

Housing, Regeneration and Planning



The Scottish
Government

Review of the Impact of Community Engagement Within Regeneration



REVIEW OF THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WITHIN REGENERATION

**Elinor Findlay
Communities Analytical Services**

Scottish Government Social Research
2010

This report is available on the Scottish Government Social Research website only www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch.

The views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and do not necessarily represent those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Ministers.

© Crown Copyright 2010

Limited extracts from the text may be produced provided the source is acknowledged. For more extensive reproduction, please contact the Queens Printers of Scotland, Admail, ADM 4058, Edinburgh EH1 1NG. Email: licensing@oqps.gov.uk

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
	<i>Introduction</i>	1
	<i>Background</i>	1
	<i>Research Aim and Objectives</i>	2
	<i>Research Methodology</i>	3
	<i>Quality of Evidence Base</i>	4
2	THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	6
	<i>Introduction</i>	6
	<i>Prominence of Community Engagement within Regeneration</i>	6
	<i>The Impact of Community Engagement</i>	6
	<i>Conclusions</i>	13

APPENDICES

Annex One	Overview of literature search
Annex Two	Overview of UK regeneration programmes

This report was peer reviewed by Professor Paul Burton (Griffith University, Australia) and Victoria Milne (Health Analytical Services, Scottish Government).

SUMMARY

This report provides a brief overview of what is known about the impact of community engagement and empowerment activity within the context of regeneration. It is limited in that it only includes: literature published since 2004 (building on a systematic review of the evidence published in 2004); published literature; and research that considers the impact of community engagement, rather than more discursive literature on good practice.

Prominence of Community Engagement within Regeneration

- Engaging residents and communities has become increasingly popular within regeneration programmes in the United Kingdom.
- The aims of engaging communities are outlined as improving the planning and delivery of services and policies and improving social capital and cohesion, although not all programmes make these aims explicit.

The Impact of Community Engagement

Social Capital and Cohesion

- Positive effects on social capital and cohesion have been reported, including individual growth and personal development. How far these benefits extend beyond those directly involved is questionable.
- Increased levels of involvement and feelings of being informed are associated with increased feelings of 'community' (i.e. belonging).
- However, less positive findings have also been reported and tend to be as a consequence of the *process* used for engaging or involving the community.

Planning and delivery of services and policy

- The literature identifies benefits to both the community (e.g. better access to services, opportunity to share policy) and to service providers (e.g. better access to local intelligence).
- These benefits are more likely to be felt throughout the community rather than solely among those directly involved.
- The corporate attitude of service providers is a key external factor found to influence the impact engagement can have.

Conclusions

- Much of the evidence identified is based on qualitative case study research and the views and experiences of those involved in regeneration programmes, rather than a more comprehensive look at the experiences and motivations of those not involved.
- There is a need for higher quality evidence to more effectively determine the impact of community engagement, from both qualitative and quantitative methods.
- Organisations need to be clearer and more explicit about what they hope to achieve through community engagement activity.
- The process of engaging the community is vital in determining the outcomes that will be achieved.

1 INTRODUCTION

Introduction

1.1 This report reviews the evidence on what is known about the impact of community engagement and empowerment activity within the context of regeneration. This review was conducted for the Community Engagement Team within the Regeneration Division and follows on from the recently published Scottish Community Empowerment Action Plan¹ that commits to developing our understanding of how best to measure the impact of community empowerment activity.

Background

1.2 The Scottish Government is committed to community engagement and community empowerment. That is to say, it is committed to communities being supported to do things for themselves and to people having their voices heard in the planning and delivery of services. A range of policies have been developed in recent years to facilitate this.

1.3 In May 2005, The National Standards for Community Engagement² were launched. The idea for developing the Standards came from people on the front line of community engagement; more than 500 people from the statutory and voluntary sectors and the communities were involved in their development and production. The Standards set out best practice principles for the way that government agencies, councils, health boards, police and other public bodies should engage with communities. In addition, to help everyone involved in community engagement to achieve the Standards, the Scottish Government then commissioned the development of a database tool for planning monitoring and evaluating community engagement; VOiCE (Visioning Outcomes in Community Engagement).

1.4 The Scottish Government has also set up a programme of work to develop a range of learning materials and programmes based on 'Better Community Engagement: A Framework for Learning', to meet the needs of those delivering community engagement in local areas. This will bring national coherence and ensure quality in training and learning around community engagement practice across Scotland.

1.5 The launch of the Community Empowerment Action Plan in March 2009 was a joint statement of commitment to community empowerment from the Scottish Government and COSLA. It set out the key principles and benefits of empowerment alongside specific actions to be carried out in the coming years. Already many of these action points have been taken forward in relation to community assets, community councils and community capacity building. The action plan defines community empowerment as:

¹ <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-Environment/regeneration/engage/empowerment>

² <http://www.scdc.org.uk/national-standards-community-engagement/>

Community empowerment is a process where people work together to make change happen in their communities by having more power and influence over what matters to them.

