

Oxfam Research Report

Oxfam Humankind Index for Scotland - Background

Methodology, Consultation and Results

**Perry Walker and Juliet Michaelson, New Economics Foundation –
Consultants to the Humankind Index in Scotland**

**Dr Kendra Strauss, University of Glasgow – Methods Advisor to
Oxfam’s Humankind Index in Scotland**

Dr Katherine Trebeck, Oxfam

April 2012

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Background	3
3. Foundations: multidimensional approaches to prosperity and flourishing	4
4. Project goals	5
5. Methodology and research design	5
6. Assets and domains	6
Table 1	7
7. Targeting seldom heard individuals and groups	8
8. Quantitative data	9
9. Gathering the voices together: the domain selection and weighting process	10
Table 2: Where the data comes from	10
Table 3: Original domains and sub-domains	11
Table 4: What happened to the original sub-domains and what new ones are there?	14
Table 5: Total time spent on each source	16
Table 6: Weighted event and survey votes	17
Table 7: Weighting the new sub-domains	19
Table 9: The final weightings for the chosen sub-domains	20
Table 10: The chosen sub-domains by order of weighting	21
Table 11 Differences in weighting between women and men	23
Appendix 1: Steering Group	25
Appendix 2: Events	26
Table 12	26
Appendix 3: Comparison of answers from different questions in the on-line survey	28
Table 13: Question types included in the survey	28
Table 14: Rank order of elements according to different survey questions	29
Appendix 4: Percentage mentions of elements in the classification framework	33
Appendix 5: Participant comments relating to the chosen sub-domains	37
Table 16	37
Appendix 6: Equivalent of table 9 by gender	40
Table 17: Equivalent of table 9 by gender	40
Appendix 7: YouGov Results	42
Appendix 8: Expert Panel	45
References	46

1. Introduction

The goal of the Oxfam Humankind Index for Scotland is assess to Scotland's prosperity by a more holistic and representative measure of progress, beyond economic growth and increased consumption. Oxfam hopes that it will stimulate debate, enable more appropriate policy responses and future research on how to foster and sustain a good life for all of the people of Scotland. The Oxfam Humankind Index represents one of the first times that a multi-dimensional measure of prosperity has been attempted for Scotland.¹

This paper describes the process of consultation with the people of Scotland regarding the composition of the Oxfam Humankind Index. This process was guided by a high level Steering Group (see Appendix 1).

The consultation generated a weighted set of elements that people report as affecting their ability to live well in their communities (see Table 10), as explained in this Technical Annex.

Then, we assess to what extent are those necessary conditions are met, and also the extent to which they are met for different people. This is the subject of the Oxfam Humankind Index report by Oxfam and the Fraser of Allander Institute at the University of Strathclyde. This latter process has been conducted by an Experts Panel (see Appendix 6), led by the Fraser of Allander Institute. The results, a picture of Scotland's real prosperity, can be found here: www.oxfam.org.uk/humankindindex.

2. Background

Since 1996 Oxfam has worked with others to overcome poverty and suffering in Scotland. Oxfam's work includes ensuring everyone has enough to live on, showing how change can happen and challenging policies and structures that perpetuate poverty. Through its work with communities, it is clear to Oxfam that the model of the economy that has dominated the UK for most of the last century has proved itself outdated and has failed to reduce poverty and inequality. Despite decades of economic growth, regeneration and anti-poverty policies², many Scots face a life characterised by high mortality, economic inactivity, mental and physical ill-health, poor educational attainment, and increasing exclusion.

To achieve sustainable livelihoods for all, we need to focus on the range of assets that are important to people, recognising that people and communities depend on social relationships; their access to the natural world and their local environment; their health and skills; and the infrastructure and services they can utilise; alongside their financial assets.

To take account of these important factors of individual and community prosperity, we need to better measure our progress and better value our community and individual assets. This measure of *real* wealth, beyond that which is counted by Gross Domestic Product, will help our journey towards a new prosperity that is community-led and focuses on the quality and distribution of growth to promote social and environmental sustainability. The Humankind Index is thus about an economy that serves the people, not the other way around.

And because the Oxfam Humankind Index is about valuing the things that really matter to the people of Scotland, Scottish people have been asked about those aspects of life that make a real difference to them. The Index and the factors included in its composition are a reflection of the priorities of Scotland. The Index will therefore help the Government to focus on what really matters, and to make more informed decisions about where society wants to go.

3. Foundations: multi-dimensional approaches to prosperity and flourishing

The Oxfam Humankind Index represents a unique process of developing a measure of Scotland's prosperity that encompasses societal assets as well as economic ones. This process is grounded in a *multifaceted* concept of prosperity. In this sense, the project has affinities with international measures that emphasise *human security*, the multifaceted nature of sustainability and wellbeing. This conceptualisation of development aims to move away from measuring societies' successes solely in terms of increased economic growth, of which GDP has been a key indicator. GDP tells us very little about how wealth and assets are distributed, or about any social, cultural or environmental costs of economic growth. The human security approach, on the other hand, focuses on 'freedom from fear, and freedom from want' and encompasses the notion of 'capabilities'³ to illustrate both the agency of those suffering poverty and social exclusion, and the barriers to the exercise of that agency. It thus shares common features with the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach⁴ (SLA) also widely used by those in the development field, which identifies a matrix of assets – social, human, physical, financial and natural – necessary for communities and individuals to flourish.

Well-known attempts to define and measure key components of wellbeing and prosperity beyond economic growth include the Commission of the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress⁵, established in France by President Sarkozy, and developed by Professor Joseph E. Stiglitz, Professor Amartya Sen and Professor Jean-Paul Fitoussi.⁶ The United Nations has developed, in conjunction with the University of Oxford, a Multidimensional Poverty Index⁷ and, separately, the Human Development Reports initiative.⁸ In the UK the National Statistics agency has begun to measure and report on indicators of societal wellbeing⁹, while the new economics foundation (nef), a key partner in the Oxfam Humankind Index project, have developed through their Centre for Wellbeing¹⁰ both National Accounts for Wellbeing and a Happy Planet Index.

The Oxfam Humankind Index builds on this important work, but with several key differences. Firstly, it adds to the debates about wellbeing by focusing on interlinking concepts of prosperity, assets and 'flourishing'. Fundamentally, it asks the question articulated by Camfield¹¹: "What resources can people draw on in their pursuit of a good life for themselves, their families and their communities, and what are the political and social barriers?" Secondly, the Humankind Index is about understanding the factors that Scottish people themselves identify as key to helping them flourish. Integral to this approach is the consultation process that encouraged participants to reflect on what is important to themselves and their communities. This required a conceptual framework to give some structure to the data gathering and analyses phases of the research design, but also required that openness and reflexivity were built into the research process. The next section sets out that framework.

4. Project goals

Sections 6 and 9 provide detailed information on what domains were used and how they were determined, as well as how data was collected. They detail how the domains for analysis were arrived at and how the data was weighted and synthesised in order to produce the final Index. This section describes the high level approach to the research design and methodology that has informed all stages of construction of the Oxfam Humankind Index. The key goals of the Oxfam Humankind consultation were:

- To consult the people of Scotland to find out what aspects of life make a real difference to the prosperity, resilience and sustainability of their households and communities.
- To ensure that this process was inclusive, especially with regard to seldom heard groups from across Scotland.
- To gather data that could be used to generate a comprehensive set of measures suitable for weighting and synthesis, such that the Index could finally represent people's attitudes and priorities in a clear and concise way.

Oxfam's mandate is to focus on improving the lives of the poorest people, so the second goal was fundamental to the research design from the outset. Oxfam did not set out to replicate existing national or international approaches to wellbeing, but rather to use its expertise and experience in the area of social justice to explore more participatory ways of defining and analysing what people feel they need to live well in Scotland. This approach underpinned the project partnerships with the Craighead Institute, Northern Star and nef, all of which have specific expertise in the areas of community engagement and participatory research and decision-making. The Humankind Index was a process of co-creation between researchers, participants, and all those who fed in their ideas, advice and views.

5. Methodology and research design

The focus on *participation* (associated with qualitative methods) and *weighting and synthesis* (associated with quantitative methods) meant that the Oxfam Humankind Index project team agreed a research design grounded in a mixed methods approach.

Mixed methods research is where both qualitative and quantitative techniques are used for data collection related to one key research problem or question. It is widely practised across the social, behavioural, health and human sciences (it has, for example, a dedicated journal, the *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*) and by think tanks and NGOs. It utilises methods such as interviews, narrative-based approaches (storytelling, oral history) and task-based group or individual activities. These are carried out in conjunction with survey methods – thereby combining the opportunities and challenges offered by different methods and analytical approaches, increasing data validity through iteration and triangulation.¹² It also enables both representative and targeted sampling. Prioritisation of participatory forms of qualitative research for the Oxfam Humankind Index reflected the project's focus on the contextual, subjective and non-material dimensions of human experience, the ways in which they illustrate the complex dynamics behind poverty and resilience, and the ways in which they facilitate the 'draw[ing] out culture, location and social group-specific understandings of the dimensions of wellbeing'.¹³

Both qualitative and quantitative methods have their limitations. Qualitative research produces rich fine-grained material that sometimes is not amenable to generalisation. Quantitative research produces data amenable to numerical techniques such as modelling and statistical analysis, but may require a reductive approach to complex social phenomena in return for parsimony and rigour. Moreover, projects such as the Oxfam Humankind Index are often subject to significant external constraints related to resources and timescales.

