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GoWell East: studying change in Glasgow’s East End

Introduction

GoWell is a collaborative partnership between the Glasgow Centre for Population Health, the Medical Research Council/Chief Scientist Office Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, and the Department of Urban Studies at the University of Glasgow; and is supported by the Scottish Government, NHS Health Scotland and sportscotland.

GoWell East: studying change in Glasgow’s East End is a substudy of the main GoWell project. GoWell East surveys the communities in the East End of Glasgow which are situated closest to the main Commonwealth Games (CWG) sites, where residents may be affected by the considerable amount of physical area changes (house building, road construction and upgraded sports facilities), as well as associated social and economic changes linked to the CWG.

GoWell East objectives

Overall the GoWell East study aims to determine the impacts of regeneration and the Commonwealth Games legacy in the East End of Glasgow. The specific study objectives are twofold: firstly, as Glasgow was the host city to the 2014 Commonwealth Games, we aimed to investigate the effect that the Games and local regeneration had on the residents before, during and after the event; and secondly, to understand if investment in improving housing, neighbourhoods and communities is improving the health and quality of life of local people and their families.

The study area

The GoWell East study area comprises six sub-areas: Bridgeton; Calton; Camlachie; Dalmarnock; Gallowgate; and Parkhead (part) – see Figure 1 below. This begins at the Saltmarket which is located in the west of the study area and it spans across the East End to Tollcross in the east of the study area. It should be noted that the GoWell East study area is
similar to the area covered by the Glasgow City Council East End Local Development Strategy area.

**Figure 1: GoWell East study area and six communities.**

![Figure 1: GoWell East study area and six communities.](image)

**Coverage and structure of the report**

The current report will outline results for the GoWell East study within four separate chapters, that are focused on the Scottish Government, Commonwealth Games legacy themes: 1) Active; 2) Flourishing; 3) Sustainable; and 4) Connected. Results will be presented for the longitudinal cohort analysis, wave 1-wave 2 (see below), and in addition, within the chapters focusing on the Active and Flourishing themes, data will be presented by gender and age.
The 2014 survey

Whereas the 2012 survey was conducted in the summer period, from 28th May to 20th August 2012, the second survey could not be conducted in the same period due to the occurrence of the Games themselves. The timing of the first post-Games survey was also influenced by the need for sports and leisure facilities to be re-opened to the public after the Games, before questions could be asked about their use by participants. Thus, the wave 2 survey was conducted from 13th October 2014 to 13th February 2015. This difference in the seasonal timing of the survey may partly explain some of the differences, for example in the Active domain particularly.

Survey methodology and longitudinal cohort

The study area was surveyed in the summer of 2012, with 1,015 adult householders interviewed across the six communities on that occasion. The aim of the current survey was to follow up as many of these baseline survey participants as possible if they remained living in the study area. Prior to making contact with those individuals who participated in 2012 (wave 1) the MRC/CSO SPHSU Survey Office employed data linkage measures in order to obtain the potential participants’ most up-to-date addresses. However, data linkage was only performed for those participants who had previously provided consent in 2012, allowing the research team to use respondents’ Community Health Index number for linkage purposes. A phased approach was implemented to survey the six communities in the following order: Bridgeton; Calton; Camlachie; Dalmarnock; Gallowgate; and Parkhead.

Individuals were sent an invitation letter and information sheet approximately one week before they were contacted by a fieldworker regarding their potential interview appointment. Contact was made by fieldworkers via telephone or email (when available and in use) or by a ‘door knock’. Once in the study area it was the duty of each fieldworker to work through their personal participant allocation which included a combination of pre-scheduled interviews and door knocks. Fieldworkers were required to door knock in order to

---

*The baseline survey in 2012 achieved a response rate of 9.8% from valid addresses sampled. No contact was made at 39.2% of the addresses.*
schedule future appointments for themselves or a colleague or to carry out an interview at that moment if the participant was willing and able. In addition, fieldworkers made telephone calls at evenings and weekends in a bid to arrange interview appointments.

Criteria for inclusion in the study in wave 1 of GoWell East in 2012 were: 1) at least 16 years of age; 2) currently paying a mortgage, owned their own home or were a social sector tenant or private sector leaseholder; and 3) either the sole or joint householder or partner thereof, residing in the dwelling.

Additional inclusion criteria for wave 2 of GoWell East in 2014/15 were:

- being a previous participant of the 2012 survey and being resident in the same property (REMAINER)
- having participated in the 2012 survey and having moved from their previous address, provided they are still in the Glasgow area (OUTMOVER)
- meeting the original inclusion criteria and being a householder who has moved into a property previously occupied by a cohort member (NEWCOMER).

It should be noted that in the current report only ‘remainers’ and ‘outmovers’ who had moved within the study area have been included in the analysis; this was in order that we could undertake longitudinal analysis of their survey responses at the two time points, which would not have been possible with the ‘newcomers’.

Response rate at wave 2

Of the achieved baseline wave 1 sample, 41% of participants (‘remainers’ and ‘outmovers’ within the study area) also completed wave 2 of the survey. As a result this formed a longitudinal dataset of 414 participants within the East End of Glasgow. It should be noted however that a total of 430 individuals were interviewed at wave 2, although a total of 16 were removed from the longitudinal analysis as three were classified as ‘newcomers’ and 13 were ‘outmovers’ who had relocated outside of the immediate study area.
Assessing the socio-demographic composition of the longitudinal cohort

Tables 1 to 3 compare the socio-demographic composition of the longitudinal cohort with the baseline sample and with the population characteristics of the study area at baseline. Key points to note are as follows:

- Both the baseline sample and the longitudinal cohort under-represent young adults in the study area, aged under 30. This is because the survey was of householders, not all adults. Compared with the baseline sample, the longitudinal cohort contains far fewer respondents aged under 30 and a higher proportion of respondents aged 65 or over (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Baseline sample (2012)</th>
<th>Longitudinal cohort (2014/15)</th>
<th>Study area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-29</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrecorded</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Both the baseline sample and the longitudinal cohort comprise half of social renters, in line with that sector’s presence in the local housing market. However, within the private sector, both samples contain more owner occupiers and fewer private renters than proportionate to the local housing market. The longitudinal cohort contains a smaller proportion of private renters than the baseline sample (Table 2).
Table 2. Housing tenure in the baseline sample, longitudinal cohort and study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GCC 2012 Housing stock estimates for neighbourhoods.

