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GoWell and Study Areas
What is GoWell?

• A longitudinal study of 15 communities in Glasgow subject to a range of public policy actions.

• A research and learning programme giving regular feedback to study communities and to a range of other stakeholders.

• A resource for social inquiry and a support for policy analysis at local and national level.
Research objectives

• To investigate how regeneration and housing investment affect individual and household health and wellbeing.
• To assess the degree to which places are transformed by policy interventions.
• To understand the processes that support cohesive, sustainable communities.
• To monitor the effects of interventions on area-based inequalities within the city.
• To develop and test research methods.
The Interventions

- Housing improvement
- Dwelling change
- Mixed tenure
- Neighbourhood improvement
- Social & economic change & development
- Tenant & community empowerment
Outcomes

- **Residential Outcomes**: housing satisfaction; psychosocial benefits of home & neighbourhood; area reputation.

- **Social & Community Outcomes**: sense of community; cohesion; social support.

- **Health & Human Capital Outcomes**: physical health; health behaviours; mental wellbeing; training & skills; employment.
Timescale

May 2006  →  May 2008  →  2014

1st survey  →  2nd survey  →  3rd survey  →  4th survey

Focus groups

Longitudinal studies (outmovers & remainers)

Empowerment and participation research

Nested studies: janitors; youth; play areas

New policy foci:
- Mixed tenure
- Young people’s experiences
- Social regeneration
- Crime and anti-social behaviour
- Lived realities study

Ecological monitoring of city-wide changes

Data linkage: health, crime

We are here

GoWell
GoWell Study Area Types
Transformational regeneration areas (TRAs)
Other area types

Govan (HIA)

Drumchapel (PE)

Red Road (WSA)

Gorbals Riverside (LRA)
Context: Deprivation

Income deprivation by Gowell areas
Source: Derived from DWP and SIMD data

% total population classed as income deprived

- Scotstoun Core Flats: 24.6%
- Riddrie: 27.1%
- Red Road Surround: 28.6%
- Cambyst: 29.0%
- Sighthill: 29.1%
- Core Area: 34.8%
- Castlemilk: 38.8%
- Gorbals Riverside: 39.9%
- Govan: 42.1%
- Drumchapel: 42.1%
- Townhead Msfs: 43.2%
- Shawbridge: 50.0%
- St Andrews Drive: 52.2%
- Scotland: 14%

Glasgow City: 25%
Scotland: rate = c.900 [right hand scale]
Two regeneration areas had rates of c.3,000
Survival to 65, by area type

% of 15 year-old boys surviving to 65 by area type, 2001/05
Source: calculated from GRO(S) mortality and CHI population data
Unbalanced Communities

• There are places where 30-40% of households are families with dependent children [Scotland = 24%]

• In some places, c. 20% of households are single parent families [Scotland = 5%]

• The ratio of adults aged 25+ to young people aged<18 can be as low as 1.2

• Some places have low numbers of older person households, <20% [Scotland = 31%]

• Half or more of the adults can be aged under 40.
Low Rates of Economic Activity

- Across Scotland three-quarters of men and two-thirds of women of working age are in employment [SHS 2007/8]
- We found places where rates of employment were 33-68% for men and 21-50% for women.
- NEETs can account for a third of 16-24 year olds in many deprived communities.
Job Search & Training

• Only 17% (1-in-6) of those people of working age not in a job or full-time education, had done anything about seeking a job in the past year.

• Participation in any training, education or life long learning was 11% for those in their 40s, 5% for those in their 50s, and 1% for those over 65.
Creeping Social Withdrawal?

- Feelings of safety at night-time in poorer places appears to be weakening over time.
- More people now say ‘I never walk alone after dark’.
- In a lot of poor places, only a minority of people say they know ‘many’ people in the area.
- Levels of social support have dropped in regeneration areas & peripheral estates. More people now say they ‘would not ask for help’.
- A small, but growing number (5-15%) of people say they never have contact with friends or neighbours.
Studying ‘Displacement’ Through Regeneration
Studying the Effects of Interventions

- Neighbourhood deterioration & improvement
- Social and economic change and development
- Tenant and community empowerment
- Clearance from regeneration areas.
- New Dwellings (& Effects of living in high-rise)
- Housing improvement works.
- Mixed housing tenure.
What Do We Want to Know?

- What is the experience of ‘moving out’ like for people? Is it ‘forced relocation’?
- Do Outmovers end up in better residential situations?
- Is relocation disruptive of people’s social networks?
- What are the health & wellbeing consequences of ‘moving out’?
The samples
The samples

• People who were living in 6 regeneration areas in mid-2006.
  – **Remainers**: 678 people from households interviewed in 2006, still living at the same address within the 6 regeneration areas, and interviewed June-Sept 2008.
  – **Outmovers**: 224 people known to have been living in the 6 regeneration areas in 2006 and interviewed Jan-May 2009 in their new location.

• Both samples weighted by age and sex according to different population estimates.
Comparing the two groups

- Very similar in age and sex profile.
- Among those not working, Remainers contained more unemployed and retired people; Outmovers contained more long-term sick & disabled people.
- Outmovers contained fewer foreign citizens.
- Outmovers contained more adult households.

