KANTAR

Department for
Digital, Culture,
Media & Sport

Community Organisers
2019 report

1. Summary

This report was commissioned by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to assess the Community Organisers Expansion Programme (COEP). The COEP launched in 2017 and aims to train 3,500 Community Organisers (COs) by March 2020. This will take the number of COs trained to 10,000, after the original Community Organisers Programme (COP), delivered by the Cabinet Office from 2011-15, recruited 6,500. The Expansion is a second phase of the original programme and builds on its achievements and learning.

There are a number of strands to the expansion programme. In particular, 20 Social Action Hubs (locally rooted community organisations) in 20 different communities are each receiving funding for three years to train and support 100 people to learn about community organising and these areas form the focus of the Community Life Survey boost survey. Social Action Hubs were selected because they worked in areas of deprivation or social or economic challenge and had the capacity to train people in community organising.

1.1 Approach

The Community Life Survey provides robust measures of social capital, loneliness and social action across England, but to analyse them at a local level requires additional survey interviews to be carried out. Kantar has therefore conducted an online and paper boost survey of the Community Life Survey, in the areas surrounding the new Social Action Hubs (SAHs) delivering the COEP. Each SAH was asked to identify a number of LSOAs[1] where they were delivering the COEP and/or expected to be working in the coming year. Each SAH selected one or more LSOAs, however a number commented that this was difficult to do because of the nature of the Programme. It was not always easy to predict where people would come from to attend training courses - as some SAH publicise their courses across their whole area of operation (e.g. a county or town), whilst others respond reactively to requests for training from community groups or organisations and cannot predict where these might come from. This means we should be cautious about the robustness of the boost survey sampling and the conclusions we draw from the boost survey. A total of 1,286 interviews of adults aged 16+ across the hubs were undertaken between 9 January and 31 March 2019. Concurrently, the survey was also asked of people in other areas of the country enabling a comparator group to be assembled comprising those living in non-CO areas with responses weighted to match the population profile of the nineteen CO areas surveyed.

The boost survey currently only enables comparisons at a single snapshot in time during which the SAHs were operational. We cannot therefore compare the situation before the organisers started work with afterwards nor can we prove any findings are directly the cause of COs. The sample sizes within the individual areas are small so it is difficult to detect differences both between individual areas and between an individual areas vs. the comparator group, so the reporting is based on CO areas as a whole. It is also important to bear in mind that COs work had been going on before the start of the survey, and this work continued throughout the fieldwork period. Consequently, it is not easy to interpret the results as they do not form a

---

[1] Lower Layer Super Output Area (LSOA) is a geographic area developed by the ONS from the census. More information can be found on the ONS census geography page:
https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeography#super-output-area-soa

'baseline' in the traditional sense but neither do they necessarily reflect the extent of work carried out in the areas and the longer term impact of the programme. It is also not possible to know if other community organisations are in operation in the comparator areas with similar aims to COs. However, we can test for statistically significant differences[2] between CO areas and comparator areas at the time of survey in order to see any differences in indicators of social capital, loneliness, and social action. Throughout this report, any reference to "significant" means a statistically significant difference.

The boost survey will be repeated over the same period in 2020, allowing for difference-in-difference analysis to be carried out. This will enable us to better establish the impact of the SAHs by comparing the trajectories of the CO areas and the comparator areas over time. This assumes that the trajectory in the CO areas would be the same as in the comparison areas if there were no Social Action Hubs. This is a reasonable assumption and underpins almost all formal evaluations of localised initiatives.

1.2 Key findings

Overall 12% of people local to the Social Action Hubs responded that they were aware of COs and 2% overall had some form of personal involvement, for example attending a training session or giving feedback about what they would like to change locally.

The CO areas were found to be similar (statistically the same) to the comparator group areas across a broad range of measures; no significant differences were found in satisfaction with the local area, community cohesion, support networks, companionship, and rates of social action.

However, those living in CO areas were significantly more likely than those in the comparator group sample to feel lonely at least some of the time (31% vs. 27% respectively). Given it is a key objective of the CO programme to develop relationships and networks within neighbourhoods, this presents an opportunity area to develop.

Those living near Social Action Hubs were significantly more likely to say they had participated in formal volunteering in the last twelve months than those in the comparator group sample (32% vs. 29%), though informal volunteering rates were similar.