- Both the baseline sample and the longitudinal cohort under-represent those in employment or education compared with the study area adult population. Although small in number in both surveys, the longitudinal cohort contains a lower percentage of adults in full-time education than the baseline sample. In all likelihood this reflects the study area’s function in accommodating students near the city centre, resulting in some past participants having moved on since the baseline survey. Compared with the baseline sample, the longitudinal cohort is more representative of the study area adult population in terms of the presence of those who are employment deprived, but is less representative of the study area adult population in terms of those who are retired, containing a higher proportion of retired people than the baseline sample (Table 3).
Table 3. Employment status in the baseline sample, longitudinal cohort and study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT work</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT work</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT education</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not emp. deprived</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp sick</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term sick/dis</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after home</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. deprived</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Geographical coverage of the longitudinal cohort

A comparison of the geographical breakdown of the longitudinal cohort in comparison with the entire study area is shown in Table 4, including the number and percentage of dwellings in the study area in comparison with the number of respondents at wave 2 of the GoWell East study. There is a close correspondence between the geographical distribution of dwellings and of cohort members across the six study communities.
Table 4. Geographical distribution of longitudinal cohort compared with residences in the study area and sub-areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Number of dwellings*</th>
<th>% of East End</th>
<th>Longitudinal cohort</th>
<th>% of cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calton</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camlachie</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmarnock</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallowgate</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhead</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,830</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: GCC Council Tax Register 2011.

Summary

The 2014 post-Games survey involved attempting to interview the 1,015 East End residents who took part in our baseline survey in 2012; in the event, we managed to re-interview 41% of the baseline participants. This report is based on an analysis of the baseline and follow-up survey responses from 414 members of an East End longitudinal cohort, constructed through data-linkage between the two surveys.

We have compared our cohort with the baseline sample and with the study area population according to certain characteristics for which data are available. Compared with the baseline sample, the wave 1-2 longitudinal cohort under-represents adults aged under 30, adults in full-time education, and residents of the private rented sector. Compared with the study area population, the longitudinal cohort also under-represents adults aged under 30, residents of the private rented sector, and adults in employment or full-time education. The longitudinal cohort over-represents those who are retired, and those who are owner occupiers. However, compared with the study area population, the longitudinal cohort includes reasonable representation from adults living in the social rented sector, adults who are employment deprived (i.e. of working age, not in employment or full-time education),

---

*b There are other characteristics which may affect survey participation and survey responses for which we cannot make such comparisons, including individuals’ attitudes, motivations and health and wellbeing.
and includes good representation from across the six constituent communities of the East End study area.

The longitudinal cohort enables us to look at change over time for a specific group of individuals who are the same people interviewed at two time points; this is the strength of the research design, as it avoids uncertainties in interpretation that might result from comparing two different response groups. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that the percentages reported in this report refer only to the cohort members and cannot be taken as prevalence figures for the study area population as a whole.
Theme 1 – Active legacy

The **Active** legacy theme was planned to inspire people to be physically active and take part in sport.

At baseline in 2012, we reported that the GoWell East resident sample were slightly less physically active than the Scottish population in terms of meeting recommended levels of activity (36% versus 39%, respectively)\(^c\). However, the GoWell East sample were slightly more likely to have participated in sport in the last four weeks than the Scottish adult population (58% versus 54%), with similar numbers in the East End and Scotland having visited the outdoors at least weekly (47% versus 46%). Here we present the evidence on active legacy indicators in 2014/15 for the longitudinal cohort developed from the baseline sample and examine if any changes have taken place.

**Adult sports participation**

Recent sports participation in the longitudinal cohort was lower in late 2014/15 than in mid-2012. At baseline, 56% of the cohort reported that they had participated in some form of sporting activity within the previous four weeks, while this was the case for 47% at wave 2, some 9 percentage points lower.

Figure 1 shows the similar change in sports participation between baseline and the post-Games survey for both men and women.

---

\(^c\) Following the standard benchmark in 2012, when the baseline survey was conducted, this was defined as 30 minutes of moderate or vigorous exercise on at least five days per week.
Respondents were asked: “I am now going to read out a list of activities, please tell me which ones you have done in the last 4 weeks” [41 sports then listed, plus ‘other’].

As the structure of the longitudinal cohort was heavily weighted towards older participants, analysis was then performed by age category (44 years and under; and 45 years and older). The results show a similar relative difference in sports participation for both age groups:

- At wave 1, 81% of those aged 44 years and under reported participating in sport within the previous four weeks in comparison with 70% at wave 2.
- For those aged 45 and over, 46% reported sports participation in the previous four weeks at baseline, while 39% participated in sport at wave 2.

**Satisfaction with local sports facilities**

Results from the current study showed that respondents’ ratings of the sports facilities in their area was higher in wave 2 compared with wave 1. At wave 1, 19% of the cohort said that the sports facilities in or near their local area were ‘very good’ and 36% rated them to be ‘fairly good’. By wave 2, 31% of the cohort said their local sports facilities were ‘very good’ and 38% said they were ‘fairly good’. When this variable was split by gender the same trend was found,
higher ratings of sports facilities in wave 2 compared with wave 1 for both males and females (Figure 2).

