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Executive summary

This project was initiated by the North East Improvement and Efficiency Partnership (NEIEP) following interest from regional local authorities in the evaluation of the impact of large scale regeneration initiatives. The project therefore centres on the Greater Eston area in Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council. The study evaluates the potential to establish a longitudinal study to monitor the performance and impact of the Greater Eston Master Plan and provides a commentary on how the techniques recommended in this area could be applied to other regeneration initiatives elsewhere. The project was commissioned through the Institute for Local Governance and was jointly funded by them and the RIEP. The project has been undertaken on behalf of the two funders by a team of researchers from the Sustainable Cities Research Institute at the School of the Built and Natural Environment, Northumbria University, and the Policy Research Group at the University of Durham, working with Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.

The following report sets out the project that has been undertaken to establish and test the potential to establish a longitudinal study in Greater Eston and in particular the South Bank area which although situated at the northern edge of Greater Eston, immediately adjacent to the A66 (see Appendix A for location and delineation of the study area) lies at the heart of the Greater Eston Master Plan. A separate report has been compiled summarising the analysis and findings of the secondary and primary data collection that has been undertaken in the South Bank.

The aim of the project was ‘to establish the baseline position and design a robust strategy for a 25 year longitudinal assessment of the impact of the delivery of a large scale regeneration project: the Greater Eston Regeneration Master Plan’.

In pursuing this aim, the research team has sought to:

1. Conduct a comprehensive analysis of related work in order to make use of good practice and lessons learned;
2. Consult with key stakeholders and interested parties;
3. Investigate financial considerations and identify potential funding sources for continuing the research over the period of the study;
4. Make a full assessment of the potential challenges, difficulties, and opportunities associated with the study, along with proposed ways to address them;
5. Develop a detailed methodology for the longitudinal study based on a flexible and transferable framework.
The project comprised five separate strands of work, all of which have been addressed specifically in this report:

- **Strand 1: Documentary analysis**
- **Strand 2: Consultation with key stakeholders**
- **Strand 3: Funding**
- **Strand 4: Identifying challenges and opportunities**
- **Strand 5: Development of methodology**

The proposed framework for the longitudinal study comprises two main research activities – interviews and focus groups, with residents and stakeholders, and secondary data analysis – complemented by a series of potential add-on projects. The study is designed to create a rolling programme of activity, whereby momentum is built up and maintained. The programme will reiterate every 3-5 years, over a period of up to 25 years, with add-on projects occurring periodically in between. A panel of residents will be recruited and maintained for the duration of the study, within which there will exist a number of smaller themed groups consisting of people who share similar characteristics or belong to the same communities. This process has already begun, with around 20 residents contributing to the baseline study (for more information, see the baseline report).

A funding strategy should be adopted that avoids reliance on a single funder, by approaching a variety of organisations for smaller sums. The short-term strategy should be to secure funding to run the main research activities once. Full costings were calculated for four other combinations of research activities as well as an estimation of the costs, for the five options, of conducting the study over a 25 year period.

The research team believes that, given sufficient funding, this proposal will create a lasting legacy for South Bank and represent an original contribution to our understanding of the performance and impact of a large scale regeneration project over the long term. The proposed study is innovative, transferable and will make a contribution to both local policy formulation and national policy evaluation. Findings derived from the study could be reported periodically to create a flow of data and analysis that could be used to inform future policy development and interventions.
1.0 Introduction

Large scale regeneration projects have been undertaken in the UK for many decades; the North East of England has its own legacy of such projects, such as the Byker Wall, Royal Quays in North Tyneside and St Peter’s in Sunderland. Despite hundreds of millions of pounds of public and private money being invested in such projects, relatively little is understood about their long-term impact. Such projects are typically evaluated midway through their delivery and at the end of the project. There has been no systematic monitoring and evaluation of large scale projects over the medium to long term, to determine their impact and performance and whether the investment made has fundamentally improved the quality of life, wellbeing and health of local communities. In short, has the regeneration effort made a real difference to peoples’ lives?

This project originates from interest expressed by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council in the evaluation of the impact of a large scale regeneration project in Greater Eston, in Tees Valley. The North East Improvement and Efficiency Partnership agreed to promote a study to evaluate the potential to establish a longitudinal study to monitor the performance and impact of the Greater Eston Master Plan. The project was commissioned by the Institute for Local Governance (see below) and was funded in part by them and the NEIEP. The following report sets out the project that has been undertaken to establish and test the potential to establish a longitudinal study in Greater Eston. A separate report has been compiled summarising the analysis and findings of the secondary and primary data collection that has been undertaken in the South Bank area of Greater Eston, which is at the heart of the wider Greater Eston Master Plan.

1.1 The Institute for Local Governance

This research was commissioned by the Institute for Local Governance (ILG). The ILG was established in 2009 by the region’s local authorities using funding from the NEIEP, as a preferred supplier of research services to local government in the North East. It is based on a knowledge exchange partnership that enables shared learning using research expertise that is locally accessible and meets excellent standards. Northumbria and Durham Universities are among the five regional ILG partner universities. The current study is one of a number of research projects being taken forward as ‘pathfinders’ to help develop procedures and protocols for commissioning and managing ILG projects.
1.2 Background to the study

The research brief, issued by the North East Improvement and Efficiency Partnership, was to develop an approach for a longitudinal study which would evaluate the performance and impact of a large scale regeneration project, with a specific focus on Greater Eston. The proposal that was agreed was to produce a flexible and transferable methodology for evaluating regeneration projects in general that could be piloted and refined in Greater Eston.

The project sponsor, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, provided the focus for the project which in turn helped shape the design of the methodology for a longitudinal study. An early meeting with the Chief Executive and Head of Regeneration at the Council helped to clarify a number of issues and further tighten the focus of the research. The meeting confirmed that the main area of interest was not the whole of Greater Eston, but a particular part of it: South Bank. The Council’s position was that South Bank has had millions of pounds of regeneration funding spent on it over the last two decades – and is likely to have more spent on it in future – and yet there is no real evidence of the impact this has had on the community and the lives of the people living in the area. The Council wanted a study which followed residents over the long term, tracking changes in their circumstances, wellbeing and quality of life, and linking these changes to progress in the regeneration process, so as to provide indications of whether the regeneration of the area worked: whether it improved their quality of life over the long term.

We also favoured a people-centred approach, both for this project and for the proposed longitudinal study. Although it was important to review data from a range of sources, we wanted to get to know the area, and develop an understanding of what it is like now and what has shaped it. To do this we needed to speak to the people who lived, worked, and played in South Bank, who had an interest in the area and cared about its future. We wanted to build relationships with these people and gain their trust, to start to lay the groundwork for the longitudinal study. By using this approach we could find out more about what matters to local people about the place they live in, and we could start gathering information about important related aspects such as their trust in the authorities and agencies operating in the area, their hopes and fear for the future of the area, and the community’s resilience to challenges ahead.