It is important to note that the research phase of the Humankind Index was conducted over a period of approximately six months, in comparison to several years for other projects mentioned above.

The methodological focus on mixed methods of data collection and generation, and the prioritisation of seldom heard voices in the research design, resulted in a multi-phase approach that combined qualitative, participatory, survey-based and quantitative methods:

Phase 1

- Focus groups: run by Craighead Institute, a not-for-profit centre of consultancy, training and research that works with individuals, groups, and organisations to promote social justice.
- Community workshops: run by Northern Star, a consultancy which supports organisations in the voluntary and public sectors to understand, engage with and measure their impact on people, using participative methods to empower communities.
- Street stalls: developed by nef and delivered by nef and Northern Star.
- An online survey: designed by the University of Glasgow and Oxfam, with input from other consultants working on the Oxfam Humankind Index. Conducted online, using a sample of those who could be reached through Oxfam Scotland's networks (postcards advertising the survey were distributed through the network of 53 Oxfam shops across Scotland); at other consultation events; organisations represented on the Oxfam Humankind Index Steering Group via their own networks; a dedicated staff member who used social media to encourage people to complete the survey; and survey respondents who were asked to tell friends and colleagues. The survey asked respondents for their views about what was important for good lives in Scotland, for themselves and for the community as a whole, and about the barriers to good lives. There were separate questions for individuals and for those responding on behalf of organisations. Appendix 3 gives details of these questions.

Phase 2

- A representative poll carried out by YouGov. This was carried out in recognition that results from Phase 1 of the consultation may have reflected a sample bias – indeed, Phase 1 was carried out using selective sampling to illuminate the voices of seldom heard groups. The poll was an online survey with 1081 people representative of all Scottish adults. The YouGov poll was used to test the Phase 1 results amongst a wider, representative sample of the Scottish population. Appendix 7 presents a brief discussion of the YouGov results.
- In each of these phases, the approach was underpinned by a conceptual and analytical framework centred on *assets* and *domains*, which also formed the basis for activities, guidelines and prompts used in the participatory component of the public consultation. This framework is described in the next section.

6. Assets and domains

The research design involved definition of the conceptual framework to guide data gathering and analysis, and the selection of methods (qualitative and quantitative) under the rubric of a mixed methods approach. Establishing a conceptual framework entailed reviewing the existing approaches to wellbeing and 'flourishing', and identifying a high-level set of assets and domains to inform the community consultation process.

A 'domain' refers to a sphere of thought or action; that is, a way of relating or associating interconnected ideas, experiences and forms of behaviour. Although the Oxfam Humankind

Index sought to explore a new approach to flourishing grounded in a prioritisation of ‘bottom-up’ (participatory, community-based) forms of generating materials, the project also built on existing research approaches and frameworks. In particular, as outlined in above, the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach was chosen for its bottom-up approach to understanding the conditions for human flourishing and for its widely-used framework for understanding livelihood assets, which highlights the importance of natural resources, technologies, skills, knowledge and capacity, health, education, financial resources and networks of social support.

An initial workshop, bringing together members of the project team, members of the Oxfam Humankind Index Steering Group and the Expert Panel, was convened prior to Phase 1 in order to produce a framework for the public consultation. The SLA framework was compared with existing sets of domains established by large-scale projects such as the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress and the EHRC Equalities Measurement Framework. It was decided that the assets-based approach could be combined with several of the high-level domains common across a number of measures of wellbeing to produce a high-level framework for the public consultation based around the five key assets and a related set of sub-domains:

- Social assets: relationships and social connections; home life; friends; feeling part of a community; being able to exercise voice and say in decisions (governance); volunteering; support from and for others; sense of trust in others; fear of crime
- Human assets: physical health; mental health; self-confidence; skills; education; qualifications
- Natural and environmental assets: local green space; neighbourhood surroundings; the Scottish landscape; the world environment; clean air; fresh water; future environment
- Financial assets: economic security; economic stability; (secure) employment; income (including benefits, inheritance and family wealth); ability to purchase basic commodities to survive and material items deemed important
- Physical assets: home environment; transport options/accessibility; infrastructure; neighbourhood facilities

This framework formed the basis for a range of activities in the street stalls, meetings and workshops. In the street stalls, for example, the framework was used as a starting point for discussing the kinds of things that make life ‘good’. Because street stalls involve short interactions with people who are passing, participants were given the opportunity to vote for as many statements (devised in relation to the framework sub-domains) as they wished. The following table demonstrates how the phrases used to start discussion and invite feedback were linked to the assets and sub-domains identified above, using the example of the social asset domain:

Table 1

Social	
Phrase	What does it mean?
Having good relationships with family and friends	Relationships and social connections, home life, sense of trust in others
Being part of a community	Feeling part of a community where you live or a community of interest, support from and for others

Having a say in what matters to you and feeling that your voice is heard	Exercising voice and say in decisions, governance, participation
Feeling that you and those you care about are safe	Fear of crime, safety

An example of the voting chart that was used to record choices in the street stalls can be found in Table 3 below.

In the workshops the core activities included:

- A ‘one thing’ exercise where participants were asked to nominate, unprompted, the one thing that made a difference to living well in their community;
- A stations exercise, which presented the assets and sub-domains on stations around the room, with exploratory questions for each, to which participants responded individually on post-it notes; and,
- An open group discussion, facilitated by a researcher(s), building on and developing the preferences and attitudes expressed through the stations exercise.

Data (for example, from the post-it notes) were coded to enable the researchers to match comments to individuals and present data anonymously, but with reference to demographic data for that individual. Notes were taken during group discussions, and all material from each workshop presented in a report that later fed into the process of data analysis described below.

7. Targeting seldom heard individuals and groups

The focus on ‘hard to reach’ groups and individuals in Scotland – called ‘seldom heard’ in this project in order to minimise the extent to which labelling exacerbates exclusion and isolation – is an extension of the goals of Oxfam’s campaigning on the multi-dimensional consequences of poverty. If we accept that dominant institutions and forms of representation – including, potentially, mainstream survey and census instruments – tend to favour and reflect the interests of dominant groups and individuals, then there is a need to ensure that the research design for a project of this type prioritises seldom heard voices.

Researchers with the Craighead Institute, a faith-based organisation with extensive experience of working with socially-excluded groups in Scotland, used their pre-existing networks to reach a range of groups and individuals (selected on the basis of demographic characteristics, including but not limited to gender, age, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, and geography), in order to reach and include a diversity of participants. All were contacted through intermediary agencies. The groups included:

1. Disadvantaged young people from rural towns (Fraserburgh, Banff and their surrounds in the north east of Scotland)
2. A rural older peoples’ group (Perth and Kinross)
3. A Muslim faith group (Glasgow)
4. Disadvantaged young families (Drumchapel, Glasgow)
5. Carers (East Ayrshire)
6. Adults with learning disabilities (Castlemilk, Glasgow)
7. People with experience of homelessness (Glasgow)
8. Refugee women from Africa (Glasgow)

9. People with substance misuse/ drug and alcohol problems (Glasgow)
10. People from the Slovakian Roma community (Govanhill, Glasgow)
11. People with Blood Borne Viruses (BBV) (Edinburgh)

As this list indicates, different challenges, forms and experiences of exclusion, ranging from economic (poverty-related) to geographical (rural, isolated, homeless) to age and health related (older people, people with physical and mental health conditions) to ethnic/religious (being from a black or ethnic minority – BME – group) were all explored in and through the research.

Using the asset and domain based approach described above, researchers sought to apply a structured, but adaptive framework for this part of the consultation. Focus groups and community meetings were structured around an initial introductory exercise involving several steps, as in the workshops. In step one, the researchers opened the focus group by explaining the purpose of the event and the wider national consultation; that is, introduced both the project and the approach. Next, researchers asked the groups to share and describe their “common experience” (related the identified challenge and/or form and experience of exclusion): e.g. the BBV group were asked, “What is life like for people with blood borne viruses?” Researchers then asked the group to consider “What they needed to live well and have a good life”, using the thematic headings of social relationships, health and wellbeing, neighbourhood and environment, finance, and services and facilities as prompts and to structure the discussion. In the final step participants were asked to weight their priorities - usually by putting themselves in the role of the Finance Minister/Chancellor and distributing the nation’s budget using 15 stickers across the 19 sub-domains (see Table 3) to meet their priorities.