---

[2] If a finding is statistically significant it means that we can be confident that the differences seen in our sampled respondents are reflective of the population.

2. Introduction

Between 2011-15, the Cabinet Office delivered the Community Organisers Programme (COP), recruiting and training over 6,500 Community Organisers (COs) to build relationships and inspire local communities to deliver positive social and political change through collective action; bringing people together and supporting them to take action on the local issues that matter most to them. Community organising aims to support and build local community networks to drive change around the needs and priorities of local areas and ultimately create a broader movement for social change in communities.

In December 2015, the Minister for Civil Society announced the intention to increase the number of COs[3] recruited to 10,000 by March 2020, an expansion of 3,500; representing a second phase of the original programme and building on the achievements and learning from the original programme. It aims to do this by training more people to practise community organising in their communities, and by building a national community of practice for those involved in community organising.

Social Action Hubs (SAHs) are locally rooted organisations committed to building networks of local people to act together to transform communities for good. The new network of 19 appointed SAHs discussed in this report comprises the most substantial part of the expansion programme to train 3,500 new COs. SAHs vary a great deal. Some focus on a small neighbourhood or group of neighbourhoods, others work across whole counties - working in a few specific villages or towns at a time - whilst others work across a city. Each SAH targets work on areas with specific needs or challenges.

The national Community Life Survey has been conducted by Kantar on behalf of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) since 2016-17, and the Cabinet Office between 2012 and 2016. The survey provides Official Statistics on issues that are key to encouraging social action and empowering communities, including volunteering, giving, community engagement, well-being and loneliness.

The key objectives of the survey are to:

- Provide robust, nationally representative data on behaviours and attitudes within communities, to inform and direct policy and action in these areas.

- Provide data of value to all users, including public bodies, external stakeholders and the public, engaging with end users to refine and develop the survey as appropriate.

- Underpin further research and debate on building stronger communities.

Many of the measures collected in the Community Life Survey relate closely to the work of COs. In particular, topic areas covered in the survey such as community cohesion, social action and volunteering align very closely with the aims of COs. Given this alignment between the two, the Community Life Survey presented an opportunity to provide an insight into the differences the COs are making within local communities.

2.1 Method

---

[3] A small number of these COs will be full time paid professional community organisers. The remainder will be volunteers or those with another frontline role with people in communities.

In early 2019, DCMS commissioned Kantar to carry out both the online and paper versions of the Community Life Survey in the areas of 19 Social Action Hubs that are training the majority of the 3,500 individuals as part of the COEP over the next 3 years.

Kantar were provided with a list of postcodes covered by the SAHs which were filtered against the Postcode Address File and a systematic sample was drawn. At each address, all adults aged 16+ (up to a maximum of four) were invited to do the survey online or request a paper questionnaire version, and a £10 voucher was available for those completing the questionnaire. Two reminders were sent to each address. Two postal questionnaires and a pre-paid return envelope were included in the second reminder letters for c.80% of selected households.

The aim was to achieve 1,000 interviews overall across the CO areas. In total, 1,233 questionnaires were completed. The actual sample size was 1,286, as fifty-three of the completed questionnaires were from two SAH areas that overlapped, and so were counted twice. Disclosure risks prevent us from identifying the areas in this report.

Further information can be found in the appendix at the end of this report.

2.2 Weighting

Interviews from the national 2018-19 Community Life Survey provided a benchmark against which to analyse the CO areas. During this period 10,627 interviews were completed on the national survey. This national sample of addresses has been more closely aligned with the profile of the sample of addresses drawn in the CO areas, based on the 2015 index of multiple deprivation (see the appendix for further details). Throughout the report this is referred to as the comparator group data. Please note that this means the estimates are not the same as the main Community Life Survey data[4].

Respondents to the CO area survey have been weighted in a fashion aligned with the national survey. Further information can be found in the appendix at the end of this report.

2.3 Analysis

The objective of this work was to assess a set of key indicators for the COEP. We chose the questions from the CLS which we felt best related to the Theory of Change (TOC)[5] for the COP and to the indicators we have chosen to measure and track progress against. For each of the indicators, a comparison between the comparator group and CO areas (as a whole) has been made.