1.3 Aims and objectives

The aim of the research was ‘to establish the baseline position and design a robust strategy for a 25 year longitudinal assessment of the impact of the delivery of a large scale regeneration project: the Greater Eston Regeneration Master Plan’ (see Project Initiation Document version 1.2).
In doing this, the research has met the following objectives:

1. To conduct a comprehensive analysis of related work in order to make use of good practice and lessons learned;
2. To consult with key stakeholders and interested parties;
3. To investigate financial considerations and identify potential funding sources;
4. To make a full assessment of the potential challenges, difficulties, and opportunities associated with the study, along with proposed ways to address them;
5. To develop a detailed methodology for the longitudinal study based on a flexible and transferable framework.

1.4 Research methods

The research involved five separate but inter-linked strands of work, as described below.

**Strand 1: Documentary analysis**
The desk-based secondary analysis drew on a range of reports, papers, datasets and other sources of information relating to: the evaluation of previous regeneration programmes, highlighting good practice and innovative methods; research into deprived areas, poverty, needs, wellbeing, and happy communities; the design and use of longitudinal research studies; and the assessment of - and indicators used to measure – a variety of regeneration outcomes, including ‘soft’ outcomes (e.g. wellbeing, quality of life, and liveability).

We scoped the longitudinal study by investigating the local environment in terms of the people, businesses, organisations and agencies. Secondary data on aspects such as housing tenure, economic data, and demographic information was collated at Super Output Area level (see Appendix A). We also investigated external perceptions and any possible stigma attached to the area, by reviewing recent press cuttings. A timeline was constructed detailing significant events in the area over the years. Together the resulting data forms a baseline against which future iterations of the longitudinal study may be compared.

**Strand 2: Consultation with key stakeholders**
45 face to face, in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted, comprising local residents, key individuals, representatives of local organisations, and other parties with an interest in the study (a full list of interviewees is available on request). We also attended local public and community meetings such as the neighbourhood forum, Housing Steering Group, and police consultative meeting. The primary aim was to seek views, opinions, needs, expectations and other information which could help shape the development of an appropriate methodology for the study. In addition, this was an opportunity to make initial contacts and start building relationships with stakeholders, with a view to recruiting them for the longitudinal study.
Strand 3: Funding
This involved calculating the cost of the longitudinal study, including the overall price and full cost breakdown. A series of different costing options has been considered, including costing by year and by research activity, and costing different levels of activity. Potential funding sources have been identified, along with assessments of: the likelihood that different funders will provide support; how much support they may provide and over what timescale; conditions such as the need for match-funding; and opportunities for repeat funding. Known and potential future changes in the funding landscape, and the implications of these for the study have also been explored, and long-term fundraising strategies and mechanisms for the longitudinal study have been considered.

Strand 4: Identifying challenges and opportunities
This strand was devoted to identifying and addressing potential challenges, difficulties, and opportunities associated with the proposed longitudinal study. Strategies for addressing challenges, overcoming difficulties and capitalising on opportunities were considered and fed into the development of the methodology. Inevitably the application of any methodology will be subject to certain constraints, limitations and parameters influenced by particular circumstances on the ground at a particular time.

Strand 5: Development of methodology
The development of a framework for the longitudinal study has been informed by the findings of the four previous strands, as well as the remit to create a methodology which:

- Is robust;
- Is flexible;
- Provides a wide range of quantitative and qualitative data;
- Can be reiterated over the life of the study, with comparative analysis being used to measure, track and understand any changes;
- Focuses on quality of life, quality of place and wellbeing to gain insight into residents’ experiences of living in the area;
- Has an in-built commitment to the use of a co-inquiry approach in order to take account of the emerging needs of the area, the evaluation process, and contextual and practical issues;
- Is transferable, so that it may be used to assess the impact of other regeneration projects.

1.5 Context

Although one of the aims of the research was to devise a methodology which was transferable to other regeneration projects and geographical areas, it was also important to gain an understanding of the local context of South Bank so that we could design the study to be fit for purpose. Through interviews, documentary analysis, and the collation of secondary data, we were able to compile a detailed picture of the area we were studying.
What we learned is summarised in Appendix B and set out at greater length in a separate report.

### 1.6 Analysis of literature on related studies

One of the first tasks of the current study was to build upon existing knowledge and ‘to learn from what works’. To achieve this we sought to find out what we could learn from comparable in-depth evaluation work that had been conducted both in the UK and internationally. The documentary analysis process involved studying a range of information relating to the following:

- The evaluation of previous regeneration programmes, including the long-term New Deal for Communities evaluation (CLG, 2010a: CLG, 2010b), which adopted a ‘bottom up’ people-centred approach to the regeneration process, and the evaluation of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (SQW, 2008). The studies highlighted innovative evaluation methods, challenges around accessing consistent data at the micro spatial scale and emerging good practice in evaluation studies;

- The design and use of longitudinal methodologies primarily in research studies (e.g. the Thousand Families study in Newcastle upon Tyne, the work of the UK Longitudinal Studies Centre, and the British Household Panel Survey);

- Research into deprived areas, poverty, and needs, such as recent work by Communities and Local Government (2009) to develop a typology of deprived neighbourhoods, a JRF (2010) study which looks at the impacts of the recession on deprived communities and the Local Wellbeing Project established by the Young Foundation in 2006, to test ways of increasing individual and community wellbeing;

- The assessment of - and the indicators used to measure – a variety of regeneration outcomes, including ‘soft’ outcomes such as wellbeing, quality of life, and liveability, e.g. The Audit Commission’s (2005) report on local quality of life indicators offers some interesting and innovative approaches to this problematic area. Equally, Longlands and Frank’s (2008: 14) research is very informative and advocates adopting an in depth qualitative approach, by suggesting that, “Capturing soft outcomes is a complex area, necessitating appropriately focused qualitative questioning...”

- Academic research studies which examine the role of the evaluator in the research process. Coaffee and Diamond’s (2008) research suggests four roles that an evaluator might play; a monitor, a facilitator, a broker and a critical friend. Their paper argues that *often in contemporary regeneration evaluation, the techniques and methodologies used are not appropriate*, “…the techniques employed are too simplistic and reductionist to ever understand the complex success factors in regeneration” (Coaffee and Diamond, 2008:89).
Exploring this participatory (community) driven paradigm of research (Coaffee and Diamond, 2008; Rhodes et al, 2005; CSER, 2009; Lawless, 2006; JRF, 2010) prompted us to think about the most appropriate ways that we could engage with and support the South Bank community, so that the longitudinal evaluation becomes a collaborative process which goes beyond the surface level of analysis and begins to drill into the complex layers of the ongoing regeneration process in the area.

Our reading led us to deduce that a participatory evaluation approach including elements of innovative tools like Participatory Appraisal (PA) would be the most appropriate approach for a longitudinal evaluation study in a challenging and evolving area like South Bank (or indeed like many other areas with similar problems). Our interviews suggest that the community has on the whole had negative experiences with previous consultation and research processes. The community felt that consultants had been very well paid, “to parachute into the community and then disappear again”. We hope that by creating a more ‘bottom up’ collaborative approach, which has at its heart a genuine long term commitment to the local area, we will avoid some of the pitfalls of the past. The two key concepts of Participatory Evaluation and Participatory Appraisal are explained below.

