

SOCIAL AUDIT
BRAG Enterprises (BRAG)
Draft Social Accounts
1st April 2001 – 31ST March 2002

Volume II
Social Capital Objectives

BRAG Enterprises
Crosshill Business Centre
Main Street
Crosshill
KY5 8BJ

Tel: 01592 860 296
Fax: 01592 869 629
Website: www.brag.co.uk
Email: markcullens@yahoo.com

CONTENTS

Volume II: Social Capital Objectives

	Page
13 Analysis of the Social Capital Objectives	79
13.1 Methodology	79
13.2 Results from the Initial Scoping Study	80
13.3 Analysis of the Social Capital Objectives	83
13.4 Other Views of the Stakeholders on Social Capital	111
14 Main Issues on the Social Capital Objectives	113
14.1 Main Issues	113
14.2 Critique on the Methodology	117
15 Conclusions and Recommendations on the Social Capital Objectives	119
15.1 Implications for Policy for BRAG Enterprise and Others	119
15.2 Recommendations for BRAG Enterprise	119
16 CONSCISE Project	121

13 Analysis of the Social Capital Objectives

13.1 Methodology

The methodology used consisted of two parts:

- An initial scoping study which included a profile of BRAG and initial interviews;
- Two social capital objectives, which were added to the key objectives and activities for BRAG's Social Accounts. For each of the Social Capital Objectives, six activities were identified and social-booking systems put in place.

The usual social audit process and methodology were used to assess how BRAG uses social capital to sustain itself; and how it generates social capital for the benefit of the local social economy. The social capital parts were integrated with the general social accounting systems and therefore many of the questionnaires and consultation methods used contained questions or a section on social capital.

The following stakeholder groups were asked about social capital:

Stakeholder Group	Method	Comments
Staff (11)	Questionnaire and Interviews	11 staff members returned questionnaires with the social capital section completed.
DTS Staff (10)	Questionnaires	9 questionnaires were returned
Board Members (13)	Questionnaires and Scoping Study Interviews	4 questionnaires were returned; 2 directors were interviewed
Partner Organisations (13)	Questionnaires	5 were returned
Tenants of the Workspace (25)	Interviews using a Questionnaire template	19 interviews were held
Local Social Enterprises (6)	Interviews using a Questionnaire template	6 social enterprises were interviewed
Funders (7)	Semi-structured interviews	4 interviews were held*

(*The funders interviewed were: Alison MacDonald, Local Economic Development (LED), Economic Development Department, Fife Council; Bill Banks, Kingdom Housing (Scottish Homes); Jennifer Ezzi, Senior Programme Manager, ESF Objective 3; Gerry MacDonald, Programme Manager, ESEP, ERDF Objective 2)

In addition:

- a map of contacts was drawn up by the research facilitators working with key staff in November 2001 (Appendix 17);
- six bi-monthly interviews were held with BRAG senior staff to identify, discuss and analyse examples of social capital. This meeting was also used as a progress and "up-date" meeting for the whole of the social audit process (Appendix 19).
- a meeting was held with the BRAG staff (not the senior staff) in October 2001 to discuss the concept of social capital, the social audit process and the CONSCISE Project. This was an information meeting only.

- It was intended that the senior staff maintain 'activity logs' to record details of their various working contacts with different groups of clients and other contacts (see social accounting plan in full social accounts) but in the event these logs were not effectively kept.

The Commentary/Interpretation sections will crystallise the main findings.

The appropriateness of the methodology will be considered in Section 14.

13.2 Results from the Initial Scoping Study

13.2.1 Profile of BRAG Enterprises

The purpose of profiling BRAG Enterprise is to confirm that it conforms to the original definition of a social enterprise as outlined in Workpackage 1 (CONSCISE Project).

ENTERPRISE PROFILE	
Name	BRAG Enterprises Limited (BRAG)
Address	Crosshill Business Centre Main Street Crosshill KY5 8BJ
Contact Details	Tel: 01592 860 296 Fax: 01592 869 629 Email: markcullens@yahoo.com
Legal Status	Company Limited by Guarantee with Charitable Status. BRAG has one trading subsidiary - DTS Services
Date Formed	1988
Number of staff	9 – 11
Not for profit status	BRAG's turnover for 2001 - 2002 was circa £1.1m. All surpluses were reinvested in the company to provide a broader range of services and benefits for the community.

Social-economic activities	Refer to the stated Mission Statement/Aim, Values, Objectives and Activities in the main social accounts (Volume I) from which it can be seen that BRAG creates employment, supplies local services, has good employment conditions for staff, supports the development of other social enterprises and promotes community development.
Member participation and co-operation	BRAG has a membership of around 30. The membership was very active and involved in the initial stages of the company but the number of active members and the level of activity has declined gradually over the years. BRAG has three very active Board members who carry out a lot of BRAG functions on a voluntary basis. They help on a day-to-day basis and are actively supportive. On average 12 - 13 members attend the AGM. There have been 2 volunteers working for BRAG during the social audit period.
Social/community benefit	BRAG has created 18 direct jobs. Indirectly jobs have been created through the social enterprises it has supported; local jobs through its workspace tenants; and employment through training The level of services provided are adequately described under in the early sections of the social accounts (Volume I). Any surplus is reinvested in BRAG.
Mutual co-operation	BRAG has numerous links with other organisations (see the relevant other sections of this report). BRAG provides considerable support in the establishment of other social enterprises and has one trading subsidiary.

13.2.2 Interviews

At the start of the social audit process and as part of the scoping study two of the more active directors were interviewed using a semi-structured format (see Appendix 17). The interview covered

- the history of BRAG in relation to social capital;
- BRAG and social capital (using social capital to sustain BRAG; creating and generating social capital to benefit the community).

The interviewees were Joe Patterson and Michael O'Hare and only the main points arising from the interviews are included below.

a) History of BRAG in relation to Social Capital

- Willy Clark and Joe Patterson were two local councillors (from different political parties) who were very influential in establishing BRAG. They used their local knowledge and influence to enable BRAG to take over the empty and unused primary school, Crosshill Primary School, on a favourable lease. They also obtained the support of the then local MP, Willie Hamilton. The interviewees felt

that the political support and lead role by councillors was vital as they ensured there was "good co-operation" from council officials and indeed the councillors were able to use social capital with departmental heads in Fife Regional Council (prior to local government re-organisation). One interviewee said that "if they had not had councillor support (in the beginning) it would have been very difficult" mainly as they had access to information and could use their formal and informal networks.

- Fife Regional Council along with two other district councils supported the creation of BRAG. All three councils were Labour controlled. Fife Regional Council was the lead partner as it had a remit for training and economic activity.
- The aspect of political support in the establishment of BRAG cannot be ignored even though the level of trust between the supporting councils varied in the early years.
- Local activists including councillors organised themselves into a steering committee and visited other social enterprises in Govan, Paisley and Wester Hailes. They were assisted by appointed consultants specialising in community enterprise development and a business plan with a training focus was written and approved in 1988. Funding was obtained through the Urban Programme.
- The "driving force" behind the creation of BRAG was down to "a few individuals" who used trust, mutuality and social networks to build a vision. They were (and still are) highly committed to the area and used information they had access to help BRAG obtain start-up resources.
- Additional support was provided after incorporation by Community Business Fife (a social enterprise support organisation backed by the local councils and funded from the Urban Programme).
- In the mid 1990s there was a breakdown in trust and co-operation between Benarty Improvement Group (BIG) - another local community-based regeneration enterprise - and BRAG. This discord was partly to do with local politics. An outside consultant at that time helped BRAG re-focus its role and mediated between the two organisations. A written Benarty 'Concordat' was agreed and signed which outlines agreement and a modus operandi for the two organisations.

b) *BRAG's Role in Using Social Capital (Social Capital Objective 1)*

- The interviewees reported that BRAG is seen as "open" and encourages local people to get involved. Its sustainability is dependent on local involvement.
- The manager and style of management ("approachability and accommodating") has always been important in the development of BRAG especially in its work with other social enterprises.
- One of BRAG's strengths has been working along side other organisations. Therefore social capital and the use of social capital is crucial.
- BRAG's main emphasis has been on training opportunities leading to jobs; provision of information for local people about opportunities; assisting social cohesion. The overall style has stressed "learning".

c) BRAG's Role in Creating Social Capital (Social Capital Objective 2)

- Over the years it was reported that BRAG has used social capital to create other local social enterprises. This might be via individuals on the Board of BRAG who help other social enterprises; or through the actions of the senior management of BRAG. The distinction can become blurred.
- The relationship with Fife Council has varied over the years. At times it has been close and mutually supportive; at other times less so. There was initial suspicion over BRAG's initiation and delivery of services.
- BRAG now has a mutually beneficial relationship with BIG. It now has "good relationships" with most of the other local organisations. For example, BRAG has supported Transfife Community Transport and the Manager of that organisation, who is also a local councillor, has been able to help BRAG. Other examples of mutuality are the relationships with Benarty Construction, Fife Day Care Services and with the local colleges
- The Board of BRAG is influential locally and the General Manager of Baynes Bakery (major local employer) is on the Board. It was reported that BRAG has tried to be inclusive, an example being when Michael O'Hare was invited onto the Board after he made public criticisms of BRAG when he was Chair of the Community Council.
- BRAG Enterprises has concentrated its activities in Benarty where it was founded. More recently the neighbouring town of Lochgelly has been added to the BRAG 'patch'. Some residents of Lochgelly feel that BRAG should expand its activities more into Lochgelly. The question is whether BRAG can have the same "sense" of commitment and belonging to Lochgelly as it has to Benarty and whether Lochgelly will see BRAG as theirs.