In these conversations and those in the community meetings, researchers prompted for ‘taken-for-granted’ ideas in recognition that people might not mention those areas of life in which they are satisfied or which are automatically provided (such as clean water). They were careful, however, not to impose these domains on participants.

The data co-produced during these meetings were recorded by the researchers. As with outputs from the broader forms of community consultation described above, these data were fed into the process of domain selection and weighting process.

8. Quantitative data

The inclusion of both an internet survey and a representative poll in the research design reflect the ways in which quantitative methods can enhance qualitative findings through theory testing, iteration and triangulation. The internet survey was targeted at a broad base of groups and individuals in Scotland. It was designed to both test the theory that individuals and groups in Scotland identify economic and non-economic factors as important to leading a good life, and to repeat (in a different way) the domain selection exercises carried out in the qualitative research. The results of the online survey are found at Appendix 3.

Using a simplified survey design the poll carried out by YouGov involved a representative sample of people over the age of 16 in Scotland to test the validity of the results emerging from the other data-gathering methods. The results of the YouGov poll are reported at Appendix 7.

9. Gathering the voices together: the domain selection and weighting process

Where the data comes from

The data sources from Phase One are ordered below according to the broad level of material deprivation of each group of participants, with the most deprived at the top of the list.

Table 2: Where the data comes from

Source of data	Number of events	Total number of participants
Focus groups	11	124
Community workshops	9	175
Street stalls	10	399
Survey	N/A	1200 respondees, 800 (approx useable answers) ¹⁴
Total		1500 (approx)

The events (listed in Appendix 2) took place between April and June, 2011. The people who completed the survey were of a higher socio-economic status than those who took part in the events and 75% of individual survey respondents held a degree-level qualification, compared to 21% of the Scottish population overall.

In addition, thanks to Sheila McMahon, Lead Officer for the Equally Well test site in Dundee, and Lynne Friedli, mental health promotion specialist and test site mentor, the research was also able to reflect on findings from a community mental wellbeing engagement exercise in Stobswell. This process identified assets, influences and indicators for mental wellbeing, from a resident perspective. The results from the "what matters for mental wellbeing" event carried out with disadvantaged people living in Dundee, focusing on mental wellbeing and fairness (and was carried out in conjunction with the Office for National Statistics as part of the national consultation to develop an index for mental wellbeing), were also reflected upon to identify the issues raised. This provided reassurance that the list of sub-domains used for the Humankind Index consultation was complete.

The data used

From these sources three types of data were gathered:

1 Open data

Evidence from the 'non-voting' aspects of the community workshops and focus groups; plus open answers given to Questions 10 and 12 of the on-line survey (see below for the reasons why these questions were selected) regarding what was important for a good life, or about what got in the way of achieving a good life. This augmented the initial list of sub-domains, by looking at what people say when they are not responding to specific prompts or when asked to identify elements not included in a predetermined list. Some of the comments were also counted in order to produce weightings for sub-domains for which there was no quantitative data (that is, because they were not part of the original list of sub-domains).

2 Quantitative voting data

All of the street stalls and the community workshops, together with most of the focus groups, involved participants being given 15 sticky dots to allocate between 19 sub-domains, presented to participants based on a list prepared by Northern Star (see table 3). There was no limit to the number of dots they could allocate to any one sub-domain.

Table 3: Original domains and sub-domains

SOCIAL	Having good relationships with family and friends
	Being part of a community
	Having a say in what matters to you and feeling that your voice is heard
	Feeling that you and those you care about are safe
	Enjoying your time off
HUMAN	Being physically healthy
	Being mentally well, not depressed or stressed
	Having confidence in yourself
	Getting enough skills and education to live a good life
	Having satisfying work to do (whether paid or unpaid)
NATURE & ENVIRONMENT	Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside
	Having a clean and healthy environment
	Preserving the environment for the future
FINANCIAL	Having a secure source of money
	Having enough money to pay the bills and buy what you need
PHYSICAL	Being able to access high-quality services
	Having good transport to get to where you need to go
	Having the facilities you need available locally
	Having a safe and secure home to live in

3 Quantitative survey data

Given the time available and the fact that there was not a straight read-across between the different answer options within the different survey questions, there was a need to focus on particular survey questions in order to get useable results to produce eventual weightings. Questions focused on were those which asked about the things which respondents felt people need (Question 10, answered by individuals and Question 2, answered by organisations) and what was important to them in being able to live well, to have a good and fulfilling life in their community (Question 12, answered by individuals) rather than:

1. The questions about barriers to being able to live a good and fulfilling life because they more directly tapped into what helps support a good life. This follows the assets orientated approach (outlined above), placing the emphasis on assets rather than deficits in order to inform policy-making.
2. The questions about what is important to the respondent's community, or Scotland as a whole, because the 'important to you' question was a more direct measure of people's sense of what was important – asking people what is important to 'the community' involves them having to imagine what is important to other people, not just themselves, which makes this less reliable.

Question 12 in the online survey was particularly useful because:

1. It was the most direct question about what is important to a good life, allowing respondents to pick as many or as few of the twelve sub-domains presented as they chose. It also asked directly about assets rather than barriers.
2. It asked about what is important to people themselves in living a good life, rather than to the community, and asked individuals for their responses rather than organisations. This means that it was the most direct route to access the views of ordinary people in Scotland, which was the aim of the consultation exercise.

Appendix 3 gives details of all the survey questions which investigated elements relating to a good life, and discusses the differences in responses between different questions and between the responses from individuals and those from organisations.

Within Question 12, individuals rated the importance of each of the twelve sub-domains presented to them:

- Quality time to spend with my family and friends
- Feeling part of my community
- Feeling that my voice is heard
- Feeling that you and those you care about are safe
- Being healthy
- Having enough income to get by and be part of my community
- Being able to access high-quality public services
- Being able to get the skills and education to be part of community and economic life
- Having a clean and healthy environment
- Having a secure job
- Less interference from the government in my daily life
- Keeping up with the latest trends

Question 12 used a shorter set of elements than the 19 sub-domains in the list used in events because it was felt that the full list would be off-putting in a survey. Items omitted were covered by other questions. The list used in the survey was randomised so each respondent saw the options in a different order and respondents were, as discussed above, encouraged to add any other elements they felt were missing from the original list.

A rating of a sub-domain as 'very important' was treated as a 'vote' for that sub-domain. How many 'survey votes' each sub-domain attracted was considered as a proportion of the

total number of votes (to provide equivalence to the voting exercises which took place in the events where participants were faced with a slightly longer set of options).

In addition, open answers to Questions 3, 10 and 12 were utilised in order to produce the augmented framework. These provided answers where respondents were either not given a list, but simply asked to identify what they needed to live well in their communities (such questions were deliberately placed before the respondent encountered any pre-determined list) or where respondents said that there were 'other' areas that were important apart from those already listed in the survey (123 of approximately 850 individual respondents, and 8 of 33 organisations who answered these questions named an 'other' area).

Selecting domains and sub-domains

In order to understand what sub-domains matter most to participants in the events and survey respondents, the following needed to be considered:

1. What sub-domains people identify as important when they have a free choice and are not just responding to a set of presented options. This allows a full picture to be built of the importance of all sub-domains, both those presented and those which emerge from what people say unprompted. The remainder of this section outlines how this task of identifying the important sub-domains was undertaken.
2. How important people think these sub-domains are. In order to establish this, a technique was devised to incorporate the relative importance of both the sub-domains which participants were presented in the established lists and those which arose unprompted from participants. It would not be possible simply to take the rankings which emerged for the sub-domains which were presented to people and to supplement these by additional suggestions made during the voting (or virtual 'voting' in the survey), in the raw proportions in which they were voted on. Being presented with options creates a momentum which deters people from making such suggestions, and, where they are made by particular individuals or in specific events, others will not have the chance to vote on them. The following sections explain how the relative importance of the different sub-domains was established.

Open data to establish the range of sub-domains which people mentioned unprompted was derived from three areas of the consultation:

1. The results of three focus groups (Aberdeen, Andalus and Healthy Communities Collaborative) where the participants defined their own sub-domains for "What they needed to live well and have a good life", using the domains as broad headings, and then voted on them.
2. An exercise in the community workshops called "One thing you think is important for a good life". Everyone in the room, participants and facilitators, were asked to introduce themselves by saying their name and one thing they think is important for a good life. Answers were written up on the flipchart and if someone expressly said they agreed with something said by someone before them, a tick was put against it.
3. In the open answers to certain survey questions as discussed above.

This open evidence produced a set of sub-domains through the following process:

1. A classification framework was developed using the sub-domains presented to respondents for voting on at the events and the open responses to survey Questions 3 and 12.
2. This framework was populated using a sample of the open answers to survey Question 10 (we used a sample of answers due to lack of time to classify the full set), plus the results from three focus groups and the "One thing..." community workshop exercise, described above. The classification process was carried out iteratively with revisions to the framework made where required. The proportion of

answers ('percentage mentions') that was finally classified into each sub-domain was calculated for each sample.