1.6 Much is being done to support better community engagement and empowerment - but the question still remains - how do we measure what that engagement and empowerment achieves?

1.7 It is often stated that where communities are engaged and empowered we would expect to see a range of benefits: local democracy boosted; increased confidence and skills among local people; higher numbers of people volunteering in their communities; more satisfaction with quality of life in a local neighbourhood and the delivery of better, more responsive services.

1.8 However, these changes have been measured in lots of different ways in the past with varying success and challenges. There are a number of pieces of work underway in Scotland which can help in this context. Most notably, many of the Single Outcome Agreements include indicators and measures that relate to community empowerment and engagement. However, measuring the impact of engagement is not straightforward; activities within groups or communities can vary widely and one methodology does not fit all.

1.9 This report provides a brief overview of the impact of community engagement and empowerment drawn from a range of existing evidence within the context of regeneration.

Research Aim and Objectives

1.10 The Community Engagement Team within the Regeneration Division asked Communities Analytical Services to provide an overview of what is known about the impact of community engagement and empowerment activity within the context of regeneration and to explore how its impact is currently being measured in Scotland.

1.11 The following research objectives were therefore set:

- Provide a succinct overview of the impact of community engagement and empowerment within the context of regeneration.
- Examine how the impact of community engagement and empowerment within regeneration is being measured via Single Outcome Agreements in Scotland.

1.12 This report outlines the findings from the first research objective.

Research Methodology

1.13 The research comprised a desk based review of previous published literature within this area. The review was not systematic but was designed to identify, as far as possible, research that considered the impact of community engagement and/or empowerment within the context of regeneration.

1.14 In 2004, the Home Office published the results of a systematic review of the literature in relation to what works in community involvement in area-based initiatives³. It was agreed that this research should use this comprehensive review as a starting point and therefore only included research published after 2004.

Scope of Review and Search Terms

1.15 While the main focus of the research was on community engagement and empowerment, as defined in paragraph 1.5, it was agreed it would not be sensible to restrict the review to only considering research that uses these terms. The following search terms were therefore also included:

- Community participation; and
- Community involvement.

1.16 The key principle was that the activity refers to a relationship between a public body and community group or individual to understand or act on community issues. A full outline of the search terms used and databases searched is included in Annex A. Terms used most often included community involvement, community engagement and community empowerment. It is important to note that the terms used to describe activities varied considerably and were not always clearly defined. What one study defined as 'community empowerment' might be defined by another as 'community involvement'. In reporting the findings in Chapter 2, the terms used by individual studies are used to report their findings.

1.17 The literature searches were carried out by the Scottish Government Information Management Unit (Library Services) and were completed by 11 May 2009. Therefore, any research published after this date may not have been identified and included. Only published literature sources were included – grey literature was not reviewed.

1.18 In order to make the review manageable and timely, it was decided to only include literature related to UK programmes or evaluations and exclude literature that focussed on descriptions of how community engagement or empowerment had been carried out, its importance in regeneration, toolkits and think pieces. Only research (both primary research and desk based reviews) that considered the **impact** of community engagement or empowerment activity was included. In addition, only research that dealt with these issues within the context of **regeneration** was included.

³ <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/rdsolr5304.pdf>

1.19 It is important to note that this review does not attempt to look at the relative impact of different methods or techniques used to engage communities. A systematic review has recently been published that looks at the different mechanisms for empowerment (e.g. asset transfer, citizen governance, participatory budgeting) although this is not specific to regeneration (Pratchett et al 2009). Instead, this review attempts to outline the positive and negative impacts engaging communities can have, irrespective of the type of engagement that has taken place. This is not to say that the techniques and methods used are un-important or will not impact on outcomes just that it is not within the scope of this review.

Quality of the Evidence Base

1.20 After reviewing the abstracts identified from the literature search, 36 full text articles and reports were sought. Upon reviewing these articles and reports, further literature was included where relevant (for example, when it was clear further studies were available that might be of interest).

1.21 As outlined in paragraph 1.14, the Home Office published a systematic review in 2004 which looked at the impact of community involvement in area based initiatives (Burton et al 2004). This provides the most comprehensive overview of evidence in this area⁴. Despite this, the authors note that the review has a number of limitations, which are primarily driven by the type and quality of studies available. These include:

- The purpose of community involvement is not always clearly set out in the studies reviewed. Linked to this, many studies do not clearly and systematically outline how far community involvement met its intended aims.
- There is an over-reliance on perceptions of the impact of community involvement among those involved (whether members of the community or wider stakeholders). This raises two issues:
 - The literature does not fully take into account the views, perceptions and experiences of those who do not get involved and cannot therefore provide a balanced view of impact.
 - The actual benefits of community involvement have not been quantified or measured, nor does the literature available tell us about the effects of different types of involvement.

