PEOPLE, PERCEPTIONS AND PLACE

Bobby Duffy and Debbie Lee Chan
August 2009
Legal notice

© 2009 Ipsos MORI – all rights reserved.

The contents of this report constitute the sole and exclusive property of Ipsos MORI.

Ipsos MORI retains all right, title and interest, including without limitation copyright, in or to any Ipsos MORI trademarks, technologies, methodologies, products, analyses, software and know-how included or arising out of this report or used in connection with the preparation of this report. No license under any copyright is hereby granted or implied.

The contents of this report are of a commercially sensitive and confidential nature and intended solely for the review and consideration of the person or entity to which it is addressed. No other use is permitted and the addressee undertakes not to disclose all or part of this report to any third party (including but not limited, where applicable, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act 2000) without the prior written consent of the Company Secretary of Ipsos MORI.
An increasing focus on ‘place’ lies at the heart of the modern vision of local public services. This means creating safer, cleaner and greener places where people want to live and work now and in the future, and requires a holistic view of the different factors affecting the quality of life of individuals and communities.

This focus on local outcomes is what drives the new Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA). The issues assessed by CAA in each area will reflect local priorities for improving quality of life and protecting the people at most risk of disadvantage. CAA means that, for the first time, local public services will collectively be held to account for their impact on better outcomes. This means looking at how councils, health bodies, police forces, fire and rescue services, the third sector and others responsible for local public services work in partnership to tackle the challenges facing their communities.

This new approach represents a fundamental shift in emphasis towards subjects about which people care deeply. It is also a significant shift in perspective, making greater use of the views of citizens and service-users as expressed in the Government’s biennial Place Survey and captured in Local Area Agreements, and it is these views which this report investigates.

Ipsos MORI’s reports on *Frontiers of Performance in Local Government* have always been an important influence on the way that the public sector considers satisfaction data, and this study is no exception. It not only makes sense of trends in people’s perceptions of their local area but also looks in more detail at what drives these perceptions of place.

By analysing the relationship between individuals’ perceptions of their area and contextual factors such as demographic patterns, levels of deprivation and ethnic diversity, this report provides a valuable framework within which to understand perception and performance data. Crucially, it further underlines the need for agencies to work in partnership to meet the needs and aspirations of their communities, marshalling resources across the public, voluntary and private sectors.

The report also looks at ways in which individual services can build public confidence. For example, the findings reinforce the impression that many local councils have failed to win the hearts and minds of those they serve. So that even where satisfaction with local areas is increasing and local people accept that council services are getting better, they often assume that this is in spite of the council rather than because of it. Ipsos MORI also provides clear pointers to local authorities about what they can do to turn these trends around, such as getting their communications right to make sure they get the credit for local improvements.

As the focus of local public services increasingly shifts towards delivering the outcomes that matter for local communities, *People, Perceptions and Place* provides a timely insight into what drives individuals’ perceptions of their local areas, and into what they are looking for from those that serve them.

Steve Bundred  
Chief Executive, Audit Commission
Summary and conclusions

This report helps local public services and partnerships better understand what factors affect key outcomes such as satisfaction with quality of life, community cohesion, feelings of influence and ratings of local services.

Our findings combine an analysis of the recent but limited release of national place survey data by Communities and Local Government (CLG) plus our own analysis of the place survey for those authorities whose data we have access to.

In this report, overall results and overall trends in relation to the perceptions-based National Indicators (NIs) are calculated using the data released by CLG. However, as the CLG release of 23 June was limited to National Indicators and a few other key variables (such as satisfaction with the council), for questions for which there are no official national statistics, we have produced best estimates from analysing the data of 150 or so authorities that we have access to. This represents nearly half of local authority areas. Although, these particular results are preliminary, they do give a good indication of likely results and trends.

This summary firstly provides an overview of the main trends and patterns in the overall data, before going on to discuss the key themes that come out as important drivers of our main outcome measures.

The key national trends

Increased satisfaction with local areas...
One of the most positive findings from our analysis is an increase in ratings of local quality of life, with 80% now saying they are satisfied with their area compared with 75% in 2006. This still tends to be lower in urban and more deprived areas. However, London, and inner London boroughs in particular, are improving faster – with satisfaction here up nine percentage points to 80%, now on a par with the average across the country.

This overall increase in satisfaction with areas does not particularly chime with trends seen in other national surveys on similar questions, but it is supported within the Place Survey findings by significant drops in concern about local problems.

...and improvements in ASB
For example, ratings on key facets of anti-social behaviour (ASB) are improving quickly. There have been real drops in concern about drug dealing/users (down 12 percentage points to 31%) and problems with teenagers (still a problem for 45% of people, but down 12 percentage points). Even litter and rubbish are slightly less of a concern. Other problems like drunken and rowdy behaviour have changed less. But overall, the 7 strand index of different ASB measures is down by three percentage points. Our analysis shows how incredibly closely related overall ratings of quality of life are to this concern about ASB. This suggests that councils, police forces and other local partners are making progress in dealing with what most concerns the public.

But satisfaction with the council is down...
This improvement makes it particularly disappointing that satisfaction with local government is going down – and by a significant amount. Our data suggests that the key overall measure of satisfaction with the way the council runs things is down from 53% to around 45%. Now, fewer than half of residents are satisfied with the performance of their authority, the lowest national score recorded in a decade or more.
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1 A partial national dataset from the Place Surveys was released by CLG on 23 June 2009.
And this appears to be fairly consistent across the board, except for inner London boroughs, which have only fallen by one point, increasing the inner-outer London gap we first noted a few years ago. Overall there is now a 10 point gap between inner London, where satisfaction averages 56%, and outer London where it has fallen to 46%.

So it seems that, overall, local government is doing a good job on place-shaping – on quality of life and key measures of anti-social behaviour and liveability – but as an institution it is worse rated than ever. It simply does not get the credit for the improvements that residents themselves, the Audit Commission and others have noted.

... because communications in decline?
Part of the reason for decline may be the apparent fall in how well informed people feel: while question changes preclude a direct comparison, it is notable that only 38% feel they are kept informed about local services. This lack of connection between observed improvements and credit for making them can be seen very clearly on litter/rubbish. While fewer people say this is a problem locally, satisfaction with council services on dealing with litter has gone down. Again, there is no credit gained from tangible improvements.

Cohesion also under pressure – particularly in urban areas outside London
However, there is also an apparently less positive movement on the key cohesion measure included in the Place Survey – whether people from different backgrounds get on well together in the area. The data here suggests this has declined from 79% to 76% overall, with Metropolitan/Unitary authorities outside London least likely to feel cohesion is strong with only 73% agreeing.

And how are local partners faring?
The greater focus on areas as whole in the Place Survey is seen in the inclusion of questions on other key services, in particular the police and health services – although this means there are no consistent questions to compare trends on here. It appears that satisfaction levels with the police are similar to those seen for councils (47% are satisfied with the police) but satisfaction with hospitals is higher (65%). GPs are the best rated of all (77%). Even dentists are nine percentage points better rated than councils (54% satisfied).

These patterns are not particularly surprising, and reflect other earlier studies – as do the differences between authority types. In particular, London again stands out, with residents more satisfied with the police, but generally less satisfied with health services.

What is driving these perceptions?
The bulk of the analysis in the report goes beyond these simple trends and uses statistical techniques to pick out which factors seem are most important in driving perceptions of these key outcomes. Of course, as with any survey data, proving cause and effect is impossible, but there are still some very clear messages.

It’s not all in your control...
Our approach firstly tries to separate out those factors that are within the control of local public services and those that are not. This helps to provide a better understanding of what is determined by area characteristics and what services can actually do. The key point of our Frontiers analysis remains – that perceptions are not as easy to influence as we might expect. As an example, we can explain 82% of all variation in satisfaction with local areas knowing only five characteristics of the local population:

- the proportion of the population with degrees;
- the proportion of people who are under-occupying their homes;
- the deprivation level;
the proportion of the population aged under 21;
and which region the area is in.

Clearly, most of these factors are not in the direct or immediate control of local services. It is therefore vital to not simply take perception scores at face value, but take account of how easy or difficult it is to achieve satisfaction in a specific area, particularly when these types of measures are used to judge the performance of services or partnerships.

So, for example, while they may not get the highest absolute scores, places like Wandsworth seem to be doing better than expected on overall satisfaction with the council, and places like Manchester are doing better than we would predict on the cohesion measure of whether people from different backgrounds get on well together.

What poses the biggest challenges?
In the spirit of CAA, we have tried to look across the key outcome measures in the Place Survey to see what background characteristics are consistently associated with making “satisfaction” hard to achieve – and created the Ipsos MORI “Area Challenge Index”. From this synthesis, there are seven clear domains:

- **The Indices of Multiple Deprivation**: this itself is a composite index. It has been seen in our analysis time and again to be very powerfully related to perceptions – the more deprived your area, the harder it will be to achieve satisfaction across a range of issues.

- **Ethnic diversity (the level of ethnic fractionalisation)**: again, this has come up in previous analyses, with the more diverse an area, the harder it is to achieve satisfaction. Interestingly, one key factor that is *positively* related to diversity is feelings of influence in local areas. This again chimes with other work (white residents do tend to have lower feelings of local influence than Asian communities for example).

- **Young people**: the more people aged 19 or under in an area, the harder it is to achieve high levels of satisfaction. The point needs to be made that the analysis does not prove that this causes dissatisfaction, but it does not have to, as the aim is only to assess which areas will have the hardest job in achieving high satisfaction levels. The challenge from having a large proportion of young people in your area comes out more strongly and consistently in this analysis than we have seen in any previous studies.

- **Population churn**: fairly intuitively, the greater the turnover of local populations, the harder it is to achieve satisfaction.

- **Physical living conditions**: a number of these measures correlate with perceptions, but over-occupancy comes out most consistently. The more households with over-crowding in your area, the harder it is to achieve satisfaction.

- **Urbanity**: the more urban, the harder it is to achieve positive perceptions.

- **Region**: in particular, being in the North East is associated with higher satisfaction (even after accounting for other characteristics included in the models), while being in London is associated with lower satisfaction scores.

From this we can create “challenge” scores for each local authority area, measuring how difficult it is for them to achieve high ratings of satisfaction – effectively how challenging it will be to do well on these perception measures. While this work is only preliminary, and needs further refinement as the full Place Survey data becomes available, our analysis suggests that of all authorities in the country, Tower Hamlets and Hackney among others have the hardest job in achieving positive perceptions, while areas in the North East like Teesdale
(now Durham County Council) and Alnwick (now Northumberland County Council) have it easiest.

The “challenged” areas are much more likely to be in London (although it does also have some of the “easiest”, such as the City of London). But other large urban centres like Manchester, Birmingham and Blackburn are confirmed as facing tough challenges to achieve satisfaction. Among Districts, places like Oxford and Burnley have a combination of background characteristics that will make it hard to score highly on perception measures.

Of course, an area can have significant challenges, but if it is given resources to deal with these then we would expect still them to perform well. Therefore, we have compared our Area Challenge Index with spending per head by the local council – and there is indeed a strong relationship between challenges and resources, particularly in single-tier authorities. That is, there is a close relationship between how hard our Index says an area is to work in to achieve positive perceptions and how much money they have to spend.

But there are things you can do…

While our models show that variations in local perceptions can be explained by background characteristics, we have taken our analysis further this year to pick out themes in what can be done. There are five key messages from looking across areas as a whole:

- **Local services really matter to a sense of place:** one of the key findings is how strongly related satisfaction with local services seems to be with overall views of the area and other key outcomes. Of course cause and effect is not possible to prove here, but the data do back up the intuitive sense that services (and councils in particular) do have a key place-shaping role.

- **Understanding and targeting local priorities:** the data confirm that taking visible action on key concerns is vital. The more people feel that their priorities drive local improvement, the better perceptions are of local public service providers. This should not be news, but the key is how we act on it. As a leading systems theorist says “Find out what matters to your customers and turn the same into operational measures - the measures against which you will work and improve. The result is always better service and lower costs.” This embedding of what is most important in performance management is of course at the heart of the Place Survey and CAA, and underlies the analysis here. However, while the models we have developed show the overall patterns, this report also emphasises how relationships will vary in different local areas. Therefore local services need to go through similar steps to make sure they are focusing on the most important targets for their areas.

- **Communicate what you’re doing – and proactively seeking views:** as we have seen, local services still do not get the credit for local improvements – and this is largely due to a communications gap. We’ve shown time and again that those who are rated highly on their communications do better in overall perceptions. Although, it is not possible to prove cause and effect here, but it remains the case that no authorities that are rated well on communications are rated poorly overall. Similarly, there are clear signs that the biggest impact on perceptions of influence (another key NI) would not be actions that involve a small number of people very deeply, but rather better communications that reach a much wider group (although, of course, these should not be seen as alternatives and it is even better to do both).

But it is not just about information provision – there is a clear theme, particularly around crime. Those that are seen as doing best are also seen to be proactively looking for feedback. What this means, in light of CAA, is that partnerships need to examine their respective communications and engagement programmes and look to
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2 John Seddon http://www.lean-service.co.uk/customer.asp
3 The Business Case for the Reputation Project, LGA/Ipsos MORI: 2006
agree on and co-ordinate key messages about how effectively they are addressing local priorities and how they want to listen more.

- **Parenting and respect:** the feeling that local people treat each other with respect, and related to this that parents have good disciplinary control over their children, come out as important to a number of key outcomes. Separately, we know these are the issues that virtually everyone in Britain agrees on. ⁴ Coupled with the large increase in the number of outcomes that seem to be related to the proportion of young people in an area, a focus on young people and family/parental support seems likely to yield particular dividends in resident satisfaction.