3. The results of the classification were used to revise the initial list of sub-domains that was voted on by participants at events.

Appendix 4 shows the percentage mentions for each element in the classification framework.

To produce a workable set of sub-domains, all of the 31 elements in the classification system could not be included so those sub-domains which had at least 2 per cent of the percentage mentions, according to the weighted average, were retained. This threshold produced a manageable number of sub-domains that between them accounted for over 90% of the percentage mentions.

Table 4 below (which summarises Appendix 4) shows all of the original 19 sub-domains. The 'In or out' column denotes whether they passed the 2 per cent retention threshold. The new list contains 18 sub-domains.

Table 4: What happened to the original sub-domains and what new ones are there?

Domain	Sub-domain	Original or new	In or out
Social	Having good relationships with family, friends, neighbours	Original	In
	Feeling that you and those you care about are safe / COMBINED WITH freedom from anti-social behaviour, noise, crime, violence	Original + New	In
	Being part of a community/ people take care of each other / opportunities to participate in community COMBINED WITH / people taking responsibility for improving lives	Original + New	In
	Having a say/ being able to influence decisions	Original	Out
	Enjoying your time off	Original	Out
	Human rights/freedom from discrimination / acceptance /respect	New	In
Human	Health / physical health COMBINED WITH Being mentally well, not depressed or stressed	Original + Original	In
	Self-esteem / resilience COMBINED WITH /Positivity about future / hope / positive attitude	Original + New	Out
	Education/ Getting enough skills and education to live a good life / Equal access to education	Original	In

	Having satisfying / enjoyable / decent work (whether paid or unpaid) COMBINED WITH /Sense of purpose, making a contribution, feeling valued	Original + New	In
	Feeling good e.g. happy, have fun, humour/ Sense of wellbeing	New	In
	Freedom to practice / not to practice / share beliefs / place to worship / opportunity for spirituality	New	In at this stage, but excluded later because its weighting was so small. See introduction to table 7.
Environment and nature	Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside COMBINED WITH Having a clean, pleasant environment	Original + Original	In
	Access to green/ wild spaces/ social/ play areas	New	In
	Preserving environment for the future	Original	Out
Financial	Having a secure source of money COMBINED WITH Financial security for the future	Original + New	In
	Having enough money (to pay the bills and buy what you need)	Original	In
	Secure work / suitable work	New	In
Physical resources	Having a safe and secure home COMBINED WITH Affordable/ decent home	Original + New	In
	Being able to access (high quality) services (eg healthcare, support services, policing, provision for elderly) COMBINED WITH Getting individual support when needed	Original + New	In
	Good transport / accessibility / mobility	Original	In
	Having the facilities /infrastructure you need available locally COMBINED WITH Local shops	Original + New	In

	Access to arts/ culture/ hobbies/ leisure activities	New	In
--	--	-----	----

One or two results stand out from the events. For instance, the following two items appeared much more frequently in the community workshops than in the other events:

- Having a good relationship with family and friends
- Happiness (this is the word used in the community workshops – it is classified above under ‘positive emotions’). Indeed, the specific word ‘happiness’ featured *only* in the community workshops.

Weighting

This revised list of 18 sub-domains was weighted by, firstly, producing weightings for each sub-domain relative to all the others (‘sub-domain weightings’). Because some of the sub-domains were those sub-domains people identified as missing from the original list (derived solely from the open data), participants could not vote on them the way they did the original list. Therefore, quantitative and source weightings for the original sub-domains for which there was quantitative data were generated. Separate weightings for the new sub-domains were also produced and these were then combined.

Secondly, producing weightings for responses from different sources (‘source weightings’). Source weightings were devised by looking at:

- How many people took part
- How long they took part for (a rough indication of how much they absorbed information and how far they deliberated, so also a rough measure of how considered their views were).
- Socio-economic status

Table 5 combines a) and b) to show the total time spent by participants in each of the source activities and the four response types in the first column are ordered according to c) with the most deprived at the top of the list.¹⁵

Table 5: Total time spent on each source

Response type (by socioeconomic status)	Approximate number of participants	Approximate average time spent by each person on their response	Total hours	Indicative weight per vote
Focus groups	124	1.5 hours	186	2X
Community workshops	182	2 hours	364	2X
Street stalls	399	10 minutes*	67	X
Survey	800	15 minutes	200	X

* The street stall estimate in particular is approximate, as time spent at the street stalls varied between individual participants.

The focus groups and the community workshops were given equal weighting so that the difference in numbers and time spent offset the difference in socio-economic status.

The street stalls and the survey were given equal weight, for the same reason.

The focus groups and the community workshops were given a double weighting to account for the broadly higher level of material deprivation among people who took part in them compared to those who responded to the survey and the street stalls.

Weighting the original sub-domains

Weightings for the 15 of the 19 original sub-domains that were selected were produced. This required combining the votes from the events (based on the original list of 19 sub-domains) with the survey votes from Question 12 (which included responses on only 12 presented options). Weightings were produced by:

1. Taking the votes cast in the three events (focus groups, community workshops and street stalls) to produce a combined event voting score for each of the original selected sub-domains (see 'Weighted events %' column in Table 6 below). This was done by producing a weighted average of the votes from each of the three events, using the relative weightings for the events as discussed above (Table 5).
2. The survey questions in Question 12 were matched to the appropriate sub-domain¹⁶ in order to be able to combine the different data sources.
3. This left 10 survey questions¹⁷, compared to 19 sub-domains. Each of the survey vote scores were multiplied by 10/19 to make them comparable to the event votes for the 19 domains. The results are shown in the 'Equivalent survey votes' column of Table 6.
4. For sub-domains that appeared in both the events and the survey, we combined the vote scores by using the relevant source weightings from Table 5. Where sub-domains were used in the events, but not Question 12 of the survey, we simply used the weighted event vote score. This produced the numbers in the final column of Table 6.

For example, 'Being able to access high-quality services' had scores of 2.6% from the street stalls, 5.8% from the focus groups, and 2.6% from the community workshops. This produced a weighted event vote of 3.8%. The survey produced a higher score of 4.65, which pulled the final percentage up to 4.0.

Table 6: Weighted event and survey votes¹⁸

Domain	Sub-domain	Weighted event votes %	Equivalent survey votes	Final percentage
SOCIAL	Having good relationships with family and friends	9	Not included	9
	Being part of a community	4	3	4
	Safety and security	6	7	6

HUMAN	Being physically healthy COMBINED WITH being mentally healthy	14	7 (physical only)	14
	Getting enough skills and education to live a good life	5	5	5
	Having satisfying work to do (whether paid or unpaid)	5	Not included	5
NATURE & ENV.	Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside COMBINED WITH Having a clean, healthy / safe / pleasant environment	11	6 (clean environment only)	11
FINANCIAL	Having a secure source of money	5	5	5
	Having enough money to pay the bills and buy what you need	7	6	7
PHYSICAL RESOURCES	Being able to access high-quality services	4	5	4
	Having good transport to get to where you need to go	6		6
	Having the facilities you need available locally	4		4
	Having a safe and secure home to live in	8		8

Weighting the new sub-domains

Table 7 below lists the new sub-domains that were selected. The 'Percentage mentions' column gives the combined weighted percentage mentions for each (see Appendix 4), calculated from the framework and classification review of open data undertaken as part of the selection of sub-domains. Because these new sub-domains were not included in the voting exercises or closed survey questions, the percentage mentions derived from the open data provide the best available information on how participants perceived their relative importance.

The percentage mentions, shown in Table 7, were calculated for all 31 elements that were initially part of the classification system. To make them equivalent to the quantitative voting scores on the original sub-domains, where they were the only sub-domains listed (representing 64% of all mentions), the mentions were multiplied by 100/64, or 1.56. This same multiplicand was applied to the new sub-domains.

Table 7: Weighting the new sub-domains

Domain	Sub-domain	Percentage mentions	Adjusted percentage mentions
Social	Human rights/freedom from discrimination / acceptance /respect	2	3
Human	Feeling good	1	2
	Freedom to practice / not to practice / share beliefs / place to worship / opportunity for spirituality	[0.2]	[0.3] ¹⁹
Environment and nature	Access to green/ wild spaces + Community/ social / play areas	5	7
Financial	Secure work / suitable work	5	7
Physical	Access to arts/ culture/ interest/ hobbies/ leisure activities	4	6

Weighting sub-domains that are combinations of original and new elements

Table 8 deals with sub-domains that have both original and new elements. The score for the original sub-domain is taken from table 6 (column 3 below) and the scores for the new element of the sub-domain uses the same percentage mentions as in table 7 (columns 5 and 6 below). The combined weight in the final column is the sum of the 'final %' in the third column and the 'adjusted % mentions' in the penultimate column.