13.3 Analysis of the Social Capital Objectives

The two social capital objectives and the activities contributing to the objectives are common to all eight social audits carried out by the social enterprises in the UK, Germany, Spain and Sweden. They are:

To use social capital in sustaining our social enterprise by.....

- Using relations of trust with social economy and other organisations and with relevant individuals
- Engaging with social enterprises and other local organisations in order to receive help on a reciprocal and mutual basis
- Receiving support from a strong local network
- Using a sense of shared commitment and belonging to Benarty and Lochgelly
- Using shared values and norms of behaviour in the local social economy
- Using extensive information channels

To create and generate social capital for the benefit of the local community by....

- Building relations of trust with social economy and other organisations and with relevant individuals
- Engaging with social enterprises and other local organisations in order to offer

- help on a reciprocal and mutual basis
- Contributing to and supporting local networks
- Contributing to a sense of shared commitment and belonging to Benarty and Lochgelly
- Strengthening the shared values and norms of behaviour in the local social economy
- Building up information channels and sharing information

In analysing the responses from some of the stakeholder groups and in particular in the discussion on the six elements of social capital it was difficult to keep the two objectives separate. Therefore, in the more discursive analysis such as the notes from the bi-monthly meetings we shall combine the two objectives, while with the questionnaire responses we shall keep them separate.

In this section we shall consider each of the six factors in social capital separately ie.

- *trust* (Activity 1 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)
- *reciprocity and mutuality* (Activity 2 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)
- *formal and informal social networks* (Activity 3 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)
- *shared norms of behaviour* (Activity 4 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)
- *shared commitment and belonging* (Activity 5 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)
- *effective information channels* (Activity 6 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)

In doing so we will consider;

- the importance of the six factors as perceived locally by the stakeholders;
- how BRAG has used each of the six factors of social capital to sustain itself (Objective 1); and
- how BRAG has created and generated each of the six factors for the benefit of the local social economy (Objective 2)

13.3.1 Trust (Activity 1 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)

Trust is a qualitative concept and therefore difficult to assess quantitatively. It is also subjective and the levels of trust between individuals and organisations can vary in interpretation. BRAG uses and generates trust in most of its dealings with other organisations and individuals; and within its own staff. In forming trusting relationships it is able to utilise social capital (or are the trusting relationships the social capital?).

a) Quantitative Data/Narrative

An attempt was made to measure the level of trust used and created by BRAG staff by the number of contacts made by staff with other organisations. A Contacts Map was drawn up; the detailed results of which are included in Appendix 17 and summarised below. Four staff members were involved in this exercise including the senior staff.

Type of Contact	Total number of individual contacts	Total number of organisational/group contacts*	Regular Contact (more than 1x/month)	No. of these that are key contacts or key to other networks
Staff of DTS	9	0	9	9
BRAG Enterprise Board members	13	0	3	10
Sessional course tutors and advisers	10	5	10	8
Funders	8	1	2	7
Partner organisations	3	15	2	3
Other organisations	14	3	5	6
Trainees, clients and users (at the time)	0	8	7	1
Local contacts, organisations and businesses	17	7	4	3
Suppliers, media and regulatory	1	8	4	4
Tenants	0	27	18	2
Local social enterprises supported	0	13	8	4
Total	75	87	73	57

*Please note that within organisational groups contacts there may be a significant number of individual contacts.

The staff identified a total of 162 individuals or groups/organisations whom they have contact with; 73 of whom are "regular" (contact made more than once a month); with 57 contacts identified as "key".

It is not clear whether or not the number of contacts is an indication of trust, but it does illustrate a considerable number of contacts outside the organisation with a high proportion of them being seen to be key to the development of BRAG. This would seem to indicate that BRAG has "key" and trusting links, which it uses to develop its organisation.

Further notes were kept at this meeting and are included in Section 13.4.

b) Qualitative Data

Different stakeholders were asked in the questionnaires the degree to which they agreed with the given positive statements. Their response was recorded and analysed in the table below. (Key: 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree not disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; DK = Don't know)

Response to questions in the questionnaires						
There is a great deal of trust between organisations/community-based groups working in the Benarty and Lochgelly area	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			3	3		5
DTS Staff (9)			1	1		7
Board Members (4)			1		2	1
Partner Organisations (7)			2	2	1	2
Comments: None						
BRAG very much <u>uses</u> trust between itself and others in order to get things done (Social Capital Objective 1)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)		1		4	2	4
DTS Staff (9)			1	3	1	4
Board Members (4)					3	1
Partner Organisations (7)			1	4	2	
Comments: "More so relating to Benarty - Lochgelly issues are different...somehow being addressed through regeneration"						
BRAG <u>creates</u> trusting relations between itself and others (Social Capital Objective 2)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)		1	1	4	1	4
DTS Staff (9)				4	2	3
Board Members (4)					3	1
Partner Organisations (7)				4	3	
Comments: "I am not involved in any other organisation and cannot comment"						

(Key: 5 = very high; 4 = high; 3 = OK; 2 = Rather low; 1 = Very low; DK = Don't know or not applicable)

Response to Questions in the Interviews						
The level of Trust between our business/organisation and BRAG is...	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Tenants (15 - not including the social enterprises supported by BRAG)			1	8	4	2
Social Enterprises (6 - all supported by BRAG)				1	5	
The level of Trust between our business/organisation and others in BRAG premises is....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Social Enterprises (6)		2		4		

The tenants and social enterprises were asked to give examples of something that had happened or developed which is based on trust with BRAG and with other tenants or local social enterprises.

Examples of Trust between Tenants and BRAG:

The detailed quotes are available in Appendix 15 but by way of illustration here are two examples:

- BRAG staff have access to the tenant's premises and there is enough trust to ensure that BRAG will be trusted not to abuse this arrangement
- BRAG and the tenants generally have a trusting understanding that rent will be paid and that even though in some cases there is not yet a lease there is expectation on both sides based on trust.

During the course of the interviews it was noted that many of the tenants referred to the BRAG staff by name indicating that the trusting relationship seemed to be between individual personalities rather than between organisations.

Examples of Trust between Social Enterprises and BRAG:

From the interviews with the social enterprises it would appear that there has been considerable development assistance provided by BRAG to the local social enterprises. This direct assistance would appear to have helped develop trust between the organisations. Some examples are:

- BRAG assisted in the initiation of the local credit union and provided free meeting places, helped with funding applications and was always helpful and approachable.
- BRAG has provided equipment on a temporary basis to some of the social enterprises - trusting that it will be cared for and eventually returned.
- BRAG would appear to have been very accommodating about the payment of rent from some social enterprises. This would indicate a high degree of trust that it will be paid.

The illustrations and examples provided during the interviews stressed the personal trusting relationship between individuals and one interviewee said that "on a personal basis there is strong trust with BRAG". The credibility of the individual appears important and this credibility or trust seems dependent on the past experience of knowing and working with specific individuals.

Examples of Trust between Tenants and other Tenants:

During the interviews of the tenants it became clear that there were not many trusting relationships between tenants and the relationships that had developed varied considerably. One typical quote was - "(trust) varies according to how well you know people and how long - so high trust with some and low with others"

In general the trust between tenants is based on intermittent contacts between tenants and although they often ask each other to help out eg. by taking in mail, by asking neighbouring tenants to "look after" the premises during a temporary absence, temporarily not locking their doors; there is no clear evidence of strong, trusting relationships between tenants.

Examples of Trust between local Social Enterprises:

Trusting relationships would, however, appear to be more evident between social enterprises. Some examples of trust are:

- Several of the people who run social enterprises are involved in other community-based organisations. For example, the activist in the credit union is on the community council, the environmental group, the elderly forum and the neighbourhood watch. He therefore claimed that there were trusting relationships between all these organisations.
- There is trust between the community transport social enterprise and the local day-care organisations. Both organisations have co-operated and helped each other.

Interestingly, an example of mis-trust was given by one interviewee - but with a non-local social enterprise who they reported "left them in the lurch". This resulted in a threatened court case and a lot of bad feeling.

Funders Interviews:

During the interviews of funders, they were asked specifically about trust in relation to BRAG. Here are the main points:

- There was a feeling that in general there is an acrimonious atmosphere between organisations in Fife and "mistrust" is as evident as "trust".
- There was general agreement that trust was more obvious between individuals and not so strong between organisations. For example, the good relationship between East of Scotland European Partnership (ESEP) and BRAG is "underpinned" by the relationship between individuals.
- Trust is something that develops over time and is dependent on the successful results of work previously carried out.
- It was commented that BRAG has trustful relationships with Fife Council and other local social enterprises - but this can fluctuate depending on general atmosphere between the public and "third" sectors. In the last year the "officegate" inquiry in Fife has resulted in a less trusting climate.
- One funder wondered if some organisations are just "more astute at engaging with funders" and those are more likely to be trusted and thus more likely to obtain funding.
- Trust exists in varying degrees between funders and applicants for funding. Trust also varies over time.
- Trust between organisations is very dependent on "personalities" - they can get on or they can clash.
- The relationship between Fife Council and BRAG has varied over the years but has generally reflected relations between staff of the two organisations and the role of two active Board members who are also elected councillors.

