



“European Framework for Measuring Progress”
e-Frame

www.eframeproject.eu

SP1-Cooperation
Coordination and support actions (Coordinating actions)
FP7 SSH-2011-3

Grant Agreement Number 290520
SSH.2011.6.2-1

Deliverable 9.1

Dissemination level: PU

**Report on conceptual framework to measure social progress
at the local level and case studies**

Authors: Nina Mguni and Lucia Caistor-Arendar

DRAFT

31 March 2013



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
European Research Area



SEVENTH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME

Funded under Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities

Deliverable 9.1

Report on conceptual framework to measure social progress at the local level and case studies

Summary

The aim of this project is to develop our understanding on how to measure social progress at a local level. The overarching aim of is to encourage greater use, consistency and development of measures of social progress across municipalities, cities and regions.

The report sets out definitions on local progress and guiding principles to develop a conceptual framework. The project builds on the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM), which was developed by The Young Foundation.

The WARM framework is populated with existing data from a range of data sources to illustrate where data exists and where there are gaps. Data is mapped at a pan-European level, sub-national level and at a local level. The conceptual framework is further refined and tested through the case studies.

The findings of this report suggest that the existing administrative infrastructure provides a good foundation to develop a common conceptual framework to measure social progress at a local level. In addition, much of the data for a conceptual framework currently exists.

However, inconsistencies in the definitions employed, in the use of geographic spatial levels and data collected do give rise to specific challenges.

The report concludes with specific recommendations on how to respond to the identified challenges and build on the aspiration to provide a common and unifying understanding of social progress at a local level.

Index

1. Introduction

2. Definition of ‘social’ progress at a local level

2.1 Defining ‘social progress

2.1 What is local?

2.2 Localising measures of progress

3 Considerations for developing a measure of local progress

3.1 Developing a measurement framework

3.2 Methodological considerations

4 Methodology

4.1 About the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM)

4.2 Stocktaking exercise

5 Stocktaking exercise

5.1 Review of data at a country level

5.2 Review of data at a sub-country level

6 Case Studies: Roquetes and Lindängen

6.1 About Roquetes, Barcelona

6.2 Review of existing micro data for Roquetes

6.3 Understanding Lindagen, Sweden

6.4 Review of existing micro data for Lindängen

7 Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

7.2 Recommendations

References

Annex/es

1. Introduction

How do we measure social progress? Traditionally, we have relied on monetary or material indicators to understand societal progress. The Young Foundation is currently part of a consortium of organisations asking what alternative measures exist and developing a way to move 'Beyond GDP' in Europe.

During recent years, there has been a lot of interest in measuring progress that takes account of a broader set of indicators (including life satisfaction) to measure progress.

This project will provide guidance on how existing robust frameworks could be used to capture progress at the local level, identify areas for further research and provide recommendations on how best to implement a conceptual framework at a local level.

Specifically, The Young Foundation is focusing on documenting existing conceptual framework, primarily the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM), and assesses data availability and gaps in the data. WARM allows local agencies to take the temperature of their communities, from assessing levels of anxiety to how often people talk to their neighbours. The project aims to encourage greater use, consistency and development of measures of social progress across municipalities, cities and regions.

Levels of life satisfaction can vary from neighbourhood to neighbourhood. Estimates of life satisfaction at country or even city level can disguise patterns or trends and disparities between localised areas, with some communities reporting high levels of satisfaction and other areas which are struggling to cope. Therefore, taking a more granular approach can help to bring into view a much more accurate picture of how communities are faring.

The aspiration is to encourage greater use, consistency and development of measures at a local level, from neighbourhood forums, municipalities, cities, to regions in Europe. A common understanding on the available measures and frameworks of measurement should prompt greater take up of measures and frameworks.

The report explores the potential for creating a general approach to measuring progress at a local level. It is our intention that the guidance contained in this report can be utilised by a range of audiences, namely local policy makers, academics and statisticians. The project builds on existing evidence and does not contain any new research.

The framework for the stocktaking exercise and the case studies adopt the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM) as a framework. The report identifies gaps in data collection and further areas for research and exploration. The report sets out the findings from a stocktaking exercise and two case studies upon which our recommendations are based

This report is structured as follows:

- Definition of local progress
- Methodology
- Stocktaking of European data
- Case studies: Lindängen (Malmö) and Roquetes (Barcelona)
- Recommendations for measuring progress at a local level

2. Definition of local progress

2.1 Defining ‘social progress’

There are no universally accepted definitions or frameworks of measurement for local progress. Local progress as a concept is often used interchangeably with concepts such as ‘wellbeing’, ‘happiness’, and ‘societal progress’. ‘Wellbeing’ means slightly different things to different people and is associated with varied attributes and characteristics, such as health and income.

The notion of happiness, influenced by philosophy, psychology and economic discourse, has subtly shaped much of public policy theory and practice. Though grounded in philosophical and religious traditions, developing a universal definition of happiness has preoccupied academics and practitioners for some time. Happiness encompasses both the realization of individual capabilities, or ‘eudaemonia’, and the hedonic approach, based on psychological experience and life satisfaction. Whilst Aristotle conceived happiness as the realization of an individual’s capabilities, much of the recent happiness discourse is aligned to the hedonic conception of happiness, in which wellbeing is defined as a ‘positive evaluation of their lives, and includes emotion, engagement, satisfaction and meaning’¹.

Utilitarian philosophy adopted the hedonic definition, described above. Rooted in ‘the greatest happiness for the greatest number’, this philosophy interprets happiness as a utility. John Stuart Mill argued that actions are to be judged against how effectively they promote happiness. This philosophy became the bedrock of welfare economics and provided a normative basis for policy making in the economy².

The challenge remains to construct an effective method in which to frame and measure wellbeing and happiness. A useful point of departure was to marry utilitarian theory to the rational economic model. This model was based on observable choices that were inferred from behaviour³ and was based on the premise that people are rational economic actors who made

informed decisions based on complete data, and, could therefore maximise their own welfare⁴.

Income as a proxy measure of wellbeing was adopted to overcome the challenge of ‘the private nature of experience and the discomfort of making interpersonal comparisons’⁵ that arise from measures of subjective wellbeing. Additionally, the development and common use of national accounting, using gross domestic product, displaced broader notions of social welfare.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP), nonetheless, as a measure of societal wellbeing is challenged on a number of fronts. In fact, Simon Kuznets, one of the authors of national accounting, issued a caveat on using GDP as a measure of welfare, stating, ‘distinctions must be kept in mind between quantity and quality of growth, between its cost and returns... Goals for ‘more’ growth should specify more growth of what and for what’.

The limitations of economics to adequately measure wellbeing have contributed to development of subjective measures of wellbeing, marking a shift away from objective measures based on what people *do*, to subjective measures based on what people *say*. This accounts for the fact that ‘real human psychology is more complicated and involves many other factors: cultural, social and physical environments, genetic predispositions and so on’⁶.

Economists have responded to this challenge by developing what is termed ‘happiness economics’. The study of happiness economics ‘relies on more expansive notions of utility and welfare’⁷ adopting a broad definition of utility and building on techniques traditionally associated with psychology and sociology.

Psychologists have also attempted to develop adequate measures for wellbeing. Research into the close correlations with other plausible measures such as physiological symptoms, brain scans, answers given by friends and self-reported happiness, have been used to measure wellbeing. Psychologically validated measures of subjective wellbeing, also provide a means by which to measure utility.⁸

Evidence clearly suggests that national measures of wellbeing should take additional steps to measure satisfaction in different domains of people lives, for instance their work and relationships.⁹ Marital status, civic participation, existence of democratic institutions, level of education, relative income and ethnicity and religious belief are also associated with an individual’s wellbeing. Social capital also influences general life satisfaction¹⁰. As reported by The Young Foundation, opportunities for residents to influence decisions, regular contact between neighbours and helping residents gain confidence, contribute to improved wellbeing¹¹.

2.2 What is local?

Community: A group of people in an ecosystem/landscape, undertaking a shared activity and prescribing to common principles¹²

A geographic community or neighbourhood is not a fixed unit and a number of definitions have been used to define 'local'. Boundaries change, people migrate into and out of areas and the landscape can change.

A local area is both a physical and social space. A local area can be defined by the physical boundaries and landmarks, but also will include less tangible characteristics such as social norms, relationships and networks and shared belief systems which tend to be more fluid. For some people, the idea of community is a social one, based on similar networks, rather than an allegiance to a geographical area¹³.

The cluster of networks that form communities can include interactions with local schools, public spaces and housing. These shared networks within a physical space provide a fixed point to locate analysis of a community or neighbourhood.

The notion of a neighbourhood provides a geographical observable unit from which to understand trends, though the risk is that the unit does not reflect a 'real' neighbourhood or community for those living within it. A geographical unit provides a useful basis for organising policy and delivering interventions.

A neighbourhood is¹⁴:

- Environmental characteristics – topographical features, particular geographic features, defining physical characteristics, pollution
- Proximity characteristics – influenced both by location and transport infrastructure
- Characteristics of buildings – type, design, materials, density, state of repair
- Infrastructural characteristics – roads, streetscape, open spaces
- Demographic characteristics
- Social class of the population
- The existence and quality of local services
- Political characteristics – political networks, local representative and advocacy groups, involvement of residents
- Social-interactive characteristics – friend and family networks, associations, strength of social control forces
- Sentimental characteristics – sense of identification with place, historical significance, myths and stories

2.3 Localising wellbeing measures

Whilst a lot of consideration has been given to defining and developing measures for individual wellbeing, there is still comparatively less work in providing a definition of community wellbeing or local progress. There is no universal definition of ‘community wellbeing’ or ‘local progress’, and there is debate on what the component parts of wellbeing are¹⁵.

The concept of local progress encompasses a number of disciplines. For instance economic, health, crime and community safety, environmental issues and planning contribute to community wellbeing. A broad conceptual understanding of local progress recognises the intersections between the different disciplines and that we generally do not assess our lives in terms of specific domains, but in its totality. The challenge for defining and measuring community wellbeing is to widen the lens to account for both the individual and the community.

A community wellbeing measure will reflect a number of component parts from which to evidence the level of progress. Community wellbeing is not the aggregate of individual wellbeing. Our understanding of local progress accounts for the exogenous factors within the locality. These include quality of public services, levels of deprivation and vibrancy of the local economy¹⁶.

A local or community-based approach lends itself well to community plans or neighbourhood initiatives. It can help orientate different professionals towards a particular goal or vision, helping establish suitable milestones and objectives and setting out a suitable pathway¹⁷.

Decision making and delivery at a community level requires good local data and a framework of analysis. Statutory agencies often work alongside local community sector organisations, with less reliance on working within professional boundaries. A framework of measurement will support a shared understanding of objectives, unifying objectives for local agencies.

3. Considerations for developing a measure of local progress

3.1 Developing a measurement framework

As described above, there are no universal definitions of local progress or community wellbeing. The development of a conceptual framework allows us to use a range of indicators which circumvents the need to establish a specific definition or a single dimension. In addition, there is more of consensus on the range of domains that contribute to our understanding of local progress or community wellbeing.

A framework encompasses multiple dimensions that refer back to a single point of departure. In this instance, the single point of departure is ‘how do we measure local progress?’ A conceptual framework will also set out how these dimensions cohere with the single point of departure, as well as how the different dimensions cohere with each other.

Segmentation is often used as a way of measuring progress. Each policy area or jurisdiction (e.g. crime or community safety) provides a battery of readily measurable indicators. These, typically, include indicators that are commonly used and routinely collected and which are valid and reliable (such as health data)¹⁸.

A framework for measuring local progress will provide a lens through which to view the multi-faceted and inter-connected ways a local area assesses progress. In reviewing the data sources for community wellbeing, it is important to recognize the inter-relationship between indicators that capture wellbeing across different aspects of people’s lives such as their general disposition, family and social life, community and the wider environment.

A measurement framework can also account for access to services and quality of services. It will also include some indicators such as perception of levels of crime. In addition, it will draw on the body of evidence on the relationship between participation, neighbourhood empowerment, a sense of belonging and strength of social networks. In summary, a framework of local progress accounts for individual, social and structural indicators.

An OECD study on a framework to measure local progress has set out some key features of sound measurement frameworks, and provides a useful starting point from which to agree a framework for local progress. A local progress framework should:

- Have a solid conceptual foundation
- Include broad domains that are ‘incommensurable, irreducible, non-hierarchical and valuable’
- Allow for broad interpretation and not be too prescriptive

- Describe outcomes rather than outputs
- Be informed by consultation with relevant stakeholders¹⁹

In recent years, a number of organisations have addressed the need for a framework of measurement. One example of this is the OECD Better Life Initiative, which sets out a framework and encompasses a functioning economic system, as well as incorporating living conditions and experiences. This reflects the wider work of the OECD on measuring the progress of societies.

There are few frameworks available at a local level, though there is increased interest²⁰. Examples of where they exist are summarised in the box below.