- **Targeting individual neighbourhoods:** finally this report outlines some initial findings from our new mapping tool – the National Indicators Mapping Application (NIMA). This is a new approach to mapping perceptions that does not rely on official geographies but rather groups residents to give “contour maps” that show real patterns of opinion. This allows us to see pockets of concern that might be lost when analysing results by collections of wards. Of course, we need to be cautious with the statistical reliability of looking at very small areas, given the sample size for each local authority is only around 1,100. But equally it is a waste of the potential power of the Place Survey not to look for local variation within local authority areas. Our maps do show some very clear differences across areas that chime with local knowledge. We can use this to identify and deal with real local priorities that would otherwise be missed.

There is much more learning to be done on what shapes perceptions of place. Under the banner of *Ipsos MORI Local* we will continue to bring together the knowledge that we have about local areas and pass on our insights to the local government family. In the forthcoming weeks, we will be releasing the full list of English local authorities ranked by our Area Challenge Index, which will help partnerships identify their statistical neighbours for Place. There will be additional fresh thinking to come from us on issues such as community empowerment and influence and on communications and information. Now that the national Place Survey data has been released, there is an opportunity to apply our *Frontiers* analysis to the entire dataset for England. In the meantime, the team will continue to work with local partnerships to research views of services and priorities in local areas.

---

⁴ *Real Trends, Ipsos MORI: 2008*
## Erratum

We have revised the district averages on some of the charts in the report, however all revisions are within the margins of error and do not alter the conclusions drawn in our analysis.
Introduction

People, Perceptions and Place

Welcome to People, Perceptions and Place, Ipsos MORI’s latest analysis on what drives perceptions of place and other aspects of local life, drawing on the latest round of local authority Place Surveys as well as our wider research.

This year, we go beyond the regression analysis conducted in our previous four Frontiers of Performance in Local Government reports and our Frontiers of Performance in Health reports. It looks more closely at the nature of perceptions of Place, Belonging, Cohesion and Satisfaction with various local public services, through multivariate techniques and a mapping application.

People, Perceptions and Place aims to help local partnerships understand what is driving people’s views in a local area, and to consider the impact on perceptions of attitudinal, demographic and other exogenous factors such as deprivation and ethnic diversity. As with all our previous Frontiers reports, one of the key points that we make is that we cannot just take absolute satisfaction scores at face value; some local areas are just more difficult to achieve positive perceptions in, and to get a true understanding of performance we need to take this context into account. But this year our analysis also looks in more detail at factors that are within the control of local services, to provide clear pointers on the most important actions that can be taken to improve perceptions in areas.

This report comes at an important time for local service providers and the partnerships they have formed. As these partnerships (led by local authorities) move more heavily towards a ‘place-based’ approach to delivering positive social outcomes, performance monitoring more than ever focuses on the local area and community well-being, and less so on service satisfaction and related areas such as complaints handling. The Place Survey – a survey specifically designed to gather local peoples’ views, experiences and perceptions of local areas as a whole – represents a marked departure from the traditional BVPI approach. The latter focused on nine service delivery and cross-cutting areas relating to the Council: Corporate Health; Litter; Waste; Transport; Culture; Housing; Benefits; Planning; and Social Services.

The new Place Survey, on the other hand signals the move from a focus on service delivery to ‘shaping places’ and will be used to assess the impact of shared attempts to meet the needs of local areas, rather than the impact of local authorities in isolation. The Place Survey is also the vehicle for collecting 18 of the citizen perspective indicators from the new National Indicator Set, which will be used by Government to assess performance of local areas through the new Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).

Policy context

In October 2006, the Government released its White Paper on public sector reform, Strong and Prosperous Communities, and many of the proposed policies were implemented through the legislation laid down by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Some of the key changes that were set in train included a new performance framework for local public services.

The CAA replaces the Comprehensive Performance Assessment and is more forward-looking, outcome-focused, risk-based and unified in its inspection of all public services, than its predecessor. The assessment of performance under the new regime will be made against Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets and the wider set of National Indicators (NIs),
which takes account of a range of evidence, including the views of citizens on local life from
the Place Survey.

That local authorities should take the lead among public service providers and work towards
better outcomes for residents and places is strongly stated in the White Paper:

“Our vision is of revitalised local authorities, working with their partners, to reshape public
services around the citizens and communities that use them.”

This place shaping role was further emphasised in the Lyon’s Inquiry into Local Government:

“Local government has an important contribution to make as part of a single system of
government, allowing different communities to make choices for themselves, and relating
and shaping the actions of government and the public sector to the needs of the locality.”

The focus on citizen empowerment and listening to the citizen voice has been further
strengthened through the Community Empowerment White Paper, Communities in Control,
which demands that public services (public servants and politicians) are in tune with, and
accountable to, local citizens. Some of the proposals in the White Paper, which have been
taken forward in the Local Democracy Bill, include new rights for the citizen to have more
information and influence over the local decisions, new powers to hold politicians to account
and, where they choose, more opportunity to get directly involved in managing and shaping
how local services are delivered.

Increasing the power of local government to shape local areas (and by implication the power
of local people) is advocated across all the major parties. The Conservative Green paper on
local government outlines a number of broad proposals for enabling local authorities to
achieve better outcomes for their areas through a range of new freedoms and powers. In
May this year, David Cameron said:

“Newly empowered councils will be able to keep the proceeds of any activities that boost
local economic growth…and through a new ‘general power of competence’ will be able to do
literally whatever they like as long as it’s legal - creating solutions to local problems without
getting permission from the centre.”

The Liberal Democrat’s statement of values ‘Make it Happen’ (2008) has a similar emphasis:

“We need to take control away from central government, where bureaucrats and ministers
are in charge, and give it to local government, people and communities”.

This builds on their earlier policy document ‘The Power to be Different’ (2007) which wanted
to see strong and democratic local government driving public service delivery as opposed to
acting as a local delivery arm of central government.

So it seems that, whichever party is in power following the next general election, the trend for
local government and its partners to place-shape is set to continue – and therefore
understanding local areas more fully will be of increasing importance for all public services.

To help achieve this local focus, Ipsos MORI will continue to bring together the knowledge
that we have about local areas. We probably carry out more research on views of services
and priorities in local areas than any other single research body, and this report will hopefully
help develop understanding of what would most improve quality of life, community cohesion
and empowerment at the local level.

---
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Technical Details

It is important to remember that not all the Place Survey results that we present here are based on recently released national data. This is because the CLG release of 23 June was limited to some of the National Indicators and a few other key variables in the Place Survey (such as satisfaction with the council). In instances where there is not yet any official national data, we have produced best estimates from analysing the data of 150 or so authorities that we have access to. Although, these results are only preliminary, they do give a good indication of possible results and trends. These include questions such as satisfaction with the police, local GP, local hospital and perceptions of some aspects of ASB.

However, we have been through an extensive validation exercise, comparing how close to the final overall average in 2006 the findings from our 150 were in that year. In most cases the results from 2006 for our 150 authorities were within one or two percentage points of the results from the full dataset of all local authorities. Therefore, unless these 150 areas have experienced significantly different types of change to the average, they should provide a very good indication of the direction of travel in results.

The trends within local authority types also need to be treated with some caution, as we have taken a simple average across local authority types rather than give weights according to population size. However, we again believe these are very likely to be useful indications of authority type trends.

More importantly, the key aim of this analysis is not to outline trends but to look for patterns in responses that can help local services target their actions, as well as help us interpret perception measures more sensitively by taking account of background characteristics. These main messages are much less likely to be affected by data changes, as the underlying patterns will almost certainly remain the same even if overall results change.

It is also important to bear in mind that while some of the questions in the Place Survey questionnaire were included in the BVPI 2006/07 and 2003/04 questionnaires (which allows us to compare the findings), the structure of the questionnaire and the contextual information provided has changed. We have only included trends where we think these changes are small enough to not make comparisons invalid, but this point needs to be remembered. So for example, the question on satisfaction with the council was also asked in 2006/07 and 2003/04. However, it appeared later in the questionnaire in both those years and was not preceded by a value for money question, as it was in 2008/09. It is also important to note that 2008/09 was the first year that local authorities were not allowed to add questions throughout the questionnaire (between questions 1 and 26) or add text to explain the type of services provided locally. The ‘What does your council do’ information sheet was also excluded in 2008/09. These contextual changes can all impact on responses and need to be borne in mind when looking at trends. We have completed a full review of the changes affecting the questions reporting here, which is available on request.

Structure of report

This report will examine key questions from the Place Survey by broad theme:

**Chapter 1:** Our opening chapter examines satisfaction with local area (NI 5) and perceptions of how well people from different backgrounds get on together (NI 1), given that CAA has signalled a move from focusing on local authority service delivery to quality of place and the communities that live in them.

**Chapter 2:** Examines overall satisfaction with how the local council runs things, ability to deliver value for money and whether local people feel they are able to influence local decisions. Taken together, these three measures provide us with a neat picture of how well local authorities appear to be serving their communities.
Chapter 3: Focuses on our analysis of the crime, ASB and policing data. Whilst force-level data is available from the British Crime Survey, the size of the sample does not allow for sub-force analysis on key questions. The Place Surveys therefore provide further opportunity for police and partners to understand the drivers of public confidence and the role which local area factors play.

Chapter 4: This chapter will take the key health satisfaction measures (GP and Hospital) used in the Place Survey and look at them within the context of the local community. Health is the least well covered theme in the Place Survey, so we have brought in information from our other work to provide some insight into the key issues in local areas.

Chapter 5: In this final chapter, we bring together what we’ve learned about which factors are most related to positive outcomes in local areas and outline our “Area Challenge Index”. This provides a single score (1-100) for each local authority area that gives an indication of how hard it will be to achieve high levels of citizen satisfaction on the type of perception measures included in the Place Survey, given the conditions in which it operates.
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1. Overall views of areas

This section of the report examines satisfaction with local area (NI 5) and perceptions of how well people from different backgrounds get on together (NI 1). It is appropriate to make this our starting point, given that CAA has signalled a move from focusing on local authority service delivery to quality of place, as outlined in the Introduction.

Specifically, NI 5 contributes to measuring the CLG Departmental Strategic Objective to ‘build prosperous communities by improving the economic performance of cities, sub-regions and local areas, promoting regeneration and tackling deprivation.’ It is also a long-standing question that has been used in surveys of local areas for decades, and is seen to provide a good overall measure of local quality of life.

NI 1 is the key perception-based indicator for community cohesion, and is included in PSA 21 which defines ‘community cohesion’ more broadly than just NI 1. There are three cohesion indicators in this PSA: the percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area; the percentage of people who have meaningful interactions with people from different backgrounds; and the percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood.

Such is the importance of NI 1 that it has been included in a number of major surveys such as the Citizenship Surveys (back to 2003), as well as being included in previous rounds of BVPI surveys.

Taken together, both NI 5 and NI 1 help us to build a picture of how strong local communities are:

“The Local Government White Paper sets out Government’s aim of creating strong and cohesive communities – thriving places in which a fear of difference is replaced by a shared set of values and a shared sense of purpose and belonging.”

1.1 Overall findings

As with each of the following chapters, we will start by looking at the overall findings from the national Place Survey dataset. Where possible, we split the results by authority type and look at trends where they are available.

The trends within local authority types need to be treated with a bit more caution, and could be subject to further change. For example, we have taken an average for each question across the different authority types rather than a weighted average to take into account of different population sizes. Nevertheless, we believe these trends by LA type are very likely to be useful indications of trends.

And there are some very positive trends. As we can see in the following chart, average satisfaction with local areas across local authorities as a whole has increased since 2006 from 75% to 80%, and it has also increased in all individual authority types. District residents remain the most satisfied, but it is Inner London residents that have seen the largest increase in satisfaction; their satisfaction with area has increased by nine percentage points, and is now the same as the overall average.

This increase in satisfaction with area does not completely chime with trends seen in other studies, such as the Survey of English Housing; while the latest available data from this
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study only goes up to 2007, the trend from the previous few years is very flat, at around 87% satisfaction. This is also clearly a very different absolute level of satisfaction, which is less surprising, given the different methodologies and questionnaires used.

The trend on the cohesion measure of whether people from different backgrounds get on well together appears to be rather less positive, with a decline of three percentage points overall, as seen in the following chart.

Looking at individual types of authority, it is residents living in Metropolitan/Unitary authorities who are now least likely to agree with the statement. This is in contrast to London which scores best on this cohesion measure. While the difference in views should not be overstated, it does raise interesting questions about how urban centres outside London are responding to increasing diversity. A clue to what might lie behind this may be found in a chapter in the 2006 ODPM report on the Profile of British Cities. It found that cities in the north and west dominated the group of places with the highest levels of segregation:

“The top eight cities on White/Non-White segregation are all from here… Seventeen of the top 20 most segregated cities are in the north and west. In contrast, 17 of the 26 cities with low segregation between Whites and Non-Whites are in the south or east.”

Other work we have conducted\(^{10}\) also suggests there is a significant variation in attitudes to multiculturalism across different areas of the UK. For example, a national survey showed that for the question “do you agree that Britain is losing its culture?”, there was a 50/50 split of people in London who agreed and disagreed, whereas in the North East, for example, only 24% disagreed\(^{11}\).

The trend seen below is again rather different from that seen in national surveys. In this case, the most recent published data from the Citizenship Survey for 2007/8 shows 82% agreeing with this statement, which is in fact a very slight increase from 80% the previous year. The explanation for the difference in absolute scores is relatively straightforward, and will again be due to different methodologies and questionnaire contexts. However, the different direction of travel again seems less explainable – but could be due to changes in

\(^{9}\) State of the English Cities: A research study, ODPM: 2006
\(^{10}\) Ben Page, The Second Death of Liberal England?, Ipsos MORI: 2004
\(^{11}\) ‘Bridging’ social capital seminar series organised by National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) and the Carnegie UK Trust Inquiry into the Future of Civil Society in the UK & Ireland. Seminar no. 3: Diversity and social capital
the questionnaire content and structure of the Place Survey as compared with BVPI surveys. This will become clearer when the final Place Survey data are released.