Respondents were asked: “How would you rate the quality of the following services in or near your local area... Sports facilities?” Response options were: very good; fairly good; neither good nor poor; fairly poor; very poor.

Use of sports facilities
Reported use of sports facilities was lower at wave 2 than in the baseline survey, the change being relatively greater for women than men (Figure 3). Around 20% of women reported being users of sports facilities at wave 2, compared with 30% of men. There was also a relatively greater difference in sports facilities use by those aged 45 or over (from 21% at baseline to 16% at wave 2), compared with those aged 44 or under (from 51% at wave1 to 46% at wave 2). The lower use of sports facilities in wave 2 compared with wave 1 (down 4 percentage points for men and 7 percentage points for women) may partly be due to general seasonal fluctuations in the use of sports facilities, but we cannot be certain.
Respondents were asked: “How often do you use or go to any of the following facilities: sports hall; gym; or fitness centre”. Answers included: never; once/a few times a year; about once a month; at least once a week.

Use of sports facilities located in the East End was a quarter lower at wave 2 than at baseline for men (changing from 19% to 14%), and lower by a half for women (from 20% at wave 1 to 11% at wave 2). Reported frequent use of sports facilities (weekly or monthly) was a fifth lower among the cohort at wave 2 than at baseline (18% versus 22%).

Levels of physical activity

The survey used the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) to measure levels of physical activity in the past seven days. In terms of the recommended level of physical activity, we found that of the longitudinal cohort, 57% reached the recommended level of 150 minutes moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) in a week\(^d\) at wave 1, while 46% did so at wave 2.

When the results were reviewed by gender, the relative difference in meeting the recommended level was greater for women than men:

\(^d\) The recommended level of physical activity used here is the current NHS guidance of 150 minutes moderate activity per week, or 75 minutes vigorous activity, or an equivalent mix of the two.
55% of men met the recommended level at wave 1, while 50% did so at wave 2. For women, 57% met the recommendation at wave 1, but only 43% did so at wave 2.

When results were reviewed by age category, the relative difference in the percentage meeting the recommended level of physical activity was similar for younger and older adults:

- 72% of those aged 44 and under met the recommended level of physical activity at wave 1, while 59% did so at wave 2.
- Of those aged 45 and over, 50% met the recommendation for MVPA per week at wave 1, and 41% did so at wave 2.

Neighbourhood walking

Results of the current study showed that there was a slight difference in levels of neighbourhood walking for the cohort as a whole. At wave 1, 62% of the cohort were found to walk in their neighbourhood for 20 minutes at a time on two or more days of the week, with the equivalent figure for wave 2 being very slightly lower at 59%. There was no difference in levels of frequent walking: at both waves, 35% of the cohort reported walking in their neighbourhood for 5-7 days in the past week.

There was a gender difference in frequent walking over time (Figure 4). The proportion of men who walked in their neighbourhood on 5-7 days in the past week decreased from 43% at wave 1 to 38% at wave 2, whereas for women the percentage increased from 31% to 34%.
Respondents were asked: “During the past seven days, on how many days did you walk for more than 20 minutes at a time in your local neighbourhood?”

When neighbourhood walking was examined by age, lower rates of neighbourhood walking among younger adults at wave 2 contrasted with little difference in rates of walking in the older group.

- For those aged 44 and under, 73% were found to walk for 20 minutes in their neighbourhood on two or more days of the week at wave 1, and 65% at wave 2. Frequent neighbourhood walking (5-7 days per week) was reported by 43% of those aged 44 and under at wave 1, and by 38% of this age group at wave 2.

- For those aged 45 years and older, 57% reported walking for 20 minutes at a time in their neighbourhood on two or more days per week at both baseline and wave 2. However, while 32% of the older adults reported walking in their neighbourhood for 5-7 days per week at eave 1, 34% did so at eave 2.
Visiting the outdoors

The number of respondents who said that they visited outdoor spaces at least once a week was lower at wave 2 than at baseline. At wave 1, 44% of the cohort visited either a park/green space/sports field/play area or a river/loch/canal/beach/seashore or woodland/forest/countryside at least once a week, although at wave 2 only 36% reported that they did so.

When results were split separately for each of the three types of outdoor space usage was as follows:

- Park, green space, sport field or play area: 42% at wave 1 and 35% at wave 2.
- River, loch, canal, beach or seashore: 12% at wave 1 and 8% at wave 2.
- Woodland, forest or countryside: 6% at wave 1 and 4% at wave 2.

Games influence on behavioural change

In terms of the influence of the Commonwealth Games on the sporting and physical activity habits of the cohort at wave 2, we can consider both behavioural change, and the contemplation of such change. In terms of the former: 7% of the cohort (almost all of whom were participating in sport at baseline) reported that they are now doing more sport or physical activity as a result of the Games; and 2% (divided between sports participants and non-participants at baseline) reported that they have taken up a new sport. Across the two items, a total of 8% of the cohort reported behavioural change as a result of the influence of the Games.

In addition, the Games have also helped some individuals to contemplate changing their sporting and physical activity habits. In the post-Games survey, 4% of the cohort reported that they were thinking about taking up a new sport, and 8% were thinking about doing more sport or physical activity as a result of the influence of the CWG. Across the two items, 12% of the cohort were contemplating behaviour change as a result of the influence of the Games.
Summary

The findings provide evidence that the CWG may have exerted an influence upon some members of the study cohort, with several reporting participating in more sport, some taking up a new sport and a further group contemplating improving their sport and physical activity behaviour as a result of the Games. However, at this stage, the overall net change across the entire study cohort is negative (see below).