**Participatory Evaluation Research**

This is a process that focuses on involving all key stakeholders in assessing the performance and achievements of an organisation, project or initiative. Local communities are clearly a central stakeholder in regeneration activity. There needs to be a commitment to attempting to involve all sections of the community in the process, this will involve an iterative process of developing trust and linkages within the community, an essential but time consuming part of the process. Within this approach all stakeholders are given an opportunity to input into setting the aims for the research, and specifying how it will be undertaken. The focus is on making sure that the research will be as inclusive, enjoyable and informative as possible for all stakeholders.

Within the United States, USAID (1996) was one of the primary developers of guides for training people to be researchers/evaluators using Participatory Evaluation methods, and has also developed various resources. Similar approaches and resources that have been developed in the UK include: Prove It! (2009) New Economics Foundation and LEAP (2009) Scottish Community Development Centre (SCDC).

**Participatory Appraisal (PA)**

Participatory Appraisal is a community-based approach to consultation and research that gives precedence to the views and attitudes of local people as experts within their own communities. Through PA, local people can explore and share their knowledge of life and local conditions as well as make decisions, and plan and carry out actions to effect change within their communities. The PA approach uses visual and flexible tools such as maps, illustrations, spider diagrams and charts. The process is interactive rather than extractive, enabling people from all backgrounds and with varying abilities to be involved in the
research, education and collective action. Northumbria University has a dedicated Participatory Appraisal (PA) community training team within the School of Built and Natural Environment called PEANuT (Participatory Evaluation and Appraisal in Newcastle upon Tyne).

### 1.7 Research methods: options analysis

A robust, reliable and effective research methodology needs to employ a variety of different research methods to collect a range of data from a variety of sources, in a range of different ways, to ensure validity of analysis and findings. The model that we have developed therefore employs data collection methods that capture in-depth data about people’s feelings of wellbeing and their quality of life, while also trying to be inclusive and enable as many people as possible to participate. We need to use methods that are replicable, as well as building in flexibility, and making use of innovative methods where appropriate. Finally, we need to consider the cost. Although there was no indicative budget for the longitudinal study, there was little point in designing a framework that was so expensive that it could not realistically be funded over the medium- to long-term. Prior to initiating the primary data collection phase of the work we reviewed a range of different research methods for inclusion in the research framework. The table in Appendix C summarises the main strengths and weaknesses of the various methods considered.

In choosing research methods, we discounted postal and door-to-door surveys because we felt that they would not give us sufficient depth of data about people’s wellbeing and quality of life. We decided that the least intrusive way to collect robust data of this (largely quantitative) type was by exploiting the increasingly extensive range of statistical data that is publicly available. This would enable updating of the study year-on-year and thus capture emerging trends; however, the data could be collated and reviewed retrospectively as time and resources allowed.

To complement the secondary data analysis and add depth and quality to the longitudinal data, we decided to use a combination of qualitative interviews and focus groups, which would enable us to get to know and understand the area and its residents, to find out about the things that mattered to them, and record the stories of their lives. We also wanted to speak to other local stakeholders who worked or volunteered in South Bank, especially those who have day-to-day contact with local people. The stakeholders we interviewed often had a deeper and more complex understanding of the area, and offered an alternative and more objective perspective compared to that of the residents.

This approach would provide a richer and more resonant study than a quantitative analysis, and the resulting data could provide a lasting legacy for the area. However, there was still a strong drive to build in more innovative aspects to the methodology. We would like, in the future, to use the longitudinal study as an opportunity to build local capacity by training
local people to deliver Participatory Appraisal training. We have identified a number of other innovative research methods through the literature search and have designed a methodology to incorporate some of these into the study to explore complex issues in greater detail, raise the profile of the area and the study, make it fun and rewarding for the participants, and enable the creation of range of materials, for example art work, photographs, and spoken and written records.

### 2.0 Proposed longitudinal study framework

#### Summary
The proposed framework design for the longitudinal study is described fully in this section. In brief, the process proposes two main research methods – interviews or focus groups with residents and other stakeholders, and secondary data analysis – alongside a series of innovative add-on projects. The main process would reiterate every 3-5 years over the next 25 years, subject to the availability of funding and the expectations and capacity of both the community and client, with add-on projects taking place periodically in between.

#### Methods
The longitudinal study will consist of the following research activities:

1. Regular in-depth interviews, focus groups, or group interviews with around 80 local residents.
2. Regular in-depth interviews with around 20 other local stakeholders who work or volunteer in the area.
3. Updating the secondary data analysis process annually for comparison with the baseline set during the current project.
4. Optional innovative ‘add-on’ projects as and when funding permits. Some ideas for potential add-ons are described later in this section.
5. Ongoing contact with the area over the life of the study, in the form of attendance at regular South Bank Forum meetings and other public and community meetings, to maintain the goodwill and rapport that has been built over the course of this project.

#### Study scale
We wanted to interview a reasonably large number of people at each iteration of the study: sufficient to capture a broad range of different views and experiences from people with a range of different characteristics and living in a variety of circumstances, but not so many that the study would become too costly or we would find it difficult to use all the data we collected. We settled on a target of 100 participants, comprising approximately 80 residents and 20 stakeholders, to guarantee sufficient data saturation without becoming unmanageable.
The panels approach
We wanted to assemble one large, broadly representative group of 80 resident participants for interviews or focus groups, within which there would exist a number of smaller themed panels consisting of people who shared similar characteristics or belonging to the same communities. This approach would provide continuity and make it easier to repeat the study by ensuring that we could call on the same group of people each time. Dividing the larger group into smaller ones would mean that we could group people together (or mix them up) in order to hold focus groups and for data analysis purposes. Participants could also move between panels with, for instance, some people belonging to several different communities of interest. The panels being used could be chosen to reflect the local community or issues of particular interest in the study. Some examples of indicative criteria that may be used to assemble panels include:

- Age/demographic
- Employment status
- Ethnicity/faith
- Education and training
- Family groups
- Health status
- Duration of residency in the area
- Leisure and special interest
- Housing type and tenure
- Local business representation
- Geographical area by streets or estate

Using a panel approach provides the opportunity to assemble a reasonably representative and balanced group of local residents, the constituency of which may be tested using secondary data analysis. The data we have compiled for South Bank indicates that for every 80 residents there should be 16 under the age of 16, around 51 should be of working age, of whom 27 should be on benefits, and 13 should be beyond working age. It should be noted that these figures are indicative and based on current data for the area. It is unlikely that a perfectly balanced sample can be assembled and the profile of participants will inevitably change over time through attrition and long term demographic changes in the population. It may be necessary to make adjustments to the make up of the panels, by recruiting new participants, to ensure that the sample remains broadly representative.

Sampling methods
Recruiting people to the study and maintaining their commitment to the project in the medium- to long-term may represent a big challenge. A significant number of contacts have been established in conducting the current study – as described below – and we would seek to ensure that these contacts are maintained. What we learned during the process has
informed our approach for recruiting and embedding participants into the study over the longer term.