Box 1: Examples of frameworks to measure progress

SAMPLE

What is SAMPLE? SAMPLE aimed at identifying and developing new indicators and models that will help the understanding of inequality and poverty with special attention to social exclusion and deprivation. Furthermore, the project developed models and implemented procedures for estimating these indicators and their corresponding accuracy measures at the level of small area (LAU1 and LAU2 level), in order to offer to local, national and European governments accurate data able to: i) ensure monitoring of poverty and inequality; ii) focus their policies on segments of population at higher risk of poverty, some of them specially elusive; iii) appreciate the multidimensional nature of poverty and inequality with attention to the non-monetary aspects of it, such as social exclusion, vulnerability and deprivation; iv) measure the subjective aspects of poverty as they are perceived by local groups and populations.

SAMPLE is used to: provide scientific evidence and analysis on poverty indicators at a local level; to understand policy implications and formulate recommendations to contrast poverty at a local level and to define research parameters in the field of poverty indicators at small area level

What are the indicators used? The SAMPLE Consortium got access to the following databases concerning the Province of Pisa: individual records of the Job centre database (IDOL); individual records of the Revenue agency database (SIATEL); and individual records of the Caritas database (MIROD).

In addition the Consortium got access to: micro data of Italian survey EU-SILC 2007; micro data of Italian survey EU-SILC 2004-6; micro data of Spanish survey EU-SILC 2004-6; micro data of Italian Population Census 2011 for Tuscany, Lombardy and Campania Regions; and micro data of the 2008 EU-SILC oversampling for the Italian province of Pisa.

The Canadian Community Wellbeing Index (CWB)

What is CWB? The Community Well-Being (CWB) Index assesses socio-economic well-being in Canadian communities. The Community Wellbeing Index uses census data to accord a 'score' to communities in Canada. The index uses income, educational attainment, labour force activity and housing to assess wellbeing in communities.

What are the indicators used?

Education: main focus is on how many people within the community have a minimum of high school education and attained a university degree.

Labour force activity: proportion of the community who participate in the labour force and the number of labour force participants have jobs.

Income: income per capita.

Housing: number of homes that are in adequate state of repair and are not overcrowded.

OECD Better Life Initiative

What is the OECD Better Life Initiative? A forum in which leaders and policy makers can work together to share experiences and seek solutions to common problems and which produces high-quality, internationally comparable statistics used to understand what drives economic, social and environmental forces. The OECD has been working for almost ten years to identify the best way to measure the progress of societies – moving beyond GDP and examining the areas that impact people's everyday lives. OECD Better Life Initiative is the culmination of this.

What are the indicators used? 11 dimensions have been identified as being essential to well-being: community, education, environment, civic engagement, health, housing, income, jobs, life satisfaction, safety, work-life balance.

Where does data come from? The data mostly comes from official sources such as the OECD or National Accounts, United Nations Statistics, National Statistics Offices. A couple of indicators are based on data from the Gallup World Poll a division of the Gallup Organization that regularly conducts public opinion polls in more than 140 countries around the world. More than 80% of the indicators in Your Better Life Index have already been published by the OECD. A full report on how OECD measures these dimensions is available to buy (or download if you have a prescription), here is a [link](#) to a preview.

Does the Index allow comparisons over time? At the moment the Index cannot be compared over time, as its methodology is still being fine-tuned

(for instance there are five new indicators this year). In addition, many of the BLI indicators do not move quickly over time and thus before assessing genuine progress/regression over time, it will be necessary to wait a few more years.

The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index

Where does the data come from? The data is based on subjective survey results. Every survey involves a fresh national sample of 2000 people that proportionately represents Australia's geographically diverse population. All survey participants are aged 18 years and over. Annually, the report follows up about 5,000 people on their answers. Every survey examines personal and national wellbeing, while each one also investigates a particular issue of social importance to Australians and its impact on wellbeing. The database contains 28,000 records.

Who collects the data? The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index is a joint project between Australian Unity and Deakin University's Australian Centre on Quality of Life.

How is well-being measured? It is based on average levels of satisfaction with various aspects of personal and national life. Satisfaction is expressed as a percentage score, where 0 per cent is completely dissatisfied and 100 per cent is completely satisfied. So a survey score of 76.5 per cent on personal wellbeing means Australians, on average, feel 76.5 per cent satisfied with their lives.

What indicators are used? Indicators are a mixture of personal and national indicators and include:

Elements of the Personal Wellbeing Index are, satisfaction with: y our health; Your personal relationships; How safe you feel; Your standard of living; What you are achieving in life; Feeling part of the community; and Your future security.

Elements of the National Wellbeing Index are, satisfaction with: Australian social conditions; Australian economic situation; the state of the Australian environment; Australian business; National security; and Government.

Is it collected annually? How long has it been collected? The project began in 2001, surveys seem to be conducted every 3-6 months and annual reports are compiled.

3.2 Methodological considerations

There are methodological challenges associated with the development of a framework of local progress. Outlined below are the most significant areas to consider:

- a) **Geographical units:** Territories are usually defined in different ways depending on the needs of the administrative body making the classification. For example, some surveys may use administrative boundaries, while others use historical boundaries. Administrative and statistical boundaries (and titles) often change with time. This means that data obtained at different times from the same country may have different area classifications.

Countries in Europe have clearly defined boundaries, which makes intra-country data collection and comparison relatively easy. However, at a lower level, territorial boundaries become a lot more complex.

There is often a difference between administrative geographical units and the way in which residents define the boundaries of their local area. Using the smallest geographical unit can enable the construction of 'natural neighbourhoods' which reflect the way in which residents define their neighbourhoods themselves. However, this can reduce the sample size and impact on the reliability of the estimates.

- b) **Comparability:** A comparative analysis using existing data across Europe can be difficult. Data collection modes vary and as stated in the Urban Audit's methodological report, "the approach of collecting data from existing sources makes it difficult and sometimes impossible to achieve comparability of variables over the entire "population".²¹ In addition, survey questions can vary and definitions are often language or culturally contingent (e.g. unemployment benefits).
- c) **Timeliness:** Census data is often the most comprehensive account of household trends, but it is only collected every ten years in most countries. Other datasets are more routinely collected, for instance labour market participation, but will often take account of specific areas of wellbeing and datasets may vary according to sample size. Additional data collection will take place within specific neighbourhoods to provide timely data. However, this limits possibility of creating comparator data and to benchmark existing data (see discussion on sample sizes).

- d) **Robustness and data quality:** It is important to be mindful of the reliability of measures used, the robustness of denominators and the level of uncertainty this can introduce to analysis.

- e) **Sample size:** Confidence intervals (how reliable the data is) are larger for smaller samples. Data for smaller areas usually has less precision than data for larger areas. The smaller the sample size, the greater the level of uncertainty introduced into your analysis. The level of uncertainty can be quantified by calculating confidence intervals (CI). Analysis should include CI levels to identify the likely range of the data values.

4. Methodology

The methodology adopted in this report uses the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM²²), a measure developed by The Young Foundation, as a framework for local progress. Adoption of the WARM framework is a point of departure for this paper, upon which a stocktaking exercise and the case studies are framed.

4.1 About WARM

The Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM) is a framework to measure wellbeing and resilience at a local level, The Young Foundation's definition of 'local progress'. WARM helps identify who is vulnerable, who is not, and why. It supports a local approach, by giving better information to both communities and residents and those agencies responding to their concerns and aspirations. The WARM tool is an analytical tool to bring into view, measure and compare levels of wellbeing and resilience in geographical areas such as neighbourhoods. The Wellbeing and Resilience Framework has been used to frame our line of enquiry.

A framework for understanding local progress broadens the focus from objective to subjective measures of wellbeing at an individual level and draws out how people experience the quality of their lives. It also encompasses support networks within the local area and the services and infrastructure available to them.

At the most basic level, a WARM analysis provides descriptions of those geographical areas which have particular characteristics and reveals different ways of making sense of data.

The way we understand local progress at neighbourhood and local levels - our work on the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM) identifies three levels that contribute to community resilience:

- **Self:** the way people feel about their own lives

- **Support:** the quality of social supports and networks within the community
- **Structures and systems:** the strength of the infrastructure and environment to support people to achieve their aspirations and live a good life

These three levels form a useful point to anchor our understanding of local progress. The three levels of self, support and structures and the corresponding indicators, interact and are not viewed in isolation.

The design of the WARM fulfils the requirements set out above as follows:

- Identifies domains upon which the conceptual framework is based
- It identifies the relevant indicators within each domain
- The basket of indicators, in their totality, sets out our understanding of local progress. The basket of indicators is indicative of the component parts of wellbeing and resilience. This is not an exhaustive list and the indicators are weighted equally.

4.2 Stocktaking exercise

The main body of this work is a stocktaking exercise to identify existing measures and indicators that can populate the WARM framework. We recognise that other frameworks that measure local progress exist and may capture local progress, but in the absence of a framework which is applied universally, the WARM was used.

The stocktaking exercise consisted of desk-based research to identify indicators used across the EU member states to map onto the WARM framework. The WARM framework served to guide our line of enquiry on existing indicators, that is, what data maps onto the WARM framework, what proxy data exists and what data is not available. The stocktaking exercise serves to inform our recommendations on developing and implementing a measure that captures local progress across the EU.

It is also worth noting that the WARM framework has been designed for the UK context and it would have to be adapted to ensure that it is applicable in other places. However the flexible nature of WARM enables a degree of adaptability to each country's context, for instance the ability to use proxy indicators and existing data. This study is experimental in nature. WARM is intended to be a pragmatic tool that enables data to stimulate practical action.

For the purpose of this study, three spatial levels have been used that are recognised across all EU member states:

1. **National level:** country level data
2. **Regional level (NUTS 1-5):** European sub-country units (regions) used in this study are defined according to the EU nomenclature of territorial units (NUTS)²³
3. **Local level -** For the purpose of measurement at a local level, we suggest using datasets that can be disaggregated to the smallest geographical units (see case studies for more information)

5. Stocktaking exercise

There is a considerable amount of data available at different scales (European Union and country levels and within country data). Whilst the aspiration is to identify data collected at the smallest geographical unit, to reflect ‘local’ progress, the report includes data at larger scales to establish where data exists and at what scale, as well as where there is limited data availability.

The stock take in the following sections maps data at two levels:

1. Country level: Pan European data across 27 EU countries
2. Regional level (NUTS 1-5)

The discussion below follows two main lines of enquiry:

1. Does data exist which can be mapped onto the WARM framework?
2. Where data exists, at what spatial level is the data available?

The two lines of enquiry are addressed according to three domains (self supports and structure).

Country level data methodology

The indicators utilise a range of existing data collection surveys. The majority of the indicators are taken from Eurostat data. As the table below shows, some of the survey data is routinely collected e.g. annually, whilst some of the data was collected as part of a one-off study. There is no consistency in the frequency and the timeliness of data collection across the different indicators.

This will present methodological challenges if a WARM analysis is to be implemented consistently and periodically. Nonetheless, all the indicators listed are dated from at least the year 2000 and can provide a relatively up-to-date picture of wellbeing and local progress, with the possibility of comparisons across different countries.

Table 1: Data sources

Name of survey	Frequency of data collection
All	
Eurostat	-
Eurostat Regional Yearbook	Annual
Urban Audit	2003/4 and 2006/7
Perception Survey, Urban Audit	2004, 2006, 2009
Urban Audit	2003/4 and 2006/7
EU SILC	Cross-sectional data pertaining to a given time or a certain time period with variables on income, poverty, social exclusion and other living conditions. Longitudinal data pertaining to individual level changes over time, observed periodically over, typically, a four year period.

5.1 Review of data at country level

In the table below we set out a summary of the stocktaking exercise. The table sets out the availability of WARM data available at country level. The table uses colour codes to illustrate where data exists (green), where proxy data exists (amber) and where no data exists (red).

Of the thirty indicators contained in the WARM framework, twenty-two of these indicators are collected across Europe and 5 proxy indicators exist. There are only 3 indicators where we could find no evidence of data.

Domain: Self

This domain focuses on education, health and employment. As these are central to national social policy, there will always be ample data for these measures. Of the ten indicators that map onto the 'self' domain, we identified nine existing indicators at a pan-European level. Classic indicators on levels of educational attainment and levels of health are available, including people's self-perceived levels of health. In addition, data is collected on self-assessed levels of life satisfaction.

With regard to material wellbeing, there is data showing the percentage of people unemployed, however a proxy has been used for the levels receiving benefits. Part of the challenge of locating this data is that every country has its own social security system. Generalised indicators for individuals or households receiving social support are more common. Nevertheless, the proxy used is very close to the original indicator but at a household level – Eurostat measure Unemployment Benefits (PY090G) collected under the Total Household Gross Income Indicator (HY010).

Domain: Supports

This domain assesses levels of wellbeing in relation to supportive networks. Specifically, it measures levels of social capital and household composition. Six of the seven existing indicators map onto the WARM framework. The indicator used to measure levels of social capital asks whether people volunteer regularly: “how often over the last twelve months have you given unpaid help to any group(s), clubs(s) or organisation(s)?”

