

East London Citizen Prosperity Index Methodology*

Georgios Melios Henrietta Moore Nikolaos Tzivanakis †
Saffron Woodcraft

Abstract

The Citizen Prosperity Index (CPI), developed by the Institute for Global Prosperity at University College London, offers a novel approach to measuring prosperity beyond traditional economic indicators. This methodology paper outlines the CPI's application in east London, focusing on 15 Lower Layer Super Output Areas across five boroughs undergoing regeneration projects. The CPI features a community-driven design, citizen scientist data collection, and a multidimensional framework encompassing five key domains: Foundations of Prosperity, Opportunities and Aspirations, Power, Voice and Influence, Belonging, Connections and Leisure, and Health and Healthy Environments. The paper describes the mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative surveys with qualitative research, and details the index construction process, including data treatment, post-stratification weights, and z-score normalisation techniques. This methodology enables individual, local, borough, and city-wide analysis, providing a nuanced understanding of prosperity across different scales. The CPI's potential for global application is discussed, highlighting its adaptability to diverse contexts, as demonstrated by its expansion to Lebanon and Tanzania. The paper examines the implications for policy and practice, emphasising the CPI's value in informing targeted interventions and investment strategies across various sectors. By offering stakeholders a sophisticated tool for understanding and promoting prosperity, the CPI contributes to a broader reconceptualisation of prosperity, aligning measurement practices with community-defined priorities and well-being.

Keywords: Prosperity, Community-driven Measurement, Socioeconomic Indicators, Citizen Science

JEL Codes: R23, I31, O18, C43

*Institute for Global Prosperity, UCL

†Corresponding Author: n.tzivanakis@ucl.ac.uk

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview of the Study

The Citizen Prosperity Index (CPI) represents a pioneering effort to redefine and measure prosperity in east London. Developed by the Institute for Global Prosperity (IGP) at University College London (UCL), this index moves beyond traditional economic indicators to capture a more comprehensive view of prosperity and quality of life (Moore and Mintchev 2023).

For decades, policymakers and economists have relied heavily on measures such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to gauge societal progress. However, these metrics often fall short of reflecting communities' everyday experiences, particularly in diverse and rapidly changing urban areas like east London. The CPI addresses this gap by incorporating various factors contributing to genuine prosperity, as defined by residents in qualitative research undertaken by citizen scientists.

The CPI methodology stands out for several innovative features. Firstly, it pioneers the use of 'citizen scientists' in prosperity research. Local residents, trained by the UCL Citizen Science Academy, are integral to every stage – from identifying the determinants of prosperity, to co-designing key indicators and collecting data. This approach ensures data accuracy and empowers communities to shape the narrative of their prosperity. Secondly, by targeting areas undergoing significant urban regeneration, the CPI offers unprecedented insights into how large-scale urban development impacts local prosperity.

This focus allows policymakers and developers to track the real-time effects of their interventions on community prosperity. Lastly, the CPI's unique methodology allows for individual, LSOA, borough, and city-wide analysis. This multiscale approach provides a nuanced understanding of how prosperity manifests at different geographic scales, offering valuable insights for policymakers, investors, practitioners, and other decision-makers across various sectors to inform targeted interventions and investment strategies.

1.2 Who can use it?

The Index can help policymakers and decisionmakers better understand their communities' social welfare needs and identify areas where resources are needed most. By tracking prosperity outcomes over time and across LSOAs, decisionmakers can evaluate the impact of policy interventions and make data-driven decisions about resource allocation.

The Index can help social service providers identify areas where their services are most needed and evaluate the effectiveness of their programs. Service providers can make data-driven decisions about program design and resource allocation by tracking prosperity outcomes.

Advocates and activists can use the Index to raise awareness about social welfare issues and advocate for policy change. By highlighting areas of social welfare need, they can build support for policy interventions and mobilise action.

1.3 Purpose and Importance of the Index

The primary aim of the CPI is to provide a detailed, community-driven measure of prosperity that can inform policy decisions and community initiatives. By offering insights into all the aspects residents have identified as determinants of their prosperity, the index helps identify where interventions are most needed and likely to have the most significant impact.

This approach is particularly crucial for east London, an area characterised by significant economic diversity and ongoing urban regeneration. As the sub-region transforms, the CPI ensures that development benefits all residents, not just a select few. It gives policymakers a complete picture of community prosperity, allowing for more targeted and effective interventions.