For the current study, a snowball sampling method was used. Starting with our first contacts at Redcar and Cleveland Council, we asked who else they thought we should speak to, i.e. others who had knowledge of and interest in South Bank or the regeneration process. With every subsequent contact we were directed to, we asked the same thing again. We also looked at relevant information such as local newspapers, South Bank community newsletter, and web resources to find out who the stakeholders were and where we could find them. This led us to speak to around 25 people who were connected to South Bank in a variety of different ways and at different operational and spatial levels. By concentrating on those who worked or volunteered in South Bank, we were able to meet ‘gatekeepers’ who could put us in touch with local residents.

The stakeholders we spoke to represented:

- Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Neighbourhood Management, Regeneration, South Bank Housing Renewal & Community Cohesion staff)
- Local councillors
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Coast and Country Housing Ltd (a Registered Social Landlord)
- South Bank Tomorrow (a local community organisation)
- Kidz Konnekt (a local youth project)
- South Bank Football Club
- Local schools
- Cleveland Police
- Local religious leaders

In the current project, this process was exploratory and we included stakeholders from, for instance, agencies which operate at borough, regional and national spatial levels. This was important to enable us to properly understand the wider context within which South Bank exists. However, it would not be necessary to revisit all of the same stakeholders in the future. The longitudinal study will involve a more targeted approach, which focuses on local, ‘on-the-ground’ workers and volunteers, who have a real feel for the area and the community. We would approach additional stakeholders such as health services, the fire service, statutory youth services, Jobcentre Plus, a local women’s centre, a local family project and other groups that may emerge in the locality during the course of the longitudinal study.

Through speaking to stakeholders and by getting to know the physical area, we also found out about local residents’ and community groups, and community places in South Bank. Of particular importance and significance to the success of the study is the identification of appropriate venues in which to convene focus groups and conduct interviews. Venues need
to be accessible, safe and either neutral or compatible with the theme of the focus group. Venues used for community activities and public meetings – and in particular the people who ran them - became a key focus for recruiting residents. We have compiled a comprehensive list of community groups and venues that represent a wide range of different interests and communities, so as to ensure a wide and balanced coverage of the area and its residents. A list of potential venues that the longitudinal study may use is shown in appendix D.

It is impossible to retain the same participants over the life of the study; 25 years is a long time and inevitably some people will move away, others may become ill or die and some will lose interest. However, some degree of churn in the participant group is a good thing. It provides an opportunity to refresh and update the list of residents, and enables newcomers to the area, and young residents who come of age during the study, to participate.

**Interviews and focus groups**

Interviews with stakeholders and residents will take place on a face-to-face basis, either in the workplace, in residents’ homes, or in an appropriate local venue. Interviews last about one hour and will be tape-recorded. The interviews will be semi-structured so as to ensure the same general topics are covered each time, while giving the freedom to explore particular issues in further depth if desired, and also to explore any new issues raised by participants. In the current study we developed and piloted two question guides – one each for stakeholders and for residents – to be used in the longitudinal study. Focus groups will be for residents only and will be conducted based on the residents’ question guide. The full question guides can be found in Appendix E.

The ratio of interviews to focus groups to be used at each iteration of the study will remain flexible. It is recommended that at least half of resident participants take part in interviews at each time, and that they all get the chance to take part in both focus groups and interviews at different times. However, in practice this may be dictated by other issues, including costs (higher for individual interviews) and people’s availability (focus groups are harder to arrange than interviews as they rely on participants being free at the same time). Group interviews are likely to be more opportunistic and ad-hoc when, for example, a participant is being interviewed and their friends, family or companions join in and offer their views too.

**Secondary analysis**

The statistical analysis will essentially consist of updating the baseline figures for the South Bank LSOAs (Lower Super Output Areas – see Appendix A), with the addition of other statistics which may become available over time – The Office for National Statistics (ONS) is attempting to make a wider range of statistics available at local levels, and the current government has indicated that it supports this agenda; the National Census will take place in 2011 and the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is under review. The data will largely be
retrieved from the Neighbourhood Statistics and/or NOMIS websites, although some has already been collated by Tees Valley Unlimited. In some cases, the data available from TVU is at a higher resolution than that available from ONS (e.g. crime data) or has been extrapolated so it is more up-to-date (e.g. population figures). Additional data will be retrieved from the Annual Business Inquiry and Companies House records to cover businesses located in the area.

We may also incorporate, by agreement, data that is not in the public domain, from the major local Registered Social Landlord, Coast & Country Housing, covering both management information on their housing stock, and data from their regular surveys of residents, which give some indication of their satisfaction with the area, in terms of cleanliness, safety etc. Potentially, we would collaborate with C&C in adding questions or redesigning the questionnaire to include more topics of interest to the research project.

It is not intended that this section be unduly lengthy, as its purpose is background contextualisation for the qualitative analysis. As such, analysis of the data will be fairly brief, reporting the main trends and implications for the area. Comparisons will be made against trends in Redcar & Cleveland, the North East and nationally, with the possibility of adding other comparator areas (e.g. similar areas elsewhere in the region or country) if requested.

Analysis of newspaper stories will serve a similar function, examining the image of South Bank as portrayed to the local population through the media. This will be undertaken through the newspaper archive Lexis-Nexis, searching for mentions of ‘South Bank’ in the local press (principally the Middlesbrough Evening Gazette), and examining substantive stories concerning residents of or events within the area, including stories on ex-residents. These stories are coded, placed into broad categories (e.g. crime, business, sport) and textually analysed, concentrating on the tenor of the story – is South Bank portrayed in a negative way? Does the article concentrate on decline in the area? How are residents characterised? In addition, the same exercise could be undertaken for neighbouring areas (Grangetown, Eston etc.) as an optional add-on, in order to assess the relative portrayal of South Bank.

Add-on projects
Add-on projects will be more innovative and opportunistic, will use different approaches and media and may be designed to align with the availability of additional funding or organised events. They may target some or all members of the main participant group, or other local residents (we may target particular groups of the local population at different times). We may be able to work with classes in the local primary schools, or the congregations of local places of worship, for instance. The add-ons may focus on specific issues of local interest (e.g. health, environment or crime), or centre on particular research approaches, such as Participatory Appraisal, action research, capacity building or
community development approaches, for example to feed into planning and regeneration initiatives.

We propose that one add-on project takes place towards the mid-point between each iteration of the main data collection process. However, add-ons could be introduced at various other times, for instance as and when funding is available. Add-ons may be funded separately – with the research team and their partners submitting funding bids to various organisations at intervals throughout the study – or be budgeted for within the main study funding. We may either run different add-on projects each time, or repeat (or follow up) the most successful projects as the study progresses.

It may be possible to design add-on projects in partnership with local groups and agencies. This would enable us to work alongside their staff and volunteers, pooling our resources and skills, and may help to provide a ready pool of local people who are associated with such groups, to act as participants. There may also be an opportunity to piggyback existing research or community events, for instance by adding items to the Coast and Country Residents Survey, or running a Participatory Rapid Appraisal exercise at the South Bank summer fete. Such activities would be relatively low in cost, and working with other types of organisation, such as charitable and voluntary groups, may open new funding streams to the study. We have already discussed this idea with stakeholders representing organisations in South Bank, and there is some local interest in pursuing it further.

