figure 4.12 illustrates, there is a significant negative relationship between IMD scores on the one hand and participation in two or



The OR scores indicate, on average, how likely a respondent from a particular study area is to participate compared with Kendray (which has some of the lowest odds of participation), taking into account the respondent and household characteristics given above.

In practice, as Figure 4.11 and Appendix 1.1 reveal, the modelled data presents a similar picture to the simple frequencies outlined earlier. In summary, key findings are:



more types of groups, adult education groups, health groups and religious groups on the other. In other words, the more deprived the area, the lower the levels of participation in these types of groups.

Having established the levels of participation across and within the nine communities and explored the relationship between levels of deprivation and participation the next chapter aims to understand who is participating.


5

Having established the levels of participation across and within the nine communities, this chapter aims to understand who within the nine communities is participating and in what types of groups they are participating in.


Who is participating?

Logistic regression modelling is used to find which cohorts of people are most likely to be participating in the nine communities. As noted earlier, logistic regression modelling allows us to understand if – for example – women are more likely to participate than men independent of their age, educational attainment, employment status, tenure and whether or not there are children in the household. Full tables are presented in Appendix 1.2.


Figure 5.1 (and appendix 1.2) indicates that females are more likely to be involved with organisations and participate in groups than males in the communities. Women are 25 per cent more likely to be involved in local organisations, 31 per cent more likely to participate with groups and 41 per cent more likely to participate in two or more groups than men. All differences are significant.



Tenure also has a significant relationship with likelihood of participation. Owner occupiers are found to be the most likely to participate overall and social renters the least likely. For example, social renters are almost 25 per cent less likely to be involved with organisations than owner occupiers.



However, the most marked influence on likelihood of participation is level of education (see Figure 5.3). Likelihood of participation increases significantly with educational attainment. Residents with no formal qualifications are least likely to participate and those with at least NVQ level four (or equivalent) are most likely. For example, residents with at least NVQ level 4 are almost 6 times more likely to be involved with two or more types and groups compared with those with no formal qualifications.




Age, work status or having children in the household do not have a significant influence on the likelihood that an individual in our study will participate.


Who is participating in what?

Having gained an understanding of who is participating, this section also makes use of logistic regression modelling to gain an understanding of which cohorts of residents participate in what types of groups.

Similar to overall levels of participation, sex – on the whole – was found to be a significant predictor of participation across the different types of groups (see Figure 5.4). Generally women are significantly more likely to participate than men. This is most notable for adult education groups for which the women sampled are over three times more likely to participate.




The three exceptions to this are hobbies and social clubs (women are 26 per cent less likely to participate) and political and/or trade union groups (women are 68 per cent less likely to participate). There are no significant differences in likelihood of participation for sports groups.




Tenure is a significant predictor for participation in adult education groups, political and/or trade union group (owner occupiers are most likely to participate) and religious groups (private renters are most likely to participate). However, tenure is not a significant predictor of participation in hobbies or social groups, sports groups, community groups, groups for children, groups for older people, and health groups.


Similar to overall levels of participation, those with higher levels of qualification are more likely to participate in all types of groups. This is particularly true for; adult education groups, health related groups, political or trade union groups (see Figure 5.6). For example residents with an educational attainment of at least NVQ level 4 are over ten times more likely to participate in adult education groups compared to residents with no formal qualifications.



Although age was not found to be a significant predictor of overall participation, it is a significant predictor of participation for certain types of groups. Older people are more likely to be involved with: groups for older people, religious groups and community groups, but less likely to be involved with sports groups (see Figure 5.7).



Work status is also related to two of the individual types of groups. Residents who are in work are significantly more likely to participate in hobbies and social groups and sports groups than those not in work (see Figure 5.8).



Finally, having children within the household was found only to be a predictor for participation in groups for children. Those residents with a child in the household are over four and a half times more likely to participate than those without.