This indicator is part of various pan-European surveys (EVS, EU SILC, EQLS). Although not included in the WARM framework, there are various surveys that also have an indicator related to trust and social relations (EQLS and EU SILC). The indicators for household composition are all collected with the exception of data on ‘percentage of people in divorced household’.

Domain: Systems and structures

Available data concerning the systems and structures supporting neighbourhoods and individuals are less available. This covers a range of measures that focus on the local area itself. Of the 13 indicators that fall under this domain, seven map onto the WARM framework, four proxy indicators are available and two indicators have not been located. Data on objective levels of crime and data on subjective levels of crime are available but only for the indicator, “how safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area after dark?”

There is less data on ‘effective public services’ in a local area. The Eurobarometer has data on access to public services like General Practitioners and primary schools however these indicators were part of a one-off ‘ad-hoc module’ on wellbeing conducted in 1999/2002. Data was not found to be collected for “subjective levels of satisfaction with public services”. Despite this, there are various data-sets that collect information about the level and type of facilities available in a local area, which this framework does not account for. For example, commonly found indicators track the number of cultural facilities (cinemas and theatres) in an area, or the access to transport (e.g. EQLS indicator: “Availability of facilities in immediate neighbourhood in rural and urban areas, by type of facility and country group (%)”).

Data availability for the indicators under the measure ‘enabling infrastructure’ is varied. The indicators “sense of belonging to a local area” and “satisfaction with local area” have been included in recent surveys (ESS Round 6 (2012/12) and EU SILC Module on Well-being (2013)).

With regard to housing, including levels of overcrowding in homes, this is covered by the EU SILC survey and there is proxy data for “homelessness” through the EU’s indicator “Severe Housing Deprivation”. There is no data on empty properties, however, this indicator is included within the Urban Audit (“Number of empty conventional dwellings per total number of

dwelling”) where data is found frequently at the city level (see regional stocktake).

With regards to ‘job vacancies in the local area’ Eurostat measures the Job Vacancy Rate (JVR) which assesses the proportion of total posts that are vacant and is collected on a quarterly basis. Nevertheless, it does not identify the vacancies specific to the local area. There are no statistics that address local voice and influence. There are, however, indicators measuring involvement in local and non-local decision-making groups (e.g. EQLS).

Table 2: Review of data on social progress across Europe at the country level

Domain	Measure	Key terms and concepts	Source	RAG* rating
Self	Life satisfaction	Self-assessed life satisfaction; happiness	European Social Survey (ESS) and European Quality of Life Survey (2003, 2007)	3
	Education	Participating in further or higher education	Eurostat [tps00062] and EU SILC PE010	3
		Young people who are unemployed and not in education	Eurostat [edat_lfse_20] and EU SILC PE020	3
		Per cent of population completed higher education	Eurostat [edat_lfse_07]	3
		Per cent of population with no or low qualifications	Eurostat [t2020_40]	3
		Health	People with long-term poor health e.g. cancer; depression - of working age (16 to 65)	Eurostat [hlth_silc_04]
	Good health	See www.healthindicators.eu and EU SILC PH010	3	
	Subjective or self assessed levels of health	Eurostat - Self-perceived health by education level [hlth_ls_spa]	3	

	Material wellbeing	Per cent of people unemployed	Eurostat [lmhr_m] [lfst_r_lfu2ltu] and [lfst_r_lfu3pers]. Harmonised unemployment rates (%), monthly data.	3
		Per cent of people receiving benefits for unemployment	Eurostat [lfsa_upgal]. Proxy: Unemployment benefits (PY090G) collected under Total Household Gross Income Indicator (HY010)	2
Supports	Social Capital	Per cent of people who volunteer regularly	Eurofound second Quality of Life Survey (2007), EU SILC PS100 (Participation in Informal Voluntary Activities), European Values Study (EVS) 2008	3
	Household composition	Per cent of people in divorced household	n/a	1
		Per cent of people in workless household	Eurostat [lfst_hhindws]	3
		Per cent of single pensioners living alone	Urban Audit	3
		Per cent of family units with married or two adults	EU SILC (2013) [ilc_lvps20]	3
		Per cent of people who care for someone else part-time	Eurofound second Quality of Life Survey (2007)	3
		Lone parents	EU SILC [ilc_lvps20]	3
		Crime	Subjective feelings of safety (1)	EU SILC 2013 Module on Well-being, PW220 (Physical Security. Proxy: "Physical security in local area")
Systems and structures	Subjective feelings of safety (2)	European Social Survey, Round 6 (2012/13) and European Quality of Life Survey (2003)	3	
	Objective levels of crime	Urban Audit (2004)	3	

	Effective public services	Access to primary schools in a local area	Eurobarometer 52.1 (1999) 2002.1 (2002) and EU SILC MH140 – Accessibility of compulsory school	3
		Access to GPs in a local area	Eurobarometer 52.1 (1999) 2002.1 (2002)	3
		Subjective levels of satisfaction with public services	Eurofound, Second European Quality of Life Survey (2007). Proxy: "Availability of facilities in immediate neighbourhood in rural and urban areas, by type of facility and country group (%)"	2
	Enabling infrastructure	Sense of belonging to local area	European Social Survey, Round 6 (2012/13)	3
		Satisfaction with local area	EU SILC 2013 Module on Well-being, PW210 (Satisfaction with Living Environment) and Eurobarometer 52.1 (1999), 62.2 (2004), 2002.1 (2002)	3
		Levels of overcrowding in homes	EU SILC [ilc_lvho05a]	3
		Homelessness	EU SILC [ilc_mdho06a] – the EU indicator for Homelessness is "Severe housing deprivation"	2
		Empty properties	n/a	1
	Local Economy	Job vacancies in local area	Eurostat [jvs_q_nace2] - The job vacancy rate (JVR) measures the proportion of total posts that are vacant. It is collected on a quarterly basis. It does not identify the vacancies specific to a local area	2

	Social Capital	People feel they can influence local decisions	n/a	1
*RAG rating: 3 = Data exists. 2 = proxy indicator exists, 1 = Indicator does not exist.				

5.2 Review of data at a sub-country level

For gathering data for inter-country, EU-wide research, it is beneficial to use geographical units based on a universal or common classification system. The European sub-country units (regions) used in this study are defined according to the EU Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) - a hierarchy of spatial units which covers each country across Europe exhaustively.²⁴ The NUTS classification aids harmonisation in data collection across the member states.

There are many advantages to using NUTS regions for a European stocktake. They are a well established and widely accepted form of classification used within social policy and by statistical authorities. NUTS classification has its limitations, mainly because they vary greatly in size in each nation. For example, LAU 2 can refer to a neighbourhood or an entire city (e.g. Malmö). However this classification provides a comparable framework for gathering statistical information that can be used across Europe²⁵.

The stocktake identifies data existing for any NUTS level between 1- 5 which covers the spatial levels smaller than the country level and larger than the local level (which are covered in the other sections).

- NUTS 1: major socio-economic region
- NUTS 2: basic region to apply regional policies
- NUTS 3: small regions for specific diagnosis
- LAU 1: local administrative units (formerly NUTS 4)
- LAU 2: local administrative units (formerly NUTS 5)²⁶

These geographical statistical units map onto country specific geographical statistical units. A table of country specific geographical units and how they map onto Eurostat units can be found in annex 2. At the time of writing this report, the 27 member states comprise 97 NUTS 1 regions, 271 NUTS 2 regions and 1303 NUTS 3 regions.

The following stocktake provides an overview of the data available at the regional level across five countries: England (EN), Spain (ES), Sweden (SE), Ireland (IE), and France (FR).

Our interrogation of data availability specifically identified data is collected by international and national public administrative bodies. This includes national statistical bodies and international agencies like EUROSTAT.

Table 3: Surveys and data sources

Name of survey	Frequency of data collection²⁷
All	
Eurostat	-
Eurostat Regional Yearbook	Annual
Urban Audit	2003/4 and 2006/7
Perception Survey, Urban Audit	2004, 2006, 2009
EU SILC	Cross-sectional data pertaining to a given time or a certain time period with variables on income, poverty, social exclusion and other living conditions. Longitudinal data pertaining to individual-level changes over time, observed periodically over, typically, a four year period.
Spain	
Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE)	-
Survey on Adult Population Involvement in Learning Activities (AES) – (INE)	Quinquennial - 2007, 2011
Survey on Active Population (INE)	Quarterly since 1999
Living Conditions Survey, (INE)	Annual since 2004
Sweden	
Statistics Sweden (SCB)	-
INKOPAK, (SCB)	
National Public Health Survey, Institute of Public Health	Annual since 2004
France	
National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE)	-
England	
Office of National Statistics	-
Communities and local government (central Government department)	-
Ireland	
Central Statistics Office Ireland (CSO)	-
Regional Quality of Life in Ireland Survey. (CSO)	Once (2008)

Box 2 : Administrative profiles

England administration profile

England is subdivided into a hierarchy of administrative divisions, and non-administrative ceremonial areas. England is divided into one of nine regions and 48 ceremonial counties, although these have only a limited role in public policy.

For local government, the administrative arrangement varies in different areas: non-metropolitan two-tier 'shire' areas, six metropolitan counties, 55 unitary authorities, and Greater London. At the most localised level, England is divided into statistical wards.

France administration profile

France is divided into 27 administrative regions. 22 are in metropolitan France, and five are overseas regions. Each mainland region and Corsica are further subdivided into departments, ranging in number from 2 to 8 per region for the metropolitan ones whereas the overseas regions technically consist of only one department each. Departments are further subdivided into 36,697 communes, which are municipalities with an elected municipal council. There also exist 2,588 inter-communal entities grouping communes. The regions, departments and communes are all known as territorial collectivities, meaning they possess local assemblies as well as an executive.

While regions cannot write their own statutory law, they have fiscal autonomy over considerable budgets. Representatives voted into office in regional elections.

The department (French: *département*) is the levels of government between the region and the commune. There are 96 departments in metropolitan France and 5 Overseas departments, which also are classified as regions.

French communes have no exact equivalent in the United Kingdom, but are closest to parishes, towns or cities. A French commune may be a city of two million inhabitants like Paris, a town of ten thousand people, or just a ten-person hamlet. Except for the municipal *arrondissements* of its largest cities, the communes are the lowest level of administrative division in France.

In recent years it has become increasingly common for communes to band together in intercommunal consortia for the provision of such services as refuse collection and water supply.

Republic of Ireland administration profile

There are 26 counties in the republic of Ireland that serve as a geographical frame of reference, but are not always equivalent to administrative divisions. The counties are grouped into eight regions, each with a Regional Authority composed of members delegated by the various county and city councils in the region. The regions do not have any direct administrative role as such, but they serve for planning, coordination and statistical purposes. Local government is a two-tier structure, with the top tier consisting of twenty-nine county councils and five city councils. The second tier consists of boroughs and town councils.

Local government functions are mostly implemented by thirty-four local authorities, termed county or city councils, which cover the entire territory of the state.

The second tier consists of five borough councils and seventy-five town councils.

Spain administration profile

Spain is subdivided into seventeen autonomous communities and 2 cities. All Autonomous Communities have their own elected parliaments, governments, public administrations, budgets, and resources. They are further subdivided into provinces (provincias), which in turn, are integrated by municipalities (municipios).

Autonomous communities are subdivided into provinces (provincias), which served as their territorial building blocks. There are 50 provinces in the Spanish territory. Provinces are integrated by municipalities (municipios).

Due to historic regional identity Catalonia, Galicia, the Basque Country, Andalusia Valencian Community, the Canary Islands, the Balearic Islands, and Aragon identify themselves as "nationalities". The Basque Country and Navarre are the only communities with fiscal autonomy.

Sweden administration profile

Sweden is subdivided into 21 Counties (Län), each with a county administrative board (government appointed by the government) and a county council (regional government elected by the electorate). The county council is further subdivided into municipalities, Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö are further divided into urban districts.

Each county further divides into a 290 municipalities or kommuner. The municipalities of Sweden (kommun) are its lower-level local government entities.

Urban districts (Stadsdelsnämndsområden or Stadsdelar) are subdivisions of the municipalities of Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö. In Swedish, they are known as stadsdelsnämndsområden in Stockholm (urban district board areas) and stadsdelar in Gothenburg and Malmö.

The purpose of this exercise is not to compare countries, but to identify commonalities in the availability and absence of data across the five countries. The Wellbeing and Resilience Measure Framework was developed in England and therefore, unsurprisingly, there is more data available in this context. Nonetheless, this is a useful exercise to identify where administrative and cultural differences across the countries give rise to gaps in data collection, and where commonalities exist, which could support the development of a common framework.

Domain: Self

Much of the data collected by the five countries at this level maps onto the WARM framework. For instance, education indicators are generally consistent with the WARM framework.

Although unemployment indicators are available, like the pan-Europe stocktake, there is less data on benefits associated with unemployment. This most likely reflects the different structures and definitions of social assistance across the five countries.