Add-on projects will be developed into project designs over the course of the longitudinal study. A list of potential projects is shown in Appendix F.

**Timing**

It is proposed that the study be designed in such a way as to create a rolling programme of activity, whereby momentum is built up and then maintained. This will enable the research team to keep up with new events in South Bank, foster and maintain relationships with stakeholders, and sustain a local presence.

It is recommended that the most concentrated and in-depth research activity – the interviews and focus groups – takes place every 3-5 years. Such a timescale is viewed as long enough to allow both actual change and people’s perceptions and understanding of change to take place, while being short enough that the key developments can be fully captured. Secondary data analysis should take place at around the same time as interviews and focus groups, in order that the findings of both can feed into the same analysis process. However, it should be possible to capture annual secondary data retrospectively at each repetition, so that this process can reveal year-on-year changes. Add-on projects should take place during years when interviews are not taking place, so as to maintain the local profile of the study and capture any new developments, while minimising research fatigue. The findings of the add-on projects will be able to stand alone or to feed into the findings of the next round of
interviews and secondary data analysis, as appropriate. (Ongoing contact will of course be continuous over the life of the study.) The table below shows the suggested timescale.

**Suggested study timescale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research activities</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews/focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add-on projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incentives**

One thing we considered for the current project was whether – and if so, how – to offer incentives to local residents in the shape of cash, a voucher or a gift in return for taking part. In the end we did not pursue this, in part because of challenges in the financial managing and auditing of such activity. We were also aware of the diversity and different motivations of the participant and were concerned that the offering of a reward to participate may actually undermine the trust and relationships that we were building with local communities and stakeholders. We were also guided by local community workers, who thought that it was inappropriate to offer incentives and that people would not expect it.

During the scoping study, some of our contacts with local people involved a short, relatively informal chat, while others took part in lengthy interviews, and still others just ‘chipped in’ while we spoke to their friends or relatives. We interviewed some people who were both local residents and local workers. It seemed impossible to build in a simple, yet fair, system of rewards for these diverse types of contact. We also did not want to create a situation where people only took part in the research because they wanted to be paid.

For the longitudinal study, it would be possible to review the issue of incentives and whether we should reward people for their ongoing commitment to the study. It may be easier to do this once a stable group of resident participants has been assembled. It is suggested that local businesses such as Asda, B&Q, and Tesco may be approached and asked to support the study by providing gifts or vouchers for participants. Alternatively, rewards may be provided in the form of free local social events that may be viewed in a more positive light and used to reinforce other initiatives that we may want to promote.
Ethics

The project and the design of study was sought and received from the School of the Built and Natural Environment Ethics Committee at Northumbria University, and all work that was undertaken by the team was compliant with both the School’s and the University’s research ethics policies and guidance.

There are a number of ethical issues that must be considered in relation to the longitudinal study. It is vital, for instance, to protect the anonymity of participants where necessary, whether they are local residents or other stakeholders. Requirements to ensure anonymity, and other measures to address ethical concerns, were built in to the current research project from the outset and apply for the longitudinal study. The main ethical considerations anticipated are:

- Fully debriefing participants about the nature and purpose of the research at the outset;
- Obtaining informed, written consent from participants;
- Making it clear that participants are free to withdraw from the research at any time;
- Taking additional measures if any participants constitute a ‘vulnerable group’ (e.g. under 18s; in this case all researchers would have to undergo a CRB check);
- Undertaking not to identify any participants by name or other identifying characteristics in any public reports or materials (anonymity may be provided by non-attribution of quotes or data aggregation, for example);
- Ensuring that the study is compliant with Data Protection Act requirements where any identifying information (e.g. names, addresses, contact details) are stored securely and are not available to anyone not working directly on the project;
- Using coding to separate personal contact details from other information relating to individual participants;
- Taking reasonable measures to protect the safety of both researchers and participants; risk assessment of activities will be undertaken where necessary.

For the current project, we prepared consent forms which participants were required to sign before the interviews took place - and information sheets (see Appendix G); forms and protocols similar to these would be used in the longitudinal study.

2.1 Costing

In costing the longitudinal study we have allowed time for the following tasks:

- Interviews and focus groups
  - Contact residents and stakeholders and arrange appointments
  - Refresh list of participants as necessary
  - Carry out interviews and focus groups (plus travel time)
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- Transcription
- Analysis

Secondary analysis
- Time in days needed to carry out desk-based analysis

Add-on projects
- Option 1: Create an indicative budget for them (e.g. £20-25K per time) then work backwards from that sum
- Option 2: Seek funding for add-ons separately over the life of the study

Other tasks
- Data analysis
- Team meetings to plan research activities and discuss findings
- Report writing
- Presentation of findings to interested parties
- Maintaining contact with the area and people, e.g. by attending SB Forum meetings

We have also considered a number of cost-related issues which arose during the current project, including:
- The high cost – in terms of researcher time – of transcribing interviews and focus groups means it may be more economical to either buy in a transcription service or have dedicated administrative support for this task;
- Other admin tasks such as arranging interviews, focus groups, and team meetings, and developing and maintaining contact lists can also be very time-consuming;
- The need to ensure the study's travel budget is high enough to cover researcher travel costs;
- How to use staff resources – research team members’ time, skills, knowledge and experience - most effectively;
- How to build in rising costs due to inflation and wage rises.

Adopting identical staffing costs to those that have been agreed for this project, we calculated the typical cost for a variety of activities which were used to compile costings for the five options set out below:

Option A: all interviews
Option B: more interviews; fewer focus groups
Option C: half interviews; half focus groups
Option D: more focus groups; fewer interviews
Option E: all focus groups
2.2 Funding options

Funding is the single most important issue for the prospects of a longitudinal study. Without adequate funding in place, the study may be significantly reduced in scale, or may not be able to take place at all. It is recommended that we use a funding strategy that avoids reliance on a single funder – and the associated risks this could bring - by approaching a range of different organisations for smaller sums. Receiving support from a mix of different funders may also enhance the credibility and independence of the research process, as well as building in sustainability to the study, and potentially ensuring that it receives endorsement from a variety of different organisations.

The best approach in the first instance may be a short-term one, i.e. to try to secure funding to run the main research activities a single time. Funding a single study of around £40K is a much less risk-laden option for funders than committing to a large-scale, long-term study with no proven track record. This would also obviate the need to try to forecast or allow for changes in the funding landscape over time. Once this first study has successfully taken place and the study has begun to amass a set of robust findings, these can be used as leverage with which to access further funding, from either the same or different funders (which could again be for a single iteration of the study). The idea of funding the add-on projects separately and individually has already been raised; this may enable us to approach a wider range of funders, for instance those who are willing to fund new and innovative projects or work of a particular type.