This chapter illustrates the importance of asking and analysing which types of group's people are engaged with, in addition to the general questions about participation. Key findings include:

- *Women, those with higher levels of education, owner occupiers and private renters are the most likely to participate overall.*
- *Women are more likely to participate in all types of groups apart from hobbies and social groups, sports groups and political or trade union groups.*
- *Older people are more likely to be involved with groups for older people, religious groups and community groups but less likely to be involved with sports groups.*
- *Those with higher levels of education are more likely to participate in all types of groups. This is particularly true for adult education groups, health related groups and political or trade union groups.*

6

This chapter describes how civic engagement and efficacy is measured. It then goes on to explore the relationship between civic engagement, efficacy and participation.

Measuring civic engagement and efficacy

The earlier social capital report⁶ identifies civic engagement and efficacy as one element of social capital.

Self efficacy is defined as 'the degree to which a person feels in control over important aspects of his or her life'². System efficacy is defined as 'confidence amongst citizens that institutions will listen and respond to citizens views'⁷.

Residents are thought unlikely to engage in civic affairs unless they believe they have an influence.

Several survey questions elicit resident's perceptions of civic engagement and efficacy:

'Would you say you are well **informed** about local affairs?'

and how much do you agree with the following statements;

'I am satisfied with the amount of **control** I have over decisions that affect my personal life.'

'By working together, people in my neighbourhood can **influence** decisions that affect the neighbourhood.'

As with the earlier report, answers to the three questions on civic engagement and efficacy were combined into an 'empowerment index'. The higher a resident's score the better their knowledge of local affairs, the more control over their personal life and the more influence they perceive over decisions that affected their neighbourhood.


⁶ Gilbertson et al (2005).

⁷ Campbell, C, Wood, R and Kelly, M (1999) *Social Capital and Health*, Health Education Authority, 22.


⁸ Joint institute for Social & Economic Research (1999) *People and Places in the North West Inner City area of Sheffield*.

Civic engagement, efficacy and community participation

Figure 6.1 illustrates that civic engagement and personal efficacy are strongly related to participation. As levels of empowerment increase, so does the likelihood of participation. For example, those with high empowerment scores are almost three times more likely to be involved with local organisations and participate with groups compared to those with low scores.




This relationship is also found to be the case for all the individual types of groups, with the exception of political or trade union groups for which levels of empowerment are not a significant predictor (see Figure 6.2). The relationship is strongest for participation in groups for children and adult education groups.



When the responses to the three components of the empowerment index are considered separately, generally, those who feel informed are most likely to participate (see Figure 6.3).

■ When the three components of the empowerment index (how well informed about local affairs, satisfaction with level of control, amount of influence) are treated separately, those who feel informed are most likely to participate.



Residents who feel well informed about local affairs are significantly more likely to be involved with local community organisations, groups, two or more groups, sports groups, community groups, groups for children and political or trade union groups.

Feeling satisfied with the level of influence over decisions that affect the neighbourhood is only significantly associated with participating in two or more types of groups and in hobbies and social groups. Those who are satisfied are 35 per cent more likely to participate in two or more groups and 37 per cent more likely to participate in hobbies and social groups.

Finally, satisfaction with the level of control residents have over decisions that affect their personal life is negatively associated with participation in community groups and political and trade union groups.

The relationship between feeling informed about local affairs and participation is interesting to consider. Does feeling informed act as a driver for engagement or do people who participate feel more informed? On balance, this relationship may well be reciprocal and increases in levels of feeling informed may increase levels of participation in a community, which in turn may enhance how informed people feel, and so on.

The key findings from this section of the report show that:

■ Civic engagement and personal efficacy are strongly related to participation – as levels of empowerment increase, so does the likelihood of participation. This relationship holds for participation in all types of groups.

This chapter describes how trust is conceptualised and measured and then moves on to explore the relationship between trust and community participation.