There is also inconsistency in data collection on life satisfaction. This is a key indicator for tracking local progress. In addition, in terms of objective and subjective health, France is the only country that has no data. Nevertheless with the indicator 'people of working age with a limiting or long-term illness' various countries have a proxy which does not relate the illness to employment activity.

Data collected in this domain is collected at a number of spatial levels, with the majority of data collected at spatial level NUTS 2.

Domain: Supports

This domain addresses levels of caring and volunteering as well as family composition and structures. We were more reliant on proxy variables for data in this domain. This was particularly evident for data associated with 'caring' (we used a proxy in three of the five countries) and 'workless households'. This may reflect a definitional discrepancy, with different countries defining concepts such as 'caring' and 'worklessness' differently. Across the five countries, data is generally collected on family composition and structure that map onto the WARM framework. There is comparatively less data collected on volunteering.

The spatial level for data collection is NUTS 3, though again, there is little consistency across the five countries on what geographical unit is used.

Domain: Structures

This domain addresses a number of areas namely: crime, access to services, housing, local economy and civic participation and belonging. This domain had the most gaps in data availability.

In terms of the data available, there is accuracy for objective data for crime, but for perception of crime, we had to rely on inference from proxy data. There is generally limited perception of crime data available. The four countries do not collect the number of job vacancies within a local area, or levels of satisfaction with public services, with the exception of England.

There is a notable gap on data that relates to satisfaction in your local area and sense of belonging to your community. Again, this may reflect a cultural or political nuance associated with policy in England. Generally, the spatial level for data collection is NUTS 3.

Table 4: Domain: Self

Measure	Key terms & concepts	Indicator	SP	SE	FR	EN	IE
Life satisfaction	Self-assessed life satisfaction; happiness	All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays?	1	3	1	3	1
Education	Participating in further or higher education	Participation of 17 year olds in education or training	3	3	3	3	3
Education	Young people who are unemployed and not in education	16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment	3	3	3	3	3
Education	Per cent of population completed higher education	% of the population whose highest qualification is a first degree (or equivalent)	3	3	3	3	3
Education	Per cent of population with no or low qualifications	Adults (25-54) With No or Low Qualification Rate (Persons, %)	3	2	3	3	3
Health	People with long-term poor health e.g. cancer; depression - of working age (16 to 65)	People of working age with a limiting long-term illness (Persons, Percentage)	2	3	2	3	3
Health	Good health	General health: Good (Persons, %)	3	3	1	3	1
Health	Subjective or self-assessed levels of health	Self-reported measure of people's overall health and wellbeing	3	3	1	3	3
Material wellbeing	Per cent of people unemployed	Unemployment rate (Persons, %)	3	3	3	3	3
Material wellbeing	Per cent of people receiving benefits for unemployment	Claimants for Less than 12 Months - Rate (Persons, %)	1	2	2	3	1

RAG rating: 3 = Data exists. 2 = proxy indicator exists, 1 = Indicator does not exist.

Table 5: Domain: Supports

Measure	Key terms & concepts	Indicator	SP	SE	FR	EN	IE
Social Capital	Per cent of people that volunteer regularly in a community setting	How often over the last 12 months have you given unpaid help to any group(s), club(s) or organisation(s)	2	1	1	3	2
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people in divorced household	People aged 16 and over living in households: Not living in a couple: Divorced	1	2	3	3	1
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people in workless household	Households with no adults in employment: With dependent children	2	3	3	3	2
Strong and stable families	Per cent of single pensioners living alone	One person: Pensioner	2	2	3	3	3
Strong and stable families	Per cent of family units with married or two adults	One family and no others: Married couple households: With dependent children	3	3	3	3	3

Strong and stable families	Per cent of people that care for someone else (time)	All people who provide unpaid care (time hours per week)	2	2	1	3	2
Strong and stable families	Lone parents	Births to lone mothers %	2	3	2	2	2
<i>RAG rating: 3 = Data exists. 2 = proxy indicator exists, 1 = Indicator does not exist.</i>							

Table 6: Domain: Systems and Structures

Measure	Key terms & concepts	Indicator	SP	SE	FR	EN	IE
Crime	Subjective feelings of safety	How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area during the day?	2	1	2	3	1
Crime	Subjective feelings of safety	How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area after dark?	2	1	2	3	1
Crime	Objective levels of crime	Crime score	3	3	3	3	3
Effective public services	Access to primary schools in a local area	Population Weighted Average Road Distance to a Primary School	3	1	1	3	2
Effective public services	Access to GPs in a local area	Population Weighted Average Road Distance to GP Premises	3	3	2	3	1
Effective public services	Subjective levels of satisfaction with public services	Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following public services in your local area – GP	1	1	1	3	1
Enabling infrastructure	Sense of belonging to local area	% of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood	2	2	1	3	1
Enabling infrastructure	Satisfaction with local area	Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?	1	1	1	3	1
Enabling infrastructure	Levels of overcrowding in homes	Overcrowding	3	1	1	3	2
Enabling infrastructure	Homelessness	Homelessness	1	3	1	3	1
Enabling infrastructure	Empty properties	Percentage of dwellings empty for more than 12 months (not including second homes)	3	3	3	3	3
Local Economy	Job vacancies in local area	Job vacancies in local area	2	2	2	3	2

Social Capital	People feel they can influence local decisions	% of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality	1	1	1	3	1
<i>RAG rating: 3 = Data exists. 2 = proxy indicator exists, 1 = Indicator does not exist.</i>							

6. Case studies: Roquetes and Lindängen

As part of this work, our wellbeing and resilience measurement framework (WARM) has been tested in two case study sites, Lindängen, Malmö and Roquetes, Barcelona. The WARM framework was adapted and applied in the context of the two neighbourhoods to test the extent to which a WARM framework can be adopted in different European cities. The framework was applied in these two areas.

Qualitative research was also undertaken to complement the data collection. The qualitative evidence contextualised the WARM data and elaborated areas where additional dimensions of local progress can be measured. Semi-structured interviews were held with residents, local policy makers and practitioners and third sector. The case studies explored how useful the existing framework is in capturing ‘local progress’, cultural and political discrepancies and identifying gaps in the existing framework.

Roquetes and Lindängen have a number of distinct similarities and differences. Both Barcelona and Malmö are port cities and experienced rapid urban expansion in the post war industrial period. The boundaries of both cities expanded to accommodate an influx of internal migrants from other cities or rural surrounding areas. Roquetes and Lindängen developed as a consequence of urban expansion. During the last decade of the century, both cities have experienced migration. In consequence, both neighbourhoods have a high proportion of migrants, with comparatively higher levels of unemployment and deprivation compared to surrounding areas.

6.1 Understanding Roquetes, Barcelona

Roquetes is on the periphery of the post-industrial, port city of Barcelona. Roquetes is located on the northern edge of Barcelona in the district of Nou Barris, and has approximately 8,300 inhabitants.

At the time of development of the neighbourhood, no strategic urban plan existed. Roquetes was planned as a posteriori. Most of the land in the neighbourhood is privately owned and residents self-built much of the housing stock that exists today. In more recent years, Barcelona City Council and urban planners have attempted to formally integrate Nou Barris, the district in which Roquetes is located, and other peripheral neighbourhoods into Barcelona’s urban plan. This is exemplified by the development of transport links to the city centre and locating public services in the neighbourhood.

In recent years, there has been increased migration into the area. The migrants tend to have poor skills and qualifications and encounter language barriers. Consequently, much of the concerns and interventions that emerge from the case study centre on limited access to employment and subsequent poverty and deprivation.

Data collection structures in Barcelona

Below, we set out a brief description of the administrative structure in Barcelona. This provides useful context on how data collection is coordinated and collected in the city, and at what scale.

The regional government area for Barcelona is the Generalitat de Catalunya. Each regional government in Spain is governed by unique administrative and data collection structures. Below the regional government sits the city council. The research and statistics division within the City Council collects data across the city.

There are ten administrative districts in the city. The city is divided into 73 neighbourhoods, each with a neighbourhood association. There is a federation of neighbourhood associations. Other agencies, such as an autonomous police force, or local youth workers, also collect data on specific outputs associated with their service provision. The City Council also uses data from the Eurobarometer survey, which is statistically significant at a district level. Barcelona City Council and the district council collect data on a range of indicators that map onto the WARM framework.

The European statistical classification used for the case studies, is Local Administrative Level (LAU) 2 (also known as NUTS 5). LAU 2 consists of municipalities or equivalent units in the 27 EU Member States.^{28,29} For Spain, the following local level classifications have been used:

- District Municipality (Distrito): Nou Barris
- Greater Statistical Zones (Zones Estadistiques Grans – ZEG)
- Greater Neighbourhood Level (GNL): Canyelles, Roquetes and Tinitat Nova
- Neighbourhood: Roquetes
- Basic Statistical Areas

6.2 Review of existing micro data for Roquetes

- **Life satisfaction:** Data on levels of life satisfaction is collected by the district council every four years.
- **Education:** There is no data collection on levels of participation in education for young people between ages of 16 and 18 years old. However, data is collected on the level of education within the local population at a neighbourhood level.
- **Health:** Subjective levels of health data is collected at district level, however we could find no data collected on objective standards of health (good health specifically).
- **Employment:** Unemployment data is collected at neighbourhood level, but we could find no evidence on data on the number of people in receipt of unemployment benefits specifically. There is additional data collection on a survey titled ‘Quality of life at your job’. The city council also looks at how many companies exist in the city, where employees work and at mobility and commuting patterns.
- **Family:** Data is collected on family structures and composition. This data is generally collected at a neighbourhood level. The qualitative findings suggest that clusters of extended family groups live in the neighbourhood. This is, in part, a consequence of chain migration. Family networks are strong and supportive. This is particularly evident in financial assistance and pooled saving accounts. Levels of home ownership are high in the area, which reflects collective financial resources.

- **Volunteering and caring:** Data on number of community services and number of participants. However, this does not capture information on unpaid volunteering and support provided within the area. The data collected reflects the opportunities to volunteer, but does not allow assessment on the strength of informal volunteering networks and activity. In addition, there is no data collected on the proportion of people that provide unpaid care.
- **Crime:** Data on subjective feelings of safety is collected at district level and objective crime data is collected at Greater Neighbourhood Level. The city council conducts an annual survey on levels of crime and perceptions of safety. The data is collected at district level and not at the neighbourhood level. The questions include:
 - What happened to you last year?
 - How do you feel about crime?

The perception level data and the data on reported criminal incidents from the police, often do not match up. The council estimates that approximately 60% of crime is unreported. In addition, the perception of crime does not reflect the historically low levels of crime experienced in Nou Barris.

- **Civic participation and belonging:** Each neighbourhood association records the level of participation at a local level. In terms of indicators that reflect ‘sense of belonging’, there is a household survey which is also conducted annually at a district level and the Greater Neighbourhood Level.

Our qualitative findings show that strong social networks exist within the area. As one interviewee stated, “The neighbourhood is very strong and the networks are positive”. The community based voluntary organisations are considered to be active in the area. Statutory organisations work with the community organisations in the design and delivery of interventions in order to avoid duplication of existing activities delivered by community organisations.

Box 3: Quotes from interviews

“The community is very ‘revindicativo’. They protest and contest. They are used to fighting for change with a more direct/activist approach, rather than engaging in dialogue. A democratic process of working together with the government is not yet happening”.

“The civil society is doing a lot and we do not want to duplicate, but they need to build on this. The social fabric here is very strong”.

- **Access to services:** There is no data collection of level of service provision in the area. However, every four years, data is collected which invites respondents to rate the management of their city, which we have used as a proxy indicator for levels of satisfaction with public services. This data is collected at district level.
- **Housing:** There is no evidence of data collected on homelessness. Data on number of empty second homes (a proxy indicator for number of empty properties) was collected in 2001. In addition, proxy data exists for overcrowding.
- **Local economy:** No data is captured on number of local vacancies in the local area. In recent years, the area has been absorbed into the city, with infrastructure projects

connecting the area to the city. The City Council have led on developing a refined infrastructure to absorb the area into the city. Alongside this work was improvement to the design of the neighbourhoods, with improvements in informal public spaces. Nonetheless, the neighbourhood remains on the periphery and the transport links are considered to be poor by some of the City Council officials.