The results demonstrate a notable positive change in people’s perceptions of the quality of local sports facilities in the East End, although reported use of sports facilities by the cohort, both generally and in the East End, was lower in the post-Games survey than two years previously. It is possible that people’s use of sports facilities over the months prior to the wave 2 survey had been disrupted by the closure of some facilities for Games-related use, and that the drop in reported use partly reflects this factor as well as the seasonal difference in the conduct of the two surveys, though we cannot be certain about these things.

There were negative differences in several measures of physical activity among the cohort between the two surveys. The proportions of the cohort who had recently participated in sport, who met recommended levels of physical activity, and who visited outdoor spaces or sites on a weekly basis, were all lower in wave 2 compared with the baseline. It is difficult to tell if this is a true underlying decline in activity as the post-Games survey was (necessarily) conducted in the autumn/winter months compared with the baseline survey in the summer months; a recent review of relevant studies concluded that physical activity is reduced in the winter season in temperate climates. We may only be sure what has happened to sports participation and physical activity levels among East End residents once we conduct the second follow-up survey in summer 2016; it is also important to compare findings across three or more time points in order to be able to discern any trends in the data.

---

Theme 2 – Flourishing legacy

The *Flourishing* legacy theme focuses on economic opportunities offered by the Games.

At baseline in 2012, we reported that a small number of the 1,015 respondents in the study area had gained employment in the previous two years, either through the construction of CWG- and regeneration-related infrastructure, or through working in the new sports facilities (3-4% in each case). A larger number, around one-in-six working-age adults, also reported undertaking training or work experience in the past year related to the CWG or regeneration; however, only a minority of these respondents (15%) reported being in employment at the time of the baseline survey. Thus, in the pre-Games period, there were modest, albeit temporary, positive impacts of the CWG upon employment and training outcomes or adults in the East End sample. Here, we present employment-related activity outcomes for the longitudinal cohort in the year of the CWG itself.

**Volunteering and unpaid help**

Legacy plans emphasised the expansion of volunteering opportunities during the pre-Games period and at Games time itself. Volunteering was seen as a route to enhanced employability or to employment itself.

Around a quarter of the longitudinal cohort (26%) had done voluntary work in the past year at baseline, i.e. helped an organisation, group or individual in an unpaid capacity. In wave 2, the rate of volunteering was slightly higher at 29%.

Different patterns of volunteering emerged by gender (Figure 5). The percentage of men who volunteered was higher at wave 1 than at wave 2 (28% versus 26%) whereas the percentage of women volunteering in an unpaid capacity was higher at wave 2 than wave 1 (24% at baseline and 30% at wave 2).
Respondents were asked: “In the past 12 months, have you done any voluntary work – that is, have you helped an organisation, group or individual in an unpaid capacity?”

The current study also asked respondents if they volunteered in an unpaid capacity for the Commonwealth Games or at any other sporting activities. Results showed that at wave 1, 1.7% reported volunteering for the Commonwealth Games whereas at wave 2, 2.9% reported such volunteering. For other sporting activities 3.1% volunteered their time in an unpaid capacity at baseline, and 2.2% at wave 2.

**Regeneration-related employment**

At both waves, respondents were asked whether, in the previous two years, they had gained any paid employment related to the construction of new facilities or infrastructure in the East End¹, or by working in such new facilities. At wave 1, 4.3% of the cohort reported that they had gained regeneration-related employment during the previous two years and at wave 2, 3.1% also reported this. Thus, the rate of regeneration-related employment among the cohort was

¹ New or refurbished sports and leisure centres, transport infrastructure, new housing, new community centres, new libraries, new office or business premises or improvements to public or green spaces.
similar in each of the two-year periods. In addition, at wave 2, 2.4% of respondents reported that other members of their household had gained some form of regeneration-related employment. Combining these two elements, 5.3% of the cohort households experienced a regeneration-related employment effect (either the householder or another household member) in the years 2013 and 2014.

**Games-related employment**

In addition to regeneration-related employment, respondents at wave 2 were also asked to report employment gained during the time of the CWG. Thus, at wave 2, 3.6% of respondents reported that they had gained employment during the Commonwealth Games and 3.6% of respondents also reported that another member of their household had obtained Games-time employment (Figure 6). Furthermore, 5.1% of respondents reported gaining extra working hours during the Games and 3.4% reported that another householder also gained extra working hours.

Taking these four possible economic impacts together, 10.4% of the cohort households at wave 2 reported one or more employment-related gains from the CWG itself.

---

6 The wave 2 employment figure quoted here is not adjusted in any way for the fact that 20 members of the cohort (4.8%) passed the age threshold into retirement (aged 65+) in the intervening period and thus were less likely to gain employment than would otherwise have been the case.
Respondents were asked: “Did you, or any member or your household, either gain employment, or get extra work/hours during the time of the Commonwealth Games?”

**Regeneration- and Games-related training**

Of those cohort members who reported not to be in full time or part time employment (excluding those who were retired) at wave 1, 2.3% had undertaken Games-related training, apprenticeship or work experience in the past year. Similarly, of those not in full or part time paid employment at wave 2, 2.6% said that they had obtained Games-related training and so on during the previous two years.

**Summary**

There continues to be small but potentially important local employment effects generated by regeneration activity in the area, with further additional employment effects observed for Games time. Employment effects among the cohort due to the physical regeneration activity in the area were similar at the two survey waves, at 3-4% of respondents. Overall, one-in-twenty of the cohort households reported being positively impacted in employment terms (including the respondent and/or other household members) by regeneration activity in the 2013-14 period, i.e. the last two years of the pre-Games period. In addition, one-in-ten...
households reported employment gains (new employment or additional working hours) from the CWG event itself.