Measuring trust

Trust is important in the debate about social capital. Some commentators see trust as an outcome of social capital,⁹ and others regard it as a component of the shared values which make up social capital, whereas some consider it to be both¹⁰. There are often two types of trust – trust in people we know and the trust we have in those we don't.

Putnam¹¹ distinguishes personal trust from social or system trust. It is argued that the first (personal trust) leads to the second (system trust), which in turn leads to better economic performance (see the sister report for more information¹²).

The survey questionnaire collected information about resident's levels of personal trust and system trust:

'How much do you trust these groups of people?'

- Police
- Courts
- Government
- Local council
- Local councillors
- Local employers
- Neighbours
- Friends
- Family


This question has enabled two trust indexes to be constructed. Firstly, a 'vertical trust' score was calculated by summing resident's responses to levels of trust in police, courts, government, local council, local councillors and local employers. Vertical trust or system trust is used here as a

measurement of 'linking social capital'. *Linking social capital 'refers to the relationship between individual groups in different social strata in a hierarchy where power, social status and wealth are accessed by different groups'*¹³.

Secondly, a 'horizontal trust' score was calculated by summing resident's responses to levels of trust in neighbours, friends and family. Horizontal trust or personal trust is used here as a measure on 'bonding social capital'. Bonding social capital is *'provided by close family and friends providing tangible assistance and care and creating a sense of well-being'*¹⁴.

Trust and community participation

Overall horizontal trust is found to have a stronger relationship with community participation than vertical trust. Resident's levels of vertical trust are not related to overall participation. However, those with high levels of horizontal trust are significantly more likely to participate than those with low levels (see Figure 7.1). For example residents with high levels of horizontal trust are over two and a half times more likely to be involved with local organisations compared to residents with low levels of horizontal trust.



⁹ Woolcock, M. (2001) The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research 2 (1) pp11-17.

¹⁰ Cote, S., Healy, T. (2001) The wellbeing of nations: the role of human and social capital, Organisation for Economic co-operation and Development, Paris.

¹¹ Putnam, R (1993) *Making Democracy Work, Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princetown University Press.


¹² Gilbertson et al (2005).

¹³ Woolcock, M. (2001) The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research 2 (1) pp11-17.


¹⁴ Gilbertson et al (2005), p8.

A slightly more refined picture emerges if we consider residents levels of trust by the type of groups they are involved with.

Figure 7.2 illustrates that horizontal trust is positively associated with participation in hobbies and social groups, sports groups, community groups and groups for children. Those with high levels of horizontal trust are significantly more likely to participate in these groups than residents with low levels.



Although vertical trust was not found to be a significant predictor of overall participation it is related to participation in adult education groups and religious groups. For example those with high levels of vertical trust are more than twice as likely as those with low levels to participate in religious groups.



The findings may suggest that those with high levels of horizontal trust (or bonding social capital) are more likely to be involved with groups which are, potentially, made up and organised by people similar to themselves e.g. sports, hobbies and social groups. Whilst high levels of vertical trust may indicate a greater likelihood for involvement with institutional type activities such as adult education and religious groups.

This chapter, again, highlights the importance of exploring the types of groups people are engaged with as well as examining levels of participation more generally.

Key findings indicate that:

- Horizontal trust (bonding social capital) seems to have more influence on overall participation than vertical trust (linking social capital).
- Those with high horizontal trust are more likely to be involved with: hobbies/social; sports; community and children's groups.
- Those with high vertical trust are more likely to be involved with: adult education and religious groups.
- Different types of social capital (i.e. 'bonding' or 'bridging') appear to have an influence on the type of groups that people participate in.

8

This chapter describes how social networks and reciprocal help and support are measured. It then explores the relationship between social networks, reciprocal help and support and community participation.

Measuring social networks and reciprocal help and support

Putnam's definition of social capital¹⁵ adopted in our earlier studies focuses on norms, trust and networks.