**Different backgrounds get on well together**

Q To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?

![Graph showing satisfaction with well-being](chart.png)

1.2 Frontiers of performance

These overall trend figures are useful in understanding how opinions are likely to be shifting and how these differ between area types. However, as we have seen throughout our *Frontiers* series of reports, we cannot take these perception measures purely at face value, as they are affected by contextual factors that are not necessarily within the control of individual local authorities or their partners.

1.2.1 Overall satisfaction with area

For example, as we can see in the following scatterchart (where each of the blocks is an individual local authority result from our dataset), there is a very strong relationship between satisfaction with area and levels of deprivation, as measured by the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). That is, areas with higher levels of deprivation have lower levels of satisfaction with their area, and vice versa. This may not be that surprising (and, indeed, it was the first pattern that we identified that started off our *Frontiers* analysis approach) but it is important, for a couple of reasons.

First of all it confirms the power of IMD as a measure of local conditions – it must be capturing important aspects of an area to tie in so closely with perceptions. And this is perhaps not surprising when you look at the breadth and quality of IMD measures. It brings together 37 different indicators which cover seven domains:

- Income Deprivation (based on e.g. people receiving income support, Job Seekers Allowance, pension credit or tax credit). This also includes two sub-domains: (i) income deprivation affecting children and (ii) income deprivation affecting older people

- Employment Deprivation (based on e.g. receipt of JSA, incapacity benefit or participation in the New Deal)
Health Deprivation and Disability (based on rates of poor health, early mortality and disability)

Education, Skills and Training. Split into two sub-domains:
- Children/young people (based on average test scores, absence rates and proportion of young people continuing to post-16 and higher education)
- Skills (based on proportion of adults with low qualifications)

Barriers to Housing and Services. Split into two sub-domains:
- Wider barriers (based on e.g. overcrowding and difficulty of access to owner-occupying)
- Geographical barriers (based on distance to local amenities and public services)

Crime (based on recorded crime figures for burglary, theft, criminal damage and violence)

Living environment. Split into two sub-domains:
- Indoors (based on condition of housing)
- Outdoors (based on air quality and road accidents)

These are weighted and combined to create the overall IMD 2007.

But secondly it also shows how related these perception measures are to context factors that will often be outside the direct and immediate control of local authorities and other agencies. Of course, as the list above makes clear, many of the individual elements will be targets for individual agencies – but the point remains that local agencies will be working in very different contexts on these types of measures, due to demographic and structural variations between areas.

Satisfaction with local area vs IMD

Base: All valid responses, 323 local authorities, Place Survey 2008/09

Source: Ipsos MORI

\[ R^2 = 54\% \]

---

But it is not just IMD which shows a very strong relationship with this key attitudinal measure – it is also much simpler demographic characteristics of local populations, such as the proportion of households with dependent children. As the following chart shows, those areas with high proportions of households with dependent children tend to have lower levels of satisfaction with the area. Clearly, as with all simple correlations, this does not tell us what is causing this relationship, and it is not necessarily the case that having children in an area makes it less pleasant to live in. However, the key point for our analysis here is that it is a factor largely beyond control of councils or other local agencies that seems to be related to this key outcome.

As for previous Frontiers reports, we have therefore created a dataset at local authority level that includes each of the key measures from the Place Survey plus a large number of variables like those above that describe local area characteristics. The full list of these is in the appendices, but includes the following type of factors:

- demographic characteristics, such as age and ethnic diversity;
- economic and educational factors, such as employment and qualification levels;
- measures of population movement, such as inward and outward migration;
- physical characteristics, such as measures of the quality of housing;
- monitoring and other performance data, such as actual crime levels/incidents;
- composite indices and their constituent parts, including IMD;
- and other measures including rurality/urbanity.

We then ran multiple regression models to identify which factors are most related to overall satisfaction with the area. This is more powerful than just looking at simple correlations, as it identifies the strength of relationships after taking account of all other variables in the model – it therefore gives a picture of what factors are most related.

And this analysis shows that we can explain a very large amount of the variation in satisfaction with local areas (82% of all variation – extremely high for models such as this) from knowing only five key characteristics of local areas (in order of importance):
the proportion with degree level qualifications or higher, which is positively related to area satisfaction. As noted above, this does not mean that having a degree makes you happier with your area, just that those types of areas with large proportions of highly educated people will tend to be happier with their area;

the proportion of households who live in homes with 0.5 people per room or fewer, which is positively related to satisfaction (i.e., the more households with 0.5 or fewer per room in a local authority area, the greater the satisfaction with the area). This may at first seem an unusual measure to come out in the model from all those available, but it is likely to be capturing some element of affluence not included in qualification levels or IMD (0.5 or fewer people per room is a low level of occupancy), combined perhaps with a distinction between urban and rural areas;

IMD, which explains 16% of all variation in this model and is negatively related to satisfaction;

the proportion of the population aged under 21, which again is negatively related to satisfaction, and comes out ahead of the proportion with dependent children (despite the strong relationship seen in the scatterchart above). As we’ll see in the Crime chapter later, the proportion of young people in an area does seem to be related to perceptions of ASB;

the region the local authority is in, with those in London authorities less satisfied with their area and those in the South West more satisfied, after controlling for other factors in the model.

But while it is interesting to demonstrate that so much of the variation in this apparently very individual or personal perception measure can be explained by very simple background characteristics, the real value of the Frontiers approach is then taking these relationships into account when judging how well each area is doing in achieving satisfaction levels. In this case, which areas are happier than we might expect – and which are less happy?

In previous versions of Frontiers, we have had access to full, published datasets of all areas, and so could create “league tables” of satisfaction that took into account these context factors. However, this year we do not have access to the full data – so we will only outline general examples to illustrate the point (anonymised tables will be provided to our individual clients).

So first of all, as the following chart shows, there is an extremely strong relationship between actual levels of satisfaction with areas and our predicted scores, as we would expect given the strength of the model. However, a number of individual authorities are relatively far from the trend line and their expected score – and (from those available to us for this analysis) these tend to be in either inner London or the North East of the country. So, for example, people are happier with their area than we would expect in places like Sunderland, Gateshead and Middlesbrough, whilst in places like Lambeth and Waltham Forest perceptions are lower than we would predict. This will clearly be for very different reasons, but it is still useful to bear in mind when comparing overall levels of satisfaction on general perceptions such as this.
1.2.2 Whether people from different backgrounds get on well together

The cohesion measure of whether people from different backgrounds get on well together is also highly related to background factors in local areas – but there is a difference in emphasis, with a particular role for employment and education factors.

So firstly, as the following chart shows, education seems to be very important, with the higher the proportion of the population in the area without formal qualifications, the less likely people are to agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together. Again, as with all these simple models based on cross-sectional survey data, we cannot say that one is causing the other, but this does seem to chime with other models that have examined the factors most related to feelings of cohesion. For example, recent work by Laurence & Heath indicates that at an individual level, indicators of advantage and disadvantage (such as educational qualifications, occupation and home ownership) strongly impact on cohesion. Furthermore, they write:

“While living in a highly disadvantaged area has a negative effect on an individual’s perception of cohesion, the higher the level of an individual’s qualifications, the weaker the effect of community disadvantage on their perception of community cohesion. Income and education thus lessen the negative impact living in a high crime or disadvantaged area has on cohesion.”

---

As with the satisfaction with area measure, we went beyond these simple correlations to use multiple regression to see which factors are most related. And from all variables included six come out as the strongest model, explaining 72% of the variation in the cohesion measure, which again is an extremely high proportion for a simple model such as this. The key factors are:

- **the proportion of people in routine manual occupations**, where the higher the proportion in these relatively unskilled occupations in a local authority, the less likely residents are to feel that people from different backgrounds get on well together;

- **the education deprivation measure from IMD**, where the greater the proportion of the population that fall into the lowest 30% in the IMD education rankings the lower the perceived level of cohesion;

- **an occupancy rating of two or more**, which is positively related to feelings of cohesion. The occupancy rating provides a measure of under-occupancy and overcrowding, where, for example, a value of -1 implies that there is one room too few and that there is overcrowding in the household – and therefore a score of 2 or more suggests significant under-occupancy. Therefore, as with satisfaction with area, the physical nature of homes is positively related to this key outcome.

- **the proportion of the population aged under 10**, with the greater the proportion, the lower the level of agreement that people from different backgrounds get on well together. It is important here to again note that we are not saying that having young children in an area causes lower feelings of cohesion, just that it is a factor largely beyond the control of local authorities that is in some way related to young people;

- again **region** comes out as important, with authorities in the **North East** scoring higher on feelings of cohesion, controlling for other factors in the model. This again chimes with work that Ipsos MORI and others have conducted.
and finally the **proportion of the local population that were born in Pakistan**, which is *negatively* related to this cohesion measure. Clearly we need to be particularly careful with the interpretation of this finding, given it picks out the presence of an individual ethnic origin group as being associated with lower levels of perceived cohesion. Again, cause and effect cannot be attributed from this analysis, but similar associations are also seen in CLG analysis of the 2005 Citizenship Survey, which found that “living in a community with a large Pakistani & Bangladeshi population is a negative predictor of community cohesion” whereas, “the strongest positive, community-level predictor of cohesion is living in a community with a large Indian population”. It is also important to note that, on its own, this characteristic does not have a particularly strong relationship with the cohesion measure – it can only “explain” 13% of the variation, and therefore while it comes out as significant in the model, the other variables in the model are more important.

Again, the key benefit of this overall model is that it allows us to identify which individual areas have higher or lower levels of cohesion than we would expect from their background characteristics. Comparing our predicted scores with actual scores (for the areas available), the largest gaps are seen in very different places to those outlined for satisfaction with area. For example, Manchester actually achieves the largest positive gap; here 74% of residents agree people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area, compared with our predicted score of 65%. While absolute ratings on this question in Manchester are not among the highest, the modelling suggests that, given local background characteristics, this area should be viewed positively on this cohesion measure – and that it would be worth exploring further what other background factors or local actions could be driving this.

### 1.3 Key drivers of views

The analysis up until this point is all at the local authority level, and focuses on context factors that are often beyond the immediate control of councils and other local bodies. But while we feel this is very useful in its own right, and important in improving how we interpret satisfaction scores and other perception measures, it does not provide much that local partnerships can act on.

This year we have therefore also run regression models that only include measures that are in the Place Survey questionnaire, to see what other service and perception factors are most related to these key outcomes. From this we hope to provide actionable points highlighting which factors local bodies should focus on in order to improve these key outcome measures.

Obviously, this type of analysis is limited to only those measures that are included in the Place Survey questionnaire, and while a lot is crammed into a relatively short postal survey, it clearly cannot cover all issues that we might like it to. However, the analysis on satisfaction with area does illustrate the wide range of factors that need to be addressed to achieve high ratings on this overall measure of satisfaction with place, as shown in the following chart.

It is important to add a caveat at this stage that the results of the key driver analysis are not based on the full national data set, and are based only on the respondent-level data of the local authorities that we have access to (some 150). So the figures presented in the key driver analysis may differ from updates we may release in the future. However, we are confident that the models shown here provide a good indication of the key drivers of satisfaction.

---

The charts that follow show both the positive drivers (those that are associated with higher levels of satisfaction) in green on the left and the negative drivers (those associated with lower levels of satisfaction) in red on the right. The percentage figure given next to each explanatory variable gives an indication of its relative importance, while the overall percentage of variation explained in the middle at the bottom of each chart indicates how strong the model overall is. The score of 39% explained variance in the following chart is relatively strong for analysis like this, but it does also illustrate that a large proportion of variation goes unexplained, which may be partly because of the importance of background characteristics explored in the previous section.

Taking the model for satisfaction with area, a large number of factors come out as significantly related, but we can break these down into four main themes, that also reflect our previous work:  

- a sense of belonging and personal connections are vitally important to satisfaction with areas, including factors such as whether people treat others with respect and whether different groups get along well together;

- closely related to this, the model highlights the importance of a sense of safety and security, which includes measures on whether people feel safe in the area either in the day or after dark, as well as satisfaction with the police and various measures of crime and ASB, particularly drugs, noise and vandalism;

- there are also a few wider aspects of liveability that come out strongly in the model, with litter and rubbish and access to open spaces in particular seeming important (which again chimes with our previous work);

- and last, but not least, the model suggests that satisfaction with local agencies is also highly related to satisfaction with areas. This is particularly the case for views of the council, which is in fact one of the strongest relationships with area satisfaction, although views of the police are also significantly related. As always, we need to be careful with our interpretation of cause and effect in these types of analyses (as, for example, other unmeasured factors could be causing this relationship), but it does suggest that councils in particular could have a key place-shaping role.

---

16 Physical Capital – the Rising Prominence of Liveability, Ipsos MORI: 2005
We can also look at how these factors within the questionnaire relate to overall satisfaction at an area level, by again simply plotting scattercharts. Interestingly, from all the measures included, the complete 7-strand ASB index shows by far the strongest relationship with area satisfaction, as shown below. This perhaps should not be a surprise, given the breadth of measures included, but it is useful in confirming that, taken together, these seven measures do capture a lot of what seems to be important to people about quality of life in local areas.

We repeated the same type of analysis as above for the cohesion measure of whether residents think people from different backgrounds get on well together – and again this shows some very interesting patterns:

- The perception that people do not treat each other with respect in the local area is by far the biggest driver of cohesion. In one sense this should not be a surprise, as we can see that the concepts of people getting on well and respect are logically related. However, this respect measure comes out in a few different models for a number of important outcomes, which suggests it is a key issue and should be a focus.