This survey is not intended to provide robust measures of the impact of the programme, however the findings still provide an insight to any differences observed, and together with other evaluation evidence contribute to overall knowledge of impact. When interpreting the findings it is important to bear in mind that COs work had been going on before the start of the survey, and this work continued throughout the fieldwork period. Consequently, it is not easy to interpret the results as they do not form a 'baseline' in the traditional sense but neither do they

---

[4] The main Community Life Survey findings can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/community-life-survey-2018-19

[5] Evaluation of the Community Organisers Programme, December 2015, p30

necessarily reflect the extent of work carried out in the areas and the longer term impact of the programme.

The sample sizes within the individual CO areas are small and therefore there are wide confidence intervals[6] associated with individual-area estimates making it difficult to detect differences both between individual areas, and between an individual area vs. the comparator group. Therefore, reporting is based on CO areas as a whole. Findings that have been highlighted as significant were statistically significant at the 5 per cent level or better unless otherwise stated.

---

[6] A confidence interval shows the extent to which the survey results would change if repeated multiple times.

3. Research findings

3.1 Awareness of Community Organisers

The boost survey contained the following description before asking respondents if they had heard of Community Organising:

Community Organising offers a way for people to improve their local community or effect social change. The role of a Community Organiser is to:

- *listen to local people*

- *support people to develop their power to act together for the common good*

- *help people take action on the local issues that are important to them*

Overall awareness of community organising was 12%[7]. This figure is in line with levels expected by the programme.

Respondents who said they had heard of Community Organising were then asked whether they had personally had any involvement with Community Organising in their local area in the last twelve months. One in six (16%) of people asked said that they had had involvement, which represents 2% of respondents overall[8]. While this might sound low, this figure is in line with the average expected by the programme across all the CO areas. It is also worth noting that this represents recalled contact and involvement. It is possible that residents may have been involved in an event or initiative which was organised or catalysed by an organiser but not been aware of it.

3.2 Community cohesion and local area satisfaction

The CO programme aims to bring people together to take action around their common concerns and overcome social injustice, while looking to develop a sustainable future for neighbourhood community organising. The national Community Life Survey includes a number of measures that aim to measure community cohesion and local area satisfaction, including:

- strength of belonging to an immediate neighbourhood

- agreement that the local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together

- overall satisfaction with the local area as a place to live

The majority of respondents living in CO areas stated that they agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together (77%). Feelings were mixed however when respondents were asked how strongly they felt they belonged to their immediate neighbourhood (53% felt strongly that they belonged, while 47% did not feel strongly). Overall, respondents were generally satisfied with their local area as a place to live (66%), though 9% felt that none of the people in their neighbourhood could be trusted.

---

[7] Full question text: "Before today, had you heard of Community Organising?"

[8] Full question text: "Have you PERSONALLY had any involvement with Community Organising in your local area in the last 12 months? For example you may have been asked by a Community Organiser about what you want to change locally, got involved in a Community Organising campaign or attended some Community Organising training."

The levels of community cohesion and local area satisfaction were broadly the same across the comparator group sample and the CO areas, as can be seen in table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Community cohesion and local area satisfaction

Measure of cohesion		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
Strength of belonging to an immediate neighbourhood	Strongly (very or fairly)	53%	56%
	Not strongly (not very or not at all)	47%	44%
	Unweighted base	*1,281*	*10,599*
Agreement that the local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together	Agree (definitely or tend to)	77%	77%
	Disagree (definitely or tend to)	23%	23%
	Unweighted base	*1,270*	*10,344*
Overall satisfaction with the local area as a place to live	Satisfied (very or fairly)	66%	64%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20%	21%
	Dissatisfied (very or fairly)	14%	15%
	Unweighted base	*1,285*	*10,505*
Thinking about the people who live in this neighbourhood, to what extent do you believe they can be trusted?	Many of the people can be trusted	22%	23%
	Some of the people can be trusted	38%	35%
	A few of the people can be trusted	31%	34%
	None of the people can be trusted	9%	9%
	Unweighted base	*1,266*	*10,475*

3.3   Social capital and loneliness

A key objective of Community Organising is to develop relationships and networks within neighbourhoods. The national Community Life Survey contains a number of questions which

look at respondents' support networks, companionships, and levels of loneliness, details of which can be found in table 1.2.