1.22 In terms of type and quality, the evidence identified in this review⁵ broadly echoes that found in the Home Office systematic review. Key points to note include:

- The vast majority of the evidence included in this review relates to evaluations of national regeneration programmes, published by national government (e.g. Communities and Local Government, the Welsh Assembly, the Scottish Government – see Annex B). A number of academic articles are also included

⁴ The review included 26 empirical studies and 8 reviews of the literature.

⁵ It is important to note that this review is not intended to be systematic and therefore may not have identified all of the available literature, although it has aimed to be as comprehensive as possible.

although these mainly focus on one particular aspect of a national evaluation, commissioned by government, in more detail.

- Much of the evidence is based on the views and experiences of those involved in the regeneration programme. Only one study was identified that explored the views, perceptions and experiences of those who were not participating (Mathers et al 2008).
- The evidence is primarily based on case studies of local areas within regeneration programmes. These tend to comprise mainly qualitative interviews and reviews of relevant reports. Some case studies (e.g. SQW Consulting 2008a) also include analysis of household surveys. In some, it is not clear how the case studies were selected and/or carried out.
- The evaluation of the New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme appears to be the most comprehensive. Only two studies were identified that attempt to develop quantifiable measures of community empowerment (Duffy et al 2008, GoWell 2010).

2 THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Introduction

2.1 This chapter addresses the first research objective. It discusses the increased prominence given to engaging communities within the regeneration of deprived areas drawing on recent regeneration programmes from across the UK, before outlining key findings from the literature.

Prominence of Community Engagement within Regeneration

2.2 Engaging residents and communities in the regeneration process has become increasingly popular throughout the United Kingdom. Annex B provides a brief outline of a number of regeneration programmes from England, Wales and Scotland that are underpinned by a strong community engagement focus. This provides a very brief outline of the purpose of the programme, how it sought to engage communities and what the overall aim of the engagement activity was (where this was available). It also briefly notes the focus of any evaluation that was carried out. This is intended to provide a brief overview of regeneration programmes that were identified in the literature search but is not intended to be comprehensive overview of all regeneration programmes that have included community engagement or involvement as a central theme.

2.3 The overall aim of the programmes reviewed is to regenerate deprived communities and it seems to be implicit within the programmes that engaging communities will improve this regeneration process and help the programmes meet their overall regeneration aims (such as improved housing, environments, employment and so on). Some of the programmes more explicitly outline the specific aims of the engagement activity, these include:

- **Improving the planning and delivery of services and policy** – following on from the assumption that by tapping into local knowledge and expertise, services and policy will be more responsive to local needs.
- **Improving social capital and community cohesion** – a number of programmes and evaluations outline potential benefits around social capital and community cohesion. Definitions of these terms tend to cover issues like an increased sense of belonging, ability to make wider connections, improved trust and civic engagement, increased confidence and capacity of individuals, as well as enabling different groups within the community to get on well together. While not all programmes make explicit the aim of engagement as influencing social capital and community cohesion, the evaluations often also consider some of these elements.

The Impact of Community Engagement

2.4 This section outlines the evidence that was identified under the two headings identified above. Some authors also considered and discussed the impact

of community engagement on active citizenship, and the findings related to this are also outlined.

Social Capital and Social Cohesion

2.5 Although most of the evaluations reviewed do consider social capital and cohesion, the prominence given to investigating their outcomes varied across the studies. Most report positive benefits although some also report less positive findings. As noted in paragraph 1.22, much of this evidence is from qualitative methodologies. However, many of the findings around social capital and cohesion seem to be taken from individual case study areas and 'stories' or 'anecdotal' evidence rather than as systematic themes. This section firstly outlines positive findings, before considering negative results.

2.6 The Home Office systematic review (Burton et al, 2004) found the following positive effects of involvement on social capital and cohesion:

- Greater cooperation, communication and contact between participants and others, which fosters further communication in the future.
- Ownership of the outcome of involvement and any subsequent policy decisions.
- A greater sense of identification with the local area.
- A greater sense of tolerance by all involved of the constraints under which public and community representatives operate.
- Some positive signs of trust being developed.
- A sense of partnership and some changed working practices in official agencies.