- And it is not just respect from individuals that is important, fairness and respect from services also come out as key drivers of this cohesion measure. The importance of these factors also reinforces the apparent role for services in achieving these outcomes locally.

- The importance of perceptions of parental control (it is the second most important single factor) to explaining ratings of local cohesion is very interesting. We have already seen that the proportion of young people in an area seems to be negatively related to both overall satisfaction with areas and perceptions of cohesion – but the relationship below also suggests that the extent to which they are perceived to be well disciplined by parents can be a positive driver of cohesion. This makes some intuitive sense, but is not something we have seen in other analyses of cohesion until now.

- The other factors that come out in the model are a similar mix of safety, community connection and service ratings that we saw with overall satisfaction with area.
So overall the two models provide some indication of the key factors that local agencies should probably be focusing on if they want to improve their scores against these key outcomes.

1.4 Mapping perceptions

While the models outlined above are important in deciding what types of issues are most important to focus on to improve perceptions, the Place Survey data can also help individual local authorities and agencies identify which local areas require particular attention. Each individual authority is required to achieve at least 1,100 completed questionnaires from their area – which clearly allows some reasonably reliable sub-area analysis.

However, this sample is not sufficient to look at most individual wards without significant survey error, and so just breaking the results down by official geographies is not possible or that useful. We have therefore worked with a mapping specialist to develop an approach that does not rely on administrative geography, but instead groups people into more meaningful areas, taking account of their responses to the questions (more details of the approach are provided in the appendices).

The importance and usefulness of this is seen in the examples below. The first map shows one area with a particular local concentration of dissatisfaction (the darker the colour the lower the level of satisfaction) and the second map shows similarly low levels of sense of belonging for the same area. This is useful to observe, but it would not have shown up in mapping approaches that rely on official geographies as the area straddles four different wards.
However, even with this more sophisticated mapping approach, we need to be mindful of the limitations of the data – not least that the sample approach is only designed to provide a representative picture for the local authority as a whole (and even here significant weighting is required because of differential non-response). We strongly believe that this tool is very important in getting the maximum from the survey data, but we should use it as tool to test our understanding of individual local areas, rather than coming to too firm a conclusion that may not be corroborated by other information.

However, the benefits of mapping perceptions even as a qualitative tool are immediately obvious from the simple example overleaf, where we show side by side the patterns of area satisfaction and sense of belonging for a number of boroughs in London.

This firstly provides an excellent picture of how views vary by area, where darker colours represent lower scores on these measures (satisfaction with area on the left and sense of belonging on the right). You can see that the chart on belonging has more dark areas, as we would expect scores on this measure to be lower than for satisfaction with the area. However, you can also see real patterns of response, including where they cross borough boundaries (for example, from northeast Sutton into Croydon).

Further, you can also see how and where these perceptions most strongly relate. In general the lightest areas on both charts correspond, as do a few areas of particular dissatisfaction with the area and lack of belonging (three locations have been circled). However, not all areas with low feelings of belonging are dissatisfied with their area overall, and vice versa – and it is here that this tool can be most useful in exploring what other factors are poorly rated in these neighbourhoods and therefore what should be a focus for action.

More examples of the benefits of mapping perceptions are given in the following chapters.
Overlap between levels of satisfaction with area and sense of belonging

Q3 Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?

Q4 How strongly do you feel part of your immediate neighbourhood?
2. Overall views of councils and local decision-making

Although the new CAA performance framework puts more emphasis on how partnerships work together to achieve better local outcomes, there will still be significant interest in how well individual public services perform.

Statutory members of Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) still have to submit Use of Resources and other self-assessment reports to inspectorates, outlining how they demonstrate value for money and how they are carrying out their duty to involve local communities – whether it is in priority setting, strategic planning or service delivery.

This section will therefore focus on two of the key overall ratings of Councils, as well as the key measure of how much influence local residents feel they have:

- Satisfaction with the way the local Council runs things.
- Whether the Council is seen to be providing value for money.
- Perceived ability to influence decisions in the local area. This is a key indicator of community empowerment, and is included in the National Indicator set as NI 4, as well as PSA 21 on empowerment (as measured in the Citizenship Survey).

The Government has made citizen empowerment a particular focus through the Community Empowerment White Paper, *Communities in Control*, which demands that public services are in tune with and accountable to local citizens. Some of the proposals in this paper which have been taken forward in the Local Democracy Bill include measures that directly relate to questions asked in the Place Survey – for example, new rights for the citizen to have more information and influence over major local decisions. This duty to involve has implications not just for local government, but for all the major players sitting on LSPs.

Taken together, examining views of overall satisfaction with how the local council runs things, their ability to deliver value-for-money and how able local people feel they are to influence local decisions should provide us with a coherent picture of how well local partnerships (led by councils) are seen to be serving their communities.

2.1 Overall findings

The trend in satisfaction with the Council is rather less positive than it is for satisfaction with the area. Overall, average satisfaction is down from 53% to 45% which means that satisfaction has dropped below 50% for first time since the statutory local authority surveys were introduced.

This is clearly concerning, given the increased focus on local government’s role in local areas – and it does seem that while perceptions of many important factors in local areas are improving (particularly on ASB as we will see in the next chapter), local councils are not getting the credit for their role in this from their local residents.

The pattern of decline is pretty similar for different types of local council, with the one clear exception of inner London boroughs, where satisfaction has remained more or less steady, and is actually above the 2003 level. In contrast, Mets/Unitaries have seen a particular decline in satisfaction (but again please note that these trends by authority type should be treated with caution).
Unfortunately, the question on value for money in the Place Survey has been changed significantly from that used in the BVPI surveys, such that trends are not meaningful. However, as the following chart shows, the ratings of councils on this measure are not particularly positive, with just one third of residents feeling they get value for money (33%). Again, it is inner London boroughs that stand out as more positive, with 44% of their residents agreeing with the statement, in contrast to 30% in outer London.

We can start to understand some of the likely reasons for this decline in satisfaction with the council (and the low ratings for value for money) in the two key charts that follow. These show negative trends in ratings of whether the council keeps the local area clear of litter and refuse (a key visible service for authorities) and information provision.

The measure of perceptions of cleanliness is particularly disappointing given the improvements seen between 2003 and 2006, and the fact that the proportion of residents that see litter/rubbish as a problem has actually gone down (as we will see in the next
chapter). Again, this seems to be a clear case of councils not getting credit for local improvements, which emphasises the vital importance of better communications.

And on this communications point, while question changes preclude a direct comparison, the trend does seem to be down, and it is notable that only 38% feel they are kept informed about local services (although again inner London is doing slightly better than average, particularly when compared with other urban authorities).

```
Q How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following services provided or supported by your local authority?… keeping public land clear of litter and refuse.
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year surveyed</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mets &amp; Unitaries</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>Inner London</th>
<th>Outer London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2006 question wording: How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the local authority has kept this land clear of litter and refuse.

Base: Place Survey 2008/09 (352 local authorities), BVPI 2006 and 2003 (387 local authorities)
Source: Ipsos MORI

```
Q Overall, how well informed do you feel about local public services?
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All council average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mets &amp; Unitaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London boroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Place Survey 2008/09 (131 local authorities: 59 district councils, 33 London boroughs, 25 Metropolitan districts and 14 unitary authorities)
Source: Ipsos MORI

Finally, in this section we have also tracked findings from the feelings of influence question – and again the trend is down, although only marginally – now 29% feel they have influence over local decisions, compared with 32% in 2006. As mentioned in the introduction to this section, this measure is also included in the Citizenship Survey (which is the basis for a PSA indicator), and while the findings from that are rather different from those in the Place Survey, the trend seen there is similar – also marginally down from 39% in 2005 to 38% in 2007/8.
2.2 Frontiers of performance

In contrast to satisfaction with area, there are fewer clear cut correlations between overall satisfaction with the council, perceptions of value for money and ability to influence on the one hand, and exogenous factors on the other. Nevertheless, there are some relationships worth noting.

2.2.1 Overall satisfaction with Council and value for money

For example, there are a cluster of key variables (as seen in our other work) such as income, occupation and educational levels in an area that correlate with satisfaction with the council – the higher the income, occupational grouping and educational attainment, the higher satisfaction is with the council. An example is shown in the following scatterchart, where areas with more residents in higher managerial and professional occupations tend to have higher satisfaction with the council. It is worth saying, however, that the strength of the relationship shown below can be influenced by a few very high income earners and a small number of very happy areas, such as in the City of London.
As in the previous chapter, by running multivariate analysis we are able to go beyond these simple correlations and identify the strongest relationships with satisfaction with the council. The model shown in the box below (although weaker than the model for area satisfaction) still explains 42% of all variation with satisfaction with the council. The key factors, again in order of relative importance are:

- the proportion of people in higher managerial and professional occupations, where the higher the proportion in these skilled occupations in a local authority, the more likely residents are to be satisfied with the way the council runs things;

- the proportion of the population aged under 10, where the greater the proportion of under 10’s, the lower the level of satisfaction. This suggests that there may be additional challenges involved in serving areas where there is a significant proportion of families with young children, although again we need to be cautious about attributing cause and effect;

- the proportion of housing in Council Tax Band C, where the greater the proportion of the population that fall into this lower end Tax band, the higher the satisfaction. This is interesting, as it contrasts with the positive relationship with higher social classes suggested above, and suggests there is not a simple relationship where the better off the area, the higher the likely satisfaction level;

- again region and in particular being situated in the North East is positively associated with satisfaction with the Council;

- the extent of urban settlements that are located in relatively sparse areas, is negatively related to satisfaction. Again this is an interesting factor to come out of the analysis and can be characterised as those larger towns and smaller cities that are based in otherwise relatively rural areas – these tend to be more prevalent in areas such as Cumbria, Northumberland, Lincolnshire, Devon and Somerset;

- inflow of people aged 1-14 years negatively impacts on satisfaction. While this is clearly related to the other measure of the proportion of under 10s in an area, this relationship is also likely to be a reflection of more general population churn.
Again the key benefit of this overall model is that it allows us to identify which individual areas have higher or lower levels of satisfaction than we would expect from their background characteristics. Comparing our predicted scores with actual scores, one area that seems to be doing particularly well on overall satisfaction is the London Borough of Wandsworth, which scores a satisfaction level of 75%, a full fifteen percentage points higher than the predicted score of 60% given its local characteristics. This chimes with wider inspection ratings – indeed, our previous *Frontiers* analysis has shown a very strong overlap with CPA scoring, and this is something we will explore now that the full data are available.

The value for money measure is very closely related to the satisfaction measure, and therefore not surprisingly similar context factors come out in the multivariate analysis. We have not therefore outlined these in full here.

### 2.2.2 Feelings of Influence

When it comes to feelings of influence locally, our analysis shows that the more diverse, densely populated an area, the higher the levels of feeling of influence. The following scatter chart shows that areas that have high ethnic fractionalisation tend to have higher feelings of influence.

This is interesting, as in previous *Frontiers* reports, ethnic diversity has tended to be negatively associated with key outcome variables. Clearly these simple correlations need to be interpreted carefully – and they only suggest that diverse areas are more likely to have higher perceptions of influence, not that it is this diversity itself that leads to higher feelings of influence. However, we do know from the individual-level analysis that those from minority ethnic groups are more likely on average to have greater perceptions of influence. This does not help us to unpick the extent to which this relationship reflects any objective reality or lower expectations, or whether the observed relationship is caused by a third, unrelated factor. Nevertheless, this analysis is important to consider when judging an individual area’s relative performance on influence using perceptions data.

Once again, by running advanced multivariate analysis of various exogenous factors we can assess which factors are most important in explaining feelings of influence. In this case the model can explain 63% of all variation with feelings of influence, which is very strong for this type of analysis. The key factors that come out are:
- Ethnic fractionalisation, is *positively* related to feelings of influence. This measure is based on the proportion of people from each of 15 different ethnic groups in a local authority area.

- The level of net international migration is also positively *correlated*. This measures the number of people per 1,000 (rate) that are entering the local authority area from another country minus those leaving to live in another country. Again this suggests diversity and change as positive drivers of feelings of influence.

- The region the local authority is in, with being in the North East showing higher levels of influence.

- Urbanity appears to correlate *negatively* with influence. This may seem surprising, given that diversity is positively related to feelings of influence and urban areas are more diverse, but we need to remember that this relationship is after controlling for other factors in the model – it therefore suggests that for any given level of diversity, less urban areas will have greater feelings of influence.

We will not present the full *Frontiers* gap analysis between actual and predicted scores for this measure (or those included in the remainder in the report), as these will be most useful when the full results are available and confirmed as final.

### 2.3 Key drivers of overall satisfaction with Council

Having examined the exogenous factors that drive satisfaction with the council, we now turn to how other perceptions data collected through the Place Survey are related to this key measure. Whilst the model below can explain almost 46% of the variation in overall satisfaction with the council, no single factor stands out as the key driver, and a whole mix of factors contribute. However, it is clear that the various factors can be grouped into themes that tell a familiar story:

- It is interesting to note that the most important factor in the model is area satisfaction, which again shows the close inter-relationship between satisfaction with the council and place. However, as noted, we need to remember that this type of regression analysis illustrates association only, not cause and effect. Naturally, what councils do in a local area is important in whether people are happy with their area, but it could also be argued that if people are happy with their area, they are likely to be more positive about the council – and that external factors such as affluence (e.g. occupation and household income) are associated with both.

- Crime and liveability factors collectively form a strong theme. These service areas – including refuse collection, litter, police performance, dealing with ASB and services working together to make the area cleaner and greener - are highly visible issues that people can judge as being delivered well or not by the council.