Respondents from both the comparator group sample and CO areas overwhelmingly agreed that there are people who would be there for them if they needed help (94% and 93% respectively). A majority of both samples also agreed that there are people they can call on if they wanted company or to socialise (90% and 91% respectively), and that they had at least one person they could count on to listen if they needed to talk (95%).

Respondents living in CO areas were significantly more likely than those in the comparator group sample to feel lonely always, often, or some of the time (31% vs. 27% respectively).

Table 1.2: Support networks, companionship and loneliness

Measure of networks, companionship and loneliness		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
If I needed help, there are people who would be there for me	Definitely agree	68%	65%
	Tend to agree	25%	28%
	Tend to disagree	5%	5%
	Definitely disagree	2%	2%
	Unweighted base	*1,282*	*10,585*
If I wanted company or to socialise, there are people I can call on	Definitely agree	59%	57%
	Tend to agree	33%	33%
	Tend to disagree	6%	7%
	Definitely disagree	3%	3%
	Unweighted base	*1,275*	*10,539*
Is there anyone who you can really count on to listen to you when you need to talk?[9*]	Yes, one person	22%	23%
	Yes, more than one person	72%	71%
	No one	5%	6%
	Unweighted base	*890*	*7,854*
How often do you feel lonely?	Often/always	9%	8%
	Some of the time	22%	19%

[9*] This question was asked to online respondents only.

Measure of networks, companionship and loneliness		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
	Occasionally	25%	26%
	Hardly ever	26%	28%
	Never	18%	19%
	Unweighted base	*1,258*	*10,450*

3.4   Social action and community empowerment

Research suggests that many local communities do not believe they have or can develop collective power to improve their neighbourhoods and tackle problems[10]. As a result, the CO programme aims to build connections and beliefs among local people that they can collectively improve their neighbourhoods and tackle problems.

3.4.1   Local decision making

In the 12 months prior to completing the survey three fifths (59%) of respondents living in CO areas had taken part in any civic engagement. This includes having some involvement in civic participation[11], taking part in a consultation about local services or problems, or being a member of a group making decisions about local issues such as health, crime or education. No significant differences were observed between the aligned national profile and the CO areas as a whole. See table 1.3.

Respondents were also asked a number of statements about influencing local decision making. Overall, 27% of respondents in CO areas believed that they can personally influence decision making in their local area, 53% said it was important to be able to influence local decisions, and 54% would like to be more involved in the decisions made by their council that affect their local area. These figures are in line with those of the comparator group sample. See table 1.3.

Table 1.3: Local decision making

Measure of local decision making		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
Taken part in civic engagement in last 12	Yes	59%	60%
	No	41%	40%

---

[10] Local Trust's The Future for Communities: Perspectives on power July 2018. See pp47 to 49

Civil Society Futures, the Independent Inquiry : Civil Society in England: Its current state and future opportunity, Nov 2018

Commission on the Future of Localism , Locality 2018, Polling Findings – findings were:

· 80% felt they have no control over decisions which affect the country

· 71% felt they have not much control over the important decisions that affect their neighbourhood

[11] Civic participation includes contacting a local official such as a local councillor, MP, government official, or mayor (not for personal reasons); attending a public meeting or rally, taken part in a public demonstration or protest; or signing a paper or online petition

Measure of local decision making		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
months (participation, consultation or action)	*Unweighted base*	*1,286*	*10,627*
Agreement that I can personally influence local decision making	Definitely agree	5%	4%
	Tend to agree	23%	22%
	Tend to disagree	46%	42%
	Definitely disagree	27%	31%
	Unweighted base	*1,263*	*10,417*
Importance of feeling able to influence local decision making	Very important	13%	15%
	Quite important	39%	38%
	Not very important	32%	33%
	Not at all important	15%	15%
	Unweighted base	*1,262*	*10,521*
Whether would like to be more involved in local decision making[12*]	Yes	54%	54%
	Depends on the issue	3%	2%
	No	43%	44%
	Unweighted base	*893*	*7,858*

3.4.2   Influencing local decisions

When asked how they would go about influencing local decisions, the top answers given by respondents living in the CO areas included: contacting the council (47%), signing an online petition (44%), contacting their councillor (35%), contacting their MP (33%), attending a public meeting (32%), and signing a paper petition (31%). There were no statistically significant differences observed between the comparator group sample and the respondents in the CO areas as a whole. See table 1.4.