Differences could reflect:
- Selection &/or phasing effects
- Tracing difficulties
The movement process
Distance moved [Outmovers]

• Actual distance moved:
  – Average distance moved was 1.7km.
  – 40% moved up to 1km.
  – 21% of people moved over 2km.

• Perceptions of distance:
  – 35% said they still lived in the same nhd.
  – 26% lived in an adjacent nhd.
  – 39% lived ‘a long way from previous nhd.’
Relocation

• Is it an undesired and brutal process?
• Would people prefer to stay or go?
• This may depend upon:
  – How people got to live in the area in the first place
  – What kind of experience they have had there:
    • Negative experiences?
    • Reliance on close social support
  – How much they are affected by area stigma
  – Whether they have ambitions of ‘betterment’ and see this predicated on moving
  – Whether they have confidence in the renewal process.
Can we call it ‘forced relocation’ for everyone?

Desire to move by Household type (row percentages)
“Before you moved, had you been wanting to move home or area in any case?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know / Can’t recall</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult household</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent family</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older person(s)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P = 0.007*
Do people find moving to be a problematic process?

- Most people did not find moving problematic, but a sizeable minority did.
- The prevalence of problems with moving varied by type of issue and household type:
  - Costs involved (after disturbance payments): 45%
  - Being kept informed about when and where you might move: 32% (esp. families with kids)
  - The upheaval and disturbance: 28% (esp. single parents)
Do people have choice?

Choice in the movement process (row percentage)  
Those saying they had ‘some’ or ‘a lot’ of choice for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Home (e.g. type &amp; size)</th>
<th>Fixtures &amp; fittings</th>
<th>N (minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult household</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent family</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older person(s)</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td><strong>36.4</strong></td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GoWell**
Housing outcomes
Dwelling Type

• Remainers:
  – 80% in high-rise flats.
  – 20% in other flats.

• Outmovers:
  – 20% in high-rise flats.
  – 60% in other flats.
  – 20% in houses.
Residential outcomes: Housing

• Dwelling satisfaction was higher among Outmovers:
  – When those in similar types of dwellings were compared
  – Note: Remainders may also have had improvement works

• Occupant assessments of dwelling quality were also higher among Outmovers:
  – The biggest gaps in quality assessments were in relation to dwelling aspects that are important for health: thermal insulation, heating systems, and home security.

But…
Affordability differences

• More Outmovers than Remainers said they experienced difficulties meeting rent and fuel costs:
  • Rent: Outmovers 22% vs Remainers 14%
  • Fuel: Outmovers 45% vs Remainers 33% (Occasionally or often had difficulty meeting the costs).
### Choice and dwelling satisfaction for Outmovers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of choice</th>
<th>Area (% satisfied with neighbourhood)</th>
<th>Home (% satisfied with home)</th>
<th>Fixtures &amp; fittings (% satisfied with home)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N                | 222                                  | 223                         | 219                                        |

| P                | 0.001                                | 0.001                       | 0.006                                       |
Neighbourhood outcomes
Change of neighbourhood status?

- 40% of Outmovers stayed in the same deprivation decile after moving.
- 30% moved to a better area (less deprived).
- 30% moved to a worse area (more deprived).
- 74% moved to an area with less social rented housing.
- Outmovers were both more likely to say their area had a good ‘internal’ reputation, and more likely to say it had a bad ‘external’ reputation.
Resident assessments

• Resident assessments of neighbourhoods were more positive among Outmovers than Remainers.

• In descending order of difference:
  – Quality of surroundings
  – Anti-social behaviour problems
  – Services & amenities (some are better, others not)

• Two-thirds of Outmovers said they had moved to a ‘better’ neighbourhood.
Effect of distance

Neighbourhood satisfaction for Outmovers, by distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current location</th>
<th>% of Outmovers</th>
<th>% Satisfied¹ (row percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of same neighbourhood as before</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining or nearby neighbourhood</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A long way from previous neighbourhood</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Percentage ‘fairly’ or ‘very satisfied’.

\[ P = 0.000 \]
Being settled

• Most Outmovers (64%) said they were “happy to stay in [their new area] for the foreseeable future”.
• Only 4% wanted to move back to their previous area.
• 8% wanted to move to another area.
• The remainder hadn’t made up their minds yet. However…
• 16% of Outmovers intended to move home in the next 12 months (‘larger dwelling’ the most common reason).
Psychosocial outcomes

All psychosocial benefits were higher among Outmovers than Remainers. The differences were greater for status-related items than for autonomy-related items. Neighbourhood gain was large compared with the equivalent dwelling item.

Psychosocial benefits of home and neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Psychosocial benefits of home and neighbourhood)</th>
<th>Remainers</th>
<th>Outmovers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My home makes me feel that I’m doing well in life</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people would like a home like mine</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My home expresses my personality and values</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in this neighbourhood helps make me feel that I’m doing well in life</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$P=0.000$ for all items
Social and community outcomes
Retention of neighbours

• Only a minority of Outmovers (a quarter) retained their ‘closest’ neighbours nearby.
  – By ‘closest’ we mean proximate in distance rather than emotionally close.