- Then there is a cluster of factors that relates to how the council actually delivers services and relates to citizens; these include being treated with respect, that services treat people fairly, that the council acts on the concerns of local people and that local people can influence decisions.

- As we have seen in previous *Frontiers* reports and other Ipsos MORI research, information appears to be a key driver of satisfaction. Being well informed about public services generally appears to correlate highly with satisfaction, alongside the more specific knowledge of how council tax is spent.
As one might expect, there are some similarities in the regression models for satisfaction with the council and perceptions of value for money. However, there are some interesting differences of emphasis on the value for money measure:

- Area satisfaction is not the top driver in this case - rather ratings of refuse collection is most related to perceptions of value for money, and more so than for satisfaction with the council. Again, this universal service is a very specific service that all tax paying citizens can see and judge whether they are getting value for money on;

- As expected, information on how council tax is spent is slightly more emphasised here. Simply put, councils need to communicate well on how they are spending money if want to be viewed positively on value for money.

Turning to what drives feelings of influence, the following model (which accounts for 32% of variation in perceptions) illustrates the importance of communication with residents on a
variety of matters ranging from how to get involved, about public services generally and what standard of services to expect. Furthermore, it suggests it is important that local partnerships show they are actively seeking citizens’ views (as opposed to passively listening) and that they act on those views. What the model cannot unpick is cause and effect, and it is not possible to say what comes first – a predisposition to being positive about these types of factors or feelings of influence.

Analysis we have conducted elsewhere has suggested that feelings of influence are more strongly related to positive outcomes in local areas\(^\text{17}\) than actual involvement in specific activities or initiatives. Taken together with the model below, these findings suggest that councils are likely to have a greater impact on feelings of influence and other perceptions by communicating and demonstrating positive change on factors that are important to people, rather than focusing on more active involvement measures that reach fewer people. Of course, we need to be careful with over-simplifying this, as communicating the existence of more engaging approaches can be an important factor in giving even those who do not actively use them an increased sense of influence.

### Drivers of agreement: Residents can influence decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive drivers</th>
<th>Negative drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How you can get involved in local decision making</td>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public services act on the concerns of local residents</td>
<td>- 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council seek peoples’ views</td>
<td>Ethnicity - white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the way the council runs things</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council provides value for money</td>
<td>Owner occupied tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belong to immediate neighbourhood</td>
<td>- 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do in the event of a large scale emergency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how well informed about local public services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents take enough responsibility for behaviour of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public services promote the interests of local residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burnt out cars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed about what standard of services you should expect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.4 Mapping perceptions

As outlined in the previous chapter, mapping perceptions data can add greatly to the usefulness of the Place Survey and help public service managers focus attention on the differences in views between relatively small geographical areas.

Again, the first map below shows a local concentration of dissatisfaction with the council (the darker the colour the lower the level of satisfaction) that would not show up in ward-level analysis, as it straddles four different wards.
But the real value of this approach is in comparing the geography of perceptions on different measures. The example below shows how satisfaction with the council compares with feelings of influence in the same local authority area (again where darker areas are more negative on each measure). There is a local concentration of negative opinion on both dimensions in the north eastern end of Enfield Lock ward, but while those in Chase ward tend to be relatively satisfied with the Council, a significant section of the ward seems to have low feelings of influence.

This will no doubt be related to the different types of local populations in each of these areas, but raises interesting questions about how different factors will be important in different areas and therefore the extent to which actions can be targeted quite finely on a neighbourhood basis.
3. Crime and safety

The need for the policing community to understand local people’s concerns, priorities and attitudes has never been greater. Over the past 18 months, the Flanagan Review\(^\text{18}\), the Neighbourhood Crime and Justice Group’s review ‘Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime’\(^\text{19}\) and the Policing Green Paper\(^\text{20}\) have all focused heavily on the need to improve public confidence in policing and the way crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) are being dealt with. The key recommendations are consistent with the themes covered in Ipsos MORI’s report *Closing the Gaps*\(^\text{21}\) and provide a clear steer for local activity:

- Increased accountability.
- More effective communications.
- Improved customer care.
- Better partnership working between police, partners and communities.

The wider policing community has moved into a new era with opportunities for more flexible styles of working with local residents truly at the core. The new single top-down confidence measure ensures that police forces will be measured, compared and judged upon how local people feel and what they say about them.

The Place Survey includes questions mirroring the British Crime Survey (BCS) measures which feed directly into PSA 23 ‘Make communities safer’. The first of these is the single measure itself which gauges public confidence in local agencies involved in tackling crime and ASB, albeit worded slightly differently within the Place Survey:

**Place Survey version:**

*It is the responsibility of the police and other local public services to work in partnership to deal with anti-social behaviour and crime in your local area …*

*How much would you agree or disagree that the police and other local public services are successfully dealing with these issues in your local area?*

**BCS version (single top-down measure):**

*It is the responsibility of the police and local council working in partnership to deal with anti-social behaviour and crime in your local area …*

*How much would you agree or disagree that the police and local council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in this area?*

Whilst force-level data is available from the BCS, the size of the sample does not allow for sub-force analysis of this key question - therefore analyses of key drivers tend to have been undertaken at either national or force level. The Place Surveys therefore provide further opportunity for police and partners to understand the drivers of public confidence and the role which local area factors play.

As well as this variation on the single confidence measure, the Place Survey replicates the seven questions within the BCS which provide a measure of perceptions of ASB. This 7-strand index was included in previous BVPI surveys and formed the basis of our previous report *Anti-Social Behaviour: People, Place and Perceptions* which mapped perceptions

---


\(^\text{20}\) From the neighbourhood to the national: policing our communities together, Home Office: 2008

across the country and identified areas where perceptions were better or worse than expected given local area characteristics.

In addition to these measures, the Place Survey includes a question to gauge overall satisfaction with the local police force. This provides a force-wide reputational measure and provides an opportunity to measure the extent to which these wider attitudes correlate with the more localised confidence measures. Similarly, the survey provides the opportunity to gauge the correlation between confidence measures and perceptions of personal safety in the local area.

The Place Survey findings therefore provide a significant opportunity for extending understanding of the main associations with key PSA 23 indicators and how these correlate with other key measures, in turn, providing a steer for how forces and local partners can most effectively drive change in order to meet the challenging targets that have been set.

3.1 Overall findings

Before we look at the findings in this section, it is important to note that some of the results in this section are not based on official data released by CLG on 23 June 2009. Only a small number of variables were made public on that date and these did not include satisfaction with the police or specific strands of the ASB Index. As such, for these questions, we have based our analysis and commentary only on data for the local authorities that we have access to (some 150). So the figures presented in some of the following charts may differ from future official updates from CLG.

The Place Survey results show that overall, under half (47%) of respondents are satisfied with their local police force, a similar proportion to those satisfied with the council (45%). When the results are broken down by local authority type, opinion is generally more positive across all most LA types other than in the Districts.

This is consistent with British Crime Survey data which shows residents in London are slightly more likely to say the police are doing a good/excellent job than across England and Wales as a whole (55% vs 53%; 2007/8 BCS22). These positive findings in the capital may reflect the strong brand of the Met and its association with high profile cases, as well the positive local initiatives in place (Safer Neighbourhood teams, etc).

---

Just over one in four (26%) agree that the police and other local public services are successfully dealing with ASB and crime issues in their local area. Again, responses are most positive in London, where 29% agree.

This figure is significantly below the 46% of people who are positive on the PSA 23 measure within the British Crime Survey\textsuperscript{23}. However, findings are not directly comparable between the two surveys for several key reasons:

1. **Differences in question wording.** For example, by adding the term “successfully”, we would naturally expect lower scores in the Place Survey findings – this will be a harder condition to satisfy than just “dealing with” used in BCS.

2. **Differences in questionnaire context.** As with any surveys one must interpret findings within the context of the questionnaire – how people answer questions can be affected by the nature of preceding questions. The BCS and the Place Survey cover very different issues.

3. **Differences in methodology.** Differences in sampling and data collection methods (i.e. face-to-face vs postal) means results cannot be directly compared.

\textsuperscript{23} *Public Confidence in the Police and their local partners: Results from the British Crime Survey year ending September 2008,* Home Office: 2009
The overall findings relating to the ASB 7 strand index are positive, showing a decrease in perceived levels of ASB across most areas. The proportion of residents rating ASB as ‘high’, as defined by the 7-strand index, has dropped from 23% in 2006 to 20% in 2008. This follows previous improvements between the 2003 and 2006 BVPI surveys.

The positive trend mirrors the pattern from the BCS which showed an improvement in the ASB index measure from 18% to 16% from 2006/7 to 2007/8, from a high of 21% in 2002/3.

The largest improvement has been observed within metropolitan/unitary areas (an average decline of 4 percentage points), but the differences are marginal with the average decline in London being -3 percentage points and in the districts -2 percentage points. This is quite surprising given the strong links between perceptions of ASB and local factors such as deprivation and population churn (as highlighted in our previous report Anti-Social Behaviour: People, Place and Perceptions), and more work will be required to understand what might be driving the positive changes observed in the metropolitan/unitary areas.
This downturn in overall perceptions of problems with ASB masks some variation between the individual elements of the index, with some witnessing particularly positive improvements. Of note, is that perceptions of drug dealing and drug use are down 12 percentage points overall and fairly consistently across areas.

There are similar decreases in the proportion of people citing teenagers hanging around and rubbish and litter as local problems as the following charts show. For both issues, the pattern of response is similar; the biggest drops appear to be among districts (-7 percentage points since 2006 for litter and -15 percentage points for teenagers hanging around).

These findings are particularly positive with regards to teenagers hanging around on which there was a negative upward trend in perceptions between 2003-2006 and where perceptions can have a particular effect on how people feel the police/others are dealing with the things that matter.
Perceptions of problems with teenagers hanging around the streets over time

Q Thinking about this local area, how much of a problem do you think each of the following are… Teenagers hanging around the streets?

Base: Place Survey 2008/09 (131 local authorities), BVPI 2006 and 2003 (387 local authorities) Source: Ipsos MORI

Perceptions of problems with rubbish or litter lying around over time

Q Thinking about this local area, how much of a problem do you think each of the following are… rubbish or litter lying around?

Base: Place Survey 2008/09 (131 local authorities), BVPI 2006 and 2003 (387 local authorities) Source: Ipsos MORI

However, not all aspects of ASB have improved. Perception of problematic drunken and rowdy behaviour is more or less at the same level as 2006. This follows previous improvements between the 2003 and 2006 BVPI surveys.

This specific ASB measure presents us with the clearest distinction between more urban areas and districts, likely reflecting geographic variations in the night-time economy and subsequent movement of people across areas.
Looking at proportions of people who feel safe in the local area after dark, nearly half say they feel safe (49%), rising to 55% in districts. Once again, there is an interesting distinction in opinion between inner and outer London, with those in inner London more likely to feel safe.

3.2 Frontiers of performance

We have identified a range of strong relationships with the various ASB, crime and policing related questions asked in the Place Survey. Many of these relate to local levels of deprivation and other key background factors such as housing tenure, occupation and educational attainment.
3.2.1 Overall satisfaction with the police and confidence in the police

By running regression analysis, we can gauge the relative strength of these various exogenous factors on satisfaction with policing and it is interesting to see that, taking into account all possible variables, region emerges as the strongest factor. The model shown in the shaded box below explains 54% of all variation in satisfaction. The key factors are:

- the **region** the local authority is in, with **North East** authorities more satisfied and those in the **East Midlands** less satisfied, after accounting for other factors in the model;
- the **proportion of people in routine manual occupations**, where the higher the proportion in these relatively unskilled occupations in a local authority area, the **less** likely residents will be satisfied with the police;
- the **net change in population aged 15-24 years**, whereby, the higher the net increase in this age group, the **lower** the satisfaction. It is possible that this measure is both an indication of an increasing young population but also as a proxy for population churn;
- the **employment deprivation rating from IMD**, which again is **negatively** related to satisfaction and is higher in areas with high levels of unemployment and illness-related benefit claimants.

Turning to the key question measuring confidence in the police and other public services in dealing with the main local issues, similar correlations emerge between occupation, income and qualifications on one hand and confidence on the other. For example, as the following chart shows, the greater the proportion of the population with no qualifications in an area, the less likely residents are to think that the key crime and ASB problems are being successfully dealt with.

**Successfully dealing with ASB and crime vs No qualifications**

![Chart showing the relationship between no qualifications and agreement with successfully dealing with ASB and crime](chart)

R^2 = 21%

Base: All valid responses, 323 local authorities, Place Survey 2008/09
Source: Ipsos MORI

Again, by running the regression analysis, we can gauge the relative strength of various exogenous factors on confidence – and it is interesting to see this model is quite different from the model on satisfaction with the police. Here, educational attainment is the strongest
factor to emerge. The model shown in the shaded box below explains 56% of all variation with confidence. The key factors are:

- the **proportion of the population with no qualifications** - where the greater the proportion of the population that fall into this category, the *lower* confidence is;
- the **proportion of the population aged under 10**, which again is *negatively* related to confidence;
- the **region** the local authority is in, with being in the **South East** negatively related to confidence (controlling for other factors in the model) while, again, being in the **North East** tends to be associated with higher levels of confidence;
- the **proportion of housing in Council Tax Band C**, where the greater the proportion of the population that fall into this lower end Council Tax band, the *higher* the confidence.

### 3.2.2 The 7 Strand ASB index

Looking at perceptions of ASB (using the 7-strand index score), the strongest correlation is with levels of local deprivation, as shown in the following chart. This correlation is consistent with previous analysis we ran on the 2006 BVPI data to inform our report *Anti-Social Behaviour: People, Place and Perceptions*.