Compared with the pre-Games survey in 2012, the post-Games survey in 2014/15 suggests that rates of volunteering in general among the East End adult cohort had risen over time for women in particular. Overall, we found 3% of the cohort had volunteered in connection with the CWG during the Games year. There was some suggestion (though the numbers are small) that a slight rise in Games-related volunteering in 2014 compared with 2012 may have been associated with an equivalent slight reduction in other sports-related volunteering during the same year, though we cannot be certain that this substitution occurred.

In respect of both volunteering and employment effects, there is a question as to whether changes observed in the immediate pre-Games period and at Games time constitute stepping stones to longer-term changes in individual and household fortunes for residents of the East End. This is something we aim to investigate in a second post-Games survey in 2016.
Theme 3 – Sustainable legacy

The Sustainable legacy theme centred on the achievement of regeneration, environmentally-friendly development, and strong communities.

At baseline in 2012 we reported that the original sample of 1,015 East End residents had relatively low levels of neighbourhood satisfaction, similar to typical values for deprived areas in Scotland. Feelings of pride in the local area were also much lower than feelings of pride for the city of Glasgow. A number of issues of low environmental quality were identified, with the majority of respondents identifying problems such as vacant and derelict land and rubbish and litter lying around. Feelings of safety in the local neighbourhood were also lower than found for Glasgow or Scotland. On the other hand, there were indications that the effects of the regeneration process were being felt. We found higher perceptions of positive neighbourhood change in the East End than reported for other deprived areas in Scotland, and perceptions of community influence upon local decisions were also relatively high compared with city or national norms. Here, we report on how the longitudinal cohort’s perceptions of their local environment compare with their own earlier views, in the pre-Games period.

Neighbourhood satisfaction
At wave 1, 74% of the cohort members reported that they were ‘very’ or ‘fairly satisfied’ with their neighbourhood as a place to live, compared with 78% at wave 2. The number of cohort members declaring themselves to be ‘very satisfied’ with their neighbourhood was 25% at baseline and 28% at wave 2.

Perceived neighbourhood change
Perceptions of positive neighbourhood change increased over time (Figure 7). At baseline, half of cohort members, 50%, said that their neighbourhood had got ‘better’ to live in over the past three years, whereas at wave 2 this was the case for 59% of respondents. Conversely, at baseline, 18% of the cohort said their neighbourhood had got ‘worse’ to live in over the past three years, whereas, at wave 2, 10% reported this to be the case.
Respondents were asked: “Overall, has this area got better or worse to live in over the last two to three years?” Answers included: the area has got better; the area has stayed the same; the area has got worse; don’t know.

Feelings of safety

Feelings of safety in the neighbourhood were higher in the second survey, despite the fact that the post-Games survey was conducted in the winter months. At baseline, just over half the cohort, 55%, said they felt safe walking alone in the neighbourhood after dark. By wave 2, this figure was nine percentage points higher at 64%.

Feelings of safety were higher for men than women, and also increased more for the former (Figure 8). For men, feelings of safety changed from 63% at wave 1 to 75% at wave 2, whereas for women there was a change from 49% to 58%.

Figure 7. Perceived neighbourhood change

![Bar chart showing perceived neighbourhood change between waves 1 and 2. The chart indicates a higher percentage of respondents feeling the area has got better in wave 2 compared to wave 1. The data is as follows:

- Wave 1: Better - 50.2%, Worse - 17.9%
- Wave 2: Better - 59.2%, Worse - 9.9%

The chart highlights the improvement in feelings of safety between the two waves.]
Respondents were asked: “How safe would you, or do you, feel walking alone in this neighbourhood after dark?” Answers included: very safe; fairly safe; neither safe nor unsafe; fairly unsafe; very unsafe; never walk alone after dark.

**Neighbourhood environment**

Several indicators of perceived neighbourhood quality were marginally higher in wave 2 compared with wave 1. When participants were asked to rate buildings in the local area as attractive, 64% said they were ‘very good’ or ‘fairly good’ at baseline, and 65% did so at wave 2. The same was found for ratings of the attractiveness of the local environment: at baseline, 53% of the cohort considered this to be ‘very good’ or ‘fairly good’, with the equivalent figure at wave 2 being 55%. Lastly, in terms of the quality of green space in the local area 73% of the cohort rated them to be ‘very good’ or ‘fairly good’ at baseline, with this figure being slightly higher at 76% at wave 2.

Conversely, perceptions of neighbourhood environmental problems were lower in the second survey. When asked about rubbish and litter being a neighbourhood problem at baseline, 83% of the cohort reported it to be a ‘slight’ or ‘serious problem’, while at wave 2 this figure was
80%. A larger change was seen in relation to vacant and derelict land. At baseline, 56% of the cohort said that vacant or derelict buildings and land sites were a ‘slight’ or ‘serious problem’ in their local neighbourhood, but at wave 2 only 48% said so, 8 percentage points lower.

Community influence
There was a small difference in feelings of community influence over time. At baseline, 42% of the cohort said that they ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ that they felt they could influence decisions affecting their local area, either on their own or with others; the equivalent figure at wave 2 was 40%.

Civic pride
Feelings of civic pride were little changed over time. At baseline, 67% of the cohort said that they felt proud of their local area (‘a great deal’ or ‘a fair amount’); this figure was 70% at wave 2. The same was found in relation to the city of Glasgow: 90% of the cohort reported ‘a great deal’ or ‘a fair amount’ of pride in the city at baseline, whilst 93% did so at wave 2.

Summary
Several indicators of neighbourhood quality and attractiveness improved marginally over time from the pre-Games to the immediate post-Games period, typically changing by between 2 and 4 percentage points, including the following: neighbourhood satisfaction; attractiveness of buildings and of the local environment; and quality of green space. These results suggest that with regard to issues such as neighbourhood aesthetics, there has been slow, progressive improvement since the baseline survey.