- Partnership depends on trust but competition between funders (or between partners for funding) can prevent trust from developing. Therefore, partners need to be clear about the role of each organisation before trust can develop.
- One funder reported that BRAG is trusted to do what they said they would do; with more formal agreements coming later in the relationship. This is seen as having a trustworthy reputation. It is important therefore for an organisation to build a reputation for being trustworthy.

Bi-monthly Meetings with Senior Staff of BRAG:

During the bimonthly interviews the senior staff of BRAG were asked to provide examples of trust. A record was kept of the interviews and for confidential reasons is not included in Appendices. The following illustrative examples have been taken from the notes:

- BRAG staff have had to deal with students with depression and other problems and this requires building up a certain degree of trust between BRAG staff and the students.
- One problem with trainees led to criticisms of BRAG being voiced which created an atmosphere of distrust, although it has also led some Board members to emphasise their support and confidence in the way the problems had been handled. Trust can be fluid and fragile.
- At one point over the year problems led to the staff becoming less trustful of students despite trying to be understanding, flexible and supportive resulting in what staff described as an uneasy relationship. These are examples of mistrust where students are perceived to have "let down" the tutors as well as BRAG staff.
- Trust has been very important between BRAG and the local colleges, which have to trust BRAG to deliver the courses while BRAG has to trust them to provide reliable tutors. However, a more commercial competitive edge to the relationship has developed since BRAG became more successful. As a consequence, trust has maybe diminished and BRAG is not now so free in sharing information.
- BRAG has twice lent money interest-free to a local social enterprise to solve cash-flow problems, on one occasion agreeing the transaction in three hours. Each time there has been a proper loan agreement, but it is something that BRAG would not just do for any organisation. It is based on trust – knowing that the social enterprise would receive funds, having confidence in the organisation and the senior staff, and also knowing that the social enterprise would reciprocate in other ways.
- BRAG has trusted senior officials in Fife Council. However, trust was "lost" temporarily when BRAG became uncertain if they really were working on their behalf. However, after contacts and meetings, trust was restored. Trust is not static and it can be repaired!
- Within BRAG a great deal depends on trust between staff. There have been stresses arising from ambiguity over staff roles within the organisation, which caused increased pressure on staff. This was tackled by changes to roles and responsibilities but staff have to trust the senior staff to make it happen.

- One local social enterprise, which is also a tenant, trusted a previous manager of BRAG with an unwritten agreement regarding their tenancy. When that manager left it was not honoured (because it was not known about) and so caused friction and loss of trust. Informal deals arise through trust and would seem to create social capital but it can again be seen to depend on the individuals striking a deal rather than on the relationship between organisations. Changing the deal – or just not knowing about it - may destroy trust and damage social capital.

c) Commentary on Trust (Activity 1 in Social Capital Objective 1 and 2)

- The Contacts Map was an interesting but rather crude exercise to try to establish the degree of trust. The number of contacts was recorded and an indication of those that were key. It did not really describe the *level* or *depth* of contact. Despite this it did illustrate the wide range of contacts and the interdependency of BRAG with other organisations. It would appear that BRAG operates in co-operation with range of stakeholders - many of whom are considered to be *key*.
- Surprisingly, almost half the staff reported that they "didn't know" whether or not there was a great deal of trust between organisations working in the area. The partner organisations were also undecided although the Board members were slightly more emphatic.
- It would appear that a significant proportion of staff felt unqualified to comment on trust in relation to BRAG. This may be because their main contacts are internal or that they misunderstood the question.
- One staff member only was more sceptical than others were when it came to trust being used and created by BRAG Enterprises.
- The tenants tended to trust BRAG but not other tenants to the same degree. Social enterprises were more likely to trust each other.
- Trust would seem to exist between individuals and personalities and not so much between organisations.
- Trust would appear to develop from working relationships between individuals and is built up over time.
- There is a link between trust and reciprocity with organisations more willing to trust each other when there is an understanding that the other organisation has something to offer them.
- The wider context has an influence on the level of trust in a particular area. If the general atmosphere is trustful within a sector then organisations and individuals can use, and depend on that trust. If there is, however, a climate of mistrust within the sector, this is no longer the case.
- There may be a connection between being successful at applying for funds and the trust, which exists between the funder and the applicant.
- Having a reputation, as a trustful organisation is an important asset, but whereas reputations can be built on 'spin', trust can only be built on relationships, which have matured from mutual exchange and reciprocal benefit. However, just as reputations can be easily shattered, so trust can be quickly damaged if something

goes wrong. Worse, in the social economy it appears that trust damaged by one organisation can too easily spread to others.

- Trust is fragile and fluid. It can vary but it appears that it takes time to build up and be generated but it can be easily and quickly dented through criticism. There could be an analogy between trust and pushing a boulder up a hill - it takes time to push up but will fall back quickly.
- Competition between organisations can run counter to developing trustful relationships. It may be that trust can only flourish between organisations that are not in competition.
- The trust within BRAG as an organisation was not explored in detail with the staff. However, it would appear to be crucially important for the organisation as a whole and a lack of internal trust can affect effectiveness.
- From the consultations it is clear that BRAG and its staff *use and create* trust with other organisations.
- BRAG generates trust between itself and other social enterprises - especially organisations where there is a mutual understanding and reciprocal help.

13.3.2 Reciprocity and mutuality (Activity 2 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)

BRAG Enterprises forms reciprocal relationships with other organisations and individuals. This section will attempt to assess the nature of the reciprocal relationships and how they are created, generated and used.

a) Quantitative/Narrative

Reciprocity and mutuality is a qualitative concept but has a very practical manifestation, which may be tracked through practical examples of reciprocity and mutuality 'in action'.

b) Qualitative

Different stakeholders were asked in the questionnaires the degree to which they agreed with the given positive statements. Their response was recorded and analysed in the table below. (Key: 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree not disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; DK = Don't know)

Response to questions in the questionnaires						
In Benarty and Lochgelly there is a strong understanding that if one organisation helps another then this help will one day be returned	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			2	3	1	5
DTS Staff (9)				2	2	5
Board Members (4)				1	2	1
Partner Organisations (7)			1	1	2	3
Comments: None						
BRAG receives help and support from other local organisations. (Social Capital Objective 1)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)		1	2	3	2	3
DTS Staff (9)				1	2	6
Board Members (4)					3	1
Partner Organisations (7)				2	3	2
Comments: "This is the key to BRAG's success - why we are still here" (staff)						
Similarly BRAG offers help to other local organisations. (Social Capital Objective 2)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			2	3	3	3
DTS Staff (9)				2	3	4
Board Members (4)				1	3	
Partner Organisations (7)				3	3	1
Comments: "Requests for assistance are always treated with care and respect" (Board)						

The tenants and social enterprises were asked to give specific examples where

- they helped BRAG;
- BRAG helped them
- they help another tenant/social enterprise
- another tenant/social enterprise helped them

The full list of quoted examples from the interviews is included in Appendix 15.

Examples of Reciprocity and Mutuality between Tenants and BRAG (a and b):

There were a variety of reciprocal relationships between BRAG and the tenants - but in general they were relatively superficial. For example, helping out by refilling photocopier with ink and being allowed to use it; lending envelopes to each other; receiving packages for each other; making recommendations to clients about others' services, etc. Here are some examples of more substantial reciprocity:

- “The Council for Voluntary Services (CVS) Fife helped out during BRAG's open day by face painting, supervising the bouncy castle, offering information and advice to attendees; also helping with the photocopying. In return, BRAG lets us use the photocopier; we sometimes use the facilities and do not pay; BRAG helped us with the setting up of the office and installation of the computers; BRAG ordered the computers; and when we first moved in they helped to put up the noticeboard. In addition the Manager of BRAG is on the Board of CVS Fife.”
- One tenant gives financial advice to BRAG employees. In return the staff of BRAG physically helped the tenant move into his workspace.
- Another tenant takes BRAG trainees on work placements, which is of mutual benefit to both organisations.

In general there appears to be an unwritten but widely understood agreement between some tenants and BRAG to help each other for mutual benefit. BRAG is seen as being understanding and helpful which creates a *climate of mutuality* within the workspace.

Examples of Reciprocity and Mutuality between Tenants and other Tenants (c and d):

A few tenants were able to provide examples of mutuality between them and other tenants - but the majority of the instances were minor eg. recommending the services of each other, helping unload deliveries, etc. Typical examples given are

- one tenant recommended using the services of another tenant whom in turn recommended that their client used the café.
- some tenants help each other out with computer problems.

The instances of mutuality between tenants tend to be concentrated between tenants of long standing where they have become friendly with each other and built up a certain degree of trust.

Examples of Reciprocity and Mutuality between Social Enterprises and BRAG (a and b):

During the interviews it became evident that there were a greater number of examples where BRAG and the local social enterprises have helped each other. Here are some examples:

- The manager of one social enterprise gives BRAG political support and in return BRAG staff have helped with that social enterprise's constitution, funding applications, customer questionnaires, etc. It was stressed that this relationship

was between two individuals who had known and trusted each other over a long period of time.

- Another social enterprise helps BRAG with favourable quotes, helps physically with moving furniture and unloading deliveries, and generally is on hand to help out. In return, BRAG has helped with management advice, funding application, legal structures, etc.

There would appear to be considerably more examples of mutuality between BRAG and the community of local social enterprises, than between BRAG and the tenants of the workspaces.

Examples of Reciprocity and Mutuality between Social Enterprises and other Social Enterprises (c and d):

During the interviews a number of examples of mutuality were described. For example:

- One social enterprise helps another by providing workshop facilities and allows them to use their tools. In return the other social enterprise is at hand to help with physical labour.
- Another social enterprise helped deliver furniture for another while receiving help on funding applications from another social enterprise.