At the time of writing, the UK economy is still extremely unsettled and budgetary cuts across the board are affecting (and will continue to affect) the research funding landscape at many different levels. It is probably the worst possible time to be trying to access funding for a longitudinal study. This is one of the reasons for advocating a short-term approach to funding. However, it is likely that the current situation will improve over time, and funding opportunities may be better when repeat funding is sought after another 3-5 years. It is very hard to accurately forecast what will happen to the research funding landscape over a 25 year period, and what implications this would have for the study. Similarly, local and regional government are likely to experience shifts in priorities and funding availability over such a timescale.
2.3 Dissemination strategy

It is recommended that the following dissemination strategy be used for reporting the findings of the study:

- For each single replication of the main research activities, a concise report of the findings will be prepared. It will be written in plain English, will not be more than 30 pages in length, and will stick to an agreed format (to be developed at the first iteration), which will include a short executive summary of no more than three pages.

- For each add-on project, a concise findings report will be prepared. It will be written in plain English and will not exceed 30 pages in length, with an executive summary of no more than three pages.

- All reports will be initially made available in draft form for comments and amendments (e.g. where factual errors have been made).

- A mailing list of interested parties will be developed and maintained for circulating final reports. Reports will also be circulated at dissemination events (and people will be able to join the mailing list at these events). The majority of dissemination will be electronic (by email) with a small number of hard copies being produced for individuals who do not have email access.

- For each single iteration of the main research activities, a short (15-20 minute) presentation will be prepared and delivered to an invited audience of interested parties (including local residents), ideally at a venue in South Bank. The presentation will include brief details of previous research activities (including add-on projects). There will be opportunities for questions and further discussion. The presentation slides will be made available for wider distribution to interested parties by email.

- Other dissemination and knowledge exchange events will be held as funding permits. Additional funding may be sought at regular intervals to pursue this.

- Additional funding may be sought to develop and maintain a website for the project. The website would act as a public repository for all materials relating to the study, and could also be used to help raise the profile of the study, keep people informed of the study’s status via ‘news’ and ‘forthcoming events’ sections, and allow people to sign up to take part in the study or make comments on the findings.

- We may investigate approaching high profile organisations or individuals to ask them to act as ‘champions’ for the study. Their role would be to endorse, support and promote the work in order to raise its profile. Possible champions could include well-known and respected local people, and former residents who have found success or fame in other spheres.

- The innovative nature of the proposed work means that its findings may be of interest to both government, for whom they are likely to have policy relevance, and academia.
The study findings, and related data, may therefore be suitable for peer-reviewed academic publication. Opportunities to do this will be pursued by the research team, and will not incur further costs.

### 2.4 Staffing and team structure

The current project was undertaken by a research team made up of staff from Northumbria and Durham Universities, with Northumbria University acting as the lead partner, and with Dr Paul Greenhalgh of Northumbria University as the Principal Investigator.

Having a strong and effective staff team in place for the longitudinal study is important. It is desirable to have some degree of continuity in the staff team, although there are likely to be some changes over the years due to staff turnover. To capitalise on the knowledge and understanding of the project (and South Bank itself) that the researchers have amassed to date, we recommend that the researchers that worked on the current project also make up the research team for the longitudinal study, although with some slight changes in role. We also recommend that the study makes use of dedicated admin support (to be provided by Northumbria University).

For the longitudinal study, we propose the following staff team:

- Three Researchers, one of whom also takes on Project Management duties (Paul Braidford, Gill Davidson and David McGuinness);
- Two Expert Advisors (Professor Fred Robinson, Durham University; and Dr Paul Greenhalgh, Northumbria University).
- Dedicated admin support (to be determined).

### 2.5 Flexibility

We have developed a flexible methodology which can respond to the needs of the local context, residents, and other stakeholders. By building flexibility into the study, we will also be able to take advantage of any new opportunities that emerge, for instance for joint work with other agencies, or piggy-backing other research and events. Being able to make changes to the work programme in order to incorporate any funding shortfall – or make use of any new additional funding opportunities – without compromising the overall study is also important.

Flexibility has been built in to the methodology in the following ways:

- The study may be repeated at different intervals over the years. We have suggested repeating it every 3-5 years, but other time intervals could be used, and time intervals could also vary over the life of the study;
The cost of resident participation can be altered by using a range of different ratios of interviews/focus groups. Rather than settling on a single ratio to be adopted throughout the study, different ratios can be used at each iteration, depending on funding and other factors;

The number, scale and timing of add-ons may be varied. We have suggested that one add-on project takes place at around the mid-point between iterations of the main research activity, but this is dependent on factors including the availability of funding, researcher time, and partnership opportunities (e.g. for joint projects with local organisations). Add-ons may be flexibly timed so as to fit in with such factors, and extra add-on projects may also be introduced if feasible;

The cost of add-ons has been pitched at between £20,000 and £25,000, but there may be opportunities to complete some add-on projects at a lower cost, or to design larger and more ambitious projects if funding permits;

A flexible funding strategy has been proposed which will potentially involve a range of different funders over the course of the study;

We are committed to a co-inquiry approach which will involve acting on the emerging findings and other contextual issues as the study develops. This will involve both and ensuring that the study design is tailored on an ongoing basis so as to respond to any relevant arising issues, and disseminating policy-relevant findings to a wide range of stakeholders as and when they emerge.

### 2.6 Transferability

In designing a flexible methodology for the longitudinal study, we have created an approach which is likely to be highly transferable; that is, one which is likely to be suitable for assessing the impact of other regeneration programmes based in other places and at different scales.

However, it must be stressed that through undertaking the current study we have been able to spend significant time and resources on local research, mapping the area and building relationships, and that this process has been absolutely invaluable in terms of preparing the ground for the longitudinal study. We have developed an intimate feel for the area, its people, its geography and history, and developed an appreciation of what regeneration plans and initiatives are seeking to achieve. Any attempt to transfer the methodology to a different area must build in time at the start of the project to pursue a similar process.
2.7 Challenges and opportunities

We have addressed a number of challenges and opportunities for the longitudinal study in this report. The prospect for the study taking place is contingent on the regeneration programme going ahead. The Coalition Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010 will have profound implications for the funding of regeneration projects such as Greater Eston and South Bank, and we await further information on this.

The impending package of austerity measures that the Coalition Government is embarking upon is hardly the best economic environment within which to seek funding for such an ambitious and unprecedented study. The risks and prospects of attracting funding for the longitudinal study are contemplated at greater length below.

In addition to funding, the other key factor in determining the success or failure of the study is the commitment and buy-in to the project from local residents, communities and stakeholders, and the need to maintain the momentum generated in the medium to long term. To achieve this, established contacts will need to be maintained and new participants recruited. Whilst a perfectly representative sample of residents/participants is desirable, it may in practice be difficult to achieve, as people cannot be coerced or pressured in to participating in the study.

Further discussion is required with the client and future funders around the boundaries adopted for the study and its precise area of focus. The delineation of the study area has significant implications for the focus, scope, coherence and potential of the study. There may be some merit in adopting a fuzzy boundary in relation to some aspects of activity that take place in and around South Bank. Similar consideration would be required with regard to comparator areas.

There are many challenges facing an evaluation of the impact of intervention and investment by the public sector, not least to capture additionality, to account for displacement and substitution effects, and to correctly attribute causal links between the original interventions and the observed outputs and outcomes. Fortunately there is an emerging body of knowledge (see bibliography) on how to recognise and deal with such effects within the design and methodology of studies that seek to evaluate the impact of policies and programmes.