2.7 Positive effects on social capital and cohesion have also been found in more recently published literature. An evaluation of the Community Participation Programme⁶ (Taylor et al 2005) found broadly positive results. It found that respondents from lead organisations⁷ perceived there to be an increase in involvement of local people in decision making and an increase in capacity among individuals involved while case study respondents felt that significant improvements had been made on networking and coordination and cohesion within the sector. A survey with community groups found that 43% said that receiving the grant had made it more likely that they would engage in networking in the future. The evaluation noted that the Chest Grants were contributing to a variety of social bonding activity (such as social and cultural events, connecting different groups through ICT) and that by giving groups the opportunity to sit on grant panels and make decisions about funding, the chest gave grant recipients the opportunity to learn new skills, gain experiences and realise that their local knowledge was valued. However, a survey of stakeholders (both internal and external) gave an average rating for progress in building capacity, confidence and skills.

⁶ More detail about the nature of the programmes discussed, including the aims and nature of community engagement activity are outlined in Annex B.

⁷ Lead organisations were responsible for channelling funding from funding programmes and were usually Council for Voluntary Services and Voluntary and Community Sector.

2.8 An evaluation of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders reported anecdotal evidence of people feeling more able to influence decisions, as well as stories of individual growth and personal development among those who had been involved (SQW 2008 a and b). Examples of personal development included growing confidence, experience of business meetings, public speaking and understanding accounts. Within this evaluation, however, the difficulties in measuring social capital and community cohesion were recognised (Taylor 2007). These include difficulties in attempting to measure these concepts quantitatively and in attempting to measure progress over a short period given that issues such as trust can take time to develop. The evaluation, therefore, also looked at conditions created that the authors argue could set the right conditions for improving social cohesion outcomes, including:

- Opportunities established for creating different groups to come together.
- New arenas for residents and service providers to work together to change attitudes.
- More willingness to engage among communities and service providers.
- More pride in neighbourhood.

2.9 How far these positive, developmental effects are experienced beyond a very limited number of participants is not clear. Goodlad et al (2005), for example, note that they are likely only to be experienced by a limited number of participants rather than the wider community.

2.10 Two studies were identified that attempted to assess the impact of community empowerment through more detailed analysis of survey data (Duffy et al 2008, GoWell 2010). Duffy et al (2008) re-analysed survey data from the New Deal for Communities household survey (2002, 2004 and 2006) to assess the impact of community empowerment on a number of key outcomes. The authors use two measures to examine community empowerment - feelings of influence and actual involvement in NDC activities. The study explored links between these on a number of key outcome variables:

- Wider perceptions of satisfaction with local area.
- Quality of life.
- Feelings of community and trust.

2.11 Their analysis showed that factors such as connection to others in the neighbourhood, crime and physical appearance of the neighbourhood are more important to these outcomes than empowerment. Other key findings include:

- People do not need to have been involved in NDC activities to feel influential. For example, half of those involved in NDC activities do not feel they have influence over local decisions while two-thirds of those who feel they can influence local decisions have not been involved in NDC activities. However, it is important to note that perceptions are not based on objective views of performance but on expectations. It is reasonable to assume that those involved in NDC activities have higher expectations of what can be achieved than those who are not involved.

- Feelings of influence seem to be more important than actual involvement⁸.
- Increases in levels of involvement show some relationship with increases in feelings of community and views of the success of the NDC (although this was a relatively weak relationship).
- Lapsed involvement and loss of influence can have a very negative impact – some of the most negative changes in perceptions of other key outcomes are seen among those who feel they used to be able to influence local decisions but no longer can.

2.12 Analysis on two waves of cross sectional data from the Glasgow Community Health and Wellbeing Research and Learning Programme (GoWell)⁹ examined whether there is an association between feeling informed and consulted about regeneration and benefits acquired from the neighbourhood (GoWell, 2010). It found that people who feel well informed about regeneration are more likely to:

- Feel a sense of social inclusion (i.e. belonging to the neighbourhood and feeling part of the community).
- Be satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live.
- Derive a sense of personal progress from living in the area.

2.13 It is important to note that none of this analysis tells us about cause and effect – it does not show that feelings of influence or involvement cause changes to the outcomes looked at.

2.14 Less positive findings were reported in a number of studies, and these appeared to be a consequence of the process used for engaging or involving the community. The Home Office systematic review found evidence of negative impacts including feelings of frustration and alienation. Within the literature reviewed, there were a number of descriptions of how the process of community involvement led to this, including:

- Lack of accessible information.
- Inappropriate times for meetings.
- Lack of childcare provision.
- Lack of transparency in decision making.
- Lack of tangible results from the process (Burton et al 2004).

2.15 The evaluation of Community Participation Programme found that it often proved difficult to build bridges between Black and Minority Ethnic networks and the 'mainstream' Voluntary and Community Sector infrastructure (Taylor et al 2005).