It was interesting to note that the examples provided suggest a multi-lateral web of mutual help and not only bi-lateral assistance between two organisations. There is also a sense that within Benarty, BRAG is very much at the hub of this network of mutual assistance. Interviewees mentioned examples of mutuality within a wider network of social enterprises and not only those located in the local area.

Funders Interviews:

During the interviews with funders, they were asked specifically about reciprocity and mutuality in relation to BRAG. Here are the main points:

- Senior staff members of BRAG attend an Advisory Group and contribute their time and expertise for no monetary award. In return, the agency "would go the extra mile for BRAG".
- Another admitted that they have more direct links with some organisations than others. These links are often reciprocal and visitors are directed to those organisations where a strong relationship has been developed as they can be trusted to make the visit worthwhile for the visitors.
- BRAG serves on various Advisory and other Groups and contributes its expertise and knowledge which is valued. Inevitably, agency personnel get to know the BRAG staff better. It was suggested that such reciprocal relationships between funder and the funded are not that common.
- More joint work between funders and BRAG can lead towards greater trust and to more reciprocity, even to new project opportunities, thus strengthening even further contacts and networks.

Bi-monthly Meetings with Senior Staff of BRAG:

During the bimonthly interviews the senior staff of BRAG were asked to provide examples of reciprocity and mutuality. A record was kept of the interviews and for reasons of confidentiality is not included in the Appendices. These notes have been used to provide the following illustrative examples:

- Staff at one social enterprise have helped BRAG with negotiations with the Council over the purchase of the Crosshill site; and BRAG in turn has helped them with cash flow problems and unsecured loans.
- The manager of a social enterprise who happens to be a councillor helped sort out a problem over disability access regarding the leasing of a BRAG property to a Council Department. In a display of mutuality BRAG staff went to Hexham with the manager to help with a presentation on community transport.
- One social enterprise did work at short notice at the Grainger Street workspace to help out BRAG, who in turn had allowed them to have some advance payment on earlier work as a sort of "credit" in respect of other work. Occasionally this social enterprise will do bits of work free of charge because they know that BRAG will put other work their way in future.
- BRAG helped one social enterprise with a funding application for the New Futures Fund. If the application is successful then the social enterprise (who is also a tenant) will be able to pay their rent as they are "about a year" in rent arrears.
- There is a reciprocal arrangement with the Community Schools Initiative which donated 3 computers to the internet café and BRAG will publicise the initiative.

c) Commentary on Reciprocity and Mutuality (Activity 2 in Social Capital Objective 1 and 2)

- BRAG works to create a 'climate of mutuality', especially amongst the local social enterprises and can be seen at the centre of a mutual web, especially as regards those social enterprises located at Crosshill Workspace.
- The level of reciprocity and mutuality appears to be higher between BRAG and the other social enterprises rather than between BRAG and the tenants and higher between the social enterprises than between the other tenants.
- The 'climate of mutuality' was evidenced by the number of examples that were volunteered to illustrate how social enterprises and tenants helps out each other. It would be interesting to compare with another workspace that is managed by a private sector company.
- The level of reciprocity and mutuality appears to be highest between individuals who have been friendly longest.
- BRAG has used reciprocity and mutuality to telling effect with external agencies (especially funders) in order to sustain and develop itself.
- There would appear, however, to be scope for BRAG to build greater mutuality between social enterprises and workspace tenants and between social enterprises more widely in the area who are not tenants of BRAG.

- The level of mutuality and reciprocal help would appear high within the "web" of social enterprises.
- It is especially note-worthy that between social enterprises mutual help is sometimes multi-lateral and not just bilateral.
- BRAG has used its political contacts particularly well. Arguably, this can only be sustained where there is a sense of reciprocal help and mutual benefit.
- As with the results from the questions about trust, a high proportion of staff "didn't" know" about the level of reciprocity and mutuality in the area. This is surprising and suggests that staff do not understand fully how this is an important aspect of the BRAG approach. One member of staff however felt that this overt reciprocity was the "key to BRAG's success - why we are still here".
- Board members and partner organisations recognised that BRAG receives help from and offers help to other local organisations.

13.3.3 Formal and informal support networks (Activity 3 of Social Capital Objective 1 and 2)

BRAG uses formal and informal support networks all the time. This section will attempt to assess the nature of these networks and how they are created, generated and used.

a) Quantitative Data/Narrative

It had been intended that BRAG senior staff keep Activity Logs for the period of the social audit to record in detail contacts with different stakeholder groups. Although the staff recognised the potential value of this and found it useful to the extent they did keep these logs, in practice they were not kept up to date continuously or comprehensively. Therefore the incomplete information has not been analysed and is not included in these Draft Social Accounts.

b) Qualitative

Different stakeholders were asked in the questionnaires the degree to which they agreed with the positive statements. Their response was recorded and analysed in the table below. (Key: 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree not disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; DK = Don't know)

Response to questions in the questionnaires						
In Benarty and Lochgelly there is a strong support network for local organisations	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			2	2		7
DTS Staff (9)				3		6
Board Members (4)					3	1
Partner Organisations (7)				3	2	2
Comments: None						
BRAG has built up and uses support from a wide network of contacts. (Social Capital Objective 1)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			2	3	4	2
DTS Staff (9)				2	2	5
Board Members (4)				1	3	
Partner Organisations (7)				3	4	
Comments: None						
BRAG is active in supporting networks in the area that help other organisations. (Social Capital Objective 2)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			3	3	3	2
DTS Staff (9)				3	1	5
Board Members (4)				1	3	
Partner Organisations (7)				2	4	1
Comments: None						

Response to questions in the questionnaires	
Tenants	
Formal support networks...	Yes 8 No 7

Examples: CVS Fife, SCVO, Fife Council, Fife Community Development Network; Fife Enterprise - Careers; Scottish Enterprise Fife; Fife Women in Business Group; Federation of Small Businesses; Caledonian Association of Independent Medical Practitioners; Childcare Partnership; Scottish independent Nurseries Association (SINA); Fife Council Education Services; New Community Schools Steering Group; Main Euroresin office		
Receive support from BRAG	Yes 5	No 10
Examples: See above; reduced rent; BRAG put posters up and advertised on Rascal's behalf		
Receive support from other tenants	Yes 1	No 14
Examples: See reciprocity and mutuality above		
Give support to BRAG	Yes 6	No 9
Examples: See above "We helped (an active Board member of BRAG) with 200 posters inviting people to a Remembrance Day" "Practical bits of help if asked" "Took on trainees (on behalf of BRAG)" "Tenants are not allowed to be members of BRAG"		
Give support to other tenants	Yes 4	No 11
Examples: See above "We have to keep our trainees away from other tenants as they will get blamed for things" "Practical bits of help given when asked" "There used to be a Tenants Association - the (previous) manager put a stop to it"		
Social Enterprises		
Formal support networks	Yes 4	No 2
Examples: Scottish League of Credit Unions (previously ABCUL); Childcare Network, Fife Childcare Partnership, CVS Fife, Transfife; Matrix and FACET (similar organisations for disabled people); Federation of Small Businesses, Community Transport Association, Association of Community? in Fife, CVS Fife		
Receive support from BRAG	Yes 6	No 0
Examples "See before; 100s of ways BRAG has helped - Would not be here without BRAG" "BRAG very supportive over the last 8 years. Personally they can assist you in many ways" "Know that BRAG are there and will help if asked"		
Receive support from other social enterprises	Yes 4	No 2
Examples: "There is no Tenants Association" "There used to be a Tenants Association but tended to be petty bickering; now there is no integration between tenants; BRAG Newsletter?"		
Give support to BRAG	Yes 6	No 0

Examples: "We quote low for everyone including BRAG" "Take on New Deal clients"		
Give support to other social enterprises	Yes 5	No 1
Examples: "We also offer advice to new credit unions wanting to start up" "(another social enterprise) asked for help in moving in; we feel relaxed about asking other social enterprises" "Links with (other social enterprise) trainees"		

Funders Interviews:

The main point from the interviews with funders regarding formal and informal social networks was:

- There is a blurring of the six social capital factors and social networks are maintained particularly by developing trust and reciprocity/mutuality.

Bi-monthly Meetings with Senior Staff of BRAG:

During the bimonthly interviews the senior staff of BRAG provided examples of formal and informal social networks.

There is a wide range of formal and informal social contacts with a seemingly endless array of examples of how BRAG staff have used these contacts and expand their networks. There is recognition amongst the senior staff of BRAG and amongst the key Board members that networking with other organisations is important for the development of the organisation. Therefore there is a "culture" of wanting to expand social networks. Here are a limited number of examples of social networking:

- BRAG and CVS Fife work closely together – especially the CVS support team for the voluntary sector. Referrals go in both directions and staff from both organisations share values and a sense of what they are seeking to achieve. Therefore, there is close and constant networking and a sharing of information and knowledge. Trust, shared values, reciprocity, networking and information sharing all come together in the relationship between the two bodies.
- Senior staff of BRAG have developed contacts with staff from the Scottish Executive and other public sector agencies and sit on various committees. Building these networks benefits BRAG and also BRAG is able to benefit the agencies from time to time – it is a two-way process.
- But there is also a third dimension and that concerns the way BRAG makes its networks available to other local social enterprises who maybe do not have the time to devote to extensive networking
- BRAG has also developed close links with social economic networks, most notably Senscot, CBS Network and the School for Social Entrepreneurs.
- Small Business Gateway had a recent event and BRAG staff "lent a hand". DTS did a call around inviting people to come to the event, which produced a positive response. In fact 30 people attended the event and DTS staff were

complimented on their professionalism. On the day BRAG staff "mucked in" allowed them to use the conference room, helped with meeting and greeting, etc.