Respondents were also asked what might make it easier for them to influence decisions in their local area. The top answers given by those living in CO areas included: if they knew what issues were being considered (49%), if they could give their opinion online or via email (44%), if they had more time (43%), if the council got in touch and asked them (34%), if they knew who their local councillor was (22%), and if they could get involved in an online group about local decision making (21%). There were no significant differences observed between the comparator group sample and the respondents in the CO areas as a whole. See table 1.4.

Table 1.4: Influencing local decisions

Measure of local decision making		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
How would you go about influencing local	Contact the council/a council official	47%	45%
	Sign an online petition	46%	43%
	Contact my councillor	35%	37%

[12*] This question was asked to online respondents only.

Measure of local decision making		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
decision making (top six answers given) [13*]	Contact my MP	33%	35%
	Attend a public meeting	32%	29%
	Sign a paper petition	31%	31%
	Unweighted base	*876*	*7,715*
Which of these might make it easier to influence decisions in local area (top six answers given)*	If I knew what issues were being considered	49%	48%
	If I could give my opinion online/via email	44%	46%
	If I had more time	43%	43%
	If the council got in touch with me and asked me	34%	37%
	If I knew who the local councillor was	22%	21%
	If I could get involved in an online group making decisions about my local area	21%	21%
	Unweighted base	*883*	*7,784*

3.4.3 Social action

Social action, in the context of this report, is defined as a community project, event, or activity which local people proactively get together to initiate or support on an unpaid basis.

It is distinct from other forms of giving time in that it is driven and led by local people rather than through an existing group (as in formal volunteering) and tends to focus on a community need rather than the needs of an individual (as in informal volunteering). Examples could include organising a street party, preventing the closure of a local post office, helping to run a local playgroup, or improving local road safety.

About half of respondents (52%) living in CO areas disagreed that people in their local area pull together to improve the neighbourhood. Results were the same for the comparator group data. See table 1.5.

One in seven (14%) respondents living in a CO area said that they have personally been involved in social action in their community. However, a higher proportion are aware of social action in their communities (28%). These percentages are comparable with those of the comparator group sample. See table 1.5.

Table 1.5: Social action

[13*] This question was asked to online respondents only.

Measure of local decision making		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
Agreement that people in the local area pull together to improve the neighbourhood	Agree (definitely/tend to)	48%	48%
	Disagree (tend to/definitely)	52%	52%
	Unweighted base	*1,263*	*10,448*
Involvement in social action in local area	Yes	14%	13%
	No	86%	87%
	Unweighted base	*1,266*	*10,447*
Awareness of social action in local area	Yes	28%	27%
	No	72%	73%
	Unweighted base	*886*	*7,819*

3.5 Volunteering

Formal volunteering is defined as unpaid help given as part of a group, club, or organisation to benefit others or the environment. About a third (32%) of respondents living in CO areas stated that they had volunteered formally in the last twelve months. This was found to be significantly higher than the respondents in the comparator group sample.

Looking at informal volunteering, that is, volunteering on a more casual basis outside of an organisation, the percentage of respondents volunteering increases. Half (51%) of respondents living in CO areas said they volunteered on an informal basis in the last twelve months. There were no significant differences observed between the comparator group sample and those living in CO areas when looking at informal volunteering.

Table 1.6: Volunteering

Measure of local decision making		Community Organiser areas	Comparator group
Formal volunteering in the last 12 months	Yes	32%	29%
	No	68%	71%
	Unweighted base	*1,286*	*10,627*
Informal volunteering in the last 12 months	Yes	51%	52%
	No	49%	48%
	Unweighted base	*1,286*	*10,627*

4. Technical Appendix

4.1 Survey design

Kantar was commissioned by DCMS to run a version of its Community Life Survey in 19 locations, each of which is covered by a Community Organiser (CO).

For the purposes of the survey, each CO area was defined with reference to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census Output Area (OA) geography, and was formed of a contiguous combination of whole LSOAs (the second smallest unit in the ONS hierarchy) following specifications from each CO.