![Perceptions of anti-social behaviour vs IMD (2007)](chart)

Given that the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) has a crime element as one of its constituent building blocks, it makes sense to break down IMD within the analysis into its separate domains and exclude the specific crime measures (as we are interested in factors beyond the control of local agencies in this section of the analysis). However, even after taking the crime-specific measures out, the model shown in the shaded box below still explains 88% of all variation with the 7-strand ASB Index, which is extremely strong for a model such as this. As we have seen, satisfaction with area can also be fully explained in this way – and we know that ASB and area satisfaction are themselves very closely related, so this is perhaps not that surprising. The key factors are:
3.2.3 Feeling safe in the local area after dark

When it comes to feeling safe in the local area after dark, a number of factors correlate which have been already identified in relation with confidence in policing and ASB index measures. These include employment status, occupation and the proportion of young people in the area – but the strongest simple correlation is again with IMD. As with the other crime-related perception measures, we have excluded the crime domain from IMD in the analysis – but again, we can still explain a very high level of the variation seen between areas. Indeed, from knowing only five background characteristics we can explain 83% of the variation in feelings of safety across different areas of the country:

- The education measure from IMD, where the greater the proportion of the population that fall into the lowest 30% in the IMD education rankings, the lower the likelihood of feeling safe.

- The extent of towns/cities of more than 10,000 people in less sparse surrounding areas is also negatively related to feelings of safety. This is basically a measure of urbanity, with feelings of safety lowest in the most urban areas.

- The proportion of Asian people living in the area also has a negative relationship with feelings of safety. As noted above, this is also seen in the model for the ASB measures, and is subject to the same caveats on cause and effect.

- The final negative factor is the inflow of people aged 1-14 years, which again comes out as a factor explaining variation in satisfaction with the Council, and is closely related to measures in the other crime-related models above – it is likely to be an indicator of both an increasing young population and more general population churn;
Lastly, the region the local authority is in, with the **North East** having greater feelings of safety and those in **London** feeling less safe (even after controlling for other variables in the model).

### 3.3 Key drivers of views

As with previous chapters, we have also looked at what factors within the Place Survey questionnaire are most related to our key crime measures, to try to identify the key issues that local agencies should focus on to improve perceptions on these key outcomes.

#### 3.3.1 Satisfaction with police

The analysis below explains 35% of variation in satisfaction with the police, which, as seen in other chapters, is actually lower than the amount of variation we can explain through background characteristics alone. This emphasises the importance of taking into account the local context, but will also partly be a reflection of the relatively small number of wide-ranging measures included in the Place Survey.

The variable with the strongest association, perhaps not surprisingly, is the proportion of respondents who agree that local services are successfully dealing with crime and ASB issues. This may seem rather circular, but if nothing else it confirms that this single confidence measure is important to wider ratings of satisfaction. This is also consistent with previous analysis of the British Crime Survey (2005/6) which identified belief that the local police are dealing with the things that matter to communities as the strongest association in believing the police are doing a good or excellent job.

Nonetheless, the model also confirms the apparent importance of how public services - not just the police - deal with the public in terms of actively seeking views, acting on the concerns of local people, and treating them with respect. These are all factors which featured strongly in the Casey and Flanagan reviews and are fundamental components of the Policing Pledge.

![Drivers of satisfaction: Your local police force](image)

**Positive drivers**

- Successfully deal with issues: 32%
- Council/services seek peoples' views: 13%
- Satisfaction with the way the council runs things: 11%
- Local public services act on the concerns of local residents: 8%
- Treated with respect by your local public services: 8%
- Overall satisfied with local area: 7%
- Satisfied with local bus services: 6%
- Keeping public land clear of litter and refuse: 5%

**Negative drivers**

- 9%
- Male

35.4% of variation explained by model

Source: Ipsos MORI

---

### 3.3.2 Agree public services are successfully dealing ASB and crime issues

When we conduct similar analysis on agreement with whether the police and other public services are successfully dealing with ASB and crime, again, being seen to actively seek views emerges as having a strong association with confidence. Indeed this comes out ahead of satisfaction with the local police force, which suggests that while satisfaction and confidence are related, they do not measure exactly the same dimension — and that if the police and other local services do want to increase this confidence measure, they need to focus a significant amount of their attention on proactively seeking residents’ views.

The factors on the right hand side of the chart which have a negative impact on perceptions illustrate the relationship between perceptions of ASB and the extent to which police and others are judged to be dealing with the issues that matter — with the key measures including teenagers hanging around, vandalism/graffiti and people being drunk/rowdy. And, as seen in earlier models on views of the area generally and perceptions of the council, feeling that people in the local area treat others with respect is an important measure.

To some extent these findings mirror those from multivariate analysis of BCS data for the year ending September 2008, although there is a slightly different emphasis. This BCS analysis identified two main factors for the similarly worded PSA 23 question; perceiving that the local police can be relied on to deal with minor crimes and perceiving that the police deal with people fairly and/or with respect.

### 3.3.3 The 7 strand ASB index

With regards to what strongly associates with the overall ASB index, the respect measure emerges as by far the strongest factor (27% of the variation is explained by the model). This is perhaps not surprising but it does confirm the close links between lack of respect and individual anti-social behaviour issues when it comes to public perceptions.

Other factors likely to impact on perceptions of ASB show that liveability issues are important too — for example, whether respondents feel street cleaning is an important improvement to prioritise.
Factors that improve perceptions of ASB again reflect the characteristics of local areas: those where it is safe to go out in the local area during the day and after dark, are clear of litter, and have more White British residents.

3.3.4 Feeling safe in the local area after dark

When similar analysis is run on the issue of whether or not people feel safe in their local area after dark, demographic factors are more likely to emerge as key factors than we have seen in previous models. Being male, in full-time work and in good health are factors positively associated with feeling safe, whilst being aged 65 or over is negatively related. This sort of relationship with demographic factors is not new, but the fact that they emerge in this analysis does illustrate the different nature of this variable compared with the previous crime and ASB-related measures.

The perceived threat from teenagers hanging around, and to a lesser extent drunkenness, vandalism and drug dealing, has a demonstrable impact on perceptions of safety and helps to explain why issues around (diversionary) activities for teenagers consistently emerge as such a key priority issue for people across the country.

Sense of belonging, perceptions of respect and attitudes towards parental responsibility also have an important bearing.
3.4 Mapping perceptions

Earlier, we showed that satisfaction with the police (and other public services) is closely related to their ability to actively seek views from citizens – such as policing priorities - and then being able to demonstrate they are acting on the concerns of local people.

Below we have mapped these perceptions, using our NIMA GIS application to show how the patterns of the PSA 23 confidence measure and seeking people’s views on ASB for the same local area look when placed side by side.

As with the previous examples, this firstly just provides a picture of how views vary across a local authority area. You can see that left hand side map on confidence has fewer dark areas, as we would expect from the scores on this measure being lower than on perceptions of views being actively sought. Furthermore, you can also see how and where these perceptions most strongly relate. In general the lightest areas on both charts correspond, as do a few areas of particular disagreement on both dimensions, in particular the concentration of negative perception circled.
ASB: Feeling that it is being dealt with, and that public services are seeking people’s views on it, are closely related
4. Health

In order to achieve the world class health services that people expect, those charged with providing those services are increasingly being asked to work with local partners to assess and meet the needs of their population. The requirement for Joint Strategic Needs Assessments, created in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, is intended to lead to stronger partnerships between communities, local government and the NHS. Partnership working was also emphasised in the Operating Framework for the NHS in 2008/09, with the aim that this will produce stronger and more informed commissioning decisions that improve health and social care provision and reduce inequalities.

The 2007 Act also includes provisions for a duty to cooperate when determining LAA targets – and a duty to have regard to those targets. LAAs will be key tools in enabling local authorities and PCTs, along with other health partners, to effectively identify and prioritise the health and well-being needs of local people.

Clearly, this creates a need for comprehensive data at a local level – the NIs on which local authorities and their partnerships will be performance managed contain 31 health-related outcomes. But it goes beyond performance management; PCTs and local authorities will need robust evidence in order to plan and commission appropriate services for the local population. They need a diverse range of information including data on health outcomes, lifestyle factors and patient satisfaction.

Two of the three main health satisfaction measures included in the Place Survey are discussed in this chapter - satisfaction with GPs and local hospitals. Of course, patient experience data like this is now being collected in a plethora of formats, for a range of reasons and audiences, not least the requirements of World Class Commissioning. But it is not enough simply to consider the surface data, particularly given the impact of exogenous factors, and this chapter will use the Place Survey data as an illustration of this.

We know from our Frontiers analysis the importance of ‘place’ in shaping people’s views of the healthcare they receive. Our 2008 report was based on further analysis of the Healthcare Commission’s patient survey data and suggested that these ratings do not always tell the full story. Our analysis showed that PCT services in areas with high ethnic fractionalisation, high deprivation, those with a younger population and those situated in London nearly always receive lower ratings than those serving wealthier, older, more homogenous populations. This means that when looking at patient perception of services, it is important to take into account local factors, and in some cases it will be misleading to compare PCTs in very different areas with each other. It is perhaps more useful to look at health services in the context of other services in the area – and how well are they doing in comparison with other local public services.

This chapter will take the health satisfaction measures used in the Place Survey and look at them within the context of the local community. It will aim to understand the relative performance of the services rated, given the area and community served and the key associations with those outcomes. This chapter will also illustrate the benefits of a visual approach to identifying patterns in the data. This approach is not just limited to satisfaction data though – it could be applied in public health for example, particularly looking at lifestyle factors.

Using the available data in a more sophisticated way will be crucial for planning services that meet the needs of a specific population. In order to commission patient-centred services, we need to understand where the pockets of dissatisfaction are and the nature of the challenges posed.
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Again, it is important to note that some of the results in this section are not based on official data released by CLG on 23 June 2009. Only a small number of data variables were made public on that date and these did not include satisfaction with the local GP, local hospital or dentist. As such, for these questions, we have based our analysis and commentary only on data of the local authorities that we have access to (some 150). So again, the figures presented in some of the following charts are preliminary.

4.1 Overall findings

Satisfaction with GPs (77%), hospitals (65%) and dentists (54%) in the local area is significantly higher than with the council (45%) and local police (47%). We also find high satisfaction scores for specific health services in other research, scores that rise even higher among those who have actually used the services (i.e. patients).

For example, in an unpublished survey from December 2008, 74% of all respondents were satisfied with their last visit to an NHS hospital. Until recently, reported overall satisfaction with the running of the NHS lagged behind these high satisfaction scores with individual services. Despite many patients seemingly having good experiences (reflected in their satisfaction scores), this did not seem to filter through to views of the NHS as a whole. However, more recently there has been a significant improvement in overall satisfaction with the running of the NHS, with more also agreeing that the NHS provides a good service nationally. Analysis suggests that good personal experiences of local NHS services are increasingly influencing levels of satisfaction with the NHS as a whole – the closing of the "perception gap" is an encouraging trend for the government.

The pattern of satisfaction by authority area type is also different for health services compared with those looked at in previous chapters; in particular, the more positive ratings of the Council and the police we have seen among Londoners (particularly those in inner London) is not reflected in views about the three local health services, as seen in the three following charts.

Satisfaction with GPs and hospitals is lower across both inner and outer London and dentists is an issue in inner London. Metropolitan/Unitary and District authorities tend to be more positive than seen in previous chapters.
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Satisfaction with your GP

*Q* Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following public services in your local area?... *Your GP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Satisfied</th>
<th>All council average</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Mets &amp; Unitaries</th>
<th>London boroughs</th>
<th>Inner London</th>
<th>Outer London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Place Survey 2008/09 (121 local authorities: 49 district councils, 33 London boroughs, 25 Metropolitan districts and 14 unitary authorities)

Source: Ipsos MORI

Satisfaction with your hospital

*Q* Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following public services in your local area?... *Your local hospital*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Satisfied</th>
<th>All council average</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Mets &amp; Unitaries</th>
<th>London boroughs</th>
<th>Inner London</th>
<th>Outer London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Place Survey 2008/09 (121 local authorities: 49 district councils, 33 London boroughs, 25 Metropolitan districts and 14 unitary authorities)

Source: Ipsos MORI
These lower ratings in London as regards health services may be different to that found elsewhere in this report in relation to the councils and local police, but they are in line with the results of our previous health *Frontiers* work. Our 2008 report also showed how results differ for London, where the overall PCT\(^\text{28}\) and inpatient ratings were significantly lower than in other regions.

Our previous *Frontiers* report suggests that the specific nature of the population in London and the demands they put on the health service results in lower ratings. Residents tend to be younger, and there are pockets of deprivation across the city along with a high level of ethnic diversity. These factors all emerge from our *Frontiers* report as key to a PCT’s rating, as well as emerging as key negative correlations in the multivariate analysis of satisfaction with local GP and hospital which we discuss below.

\(^\text{28}\) Overall PCT rating derived from 28 questionnaire items from the 2005 PCT patient survey
4.2 Frontiers of performance
4.2.1 Overall satisfaction with GP

The apparent importance of even very simple measures of the age structure of local populations is seen in the following chart, where those areas with higher proportions of residents aged 60 or over tend to have higher satisfaction with their GPs.

Multivariate analysis allows us to look across a large number of these type of relationships between residents’ satisfaction with their local GP and exogenous factors to identify the most important. The resulting model explains 66% of all variation in satisfaction, which is very high and includes just the following four factors:

- The **region** the local authority is in, appears to have the strongest association with satisfaction with GPs, with living in the **North East** having higher satisfaction scores and those in **London** lower scores. This is very consistent with the regional patterns seen in previous chapters – services across all domains seem more likely to achieve higher levels of satisfaction in the North East than in other regions.