In essence, BRAG Enterprise has "loads of informal networks" and sees it as important to build bridges with other organisations. It adopts a policy of being open with information and sharing information. Senior staff in BRAG attend a significant number of forums and networks – formal and informal – as part of their job.

Contacts Map:

Please refer to the previous section analysing the data from the Contacts Map.

c) Commentary on Formal and Informal Support Networks (Activity 3 in Social Capital Objective 1 and 2)

- The Staff, DTS Staff, Board Members and Partner Organisations agree that there is a social network of supportive contacts within the area and that BRAG uses these networks and is active in supporting the networks.
- The DTS staff, again, show that they are "one step removed" from an understanding of the locality and an understanding of the workings of BRAG. This is indicated by the relatively high proportion of "don't know" answers. In some ways this is not surprising as the DTS Services is relatively new, employing young people, and with offices in Lochgelly separated from the 'heart' of BRAG at Crosshill Workspace.
- Most of the tenants admitted to having formal support networks; some receiving support from BRAG; with only one saying they had received support from other tenants. Six felt they had given support to BRAG and 4 stated they had supported other tenants.
- On the other hand social enterprises are much more mutually connected. Two thirds said they had formal support networks; all six felt they received support from BRAG and gave BRAG support; two thirds said they had received support from other social enterprises and five out of six stated they gave support to other social enterprises.
- Social networking is more important and more readily evident amongst social enterprises than among tenants who are not social enterprises.
- Trust, reciprocity/mutuality and social networks are all interconnected while trust is perceived to be essential it can be argued that without social networks trust does not have the chance to develop. In other words, through networks people meet and develop relationships in which trust builds.
- BRAG staff appear to have prioritised the development of social networks and recognise their importance in the survival and further development of their organisation. They seem to be particularly good at using and generating social networks and they invest considerable time in networking. Not all social enterprises are able to do that.
- BRAG staff have been invited to participate in local partnership organisations and through these contacts they have widened their network of local contacts.

13.3.4 Sense of belonging and commitment (Activity 4 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)

BRAG is located in a disadvantaged area in Fife. It was started by local people in an attempt to counter social and economic decline. It is owned and controlled by local people and is therefore committed to the local area and the local residents. This section will attempt to gauge how much BRAG uses and generates this sense of belonging and commitment to the Benarty and Lochgelly area.

a) Quantitative Data/Narrative

No quantitative data relevant to this activity was collected.

b) Qualitative

Different stakeholders were asked in the questionnaires the degree to which they agreed with the positive statements. Their response was recorded and analysed in the table below. (Key: 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; DK = Don't know)

Response to questions in the questionnaires						
Generally amongst local organisations, there is a strong sense of belonging to Benarty and Lochgelly and commitment to the development of the area	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			1	5	1	4
DTS Staff (9)				2	1	6
Board Members (4)				1	3	
Partner Organisations (7)			1	1	4	1
Comments: None						
This sense of belonging and commitment assists BRAG in its development and in its work (Social Capital Objective 1)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)		1	1	4	2	3
DTS Staff (9)			1	2	2	4
Board Members (4)				1	3	
Partner Organisations (7)				2	3	1
Comments: None						
BRAG contributes to this sense of local belonging and commitment (Social Capital Objective 2)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)		1	1	5	1	3
DTS Staff (9)			1	1	1	6
Board Members (2)				2	2	
Partner Organisations (7)			1	2	3	1
Comments: "Knowledge of BRAG can be a bit "patchy" with clients outwith the immediate area eg. Cardenden, Kinglassie, Glenrothes"						

(Key: 5 = very high; 4 = high; 3 = OK; 2 = Rather low; 1 = Very low; DK = Don't know or not applicable)

Response to Questions in the Interviews						
Business/organisation is strongly rooted in Benarty/Lochgelly?	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Tenants (15)	2	3	1	3	6	
Social Enterprises (6)				3	3	
Business/organisation committed to working for the benefit of Benarty/Lochgelly?	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Tenants (15)	3	3	3	2	4	
Social Enterprises (6)			1		5	
Selected Comments:						
".... and several volunteers went round the street to get support. Kids Come First (KCF) started in 1996 and re-employed the two core workers but at less money; - this is a very close knit community and local extended families tends to care for the kids"						
"We have 550 members from all over including Edinburgh" (Benarty Improvement Group)						

Funders Interviews:

The main points from the interviews of funders regarding a sense of belonging and commitment to the area were:

- Funders noted that there appeared to be a strong sense of belonging within the BRAG staff and the impression was one of commitment to the area.
- Fife appears to have a "very co-ordinated approach to making funding applications" and this would suggest that local organisations talk to each other and are committed to the area.

Bi-monthly Meetings with Senior Staff of BRAG:

During the bimonthly interviews the senior staff of BRAG were asked to provide examples of a sense of belonging and commitment. The main points are:

- The majority of BRAG staff are from the area or live nearby and BRAG has a reputation of keeping its staff which would indicate that staff do have a long-term commitment to the area and to the work they do.
- BRAG has survived for more than ten years in the area and brothers, sisters, and parents have gone to past courses, etc. organised by BRAG.
- BRAG is very much seen as committed to Benarty – not Benarty and Lochgelly. There is allegedly less of a sense of community in Lochgelly; but equally BRAG was started by Benarty folk for Benarty and has only recently included Lochgelly in its area of benefit.
- BRAG has helped several local social enterprises with funding applications, which illustrates a commitment to the development of the area.
- BRAG facilities were offered to the Gala as a place for the football team to change and as a wet weather venue for prize distribution - an example of BRAG acting with a sense of belonging and being part of the community fabric.
- BRAG held an Open Day linked to the launch of the internet café on 31/08 for local people, local organisations and others. 50 – 60 people attended and the official agenda went well with a "good press".

c) Commentary on the sense and belonging and commitment (Activity 4 in Social Capital Objective 1 and 2)

- Any resident in the Benarty and Lochgelly area may join BRAG as a member. However the current membership stands at around 30. This is low for a social enterprise, which considers it to be community-owned and controlled.
- Although the senior staff of BRAG do not live immediately locally, most of the Board members and other staff members do so.
- The majority of the staff, Board members and partner organisations who answered the questionnaires believe that there is a strong sense of belonging and commitment in the area. However the number of "Don't Knows" from staff and DTS employees is again significant.
- Most of the stakeholders who responded feel that BRAG is assisted by this sense of belonging and that BRAG also contributes to the sense and feeling of commitment to the area.
- Nearly all the social enterprises feel that their organisations are strongly rooted in the local area and committed to the development of the area; while there was a broader range of responses from the tenants. This may reflect a difference between community enterprises and private enterprise.
- The funders, who are generally outside agencies, believe that the social enterprises operating in Fife have a strong sense of belonging and commitment to the area.
- Being a community-based enterprise, BRAG uses this sense of belonging and commitment to the area. By being located in the area and having survived for a decade it has been and is contributing to the area's development. It is seen as very much rooted in Benarty and this may prove to be counter productive in its move to provide services in Lochgelly. The perception will be that BRAG is a Benarty organisation.
- Through the provision of services in the area, BRAG is committed to the area and has a sense of belonging there. The senior staff are conscious of BRAG's status as a *community* enterprise and organise events and strategic plans that recognise this fact. However, it appears that its "rooted-ness" in the area may have weakened in recent years as BRAG has moved to focus more on delivering services and securing the funding for its sustainability. Perhaps community involvement and commitment is more essential during the struggle to start up than during the work to survive and be sustainable. Or perhaps local roots wither without nourishment.

13.3.5 Shared values and norms of behaviour (Activity 5 of Social Capital Objective 1 and 2)

BRAG shares values with neighbouring organisations and others. Locally there are norms of behaviour within the current population. This section examines how BRAG uses, promulgates and generates these values and norms in order to operate more successfully and thus encouraging local development.

a) Quantitative Data/Narrative

No quantitative data was collected relevant to this activity.

b) Qualitative

Different stakeholders were asked in the questionnaires the degree to which they agreed with the positive statements. Their response was recorded and analysed in the table below. (Key: 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; DK = Don't know)

Response to questions in the questionnaires						
Generally speaking most local organisations in Benarty and Lochgelly share the same overall values	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			2	4	1	4
DTS Staff (9)				1		8
Board Members (4)					3	1
Partner Organisations (7)				5	1	1
Comments: None						
BRAG bases its work and its behaviour on those shared values (Social Capital Objective 1)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			2	4	1	4
DTS Staff (9)				3	1	5
Board Members (4)					3	1
Partner Organisations (7)			1	3	2	1
Comments: None						
The work and the staff of BRAG strengthen the sense of shared values between the organisations in the area (Social Capital Objective 2)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)		1		4	1	5
DTS Staff (9)		1	1	1	1	5
Board Members (4)				1	2	1
Partner Organisations (7)				1	4	2
Comments: None						
Response to Questions in the Interviews						
Which of the following value statements would the business/organisation agree with?	Tenants (15)		Social Enterprises (6)			
Being a democratic organisation	10		4			
Giving/making socially useful services/products	12		6			
Having respect for economic, social, cultural and environmental aspects of life.	12		3			
Working for the Common Good	11		5			

Supporting the Community	12	5	
Working in co-operation	12	5	
Being socially inclusive offering equal opportunities	11	5	
Being focused on people rather than profits	11	6	
Other	0	0	
Don't know	2	0	
Comments: "Other people worry about profits - I just do the work!" "Equal opportunities to people that are socially excluded including the disabled; lots of people in the area but they are "wooden" - not as well educated"			
Share similar values to BRAG?			
Tenants (15)	Yes 11	No 1	DK 3
Social Enterprises (6)	Yes 6	No 0	DK 0

Funders Interviews:

The main points from the interviews of funders regarding shared values and norms of behaviour are:

- One funder reported that BRAG is seen as a model of a local development agency with a strong value base.
- It was commented that "you tend to trust those people who share the same values as you" and that the senior staff of BRAG "seem to have bought into BRAG".
- Values of an organisation are often seen to be underestimated but are important in the direction that the organisation takes.
- Although funders often refer to applicants as "partners" and thus sharing common values, this is not always the case. The relationship can break down if the recipient of the funding "does not deliver".
- One funder commented that they "should share the same values" as the applicant as they are both committed to the ultimate beneficiary but that this sense of common values is often lost.
- The social economy is becoming more recognised and understood and this appears to be linked with an understanding of the values of the social economy.
- One funder commented that organisations have to share values "to be able to work together for mutual benefit". This understanding of shared values can be strengthened through the flow of information and contacts.