In other respects, more marked improvements are indicated by the cohort. Nearly one-in-ten more of the cohort at wave 2 than at baseline thought that their local area had changed for the better over the past two to three years (+ 9 percentage points); reported feeling safe
walking around their neighbourhood after dark (+9 points); and thought that vacant and derelict land and buildings were not a problem in their neighbourhood (+8 points)\textsuperscript{h}.

In some respects, the East End appears to be outperforming deprived areas nationally in terms of neighbourhood change. We can see this if we compare some of our wave 2 findings from the East End cohort for 2014, with national survey data from deprived areas across the country for 2013. Thus, while a quarter (24%) of adults living in deprived areas nationally think that their neighbourhood has improved over the past three years\textsuperscript{i}, this was true for three-in-five of the East End cohort, over twice the national rate. Similarly, although perceptions of neighbourhood empowerment were very slightly lower at wave 2 than at baseline, it is nonetheless the case that perceived empowerment among this group of residents in the East End remains at approximately twice the national level: around a fifth of people nationally think they can influence decisions affecting their local area, compared with two-in-five in our longitudinal cohort\textsuperscript{j}.

\textsuperscript{h} It was still the case, however, that nearly half the cohort identified vacant and derelict land and buildings as a problem in their area in 2014/15.
\textsuperscript{i} Scotland’s People: Annual Report, Results 2013 Scottish Household Survey, Table 4.3.
\textsuperscript{j} The Scottish Household Survey 2013 reports that 22% of people nationally, including 19% in the most deprived quintile of neighbourhoods, agree that they can influence decisions affecting their local area (Scotland’s People: Annual Report, Results 2013 Scottish Household Survey, Tables 10.4 and 10.5). Note that the SHS question says: “I can influence...” whereas our question says: “On your own, or with others, you can influence...”. Our question thus allows for collective influence as well as individual influence, reflecting the manner in which regeneration programmes in deprived areas operationalise their engagement strategies.
On the other hand, although we found that feelings of safety in the neighbourhood had improved over time, it is still the case that feelings of safety appear to be lower in our East End cohort than is the case nationally\(^k\). Alongside the findings for modest differences over time in indicators of neighbourhood aesthetics and quality, these results underscore the need for ongoing intensive neighbourhood management in the study area, alongside continued major physical improvements through the regeneration programme.

These reported changes in neighbourhood environments in the East End may be important for both sustainable and active legacy outcomes. High quality, safe environments may be more conducive to local physical activity and active travel. Thus, following further analysis and a further survey in 2016, we aim to investigate whether enhanced perceptions of local environments among residents are influential upon behaviours such as walking in the local area and active travel.

\(^k\) While we found that at wave 2 64% of the cohort felt ‘very’ or ‘fairly safe’ walking around their neighbourhood after dark in the East End, the Scottish Household Survey 2013 reported that 84% of people nationally thought this, including 70% in deprived areas (Scotland’s People Annual Report Results 2013, Table 4.13). However, the differences may partly reflect the gender balance in our cohort, where women feel less safe than men.
Theme 4 – Connected legacy

The **Connected** legacy theme was intended to generate participation in the Games and in wider culture and learning, as well intending to boost local pride.

At baseline, we reported high levels of support for the Commonwealth Games (around three quarters of the original 1,015 respondents), indeed higher than recorded among local residents prior to the Olympics in London. We also reported relatively high levels of intention to attend the CWG or related cultural events (compared with Glasgow and Scotland), albeit prior to the announcement of prices and release of tickets.

East End survey respondents at baseline also had high expectations of the Games: around half thought that the Games would positively impact upon their own family (comparable with views across the city), and four-out-of-five thought the Games would positively impact upon their area (much higher than across the city).

Here we examine actual involvement in the Games as reported after the event by the cohort members, as well as post-Games views on the impacts of the event. Finally, we consider issues of disruption, which were considerable for local residents and much reported in the media. We asked cohort members to reflect on their experience of different kinds of disruption, and to consider if they thought the disruption was worth it.

**Level of public support for the Games**

The level of support for the hosting of the CWG started high and increased over time among the cohort. At baseline, 74% of respondents reported that they were supportive (either ‘strongly’ or ‘slightly supportive’) of Glasgow hosting the Commonwealth Games, and after the event, 81% reported being supportive of the Games.
Participation in the Games

At wave 1 each respondent was asked to report their prior intentions to become involved with the Commonwealth Games and subsequently at wave 2 they were asked to report their actual participation. The findings for three areas of involvement are shown in Figure 9.

Around half as many people attended a Games ticketed event as expressed an intention to do so in 2012. At baseline, 43% of the cohort said that they intended to attend a ticketed Games event, whereas at follow-up, 23% reported that they had attended a ticketed sports event or Games ceremony. This is higher than the number of all adults resident in Glasgow who attended such sporting events, estimated at 17%.

There are a number of potential reasons why attendance at ticketed Games sports events by our cohort members may have been lower than intended. Our respondents had relatively high levels of interest in participating in the Games beforehand, which may have been due to their awareness of preparations for the Games and of its association with their area. It is also not unusual in consumer behaviour that actual purchases turn out to be less than expressed intentions to purchase beforehand. While it is possible that the drop-off in the case of our cohort may partly reflect the fact that our wave 1 question asked about intention to attend a ticketed Games event, without mentioning the word ‘buy’ or ‘purchase’, it is also likely that the cohort members may not have applied for tickets in accord with their prior intentions, for reasons we do not know. Lastly, cohort members may have applied for tickets and not been successful in the ballot or allocation process, though it is unlikely that this would have affected applicants from the East End more than those from anywhere else.