The CPI's importance extends beyond east London. As the first citizen-led prosperity index in the UK, it offers a model for how communities across the country—and potentially worldwide—can measure and pursue prosperity in meaningful ways. This approach can reshape how we think about global progress and development.

This methodology paper aims to provide a clear and transparent account of the CPI,

enabling policymakers, researchers, and community leaders to understand the process and its application in different contexts. We hope to contribute to the broader discussion on measuring societal progress by detailing our process.

2 Data Collection Approach

2.1 Study Areas and LSOA Descriptions

The Citizen Prosperity Index (CPI) focuses on east London, a sub-region that has experienced significant economic transformation and urban regeneration in recent decades. It has been developed as part of the Prosperity in east London 2021-2031 Longitudinal Study (Woodcraft et al. 2024; Woodcraft and Chan 2022). The study targets 15 Lower Layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) across five London boroughs: Newham, Tower Hamlets, Hackney, Waltham Forest, and Barking & Dagenham. These areas were selected due to their involvement in large-scale urban regeneration projects and their demographic diversity, offering a unique opportunity to examine the impacts of these developments on local prosperity.

- **Royal Docks:** This area includes four LSOAs within the London Borough of Newham - Custom House, Silvertown Quays, Beckton, and North Woolwich. As part of the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area, these LSOAs are situated within one of London's largest regeneration zones, expected to create 30,000 new homes and 40,000 jobs over the next two decades.
- **Olympic Park and its Fringes:** This area includes neighbourhoods directly impacted by the 2012 Olympic Legacy. It comprises six LSOAs spread across four London boroughs: Hackney Wick and East Wick, Gascoyne Estate, Fish Island and Sweetwater, Leyton, Chobham Manor, East Village, and International Quarter London (IQL) and Pudding Mill East. These LSOAs have been at the heart of efforts to close the prosperity gap between east London and more affluent parts of the city.
- **Teviot Estate and Coventry Cross Estate:** Located in the London Borough of Tower

Hamlets, these four LSOAs—Coventry Cross, Teviot Estate North, Teviot Estate East, and Teviot Estate West—are undergoing extensive regeneration following a 2019 resident ballot. The regeneration project aims to construct 2,500 new homes and enhance community facilities over the next 15 years.

- Heath: This LSOA in the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham is part of the London Riverside section of the Thames Gateway, a national priority for urban regeneration. Heath was selected for the study due to its unique position in an outer London borough undergoing rapid socio-economic changes.

2.2 Data Sources and Collection Methods

The CPI primarily utilises quantitative surveys for data collection. At the same time, complementary qualitative research conducted by residents trained as citizen scientists helps to inform the conceptual model and provides valuable context for interpreting and validating the CPI results. This approach ensures that the data reflects the community’s lived experiences and provides a comprehensive understanding of prosperity in these areas.

The survey was designed with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error, ensuring the results are statistically robust and representative of the target population. 4,093 households were surveyed across the 15 LSOAs.

The survey was designed to capture a wide range of indicators related to the five domains of prosperity: Foundations of Prosperity, Opportunities and Aspirations, Power, Voice and Influence, Belonging, Connections and Leisure, and Health and Healthy Environments.

The survey includes standardised questions from national surveys, such as Understanding Society and Eurobarometer, and locally developed questions tailored to east London’s context. This combination allows for comparability with national data while capturing local nuances.

A key feature of the data collection process was the involvement of local residents as citizen scientists. The UCL Citizen Science Academy recruited and trained these

individuals to conduct the surveys and qualitative research. This approach builds trust within the community and ensures that the data collected is grounded in the residents' lived experiences.

2.3 Treatment of Missing Data and Post-Stratification Weights

To ensure the integrity and representativeness of the data, the CPI methodology includes rigorous processes for handling missing data and applying post-stratification weights.

CPI, like most composite indices, faces the challenge of incomplete data. Some data points may be missing for specific years or locations, and some indicators may be released with a time lag. To address this, we prioritise actual data and use the latest known value for an indicator if data is missing for a specific location. If no reliable actual data is available, we use imputation techniques on a case-by-case basis. This approach ensures that the absence of responses does not bias the results. Imputation is based on data from leading databases that include similar information at the LSOA level, such as the British Household Panel Study (BHPS) and the Labour Force Survey. Sensitivity analyses assess the impact of different imputation methods on the overall index scores, providing transparency and robustness to the methodology.