Bi-monthly Meetings with Senior Staff of BRAG:

During the bimonthly interviews the senior staff of BRAG were asked to provide examples of shared values and norms of behaviour. The main points are:

- The senior staff of BRAG were asked why they are working for BRAG as both gave up relatively secure positions with Fife Council. They said that they had a vision for BRAG and liked working directly with community organisations. One said that working for BRAG "felt right - as it brings together all the things that I had done before." However, others had felt they had taken a "step down" in moving to a social enterprise.

- An example of *not* sharing values arose in the negotiations to purchase of the Crosshill site which led to misunderstandings between BRAG and that part of the Council and to a temporary diminution of trust.
- BRAG shares norms and values with most local social enterprises as they have a commonality of approach. One, which operates more as a private sector business, tends to collaborate less.
- Where BRAG does share the same values as social enterprises it is able to support them: for example assisting the local credit union with a funding bid (which was successful!) to Fife Council.

c) Commentary on the shared values and norms of behaviour (Activity 5 in Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)

- During the consultation process it was very difficult to get people to understand the meaning of shared "values" and "norms of behaviour". To some it appears a rather trite question; to others it is unspecific and ambiguous.
- There was a particularly high number of "don't knows" amongst the DTS staff when asked about values. However, stakeholders generally felt that most local organisations in the area shared much the same values; and that BRAG both makes use of sharing of values and at the same time contributes by strengthening the "shared sense of values".
- The questions asking tenants and social enterprises about which values they agreed with were not successful with most people agreeing with the majority of the value statements. The aim had been to see if certain values were more likely to be held in common than others and to see if there was a significant difference between social enterprises and other tenants. It was interesting that all six social enterprises agreed with the statements about "giving/making socially useful products/services" and "being focused on people rather than profits". Both these statements are at the heart of being a social enterprise.
- Nearly all the tenants and all the social enterprises stated that they shared the same values of BRAG.
- The actual values of BRAG were however not explored in any depth.
- The interviews with funders contributed to the debate on shared values. One commented that BRAG was seen to have a strong value base.
- In the consultations there was recognition that "shared values" are important in the development process but that what exactly these values are was left open to interpretation.
- Shared values and norms of behaviour are a very and increasingly important aspect of social enterprise. The basis of social enterprises is to be found in the values that they hold, but these are often implicit rather than explicit or at best understated and seldom explored. Shared values may indeed be a key to social capital. People and organisations who share values, who share a way of thinking are more likely to make trusting, reciprocal relationships and engage in mutual assistance.

13.3.6 Information Channels (Activity 6 of Social Capital Objectives 1 and 2)

BRAG uses information channels in its day-to-day work. It also is a channel for information to local people. This section will examine the extent of the channels and to what degree they are used and developed.

a) Quantitative Data/Narrative

It had been intended to record incidences of obtaining and giving information through the activity logs but this element of the social book-keeping did not happen.

Analysis of the Contacts Map is covered in Activity 1.

b) Qualitative

Different stakeholders were asked in the questionnaires the degree to which they agreed with the positive statements. Their response was recorded and analysed in the table below. (Key: 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; DK = Don't know)

Response to questions in the questionnaires						
In Benarty and Lochgelly accessing information which helps local organisations develop is not a problem	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			1	4	1	5
DTS Staff (9)				3		6
Board Members (4)			2		1	1
Partner Organisations (7)		1	3		1	2
Comments: None						
BRAG makes good use of sources of information to help develop its work (Social Capital Objective 1)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			3	3	3	2
DTS Staff (9)				1	2	6
Board Members (4)				1	3	
Partner Organisations (7)				2	4	1
Comments: None						
BRAG assists other organisations access information and readily shares the information it receives (Social Capital Objective 2)	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Staff (11)			1	6	1	3
DTS Staff (9)				1	2	6
Board Members (4)				1	3	
Partner Organisations (7)				2	3	2
Comments: None						
Response to Questions in the Interviews						
When you need information where do you turn to?	Tenants		Social Enterprises			
BRAG			5			4
Fife Council			3			3
Local councillor			1			2

Family	5	1
Friends	6	1
Scottish Enterprise	4	
CVS Fife	1	2
Local newspapers	4	
Other.....	See below	1
Don't know	1	
Other organisations: SCVO, CVS Scotland; London Chamber of Commerce and Industry; SEF Information Service; Fife Women's Business Group; Federation of Small Businesses; Solicitor; Internet; Yellow Pages; Fife Business Directory; Small Business Gateway; business reps.; Caledonian Association of Independent Medical Practitioners; telephone directory; Childcare Partnership (on their Board); Euroresin main office; Scottish League of Credit Unions		
Comments: "Depends on the problem" (4) "Go to different groups for different things"		

Generally, can business/organisation always find the information needed?		
Tenants (15)	Yes 15	No 0
Social Enterprises (6)	Yes 5	No 1
What cannot be found? "BRAG are very helpful and can put you on to some-else" "Not always - go to CVS"		
Willingly share information with other people?		
Tenants (15)	Yes 15	No 0
Social Enterprises (6)	Yes 6	No 0
If yes some examples? "Sharing information all the time" (3) "We are a service provider" "Skillseekers: told the Women's Small Business Group about them and discovered a member of the group deals with skillseekers and she talked about them to the groups" "Really only about financial services ie. about his own business" "Would be willing to share knowledge about tax - if anyone came chapping on the door" "But it depends on who...." "When people starting a nursery they often get advice from Rascals - signposting role" "We share our vision statement with community services, staff services and try to promote the project" "We share information with people wanting to start credit unions - we can give figures but not information on members; we often receive visitations from groups from Dunfermline, Cowdenbeath, Dundee, Rosyth, and individuals" "Other After School Clubs from Kelty and Rosyth; also other schools come and visit" "Willing to share as long as people do not abuse it" "Known as the person who knows about disabilities eg. benefits, etc." "Sharing information on opportunities, resources and fore-knowledge; networking with others; good communication and good understanding (don't go to conferences)" "If we do not know will signpost people"		

Funders Interviews:

The main point from the interviews of funders regarding information channels was:

- Most funders thought that BRAG appears to use information channels "rather well".

Bi-monthly Meetings with Senior Staff of BRAG:

During the bimonthly interviews the senior staff of BRAG were asked to provide examples of information channels. The main points are:

- BRAG staff know where to go for information and have no problem in accessing the information they need for the development and sustainability of BRAG.
- It is part of the BRAG way to share information with others, especially local social enterprises and it appears that BRAG plays an important role in this respect. Many of the examples of reciprocal work quoted were to do with making use of information held or obtained by BRAG.
- BRAG holds information at reception eg. leaflets, council brochures, etc. and Day by day there is a constant flow of information coming in to BRAG and flowing out.

c) Commentary on the information channels (Activity 6 in Social Capital Objective 1 and 2)

- This is the one element in the definition of social capital that seems to stand alone and is different from the others in that it is not to do with relations between people and shared thinking. Having access to information comes from effective networking and sharing information comes from a willingness to do that because of trusting relationships and a climate which encourages reciprocal and mutual help between organisations.
- Half of the Partner organisations and half of the Board members who responded were uncertain whether organisations generally did have good access to information.
- There was general agreement amongst stakeholders that BRAG makes good use of information channels and readily shares information with others.
- The majority of local social enterprises supported would turn to BRAG for information; while the tenants get their information from a wider variety of sources.
- Most tenants and social enterprises are able to find out the information they need and all say they are willing to share it (along with examples of how they share it).
- BRAG is seen as an organisation that uses information well - in a similar way that it is seen to be good at networking.

13.4 Other Views of the Stakeholders on Social Capital

This section includes comments made during the consultation process about social capital in general. It includes points of view and opinions that did not fit easily under any of the six elements of social capital. It also includes some observations made by the CBS Network researchers.