• Distance affected this outcome:
  – 36% of those who moved to an adjacent neighbourhood retained their closest neighbours, compared with 19% of those who moved ‘a long way’.

• Those who retained their neighbours were happier than others.

• But most of those who ‘lost’ their neighbours in the move were indifferent about this.
Feelings about previous neighbours

Satisfaction with retention (or not) of ‘closest’ neighbours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closest neighbours still live ‘very nearby’</th>
<th>Feelings about retention of neighbours</th>
<th>Total % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Not happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ P=0.000 \]

“Do your closest neighbours from when you lived in X, still live very nearby to you?”

“Are you happy or unhappy about that, or do you not mind either way?”
Neighbourliness

- Neighbourly behaviours were higher among Outmovers, despite their shorter length of residence.
  - Those who retained their neighbours were the most likely to engage in neighbourliness.
  - The least likely were those who didn’t know where their neighbours were now.
- Moving seems to have spurred people to be neighbourly, maybe in an effort to ‘settle in’.
- The change of environment may also have played a part in this.
Neighbourly behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourly Behaviours</th>
<th>Remainers</th>
<th>Outmovers</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know ‘many’ or ‘most’ people in their neighbourhood</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak to neighbours at least once a week</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit neighbours in their home</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow things &amp; exchange favours</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop &amp; talk to people in the neighbourhood</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum N</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Those who answered ‘a great deal’ or ‘a fair amount’.

![GoWell logo](GoWell.png)
Sense of community

• More Outmovers felt they moved to an area with a better feeling of community (53%) than thought they had moved to an area where this was worse (14%).

• Views of the change in community were less positive the further the person moved.

• If we compare people of the same citizenship status and similar length of residence, Outmovers were more positive in their feelings of belonging and inclusion than Remainers.
### Sense of community

#### Sense of community, British Citizens only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings…</th>
<th>Remainers</th>
<th>Outmovers</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…Belong to the neighbourhood</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…Part of the community</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…Enjoy living here</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trust in those around you

- Trust was higher among Outmovers.
- Levels of perceived safety were markedly higher.
- Other elements of trust, although higher, were still modest, e.g. compared to our 2008 findings in HIAs and WSAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remainers (%)</th>
<th>Outmovers (%)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety: feel safe walking at night</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance: expect someone to intervene in harassment incident</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty: expect lost wallet to be returned intact</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health outcomes
General and physical health

• Outmovers had worse self-rated health:
  – 55% of British citizen Outmovers rated their health as good or better, compared with 65% of Remainers.

• Many long-term and short-term conditions were more common in the Outmovers.
  - 20% of Outmovers had long-term respiratory problems compared with 9% of Remainers.

• In most cases, there was no difference between Outmovers and Remainers in the numbers reporting that their condition had got worse in the past two years.
Mental health and wellbeing

- A relatively high proportion of Outmovers said they had a long-term problem of stress, anxiety or depression (35% vs. 14%).
- More Outmovers than Remainers had sought help from a GP about a mental health issue in the past year (38% vs. 20%).
- The mean WEMWBS score (measuring positive mental wellbeing) was significantly lower for Outmovers than for Remainers (36.6 vs. 49.6).
  - This difference was confirmed after controlling for several socio-demographic factors and for citizenship status.
  - Mental wellbeing scores were also lower for Outmovers when we looked only at respondents without any long-term health conditions.
Health behaviours

• There were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of eating 5 portions of fruit & veg. per day, being a current drinker or being a smoker (the last two looking at British citizens only).

• However, Outmover smokers were more likely to have reduced the amount of their smoking in the past two years, and more likely to have plans to give up smoking in the next year (49% vs. 32%).
Walking

• Outmovers were less likely to walk than Remainers.
  – Fewer Outmovers walked (anywhere) for at least 10 minutes on 5 days or more in the past week (44% vs. 55%).
  – More Outmovers had not walked around their neighbourhood for 20 minutes at a time on any day in the past week (41% vs. 28%).
Conclusions

• The process of moving people from clearance areas does not seem as brutal as descriptions of ‘forced relocation’ imply.

• Residential outcomes for Outmovers compared favourably with Remainers, but with a few problematic issues arising:
  – Costs of moving itself.
  – Costs of rent and fuel in the new home.
  – Continuing to live in deprived areas.
• Social connections and sense of community were relatively positive among the Outmover group, contrary to the notion that relocation results is ‘displacement’.

• The health findings were disappointing and a conundrum given the positive residential and social outcomes for Outmovers.
  – We do not know for certain whether clearance processes have a tendency to move the less healthy people first, although it looks like this might be the case.
  – We cannot yet tell whether relocation has any negative health impacts, though we hope to be able to address this issue later.
  – Given the findings on local environments, walking and smoking, there may be a case for considering introducing behavioural support programmes alongside relocation processes.
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