Creating post-stratification weights begins with stratification, where the population is divided into different strata or subgroups based on specific characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, income, or education level. These strata are defined by variables believed to influence the outcome of interest and are available in both the sample and the population.

Following stratification, the population proportion for each stratum is calculated using reliable population data, such as census data or other large, representative datasets. Similarly, the sample proportion within each stratum is determined by analysing the sample data to understand how it is distributed across the different strata.

Once these proportions are established, post-stratification weights are calculated by dividing the population proportion for each stratum by the corresponding sample proportion. This calculation results in a weight for each stratum that, when applied, adjusts

the influence of each observation in the sample. The mathematical expression for the weight w_i for a given stratum i is the population proportion in that stratum divided by the sample proportion in that same stratum. Applying these weights ensures that the weighted sample distribution aligns with the population distribution.

After calculating the weights, they are applied to the data, meaning each observation in the sample is multiplied by its corresponding weight. This step adjusts the contribution of each observation to any estimates or analyses, thereby correcting for biases introduced by overrepresented or underrepresented strata. This process enhances the sample's representativeness with respect to the entire population. Finally, the effectiveness of the weights is evaluated by comparing weighted estimates from the sample to known population parameters. If the estimates do not accurately reflect the population, further adjustments to the stratification variables or the weight calculation process may be necessary. By applying post-stratification weights, researchers can reduce the impact of sampling biases and produce findings that better reflect the characteristics of the entire population. By aligning the survey data with known population characteristics from the most recent Census data, we enhance the representativeness and reliability of the CPI.

This comprehensive approach to data collection and treatment forms the foundation of the CPI, ensuring that the index is both statistically sound and deeply rooted in the experiences of east London communities.

3 Methodology for Building the Index

Theoretical Framework and Rationale The Citizen Prosperity Index (CPI) is built upon a theoretical framework that conceptualises prosperity as a multidimensional construct encompassing economic, social, and environmental well-being (Moore and Mintchev 2023; Moore and Woodcraft 2019; Woodcraft and Anderson 2019; Moore and Mintchev 2023). This approach, grounded in the capabilities approach pioneered by economists like Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, moves beyond traditional economic measures to capture a more holistic view of urban thriving.

The CPI operationalises this approach through five key domains, each identified through extensive consultations with east London communities. Each domain is divided into subdomains comprising specific indicators. This hierarchical structure allows for a detailed measurement of prosperity while maintaining a clear overall framework. To create the index, we collect data for over 100 variables that enable us to develop our indicators, each chosen for its relevance to east London’s local context and its ability to capture essential aspects of community-defined prosperity. Here’s a brief overview of each domain:

- **Foundations of Prosperity:** Measures secure livelihoods, affordable housing, access to basic services, freedom from financial stress, economic inclusivity, and factors contributing to a good start in life for children and youth.
- **Opportunities and Aspirations:** Assesses education quality, lifelong learning opportunities, and residents’ sense of autonomy and ability to shape their lives.
- **Power, Voice, and Influence:** This concept captures political inclusion, trust in institutions, and residents’ perceived ability to influence local decisions.
- **Belonging, Connections, and Leisure:** Evaluates the strength of social relationships, sense of community, and participation in cultural and recreational activities.
- **Health and Healthy Environments:** This domain measures physical and mental health outcomes, access to healthcare, neighbourhood safety and cleanliness, and community resilience.

The construction of the CPI involves systematically selecting, normalising, and aggregating these indicators. This structure provides a comprehensive view of prosperity, allowing for analysis at various levels—from broad domains to specific indicators. It enables policymakers and community leaders to identify overarching trends and specific areas for intervention.

By grounding the CPI in community-identified priorities and a broad understanding of well-being, we aim to provide a more accurate and valuable tool for understanding and

promoting prosperity in east London and beyond. This approach represents a significant departure from traditional, economically-focused indices, offering a more nuanced and locally relevant measure of prosperity.

3.1 Weighting and Normalisation Techniques

In the current CPI iteration, all indicators within each subdomain are given equal weight. This approach was chosen to ensure that each aspect of prosperity is considered equally important in the overall assessment. However, as the methodology evolves, there are plans to incorporate a more sophisticated weighting scheme using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), which will allow for the differential weighting of indicators based on their relative importance to the community.