2.16 As noted in paragraph 1.22, most of the evidence available is from perception of residents and stakeholders involved in engagement activity and the views and perceptions of non-residents are often not taken into account. Mathers et

⁸ The authors contend this may, in part, reflect the measure of involvement used in the survey which they describe as 'relatively weak'.

⁹ GoWell is a research and learning programme that aims to investigate the impact of investment in housing, regeneration and neighbourhood renewal on the health and wellbeing of individuals, families and communities over a ten-year period. More information can be found at <http://www.gowellonline.com/>

al (2008) is the only study identified that explores the perceptions and motivations of residents who are not involved in New Deal for Communities area. Using a variety of qualitative methods, they examine why people do not participate and how they resist participation. The authors conclude that non-participation is not necessarily the results of a lack of capacity among residents (as is often claimed), but is a rational response to coping with everyday life in their area, which often includes, for example, the need to avoid state agencies which they perceived the NDC to be. Although these results are based on only one case study, it does highlight the need to improve understanding of why some residents do not get involved in engagement activity if an aim of engagement is to encourage involvement.

Planning and delivery of service and policy

2.17 The Home Office systematic review (Burton et al, 2004) concludes that community involvement in relation to the planning and delivery of public services leads to mainly positive impacts. In addition, these benefits are more likely to be experienced by a wider range of groups and service users (Goodlad et al 2005) than those benefits relating to social capital. Positive findings reported include:

- Direct employment and training experience, for example employing local residents to carry out research which lead to enhanced skills, self confidence and self esteem.
- Enhanced visibility of the area and its needs.
- Shaping regeneration strategies to include social issues (such as childcare) as well as economic aims.
- Policy and service effectiveness and realism.

2.18 The authors note in a subsequent publication (Goodlad et al 2005) that the impact of community engagement is more likely to be found on the development of strategies rather than changes to services.

2.19 Another comprehensive review published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (SQW Consulting 2005) looked at whether communities in deprived areas being involved in service provision leads to better outcomes. The review concludes that the benefits of community involvement systematically outweigh the costs. It outlines a number of 'returns' from investment in community involvement including:

- Provides better local knowledge.
- Benefits users' access to services.
- Increases awareness of the potential for joined up solutions among service providers.
- Enhances the motivation of front line staff.
- Encourages innovation in service design and delivery.
- These benefits translate into new and improved services for local people.

2.20 An evaluation of Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders (SQW Consulting 2008a) found evidence of benefits to both residents involved, the wider community and service providers. Benefits to service providers included a greater understanding among residents of the roles and remit of different service providers

and increased communication with residents and therefore better access to local intelligence. This improved communication and greater level of engagement helps service providers identify the need for additional or re-shaped services and enables providers to more quickly tailor services so they are less remote and more responsive to local needs. It also provides access to hard to reach groups and an already made consultative group of residents.

2.21 The evaluation also indicated that the Pathfinders benefited a larger number of people than just those directly involved and could have a more lasting consequence for service delivery. It found the Pathfinder programme successfully influenced service changes across a wide range of services. While the evaluation found that services were re-shaped to improve their relevance or quality and existing services were expanded or improved, there were few instances of changes in corporate policies or direct intentional re-allocation of resources.

2.22 The evaluation also identified a number of benefits to residents involved, including an increased understanding of the way service providers work, what resident entitlements are, what can be expected from service providers and an opportunity for residents to make direct contribution and shape development of their area.

2.23 The most significant external factors found to influence impact was the corporate attitude of service providers. Changes were more likely to happen where they realise the value of engaging residents, have a clear agenda for service improvement and at least some interest in neighbourhood working. While it is not explicit the exact contribution resident involvement had on these outcomes, the evaluation did indicate that the involvement of residents could explain some of the differences observed. It found the involvement of residents:

- Provided a degree of focus and accountability in improvement in services.
- Secured greater responsiveness to local needs than would have been likely without their involvement.
- Provided an energy and vitality to neighbourhood management which has contributed to achieving changes in local services.

2.24 Practical problems with the way involvement was planned and organised were also reported in the studies reviewed (Burton et al 2004). This has been echoed in subsequent studies (e.g. Taylor et al 2005, Lawson 2009) and it is clear the way engagement is carried out has an impact on the likely outcomes. As outlined above how agencies respond to engagement activity is a key factor in influencing its success (SQW Consulting 2008). For example, there is evidence available to suggest that engaging communities has not lead to any changes in design of service provision (Adamson and Bromiley 2008). Looking at the Community First programme in Wales, Adamson and Bromiley (2008) examine the level and nature of community participation and explore the experience of community members. They report that while community members are willing and able to take part in decision making at the local level, agencies have not responded effectively to this. Although the authors do not report on the impact this has on outcomes it is reasonable to assume it will not be positive.