The intention was to ensure c.1,000 completed questionnaires, with an approximately even number (53) per CO area, regardless of the relative number of households in each area. This was done to ensure that variance between CO areas could be understood but also because the relative importance of each CO area to the CO programme as a whole is not directly proportional to the number of households in the area.

The number of LSOAs in each CO area varied from 1 to 22 and the number of addresses from 649 to 17,912. Two of the areas overlapped; completed questionnaires in the overlap area count towards both CO area totals.

Disclosure risks prevent us from identifying the CO areas in this report.

4.2 Sampling of addresses and identification of the comparison sample

4.2.1 Sampling addresses

Within each CO area, Kantar drew a systematic random sample of addresses from the Royal Mail Postcode Address File, aiming for 53 completed questionnaires and maximal geographical dispersion. The number of addresses to sample in each CO area was calculated via a statistical model of response probability, using data from the 2017-18 Community Life Survey. This number was inflated by 25% to insure against the risk of over-estimating the area's mean response probability (a common mitigation against a genuine risk when applying a general model of response to specific locations).

As noted above, there was one set of LSOAs that was part of two CO areas (61% of the first and 76% of the second). Addresses in this overlap area were sampled separately with a target total equal to 76% of the total number of addresses required for the second CO area. This overlap area was expected to yield 35-40 completed questionnaires so the target number of completed questionnaires for all CO areas was reduced from 1,000 to 965 (because 35-40 of these were expected to be used twice).

In total, 3,672 addresses were sampled, with the number varying from 131 to 215 per CO area (reflecting different estimated response rates)[14]. Within each CO area, the addresses were sorted by LSOA code, then OA code, then postcode before a systematic random sample was drawn.

---

[14] In fact, 5,508 addresses were sampled but one in three was allocated to a reserve pool. This pool was not required.

4.2.2 Sampling within addresses

At each address, all adults aged 16+ were invited to complete the questionnaire, either online or on paper. A small minority of the sampled addresses will have contained more than one household (probably <3% although this share will have varied in an unknown fashion between CO areas). Multi-household addresses like this cannot be reliably identified in advance. Consequently, the 'sampled' household at each of these addresses was the household of whoever picked up the letter. This is unlikely to have caused meaningful sample bias due to the small number of addresses affected.

4.2.3 Identification of a comparison sample

To identify a comparison sample from within the national 2018-19 Community Life Survey dataset, Kantar profiled the CO areas as a group, giving each an equal weight. LSOA level statistics were used to quantify the profile of each CO area and thereby the CO 'super-area'.

The profile of each LSOA was represented by the 2015 index of multiple deprivation plus a set of six Census-derived 'principal component' scores, each reflecting a different aspect of that LSOA[15]. These seven variables were used as predictor terms in a logistic regression model, designed to find a 'propensity score' for each LSOA. The propensity score for LSOA t is equal to the estimated probability that LSOA t is within the equal-weighted CO super-area if the only information we had were the seven LSOA-level profile variables. Naturally, this propensity score tends to be much higher than average for the LSOAs that are part of the CO super-area. The objective is to estimate importance weights that can be used with the national sample to ensure it has a similar propensity score distribution as the sample from the CO super-area.

Kantar tested several methods of doing this but settled on the computationally simple 'quintile points' approach because this achieved the best match overall – better than more complex algorithms – while also ensuring an effective sample size of c.2-3,000 within the 2018-19 Community Life Survey sample.

Under the 'quintile points' approach, the LSOAs within the CO super-area are sorted in descending order of propensity score. Each LSOA has a weight that is (i) proportional to its address coverage within its CO area, and (ii) is scaled so that the weighted sum of addresses is the same in all CO areas. The (weighted) 20th, 40th, 60th and 80th percentile propensity scores within the CO super-area are noted, creating five approximately equal-sized groups of LSOAs that are defined by their upper and lower bound propensity scores. Once this is done, all LSOAs in England can be placed into one of these propensity score groups and the (address-weighted) distribution of propensity score groups compared to the (compound-weighted) distribution of propensity score groups in the CO super-area. The importance weight is simply a weight that would convert the all-England distribution of propensity score groups into the CO super-area distribution of propensity score groups. The importance weights for each group are shown in table A1.