It's important to note that the current equal weighting approach offers flexibility to end-users. The fact that we do not impose predetermined weights means that anyone can apply their weighting scheme if they see fit. This is particularly valuable when users want to emphasise specific domains they believe are of heightened importance due to current economic, social, or political climates. This adaptability allows the CPI to remain relevant and responsive to varying contexts and priorities.

Normalisation involves converting each indicator into a standardised score, typically using Z-scores. This process ensures that all indicators contribute equally to the overall index regardless of their original scales. Using Z-scores allows the CPI to accommodate a wide range of data types and ensures that outliers or extreme values do not unduly influence the index.

3.2 Z-Score Normalisation Process

In data analysis, researchers often face the challenge of comparing information in different forms or scales. This challenge is akin to comparing prices across countries with different currencies. Z-score normalisation emerges as a powerful tool to address this issue, acting as a universal converter for diverse data types. At its core, Z-score normalisation is a method that standardises data, allowing for meaningful comparisons between datasets

that originally had different scales or units. This technique is particularly valuable in two key scenarios: firstly, when comparing data from diverse sources, and secondly, ensuring that data meets the assumptions of normal distribution required for many statistical analyses.

The principle of Z-score normalisation involves transforming each data point in relation to its dataset's mean and standard deviation. The formula for calculating a Z-score is as follows:

$$Z_i = \frac{X_i - \mu}{\sigma}$$

In this formula, Z represents the Z-score, X is the individual data point, μ is the mean of the dataset, and σ is the standard deviation of the dataset. Essentially, this formula quantifies how far a data point is from the average, measured in standard deviations.

A practical application of this method can be observed in a multi-level analysis of prosperity in east London. This case study demonstrates how Z-score normalisation can be applied across different geographical scales to create a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of economic conditions.

The analysis in east London is conducted at three distinct levels: the Lower Super Output Area (LSOA), the borough, and the east London sub-region as a whole. LSOAs are small areas, typically containing about 1,500 residents or 650 households, while boroughs are larger administrative divisions such as Tower Hamlets or Hackney. The process begins by calculating Z-scores at each level, using level-specific means and standard deviations. This initial step provides insight into how individuals or areas compare to others within the same geographical unit.

Z-score at LSOA level:

$$Z_{LSOA} = \frac{value_i - \mu_{LSOA}}{\sigma_{individual,LSOA}}$$

Z-score at borough level:

$$Z_{borough} = \frac{value_i - \mu_{borough}}{\sigma_{individual,borough}}$$

Z-score for individuals in east London:

$$Z_{eastLondon} = \frac{value_i - \mu_{eastLondon}}{\sigma_{individual,eastLondon}}$$

The next stage involves comparing these Z-scores across the different levels. This comparison reveals how an individual's or area's relative position changes from different geographical perspectives. For instance, a neighbourhood might appear relatively prosperous compared to other areas in its LSOA but less so than the borough. Similarly, a borough might seem less prosperous than east London overall, but it may contain pockets of high prosperity at the LSOA level.

The final and crucial step in this process is standardising Z-scores across all levels. This step is analogous to adjusting for inflation when comparing prices from different years. It ensures the data is comparable across different geographical scales, accounting for population size and distribution variations. Standardisation is essential for creating a fair and accurate representation of prosperity across east London. This multi-level normalisation approach offers several key benefits. Firstly, it ensures data comparability across different geographical levels, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of prosperity patterns. Secondly, it provides a nuanced view of how economic conditions vary between areas and within them. Perhaps most importantly, it allows for the fair integration of data from different scales into a comprehensive prosperity index.

In conclusion, applying Z-score normalisation in this multi-level analysis of east London demonstrates the power of this statistical technique in understanding complex socio-economic phenomena. By enabling accurate comparison and integration of data across different geographical scales, it provides a robust foundation for analysing patterns of prosperity. This approach enhances our understanding of economic conditions in east London and offers a model for similar multi-level analyses in other contexts and regions. By breaking down the barriers between different types and scales of data, Z-score normalisation helps us gain a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of our world, providing valuable insights for policymakers and researchers.

3.3 Validation and Robustness Checks

The index is subjected to validation and robustness checks to ensure the CPI's reliability and validity. One key aspect of this process is benchmarking the CPI against external datasets, such as LSOA-level data from the Understanding Society project. This comparison helps to identify any discrepancies and ensures that the CPI is consistent with broader patterns of socio-economic data.