13.4.1 Views of the Staff from the Bimonthly Meetings

- Trust seems to be at the root of it all and therefore the most important factor while networking tends to happen most with people who are trusted. But do we trust (and network) most with the people we meet most often? If this were so, it would imply that BRAG is closer to the social enterprises based at Crosshill than to others - and therefore trusts them more.
- Is the level of trust affected by the success or otherwise of reciprocal help? Perhaps doing things for people and following it through is what creates trust – it is much more than just “contacts”.
- BRAG has tended to focus on external contacts developing trust (“charm offensives” but followed through by action) rather than internal contacts and communication. Thus they have become strong on external “bridging” social capital but have not concentrated on maintaining such strong internal “bonding” social capital.
- Personal contacts and trust happen between people rather than between organisations as such.
- Information channels is the odd one out of the six elements. It is hard to differentiate between the remaining five social capital elements and the more you study them the more you see them interacting and blurring the one into the others. Although it seems that trust is most important, it can be seen that trust, in turn, depends on the other elements.
- Much happens on an informal level – chance meetings, a chat on the phone, informal contacts – and it is hard to record this for research purposes. It also depends on style and approach – some people are more “tuned” to chatting and sharing information (along with gossip?) Apparently unproductive chat can be good for building social capital.
- People make an organisation successful and success is specific to an organisation (its reputation). But the failure of one organisation within a sector can adversely affect the whole “sector”. In this sense trust (and social capital) can be fragile.
- The Contacts Map will never be fully comprehensive as there are always new contacts being made.

13.4.2 Views from the Staff at the Contacts Map Meeting

- Staff found it difficult to name the “top” 10 people who are crucial to BRAG but recognised that there are two crucial areas – *funding* and *political support*.
- BRAG is accountable to customers, trainees and tenants but the “longer established you are, the less you concentrate on accountability to the local

community". The "community" is not as crucial now as it once was when BRAG was a campaigning organisation seeking to establish a local mechanism to tackle unemployment. Now, BRAG is more of a service provider, contracted largely to the public sector.

- Although the staff claim that BRAG is not "funding driven" funders are now more important than users. The "trust and reciprocity" now is mainly with funders; less so with users; and less again with the local community. But when BRAG started it was centred around trust with the local community and in representing them to the funders.
- BRAG is now working with young people – when BRAG started it was mainly working with older people who had lost their jobs.
- The Manager is crucial to the development of BRAG. The values and priorities of the manager can influence the focus of the organisation as well as the context in which it operates, in particular the "funders' role is crucial as they can dictate whether or not BRAG succeeds". Recently the political agenda has changed and there is now much more policy thinking about the social economy.

13.4.3 Additional Views of the Board Members (from the Board questionnaire)

- "There would appear to be little interest from the public in the area. This is not the fault of the Board or BRAG employees. The apathy that prevails in most communities is reflected in the poor turnout when electing local council representatives. BRAG and its objectives are not fully understood or appreciated. Who has the answer to this?"
- "I believe BRAG has progressed over the years. The organisation has grown beyond anyone's dreams. The training college links are vital to our progress. More input is required from younger people."

13.4.4 Additional Views of the Social Enterprises (comments from the questionnaires)

- "The whole of social capital depends a lot on personal contacts and not between organisations"
- "BRAG is good at what they do: glad the area had BRAG; some people get jobs again through BRAG; learning on our doorstep - makes it easier for people; would like to see them doing more"

13.4.5 Views of the Partner Organisations (from the questionnaires)

- "While our experience has been very positive in all aspects of our joint relationship, we have not sufficient experience to answer a number of the questions. My "impression" is that the contribution made to the local economy would be valuable and positive."
- "The regeneration of Lochgelly and the wider area is an ideal opportunity for BRAG, the council and its partners and the community to build on the work already being done in the area."

14 Main Issues on the Social Capital Objectives

14.1 Main Issues

General

The six elements of social capital fall into three categories.

- **trust, social networks** and **reciprocity/mutuality** are about relationships *between* individuals and organisations;
- **shared values, norms of behaviour** and **shared commitment and belonging** are about more than one individual and/or organisation *sharing* values or a way of thinking about certain issues; and
- **effective information channels** allowing individuals and organisations to access information from outside and within a community or an organisation.

The sixth element – information channels – is fundamentally different from the others in that it is not to do with how people or organisations relate to each other or understand each other. It is about knowing the way around a system and being able to acquire information. That is an essential prerequisite for development and action and therefore for the development of a healthy community. But having access to information can be seen as something, which flows, as a positive result of the other five elements of social capital, especially social networks, knowing whom to contact and having the connections, which make contacts possible. In the following paragraphs most of the discussion is therefore about the **five** elements of social capital.

The five elements of social capital are interlinked. It is difficult to separate one element from another. Together they generate a sense of community, which is "a web of relationships defined by a significant level of mutual care and commitment". (Prove It, New Economics Foundation publication). For example, one person makes friendly contact with another which leads to mutual trust between them resulting in turn in a reciprocal understanding which may lead to further social contacts and so on.

The measurement of social capital is not easy. This is largely because the definition tends to be rather "woolly" and each of the elements is qualitative and open to subjective interpretation. This project made an attempt to measure the level of social capital used and generated by BRAG.

There appears to be a "hierarchy" of the five elements with trust being the most important. For example, social contacts are made through networks; people then tend to work with others and organisations who share the same values (norms of behaviour and sense of belonging/commitment); this may then lead on to working together. But without trust none of this may develop and certainly not reciprocity. For the maintenance of social capital, trust is over-ridingly important. When it breaks down social capital is noticeably depleted. But, at the same time, the creation of trust depends on people meeting other people and this is achieved through social networks. The community with few community organisations is likely to be low in social capital simply because people do not meet.

This research shows that social capital is strong between individuals but not so evident between organisations. Or rather that social capital between organisations depends on relations between individuals representing the organisations. Thus, if a key person leaves an organisation, social capital in relation to other organisations is likely to decline but not necessarily to disappear.

In examining social capital it would seem that "history" is crucially important. The level of social capital within a community may be determined by the historical development of the community which has set the pattern of what is seen in that community to be normal. For example, the close communities in Fife which originally were based on the mining industry have developed a strong sense of mutual trust manifest in a robust trade union tradition and in many social and sports clubs. Traces of this social capital are still evident despite that fact that the mines have all closed and the area has suffered economic and social decline. In particular, it can be seen from the scoping study interviews that social capital was very actively used to get BRAG up and running.

Social capital is also determined by the context in which it operates and the prevailing attitudes of local authorities and other influences. This is especially important in the development of the social economy. The overall political and statutory "climate" may be more conducive to the development of the social economy in one area, while not so accommodating and understanding in another. In the creation of BRAG the role of the local authority and the role of Community Business Fife was very important.

Linked to this is the crucial role that local politicians played in the setting up and maintaining BRAG, ensuring that Fife Council backed BRAG and enabled it to provide its services. These local politicians used their contacts and trust networks to great effect.

Within the Benarty area there are many organisations and companies operating alongside each other. Post offices and corner shops provide services to the local communities and employ local people; community councils and local authority offices do the same. They are integral parts of the local communities and with Third System organisations they are all responsible for the generation and maintenance of local social capital. At a neighbourhood level the public, private and community systems tend to be close and operate in a closely integrated way.

At a local level social capital can play a significant role in the development of the local economy as it can reduce *transaction costs* eg. there can be unwritten agreements and mutual understanding instead of the need for formal contracts.

BRAG has in recent years very much focussed on "bridging" social capital using it to make links with other organisations – local-based or further afield. It has tended not to concentrate on "bonding" social capital - building up relationships within BRAG itself, the staff, the directors and the local community members. This has come about as BRAG has moved from the *start-up phase*, when community solidarity to persuade others that they had a legitimate role to play in tackling local problems was essential, to the *sustaining phase*, when the emphasis is more on delivering programmes and projects and building the reputation to acquire the resources needed to survive and develop.

Although social capital is not a precise concept, it is implicitly recognised by many people in their day-to-day work. During the course of this research it was striking

how, once the idea of social capital had been explained, people related quickly to the concepts and began to quote examples of social capital in action.

Although intangible, it illustrates an accepted way of working together and this is how communities have always functioned.

Trust

Trust exists between individuals and between groups of individuals. The sum of all these trusting relationships creates a climate of trust within a wider group or in a community or an area. Trust is something that everyone can identify with but it is difficult to quantify, gauge or measure. Trust seems to be strongest between individuals and less strong between organisations in that organisational trust depends on the relationships between individuals.

A level of trust built up by people working successfully together takes time to build. There is a very direct link between trust and reciprocity. Where reciprocal arrangements ensure engagement between organisations, trust may build up faster.

However, as noted above, if a community lacks social networks or if an individual is isolated, the meetings do not happen through which trust may begin to build. Thus, while trust may be perceived as the most important element in that everything depends on trust, the social networks which allow trust to build are an essential pre-requisite to the generation of social capital.

Trust is fragile and can be destroyed in a moment while taking an age to develop and establish. During the fieldwork for this research, several examples were quoted where mis-trust between organisations and individuals has hampered co-operation and opportunities for mutual development. Especially noted were how the problems of one social enterprise could result in a lowering of trust in all social enterprises.

From the research it would also seem that competition between organisations is not conducive to building trust between those organisations. It is very difficult to build up social capital between organisations that are actively competing in the market place, yet the contemporary trend is to build a social enterprise market place and to encourage competition between organisations, especially for public sector contracts.

Reciprocity and Mutuality

BRAG uses and generates mutuality and reciprocal relationships to a high degree. It is seen as helpful and open in its relationships and has contributed to the creation of a strong mutual bond between the social enterprises operating in the Benarty area (but not in Lochgelly – see later). Additionally, it has built up reciprocal arrangements with some key funders, helping them in assessing applications.