2.25 The evaluation of the Community Participation Programme (Taylor et al 2005) also found more negative results in relation to governance. This included issues around representation and accountability. While it found evidence that there was improved access to decision makers, this varied and some areas found it difficult to establish contact.

2.26 Similarly, research to assess community engagement activity within Regeneration Outcome Agreements (ROA) in Scotland found that while structures were being established in local areas to facilitate the engagement of the community there was little evidence of the transfer of power or decision making from agencies to communities or of a significant change in the culture within agencies (ODS Consulting 2006). It should be noted, however, that this evaluation was carried out only one year into the ROA process. Similarly, research on the implementation of the Fairer Scotland Fund (FSF) has indicated that some local areas are finding it more difficult to engage communities in more thematic approaches to regeneration (ODS Consulting, 2009).

2.27 Research with residents involved in the planning phase of area regeneration in Glasgow¹⁰ reported that those involved felt 'sceptical' about how much influence they would have on final decision made (Lawson 2009) although did report feeling valued and listened to.

Active Citizenship

2.28 The Home Office systematic review (Burton et al 2004) also discusses the impact of engagement activity on active citizenship. The authors consider the potential impact of community empowerment to active citizenship and the 'right' of residents to be involved which is thought to result in a sense of inclusion, self respect and self esteem (Burton et al 2004). It found mainly positive findings from the literature reviewed, including:

- Feelings of inclusion, self-respect and self-esteem.
- A sense of empowerment.
- More equal power between community representatives and other stakeholders.

2.29 However, there is also evidence from some studies that community involvement does not always generate this sense of due process and some report weaknesses, barriers and difficulties (Goodlad et al 2005).

2.30 Added to this, some authors argue that the way policy view and implement community engagement in regeneration can have a detrimental effect on the ability of regeneration programmes to meet their aims. For example, Dargan (2009) argues that involvement of the community in the New Deal for Communities programme undermined its success, given that it is based on an assumption that communities are united with the same goals, when in reality this is not the case. Using the case

¹⁰ Research carried out as part of the Glasgow Community Health and Wellbeing Research and Learning Programme (GoWell) – see <http://www.gowellonline.com/>

study of Newcastle West Gate, Dargan (2009) outlines that participants acted as individuals rather than collectively and in the absence of any pre-agreed outline of their roles, expectations or understanding of their involvement, this led to many being unwilling to compromise. This has been found in other studies (e.g. Lawson 2009).

Conclusions

2.31 The impact of community engagement activity tends to focus on two outcomes – social capital and cohesion, and the planning and delivery of policy and services. There are a number of issues with the quality of the evidence base which are discussed in full in paragraphs 1.20 to 1.22. This limits the strength of the evidence that is available.

2.32 However, the evidence available does *indicate* that engaging communities in the regeneration process *can* have positive effects on social capital and cohesion as well as service planning and delivery. Positive impacts have been found in the development of trust and tolerance, the level of contact and co-operation, engendering a sense of partnership and feelings of ownership, level of identification with the local area and feelings of community. Examples of individual growth and personal development and capacity were also found. However, these benefits have not been found to extend to the wider community, only participants directly involved and are at times based on anecdotal evidence from individual case study areas. In addition, the literature indicates that the *process* of how individuals and communities are involved and engaged influences how it affects social capital and cohesion. Barriers to involvement and engagement can lead to negative social capital and cohesion outcomes, such as feelings of frustration and alienation.

2.33 Positive impacts on the planning and delivery of services were also found providing benefits to both service providers and the local community such as improved local services and greater awareness and understanding of local needs. However, again, there was also evidence that engaging communities has not led to changes in the design of services, due to local agencies not being receptive to local decision making.

2.34 It is possible to conclude therefore, that there is evidence that community engagement can bring a wide range of benefits around social capital and cohesion and the design and delivery of local services. However, there is also evidence that engaging and involving communities can lead to negative outcomes which suggests that the way in which engagement is done is vital. It is out with the scope of this review to consider good practice at this level.

2.35 A number of important issues have been highlighted from the review, including:

- The need for higher quality evidence to more effectively determine the impact of community engagement, from both qualitative and quantitative methods.
- The importance of capturing intended and unintended outcomes.

- The need for organisations to be clearer and more explicit about what they hope to achieve through community engagement activity.
- The importance of the process of engaging the community which is vital to determining the outcomes that will follow.