Robustness checks are also conducted to test the index's sensitivity to different methodological choices, such as treating missing data and selecting indicators. These checks involve recalculating the index under different scenarios to ensure stable and reliable results. Sensitivity analyses are particularly important for understanding how changes in the weighting of indicators or the inclusion/exclusion of certain data points might affect the overall index scores.

By grounding the CPI in community-identified priorities and a broad understanding of prosperity, we aim to provide a more accurate and valuable tool for understanding and promoting prosperity in east London and beyond. This approach represents a significant departure from traditional, economically-focused indices, offering a more nuanced and locally relevant measure of prosperity.

4 Future Directions and Opportunities

The Citizen Prosperity Index (CPI) represents a significant advancement in measuring and understanding prosperity. As we look to the future, we see numerous opportunities to enhance and expand the CPI's methodology and application.

4.1 Expanding Global Relevance

Our initial focus on east London provided a solid foundation for developing the CPI, allowing us to refine our methodology and gain deep insights into the nuances of prosperity. Building on this success, we have already expanded the CPI's application to Lebanon and Tanzania, demonstrating its adaptability to diverse global contexts (Jallad et al. 2021;

Mintchev et al. 2019; Moore and Mintchev 2023; Woodcraft and Anderson 2019; Woodcraft et al. 2020). As we progress, we see exciting opportunities to further extend the CPI's reach to additional regions worldwide, enhancing our understanding of prosperity across varied urban environments. We can create a rich, comparative analysis of prosperity by scaling our approach to different cities and regions worldwide. This expansion will allow us to identify universal and context-specific factors contributing to community well-being. It also allows us to adapt our indicators and data collection methods to reflect various cultural and socio-economic realities while maintaining comparability across regions.

4.2 Enhancing Data Integration

The CPI's current reliance on primary, community-level data has provided us with valuable insights grounded in lived experiences. We see significant potential in integrating secondary data sources to complement our primary research. This evolution will allow for a more comprehensive, multi-layered understanding of prosperity.

By leveraging existing global datasets alongside our targeted surveys, we can create a more robust and wide-reaching measure of prosperity. This approach will enable us to identify trends and patterns at a global scale while still maintaining the depth of our community-level insights. Integrating diverse data sources allows for more sophisticated cross-cultural comparisons and policy impact assessments.

4.3 Longitudinal Insights and Dynamic Analysis

As we conduct additional waves of data collection, the CPI will evolve from providing static snapshots to offering dynamic, temporal insights into prosperity. This progression will allow us to track changes in prosperity over time, not just in east London but in multiple contexts worldwide.

By comparing prosperity trajectories across different cities and regions, we can gain unprecedented insights into the factors that drive positive change in diverse environments. This longitudinal approach will also enable us to evaluate the impact of specific policies

or interventions on community prosperity, providing valuable feedback for policymakers and community leaders.

4.4 Methodological Advancements

The planned adoption of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) represents an exciting opportunity to enhance the sophistication of our analysis. This advanced statistical technique will allow us to model complex relationships between different aspects of prosperity, providing a more nuanced understanding of how various factors interact to shape overall well-being.

SEM will also enable us to refine our weighting scheme, moving beyond the current equal weighting approach to one that reflects the relative importance of different indicators to overall prosperity. This advancement will result in a more accurate and context-sensitive measure of prosperity.

While our current approach has provided valuable insights, these future directions position the CPI to become an even more powerful tool for understanding and promoting prosperity on a global scale. By leveraging advanced statistical techniques, integrating diverse data sources, and expanding our geographic scope, we create a more comprehensive, nuanced, and globally relevant measure of prosperity. This evolution of the CPI reflects our commitment to developing a versatile and impactful tool that can inform policy and practice in diverse contexts worldwide, ultimately contributing to creating more prosperous, inclusive, and sustainable communities.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Summary

The Citizen Prosperity Index (CPI) represents a significant advancement in conceptualising and measuring prosperity. By moving beyond traditional economic indicators and incorporating a broader range of dimensions—such as health, social connections, and environmental quality—the CPI provides a more holistic understanding of what it means

to prosper in contemporary society. The participatory approach, involving local communities in the design and data collection processes, ensures that the index reflects the lived experiences and priorities of those it serves.