Table 8: Weighting sub-domains with original and new elements

1	2	3	4	5	6	7 ²⁰
Domain	Original sub-domain	Final % (from Table 6)	New element of the sub-domain	% mentions	Adjusted % mentions	Combined weight (columns 3 + 6)
Social	Feeling that you and those you care about are safe / Security	6	Freedom from anti-social behaviour, noise, crime, violence	1	2	8
Social	Being part of/ sense of a community /	4	People taking responsibility for improving lives / community	0	0	5

Human	Having satisfying / enjoyable / decent work to do (whether paid or unpaid)	5	Sense of purpose, making a contribution, using abilities, feeling valued	2	3	9
Financial	Having a secure source of money	5	Financial security for the future	1	1	6
Physical	Having a safe and secure home to live in	8	Affordable / decent home / good housing	4	6	14
Physical	Being able to access (high quality) services	4.0	Getting individual support when needed	0	0	4
Physical	Having the facilities /infrastructure you need available locally	4.0	Local shops	1	1	5

The final weightings

Table 9 combines the scores derived from the previous three tables. Adding together the scores gives a total of 127 per cent. The final column adjusts the scores so that the final weights sum to 100 per cent.

Among the final weights, the highest score is 11%, suggesting that no one sub-domain is likely to dominate the resulting Index. Appendix 6 uses quotes from participants to give an impression of some of the aspects of each sub-domain. Table 10 lists them by order of weighting.

Table 9: The final weightings for the chosen sub-domains

Domain	Sub-domain	Scores (%)	Final weights
SOCIAL	Having good relationships with family and friends	9	7
	Feeling that you and those you care about are safe	8	6
	Being part of a community	5	4
	Human rights/freedom from discrimination / acceptance /respect	3	2

HUMAN	Being physically and mentally healthy	14	11
	Getting enough skills and education to live a good life	5	4
	Feeling good	2	2
	Satisfying work (whether paid or unpaid)	9	7
NATURE & ENVIRONMENT	Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside + Having a clean and healthy environment	11	9
	Access to green/ wild spaces/ open spaces/ play areas	7	6
FINANCIAL	Having a secure source of money	6	5
	Having enough money to pay the bills and buy what you need	7	5
	Secure work / suitable work	7	5
PHYSICAL RESOURCES	Affordable/ decent home + Having a safe and secure home	14	11
	Being able to access high-quality services	4	3
	Having good transport to get to where you need to go	5	4
	Having the facilities you need available locally	5	4
	Access to arts/ culture/ hobbies/ leisure activities	6	5
Totals:		127	100

Table 10: The chosen sub-domains by order of weighting

Sub-domain	Final weights	Order
Affordable/ decent home + Having a safe and secure home	11	=1
Being physically and mentally healthy	11	=1
Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside + Having a clean and healthy environment	9	2
Having satisfying work to do (whether paid or unpaid)	7	=3
Having good relationships with family and friends	7	=3

Feeling that you and those you care about are safe	6	=4
Access to green/ wild spaces + open spaces/ play areas	6	=4
Secure work/ suitable work	5	=5
Having enough money to pay the bills and buy what you need	5	=5
Having a secure source of money	5	=5
Access to arts/ culture/ hobbies/ leisure activities	5	=5
Having the facilities you need available locally	4	=6
Getting enough skills and education to live a good life	4	=6
Being part of a community	4	=6
Having good transport to get to where you need to go	4	=6
Being able to access high-quality services	3	=7
Human rights/freedom from discrimination / acceptance /respect	2	=8
Feeling good	2	=8
Total	100	

These results were tested by a representative poll carried out by YouGov in November 2011. The results of this poll were deemed by Oxfam's methods advisors and the Oxfam Humankind Index Steering Group as a sufficient corroboration of the consultation results to consider the results presented in Table 10 as adequately representing the views of Scottish people. See Appendix 7 for some discussion of the YouGov results.

What story did the consultation tell?

The word that summarises people's responses is 'immediate'. Among the aspects of life that contribute to living well, the high scorers were those that contributed directly and immediately: safety; security of money; family and friends.

'Immediate' has two aspects. In several of the domains it was possible to separate aspects of the domain that were nearer at hand, which did better, from those further afield, which did worse. For example, in the social domain, people rated connections with family, friends and neighbours higher than connections within their community. In the 'environment and nature' domain, people's local living environment did better than the wider environment. Physical resources relating to the home were ranked as more important than resources outside the home, such as services and facilities.

Quotes from the events flesh out this story. Here are a few examples:

It is expensive to use public transport and this has a big effect on families – they can't afford to travel which means they have to shop in local (more expensive) shops (Community workshop – Lochgilphead)

Safety is crucial thing for a given community. Because, if we are not safe we can't do our day to day tasks. That means we can't generate income. If we don't have enough source of money [sic] our life could be affected negatively. (Community workshop - Glasgow)

Male, appeared to have learning difficulties: "I don't go outside cos [sic] people call me names" (Street stall – Motherwell)

Social relationships – family is important because we can support each other and talk to each other in the language(s) we know the best (Focus group – Slovakian Roma)

Appendix 6 presents more quotes from the events and the survey to illustrate some of the aspects of each sub-domain.

Producing results by gender

The calculations have been repeated to give a breakdown for women and for men. These will be found in Appendix 7. Note that this exercise did not recalculate the source weightings which have an inevitable element of arbitrariness: recalculating the very complex set of calculations by gender would have made it more complicated still.

There were two main difficulties in repeating the calculations by:

1. The open data from the “one thing” exercise in the community workshops was not classified by gender.
2. By no means did everybody give their gender, so we were only able to use those people who had stated a gender to create the results by gender.

On the whole, the weightings for women and for men were similar. Table 11 below lists those sub-domains where the weightings for women and men were at least two percentage points apart.

Table 11: Differences in weighting between women and men

Sub-domain	Weighting for women (%)	Weighting for men (%)
Human rights/freedom from discrimination	5	2
Affordable/ decent home + Having a safe and secure home	13	11
Having satisfying work to do	7	9
Secure work / suitable work	5	9
Access to arts / culture / interest / stimulation / learning	4	7

Glossary of terms

Term	Explanation
Community workshop “one thing” exercise	An exercise in the community workshops where all participants were invited to name “One thing you think is important for a good life”.
Open data	Evidence from the ‘non-voting’ aspects of the community workshops and focus groups; plus open answers given to Questions 3, 10 and 12 of the on-line survey regarding what was important for a good life, or about what got in the way of achieving a good life. This augmented the initial list of sub-domains.
Percentage mentions	The proportion of answers classified into each new sub-domain from a sample of the open answers (to survey Question 10, and from the results from three focus groups and the community workshop ‘one thing’ exercise). This was used to augment the original list of sub-domains.
Quantitative survey data	‘Votes’ from the survey, derived from those issues respondents identify as ‘very important’ in their ability to live well in their community.
Quantitative Voting data	All of the street stalls and the community workshops, together with most of the focus groups, involved participants being given 15 sticky dots to allocate between 19 original sub-domains. This produced votes for these 19 sub-domains.
Source weightings	The data comes from four sources: three different types of event plus a survey – see table 1. The scores from each source were themselves weighted according to the total time spent on each source and the level of deprivation of the participants. The weights resulting from this we refer to as source weightings.
Sub-domain weightings	The weightings for the sub-domains are a combination of weights based on the quantitative data where available and source weightings.

Appendix 1 Steering Group

Judith Robertson (Chair)	Head of Oxfam Scotland
Chris Johnes	Director of Oxfam UK Poverty Programme
Dr Harry Burns	Chief Medical Officer for Scotland
Fiona Crawford	Glasgow Centre for Population Health
Stephen Boyd	Asst Secretary, Scottish Trades Union Congress
Jo Swinson	MP for East Dunbartonshire (Liberal Democrats)
Linda Fabiani	MSP for Central Scotland (SNP)
Patrick Harvey	MSP for Glasgow (Scottish Green Party)
David Martin	MEP for Scotland (Labour)
Rosemarie MacIlwhan	Human rights expert
Shelagh Young	Sustainable Development Commission
Peter Kelly	Poverty Alliance Director
Janette Harkess/ James Alexander	Scottish Council for Development and Industry
Jane Wood	Scottish Business in the Community
Paula Evans	COSLA
Colin Mair	Scottish Improvement Service
Jim Boyle	Oxfam UKP
Dr Katherine Trebeck	Oxfam UKP