At the heart of the proposal for a longitudinal study is the recognition that regeneration takes time and that it may be many years before the full impact of investment is felt within an area or community. Many evaluations are snapshots in time and fail to capture the dynamic and complex nature urban regeneration initiatives. It is hoped that a long-term
perspective as proposed by this project would offer a more effective mechanism by which to capture and represent the lifecycle of long-term regeneration projects.

Finally, the team has been determined to design an evaluation framework that is not only robust but is also flexible and responsive to the needs of the client, funders and the local community. An inevitable downside of building in flexibility is the necessary sacrificing of a degree of certainty and clarity about what will be undertaken and at what cost. This report offers a series of options that can be tailored to fit the funding that may be available while delivering the outcomes that the client and stakeholders want to achieve.

3.0 Conclusion and recommendations

The aim of the research was ‘to establish the baseline position and design a robust strategy for a 25 year longitudinal assessment of the impact of the delivery of a large scale regeneration project: the Greater Eston Regeneration Master Plan’. A wider ambition of the project is to develop a flexible and transferable methodology for evaluating regeneration projects in general that could be piloted and refined in South Bank in Greater Eston.

In pursuing this aim, the research team has sought to make use of good practice and lessons learned from other studies, consult with key stakeholders, investigate financial considerations, and address potential challenges and opportunities, in order to develop a detailed methodology for the longitudinal study based on a flexible and transferable framework.

The proposed framework for the longitudinal study comprises two main research activities – interviews and focus groups, with 80 residents and 20 other stakeholders, and secondary data analysis – complemented by a series of potential add-on projects. The study is designed to create a rolling programme of activity, whereby momentum is built up and then maintained. The programme would reiterate every 3-5 years, over a period of up to 25 years, with add-on projects occurring periodically in between. A panel of residents would be recruited and maintained for the duration of the study, representing a variety of communities and interest groups.

It is recommended that a funding strategy is adopted that avoids reliance on a single funder – and the associated risks this could bring - by approaching a range of different organisations for smaller sums. A short-term strategy should attempt to secure funding to run the main research activities once, which carries considerably less risk for potential funders than committing to a large-scale, long-term study with no proven track record.
In conclusion, the team believes the following principles and values should be embedded within any approach that is adopted to study the impact of large scale regeneration projects on a community:

- Residents should be placed at the heart of the study; it should not be yet another thing that is ‘done to them’;
- The study presents an opportunity for training and capacity building within the local community;
- Local residents and stakeholders should be included in the dissemination process;
- The research team should remain independent from the various partner agencies;
- This study should be based on a sustainable and realistic funding strategy that can capitalise on arising opportunities;
- The research should take place within a flexible and responsive framework that can be adjusted according to funding availability and local needs.

Given sufficient funding, this proposal would create a lasting legacy for South Bank and represent an original contribution to our understanding of the performance and impact of a large scale regeneration project over the long term. The study would be innovative and transferable, and would potentially make a contribution to both local policy formulation and national policy evaluation. Findings derived from the study would be reported periodically to create a flow of data and analysis that could be use to inform future policy development and interventions. The research team is enthusiastic about the prospect of taking this proposal further and looks forward to continuing their work with both the ILG and Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.

Footnotes

1. It is unlikely that under 16s would be research participants, but they could be represented, for instance, by recruiting parents of young families. More add-ons which involve young people under the age of 16 may be used, e.g. by working with local schools or youth groups, if a large proportion of the population of an area is made up of children and young people.)

2. Northumbria University Research Ethics and Governance handbook is available at www.northumbria.ac.uk/static/5007/respdf/ethics_handbook_2.pdf
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APPENDIX A – SOUTH BANK SUPER OUTPUT AREAS
APPENDIX B – A HISTORY OF SOUTH BANK

The area of interest is the former ‘heart’ of the town of South Bank, in Redcar and Cleveland. It is a relatively small residential area largely made up of small terraced properties – known locally as ‘street houses’ – along with a shopping street and some businesses, community buildings and communal areas, and places of worship.

South Bank was a rural area until around 1850, but grew up quickly over the next fifty years after the iron and steel industries were established locally. Most of the terraced street housing was built around this time for the workers and their families. The area experienced both good and bad times throughout the 20th century. At its most prosperous South Bank had a vibrant ‘heart’ with its own town hall, weekly market, shopping areas and social scene, but industrial restructuring and technological change led to a slow degeneration of the area. By the 1980s there were reports of serious problems in South Bank: high unemployment, high crime rates, and problems with anti-social behaviour.

Regeneration efforts commenced in the 1990s included physical improvements using Single Regeneration Budget funding (£17.5 million) and the demolition of housing where anti-social behaviour was concentrated. However, an SRB position statement in 2001 reported that there were still numerous problems in the area, including social exclusion, low housing demand (to rent or buy), unattractive housing stock, falling population, low incomes, and ‘a degree of apathy within the community’. The SRB report described what it regarded as the two main types of South Bank residents: ‘those who have been there all their lives and don’t want to or can’t afford to move; and young people who move into the area because they cannot afford anywhere else’ (DETR 2001).

By the turn of the new millennium, South Bank terraced housing property prices had reached an all-time low (~£3,000), with the result that many private landlords bought properties in the area for private rental. Problems relating to private tenants appear to have made up a high proportion of incidences of crime and anti-social behaviour in South Bank in recent years.

Over the past ten years, a series of plans for the area’s future have been developed – a Housing Renewal Plan, Sustainable Communities Plan and Masterplan – which have sought solutions to the problem of housing market failure in South Bank. There has been widespread demolition of the street houses, with no rebuilding to date, and the area has lost a significant proportion of its population (mostly to the surrounding areas). The Audit Commission (2010) observed that in some areas of Tees Valley clearance is continuing without a clear idea of what the replacement housing offer will be. Inevitably, there is frustration among some residents at the lack of progress in the shape of new housing being built, or any hard evidence of high level commitment to the area’s future. Furthermore, the
extensive community consultation activity that has taken place alongside the planning process has led to consultation fatigue.

The picture is not entirely negative. At least some residents are strongly committed to the future of South Bank, and a number of these are actively working to improve the area through voluntary and community activities. Extended families and neighbours help and support each other. Many former residents retain a strong interest in the area. Faith communities are alive and well. South Bank is one of the most ethnically diverse parts of the Borough, with established Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities. It also has a travellers’ site and is home to a number of former travellers. The area’s young people regularly achieve sporting success in football and amateur boxing. Crime and anti-social behaviour has reduced over the years. The area has good schools, and a new health village and library was opened to the south of the area earlier this year.