REFERENCES

- Adamson D and Bromiley R (2008). Community empowerment in practice: Lessons from Communities First. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Burton P, Goodlad R, Croft J, Abbott J, Hastings A, Macdonald G and Slater T (2004). What works in community involvement in area-based initiatives? A systematic review of the literature. Home Office.
- Dargan (2009). Participation and Local Urban regeneration: the case of New Deal for Communities (NDC) in the UK. *Regional Studies*, Vol 43.2, pp205-317.
- Duffy B, Vince J and Page L (2008). Searching for the impact of empowerment. Ipsos MORI.
- Goodlad R, Burton P and Croft J (2005). Effectiveness at what? The process and impact of community involvement in area-based initiatives. *Environment and Planning: Government and Policy*. Vol 23, p 923-938.
- GoWell (2010). Progress for People and Places: Monitoring Change in Glasgow's Communities. Evidence from the GoWell Surveys 2006 and 2008. Glasgow: GoWell.
- Lawson L (2009). Community engagement in the initial planning of regeneration in Glasgow. Glasgow Community Health and Wellbeing Research and Learning Programme (www.gowellonline.com).
- Mathers J, Parry J and Jones S (2008). Exploring resident (non-)participation in the UK New Deal for Communities Regeneration Programme. *Urban Studies*. 45(3), 591-606.
- ODS Consulting. (2006) Evaluation of the effective engagement of communities in regeneration – Final baseline report. Communities Scotland.
- ODS Consulting (2009). Informing future approaches to tackling multiple deprivation in communities: beyond the Fairer Scotland Fund. Scottish Government.
- Pratchett L, Durose C, Lowndes V, Smith G, Stoker G and Wales C (2009). Empowering communities to influence local decision making: A systematic review of the evidence. Department of Communities and Local Government.
- SQW Consulting (2008a). Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders: Final evaluation report People, places, public services: making the connections. Department for Communities and Local Government.
- SQW Consulting (2008b). Community cohesion and neighbourhood management – A themed report for the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders National Evaluation. Department for Communities and Local Government.

SQW Consulting (2005). Improving delivery of mainstream services in deprived areas – the role of community involvement. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Taylor M, Purdue D, Carlton N, Mackridge R, Syed A, Ardron R, Wilson M, Meegan R and Russell H (2005). Making Connections: An Evaluation of the Community Participations Programmes. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Taylor (2007). Neighbourhood management and social capital. Department for Communities and Local Government.

ANNEX A OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE SEARCH

Databases searched

EBSCOHost Research Databases, including:

- SOCIndex
- Sociological Collection

CSA Collections, including:

- ASSIA
- Econlit
- Social Services Abstracts
- Sociological Abstracts
- PAIS International

IBSS: International Bibliography of Social Sciences

OCLC, including:

- ECO
- Article First
- Ebooks
- WorldCat

Urbaline

IDOX

IngentaConnect

Web of Science – Social Science Citation Index

Search terms

- Community/civic/public engagement
- Community/civic/public empowerment
- Community/civic/public participation
- Community/civic/public involvement

AND

- Impact
- Efficacy
- Evaluation
- Effectiv*

AND

- Regeneration
- Area based initiatives

ANNEX B OVERVIEW OF UK REGENERATION PROGRAMMES

Programme	Background to Programme	Methods of Engagement	Aim of Engagement	Focus of Evaluation
Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder (England) 2001-2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbourhood management aims to bring together the local community and service providers to tackle local problems and improve local services. The approach brings together three groups: representatives from the local community, local service providers and a small professional team led by a neighbourhood manager to facilitate change. Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme was established in 2001 to test the neighbourhood management approach. Funded 35 pathfinder partnerships over two funding rounds: round one covered 2002/03 (20 pathfinders) to 2008/09 and round two funding covered 2005/06 to 2011/12 (15 pathfinders). Majority of pathfinders located in 20% most deprived areas in England. National evaluation website – www.sqw.co.uk/nme 	<p>Engagement activities included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraging local people to get involved with the pathfinder. Promoting or improving community engagement directly with service providers. Providing information to, and at least some involvement of, a much wider range of local residents. Developing community and voluntary sector groups and voluntary activity and social networks more generally. <p>Residents included on Pathfinder Board and thematic working groups. Community outreach, consultation and capacity building.</p>	<p>To enable deprived communities and local services to improve local outcomes, by improving and joining up local services, and making them more responsive to local needs.</p> <p>Improve local services.</p>	<p>Examine whether the pathfinders helped deprived communities and local service providers work together at the neighbourhood level to improve and join up local services.</p> <p>Specifically, it considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to engage residents. The representativeness of residents involved. Benefits to service providers. Benefits to residents (including social capital). Ability to influence local services. Impact on neighbourhoods (including resident satisfaction, crime and environment, housing, education).
Community Participation Programme (England) 2001-2006	Ran from 2001 to 2006 as part of National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (which aimed to close gap between most disadvantaged neighbourhoods in England and the rest). Central strand of strategy was to	Community Chest and Community Learning Chest – small grants to support local self-help and community activity, develop skills, knowledge and community	Social capital – skills and knowledge of local residents. Involve local community in regeneration process, including governance and	Evaluation explored: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social capital (confidence, capacity and networks) Social inclusion and cohesion (focussing on including hard to reach