Attendance at cultural events around the Games was at the level intended. Around a quarter of the cohort, 26%, said in 2012 that they intended to take part in a Games-related cultural event, and in fact 25% of the cohort reported going to a Games-related cultural event at wave

---

1 We have estimated the equivalent figures for attendance at Games sporting and cultural events by adult residents of Glasgow from the findings presented in the official visitor study report, taking into account the adult population of Glasgow in 2014. (Sources: TNS (2015) XX Commonwealth Games Visitor Study: Visitor Survey Results Report. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government; NRS (2015) Glasgow City Council Area – Demographic Fact Sheet. Edinburgh: NRS.)
2, including as part of Culture 2014, Festival 2014, or the Merchant City Festival. This is again higher than the number of all adults in Glasgow who attended such cultural events, estimated at 22%\textsuperscript{11,m}.

Overall attendance at the Games, including sporting and cultural events, by cohort members was at a rate higher than that reported for all Glasgow residents: 36% of the cohort attended either a sports or cultural event compared with an estimated 25% of all Glasgow adults\textsuperscript{11}.

Respondents were asked: “In which ways, if any, did you get involved in the Commonwealth Games over the past year, or at the time of the Games itself?” Answers included up to 12 items including: attended a ticketed Games sporting event or ceremony; went to a Games-related cultural event including as part of Culture 2014, Festival 2014, Merchant City Festival; was a ‘Clydesider’ volunteer; was a ‘Host City’ volunteer.

Games-related volunteering among the cohort was far less than originally intended. At baseline in 2012, a quarter of the cohort, 25%, said that they intended to volunteer during the Games, but in fact only 3% did so: 1.7% as a ‘Clydesider’ and 1.4% as a ‘Host City’ Volunteer.

\textsuperscript{m} This difference of three percentage points is within the margin of error given in the official visitor report for estimates of attendance by the Glasgow population.
It should be noted that the volunteering rate in the study area was unlikely to be very high given the number of opportunities available: if all Clydesider volunteering places had been allocated to eligible Glasgow citizens (those aged 18 or over), the city-wide volunteering rate would have been approximately 2.5%. If it were, or had been, the case that volunteering was being used to provide employability assistance to those in deprived circumstances, then we might have expected to find a higher rate of volunteering in our study area, though again not substantially so given the total number of places available, unless the host community had been particularly targeted for opportunities moreso than other areas. The wave 2 survey did not ask whether respondents had applied for volunteering positions but were unsuccessful, rather it only recorded the proportion who had volunteered, therefore it is not clear whether respondents acted as they intended to at the 2012 baseline survey and were unsuccessful, or if they decided not to apply when the time came. However, given what is known about the number of Clydesider volunteer applications from the East End⁰, it looks likely that the application rate in the area may have been around 1.5% of the eligible population, so it is apparent that most of those who expressed an interest in participating in volunteering in our baseline survey probably did not go on to apply for a position⁰.

**Perceived impact of the Games**

The expected impacts that the Games would have on respondents’ families were matched by perceptions of the actual impact. When asked at wave 1 to report what effect the Games would have on themselves and their families, 54% of the cohort reported that they thought the Games would have a positive effect. When asked subsequent to the Games at wave 2, again 53% reported that the Games had had, or would have, a positive effect upon themselves and their family.

In contrast, actual perceived impacts on the area were lower than anticipated impacts. Seventy-nine per cent of the cohort at baseline thought the Games would have a positive effect. When asked post-Games at wave 2, 70% of the cohort stated that the Games had had, or would have, a positive effect.

⁰ Private correspondence with GCC legacy staff.
ⁱ We have no information on the number of CWG volunteers who were from the East End, nor of the success rate for those from the area who did apply.
Games-time inconvenience

Detailed in Table 3 are the percentages of respondents who reported that each of eight kinds of Games-time disturbances inconvenienced them either ‘a lot’ or ‘a little’. Traffic congestion and changes to road layouts caused the most inconvenience, experienced by nearly half the cohort. A third or more of the cohort reported being inconvenienced by security cordons, parking restrictions, the closure of amenities, and changed or overcrowded public transport services. A fifth of the cohort was inconvenienced by the crowds and/or noise, and less than one-in-ten were inconvenienced by antisocial behaviour.

Table 3. Games-time inconvenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disturbance</th>
<th>Inconvenienced a lot n (%)</th>
<th>Inconvenienced a little n (%)</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>79 (19.1)</td>
<td>118 (28.5)</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to road or cycling lanes</td>
<td>87 (21.0)</td>
<td>103 (24.9)</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security cordons</td>
<td>76 (18.4)</td>
<td>78 (18.8)</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic or parking restrictions</td>
<td>78 (18.8)</td>
<td>73 (17.6)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure or restrictions on public amenities</td>
<td>52 (12.6)</td>
<td>94 (22.7)</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed or overcrowded public transport services</td>
<td>55 (13.3)</td>
<td>80 (19.3)</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowds or noise</td>
<td>31 (7.5)</td>
<td>59 (14.3)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>10 (2.4)</td>
<td>21 (5.1)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 72% of the cohort experienced one or more inconvenience from the Games, and of these, 77% thought that the inconvenience they experienced was worth the enjoyment or benefit that the Games brought, as opposed to 12% who disagreed that the inconvenience they experienced was worth it.

Summary

Support for the hosting of the CWG rose by 7 percentage points among the East End cohort from before to after the event, despite the fact that perceptions of the Games’ impacts upon the area dropped by nine percentage points from the pre- to post-Games period.