Appendix 2 Events

Table 12

Community workshops		How recruited/location/who attended	No. People
26th April	Hawick/Borders	Mothers of school children	18
27th April	Wishaw, Motherwell	Via volunteer centre	25
4th May	Kilmarnock	Through community groups	9
7th May	Benbecula	Through community groups	10
11th May	Lochgilphead	Through community groups	13
11th May	Lochgilphead	Through community groups	5
14th May	Dundee	Women's knitting group	10
17th May	Fort William	Through community groups	9
21st May	Renfield Centre, Glasgow	Via Glasgow Council for Voluntary Organisations	83
Street stalls			
19th April	Ayr	Trades unionists	33
27th April	Motherwell	Shopping centre	24
30th April	Stirling	Outside shopping centre	44
4th May	Kilmarnock	Market square	34
11th May	Lochgilphead	Shoppers using Co-op	23
14th May	Dundee	Shopping mall	82
17th May	Fort William	High Street	21
20th May	Edinburgh	Visitors to Oxfam Marathon stall	30
21st May	Glasgow	St Enoch shopping centre	44
28th May	Glasgow	Oxfam stall at Southside Festival	64
Focus groups			
9 th May	Glasgow	People with experience of homelessness	20
14 th May	Andalus, Glasgow	Muslim faith group	12
17 th May	Perth and Kinross	Older people's group	7

18 th May	Banff & Fraserburgh	Disadvantaged rural young people	8
19 th May	Drumchapel	Disadvantaged young families	8
19 th May	Glasgow, Castlemilk	Adults with learning difficulties	10
24 th May	Govanhill, Glasgow	Slovakian Roma	12
25 th May	South Lanarkshire	People with drug and alcohol problems	7
25 th May	Karibu	African women's support group	25
31 st May	Edinburgh	Blood Borne Viruses Group	8
2 nd June	Kilmarnock	Carers Forum	7

Appendix 3 Comparison of answers from different questions in the on-line survey

The on-line survey included a number of different question types, all aimed at understanding what respondents felt was important to people individually, and to the community, in being able to live well, and what were barriers to living well. There were two sets of parallel questions, one answered by people responding as individuals, the other by those responding on behalf of organisations.

Table 13: Question types included in the survey

Question type	Individuals	Organisations
Open – what people need to live well (unlike the remaining questions, there were no fixed response categories in these questions)	Q10	Q2
People's assets – what is important to people living well	Q12	Q3
Barriers – which are perceived as barriers	Q13	Q4
Barriers – ranked by most significant	Q14	Q5
Community assets - ranked by most important to the community and Scotland	Q15	Q6

The main text explains the reasons for focusing on Questions 3, 10 and 12 in the analysis of responses. However, the ranking of the elements changes between different survey questions and between individuals and organisations is considered in Table 14.

Note that the number of responses from organisations was relatively small, so differences between organisation answers and those from individuals should be treated with caution.

Table 14: Rank order of elements according to different survey questions

	People's assets (ranked by proportion of respondents saying it is 'very important')	Barriers (ranked by proportion of respondents saying it is 'very important')	Barriers - ranked	Community assets – ranked	
	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	
Individuals	1	Safety of you/care about	Job to pay bills	Job to pay bills	Health
	2	Quality time with friends and family	Not feeling safe in home/neighbourhood	Stressed about home life	Secure jobs
	3	Being healthy	Stressed about home life	Not feeling safe in home/neighbourhood	Safe
	4	Clean & healthy envt	Education and training	Education and training	Skills and education
	5	Income	Job stops you spending time with friends and family	Job stops you spending time with friends and family	Quality time with friends and family
	6	Skills and education	Nothing to contribute	Nothing to contribute	Clean & healthy environment
	7	Secure job	Voice not heard	Voice not heard	High quality public services
	8	Access high-quality services	Green space not enough	Not good quality local facilities	Feeling part of community
	9	Voice is heard	Not good quality local facilities	Worried about crime	Feeling voice is heard
	10	Part of community	Worried about crime	Green space not enough	Less govt interference

	11	Less govt interference	Concerns about others in society	Concerns about others in society	Trends
	12	Trends	Worried about environment	Worried about environment	
	13		Not enough money for what others have	Not enough money for what others have	
Organisations		Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6
	1	Skills and education	Unable to find job =1	Not find job	Secure jobs
	2	Clean & healthy environment	Education & training =1	Education and training	Health
	3	Being healthy	Nothing to contribute	Voice not heard	Skills and education
	4	Safety of you/care about	Voice not heard	Nothing to contribute	Feeling part of community
	5	Quality time with friends and family	Not good quality local facilities	Not good quality local facilities	Feeling voice is heard
	6	Voice is heard	Stressed about home life	Stressed about home life	High quality public services
	7	Part of community	Not feeling safe in home/neighbourhood	Not feeling safe in home/neighbourhood	Safe
	8	Income	Job stops you spending time with friends and family	Job stops you spending time with friends and family	Quality time with friends and family
	9	Access high-quality services	Worried about crime =9	Concerns about others in society	Clean & healthy environment

	10	Secure job	Concerns about others in society =9	Worried about crime	Less govt interference
	11	Less govt interference =11	Worried about environment = 11	Green space not enough	Trends
	12	Trends=11	Green space not enough = 11	Not enough money for what others have	
	13		Not enough money for what others have	Worried about environment	

Points of note among answers from individuals

Some notable similarities and differences between the responses include:

- The high ranking of elements to do with safety across all questions
- A 'job to pay the bills' (a combination of the two categories from the asset questions about a 'secure job' and 'enough income') is ranked first in the barriers questions, similar to the ranking of 'secure job' 2nd in the community assets question. This differs from the ranking of income as 5th and secure job as 7th in the people's assets question
- The element relating to time with friends and family ranking 2nd in the people's assets question, and 5th in all other questions

Points of note among answers from organisations

Some notable differences and similarities between the responses include:

- The high ranking of elements to do with education across all questions
- The low ranking of 'secure job' in the people's assets question, compared to job elements being ranked first in the other three questions
- The clean and healthy environment being ranked 2nd in the people's assets question, compared to 9th in the community assets question

Points of note between answers from individuals and those from organisations

Some notable differences and similarities between the responses include:

- The immediate issues of safety and spending time with friends and family tend to rank lower in organisations' answers than individuals'
- The less immediate issues of voice not being heard, education and feeling part of the community tend to rank higher in organisations' answers than individuals'
- Health ranks similarly in both individuals' and organisations' answers
- Income and jobs rank lower in organisations' answers about people's assets than in individuals' answers to the same questions, but in the other questions jobs are ranked similarly highly by individuals and organisations.

Appendix 4 Percentage mentions of elements in the classification framework

This Appendix shows the percentage mentions of each element in the open data from different sources, based on the iterative classification exercise. The classification was also informed by the original set of sub-domains. The average (equal weight) column shows a pure average of percentage mentions across the different sources, the combined (weighted) column shows an average (weighted according to the weighting schema described in table 5 above).

Table 14

Domain	Sub-domain	FOCUS GROUPS		COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS		SURVEY QU 10		AVERAGE (equal weight)	COMBINED (weighted)
Social	Having good relationships with family, friends, neighbours	29	9.9%	56	27.5%	36	7.7%	15.0%	16.5%
	Feeling that you and those you care about are safe / Security/freedom from anti-social behaviour, noise, crime, violence	0	0.0%	9	4.4%	27	5.2%	3.2%	3.6%
	Being part of/ sense of a community / well-balanced community / people take care of each other / opportunities to participate in community/ people taking responsibility for improving lives / community	24	8.2%	6	2.9%	35	6.9%	6.1%	5.3%
	Contact with people who share values	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	0	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
	Having a say / feeling voice is heard / being able to influence decisions	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	7	2.3%	0.9%	0.8%
	Good governance e.g. conscientious policing, little interference from government, ability to participate in politics, transparent democracy/respect for or trust in leaders	4	1.4%	0	0.0%	5	1.4%	0.9%	0.7%

Domain	Sub-domain	FOCUS GROUPS		COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS		SURVEY QU 10		AVERAGE (equal weight)	COMBINED (weighted)
	Welfare of others in society	0	0.0%	2	1.0%	1	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%
	Human rights/freedom from discrimination / acceptance /respect	13	4.4%	3	1.5%	11	2.1%	2.6%	2.3%
Human	Health / physical health/ being mentally well, not depressed or stressed	24	8.2%	29	14.2%	16	3.1%	8.6%	9.7%
	Having confidence in yourself / self-esteem / resilience	1	0.3%	1	0.5%	2	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
	Education/ Getting enough skills and education to live a good life / Equal access to education /Positivity about future / hope / positive attitude	30	10.2%	11	5.4%	14	3.8%	6.5%	6.2%
	Having satisfying / enjoyable / decent work to do (whether paid or unpaid) /Sense of purpose, making a contribution, using abilities, feeling valued	3	1.0%	5	2.5%	25	5.4%	3.0%	2.9%
	Autonomy / making choices, freedom, independence, dignity	0	0.0%	3	1.5%	4	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%
	Feeling good e.g. happy, have fun, laughter/humour/ Sense of wellbeing	0	0.0%	16	7.9%	8	1.4%	3.1%	4.1%
	Freedom to practice / not to practice / share beliefs / place to worship / opportunity for spirituality	2	0.7%	8	3.9%	1	0.2%	1.6%	2.1%