	<p>ensure communities themselves are at the heart of any programme for change.</p> <p>Designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stimulate and support community activity in deprived areas, so people are more involved in regeneration of their communities and neighbourhoods Help residents gain skills and knowledge needed to play a more active role Support voluntary and community sector to be equal partners in Local Strategic Partnerships. 	<p>learning.</p> <p>Community Empowerment Fund – support Community Empowerment Networks to engage community effectively in Local Strategic Partnerships and Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies.</p>	<p>service delivery.</p>	<p>groups)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance and service delivery (contribution of local communities to local governance, impact on decision making and service delivery) <p>Impact – observable improvements in services and quality of life at neighbourhood level.</p>
<p>New Deal for Communities (England) 1998-date</p>	<p>Launched in 1998 in 39 deprived areas in England.</p> <p>The key principles of the fund are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create dedicated agencies for neighbourhood renewal A commitment to community engagement (local communities should be at the heart of the renewal process) Engaging partner agencies A learning programme Achieving strategic transformation in five key outcome areas: education, health, crime, worklessness and housing and the physical environment. <p>39 deprived areas in England.</p>	<p>Informing residents, representation from local residents on NDC structures, build capacity of local voluntary and community groups to allow them to take more active role (Russell 2008).</p>	<p>Secure improvements in public services Re-engage citizens with institutions of government</p>	<p>Programme of evaluation – see NDC evaluation website for more detail.</p> <p>Looks at overall impact of the programme on the five key intended outcomes.</p>
<p>Communities First (Wales) 2001-date</p>	<p>Established in 2001 in some of most deprived areas in Wales. The aims of the programme were:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi agency partnership delivery structure – one third are community 	<p>Adapt service provision and improve service quality in response to</p>	<p>Level and nature of community participation. Including capacity and personal</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build the confidence and self-esteem of those living in these communities and develop a can do culture. • Encourage education and skills training for work. • Create job opportunities and increase the income of local people. • Improve housing and surrounding environment. • Improve health and wellbeing • Make communities safe and secure places to live, work and play. • Drive changes to way public services are delivered. 	<p>members (rest statutory sector and business / voluntary sector).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions determined by local community engagement and participation through development of community audit, community capacity development plan and community action plan. 	<p>community concerns. Includes prioritisation and allocation of resources.</p>	<p>development of community members. Assess how decision making and influence are achieved. Experiences of community members who were engaged.</p>
Regeneration Outcome Agreements (Scotland) 2005-2008	<p>ROAs ran from 2005-2008 and were designed to provide the strategic and operational framework for Community Planning Partnerships to regenerate the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Focused on 15% most deprived areas in Scotland. Effective and genuine community engagement was designed to be at the heart of community planning and was therefore required to be evidenced in the ROA</p>	<p>Varied by Community Planning Partnerships. Some common methods used included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community capacity building • Resident panels • Civic forums and assemblies • Community involvement in developing local plans • Resident juries • Community led research on community priorities • Youth forums, groups or committees. 	<p>The main aim of community engagement was to improve the planning and delivery of services to make them more responsive to the needs and aspirations of communities.</p>	<p>Analysis of 32 Regeneration Outcome Agreements (ROAs) to assess current position of community engagement activity.</p>
Fairer Scotland Fund (Scotland) 2008-2011	<p>The Fairer Scotland Fund (FSF) is allocated to Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) to help them achieve sustainable economic growth by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regenerating disadvantaged communities; 	<p>Wide variety of approaches adopted, including panels, forums, work focusing on specific groups (e.g. young people, older people).</p>	<p>Engaging communities is intended to lead to CPPs developing and refining their approach to improving lives, regenerating communities</p>	<p>Research to assess the implementation of the first round of the FSF, undertaken with all 32 Community Planning Partnerships, with more detailed case study work taking</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tackling poverty by helping vulnerable people and groups; and • overcoming barriers to employment. <p>The fund totals £435m over three years.</p> <p>The principles underpinning the fund are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a clear focus on investment to address the causes of poverty, not only its symptoms; • a strong emphasis placed on making early interventions for vulnerable individuals, families and disadvantaged communities; • promotion of joint working between local partners; • focused action on improving employability as a key means of tackling poverty; and • empowering communities and individuals to influence and inform the decisions made by Community Planning Partnerships. 		<p>and in planning investment of the FSF.</p>	<p>place in 8 areas.</p>
--	--	--	---	--------------------------

ISSN 0950 2254
ISBN 978-0-7559-7806-9
(Web only publication)

www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch

RR Donnelley B63436 01-2010