The methodology outlined in this paper demonstrates the careful consideration given to each step of the index's construction. The CPI is grounded in robust and transparent practices, from selecting study areas and rigorous data collection methods to using Z-score normalisation and the planned transition to more sophisticated Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) techniques. These efforts culminate in a scientifically sound index deeply relevant to the communities it measures.

Moreover, expanding the CPI to a global scale, leveraging secondary data and targeted primary research, positions it as a versatile tool for understanding prosperity across diverse contexts worldwide. This evolution allows for unprecedented insights into the factors that drive well-being and quality of life in different cultural and socio-economic settings.

5.2 Implications for Policy and Practice

The CPI's implications for policy and practice are profound and far-reaching. It is a valuable tool for policymakers, planners, and community organisations at local, national, and international levels. It provides a nuanced picture of prosperity that captures communities' strengths and challenges.

At the local level, the CPI offers actionable insights into areas where interventions are most needed, whether improving access to education, enhancing public health, or fostering greater social cohesion. The longitudinal nature of the study allows for tracking the impact of local policies and initiatives over time, providing valuable feedback on their effectiveness.

On a global scale, the CPI's ability to analyse secondary data across countries and regions opens up new possibilities for international comparisons and policy learning. Decisionmakers can identify successful models of prosperity and adapt them to their local contexts. The targeted approach to primary data collection ensures that resources are

efficiently deployed to areas where deeper insights are most needed. Moreover, the CPI challenges policymakers to rethink the metrics by which success is measured. The CPI encourages a shift towards policies prioritising well-being, equity, and sustainability by elevating indicators reflecting quality of life rather than merely economic output. This shift is particularly relevant in areas undergoing significant change, such as rapidly urbanising regions or cities facing economic transitions.

The CPI provides a comprehensive framework for assessing the impact of international organisations and development agencies' interventions. The index's multidimensional nature ensures that the full spectrum of development outcomes is considered, not just economic growth.

5.3 Final Thoughts

As the CPI continues to evolve, it holds the potential to profoundly reshape our understanding of prosperity on a global scale. Its emphasis on community involvement, comprehensive approach to measurement, and ability to bridge local and global perspectives make it a powerful tool for assessing current conditions and guiding future development.

The planned methodological enhancements, including the adoption of SEM and the integration of secondary data sources, will further strengthen the index's ability to provide meaningful and actionable insights across diverse contexts. Expanding to more locations worldwide will create a rich dataset for comparative analysis, contributing to our understanding of what drives prosperity in different environments.

In conclusion, the Citizen Prosperity Index is a pioneering effort to redefine prosperity more aligned with communities' values and aspirations locally and globally. As it expands its reach and continues to evolve methodologically, the CPI can influence local policies and broader international discussions on what it means to create prosperous, inclusive, and sustainable societies in our increasingly interconnected world.

References

- Jallad, M., N. Mintchev, E. Pietrostefani, M. Daher, and H. L. Moore (2021). “Citizen social science and pathways to prosperity: co-designing research and impact in Beirut, Lebanon”. In: *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 25.6, pp. 769–782. DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2021.1942664.
- Mintchev, N., H. Baumann, H. L. Moore, A. Rigon, and J. Dabaj (2019). “Towards a shared prosperity: co-designing solutions in Lebanon’s spaces of displacement”. In: *Journal of the British Academy* 7.S2, pp. 109–135. DOI: 10.5871/jba/007s2.109.
- Moore, H. L. and N. Mintchev (2023). “What is prosperity?” In: *Prosperity in the Twenty-First century: Concepts, models and metrics*. Ed. by H. L. Moore, D. Matthew, N. Mintchev, and S. Woodcraft. London: UCL Press.
- Moore, H. L. and S. Woodcraft (2019). “Understanding Prosperity in East London: Local Meanings and ”Sticky” Measures of the Good Life”. In: *City & Society* 31.2, pp. 275–298.
- Woodcraft, S. and B. Anderson (2019). *Rethinking prosperity for London: When citizens lead transformation*. Tech. rep. London: Institute for Global Prosperity UCL.
- Woodcraft, S. and G. Chan (2022). *Prosperity in east London 2021-2031: About the Study*. Tech. rep. London: Institute for Global Prosperity UCL.
- Woodcraft, S., J. Izcue-Gana, G. Melios, N. Tzivanakis, E. Pietrostefani, G. Chan, Z. Hasan, and J. Perez (July 2024). *Prosperity in and around London’s Olympic Park Findings from the Prosperity in east London 2021-2031 Longitudinal Study*. Tech. rep. London: UCL Institute for Global Prosperity.
- Woodcraft, S., E. Osuteye, T. Ndezi, and F. D. Makoba (2020). “Pathways to the ‘Good Life’: Co-Producing Prosperity Research in Informal Settlements in Tanzania”. In: *Urban Planning* 5.3, pp. 288–302.