- **IMD**, which explains 18% of all variation in this model and is *negatively* related to satisfaction.

- **Ethnic fractionalisation**, is also *negatively* related to satisfaction.

- The **proportion of the population aged 60+** is a positive correlation, as we might expect from the chart shown above.

This model contains some of the same factors previously found to be important in patient ratings of PCTs in the *Frontiers of Performance in Health* report, confirming their relevance when interpreting patient ratings. The North East (albeit less strongly) and areas with a higher proportion aged 65 and over have positive relationships with PCT ratings. Ethnic fractionalisation and deprivation emerged as having a negative relationship. The current analysis therefore confirms the continuing importance of ‘place’ in developing an understanding of patient experience in primary care.
4.2.2 Overall satisfaction with hospital

Turning now to consider the importance of local factors in relation to ratings of local hospitals, the Place Survey data shows a fairly clear relationship between ethnicity and satisfaction. In particular, there is a fairly strong negative relationship between our measure of ethnic diversity and satisfaction with the local hospital - areas in which there are a wider range of ethnicities living together tend to record lower ratings for their local hospital, as the following chart shows. The relationship is not perfect, or particularly strong – but this is partly due to a small number of significant outliers in the bottom left-hand side of the chart, where satisfaction with hospitals is very low despite the local population being relatively homogenous. When the full Place Survey results are published we will be able to explore reasons behind these outliers in more detail.

The multivariate analysis confirms the importance of the ethnic profile of areas, as well some familiar patterns from earlier sections. The resulting model explains 42% of all variation in satisfaction with the hospital, which is lower than for satisfaction with local GPs, but still relatively strong, and includes just three factors:

- The **region** the local authority is in appears to have the strongest association with satisfaction, with, again, the **North East** having higher satisfaction scores with local hospitals and those in **London** lower scores.

- **Ethnic diversity** is confirmed as *negatively* related to satisfaction.

- An age-related factor also again comes out – this time the **proportion of the population aged 10-16 years** is also a negative correlation.

The current analysis closely echoes previous *Frontiers* findings. In the 2008 report, we found that exogenous factors were less strongly associated with ratings of inpatient care than for PCTs, and the same sort of significant relationships were seen: that analysis found a negative relationship between ratings of inpatient care and the level of ethnic fractionalisation.

---

29 Previous Frontiers analysis refers to ratings of inpatient care only, not all hospital care
4.3 Key drivers of views

As might be expected, Key Driver Analysis, looking for associations between factors from the Place Survey and satisfaction with local health services, is of much more limited use than in previous chapters, because there are very few health-related variables included in the survey.

As the following chart shows, it only explains around 15% of variation in satisfaction with GPs. Nonetheless, there are some findings shown in the following chart worth considering. Firstly, and unsurprisingly, we can see that those people who are satisfied with a range of other local services are also more likely to be satisfied with the healthcare they receive.

Furthermore, there are other factors which are useful in confirming trends and patterns of response that we know from other research. For example, an older age profile (aged 65+) appears to be closely and strongly related with satisfaction with GPs. This is a common finding, not just in relation to health services, with older people more likely to rate most public services highly.

By contrast, just two factors show negative association with GP satisfaction in this model. Full time workers are less likely to be satisfied – possibly related to ease of access to GP services. We know from the National GP Patient Survey (2007/08) that most people are relatively happy with the appointments they are able to make but a significant minority report problems. For example, 82% report they are satisfied with their practice’s opening hours, with those in full time work more likely to be amongst those who are dissatisfied.

The model also shows a negative association between satisfaction and residents of Asian ethnicity; this may be linked to language barriers and cultural issues. For example, we know from qualitative work carried out for NHS Oldham the importance of designing services around the specific needs of the community. While not all residents wanted GPs to be matched to the community they served, several areas were highlighted where a better understanding of the community would lead to more effective delivery of services.

---

*Oldham Public Health Report, NHS Oldham: 2008*
With regard to satisfaction with hospitals, the following chart shows a similar set of factors as coming out as most related to perceptions. Again, it should be noted that this model only accounts for 16% of variation in satisfaction and so should be treated with caution.

However, it does show the importance of being treated with respect by the services used – the most important factor here. Again, this echoes findings from our previous Frontiers analysis (shown in the second chart below), where being treated with dignity and respect was found to be by far the most important factor in a very strong model of patient satisfaction with inpatient care.

The analysis of the Place Survey data, while much less tailored to health-related issues, is very consistent with previous findings from health analyses we have conducted, and confirms the importance of a more sophisticated approach to the analysis of patient experience data. Particularly for commissioners, an understanding of the nature of the area and the challenges it poses will be crucial in the planning and delivery of effective services.
4.4 Mapping perceptions

The benefits of mapping perceptions even as a qualitative tool are obvious from the simple example below, where we compare patterns of GP satisfaction and perceptions of being treated with respect by public services generally in a local area.

This identifies a pocket of real dissatisfaction with both measures on the edge of Cray Valley East ward, in a wider area of broadly positive ratings. The fact that there is a geographical relationship between these two variables should not be surprising, given the importance of being treated with respect in health services that we have seen above. However, it suggests that it could be useful for local services to explore GP provision in this particular geographical area further to see whether aspects of service can be improved, as it is possible that particular experiences are colouring wider views of public services locally.
5. The Ipsos MORI Area Challenge Index

Our Frontiers studies have always been about taking better account of context when interpreting perception measures. This is an increasingly important issue when, on the one hand, so much of performance is now judged on perceptions, but on the other hand, as we’ve seen, these perceptions are highly related to factors that are not in the direct or immediate control of local agencies.

In the spirit of CAA, we have therefore tried to look across the key outcome measures in the Place Survey to see what background characteristics are consistently shown to be associated with making satisfaction hard to achieve – and created what we’ve called our “Area Challenge Index”.

Some very useful area classification systems are already available, along with useful indices published by government and others. However, we haven’t seen anything that tries to summarise how difficult it is to achieve high perception scores in particular areas – which is what we are trying to do here.

Obviously, as we have seen, different background factors will be more or less important for different services, but we have also seen that there are core features and domains that remain fairly consistent. From this synthesis we have constructed a seven domain index which includes:

- **the Indices of Multiple Deprivation:** this is itself a composite index, and has been seen in our analysis time and again to be very powerfully related to perceptions – the more deprived your area, the harder it will be to achieve satisfaction across a range of issues;

- **ethnic diversity:** again, this has come up in previous analyses, with the more diverse an area, the harder it is to achieve satisfaction. Interestingly, one key factor that is positively related to diversity is feelings of influence in local areas, which again chimes with other work;

- **young people:** the more people aged 19 or under in an area, the harder it is to achieve satisfaction. The point needs to be made that the analysis doesn’t prove that this causes dissatisfaction, but it doesn’t need to, as the aim is only to assess which areas will have the hardest job in achieving high satisfaction levels. The challenge from having a large proportion of young people in your area comes out more strongly and consistently in this analysis than we have seen in any previous studies;

- **population churn:** fairly intuitively, the greater the turnover of local populations, the harder it is to achieve satisfaction;

- **physical living conditions:** a number of these measures correlate with perceptions, but the one that comes out most consistently is a measure of over-occupancy – the more households over-occupying their homes in your area, the harder it is to achieve satisfaction;

- **urbanity:** the more urban, the harder it is to achieve positive perceptions.

- and **region:** in particular, being in the North East is associated with higher satisfaction (even after accounting for other characteristics included in the models), while being in London is negatively associated.

From this we can create scores for each local authority area on how easy or difficult a job it is for them to achieve high ratings on these satisfaction measures – effectively how challenging...
it will be to do well on these perception measures. The index scores run from 1-100, where 1 represents the least challenged area and 100 the most challenged. While this work is only preliminary and needs further refinement, our analysis suggests that from all areas in the country, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Hackney have the hardest job in achieving positive perceptions – and areas in the North East like Teesdale (now Durham County Council) and Alnwick (now Northumberland County Council) have it the easiest.

The “challenged” areas are much more likely to be in London (although it does also have some of the easiest, such as the City of London), but other large urban centres like Manchester, Birmingham and Blackburn are confirmed as facing tough challenges in achieving high levels of satisfaction. Among Districts, places like Oxford and Burnley have a combination of background characteristics that will make it hard to score highly on perception measures.

The tables of the five most and least challenged for each type of authority are shown below.

### Five most challenged metropolitan/unitary authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authority</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

### Five least challenged metropolitan/unitary authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authority</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lincolnshire</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire, County of</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

### Five most challenged London boroughs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authority</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

### Five least challenged London boroughs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authority</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond upon Thames</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*
Five most challenged district/borough authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authority</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

Five least challenged district/borough authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authority</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth (now Northumberland CC)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shropshire (now Shropshire CC)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale (now Northumberland CC)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick (now Northumberland CC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale (now Durham CC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

Of course, an area can face significant challenges, but if it is given resources to deal with these then we would expect them to still perform well. We have therefore compared our Area Challenge Index with spending per head by the local council – and there is indeed a strong relationship between challenges and resources, particularly in single-tier authorities. That is, there is a close relationship between how hard our Index says an area is to work in to achieve positive perceptions and how much money they have to spend as the following chart shows.

**Area challenge index vs single tier authorities spend per capita**

![Chart showing the relationship between area challenge index and spend per capita](chart.png)

*Base: 114 single tier authorities, Place Survey 2008/09*
Appendices

Appendix A: National Indicators measured using data from the Place Survey

In 1998, when Public Service Agreements (PSAs) were first brought in, only one was based on public perceptions from the 600 targets set. Now over a quarter of the 30 current PSAs include perception-based measures, as do a sixth of the 188 National Indicators used to assess local government performance.

The Place Survey is one of the main sources for many of these perception-based measures at the local level, and the 18 National Indicators which are measured using data from the Place Survey are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>NI Category</th>
<th>Headline description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of people who feel that they belong in their neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civic participation in the local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall/general satisfaction with local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in regular volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stronger Communities</td>
<td>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime issues by the local council and police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of parents taking responsibility for the behaviour of children in their area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions that people in the area treat one another with respect and consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime issues by the local council and police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of civil protection arrangements in the local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour as a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of drug use or drug dealing as a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Adult health and wellbeing</td>
<td>Self reported measure of people's overall health and wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction of people over 65 with both home and neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which older people receive the support they need to live independently at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair treatment by local services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Variables included in the Frontiers model

Themes
Age, gender, ethnicity, religion and place of birth - including Workplace Population (UV75), age structure and age groups, Country of Birth (KS05 and UV08), Ethnic Group (KS06 and UV09) and Percentages (UV09P) and Identification as Welsh (KS06A), Multiple Ethnic Groups (UV69), Religion (KS07 and UV15), Sex (UV03)

Health: Air Emissions: Benzene Emissions/Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) Emissions/Particulate Matter (PM10) Emissions/Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) Emissions from all Sources, Ambient Air Quality: Scores of Benzene Concentrations/ Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) Emissions/Particulate Matter (PM10) Emissions/Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) Emissions at Background and Roadside Locations, Combined Air Quality Indicator, General Health (UV20), Healthy Lifestyle Behaviours: Model Based Estimates, Health and Provision of Unpaid Care (KS08), Life Expectancy at Birth, Infant Mortality, Life Expectancy: Healthy and Disability-Free Years, Limiting Long-term Illness (UV22), Live Births, Years of Potential Life Lost Indicator, Low Birthweight Live Births, Mental Health Indicator, Mental Illness: 1) Admissions and Admission Rates to NHS Hospitals by Age and Gender, 2) by Fitted Consultant Episodes and Discharges by Primary Psychiatric Diagnosis and Gender, Hospital Admissions by Age and Sex and Summary Statistics, Hospital Episode Statistics by Age and Sex and Ethnicity, Welsh Patient Episode Statistics, Conceptions - Under 18's, Comparative Illness and Disability Indicator, Emergency Admissions to Hospital Indicator, Percentage of Hospital Episode Statistics, Percentage of Road Accidents by Type and Age, Road Accident Data, Provision of Unpaid Care (UV21), Total Fertility Rate, Standardised Mortality Ratios, Deaths

Benefits: Legal Help and Help at Court Claimants, Attendance Allowance Claimants, Child Benefit Statistics, Disability Living Allowance Claimants, Family Credit Claimants, Housing Benefit, Working Families Tax Credit Claimants, Council Tax Benefit Claimants, Incapacity Benefit and Severe Disablement Allowance Claimants, Private Rent Determinations for Housing Benefit, Severe Disablement Allowance Claimants, Benefits Data Indicators: Working Age Client Group/Summary Statistics/Working Age Client Group, Pension Credit Claimants, State Pension Claimants, Percentage of Income Support Claimants/Percentage of Jobseekers Allowance Claimants by Age and Dependents, Percentage of Working Families Tax Credit Claimants, Claimant Count and Claimant Count Rate

Financial - income and debt: Combined Income Indicator, County Court Judgments - Personal Consumer Debt, Income: Model-Based Estimates

Rurality, population density and area classification: Combined Road Distance to Services Indicator, Countryside Agency's Ward Level Definition of Rural Areas, Rural and Urban Area Classification for Output Areas, Super Output Areas and Wards, Population Density (People Per Square Km) and Population Density (UV02), National Statistics 2001 Area Classification of Local Authorities/Output Areas/Super Output Areas/Data Zones