BRAG is a social enterprise and it is part of its ethos to generate a climate of mutual help. In this respect BRAG leads by example offering (and taking) reciprocal help to (and from) social enterprises in the area. The research uncovered a large number of practical examples of reciprocal help and it was noticeable how people would use the same examples to illustrate trust and reciprocity, thus reinforcing the closeness of the two elements. It was also noticeable how examples of reciprocity were stronger between BRAG and social enterprises than between BRAG and its other tenant enterprises.

Not surprisingly the level of reciprocity and trust is highest between people and organisations who have worked together successfully for longest (and therefore known each other and trusted each other longest).

It was also observed that within the social enterprises reciprocal help was often multi-lateral - that is an organisation would assist another without expecting a direct bi-lateral payback, but knowing that help from within the social enterprise group could be received in the future. In this sense social capital in action is rather like LETS systems: the more services you use from people within the system the stronger the system becomes.

Formal and Informal Support Networks

Networks are essential to the building of social capital and social networking is more evident amongst the social enterprises than among the other tenants within the BRAG workspaces.

BRAG itself has been very active in developing and orchestrating its own formal and informal social networks which have enabled BRAG to take advantage of a range of opportunities which BRAG is successfully undertaking. However, these have been "bridging" networks strengthening BRAG's links with the outside world and with project opportunities in particular. To a degree they have been built at the cost of neglecting local "bonding" networks.

BRAG staff have been fortunate that they can volunteer time to attend meetings and sit on committees of other organisations allowing them to nurture contacts and other networks that BRAG can tap into. Other organisations simply cannot afford the time to do this. However, BRAG is generous in using its networks to the benefit of other local social enterprises.

Sense of Belonging and Commitment

If the level of community membership were a direct measure of how "community-based" a community enterprise was, then BRAG would be struggling! Membership is low. Nonetheless, there is a strong sense of belonging and commitment to the area demonstrated by the Board and the staff of BRAG. Equally there is a general recognition that BRAG is part of the Benarty community and is working hard for community benefit.

It is suggested that BRAG may now be less accountable to the local community than when it started. Trust and reciprocity are more focussed on funders rather than on the local community. Is it inevitable that the larger and more professional an enterprise becomes the more likely it will concentrate on funding, contracts and service delivery rather than on its commitment and accountability to local people and attempting to get them more involved?

BRAG Enterprise is very much seen as rooted in the Benarty area but not in Lochgelly. BRAG was created in Benarty by Benarty people to tackle the problems facing Benarty. This brings a strong two-way sense of commitment and belonging from BRAG and towards BRAG, but it can be counter-productive when BRAG seeks to expand its role into other areas, such as Lochgelly, which was defined as part of the BRAG catchment area for the purposes of the CONSCISE Project.

Historically BRAG has used this sense of belonging and commitment to good advantage in building its work. The fact that it was community controlled has

provided authorities with a conduit for services to be delivered locally; and at the same time local activists have tenaciously held on to BRAG as a *community* organisation

Shared Values and Norms of Behaviour

The research indicates that people work best with those people and organisations who share their own or similar values. Two individuals who share the same values are more likely to form a trusting relationship faster. The sharing of values between people can significantly speed up the establishment and development of social capital.

It would seem from the consultations that values are very important in defining what people do and whether they work together or not. Arguably, the values that people share may be at the very core of social capital. But it also seems that at local level people can coalesce around a “way of thinking” about their community (visions) and commitment to it (sense of belonging) which may transcend otherwise conflicting value systems. For example the BRAG Board brings together people from at least three (maybe more) political parties to work for a common cause.

Values are very important and organisations have values although these are not always overtly articulated. Tensions will arise when the individual does not share their organisation's values; and key individuals can probably shape an organisation's values to a significant (even undue?) extent.

Information Channels

As explained above this is the one element in the CONSCISE Project definition that seems to be different from the others and perhaps should not be included in future. Information is no doubt important, but people and organisations access information through their networks and through people whom they trust.

BRAG sees itself as a conduit or channel for information into the community and is willing to share the benefit of its networks with others, especially other organisations of the local social economy. It is part of the BRAG way of doing things to network extensively and much of that networking is about giving and getting information (and using contacts). Much of the reciprocal help which BRAG offers social enterprises is to do with getting, or more especially, using information – for example helping other organisations complete application forms for funding proposals.

As well as providing leaflets etc. and offering information when asked, BRAG has established an internet café for local people to use and access information. It was reported that BRAG is very good at using the information to sustain itself - through contacts, contracts, funding applications and new initiatives, etc.

14.2 Critique on the Methodology

Social accounting and audit as a process was a very useful exercise for BRAG as has been reported in the main section of the social accounts. Within the CONSCISE Project it was always understood that there would be a trade off for the social enterprises such as BRAG whom were taking part. They would be assisted to prepare social accounts based on their Values, Key Objectives and Activities and in return they would allow themselves to be part of the research into social capital. In

order to do that two social capital Objectives, with Activities, were agreed and added to the social accounting process.

Some of the techniques devised to record and measure social capital were *not wholly* successful.

- a. The **Contacts Map**, designed to map the range and extent of networks, in itself was inconclusive, although the discussion that it provoked was interesting and pertinent.
- b. The **Activity Logs**, designed to record in detail the contact work with other organisations, were only kept by the senior staff and only sporadically. Therefore, they were of marginal usefulness in assessing the generation and use of social capital. One problem of the Activity Logs was that staff simply did not have the time – nor the inclination – to maintain them. With hindsight, it would have been more sensible to have sought to keep one log for one set of activities rather than try and introduce them across the board.
- c. The results from the **questionnaires** were indicative at best and when they were not the basis of interview the answers were ambiguous. The questions about values which sought to identify differences in value base between BRAG and other enterprises was totally unsuccessful.
- d. The **interviews** and particularly the bi-monthly meetings were productive. During these interviews there was real insight into how BRAG operates. The staff and the researchers built up a significant amount of social capital between themselves in what became a trusting relationship. BRAG staff reported that they felt the meetings were very helpful to them - almost a bi-monthly "confessional" - and it was during those meetings that most understanding was achieved.

Towards the end of the social audit period it became increasingly evident that shared "social values" were very important in generating and using social capital. If this had been known at the start more emphasis would have been place in discerning values of BRAG and its stakeholders and exploring to what extent they really were shared by others.

The distinction between "creating" and "using" social capital in the two social capital objectives came to be meaningless. In practice it was easier to examine both aspects of the six elements of social capital, as "creating" and "using" social capital can amount to the same thing. One generates social capital by using it.

The five main elements tended to blur together as they are not mutually exclusive but rather inter-related, and seen as such by people consulted. As explained earlier it would seem that they may be divided into two categories:

- **Relationships between people and/or entities** (networks, trust, reciprocity and mutuality)
- **The attitudes held by people and/or entities** (norms, values, sense of belonging)

The working definition for social capital might be changed to take account of this.

15 Conclusions and Recommendations on the Social Capital Objectives

15.1 Implications for Policy for BRAG and Others

Social Capital itself is not new, it is the giving it a tag which is new. Unfortunately the tag and the definitions are imprecise and hard for people to understand until, that is, they engage with the concept and realise it is not just social science jargon but it is what makes people and communities tick. The importance of social capital is its very articulation – by talking about it it is possible to recognise what it is, and especially where it is lacking.

That recognition and understanding of social capital has implications for government and for local authorities who wish to create policies to strengthen the social economy. At a local level, policies may be developed that encourage local people to get together thus forming social networks. Institutions and programmes which foster a sense of community may be promoted.

The social economy is fragmented and therefore somewhat lacking in social capital. Policies to strengthen the social economy would focus on:

- building trust (through encouraging and supporting networks at all levels);
- articulating and agreeing shared values (through discussion and debate within and between the networks);
- encouraging mutuality (through collaborative projects between factions within the social economy);
- building all embracing support networks;
- promoting an understanding of what social capital is and encouraging social enterprises to include monitoring it as part of their social accounting systems.
- The levels of social capital within society also require to be monitored. If it begins to breakdown or it is used to exclude, steps should to be taken to counter this. Of itself social capital is value-free and may be used for good or for bad intent. Society therefore must monitor how social capital is used and ensure it is for the common good and not to sustain privilege or bolster secret societies to the disadvantage of others.

15.2 Recommendations for BRAG

1. BRAG could encourage the formation of a Tenants' Association, as it would bring all the workspace tenants together and facilitate mutual trading and possible co-operation.
2. The social enterprises already feel a direct link to BRAG but not really to each other. There is scope to form a local social economy forum.
3. Sensitivity is required in any move to operate in a different area other than Benarty. BRAG is strongly identified with Benarty and therefore "bridging" into a

different area will be difficult. If that is to be done it might be advisable to consider forming a different management committee made up of local people in the new area with the understanding that they may in due course become completely independent from BRAG. Thus BRAG becomes the developer or facilitator in areas outwith Benarty rather than the long-term provider.

4. BRAG should focus more on "bonding" social capital within and amongst the staff, Board members, community members of BRAG and local residents more generally.

16 CONSCISE Project

Following the Social Audit Panel meeting, these Draft Social Accounts will be finalised. Workpackage 7 will be written which summarises the main findings of the social audit reports in the 8 locations in UK (2), Sweden (2), Germany (2) and Spain (2).

Workpackage 8: Final Report will then be written which highlights all the findings of the CONSCISE Project along with conclusions and recommendation on social capital.

The Final Report will be presented at a conference to be held in London in May 2003.