Domain	Sub-domain	FOCUS GROUPS		COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS		SURVEY QU 10		AVERAGE (equal weight)	COMBINED (weighted)
	A good time balance / time to do things you want to/ Enjoying your time off	3	1.0%	1	0.5%	7	1.6%	1.0%	0.9%
Environment and nature	Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside/ Having a clean, healthy / safe / pleasant environment	22	7.5%	3	1.5%	17	3.7%	4.3%	3.5%
	Access to green / natural / wild spaces/ Community / social / open spaces / play areas	0	0.0%	4	2.0%	20	4.7%	2.2%	2.2%
	(Good quality) affordable/local /healthy / access to food	1	0.3%	2	1.0%	19	3.7%	1.7%	1.5%
	Access to clean and safe water	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
	Preserving environment for the future/ Ability to live sustainably	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%
	Animal welfare	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Financial	Having a secure source of money/ Financial security for the future	12	4.1%	3	1.5%	9	1.7%	2.4%	2.2%
	Having enough money (to pay the bills and buy what you need) / to not have to worry	20	6.8%	9	4.4%	37	7.7%	6.3%	5.9%

Domain	Sub-domain	FOCUS GROUPS		COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS		SURVEY QU 10		AVERAGE (equal weight)	COMBINED (weighted)
	Secure work / suitable work	13	4.4%	4	2.0%	22	4.5%	3.6%	3.3%
Physical resources	Having a safe and secure home to live in/ Affordable / decent home / good housing	11	3.8%	7	3.5%	38	8.4%	5.2%	4.9%
	Being able to access (high quality) services i.e. healthcare, support services, policing, provision for elderly/ Getting individual support when required	31	10.6%	10	4.9%	27	7.5%	7.7%	7.0%
	Good transport / accessibility / mobility	19	6.5%	2	1.0%	17	3.7%	3.7%	3.1%
	Having the facilities /infrastructure you need available locally/ Local shops	25	8.5%	2	1.0%	13	4.0%	4.5%	3.7%
	Access to arts/ culture/ interest/ hobbies/ leisure activities	5	1.7%	5	2.5%	14	3.7%	2.6%	2.6%
Other		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	2.6%	0.9%	0.7%
Total responses		293	100.0%	204	100.0%	440	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Appendix 5 Participant comments relating to the chosen sub-domains

Table 16

Sub-domain (by order of weighting)	Quote
Affordable/ decent home + Having a safe and secure home	<i>Being able to have the right to council housing [is important] as too many people [are] staying in private rented accommodation that they can't really afford but [they] have no option (Survey, individual)</i> <i>A secure place that people can call their own, control access to and build a life from (Survey, organisation)</i>
Being physically and mentally healthy	<i>When I got ill I felt very isolated, alone (Focus Group, Waverley Care)</i> <i>Without good health you cannot work and [you cannot] help your family and community. Without health you cannot be positive or achieve your dreams (Focus Group, Karibu)</i> <i>Health, including a healthy diet and lifestyle and local support in all your health needs, including mental [health] (Survey, organisation)</i>
Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside + Having a clean and healthy environment	<i>The environment's important to me, it makes me happy. [Many other participants agreed with this statement]. It affects my mental health, it's inspirational, it supports my income and my family's income (Community workshop, Benbecula)</i> <i>Pleasant, safe green spaces/easy access to nature (Survey, organisation)</i> <i>Well planned, aesthetically pleasing, old and new quality buildings giving a sense of place (Survey, organisation)</i>
Having satisfying work to do (whether paid or unpaid)	<i>Having not just a secure job but one that feels worthwhile - not drudgery (Survey, individual)</i> <i>Satisfying work – or at least work that does not make you ill (Survey, organisation)</i> <i>Local and meaningful employment (Survey, organisation)</i> <i>Job opportunities that are fulfilling (Survey, organisation)</i>
Having good relationships with family and friends	<i>Strong supportive family relationships (children, parents & grandparents) (Focus Group, Andalus)</i> <i>Need to feel valued and happy, have great relationships with family and close friends (Survey, individual)</i> <i>A stable network of supportive, caring, loving relationships to encourage, console, enthuse and otherwise support people through to having life and living it to the full (Survey, organisation)</i>

Feeling that you and those you care about are safe	<p><i>You want the kids to be safe when outside (Community workshop, Borders)</i></p> <p><i>If you are always watching your back, it saps your energy, you're not living your life as you're that busy worrying (Community workshop, Borders)</i></p>
Access to green/ wild spaces + Community/ social / play areas	<p><i>Space to participate in community life without necessarily spending money (Survey, organisation)</i></p> <p><i>Enough green space to allow them and theirs to have fresh air (Survey, organisation)</i></p> <p><i>Play areas for children and pets (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Secure work / suitable work	<p><i>Good quality employment/employers (Survey, organisation)</i></p> <p><i>The key issues for people in Barra and Vatersay is in provision of secure, worthwhile employment opportunities (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Having enough money to pay the bills and buy what you need	<p><i>Me, my partner and little boy have to live on £75 [a week]. I sometimes don't eat so my little boy can eat – we don't have money for basics or extras – I had to sacrifice to save up for Gran's 80th birthday (Street stall, Kilmarnock)</i></p> <p><i>Knowing that I will be able survive, economically, when retired (Survey, individual)</i></p> <p><i>Sufficient income to pay bills but also enjoy cultural or other activities (pastimes, hobbies) (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Having a secure source of money	<p><i>A man goes to work full time and still has to get the social because wages is [sic] so low; he needed that money to keep his kids (Dundee)</i></p> <p><i>An economy that supports everyone (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Access to arts/ culture/ interest/ hobbies/ leisure activities	<p><i>Some stuff to do – activity clubs instead of using drugs and alcohol; community centre (archery, football, pool, dancing, squash); air cadets and army cadets (Focus Group, Aberdeen Foyer)</i></p> <p><i>Culture - whether on TV or live (Survey, individual)</i></p> <p><i>A vibrant, inclusive, exciting cultural life that reflects their own history and environment (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Having the facilities you need available locally	<p><i>Shops, bookies, doctors, dentist all nearby (Dundee)</i></p> <p><i>The most important services are [the] post office: because it's handy, and has nice people (Community workshop, Borders)</i></p> <p><i>Having somewhere local to socialise, cafe, Pub, restaurant, etc. (Survey, individual)</i></p> <p><i>Also need the places that people go to in their normal daily living to be dementia-friendly in terms of their design (Survey, organisation)</i></p>

Getting enough skills and education to live a good life	<p><i>If you don't have the skill you need there is a barrier between you and society (Community workshop, Glasgow)</i></p> <p><i>[Education] enables you to advocate for yourself and brings hope (Focus Group, Karibu)</i></p> <p><i>Access to education for all ages. Literacy and the ability to engage in social dialogue are critical (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Being part of a community	<p><i>Atmosphere; feel happy to go to all the wee shops and talk to people. Good bus service (Dundee)</i></p> <p><i>You get to know everybody and all my friends live here as well (Dundee)</i></p> <p><i>Ability to know neighbours and be able to help and be helped (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Having good transport to get to where you need to go	<p><i>Getting a job is a nightmare. There's no transport after 7pm or at weekends so I can't work at weekends (Community workshop, Wishaw)</i></p> <p><i>I go 45 minutes on the bus to get to the Job Centre – travel costs are high, sometimes I have to go twice a week (Community workshop, Wishaw)</i></p>
Being able to access high-quality services	<p><i>It's a blessing that we have basic services like clean water in this country when there are countries around the world that do not (Community workshop, Dundee)</i></p> <p><i>High quality health and social services (Survey, organisation)</i></p> <p><i>Services that are properly accountable to service users (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Human rights/freedom from discrimination / acceptance /respect	<p><i>Freedom from violence and discrimination (Survey, organisation)</i></p> <p><i>Freedom to associate, organise and represent...the right to organise politically (Survey, organisation)</i></p>
Feeling good*	<p><i>Being happy with who you are (Community workshop, Wishaw)</i></p>

Appendix 6: Equivalents of table 9 by gender

Table 17: Equivalent of table 9 by gender

Domain	Sub-domain	Original score	Female	Male	Final weights	Female	Male	Female	Male
SOCIAL	Having good relationships with family and friends	8.5	7.9	7.9	6.8	6.7	6.2	7	6
	Feeling that you and those you care about are safe	7.6	8.8	8.3	6.1	7.5	6.5	8	7
	Being part of a community	4.5	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.5	2.9	4	3
	Human rights/freedom from discrimination	3.3	5.6	2.6	2.7	4.8	2.0	5	2
HUMAN	Being physically and mentally healthy	13.5	13.2	13.5	10.9	11.3	10.6	11	11
	Getting enough skills and education to live a good life	4.7	4.8	4.8	3.8	4.1	3.8	4	4
	Having satisfying work to do	8.6	7.8	11	6.9	6.7	8.6	7	9
	Feeling good	2.2	0.7	1.8	1.8	0.6	1.4	1	1
NATURE & ENV.	Living in a neighbourhood where you can enjoy going outside + Clean and healthy environment	10.8	10.7	10.9	8.7	9.1	8.6	9	9
	Access to green / natural / wild spaces /Community	7.3	2.8	2.3	5.9	2.4	1.8	2	2