The survey contains two questions which measure social networks:

'Thinking about your immediate area would you say that you know most/many/a few/not many of the people in your neighbourhood?'

and

'To what extent do you agree or disagree that this neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?'

Both these questions are measures of "local social capital" which was identified as important to local residents in one of the workshops undertaken with local people¹⁶. The second question (which was added to the survey in 2004) relates to recent developments in the concept of social capital. In Putnam's later work¹⁷, he distinguished between two important types of social capital – bridging and bonding. Bonding social capital, as defined earlier in this report in chapter 7, relates to the cementing of homogeneous groups and is good for 'getting by'. Bridging social capital are the bonds of connectedness that are formed across diverse social groups and seen as crucial for 'getting ahead'¹⁸. The new question incorporated into the 2004 survey – of whether people from different backgrounds get on – is designed to elicit bridging social capital.

¹⁵ Putnam, R.D. (1993) *Making Democracy work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

¹⁶ Gilbertson et al (2005), p9

¹⁷ Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling alone – The collapse and revival of American community*, New York: Simon and Schuster

¹⁸ see Gilbertson et al (2005), p9

¹⁹ Gilbertson et al (2005), p43

Levels of reciprocal help and support have been measured using three survey questions:

'In general what kind of neighbourhood would you say you live in? Would you say it is a neighbourhood in which people do things together and try and help each other or one in which people mostly go their own ways?'

'In the past 6 months have you done a favour for a neighbour?'

and


'If you needed a lift to be somewhere urgently, could you ask anyone for help?'

These questions, which help measure 'bonding social capital, have a 'degree of consistency between responses and over time'¹⁹.

Social networks, reciprocal help and support and community participation

Two of the reciprocity questions – help each other and needed a lift could ask someone – were found to have little relationship with likelihood of participation.


However, the third question on reciprocity – favour for a neighbour – was found to be strongly related to likelihood of



participation (see Figure 8.1). Those who have done a favour for a neighbour in the last six months are significantly more likely to participate overall and participate in most types of groups. The only exception to this is participation in hobbies and social groups and political or trade union groups which were not found to be related to having done a favour for a neighbour.


Social networks appear to have a stronger relationship with participation (see Figures 8.2 and 8.3). The more people in the area that residents know, the more likely they are to participate in two or more types of groups, and in hobbies and social groups, community groups and groups for children. For example residents who say they know many people in the neighbourhood are over two and a half times more likely to participate in groups for children than people who do not know many people.

Figure 8.2: **Adjusted ORs for participation and know people in the area**



A resident's opinion on whether people from different backgrounds in the area get on is also a strong predictor of participation. Residents that definitely agree that people from different backgrounds in the area get on are significantly more likely to be involved with organisations and participate with groups, two or more types of groups, hobbies and social groups, sports groups and groups for children than those who definitely disagree with the statement.

Figure 8.3: **Adjusted ORs for participation and people from different backgrounds get on**



In summary, of the three reciprocity questions explored, only having done a favour is strongly related to levels of participation.

- Social networks appear to be more strongly related to levels of participation.
- Both indicators – knowing people in the area and agreeing with the statement that people from different backgrounds in the area get on – are positively related to participation.

9

This chapter explores the relationship between attitudes towards the local area and levels of participation. It then considers which cohorts of people want to move out of the area and which are moving into the area.

Measuring attitudes towards the area

Other surveys have found that attitudes towards the area relate to levels of participation. Analysis of the New Deal for Community survey data²⁰ found length of residence in the area to be positively related to participation (as length of residence increases so does likelihood of participation). The analysis also revealed that those who perceive a high degree of problems in the local area (anti-social and environmental problems) are more likely to participate than those who do not.

Within this report attitudes towards the area have been measured using three survey questions:

'Taking everything into account, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with (this area) as a place to live?'

'How long have you lived in (this area)?'

and

'Do you want to stay in (this area)?'