Table 7: RAG rating, Roquetes, Barcelona

Measure	Key terms and concepts	Year	Frequency	Data source	Local level	RAG* rating
Life satisfaction	Self-assessed life satisfaction; happiness	2010	Every four years	Survey of Social Values (Enquesta de Valors Socials) No. 1500, Ajuntament de Barcelona	District level	3
Education	Participating in further or higher education	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Education	Young people who are unemployed and not in education	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Education	Per cent of population who have completed higher education	2012	Annual	Lectura del Padró Municipal d'Habitants, Ajuntament de Barcelona	Neighbourhood level	3
Education	Per cent of population with no or low qualifications	2013	Annual	Lectura del Padró Municipal d'Habitants, Ajuntament de Barcelona	Neighbourhood level	3
Health	People with long- term poor health e.g. cancer; depression - of working age (16 to 65)	2001	Annual	Característiques de la població de Barcelona	District level and Greater Statistical Zones	3
Health	Good health	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1

Health	Subjective or self- assessed levels of health	2008	Every four years	Survey on Quality of the City (Enquesta de Qualitat de La Ciutat), Ajuntament de Barcelona	District level	3
Material wellbeing	Per cent of people unemployed	2011	Annual	Neighbourhood profile, Les Roquetes, Nou Barris, Ajuntament de Barcelona	Neighbourhood level	3
Material wellbeing	Per cent of people receiving benefits for unemployment	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Social Capital	Per cent of people who volunteer regularly in a community setting	2010	Every four years	Survey of Social Values (Enquesta de Valors Socials) No 1500, Ajuntament de Barcelona	District level	3
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people in divorced household	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people in workless household	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Strong and stable families	Per cent of single pensioners living alone	2011	Annual	Neighbourhood Profile, Les Roquetes, Nou Barris, Ajuntament de Barcelona	Neighbourhood level	3
Strong and stable families	Per cent of family units with married or two adults	2011	Annual	Lectura del Padró Municipal d'Habitants, Ajuntament de Barcelona	Neighbourhood level	2
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people who care for someone else (time)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1

Strong and stable families	Lone parents	2011	Annual	Lectura del Padró Municipal d'Habitants, Ajuntament de Barcelona	Neighbourhood level	3
Crime	Subjective feelings of safety	2008	Every four years	Survey on Quality of the City (Enquesta de Qualitat de La Ciutat), Ajuntament de Barcelona no.1111	District level	3
Crime	Subjective feelings of safety	2008	Every four years	Survey on Quality of the City (Enquesta de Qualitat de La Ciutat), Ajuntament de Barcelona no.1111	District level	3
Crime	Objective levels of Crime	2012	Annual	Survey on Victimization, Barcelona. EVB2012	Aggregated data at Greater Neighbourhood Level	3
Effective public services	Access to primary schools in a local area	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Effective public services	Access to GPs in a local area	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Effective public services	Subjective levels of satisfaction with public services	2011	Annual	Municipal Services Survey, Nou Barris (Enquesta de Serveis Municipals Nou Barris), Ajuntament de Barcelona	District and Greater Neighbourhood Level	3

Enabling infrastructure	Sense of belonging to local area	2011	Annual	Municipal Services Survey, Nou Barris (Enquesta de Serveis Municipals Nou Barris), Ajuntament de Barcelona	District and Greater Neighbourhood Level	2
Enabling infrastructure	Satisfaction with local area	2011	Annual	Municipal Services Survey, Nou Barris (Enquesta de Serveis Municipals Nou Barris), Ajuntament de Barcelona	District and Greater Neighbourhood Level	3
Enabling infrastructure	Levels of overcrowding in homes	2012	Annual	Lectura del Padró Municipal d'Habitants, Ajuntament de Barcelona	Neighbourhood level and Basic Statistical Areas	2
Enabling infrastructure	Homelessness	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Enabling infrastructure	Empty properties	2001		Census	District level and Greater Statistical Zones	2
Local Economy	Job vacancies in local area	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Social Capital	People feel they can influence local decisions	Pending 2012	Every four years	Survey on Quality of the City (Enquesta de Qualitat de La Ciutat), Ajuntament de Barcelona no.1111	District level	2
*RAG rating: 3 = Data exists. 2 = proxy indicator exists, 1 = Indicator does not exist.						

Box 4: Case study: Barcelona Activa

Barcelona Activa focus on the economy, enterprise and employment and implement economic development policies on behalf of Barcelona City Council. Barcelona Activa has worked in Roquetes since 2007.

The organisation designs and delivers interventions which accommodate the particular deprivations experienced by the community that they are working in. The organisation meets with community groups every month to identify emerging concerns and to gather qualitative data. The data informs how Barcelona Activa adapt existing interventions for residents in the area.

“We do not have data at a local level and it is therefore important that we are co-located. We mix with the neighbours, which is very important. They know who we are and we are constantly evaluated by the neighbours”.

Box 5: Case study: partnerships between the District Council and the neighbourhood

In the district of Nou Barris, the council is currently piloting a new response to local evictions, attempting to minimise the number of residents who are being forced out of their homes. Often, residents at risk of losing their homes, are not identified early enough and only ask for help once the eviction process has already started.

The district council is now trying to target people with a high risk of eviction, as early as possible. Recognising the strength of communication *within* the community, the district council relies on informal leaders to identify and support their neighbours. In Roquetes, the council are working with the locally elected leader of the neighbourhood association, to develop their role as a key intermediary between the council and local residents. For this particular project, they are using this relationship as a vehicle for passing on information on legal and housing options to residents.

6.3 Understanding Lindängen, Sweden

Lindängen is located on the southern edge of Malmö in a district called Fosie. This neighbourhood is smaller in size, with a population of approximately 6,600 inhabitants.

Lindängen was developed in accordance with a master plan, to absorb the increased urbanisation in the city. Apartment blocks are organised around vast green spaces with a stand-alone high street in the centre. Much (proportion) of the housing is rented from the municipal council and is subsidised. There is also a smaller proportion of privately owned and rented accommodation.

There are approximately 6,500 residents in Lindängen. The neighbourhood is characterised as one of entry and transition. Swedish migrants arrived in the 1960's and Lindängen was built to accommodate the overspill from the city. More recently, migrants from outside Europe and Eastern Europe reside in the neighbourhood.

Data collection structures in Malmö

Regional administration counties (Län) are used in Sweden. Lindängen is in the county of Skåne (NUTS 3) which is within Malmö Municipality and Burlöv Municipality. Malmö is the seat of Malmö Municipality and the capital of Skåne. The county (Län) is subdivided into 33 local administrative districts (kommuner - LAU 2), 10/33 administrative districts are located in Malmö city. The administration of the City of Malmö is split into ten city districts in 1996, Fosie is the district in which Lindängen is located. Each city district is managed by a political committee called the City District Council, which constitutes a municipal committee in accordance with Sweden's Local Government Act.

For Sweden, the following local level classifications have been used:

- District Municipality (Kommune) – Fosie
- Neighbourhood – Lindängen

6.4 Review of existing micro data for Lindängen

- **Life satisfaction:** Every four years, self-assessed life satisfaction level is collected at district level. However, some service providers perceive wellbeing to be generally low.
- **Education:** Data is collected on levels of participation in education post-16. This data is collected at the district level and the neighbourhood level. In addition, data on proportion of the population in higher education and with no, or low, qualifications is collected at district level.

The general perception of people participating in the case study is that level of education is low. This is in part due to a sizeable migrant community for whom Swedish is a second language. In addition, poor attainment and disruption within the local school, for example fire alarms set off on a daily basis, contribute to perception that education in the area is low.

- **Health:** A proxy indicator was identified: ‘number of people on long-term sick leave’, to reflect the proportion of people with long-term poor health. There is no evidence of data which records levels of good health in the area. However, self-reported levels of health are collected at district level.
- **Employment:** There is data collection on the number of unemployed people; this is collected at district level. Data is collected on number of households with social assistance, but there is no data on proportion of people receiving benefits for unemployment.
- **Family:** Generally, there is limited data collected on family composition, though data is collected on the proportion of pensioners living alone.
- **Volunteering and caring:** There is no data collected on proportion of people who provide unpaid care. Sweden applies a specific definition of volunteering, ‘forening’, which is formal and activities are registered.

The qualitative findings suggest that the city council invest resources in many local activities. Typical activities include a local woman’s support group, an inter-cultural fashion show for women, and an employment scheme for youth workers who are resident in the area. Initiatives such as a ‘bridge builder’, a youth worker located in the library, or a youth worker based in the local high school, help engage young people. These initiatives are often publicly funded.

Some local service providers report weak social networks within the area, and little self- organisation. However, groups for pensioners are more visible. In contrast, residents report strong social ties and mutual support between neighbours and within families. The existence of this local activity does not register for some local providers who deliver services in the area.

However, some of the residents we spoke to do volunteer. One local mum helps to support the local kindergarten when a staff member is unable to work. But some residents expressed frustration in trying to establish new initiatives or in using public spaces for community activities.

Box 6: Case study: The father’s group

Lina, a young mother from Lindängen, argues that there is a lot of support for women and young people, but the Arab men in the community are not supported. There is nothing for them in Lindängen. Lindängen is very residential, with few residents actually working in the area. After work, men tend not to come back to their neighbourhood, but will go to the mosque or socialise in cafes in the centre of town. As a result, they often end up spending very little time with their families.

Lina feels that it is important for fathers to play a greater role in supporting their wives and children. For the past two years, Lina has been organising family gatherings for the Arab community from her own home. They prepare coffee and treats, so that the fathers come along and spend time with their children. So far, around 12 fathers have been coming along. But for Lina this is not enough. She argues that there needs to be more support in place for men in the community; there needs to be a space just for them, where they can meet and also connect with relevant support services such as GPs and parenting advisers.

- **Crime:** Crime data is collected at a district level as part of an annual safety survey. The local area has experienced disturbances in recent years. Media attention on recent

riots and criminal activities, influences perceptions of crime and community safety in the area. In addition, there have been episodes of arson.

- **Civic participation and belonging:** There is no data collected on sense of belonging or levels of satisfaction with the local area.

The qualitative findings indicate differences between perceived levels of belonging and actual levels of belonging, based on residents' views.

The area has had negative media coverage in recent years and this influences how people feel about their local area. Despite the negative reputation in the area, most of the residents were positive about their community.

Box 6: Resident quotes

“Lindagen is like a family. Everyone is like a big family.”

“I have lived here for 35 years. I have never felt afraid of anything or anyone. I hear so much that is negative about the Lindängen. I am going to live here until I am carried out”.

“I have lived in Lindängen for 40 years. I have never been afraid and I am positive about it. This is a much more open area. The community spirit has improved. People stop and talk and it is a much friendlier place.”

In addition, no data is collected on the proportion of people who feel they can influence decisions. Political participation is deemed to be low. As one service provider noted: “There are a lot of people who do not vote. People don't know how it works and how the system works”.

- **Access to services:** Access to service data is collected. However, the discussion with local service providers reflected on how public spaces have adapted to respond to needs of residents.

One librarian noted: “The library is a public space. The kinds of people who come to the library are excluded from society. The newcomers [to the area] focus on the library. They use this as a resource for access and as an informal meeting space... we read letters to them... people are often spending time alone here, they often spend time in the library. The only human contact they have is with the library.”

- **Housing:** Data is collected on overcrowding and homelessness. The interviewees reported concern about level of overcrowding in the local area. Most of the households in Lindängen are two to three bedrooms. There is perception of overcrowding, as family composition has changed in recent years, in light of larger new migrant families. According to one resident, there are only 24 apartments in the neighbourhood with 4 bedrooms.
- **Local economy:** There is no data on the number of job vacancies in the local area.

Table 8: Rag rating, Lindängen, Malmö

Measure	Key terms and concepts	Year	Frequency	Data source	Local level	RAG* rating
Life satisfaction	Self-assessed life satisfaction; happiness	2012	Every fourth year	Division of Public Health and Social sustainability, Region Skåne.	District level	3
Education	Participating in further or higher education	2010	-	City of Malmö (Malmö Stad)	District level and neighbourhood level	3
Education	Young people who are unemployed and not in education	2010	-	Malmö City (Malmö Stad)	District level and neighbourhood level	3
Education	Per cent of population completing higher education	2011	Annual	Malmö City Welfare Report (see also MONA (SCB) SuperCROSS)	District level	3
Education	Per cent of population with no or low qualifications	2011	Annual	City of Malmö Welfare Report (see also MONA (SCB) SuperCROSS)	District level	3
Health	People with long-term poor health e.g. cancer; depression - of working age (16 to 65)	2008	Every fourth year	Division of Public Health and Social sustainability, Region Skåne.	District level	2
Health	Good health	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Health	Subjective or self- assessed levels of health	2012	Every fourth year	Division of Public Health and Social sustainability, Region Skåne.	District level	3

Material wellbeing	Per cent of people unemployed	2010	-	MONA (SCB) SuperCROSS	District level	3
Material wellbeing	Per cent of people receiving benefits for unemployment	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Social Capital	Per cent of people who volunteer regularly in a community setting	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people in divorced household	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people in workless household	2010	-	MONA (SCB) SuperCROSS	District level	2
Strong and stable families	Per cent of single pensioners living alone	1990	-	Census	Neighbourhood level	2
Strong and stable families	Per cent of family units with married or two adults	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Strong and stable families	Per cent of people who care for someone else (time)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Strong and stable families	Lone parents	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Crime	Subjective feelings of safety	2011	Annual	Security Survey, for Police in Skåne (Trygghetsmätning Polismyndigheten i Skåne)	District level	2
Crime	Subjective feelings of safety	2011	Annual	Malmö City Welfare Report	District level	3

	Objective levels of crime	2011	Annual	Security Survey, for Police in Skåne (Trygghetsmätning Polismyndigheten i Skåne)	District level	3
Effective public services	Access to primary schools in a local area	2011	-	Malmö City	District and neighbourhood level	3
Effective public services	Access to GPs in a local area	2012	-	Region Skåne	District and neighbourhood level	3
Effective public services	Subjective levels of satisfaction with public services	2008	Every fourth year	Region Skåne	District level	2
Enabling infrastructure	Sense of belonging to local area	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Enabling infrastructure	Satisfaction with local area	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Enabling infrastructure	Levels of overcrowding in homes	2011	Annual	Malmö City Welfare Report	District level	3
Enabling infrastructure	Homelessness	2011	Annual	Malmö City Welfare Report	District level	3
Enabling infrastructure	Empty properties	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Local Economy	Job vacancies in local area	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Social Capital	People feel they can influence local decisions	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
*RAG rating: 3 = Data exists. 2 = Proxy indicator exists, 1 = Indicator does not exist.						

7. Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

This study attempts to test the feasibility of developing a framework to measure progress at a local level. The aspiration of the framework is to provide a common and unifying understanding of social progress at a local level. We draw on existing data available at a pan-Europe level, at country level (England, France, Ireland, Spain and Sweden) and at a micro level to identify the opportunities and challenges for developing a common framework for measurement across Europe.

The WARM provided a framework for a local measure. The challenge is to illustrate how the WARM framework can be applied at a European level to highlight the opportunities and challenges associated with measuring local progress.

Our study finds that opportunities for developing a framework to measure social progress at a local level do exist. A systemic change in the way that Europe collects data at the local level will be supported by a common country level infrastructure for collecting data exist. Our study finds that a number of universal administrative data collection structures do exist at a pan-Europe level and the data does map onto our WARM framework.

At a country level, data is generally available and maps onto the WARM framework. This is particularly evident when mapping data on the self domain. For the other domains, supports and structures, where data does not exist, there is generally proxy data.

There is a positive relationship between the size of the spatial unit and the data available. A wealth of data exists at the country level that is publicly accessible. For instance, the interactive database on living conditions and subjective wellbeing, EurLIFE, collected by Eurofound, provides data across the 27 countries.

However, our central concern is what data is available at the local level. The smaller the geographical unit, the more varied the spatial unit used and data availability. Whilst generally data is collected in the five countries, again, we were more reliant on proxy data for the supports domain.

Some gaps exist in data availability, namely volunteering, sense of belonging to the community and perception of influence in local decisions. Interestingly, when residents reflected on positive aspects of their community, they often reflected on strong social capital and feeling of belonging, which is data that is generally not available to service providers.

Data at a local level is not often collected systematically across each country. Each municipality uses their own methods for collecting data and their own area classifications. This is a methodological challenge for devising a framework for measuring local progress. Below, we set out the challenges in more detail:

1. Definitional discrepancies

Given that available data in different countries reflects different policy and priorities, mapping the data onto the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure is difficult. Different policy, language and contextual landscapes exist across Europe and this is a key challenge for creating a common framework. For instance, concepts such as 'wellbeing', 'welfare' and 'sustainable development' are subject to extremely different interpretations

across Europe and there is a limited common terminology, which can give rise to competing definitions.

For the purpose of this study, we have used indicators that capture the spirit of the WARM framework and have also used proxy data. This allows us to partially overcome this challenge. For instance, the WARM framework includes the indicator: ‘percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood’. Our proxy indicator states, ‘the respondent’s possibility of asking for help (any kind of help: moral, material or financial) from any relatives, friends or neighbours’.

2. Data accessibility

Each country will have different protocols that govern how individuals and organisations access data. Data is more readily identifiable in public reports (OECD, Council of Europe, European Commission) and comparisons at country level are more readily available and can be accessed through an international body e.g. EUROSTAT.

Licenses and permission requirements can prevent organisations which are neither National Statistical Institutes or statutory organisations from being able to access the data. This will challenge the broad aspiration of a common framework. For example, the majority of the micro data needed for the two case studies was obtained through requests to local administrative bodies. In many cases, this data is not free and requires a membership to a formal institution. Accessibility is therefore a key barrier to smaller informal institutions such as neighbourhood forums.

3. Administrative structures

There is a lack of coordination and structural cohesion between different countries, and even within countries and within cities. In the case of Spain, each region adopts different approaches and had different data collection priorities. In addition, different agencies within a city or district may adopt different definitions of spatial levels and definitions of indicators.

Whilst our study finds a range of existing robust measures, which can be mapped on to the WARM framework, the existing administrative and definitional inconsistencies present a challenge.

The case studies presented an opportunity to test our framework, and understand how data is used at a local level. The case studies were an opportunity to interview local service providers and residents in the area.

Generally, there is a consensus that a framework, which includes a range of indicators, is a useful measure of social progress at a local level and could help to identify the needs and assets within a local community. This would help to provide a common understanding of the composite parts of social progress and link to existing neighbourhood plans.

Some of the local service providers collect data (quantitative and qualitative) which is not used by statutory agencies or does not contribute to wider body of evidence on trends in the local area. This is often a missed opportunity to develop a more comprehensive view on conditions within a local area. In addition, additional data on perceptions of financial security and social networks is viewed as an important aspect of local progress, which are indicators that are overlooked in most statutory datasets.

7.2 Recommendations for measuring social progress at a local level

Below, we set out recommendations for developing measures of social progress at a local level. Where appropriate we have provided sector specific recommendations (NSI's, civic society, local policy makers).

1. **Utilise existing frameworks which measure social progress:** A number of frameworks which measure local progress currently exist. There are few definitional inconsistencies between the frameworks.
2. **Develop guidance on quality assured frameworks:** Further work to develop guidance and quality assurance of frameworks will encourage take up and use of frameworks of social progress. This will support statutory and community-based organisations to identify quality assured frameworks.
3. **Encourage local providers and community organisations to utilise common framework of social progress:** A framework to measure local progress can be used as a lever for policy reform, and support design and delivery of services within a local area. A framework to measure local progress should reflect the requirements of the range of organisations and individuals that deliver services within a local community.
4. **Promote data accessibility and transparency:** We recommend that data protocols are developed which facilitate data transparency and accessibility. This will enable community-based organisations, individuals as well as policymakers, to contribute to and utilise data. We recognise that interpretation of the results requires a level of literacy in statistics (numeracy) that may vary between stakeholders (statistician, researchers and policy makers)
5. **Encourage data collection at a local level:** A local measure requires information to be collected at a lower territorial level. As we set out in our conclusions, there is some variation on geographic spatial units used to define 'local'. We recognise that NUTS and LAU's is a hierarchical structure that is widely adopted. We therefore recommend that a framework of local measures should build on existing administrative infrastructures and recommend LAU 1 and 2 is spatial unit used to define 'local'.
6. **Develop mechanisms to collect data locally:** Local data is routinely collected by agencies operating in the neighbourhoods. An online portal to upload and collate data would enable facilitate the availability of data at a local level. A robust and common framework would ensure consistency across different countries and would greatly enhance the evidence base on local progress and the factors that influence levels of local progress. The data could also act as a lever for local agencies to influence commissioning decisions and shape decisions that impact on the local area. This would act as an incentive to promote and contribute to data collection for the organisations concerned.
7. **Encourage grass root collaboration platforms:** In the future, these changes could potentially encourage grass root collaboration platforms for local groups to access data from a publicly accessible online portal and make their own assessment of local progress, test and incorporate additional data reflecting local issues and track progress across time.

8. **Enhance data availability on systems and structures:** Though there is ample data about individuals and households, there is limited data on systems and structures, such as access to GP's, schools and levels of satisfaction with public services.
9. **Consider additional indicators of social progress:** Our case studies highlighted a number of aspects of local progress that are largely absent from WARM and other frameworks. Specifically, existence of local networks in some of the communities is largely invisible to data collection. The local networks often contribute to what we term 'community resilience', and reflect the shift towards co-delivery of services. The strength of community ties between residents and between local providers should be incorporated into our conceptual understanding of local progress.

10. Other variables that are useful to include are:

- extended families: composition and proximity of extended families
- unpaid care: quantify hours of unpaid care and for whom (neighbour or family member)
- access to I.T: access and proficiency in I.T
- subjective levels of financial security (current and future)³⁰

References

Bacon, N., Brophy, M., Hothi, M., Mulgan, G. (2008) *Neighbourliness + empowerment = wellbeing* London: Young Foundation

Bacon, N., Mguni, N. (2010) *Taking the temperature of our local communities*. London: The Young Foundation

Billings J.R. (2000) Community development: a critical review of approaches to evaluation. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 31 (2) pp. 472-480

Chanan G., (2002). *Community Development Foundation Measure of community*. A study for the Active Community Unit and Research, Development and Statistics Unit of the Home Office, UK

Diener, E. and Seligman, M.E.P. (2004) Beyond Money: Toward an Economy of Wellbeing. *American Psychological Society* 5(1) pp. 1-31

Donovan, N. and Halpern, D. (2002). *Life Satisfaction: the state of knowledge and implications for government* [pdf] GOV - Cabinet Office analytical paper; REVIEW. Available at: < <http://www.sd-research.org.uk/post.php?p=107>> [Accessed 9 March 2013]

European Commission, 2009. *Eurostat*. [online] Available at: <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home>. [Accessed 19 March 2013]

European Commission, 2004. *Urban Audit: Methodological Handbook*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Available at: < http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-BD-04-002/EN/KS-BD-04-002-EN.PDF> [Accessed 19 March 2013].

European Commission. *Eurofound Eurobarometer*. [online]. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm> [Accessed 19 March 2013]

Frey, B. and Stutzer, A. (2002). What can economists learn from happiness research? *Journal of Economic Literature, American Economic Association*, 40(2), pp. 402-435

Galster, G. (2001). On the Nature of Neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 38(12) pp. 2111-2124

Graham, C. (2005). The Economics of Happiness: Insights on Globalization from a Novel Approach, *World Economics*, 6(3), pp. 41-55

Hall, J., Giovannini, E., Morrone, A. & Ranuzzi, G. (2010) *A framework to measure the progress of societies* [pdf] London: OECD Publishing. Available at: <[http://search.oecd.org/officialdocuments/displaydocumentpdf/?cote=std/doc\(2010\)5&docLanguage=En](http://search.oecd.org/officialdocuments/displaydocumentpdf/?cote=std/doc(2010)5&docLanguage=En)> [Accessed 19 March 2013]

Hird, S. (August 2003) *Community Wellbeing: A discussion paper for the Scottish Executive and Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics*, NHS Health Scotland.

Johnson, S. (2007). The role of markets in the construction of wellbeing: the need for a Polanyian Perspective. *Working Paper*. Bath, UK: University of Bath/Wellbeing in Developing Countries Research group

Kahneman, D., Kruger, A., Schkade., D., Schwarz, N. and Stone, A. (2004). Toward national Wellbeing accounts. *The American Economic Review*, 94 (2) pp. 429-434

Salvaris, M. (2000). *Community and Social Indicators: How Citizens Can Measure Progress* [pdf]Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne.