Appendix A

Table 1: Citizen Prosperity Index Detailed Table of Indicators

Domain	Subdomain	Headline Indicator	Measures
Foundations of Prosperity	Secure Livelihoods	Secure Income and Good Quality Work	Pre-tax income, Real household disposable income, Proportion of Permanent Contracts, Commute time, Satisfactory leisure time, etc.
		Genuine Affordable and Secure Housing	Affordable housing, Size of house, Mortgage status, House ownership, Ability to pay rent/mortgage, etc.
		Food and Energy Security	Eating less due to lack of money, use of food banks, ability to keep accommodation warm
		Access to Basic Services	Access to public transport, Access to childcare, Access to the internet, etc.
		Freedom from Financial Stress	Experience of financial difficulties, Ability to meet unexpected expenses, Debt levels, etc.
		Secure Future	Perceived security of future income, Savings levels, Access to financial advice, etc.
Inclusive Economy		Fairness and Equity	Income inequality, Employment rates, Unemployment rates, Wage disparity by gender/ethnicity, etc.
A Good Start in Life		Childhood Poverty	Child poverty rates, Adolescent transitions to work or study, Access to early childhood education, etc.

Continued on next page

Table 1 – continued from previous page

Domain	Subdomain	Headline Indicator	Measures
		Adolescent transitions to work or study	Education levels among adolescents, Unemployment, School attendance
Opportunities and Aspirations	Good Quality Education	Access to Good Quality Education	Satisfaction with local schools, Literacy and numeracy levels, etc.
	Lifelong Learning	Access to Skills and Training for Work	Access to professional training, Satisfaction with opportunities for learning, etc.
		Opportunities for self-improvement and personal development	Participation in adult education
	Freedom, Choice, and Control	Freedom from Discrimination	Degree to which people from different backgrounds live in harmony, degree to which different cultures and beliefs flourish in area.
		Having choices and control over one's future	Personal Autonomy, ability to improve one's own life
Power, Voice, and Influence	Political Inclusion	Political Inclusion	Voter turnout, Trust in government institutions, Participation in political activities, etc.
	Voice and Influence	Feelings of Influence	Perceived ability to influence local decisions, Participation in community meetings, Trust in local authorities, etc.

Continued on next page

Table 1 – continued from previous page

Domain	Subdomain	Headline Indicator	Measures
Belonging, Connections, and Leisure	Social Relationships	Regular contact with family, friends and neighbours	Frequency of contact with family and friends, Levels of loneliness, Participation in community activities, etc.
	Sense of Community	Community Cohesion	Feeling of belonging to the neighbourhood, Trust in neighbours, Length of residence in the area, etc.
		Getting Involved in community life	Volunteering, Participation in local social activities, Membership in civic organisations
	Arts, Leisure, and Sports	Participation in arts, sport, and leisure activities	Participation in arts and cultural activities, Access to recreational facilities, Satisfaction with leisure opportunities, etc.
Health and Healthy Environments	Healthy Bodies and Healthy Minds	Healthy bodies	Self-reported health status, Access to healthcare, Levels of physical activity, Mental health indicators, etc.
		Wellbeing	Measures of overall life satisfaction, including the psychological and emotional state of residents.
		Access to health and care services	Evaluation of the availability and quality of both mental and physical health services, including residents' satisfaction with these services.
	Healthy, Safe and Clean Neighbourhoods	Good quality housing	Satisfaction with local quality of housing / living conditions

Continued on next page

Table 1 – continued from previous page

Domain	Subdomain	Headline Indicator	Measures
		Safe and clean neighbourhoods	Self-reported safety at night/day
		Access to green space	Satisfaction with green/open spaces
Sustainable and Resilient Communities	Natural Environment		Satisfaction with the natural environment, Access to green spaces, Environmental sustainability initiatives, etc.