Attitudes towards the area and participation

Satisfaction with the area does not influence participation apart from participation in sports groups. Those who are satisfied are 42 per cent more likely to participate in sports groups than residents who are dissatisfied.

Length of residence was found only to be a predictor of participation in adult education. Perhaps surprisingly, this relationship is negative. For example, residents who have lived in the area between four and 10 years are 65 per cent less likely to participate in adult education groups than residents who have been in the area less than a year.

A worrying relationship is found when we explore participation levels for those who want to move out of the area (see Figure 9.1). Residents who want to move out of the area are significantly more likely to be involved with organisations and participate in groups than those who want to stay. These residents are also 62 per cent more likely to take part in adult education groups.

These findings raise some interesting questions about the long term sustainability of these areas. For example; is participation good for the areas long term sustainability? Are those who want to move out of the areas relatively better off than those moving in?



Who wants to move out of the local area?

Exploration of who want to move out of the areas in the study reveals that:

- Younger people are more likely to want to move – residents aged 65 and over are 80 per cent less likely to want to move compared to those aged 16 to 24.
- Private or social renters are more likely to want to move – private renters are 85 per cent more likely to want to move compared with owner occupiers.
- More educated residents are more likely to want to move – residents who have attained at least NVQ level

²⁰ Hickman, P and Manning, J (2005) *Community involvement in neighbourhood regeneration: who participates?* Voluntary Action, Vol 7, 1 pp43-51

four are more than twice as likely to want to move as those with no formal qualifications.

- But, work status is not a significant predictor of wanting to move.

Who is moving in to the communities?

The definition of in-movers adopted by the report is residents who have been in the area for less than a year. Logistic regression modelling reveals that in-movers to the nine communities are not dissimilar to those expressing a desire to move out (see Figure 9.2). Residents who have moved into the area within the last year are:


- Younger – residents aged 65 and over are 95 per cent less likely to be in-movers than those aged 16 to 24
- Social or, in particular, private renters – private renters are six and a half times more likely to be in-movers compared with owner occupiers.

Similar to those who want to move out of the area, work status is not a significant predictor of which residents are in-movers.

Finally, the relationship between educational attainment and likelihood of being an in-mover is not straight forward. Residents with NVQ level one are least likely to be in-movers and those with NVQ level three are most likely.

Nevertheless, the overall picture is quite encouraging. Although, residents wanting to move out of the area are younger, more educated and more likely to participate, in-movers into the nine communities are also younger and, on the whole, more educated and also more likely to participate in adult education groups.

Figure 9.2: **Adjusted ORs for want to move and in-movers**



It should be remembered when studying who wants to move out of the area versus who is moving into the area, that the first of these questions relates to aspirations. It establishes if residents would like to move, but does not provide an indication of whether this desire will be translated into an actual move. Indeed, it is unlikely that all residents wanting to move will move out of the area.

10

This study provides an insight into the levels of community participation in nine ex-coalfield communities in South Yorkshire, and examines how levels of participation, and participation in different types of groups in these areas, relate to particular components of social capital (civic engagement, efficacy, trust and neighbourhood reciprocity). It also examines whether attitudes towards the local area influence levels of participation.

The report utilises data collected for two earlier social capital studies undertaken in these communities and this analysis is funded by Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham PCTs.

The main results are summarised below.

Summary of findings

Overall participation levels are higher for:

- Women
- Better educated
- Owner occupiers
- Those with high levels of empowerment and, in particular, those who feel well informed about local affairs
- Those with high levels of horizontal trust (bonding social capital), although participation in adult education and religious groups is associated with high levels of vertical trust (linking social capital)

The bad news is:

- Participation is associated with aspirations to leave the local area - those that want to move are more likely to participate with organisations, groups and adult education groups than people who want to stay in the area

However, the good news is:

- Residents who have newly moved into the area are not dissimilar in characteristics to those who want to move. They are also more likely to participate in adult education groups