Available at:

<<http://snifferdogonline.com/reports/Community%20Capacity%20Building/Community%20Social%20Indicators.pdf>> [Accessed 19 March 2013]

Sen, A. (1996) *On the foundations of Welfare economics: Utility, Capability and Practical reason*, in Francesco, F, Hahn, F, Vannucci, S (eds) *Ethics, Rationality , and economic behaviour* , Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp 50 – 65

Subramanian, S., *Bio-enterprises, endogenous development and wellbeing*. [presentation]. United Nations University

Annexes

Annex 1: Source of data for five countries

Table 9: Sources of data for five countries in Europe at NUTS levels 1-5 including a RAG* rating

Key terms & concepts	Indicator	SP	Sources (SP)	SE	Sources (SE)	FR	Sources (FR)	EN	Sources (EN)	IE	Sources (IE)
Self assessed life satisfaction; happiness	All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays?	1	n/a	3	n/a	1	n/a	3	Place Survey, 2008	1	n/a
Participating in further or higher education	Participation of 17 year olds in education or training	3	Eurostat regional year book. 'Students aged 17 years in all levels of education (ISCED levels 0–6), by NUTS 2 regions, 2010 (!) (% of 17-year-olds)	3	Eurostat regional year book. 'Students aged 17 years in all levels of education (ISCED levels 0–6), by NUTS 2 regions, 2010 (!) (% of 17-year-olds)	3	INSEE Local Statistics (2010) NUTS 2 (region) level. Proxy: proportion of students in the public education students	3	Eurostat regional year book. 'Students aged 17 years in all levels of education (ISCED levels 0–6), by NUTS 2 regions, 2010 (!) (% of 17-year-olds)	3	Eurostat regional year book. 'Students aged 17 years in all levels of education (ISCED levels 0–6), by NUTS 2 regions, 2010 (!) (% of 17-year-olds)
Young people who are unemployed and not in education	16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment	3	National statistics, annual survey on Active Population. Proxy: Unemployed population by age and (16-19yrs), NUTS level 2 (Auton. Communities)	3	Eurostat, NUTS 1	3	Eurostat, NUTS 1	3	Eurostat, NUTS 1	3	Eurostat, NUTS 1

Per cent of population completed higher education	% of the population whose highest qualification is a first degree (or equivalent)	3	National statistics. Annual Survey on Active Pop. Proxy: Level of education attained by age (absolute) level: NUTS 2 (auton. Coms)	3	EU SILC: 'Tertiary educational attainment by sex, age group 25-64 and NUTS 2 regions' - %	3	INSEE data (2010) at NUTS 5 (Commune), city and regional levels	3	EU SILC: 'Tertiary educational attainment by sex, age group 25-64 and NUTS 2 regions' - %	3	CSO Census data (2011) NUTS 3. Proxy: 'Highest level of education completed by region' (%)
Per cent of population with no or low qualifications	Adults (25-54) With No or Low Qualification Rate (Persons, Percentage)	3	National statistics. Annual Survey on Active Population. Level of education attained by age (absolute) level: NUTS 2 (auton. Coms)	2	Eurostat, NUTS 1	3	INSEE data (2010) on education by age at NUTS 5 (Commune level)	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	3	CSO Census data (2011) in Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. 'Age at which full-time education ceased by region' (%)
People with long term poor health e.g. cancer; depression - of working age (16 to 65)	People of working age with a limiting long-term illness (Persons, Percentage)	2	EU SILC health question: 'Do you have any long-standing illness or (longstanding) health problem?'	3	Statistics Sweden, INKOPAK. NUTS 5 (2005) 'The population broken down by sickness and activity 1), sex, family status 2) and age.	2	EU SILC health question: 'Do you have any long-standing illness or (longstanding) health problem?'	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	3	CSO Census data (2011) NUTS 3. 'Unable To Work due to Sickness or Disability (Total)'
Good health	General health: Good (Persons, Percentage)	3	Health surveys available at each NUTS 2 (autonomous community)	3	FHI - National Inst. Of Public Health (2011), counties - NUTS 3.WHO question: 'How do you assess your general health?'	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a

Subjective or self assessed levels of health	Self reported measure of people's overall health and wellbeing	3	Health surveys available at each NUTS 2 (autonomous community)	3	FHI - National Inst. Of Public Health (2011), counties - NUTS 3.WHO question: 'How do you assess your general health?'	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	3	EU SILC. CSO. See in Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. 'Perception of health status by region. (Age 15 and over)'
Per cent of people unemployed	Unemployment Rate (Persons, Percentage)	3	Eurostat: NUTS 2	3	EU SILC NUTS 2	3	INSEE Local statistics (2009) at NUTS 5 (commune), NUTS 4 and 3. Proxy: Active population	3	EU SILC: NUTS 2	3	CSO Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. 'Employment and unemployment rates by sex and region' (2002 & 2007)
Per cent of people receiving benefits for unemployment	Claimants for Less than 12 Months - Rate (Persons, Percentage)	1	n/a	2	Urban Audit (2001) Proxy: 'Proportion of individuals reliant on social security' at city level	2	INSEE data (2009) at NUTS 3 (department) Proxy: Social Assistance (euros/inhabitant)	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a
Per cent of people that volunteer regularly in a community setting	How often over the last 12 months have you given unpaid help to any group(s), club(s) or organisation(s)	2	Survey on Adult Population Involvement in Learning Activities (AES) 2007. NUTS level 2 (Auton. Community) Proxy: Participation in activities of charitable and volunteer-run organisations	1	n/a	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics	2	CSO Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. 'Type of voluntary work by county, age 15 and over'

Per cent of people in divorced household	People aged 16 and over living in households: Not living in a couple: Divorced	1	n/a	2	Statistics Sweden, NUTS 5 (2000-11) 'Home children and adolescents 0-21 years whose parents are separated by region, gender, age and their parents are in the same housing'	3	INSEE population census data (2008)	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a
Per cent of people in workless household	Households with no adults in employment: With dependent children	2	EU SILC: People living in households with very low work intensity by NUTS 2 regions (population aged 0 to 59 years)	3	Statistics Sweden, INKOPAK (1998) NUTS 5. Tabell I B.FAM. 'Total Married / cohabiting with at least one child under 18,	3	INSEE	3	EU SILC People living in households with very low work intensity by NUTS 2 regions (population aged 0 to 59 years)	2	EU SILC People living in households with very low work intensity by NUTS 2 regions (population aged 0 to 59 years)
Per cent of single pensioners living alone	One person: Pensioner	2	Urban Audit (2001) at city level but only roughly 75% of all cities covered	2	Eurostat (2012) Population by sex, age group, household status and NUTS 3 regions - Person Living Alone (by age) [cens_01rhtype]	3	Urban Audit (2001) at SCD level.	3	Urban Audit 2001 - SCD	3	Urban Audit (2001) City level.
Per cent of family units with married or two adults	One family and no others: Married couple households: With dependent children	3	Eurostat (2001) NUTS 3	3	Eurostat (2001) NUTS 3	3	Eurostat (2001) NUTS 3	3	Eurostat (2001) NUTS 3	3	Eurostat (2001) NUTS 3

Per cent of people that care for someone else (time)	All people who provide unpaid care. time hours per week	2	National Stats. Living Conditions Survey (2006) Level: NUTS 2. Proxy: ADULTS by number of times they have helped personally, outside organizations, a person who is not a member of the household in the last 12 months and CCAA	2	Statistics Sweden. NUT 5 (2010-14) 'User involvement / meskapande in municipal activities by municipality' - in individual care/ care of older people/ care of people with disabilities	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	2	CSO Census (2006) Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. 'Carers by hours of unpaid work and county (Age 15 +)'
Lone parents	Births to lone mothers %	2	Eurostat NUTS 3	3	Statistics. Sweden. INKOPAK (1998) NUTS 5. Tabell I B.FAM. Lone parent (by sex) with at least	2	Eurostat NUTS 3	2	Eurostat NUTS 3	2	Eurostat NUTS 3
Subjective feelings of safety -	How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area during the day?	2	Urban Audit Perception Survey - (2004) -partial coverage (3 cities) 'You feel safe in the neighborhood you live in'	1	n/a	2	Urban Audit Perception Survey - (2004) -partial coverage (3 cities) 'You feel safe in the neighborhood you live in'	3	Urban Audit Perception Survey - (2004) -partial coverage (3 cities) 'You feel safe in the neighborhood you live in'	1	n/a
Subjective feelings of safety -	How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area after dark	2	Urban Audit Perception Survey - (2004) -partial coverage (3 cities) 'You feel safe in the neighborhood you live in'	1	n/a	2	Urban Audit Perception Survey - (2004) -partial coverage (3 cities) 'You feel safe in the neighborhood you live in'	3	Urban Audit Perception Survey - (2004) -partial coverage (3 cities) 'You feel safe in the neighborhood you live in'	1	n/a

Objective levels of crime	Crime score	3	Urban Audit (2004) 'Total number of recorded crimes per 1,000 population' City level	3	Urban Audit (2004) 'Total number of recorded crimes per 1,000 population' City level	3	INSEE Local Statistics (2010) crime at NUTS 3 (departement) level	3	Urban Audit (2001) City level. 'Total number of recorded crimes per 1,000 population' City level	3	Urban Audit (2001) City level.
Access to primary schools in a local area	Population Weighted Average Road Distance to a Primary School	3	National Stats, Living Conditions survey (2007) Level: NUTS 2 (Auton. Com) 'Households by access to compulsory education by Autonomous Community'	1	n/a	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	2	Source: Dep of Education & Science. CSO Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. 'Primary schools, pupils and teachers by county, 2006'
Access to GPs in a local area	Population Weighted Average Road Distance to GP Premises	3	National Stats, Living Conditions survey (2007) Level: NUTS 2 (Auton. Com) 'Households by accessibility to primary health care services and size of municipality'	3	Urban Audit (2004) City level. Proxy: 'Number of practising physicians per 1000 residents'	2	EU SILC Proxy: 'Physicians or doctors by NUTS 2 regions' per 100,000 inhabitants	3	EU SILC Proxy: 'Physicians or doctors by NUTS 2 regions' per 100,000 inhabitants	1	n/a
Subjective levels of satisfaction with public services	Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following public services in your local area – GP	1	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a

Sense of belonging to local area	% of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood	2	National Stats, Living Conditions survey (2006) Proxy: Adults who could ask for help if need it, to family, friends or neighbors by Autonomous Community' level: NUTS 2	2	Institute of Public Health, National Public Health Survey (2004-12) NUTS 5. Proxy: 'Percentage with low social participation by region, gender and years'	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a
Satisfaction with local area	Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?	1	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a
Levels of overcrowding in homes	Overcrowding	3	Urban Audit (2001) City level, 90%	1	No Urban Audit data	1	No Urban Audit data	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	2	CSO Census (2011) Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. Average Number of Persons per Room in Private Households in Permanent Housing Units by Aggregate Town or Rural Area, Province

Homelessness	Homelessness	1	n/a	3	Urban Audit (2004) City level. Proxy 'Number of roofless persons per 1000 pop'	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a
Empty properties	Percentage of dwellings empty for more than 12 months (not including second homes)	3	Urban Audit (2001) City level, 90%	3	Urban Audit (2004) City level	3	Urban Audit (2001) City level	3	Urban Audit - (2004) city level	3	CSO Census (2006) Regional Quality of Life in Ireland survey NUTS 3. 'Housing stock and vacancy rates by county'
Job vacancies in local area	Job vacancies in local area	2	Eurostat NUTS 2	2	Eurostat NUTS 2	2	Eurostat NUTS 2	3	Eurostat NUTS 2	2	Eurostat NUTS 2
People feel they can influence local decisions	% of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality	1	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a	3	Office for National Statistics: Neighbourhood statistics LAU 2	1	n/a

Annex 2: NUTS classifications

Table 10: NUTS classifications for the 27 countries in Europe

Country	NUTS 1		NUTS 2		NUTS 3		Local Admin Units (LAU) 1 (formerly NUTS 4)		Local Admin Units (LAU) 2 (formerly NUTS 5)	
BE	Gewesten / Régions	3	Provincies / Provinces	11	Arrondissementen / Arrondissements	44	-		Gemeenten / Communes	589
BG	Rajoni	2	Rajoni za planirane	6	Oblasti	28	Obshtini	264	Naseleni mesta	5329
CZ	Území	1	Oblasti	8	Kraje	14	Okresy	77	Obce	6249
DK	-	1	Regioner	5	Landsdeler	11	Kommuner	99	Sogne	2148
DE	Länder	16	Regierungsbezirke	39	Kreise	429	Verwaltungsgemeinschaften	1457	Gemeinden	12379
EE	-	1	-	1	Groups of Maakond	5	Maakond	15	Vald, linn	227
IE	-	1	Regions	2	Regional Authority Regions	8	Counties, Cities	34	Electoral Districts	3441
GR	Groups of development regions	4	Periferies	13	Nomoi	51	Demoi, Koinotites	1034	Demotiko diamerisma, Koinotiko diamerisma	6130
ES	Agrupacion de comunidades Autonomas	7	Comunidades y ciudades Autonomas e.g. Catalonia	19	Provincias + islas + Ceuta, Melilla e.g Barcelona: ES511	59	-		Municipios	8111
FR	Z.E.A.T + DOM	9	Régions + DOM	26	Départements + DOM	100	Cantons de rattachement	3787	Communes	36683
IT	Gruppi di regioni	5	Regioni	21	Provincia	107	-		Comuni	8101

CY	-	1	-	1	-	1	Eparchies	6	Dimoi, koino- tites	613
LV	-	1	-	1	Reģioni	6	Rajoni, republikas pilsētas	33	Pilsētas, novadi, pagasti	527
LT	-	1	-	1	Apskritis	10	Savivaldybės	60	Seniūnijos	518
LU	-	1	-	1	-	1	Cantons	13	Communes	116
HU	Statisztikai nagyregiók	3	Tervezési- statisztikai régiónok	7	Megyék + Budapest	20	Statisztikai kistérségek	168	Települések	3152
MT	-	1	-	1	Gzejjer	2	Distretti	6	Kunsilli	68
NL	Landsdelen	4	Provincies	12	COROP regio's	40	-		Gemeenten	443
AT	Gruppen von Bundesländern	3	Bundesländer	9	Gruppen von politischen Bezirken	35	-		Gemeinden	2357
PL	Regiony	6	Województwa	16	Podregiony	66	Powiaty i miasta na prawach powiatu	379	Gminy	2478
PT	Continente + Regioes autonomas	3	Comissaoes de Coordenação regional + Regioes autonomas	7	Grupos de Con- celhos	30	Concelhos - Municípios	308	Freguesias	4260
RO	Macroregiuni	4	Regiuni	8	Judet + Bucuresti	42	-		Comuni + Municipiu + Orase	3174
SI	-	1	Kohezijske regije	2	Statistične regije	12	Upravne enote	58	Občine	210
SK	-	1	Oblasti	4	Kraje	8	Okresy	79	Obce	2928
FI	Manner- Suomi, Ahvenanmaa / Fasta Finland,	2	Suuralueet / Storområden	5	Maakunnat / Landskap	20	Seutukunnat / Ekonomiska regioner	77	Kunnat / Kommuner	416

	Åland									
SE	Grupper av riksområden	3	Riksområden	8	Län SE224 (county)	21			Kommuner 1280	290
UK	Government Office Regions; Country	12	Counties (some grouped); Inner and Outer London; Groups of unitary authorities	37	Upper tier authorities or groups of lower tier authorities (unitary authorities or districts)	133	Lower tier authorities (districts) or individual unitary authorities; Individual unitary authorities or LECs (or parts thereof); Districts	443	Wards (or parts thereof)	10664
EU-27		97		271		1,303		8397		121601

BE: Belgium, **BG:** Bulgaria, **CZ:** Czech Republic, **DK:** Denmark, **DE:** Germany, **EE:** Estonia, **IE:** Ireland, **GR:** Greece, **ES:** Spain, **FR:** France, **IT:** Italy, **CY:** Cyprus, **LV:** Latvia, **LT:** Lithuania, **LU:** Luxembourg, **HU:** Hungary, **MT:** Malta, **NL:** Netherlands, **AT:** Austria, **PL:** Poland, **PT:** Portugal, **RO:** Romania, **SI:** Slovenia, **SK:** Slovakia, **FI:** Finland, **SE:** Sweden, **UK:** United Kingdom.