FINANCIAL	Having a secure source of money	5.8	6.2	5.8	4.7	5.3	4.6	5	5
	Having enough money to pay the bills	7	6.7	6.8	5.6	5.7	5.3	6	5
	Secure work / suitable work + Having satisfying work to do	7.1	5.6	11.1	5.7	4.8	8.7	5	9
PHYSICAL RESOURCES	Affordable/ decent home + Having a safe and secure home	14.2	15.2	13.9	11.4	13.0	10.9	13	11
	Being able to access high-quality services	4.3	4.3	5.3	3.5	3.7	4.2	4	4
	Having good transport to get to where you need to go	4.5	3.9	4.9	3.6	3.3	3.9	3	4
	Having the facilities you need available locally	4.8	4.7	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.1	4	3
	Access to arts / culture / interest / learning /	5.7	4.1	8.7	4.6	3.5	6.8	4	7
	Totals:	124.4	117.1	127.2	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Appendix 7 YouGov Results

The YouGov poll carried out in November 2011 presented 1081 adults representative of the Scottish population with the list of sub-domains seen in Table 10. Respondents were asked to review the list and nominate the five which they thought they most needed to live well and have a good life in their community.

The YouGov and consultation results were:

Order of importance in YouGov poll	Sub-domain ¹	(Ranking by weights in consultation – see Table 10)
1	Being healthy, both physically and mentally	(=1)
2	Having enough money to pay the bills and buy what I need	(=5)
3	Having good relationships with family and friends	(=3)
4	Knowledge that both myself and those that I care about are safe	(=4)
5	Having a secure source of money	(=5)
6	Having affordable and decent housing that is safe and secure to live in	(=1)
7	Feeling good about myself, feeling happy and having a sense of wellbeing	(=8)
8	Having secure and suitable work/employment	(=5)
9	Having human rights/freedom from discrimination/acceptance and respect	(=8)
= 9	Living in a neighbourhood where I can enjoy a clean and healthy environment when I go outside	(=2)
11	Being able to access high-quality services (eg government support, social care, health services etc)	(7)
12	Having good and affordable transport to get where I need to go	(=6)
13	Having satisfying work to do (whether that is paid or unpaid)	(=3)

14	Access to green, natural, wild spaces, community/social areas and open spaces/ play areas	(=4)
15	Gaining the skills and education required to participate fully in society and the economy	(=6)
16	Having good and available local facilities (eg libraries, sports facilities, community halls)	(=6)
17	Having access to cultural attractions, places of interest, learning facilities and/or places to undertake hobbies	(=5)
18	Being part of a community	(=6)

The rankings are not directly comparable because they were derived by different methods, and the YouGov results are simply a rank order, while the consultation results are ranking of weightings, but they do show some similarities and differences. For example:

- Of the first seven sub-domains according to the YouGov, only one (feeling good) is not also in the top seven of the consultation results.
- Having good relationships with family and friends was placed the same in the consultation and the YouGov poll (=3).
- Knowledge that both myself and those that I care about are safe placed the same in the consultation and the YouGov poll (=4).
- Having a secure source of money placed the same in the consultation and the YouGov poll (=5).
- Having affordable housing that is safe and secure to live in was higher in the consultation (=1) than in the YouGov poll. This might reflect the personal circumstances of the groups engaged in the consultation – many of whom are on low incomes, have a refugee background or are homeless.
- Having enough money to pay the bills and buy what I need was placed second in the YouGov poll, but equal fifth in the consultation. On first glance this might be surprising, given that the consultation deliberately sought to engage with deprived groups. However, it might be because the groups in the consultation are used to living on not much money, and not having enough money to buy what they need is something they have come to manage – and as such it does not have such a significant bearing on their ability to live well in their community.

The YouGov poll also asked respondents whether the list of 18 sub-domains was missing any factors that had a bearing on their ability to live well in their community. A review of these answers suggests that most respondents were happy that the 18 sub-domains identified in the consultation captured those factors important to living well in their community. Many additional answers provided were simply reiterating sub-domains already in the list of 18 from the consultation, albeit sometimes using slightly different language. One area that does seem to emerge as important for at least 34 respondents to the YouGov poll is government – quality, representativeness, proportional interference and

honesty. A selection of other areas nominated include 'a low tax community', 'a reliable and efficient broadband service', 'feeling that you are not being shafted by capitalism', 'healthy food and clean drinking water', 'having a ruling class that is not greedy', 'a free and independent media' and 'pets'.

The YouGov results are broken down by, *inter alia*, gender, age group, social grade, Scottish region and employment status. Looking at the top five ranked sub-domains in the YouGov results, there are some notable differences and similarities in the responses including:

- The similarity between responses from males and females
- The similarity of responses between social grades
- Some differences according to working status: 69% of full time students nominated having good relationships with family and friends in their top five, compared to 42% of those who are not working/other; 69% of retired people said having enough money to pay the bills and buy what I need was important to living well in their community, compared to 39% of full time students.

Appendix 8 Expert Panel

- Fraser of Allander Institute, University of Strathclyde – Chair
- Dr John McKendrick, Glasgow Caledonian University
- Professor Patricia Findlay, University of Strathclyde
- Jeannette Findlay, University of Glasgow
- Neil Quinn, University of Strathclyde
- Bruce Whyte, Glasgow Centre for Population Health
- Professor Susan McVie, University of Edinburgh
- Professor Ailsa McKay, Glasgow Caledonian University
- Professor Nick Hanley, University of Stirling
- Dr Ralph Blaney, Scottish Natural Heritage
- Dr Julie Clark, University of Glasgow

References

Camfield, L., Crivello, G., and Woodhead, M. (2009). 'Wellbeing Research in Developing Countries: Reviewing the Role of Qualitative Methods'. *Social Indicators Research*, 90(1), p5-31.

McAllister, F. (2005). 'Wellbeing Concepts and Challenges' Discussion paper. Sustainable Development Research Network (SDRN) Discussion paper.

Nussbaum, M and Sen, eds. (1993) *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Stiglitz, J, Sen, A and Fitoussi, J P (2009) *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. Paris: Commission for the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.

UN (2004) *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*.

Whatmore, S. (2003) 'Generating Materials'. In M. Pryke, G. Rose and S.Whatmore (Eds.), *Using Social Theory*. London: Sage.

White, S., & Pettit, J. (2005). 'Participatory Approaches and the Measurement of Human Wellbeing'. In M. McGillivray (Ed.), *Measuring Human Wellbeing*. Oxford, UK: WIDER/Oxford University Press.

¹ Other national and regional wellbeing research includes the Health and Wellbeing Indicators for Glasgow and the 'Forward Scotland consultation.

² See Whose Economy? http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/search?i=1;q=*;q1=publications;q2=whose+economy+papers;x1=page_type;x2=series

² Apparent oddities (such as $4 + 0 = 5$ for 'Being part of/sense of a community') are due to rounding.

³ Nussbaum and Sen 1993; UN 1994

⁴ See, for example, <http://www.ifad.org/sla/index.htm>

⁵ <http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/en/index.htm>

⁶ See, for example, Stiglitz *et al.* 2009

⁷ <http://www.ophi.org.uk/policy/multidimensional-poverty-index/>

⁸ <http://hdr.undp.org/en/>

⁹ <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub/people-places/communities/societal-wellbeing>

¹⁰ <http://www.neweconomics.org/programmes/wellbeing>

¹¹ Camfield *et al.* 2009, 6

¹² Camfield *et al.* 2009

¹³ White and Pettit 2005, 13

¹⁴ See below for why only some answers were used

¹⁵ It might be possible to produce more precise weighting, using the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, but this is not recommended because making one aspect of the calculation (the latter) more precise will not offset the inevitable crudity of the other aspects (the first and second). Furthermore, visual inspection suggests that the weighting is not that significant. It does not look as if the double weighting for the focus groups and the community workshops makes a significant difference, compared to giving each source an equal weighting.

¹⁶ In some cases the wording was quite different. For example, 'Enjoying your time off' became 'Quality time to spend with my family and friends' in the survey.

¹⁷ The closed response questions in the survey contained two sub-domains not used in the events (to do with government interference in people's lives and keeping up with trends), but these received significantly lower 'survey votes' (i.e. proportions of the 'very important' responses for these answers) than the rest. The survey vote proportions were recalculated by excluding these, and using only the 10 options for which there were equivalent sub-domains presented in the events.

¹⁸ Note that where Table 7 refers to sub-domains being combined, this only covers the case where two *original* sub-domains were combined.

¹⁹ Freedom to practice dropped out at this point because the percentage mentions are so small, disappearing when rounded to the nearest whole number.