---

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

Table A1: Importance weights

Propensity score area groups	(A) Compound-weighted distribution in CO super-area	(B) Address-weighted distribution in England	(A/B) Importance weight for national survey respondents in these areas
Highest propensity scores	25%	3%	8.78
2nd highest	24%	5%	4.81
Middle	23%	11%	2.19
2nd lowest group	17%	27%	0.62
Lowest propensity scores	11%	54%	0.20

Each respondent in the national Community Life survey sample received a 'comparison sample' weight equal to their LSOA's importance weight multiplied by their personal weight within the national sample. Descriptive statistics of this comparison sample weight are shown in table A2.

Table A2: Descriptive statistics for comparison sample weights

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Design effect	Neff
2-mode comparison weight	10,627	0.03	17.85	1.04	1.63	3.46	3,072
Web-only comparison weight	7,902	0.03	19.46	1.02	1.79	4.10	1,928

4.3 Fieldwork

The standard model for the Community Life Survey is to send two reminders, each a fortnight apart, but with a third reminder in reserve (not used in this case). In the second reminder, two paper questionnaires are included for a targeted subset of addresses. The probability that the second reminder will contain the paper questionnaires is a function of the address's (expected) online response rate:

- In the 40% of England with the lowest expected online response, all 2nd reminders include two paper questionnaires;

- In the 20% of England with mid-level expected online response, nearly half (46%) of 2nd reminders include two paper questionnaires;

- In the 40% of England with the highest expected online response, no 2nd reminders include two paper questionnaires.

In total, 88% of the sampled addresses in the operational areas were designated to have paper questionnaires included in the second reminder if required (3,220 out of 3,672).

In total, 1,233 questionnaires were completed compared to a target of 968, suggesting that the 25% over-sample had not been necessary and that the model-based estimated response probabilities had been accurate in aggregate. 53 of the completed 1,233 questionnaires contributed to the totals for two CO areas, taking the analysis sample size up to 1,286. 895 (70%) of these were online completions and 391 (30%) were paper completions. The expected distribution had been 62%/38%; relative to model expectations, the online completion rate was higher than expected even if the overall response rate was not.

4.4 Weighting the CO area sample

Respondents to the CO area survey have been weighted in a fashion aligned with the national survey. To do this, Kantar used a two-part regression model to estimate the calibration weight that would have been applied to each case if it had been part of the national (Community Life Survey) sample. This gets around the problem of no contemporary population data for the CO super-area (as well as the relatively small respondent sample size). The same approach was used to generate a weight specific to the online subset of each sample.

Part one was to fit the expected number of completed questionnaires for each sampled address as a function of neighbourhood-level variables held for each address. This model is exactly the same as used for the national 2018-19 Community Life Survey sample. The part one weight is equal to 1/(expected number of completed questionnaires / expected number of eligible individuals at the address). The last term - the expected number of eligible individuals at the address – is derived from an internal Kantar model, itself based on data from the 2015-17 ONS Crime Survey of England & Wales.

Part two was to fit an individual-level calibration factor (calibration weight divided by the part one weight) so that respondents in the CO area sample had the same calibration factors as respondents in the national survey sample. This is possible because the national survey sample calibration uses a generalised regression method to fit the calibration weights. The model it uses can then be applied to a new sample (in this case the CO area sample). The part two weight was equal to the part one weight multiplied by the modelled calibration factor.

Finally, the respondent data was scaled so that the sum of weights in each CO area was exactly equal.

Note that no address-level design weights have been applied because of (i) the equal probability sample design within each CO area and (ii) the decision to include data from each area in equal proportions.

The weighting efficiency was estimated at 87% (two-mode responding sample) and 84% (web responding sample). These are very similar efficiencies to the national survey sample (82% and 84% respectively). The weighting efficiency is a descriptive statistic that indicates how the variation in weights may impact on the precision of the survey estimates. In general, the actual sample size should be multiplied by the weighting efficiency to demonstrate this but the true 'effective sample size' takes account of several other design effects. For example, for the 2018-19 national sample, the effective sample size averages out at two thirds (68%) of the actual sample size.

In this report, Kantar has used specialist statistical software (the Complex Samples module within SPSS) to estimate sampling errors that account properly for the survey design and the weighting of the data.