Key messages for policy makers and the community and voluntary sector include:

- 1 Educational attainment, feelings of empowerment and levels of trust are important factors which influence the likelihood of participation in local organisations and groups.
- 2 Participation in local organisations and groups enhances feelings of civic engagement.
- 3 Certain types of social capital appear to influence different types of participation - if involvement in wider groups is to be encouraged, then it may be necessary to pay attention to, and invest in, policies and initiatives which help to enhance a communities' 'vertical trust' i.e. trust in employers and other institutions.
- 4 Given the relationship between wanting to move, participation and educational attainment - it is important to consider issues which relate to a local area's long term sustainability.

Appendix 1.1: **Adjusted ORs for participation by area**

| Area | Organisations | Groups | 2+ types of group | Hobbies/social | Sports | Community | Children | Adult Education | Older people | Health | Religious | Political/tradeunion |
|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Kendray | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s |
| Brinsworth | 1.48 | 1.56 | 2.25 | 0.97 | 2.47 | 1.34 | 3.13 | 2.14 | 2.78 | 3.45 | 2.09 | |
| Denaby | 2.19 | 1.67 | 1.57 | 1.18 | 2.23 | 0.74 | 3.56 | 2.15 | 3.49 | 1.53 | 2.26 | |
| Intake | 1.22 | 1.30 | 1.43 | 0.72 | 1.49 | 1.44 | 1.94 | 0.85 | 2.04 | 3.24 | 1.40 | |
| Darfield | 1.81 | 1.98 | 3.01 | 1.49 | 2.75 | 1.01 | 3.87 | 2.03 | 4.89 | 2.22 | 3.20 | |
| Maltby | 1.32 | 1.42 | 1.50 | 0.89 | 1.31 | 1.42 | 1.98 | 2.09 | 1.84 | 2.78 | 2.33 | |
| Moorends | 2.05 | 2.28 | 2.22 | 1.10 | 2.23 | 2.14 | 4.87 | 2.01 | 2.47 | 3.65 | 1.25 | |
| Rawmarsh | 2.74 | 2.25 | 2.89 | 1.39 | 1.63 | 1.64 | 3.11 | 2.16 | 4.88 | 2.38 | 3.67 | |
| Thurnscoe | 1.52 | 1.67 | 1.66 | 1.33 | 1.72 | 1.58 | 2.87 | 1.56 | 4.38 | 1.14 | 1.19 | |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant

Appendix 1.2: **ORs for participation**

| Sex | Organisations | Groups | 2+ types of group | Hobbies/social | Sports | Community | Children | Adult Education | Older people | Health | Religious | Political/tradeunion |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Male | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Female | 1.25 | 1.31 | 1.41 | 0.74 | | 1.38 | 2.38 | 3.01 | 2.21 | 1.94 | 2.03 | 0.32 |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16-24 | n.s. | n.s. | n.s | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s. | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | 1.00 | n.s |
| 25-34 | | | | 1.57 | 0.96 | 1.96 | | | 2.70 | | 1.75 | |
| 35-54 | | | | 1.30 | 0.64 | 2.12 | | | 5.14 | | 2.11 | |
| 55-64 | | | | 1.69 | 0.62 | 3.44 | | | 5.74 | | 3.60 | |
| 65+ | | | | 1.52 | 0.40 | 3.15 | | | 26.36 | | 6.84 | |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| none/other | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| NVQ1 | 1.26 | 1.32 | 2.13 | 1.13 | 1.70 | 0.96 | 2.26 | 2.06 | 1.26 | 0.79 | 1.74 | 2.94 |
| NVQ2 | 1.87 | 2.00 | 2.21 | 1.22 | 1.95 | 1.90 | 2.18 | 4.13 | 1.29 | 2.45 | 2.04 | 1.21 |
| NVQ3 | 2.32 | 2.60 | 2.90 | 1.53 | 2.10 | 3.62 | 3.14 | 6.83 | 2.58 | 2.50 | 1.66 | 2.80 |
| NVQ4 | 4.55 | 4.95 | 5.81 | 1.79 | 3.96 | 2.84 | 4.65 | 10.67 | 1.93 | 7.71 | 4.67 | 5.29 |
| Workless | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | n.s. | n.s. | n.s | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s. |
| No | | | | 1.38 | 1.31 | | | | | | | |
| Children | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | n.s. | n.s. | n.s | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | 1.00 | n.s. | n.s. | n.s | n.s | n.s. |
| Yes | | | | | | | 4.65 | | | | | |
| Tenure | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Owner occupied | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | 1.00 | n.s. | n.s. | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Social rented | 0.76 | 0.73 | 0.71 | | | | | 0.58 | | | 0.45 | 0.43 |
| Private rented | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.95 | | | | | 0.55 | | | 2.32 | 0.42 |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant

Appendix 1.3: **Adjusted ORs empowerment index and participation**

| | Organisations | Groups | 2+ types of group | Hobbies/social | Sports | Community | Children | Adult Education | Older people | Health | Religious | Political/tradeunion |
|----------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Very low | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s |
| Low | 1.45 | 1.45 | 1.61 | 1.61 | 1.73 | 1.26 | 2.52 | 2.69 | 1.87 | 0.45 | 0.62 | |
| Medium | 1.56 | 1.57 | 2.04 | 1.80 | 2.08 | 1.52 | 2.92 | 2.60 | 1.53 | 0.62 | 0.82 | |
| High | 2.85 | 2.87 | 3.62 | 2.23 | 3.35 | 3.91 | 4.81 | 4.69 | 3.28 | 1.41 | 1.43 | |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant

Appendix 1.4: **Adjusted ORs civic engagement, efficacy and participation**

| | Organisations | Groups | 2+ types of group | Hobbies/social | Sports | Community | Children | Adult Education | Older people | Health | Religious | Political/tradeunion |
|------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|--------|-----------|----------------------|
| Control | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | 1.00 |
| Neither | | | 0.54 | | | 0.50 | | | | | | 0.40 |
| Agree | | | 0.87 | | | 0.66 | | | | | | 0.34 |
| Influence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s |
| Neither | | | 0.93 | 1.09 | | | | | | | | |
| Agree | | | 1.35 | 1.37 | | | | | | | | |
| Informed | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not well/poorly | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s. | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | 1.00 |
| Don't know | 1.08 | 1.03 | 0.75 | | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.99 | | | | | 2.17 |
| Well | 1.26 | 1.27 | 1.42 | | 1.26 | 1.77 | 1.46 | | | | | 2.11 |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant

Appendix 1.5: **Adjusted ORs for trust and participation**

| | Organisations | Groups | 2+ types of group | Hobbies/social | Sports | Community | Children | Adult Education | Older people | Health | Religious | Political/tradeunion |
|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|--------|-------------|----------------------|
| Vertical trust | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s |
| Medium | | | | | | | | 1.57 | | | 1.70 | |
| High | | | | | | | | 1.49 | | | 2.19 | |
| Horizontal trust | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s |
| Medium | 1.52 | 1.45 | 1.19 | 2.49 | 1.28 | 1.51 | 1.74 | | | | | |
| High | 2.58 | 2.50 | 2.40 | 3.59 | 2.27 | 3.66 | 3.94 | | | | | |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant

Appendix 1.6: **Adjusted ORs for social capital and participation**

| Help each other | Organisations | Groups | 2+ types of group | Hobbies/social | Sports | Community | Children | Adult Education | Older people | Health | Religious | Political/tradeunion |
|--|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Go own way | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s |
| Mixture/other | 0.96 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Help each other | 0.83 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Favour for a neighbour | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s |
| Just moved | 1.12 | 1.01 | 0.30 | | 0.57 | 0.76 | 1.19 | 4.71 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 1.47 | |
| Yes | 1.54 | 1.54 | 1.81 | | 1.30 | 1.88 | 1.52 | 4.63 | 1.89 | 2.07 | 1.68 | |
| Need lift could ask someone | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s |
| Just moved | 0.53 | | | | | | | | | 0.30 | | |
| Yes | 0.88 | | | | | | | | | 0.35 | | |
| Know people in the area | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not many | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s |
| Few | | | 1.15 | 1.66 | | 1.48 | 1.72 | | | 0.33 | | |
| Many | | | 0.83 | 1.52 | | 1.08 | 1.50 | | | 0.31 | | |
| Most | | | 1.76 | 2.01 | | 2.41 | 2.67 | | | 0.51 | | |
| People different backgrounds get on | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Def disagree | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s |
| Tend disagree | 0.81 | 0.87 | 0.90 | 1.22 | 0.88 | | 1.45 | | | | | |
| Don't know/too few/all same | 1.04 | 1.08 | 0.91 | 1.07 | 0.95 | | 1.16 | | | | | |
| Tend agree | 1.20 | 1.24 | 1.12 | 1.41 | 1.34 | | 1.19 | | | | | |
| Def agree | 1.89 | 1.84 | 1.81 | 1.66 | 1.98 | | 2.16 | | | | | |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant

Appendix 1.7: **Adjusted ORs for attitudes towards the area and participation**

| Stay in area | Organisations | Groups | 2+ types of group | Hobbies/social | Sports | Community | Children | Adult Education | Older people | Health | Religious | Political/tradeunion |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|--------------|--------|-----------|----------------------|
| Yes | 1.00 | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s |
| No | 1.34 | 1.31 | | | | | | 1.62 | | | | |
| Satisfied with area | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dissatisfied | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s |
| Neither | | | | | 1.32 | | | | | | | |
| Satisfied | | | | | 1.42 | | | | | | | |
| Length residents in area | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Less year | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s | 1.00 | n.s | n.s | n.s | n.s |
| 1 to less 4 | | | | | | | | 0.32 | | | | |
| 4 to less 10 | | | | | | | | 0.35 | | | | |
| 10+ | | | | | | | | 0.46 | | | | |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant

Appendix 1.8: **ORs for who wants to move and who has moved into the areas**

| | Want to move | In-movers |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Sex | | |
| Male | n.s | n.s |
| Female | | |
| Age | | |
| 16-24 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 25-34 | 0.70 | 0.93 |
| 35-54 | 0.50 | 0.42 |
| 55-64 | 0.46 | 0.15 |
| 65+ | 0.20 | 0.05 |
| Tenure | | |
| Owner occupied | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Social rented | 1.28 | 1.98 |
| Private rented | 1.85 | 6.56 |
| Workless | | |
| Yes | n.s | n.s |
| No | | |
| Child | | |
| No | n.s | n.s |
| Yes | | |
| Education | | |
| None/other/skills | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| NVQ1 | 0.93 | 0.68 |
| NVQ2 | 1.33 | 0.83 |
| NVQ3 | 1.47 | 2.03 |
| NVQ4 | 2.07 | 1.34 |

Note: Figures in **bold** are significant at the 95% level / n.s is not significant



Further copies of this report
are available from:

Centre for Regional Economic
and Social Research
Sheffield Hallam University
Unit 10 – Science Park
Howard Street
Sheffield S1 2LX

Tel: 0114 225 3073
Fax 0114 225 2197

Price £10.00 inc p&p
ISBN 1 84387 222 6

This information can be
made available in other
formats. Please contact
us for further details.

*Cover photograph © David Bocking 2003
(0114 266 4866 - david@bocking.co.uk)*

Design: www.paulpugh.co.uk (0114 230 2182)

Print: Northends (0114 250 0331)