Participation in the Games by cohort members was higher than has been reported for all Glasgow adults, suggesting that proximity to many of the sporting and cultural events taking
place in or near the East End may have encouraged those in the East End to attend. However, compared with their pre-Games intentions, participation at ticketed sporting events was lower than expected by cohort members, although participation at cultural events was at the level intended. Volunteering by East End cohort members was very much lower than respondents intended two years before the Games: despite a quarter of the cohort expressing an intention to volunteer at Games time, only 3% actually did so. Given that volunteering was one of the main employment legacy programmes delivered around the Games, this raises important issues about why more East End residents did not apply to become volunteers for something they had expressed a lot of interest in, and which was happening to a large extent on their doorstep, as well as about whether the Games organisers should or could have done more to recruit volunteers from the East End.

Many East End cohort members were inconvenienced by the Games arrangements and by the event itself: in total, seven-out-of-ten cohort members were inconvenienced in at least one way; typically between one-third and half of the cohort reported being inconvenienced by each of the eight types of disturbance we enquired about. People-related disturbances were far less commonly experienced than problems relating to transport, parking, and security arrangements around the Games. However, the majority of those affected (77%) considered the inconvenience to be worth it, in view of the enjoyment or benefits the Games brought.
Conclusion

This report presents headline indicators available from the post-Games survey of East End residents. The study is based on repeat interviews with a longitudinal cohort of adult householders who participated in both the 2012 and 2014 GoWell East community surveys. Although not representative of all adult residents in the study area in all key respects, it offers valuable insights into how a substantial group of residents have responded over time to the Commonwealth Games and other changes brought about by regeneration in their area.

In terms of an ‘active’ legacy, the Commonwealth Games appears to have had some behavioural influence to a small degree (in terms of reported and intended increase and expansion of sports participation), mostly for those already participating in sport rather than for new participants. There is a need to confirm this with further analysis of pathways to outcomes within the cohort dataset, and later to see if this effect comes fully to fruition in terms of intentions to play more sport being converted into behaviours by 2016. In relation to a facilities pathway to sports participation, residents have noticed an improvement in the quality of local sports facilities, although this has yet to feed through to measures of activity.

While indicators of use of sports facilities, sports participation, and physical activity levels were all lower at wave 2 than at baseline – clearly not suggestive of any short-term boost to sports involvement – it is hard to tell at this point whether the findings reflect an underlying decline in activity for two reasons. First, the availability of local sports facilities for use by local people was disrupted by the Games itself for part of 2014, which may affect the retrospective reporting of regularity of use of sports facilities. Second, the seasonal difference in the conduct of the pre- and post-Games surveys may have affected the findings, with lower rates of sports participation likely in the winter compared with the summer months. For these reasons, we must await the findings from the second post-Games survey of East End residents in summer 2016 to make to be able to make a better pre- to post-Games comparison of the ‘active’ legacy indicators.
With regard to a ‘flourishing’ legacy, there is evidence of an ongoing impact from regeneration and a larger, Games-time impact. One-in-twenty of the cohort households experienced an employment gain from regeneration projects in the area over the two-year period up to the end of 2014, either employment in the construction of infrastructure and facilities, or subsequent employment working in those facilities. In addition, one-in-ten of the cohort households experienced an additional employment effect from the Games itself, either gaining employment or working extra hours at Games time. There is therefore an interesting question to be addressed in our future survey as to whether these time-specific employment effects contribute to longer-term economic impacts for the households concerned.

There have been some notable advances in terms of a ‘sustainable’ legacy. Neighbourhood aesthetic qualities and cleanliness as perceived by residents in the cohort have improved marginally over the past couple of years, while other important neighbourhood elements have shown marked improvements. The large-scale changes brought about by regeneration have been noticed by residents, with a significant reduction in the identification of vacant and derelict land as a problem (though it is still a problem for a substantial number of residents), a marked increase in feelings of neighbourhood safety, and a notable rise in perceptions of a positive neighbourhood change (which is an important psychosocial indicator related to wellbeing).

Lastly, there is evidence for both positive and negative aspects of a ‘connected’ legacy. On the one hand, attendance at Games-time events was higher than for Glasgow adult residents as a whole. However, the rate of participation in the Games by cohort members was less than they anticipated two years prior to the event: while participation in cultural events around the Games was at the level expected by respondents, their attendance at ticketed sports events was half as much as anticipated; meanwhile, very few of the cohort members volunteered at the Games despite a quarter expressing an interest in doing so beforehand. There are various competing explanations for the disparities between pre-Games intentions and post-Games reporting of involvement in the Games themselves, including lower than expected rates of applications for tickets or volunteering places and/or lack of success for East End residents in both regards. We cannot tell to what extent each of these factors applied (or indeed other
factors), although there is evidence to suggest that East End residents did not apply for volunteering places to any significant degree. As far as the East End is concerned, the findings raise some questions about the promotion and accessibility of the Games and some of its associated legacy programmes to members of the local, host community.

Nonetheless, positive perceptions of the Games appeared to outweigh negative or disappointed views among the cohort at this stage. Support for the hosting of the Games increased from the pre-Games to the post-Games period, even though fewer of the cohort after the event thought that the Games had, or would, positively impact upon the area, compared with their pre-Games perspective. Similarly, although between a third and a half of the cohort were inconvenienced with respect to each of a range of different kinds of Games-time disturbance (the most common inconveniences being related to traffic and transport), three-quarters of those affected were of the view that the inconvenience was worth it for the enjoyment and/or benefits the Games brought.

We have used this report to give an overview of East End residents’ responses to regeneration and the Commonwealth Games and associated legacy programmes in the six month period after the Games themselves. The findings indicate a number of areas where we need to follow up in a further post-Games survey in 2016 to assess whether the immediate impacts of regeneration and the Commonwealth Games can lead to longer-term change and benefits for local people.