Employment and occupation: Employee Jobs, Employment Rate, Economic Activity - By gender and age, Worklessness: Summary Statistics, Hours Worked (KS10 and UV41), Industry of Employment - All People (KS11A and UV34), by gender, NS-SeC of Household Reference Person - People Under Pensionable Age (UV32 and UV33, Distance Travelled to Work - Workplace Population (UV80 and UV35), Annual Population Survey - Economic Activity, Employment Activity all Ethnicity/Gender/Age, Approximated Social Grade - Workplace Population (UV78), Combined Employment Indicator, Occupation Groups - All People (KS12A and UV30), by gender, National Statistics Socio-economic Classification - All People (KS14A and UV31) and by gender and Workplace Population (UV76), New Deal Programme: Starts and Jobs Gained, by ethnic group and by gender, Residents in Households by NS-SeC of Household Reference Person Under Pensionable Age (UV85), Time Since Last Worked (UV27)

Household Composition and over crowding: Households (UV65) and Alternative Classification (UV66), Household Composition - People (UV46) and Alternative Classification (UV47), Household Composition (KS20), Living Arrangements (KS03 and UV82), Lone Parent Households with Dependent Children (KS22), Spaces and Accommodation Type (KS16) and Type (UV68), Marital Status (KS04 and UV07), Households with Limiting Long-term Illness and Dependent Children (KS21), Number of People Living in Households (UV51), Number of Rooms (UV57), Occupancy Rating (UV59), Persons per Room - Household Residents (UV83), Persons per Room - Households (UV58), Communal Establishment Residents (KS23 and UV71) and Communal Establishments - People (UV73 and UV70), Dependent Children (UV06), Same-Sex Couples (UV93)

Tenure and amenities: Tenure - Households (UV63 and KS18) and Pensioners (UV45) and People (UV43), Households by Selected Household Characteristics (UV67), Local Authority Dwelling Stock by Size, Age and Type, Housing Stock (UV53), Homelessness, Accommodation Type - Household
Spaces (UV56) and People (UV42), Lowest Floor Level (UV61), Rooms, Amenities, Central Heating and Lowest Floor Level (KS19), Dwelling Stock by Council Tax Band, by Tenure and by Condition, Difficulty of Access to Owner-Occupation Indicator, Changes of Ownership by Dwelling Price, Percentage Change in Dwelling Prices, Social Housing Rents, Social Rented Housing: Demand and Supply, Vacant Dwellings, Amenities (UV60), General Demand Indicators

**Deprivation:** Indices of Deprivation 2007 for Super Output Areas, Wards, Local Authority Summaries and Electoral Divisions, Indices of Deprivation 2007 Underlying Indicators: Barriers to Housing and Services/Education, Skills and Training/Employment/Health Deprivation and Disability/Living Environment/Income Deprivation Affecting Children and Income Deprivation Affecting Older People

**Education and qualifications:** Qualifications (UV24), and Qualifications and Students (KS13), Working Aged Adults with No or Low Qualifications Indicator, University Admissions by Place of Residence, Key Stage 3 Achievements of 14 Year Old Pupils in Maintained Schools (Referenced by Location of Educational Institution), National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 1, 2 and 3 by Ethnic Group, Referenced by Location of Pupil Residence/Free School Meal Eligibility, Referenced by Location of Pupil Residence/Referenced by Location of Educational Institution, National Curriculum Assessments of 11 Year Olds by Gender in England (Referenced by Location of Educational Institution/Referenced by Location of Pupil Residence/Referenced by Location of Pupil Residence), Annual Population Survey - Qualifications all Ethnicity/Gender/Age, Secondary School Absence Indicator, Combined National Curriculum Assessments (Key Stages 2, 3 & 4) Indicator, Further Education Success, Retention and Achievement Rates, Examination Results for Young People by Ethnic Group, Referenced by Location of Student and Pupil Residence and Educational Institution, Home Student Enrolments on Higher Education Courses at Publicly Funded Higher Education Institutions (Referenced by Location of Student Residence), Knowledge of Welsh (KS25 and UV13), Percentage of Home Student Enrolments on Higher Education Courses at Publicly Funded Higher Education Institutions (Referenced by Location of Student Residence), Percentage of Pupils Achieving 5 or More GCSE Grade A*-C (or Equivalent), Key Stage 2 Maths and English Level 4, Primary School Pupils at Key Stage 2, Pupil Absence in Schools by Ethnic Group, Referenced by Location of Pupil Residence, Free School Meal Eligibility, Referenced by Location of Pupil Residence, Referenced by Location of Educational Institution, Referenced by Location of Pupil Residence, Work Based Learning Success Rates, Schoolchildren and Students in Full-time Education Living Away From Home During Term-time (UV05)

**Crime, ASB and justice:** Local Crime Data (Selected Offences): Information from Individual Police Forces and Information from Regional Crime Partnerships, Notifiable Offences Recorded by the Police, 1999/00, 2000/01, Fire and Rescue Service: All Incidents and Fires Attended

**Business and enterprise:** Local Units by Broad Industry Group: Urban/Rural, Local Units by Employment Size Band: Urban/Rural, Local Units by Public/Private Status: Single/Multi Site, Commercial and Industrial Floorspace and Rateable Value of Premises either with or without Accommodation/Commercial and Industrial Property Vacancy Statistics, Enterprises by Age of Business, Business Demography: Enterprise Births & Deaths, VAT Based Enterprises by Age of Business and Broad Industry Group (at ward level and rural/urban), VAT Based Enterprises by Employment Size Band and Public/Private Status: Single/Multi Site (at ward level and rural/urban), VAT Based Local Units by Broad Industry Group and Employment Size Band (at ward level and rural/urban), VAT Based Local Units by Public/Private Status: Single/Multi Site (at ward level and rural/urban), VAT Registered Enterprises by Employment Size Band and Industry Group

**Transport and Travel:** Method of Travel to Work - Daytime Population (UV37) and Resident Population (UV39), Cars or Vans (KS17), Vehicle Licence Data, Travel to Work (KS15)


**Sundry:** Domestic Energy Consumption, Vital Statistics, Welsh Language Skills (UV84), Armed Forces (UV81), Best Value Performance Indicators, 2000/01 (Survey Data) General Satisfaction with Local Authority and Street Cleanliness, Best Value Performance Indicators, 2000/01 (Survey Data) Tenants Satisfaction with Opportunities for Participation, Land Use Statistics (Generalised Land Use Database and Previously-Developed Land)
Appendix C

IMD definitions
The IMD 2007 is a measure of multiple deprivation at the small area level. The model of multiple deprivation which underpins the IMD 2007 is based on the idea of distinct dimensions of deprivation which can be recognised and measured separately. These are experienced by individuals living in an area. People may be counted in one or more of the domains, depending on the number of types of deprivation that they experience. The overall IMD is conceptualised as a weighted area level aggregation of these specific dimensions of deprivation.

The IMD allows direct comparison between areas while recognising the multidimensional nature of deprivation. IMD and its constituent individual domains measure deprivation at a small area level – Lower Layer Super Output Area (LSOA). Each LSOA is made up of a grouping of Census output areas and contains, on average, about 1,500 residents.

Income Deprivation Domain
The purpose of this domain is to capture the proportion of the population experiencing income deprivation in an area.

- Adults and children in Income Support Households (Source: Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) 2005)
- Adults and children in Income-Based JSA Households (Source: DWP 2005)
- Adults and children in Pension Credit (Guarantee) Households (Source: DWP 2005)
- Adults and children in those Working Tax Credit households where there are children in receipt of Child Tax Credit whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60 per cent of the median before housing costs (Source: Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs (HMRC) 2005)
- Adults and children in Child Tax Credit Households (who are not eligible for IS, Income-Based JSA, Pension Credit or Working Tax Credit) whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60 per cent of the median before housing costs (Source: HMRC 2005)
- National Asylum Support Service (NASS) supported asylum seekers in England in receipt of subsistence support, accommodation support, or both (Source: NASS 2006)

In addition, an Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index and an Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index were created. These two indices represent the proportion of children aged 0-15 living in income deprived households and the proportion of older people aged 60 and over living in income deprived households respectively.

Employment Deprivation Domain
This domain measures employment deprivation conceptualised as involuntary exclusion of the working age population from the labour market.

- Recipients of Jobseekers Allowance (both contribution-based and income based): men aged 18-64 and women aged 18-59 (Source: DWP 2005)
- Recipients of Incapacity Benefit: men aged 18-64 and women aged 18-59 (Source: DWP 2005)
- Recipients of Severe Disablement Allowance: men aged 18-64 and women aged 18-59 (Source: DWP 2005)
Participants in the New Deal for the 18-24s who are not in receipt of JSA (Source: DWP 2005)

Participants in the New Deal for 25+ who are not in receipt of JSA (Source: DWP 2005)

Participants in the New Deal for Lone Parents (after initial interview) (Source: DWP 2005)

**Health Deprivation and Disability Domain**
This domain measures rates of poor health, early mortality and disability in an area and covers the entire age range.

- Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL) (2001 to 2005, Source: ONS)
- Comparative Illness and Disability Ratio (CIDR) (2005, Source: DWP)
- Measures of acute morbidity, derived from Hospital Episode Statistics (2004 to 2005, Source: Department of Health)
- The proportion of adults under 60 suffering from mood or anxiety disorders based on prescribing (2005, Source: Prescribing Pricing Authority), Hospital Episode Statistics (2004 to 2005, Source: Department of Health) and Incapacity Benefit data (2005, Source: DWP)

**Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain**
This domain captures the extent of deprivation in terms of education, skills and training in a local area. The indicators are structured into two sub domains: one relating to education deprivation for children/young people in the area, and one relating to lack of skills and qualifications among a sub-set of the working age adult population.

**Sub Domain: Children/young people**

- Average test score of pupils at Key Stage 2 (2 year weighted average, 2004-2005, Source: Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF))
- Average test score of pupils at Key Stage 3 (2 year weighted average, 2004-2005, Source: DCSF)
- Best of 8 average capped points score at Key Stage 4 (this includes results of GCSEs, GNVQs and other vocational equivalents) (2 year weighted average, 2004-2005, Source: DCSF)
- Proportion of young people not staying on in school or non-advanced education above the age of 16, Source: HMRC Child Benefit (CB) data
- Secondary school absence rate (2 year average 2004-2005, Source: DCSF)
- Proportion of those aged under 21 not entering higher education (5 year average, 2001-2005, Source: Universities and Colleges Admission Service (UCAS), Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA))

**Sub Domain: Skills**

- Proportions of working age adults (aged 25-54) in the area with no or low qualifications (Source: 2001 Census)

**Barriers to Housing and Services Domain**
The purpose of this domain is to measure barriers to housing and key local services. The indicators are structured into two sub-domains: ‘geographical barriers’, and ‘wider barriers’ which includes issues relating to access to housing, such as affordability.

**Sub Domain: Wider Barriers**

- Household overcrowding (Source: 2001 Census)
- LA level percentage of households for whom a decision on their application for assistance under the homeless provisions of housing legislation has been made, assigned to the constituent SOAs (Source: Communities and Local Government, 2005)
- Difficulty of Access to owner-occupation (Source: modeled estimates produced by Heriot-Watt University, 2005)

**Sub Domain: Geographical Barriers**

- Road distance to a GP surgery (Source: National Administrative Codes Service, 2005)
- Road distance to a general stores or supermarket (Source: MapInfo Ltd, 2005)
- Road distance to a primary school (Source: DCFS, 2004-05)
- Road distance to a Post Office or sub post office (Source: Post Office Ltd, 2005)

**Crime Domain**

This domain measures the rate of recorded crime for four major crime types, representing the risk of personal and material victimisation at a small area level.

- Burglary (4 recorded crime offence types, Police Force data for April 2004-March 2005, constrained to Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) level)
- Theft (5 recorded crime offence types, Police Force data for April 2004-March 2005, constrained to CDRP level)
- Criminal damage (10 recorded crime offence types, Police Force data for April 2004-March 2005, constrained to CDRP level)

**The Living Environment Deprivation Domain**

This domain focuses on deprivation with respect to the characteristics of the living environment. It comprises two sub-domains: the ‘indoors’ living environment which measures the quality of housing, and the ‘outdoors’ living environment which contains two measures about air quality and road traffic accidents.

**Sub-Domain: The ‘indoors’ living environment**

- Social and private housing in poor condition (2003 – 2005 average, Source: BRE and Communities and Local Government, modelled EHCS)
- Houses without central heating (Source: 2001 Census)

**Sub-Domain: The ‘outdoors’ living environment**
- Air quality (2005, Source: Geography Department at Staffordshire University and NAEI modelled at LSOA level)

- Road traffic accidents involving injury to pedestrians and cyclists (2003-2005 average, Source: DfT, STATS19 (Road Accident Data) smoothed to LSOA level)

The following table sets out the domain weights which were used to combine the domains into an index of multiple deprivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Weight</th>
<th>Domain weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Deprivation Domain</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Deprivation Domain</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Deprivation and Disability Domain</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Housing and Services Domain</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Domain</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Environment Deprivation Domain</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Geospatial Analysis
In order to create geo-spatial maps from survey data we have to use a technique by which we can interpolate estimates for all points (postcodes) within a local authority rather than just those we achieved responses from. **Inverse distance weighting (IDW)** is a common method for multivariate interpolation, a process of assigning values to unknown points by using values from a randomly scattered set of known sample points (our respondents).

We have chosen this methodology rather than some of the more complex geostatistical interpolation techniques because IDW is an exact interpolator, where the maximum and minimum values in the interpolated surface can only occur at sample points. IDW assumes that the surface is being driven by the local variation, which can be captured through the neighbourhood - and this is what we expect to find in the place survey data.

The test surface we developed in the NIMA pilot (using BVPI 3) used IDW and passed empirical verification - the “hotspots” it derived were meaningful to the local authority. Nevertheless, the output surface is prone to error since the output surface is sensitive to clustering and the presence of outliers, which is why we passed a smoothing kernel over the raw IDW data surface (we have used a circular kernel of radius 250m) which not only smoothes some of the localised error, but also creates a more visually appealing output surface.