Future plans for South Bank include the final housing demolitions - of two more terraced streets – which will take place in 2011, and a long-planned Eco-Village development of 15 new houses plus a refurbished terrace in the heart of the area. The proposed development of an urban village at Low Grange (North Grangetown) immediately to the east of South Bank creates uncertainty about the viability and prospects of a renaissance in South Bank. There is also a planning application for a new Tesco retail development to the south of the area which may also have consequences for renewal of the core of South Bank.
### APPENDIX C REVIEW OF RESEARCH METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research method</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Door-to-door interview survey    | ▪ Many residents are given the chance to take part.  
▪ Results may be more representative than other methods.  
▪ Suitable for use with people with literacy problems.  
▪ Easy to replicate.                                                                                                                                                                             | ▪ Intrusive.  
▪ People would be unlikely to engage (cold callers operate in the area).  
▪ Researcher safety may be a problem.  
▪ Expensive to target other language users.  
▪ Little opportunity to explore issues in any depth.  
▪ The resulting data maybe of limited use in exploring wellbeing.  
▪ Time-consuming therefore expensive.                                                                                                      |
| Focus groups                     | ▪ Can result in data of wide range, depth, and meaning.  
▪ Allows discussion, information sharing and learning between participants.  
▪ Opportunity to explore wider issues.  
▪ Cheaper than interviews.  
▪ Suitable for use with people with literacy problems.                                                                                                                                       | ▪ More expensive than postal surveys.  
▪ Rich data - may be harder to analyse than survey data.  
▪ Harder to arrange than individual interviews.  
▪ It may be difficult to recruit participants.  
▪ Expensive to target other language users.  
▪ Possibility of group polarisation/dominance by some individuals.  
▪ Results may not be representative.  
▪ Hard to replicate over time due to possible loss of participants/non-uniform nature of group process.                                                                                               |
| In-depth interviews              | ▪ Can result in data of wide range, depth, and meaning.  
▪ Opportunity to explore wider issues.  
▪ Easier to ensure confidentiality than focus groups.  
▪ Suitable for use with people with literacy problems.  
▪ Can be replicated to an extent by using the same flexible question schedule.                                                                                                                    | ▪ Expensive because of the time involved.  
▪ Rich data - may be harder to analyse than survey data.  
▪ Results may not be representative.  
▪ Expensive to target other language users.  
▪ It may be difficult to recruit participants.                                                                                                                                                |
| Participatory Appraisal methods  | ▪ Potential to enhance participants’ skills and confidence.  
▪ Potential to raise capacity of                                                                                               | ▪ Labour-intensive at first.  
▪ May be hard to arrange and recruit participants.  
▪ May be hard to retain trained                                                                                                                                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal survey</td>
<td>Relatively quick and cheap. All residents can have the chance to take part.</td>
<td>Low response rates are common (~10%). Unsuitable for people with literacy problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to replicate.</td>
<td>Expensive to include other language users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little opportunity to explore issues in any depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The resulting data maybe of limited use in exploring wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data analysis</td>
<td>Cheap. Uses existing sources of data. A wide range of detailed data is available specific to a small geographical area. Easy to replicate providing the same data is available. Can reveal general trends for the area. Can readily be used to compare the area over time and with other areas.</td>
<td>Data is limited to facts and figures rather than providing information of any depth. Process is limited to whatever data is available. The resulting data may be of limited use in exploring wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative research methods (various – see framework section)</td>
<td>Can add interest to the longitudinal study. Enables triangulation of methods. May enable exploration of a range of different issues in depth and from different angles. Possibility of working in partnership with community groups to deliver. Funding streams may be available for innovative methods. Can occur as and when funding is available over the life of the study. May be memorable and exciting for participants.</td>
<td>Irregular activity, so hard to include – and fund – within the main research framework. Unlikely to be easily replicated, so may not provide longitudinal data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Potential for enhancing the skills of participants.
- May create a legacy for the area (e.g. art, photos, life stories).
- May help to promote the longitudinal study and the area.
APPENDIX D POTENTIAL VENUES FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

1. South Bank Tomorrow (based in the former Generation Centre)
2. South Bank Sure Start Centre
3. Tees Valley Women’s Centre
4. Places of worship (two mosques and St John’s Church)
5. Kidz Konnekt
6. Erimus Social Club
7. South Bank Football Club
8. South Bank Health Centre and Library
9. South Bank Community Forum
10. Chandni Ladies Group
11. Local community events (e.g. summer fete and fun days)
12. Local schools
## APPENDIX E QUESTION SCHEDULE FOR STAKEHOLDERS AND RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders’ question guide</th>
<th>Residents’ question guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>About them</strong></td>
<td><strong>About them</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: What is their connection to the area?</td>
<td>Examples: Their age, gender, any recent life changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About where they live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: How long have they lived here? Who do they live with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About the area</strong></td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: What sort of problems does the area face?</td>
<td>Examples: What do they do? Do they like it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: What do they think are the reasons for local unemployment?</td>
<td>Examples: What do they do? Do they like it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples: What are the local schools like? Are local people happy with them?</td>
<td>Example: What skills and training have they done?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and wellbeing</strong></td>
<td>Health and wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Is it a healthy place?</td>
<td>Example: Are they happy to live here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council</strong></td>
<td>Local services and the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: What are people’s attitudes towards the Council?</td>
<td>Example: What local services do they use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Comment on the mix of residents in the area?</td>
<td>Example: Do they know their neighbours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and anti-social behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Crime and anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Is it a safe place to work and visit?</td>
<td>Example: Is it a safe place to live?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The regeneration process</strong></td>
<td>About the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Do they think local people know about and understand regeneration plans?</td>
<td>Example: Is the area better or worse than before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The regeneration process</strong></td>
<td><strong>The regeneration process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Have they been involved in consultations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F POTENTIAL ADD-ON PROJECTS

- Case studies, for instance to celebrate local sporting achievements;
- Issuing camera phones to residents and asking them to record images and data about what particular parts of the area mean to them e.g. ‘sense of place’ data (data may be embedded in GIS, Google Earth or other web based interface)
- An oral history project (possibly with the support of the North East Oral History Network);
- Art projects, e.g. creating posters, stained glass pictures or murals;
- Local competitions, perhaps involving creative activities;
- Social network analysis to map relationships between key local players;
- Workshops and events using Prove It, Planning for Real, Open Space Technology or similar group approaches;
- Social networking approaches, for instance developing a website for the longitudinal study and using it to engage with local residents;
- Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to capture manage and analyse local data on a geographical basis;
- Similar approaches in collaboration with existing sites such as the South Bank Tomorrow Facebook page, or the Slaggy Island local history website found at www.communigate.co.uk/ne/slaggyisland).
APPENDIX G PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Project: Research on a proposed approach for a longitudinal assessment of the impact of the regeneration of South Bank, Greater Eston.

Research team: Paul Greenhalgh, Fred Robinson, Paul Braidford, David McGuinness, Gill Davidson, Paul Biddle

Name of participant: 
Address: 
Contact Tel: 
E-mail: 

Statement of participant’s consent

* Please read the statements below and tick the boxes to show that you agree with them.
I have been told about this research project and its purpose* □
I agree to participate in this research project* □
I have discussed any need for anonymity or confidentiality with the researcher** □
I agree to being audio taped during the interview □

* Participants under the age of 18 normally require parental consent to be involved in research.
** See the section below for any specific requirements for anonymity or confidentiality.

Signed .............................................. Date ........................

Specific requirements for anonymity or confidentiality

Standard statement by researcher
I have provided information about the research to the research participant and believe that he/she understands what is involved.

Researcher’s signature ........................................................................................................... Date