NUTS: Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics

NUTS 1: major socio-economic regions

NUTS 2: basic regions for the application of regional policies

NUTS 3: small regions for specific diagnoses

LAU 1: (formerly NUTS 4)

LAU 2: Municipalities (formerly NUTS 5)

Annex 3: Data sources for stocktaking at national and sub-country level

The indicators utilise a range of existing data collection surveys:

- European Social Survey (ESS)
- Eurostat data (including special reports)
- Health indicators
- Eurofound's European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS)
- Urban Audit (including Perception Survey)
- Eurobarometer
- EU SILC

European Social Survey (ESS)

The European Social Survey (the ESS) is social survey designed to capture trends in Europe's changing institutions, attitudes, beliefs and behaviour of European residents. The survey has been in existence since 2001. The cross-sectional survey is delivered every two years.

There is a thematic focus on societal wellbeing, which is conducted as part of the wider work of the European Social Survey. This theme is divided into four areas of work: individual subjective wellbeing; individual living conditions, objective indicators of society, perceived quality of societies.

More information can be found here: <http://www.societalwellbeing.org/>

Urban Audit (AU)

Eurostat's Urban Audit measures quality of life in 258 cities within 27 European countries. It is the most comprehensive collection of data on social progress across Europe that goes below the country level. The 300 indicators used are taken from the variables collected by the European Statistical System. The three geographic levels are Larger Urban Zone (the city region), City level (as defined by administrative or political boundaries) and Sub-City District Level 1 (established city districts in larger cities) and Sub-City District Level 2 (a district with a population threshold between 5,000-40,000). SCD levels are particularly relevant for larger cities that will have more intra-urban disparities. The Urban Audit does not have data for all the social indicators at all three levels. There are 40 indicators used at the SCD level. It has key demographic and social indicators for over 6,000 SCD districts³¹. For this exercise, SCD data from 2001 is the most useful comparison. 2004 data does not seem to be processed. 2001 data has more – probably because of the 2001 census. So, there should be more data at SCD level soon with new national census data.

The Urban Audit Perception Survey was created to complement the data from the main Urban Audit exercise, which collected over 250 indicators on the quality of life in 258 European Cities. This survey was conducted in January 2004, to measure the local perceptions of quality of life in 31 European cities.

European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC)

The EU-SILC is an annual survey involving all member states, which provides micro data on a wide range of social indicators such as income, poverty, social exclusion and living conditions.

The survey collects information from different types of households and provides a comprehensive picture of income, living conditions and poverty.

See this report for more information on the robustness of EU SILC regional data:

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-RA-10-020/EN/KS-RA-10-020-EN.PDF

The primary variables are collected every year. These variables refer either to households or to individuals (for person aged 16 and over) information is regrouped into domains: At household level, four domains are covered: (1) basic data, (2) housing, (3) material deprivation and (4) income. The personal level is regrouped into five domains: (1) basic/demographic data, (2) education, (3) health, (4) labour and (5) income.”

Secondary variables are collected every five years or less frequently in the so-called ad-hoc modules. They include information either at household or personal level about specific topics.

For the purpose of this study, the most relevant secondary variables are within the module on wellbeing (2013) and social participation (2006).

See here for list of secondary variables included in this module:

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/income_social_inclusion_living_conditions/documents/tab/Module%202013/2013%20Module%20list%20of%20variables.pdf

Source:

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/income_social_inclusion_living_conditions/methodology/list_of_variables

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound)

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, is an autonomous body of the European Union, created to assist in the formulation of future policy on social and work-related matters. Eurofound has developed a regularly repeated survey related to quality of life and living conditions.

European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS)

Developed by Eurofound, the [European Quality of Life Survey \(EQLS\)](#), implemented in 2003, 2007 (with an updated version in 2009) and 2011-12, provides a comprehensive portrait of living conditions in European countries. Conducted every four years, it contains a broad range of indicators on different dimensions of quality of life, both objective and subjective.

EurLIFE

EurLIFE is an interactive database on quality of life in Europe, offering data drawn from the Foundation's own surveys and from other published sources. The data provided deals with the

objective living conditions and subjective well-being of European citizens. Today, we have 27 EU Member States and the candidate countries Croatia and Turkey in the database.

Eurobarometer

Eurobarometer is a series of surveys conducted on behalf of the European Commission. Eurobarometer produces reports of public opinion, of certain issues relating to the European Union across the member states. The Eurobarometer results are published by the Public Opinion Analysis Sector of the European Commission Directorate-General Communication. Each survey consists of approximately 1000 face-to-face interviews per country. Reports are published twice a year.

The data mentioned in this report, refers to the Eurobarometer 52.1 (1999) which focused on “quality of life and lifestyle”, Eurobarometer 62.2 (2004) which looks at “social capital”, and Candidate Countries Eurobarometer 2002.1 (2002) covering the “Social Situation in the Countries Applying for European Union Membership³²”.

More information: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm

Annex 4: Sources for micro data in Malmö

Statistics Sweden

Statistics Sweden has developed a statistical package to generate statistics for sub-areas within a municipality. Sub areas, real estates, are an area of interest defined by a municipal authority. The real estate designation is linked to data collected on individuals in the area, in the Total Population Register, and property. There are five main statistical packages for municipalities within the key code:

- BEFPAK: demographic data on age, sex, marital status, citizenship, country of birth, births, deaths and migration
- INKOPAK: data on sources of income of individuals and families
- AMPAK: data on commuting and employment
- FASTPAK: data on real estate
- BILPAK: data on vehicles

Welfare report

This is the annual report in Malmö which presents statistics concerning health etc. Data is gathered from different databases and surveys.

MONA (SCB) SuperCROSS

This database provides information from Statistics Sweden (SCB). This database contains micro data on unemployment, education, housing etc. for Malmö, its ten districts and also smaller areas.

Safety survey

This is an annual survey concerning safety, security etc. In Malmö it is performed in partnership between the police and Malmö.

Public health survey Skåne Region.

The public health survey in Skåne (which includes Malmö) from 2008 is a cross-sectional postal questionnaire study, based on a random sample of people aged 18-80 years. 28,198 people within Skåne's municipalities participated (55% participation).

Annex 5: Sources for micro data in Barcelona

Survey of Social Values

The Survey of Social Values is conducted by the Directorate of Research and Evaluation at Barcelona City Council. The survey incorporates topical issues that reflect emerging concerns such as immigration, family reconciliation and new Family structures family and access to housing.

Survey on Quality of the City

This survey is conducted by the City Council. The survey is used to capture subjective data on levels of satisfaction with the city. The survey is conducted with random simple of 2000 residents. The survey has been conducted three times to date: 2004, 2008 and 2012. There are 100 indicators in the survey, which account for a wide range of issues from satisfaction with municipal to personal satisfaction with health.

Municipal Services Survey, Nou Barris

This is an annual survey, conducted with 6,000 Barcelona residents. The survey captures data on levels of satisfaction with services in the city. The survey is divided into four parts and provides a picture of Barcelona residents view their city. This data is captured across the 39 districts.

Survey on Victimization, Barcelona

Since 1984 the City Council has Barcelona's victimisation survey has been conducted Every year. 4,000 residents complete the survey through telephone interviews. The survey includes data on levels of crime (people who have been the victim of crime, and perceptions of community safety in their city and their neighbourhood. The main indicators include: security personal, home, vehicle, second homes, businesses or businesses and the agricultural economy. The data captures data on location of criminal activity and where victims live. It also includes data on subjective public safety, in the region and in neighbourhoods.

-
- ¹ Diener and Seligman (2004) *Beyond Money: Toward an Economy of Wellbeing*, American Psychological Society (5) 1: 1-31
- ² Sen, A (1996) *On the foundations of Welfare economics: Utility, Capability and Practical reason*, in Francesco, F, Hahn, F, Vannucci, S (eds) *Ethics, Rationality , and economic behaviour* , Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp 50 - 65
- ³ Frey, B and Stutzer, A(2002) *What can economists learn from happiness research*, Journal of Economic Literature, American Economic Association, vol. 40(2), pages 402-435
- ⁴ Donovan, N. and Halpern, D. (2002). *Life Satisfaction: the state of knowledge and implications for government*
- ⁵ Kahneman, D, Kruger, A, Schkade, D Schwarz, D and Stone, A *?Toward national Wellbeing accounts*,
- ⁶ Donovan, N. and Halpern, D. (2002). *Life Satisfaction: the state of knowledge and implications for government*
- ⁷ Graham, C, *The Economics of Happiness*, The Brooking Institute
- ⁸ Johnson, S, *The role of markets in the construction of wellbeing: the need for a Polanyian perspective*.
- ⁹ Diener and Seligman (2004) *Beyond Money: Toward an Economy of Wellbeing*, American Psychological Society (5) 1: 1-31
- ¹⁰ Diener and Seligman (2004) *Beyond Money: Toward an Economy of Wellbeing*, American Psychological Society (5) 1: 1-31
- ¹¹ Bacon, N, Brophy, M, Hothi, M, Mulgan, G (2008) *Neighbourliness + empowerment = wellbeing* London: Young Foundation
- ¹² Presentation by Subramanian, S, *Bio-enterprises, endogenous development and wellbeing*, United Nations University
- ¹³ Billings JR (2000) *Community development: a critical review of approaches to evaluation* Journal of Advanced Nursing 31 (2) 472-480
- ¹⁴ Galster, G. (2001) *On the Nature of Neighbourhood*, Urban Studies, 38(12): 2111-2124
- ¹⁵ Hird, S (August 2003) *Community Wellbeing: A discussion paper for the Scottish Executive and Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics* NHS Health Scotland.
- ¹⁶ Chanan G (2002) *Community Development Foundation Measure of community a study for the Active Community Unit and Research, Development and Statistics Unit of the Home Office*, UK
- ¹⁷ Salvaris, M, (2000) *Community and social indicators: How citizens can measure progress: An overview of social and community indicator projects in Australia and internationally*.
- ¹⁸ Hall, J et al. (2010) *A framework to measure the progress of societies* OECD Statistics Working Papers, 2010/5, OECD Publishing
- ¹⁹ Hall, J, Giovanini, E, Morrone, A, Ranuzzi, G *A framework to measure the progress of societies*, OECD Statistics Working Papers 2010/05
- ²⁰ See for instance, Hall, J, Giovanini, E, Morrone, A, Ranuzzi, G *A framework to measure the progress of societies*, OECD Statistics Working Papers 2010/05
- ²¹ *Urban Audit*, (2004) *Methodological Handbook* , European Union
- ²² Bacon, N, Mguni, N (2010) *Taking the temperature of our local communities*, London: The Young Foundation
- ²³ NUTS is an acronym for the EU Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics. This classification was legally established by EU regulation No 1059/2003 on 29 May 2003. ([Eurostat](#))
- ²⁴ (2010) *Robustness of some EU-SILC based indicators at regional level*, Eurostat
- ²⁵ (2010) *Robustness of some EU-SILC based indicators at regional level*, Eurostat
- ²⁶ (2007) *Regions In the European Union, Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics, NUTS 2006/ EU27*, Eurostat
- ²⁷ - denotes no fixed data collection points
- ²⁹ For more information on Local Administrative Units see: [Eurostat](#)
- ³⁰ See *Understanding Society* survey
- ³¹ *Urban Audit methodological handbook* (2004) Eurostat

³² Eurofound Eurobarometer: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm