

Annexes

CONTENTS

A.1	The Evaluation Framework	290
A.2	The Household Surveys.....	295
A.3	Answering the Really Difficult Questions	297
A.4	Publications to Date	316

A.1 The Evaluation Framework

Introduction

- A.1.1 A full evaluation plan was produced for the national SRB evaluation at the outset which can be downloaded from the Department of Land Economy website at http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk/research/reuag/uars/pdf/discussion_paper_083.pdf. This section describes those elements that relate to the calculation of the VFM and mainstream bending.

A Suggested Approach

- A.1.2 It is clear that the VFM component of the evaluation of the SRB requires a robust methodology that is consistent with existing Treasury Guidance and also reflects new thinking as presented in the Draft Green Book. The methodology has to be capable of bringing together a considerable range of benefits that SRB will bring to the residents of the areas upon which it is being targeted. It has to identify the appropriate alternative position that would exist in the area concerned without the SRB and disentangle the contribution of a wide range of other disparate influences on the changes in outcomes that occur in the SRB areas. The fact that the effects of SRB will unfold over a considerable period of time and that regeneration will be achieved through different mechanisms makes the evaluation particularly challenging. It suggests that considerable emphasis should be placed on establishing a clear baseline position that describes the economic, physical and social characteristics of the area at the outset and from which change can be assessed in the policy period.
- A.1.3 It will also be necessary as part of the VFM exercise to obtain a wide variety of data using carefully constructed questionnaires and interview techniques including the use of social surveys. The work will require an analysis of how flows of public expenditure are influenced by the actions of SRB and, thus, what additional public expenditure takes place relative to the non-SRB alternative position.
- A.1.4 We suggest that a number of key stages of analysis are required and these are summarised in Diagram A.1. The key steps are:

- ◆ Obtain information on the activities and gross outputs associated with the SRB projects and the expenditure incurred disaggregated by key funding source. We discuss below the arguments for doing this for all SRB areas or only a sample;
- ◆ Assess the additionality of SRB projects using five categories. These are:

	Range	Mid-point
Negligible additionality	0-9%	4.5
Low additionality	10-34%	22.0
Medium additionality	35-54%	44.5
High additionality	55-74%	64.5
Very high additionality	75-100%	87.5

Other information will need to be assembled for the relevant projects relating to intended beneficiaries, displacement, substitution and leakage effects;

- ◆ Assess the additionality of the public sector financial contribution to the funding of the project. This will require an analysis of mainstream bending according to

whether it has taken place over short or relatively long distances;

- ◆ Establish the baseline position in relation to key outcome indicators in each SRB area drawing upon a range of published and unpublished data sources and through the use of social surveys;
- ◆ Establish evidence for each of the key outcome indicators in the SRB area at specific times during the life of the SRB and identify gross changes that lie behind the net outcomes. (The social surveys are essential in order to establish the gross changes that lie behind changes in net outcomes);
- ◆ Combine evidence from project outputs with evidence on changes in area key outcomes remembering that there are difficult measurement problems, that change takes place often only relatively slowly and people move into and out of the areas that are the subject of the SRB assistance. This has clear implications for the scale of the survey work that should be undertaken.

A.1.5 When the above information is brought together it should be possible to provide estimates of:

- ◆ The cost per unit of gross and net additional outputs across SRB areas for the programme as a whole and for particular “types” of SRB areas (see below);
- ◆ An assessment of the contribution of SRB in bringing about changes in key outcome indicators according to each domain. This work should contribute to, and be a part of, the evidence base cross-domain interactions that occur under SRB.
- ◆ The extent to which SRB has been able to “bend” mainstream funding over short and long distances;

A.1.6 The overall VFM associated with the SRB programme as a whole and how it has varied across individual SRB areas and perhaps groups of SRB areas.

DIAGRAM A.1: THE KEY STEPS IN THE VFM CALCULATION

Step 1: Contextual area analysis



- Establish the baseline conditions for the area through household survey (e.g. employment rate, unemployment rate, housing tenure, health status, educational achievements, compared to District, Regional and national average). Also use secondary data sources (published/unpublished).
- Prioritise objectives of the urban policy based on current baseline conditions.
- Obtain information on activities and outputs designed to meet objectives of the programme through delivery of outputs (e.g. number of jobs created, business start-ups, houses improved etc).
- Set in place mechanisms to monitor project progress, milestones and achievements. Record gross outputs and key expenditure flows.
- Audit of physical, economic and social characteristics of area.
- Stocktake of mainstream expenditure and other expenditure by Area-Based Initiatives (ABI's).

Step 2: Establish actual gross outputs

Gross outputs from programme*			
Output description	Actual gross outputs	Forecast outputs	Actual as % of forecast
No FTE jobs created	200	150	133
No FTE jobs safeguarded	300	300	100
No new business start-ups	100	90	111
Number private sector dwellings completed	150	150	100
No benefiting community safety initiatives	1000	1000	100
No dwellings with upgraded security	400	450	89
Land improved/reclaimed for open space (Ha)	100	100	100
People access to new health facilities	5000	5000	100
No using improved sports facilities	500	490	102
No voluntary organisations supported	20	20	100
Etc...			

* ALL FIGURES ARE ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY

Step 3: Assess project additionality

Range of project additionality estimates		
	Range	Mid-point
Negligible additionality	0-9%	4.5
Low additionality	10-34%	22.0
Medium additionality	35-54%	44.5
High additionality	55-74%	64.5
Very high additionality	75-100%	87.5

Interviews with project managers and beneficiaries that allow relevant counterfactuals, deadweight, displacement and leakage to be established.

Step 4: Gross to net

Net additional outputs from programme	
Output description	Net additional outputs
No FTE jobs created	90
No FTE jobs safeguarded	150
No new business start-ups	70
Number private sector dwellings completed	100
No benefiting community safety initiatives	1000
No dwellings with upgraded security	300
Land improved/reclaimed for open space (Ha)	65
People access to new health facilities	1100
No using improved sports facilities	222
No voluntary organisations supported	20
Etc	

Links with beneficiary surveys

Step 5: Estimate net additional public expenditure



Net additional public expenditure (£000s)					
Project	Urban policy	Other public expenditure	Additional estimate of other public	Net additional other public	Total net additional public expenditure
Project 1	100	100	64.5	64.5	164.5
Project 2	50	75	4.5	3.4	53.4
Project 3	250	300	44.5	133.5	383.5
Project 4	1000	750	22.0	165	1165
Total scheme	1400	1225		366.4	1766.4

BENDING ANALYSIS
(see A below)

Interactions between key domains and also welfare to work

A - ESTIMATES OF PROGRAMME BENDING IN CASE STUDY SCHEMES (£M)						
	Mainstream Programmes			Other regeneration programmes		
	Total	Short distance bending	Long distance bending	Total	Short distance bending	Long distance bending
Project 1	7.9	3.5	1.3	0	0	0
Project 2	3	1.5	0.1	8.6	2.1	2.1
Total	10.9	5	1.4	8.6	2.1	2.1

Step 6: Net additional outputs per £20,000

net additional public spend



Net additional outputs per £20,000 net additional public expenditure		
Output description	Net additional outputs	Net additional outputs per £20,000 net add pub expend
No FTE jobs created	90	1.02
No FTE jobs safeguarded	150	1.7
No new business start-ups	70	0.8
Number private sector dwellings completed	100	1.13
No benefiting community safety initiatives	1000	11.3
No dwellings with upgraded security	300	3.4
Land improved/reclaimed for open space (Ha)	65	0.7
People access to new health facilities	1100	12.5
No using improved sports facilities	222	2.5
No voluntary organisations supported	20	0.2

COMPARISON OF NET ADDITIONAL OUTPUTS PER £20,000 NET ADDITIONAL PUBLIC EXPEND FOR SELECTED OUTPUTS					
	Jobs created	No businesses advised	No priv dwellings improved	No benefiting from comm safety inits	People with access to new sports facs
Policy 1	0.4	3	2	1000	500
Policy 2	0.2	6	3	2000	600
All	0.3	4.5	2.5	1500	550

Step 7: Compensate 'basket' of benefits for distributional considerations



RECOGNISE IMPORTANCE OF DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS (GREEN BOOK ASKS FOR EXPLICIT RECOGNITION)

- Suggest using survey work to establish resident 'weights' (quality of life through the economic/social/physical);
- Attach weights to elements in 'basket';
- Weights established through household surveys, also specific surveys (focus groups);
- Also allow for distributional impact marginal utility of consumption gain higher for lower income groups

Step 8: Attributing outcome changes to urban policy



- Assess domain outcomes changes on residents who have participated in urban projects and compare domain outcome changes on residents who have not participated directly. Use of common data set.
- Consider both gross and net outcome changes.
- Combine gross outcome data with net output data and beneficiary survey data.

	AREA AS A PLACE TO BRING UP CHILDREN							
	SATISFACTION WITH ACCOMMODATION AND AREA							
	COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT							
	CRIME AND SAFETY							
HEALTH								
INCOMES - RESPONDENT/SPOUSE INCOME								
QUALIFICATIONS, SKILLS, TRAINING								
HOUSEHOLD ATTRIBUTES								
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD								
	ALL AREAS				Area 1			
	2002		Change 02-05		2002		Change 02-05	
	%		%		%		%	
Employed full-time	32	(32)	+1	(-1)	26	(22)	0	(-1)
Employed part-time	10	(8)	-2	(0)	10	(5)	-1	(+2)
Unemployed (registered & not registered)	10	(8)	-2	(-1)	17	(16)	-3	(-3)
Economically inactive (working age)	30	(29)	-4	(-4)	34	(41)	-4	(-7)
Retired	23	(28)	+7	(+7)	16	(27)	+11	(+5)
Employment rate excluding retired (%)	55	(56)	+4	(+4)	43	(37)	+5	(+4)
Unemployment rate as conventionally measured (%)*	19	(17)	-3	(-4)	31	(37)	-2	(+3)

Use of household surveys;
Panel element surveys establish beneficiaries from projects - effects of project involvement consider in/out movement directly.

*Panel element shown in brackets.

A.2 The Household Surveys

Introduction

- A.2.1 The first stage of the social survey work was undertaken by MORI between November 1996 and February 1997 when 3,459 interviews were conducted with households in Chalkhill, Hangleton & Knoll, Royds Bradford, Canalside Rochdale, Swadlincote, Sunderland and Nottingham. The results of this work were published in 1998¹.
- A.2.2 Between November 1999 and February 2000 a repeat resident social survey was undertaken by MORI in the three SRB case study areas that had completed their SRB schemes, namely Hangleton and Knoll in Brighton and Hove, the Chalkhill estate in the London Borough of Brent and Canalside Rochdale. The survey used virtually the same questionnaire as was used in the baseline survey which was undertaken in the three areas in 1996. This enabled a three year comparison of changes in resident characteristics, behaviour and attitudes over the period of the SRB schemes, providing useful statistical evidence on any possible regeneration outcomes which may have been caused, at least in part, by the SRB schemes. The findings from this work were published in the Department of Land Economy Discussion Paper series²
- A.2.3 More recently, between September and December 2001 MORI undertook the final phase of the social survey work involving the four remaining areas of Bradford, Nottingham, Sunderland and Swadlincote to coincide with the completion of their SRB schemes.

Survey design and methodology

- A.2.4 The surveys in 1996, 1999 and 2001 consisted of face-to-face interviews with households of, on average, about 45 minute duration.
- A.2.5 Both the 1999 and 2001 repeat surveys were made up of three elements: a panel element, a cross-section element and a movers follow-up. We chose this approach to gain a better understanding of how changes in regeneration outcomes occur.
- A.2.6 A feature of the survey design this time was to include a panel element so that some of the families surveyed in 1996 were surveyed again in 1999 and 2001. This permits results to be generated about changes in behaviour and attitudes of the same household at both points in time. The aim was to make the panel component as large as possible but attrition rates in deprived areas are relatively high. By the time of the follow up surveys some of the households responding in 1996 had moved out of the area and yet other households refused to answer the questionnaire a second time. In 2002 panel sample sizes were reduced to 233 in Bradford, 120 in Nottingham, 219 in Sunderland and 259 in Swadlincote, a total of 831 for the four areas, which represents 36% of the original respondents. This compares favourably with the 1999 survey when 33% of original respondents made up the 'panel' element. Overall, the 'panel' element for the seven areas was 35% (see Table A2.1).
- A.2.7 After taking account of the 'panel' component of the survey the sample numbers were topped up with new households which had not been surveyed in 1996 in order to obtain survey results for each of the neighbourhoods comparable in random sample

¹ Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund: Key results from the residents' baseline social surveys, Department of Land Economy Discussion Paper 100.

² Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund: Summary household survey results 1996-1999, Department of Land Economy Discussion Paper 122.

size to the 1996 survey. These 'area' results are referred to as the cross-sectional sample and this was selected to be representative of the whole so that comparing the 1996 cross-section to the repeat survey cross-section is a valid statistical exercise.

- A.2.8 It was originally hoped that the outward movers could literally be tracked to their new location to answer a second questionnaire. However, it was not possible in 1996 to put in place a mechanism which would provide information on the new address people had moved to. Considerable effort was put in to trace the whereabouts of outward movers but very few had left forwarding addresses and the local authorities and SRB partnerships either had no record of destinations or could not reveal them for reasons of data protection. A small number were traced - but too few to give statistically reliable results.
- A.2.9 However, we were able to identify the characteristics of those households which took part in the 1996 baseline survey and subsequently moved away and compare them with the characteristics of the panel sample. It was also possible to identify households in the 1999 survey which had moved into the area since 1996 and compare their characteristics with out movers. Such analysis highlights how changes in outcomes in the area had been affected by movement out of and into the areas.
- A.2.10 The analysis presented in the thematic tables of the survey results below compare net changes in outcomes both for the panel samples and the cross-section samples between 1996 and 2001 for each of the seven areas. In addition, for comparison purposes they show the aggregate results from the 1999 survey of the other three SRB areas (Chalkhill, Hangleton & Knoll and Rochdale). Results from all seven SRB areas are also presented. Net changes in outcomes are those revealed by the survey and they represent the average change in outcome for the sample households as a whole. They are the average response of those households reporting an improvement or deterioration in circumstances and those reporting "no change". All statistically significant results are presented in bold.
- A.2.11 As part of the survey methodology some analysis of the panel sample is being undertaken to show how relatively small net changes in household responses were made up of much larger gross changes in responses in both directions. For example, if satisfaction with the area had increased by two percentage points it was possible to see how this small net change occurred as the balance between larger gross numbers who recorded improved satisfaction levels between 1996 and 1999 partially offset by those who recorded no change or a deterioration in satisfaction levels. It was also possible to see the proportions making only one step up the satisfaction rating (e.g. from fairly satisfied to very satisfied) and those leaping 8 steps from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. More work is being undertaken on the analysis of gross change and the modelling of change. Actual sample sizes for the 1996, 1999 and 2001 surveys are presented in Table A2.1 below with response rates:

Table A2.1: Sample sizes for 1996, 1999 and 2001 surveys

	Cross-section sample				Panel sample		Response rate %	
	1996		1999/2001		No	As % of total sample	1996	1999/2001
Chalkhill ¹	465	13	477	12	128	27	61	63
Hangleton & Knoll ¹	384	11	538	14	204	38	51	46
Rochdale ¹	480	14	560	14	195	35	56	58
Bradford ²	523	15	633	16	230	36	76	73
Nottingham ²	438	13	498	13	120	24	66	50
Sunderland ²	564	16	595	15	219	37	66	63
Swadlincote ²	605	18	565	15	257	45	69	61
Total	3459	(100%)	3866	(100%)	1353	(35%)	59	59

¹Follow up survey in 1999. ²Follow up survey in 2001.

A.3 Answering the Really Difficult Questions

(Bobby Duffy, John Rhodes, Peter Tyler, Rachel Williams and Angela Brennan)

Introduction

A.3.1 A key feature in the national evaluation was to use resident household surveys. This section describes the approach.

The key research questions

A.3.2 In order to answer many of the key research questions it was necessary, during the course of the evaluation, to collect a considerable amount of information about individuals and households both at a point in time and also through time. The information was required to assess the characteristics of residents in relation to their social and economic well-being, and thus their unemployment status, level of income and many other characteristics. It allowed an assessment to be made of the breadth and depth of the social exclusion that they were experiencing and how this has been changing through time.

A.3.3 With this sort of information to hand it was then possible to investigate the inter-relationships that exist between different components of the problem, i.e., how poor educational achievement is associated with labour market performance, etc. This is a starting point from which to analyse whether geographical concentration *per se* helps to reinforce the problems associated with integrating individuals into the labour market and to investigate the really difficult issue as to why social exclusion at the local level often seems to persist from one generation to the next. Moreover, the evidence needed to include information on the perceptions of residents about the quality of their life, including what they thought about where they lived and what their aspirations were for changing things in the future.

A.3.4 There was one other very important dimension to consider and this concerned the extent to which policy intervention affected the problem. There are a number of inter-related issues here. In the first instance there is the obvious need to identify how mainstream service delivery affects the ability of individuals and households to break out of the social and economic exclusion that they are experiencing. If mainstream policies fail in this respect then we need to know why. One justification for Area-Based Initiatives (ABI's) is that they can help to reintegrate individuals where mainstream policies fail and an obvious question then becomes how such policy intervention actually helps to improve things for individuals and households relative to an original baseline position. Some policies may improve the life-chances of some individuals and families to such a degree that they decide to move from the area in which they currently live and if this is the case then we need to know this.

A.3.5 Overall, for those individuals and households who live in deprived areas it is desirable to have evidence relating to:

- ◆ household attributes: family structure, age, ethnicity;
- ◆ qualifications, skills and training;
- ◆ work and worklessness;
- ◆ income benefit dependency;
- ◆ health;
- ◆ childcare arrangements and attitudes to education;

- ◆ crime and safety;
- ◆ sport and leisure facilities;
- ◆ community involvement;
- ◆ satisfaction with accommodation and area;
- ◆ housing tenure and views of accommodation;
- ◆ movement into and out of areas;
- ◆ the effects of ABI's and, where relevant, mainstream delivery.

A.3.6 Some of the evidence allows an assessment to be made about the degree of exclusion that an individual is experiencing. This may be because they can not gain employment, receive an adequate income or cannot feel a part of the local community in which they live. They may live in poor, sub-standard housing, experience or feel threatened by crime and suffer persistent ill-health relative to the population in surrounding areas or the nation as a whole.

A.3.7 The amount of data that is available from existing secondary sources that can meet the evidence needs is relatively small. A review of the existing information base inevitably reinforces the conclusions reached by the Social Exclusion Unit in 1998 about the lack of knowledge that exists about the scale of social exclusion in deprived neighbourhoods. One cannot but agree with the statement made by Hilary Armstrong in her Forward to the Report of PAT 18; Better Information when she remarked "If so little is known about the social conditions in an area, how can effective programmes be deployed to tackle social exclusion? If the level of deprivation is not known, or reliable baselines cannot be established, it will be difficult to assess whether renewal has been successful" (PAT 18, 2000).

A.3.8 Even where data does exist it often suffers from a number of limitations when it comes to address the central research questions. One difficulty is the geographical coverage of the data that is available with that which is required for the areas being studied. Many deprived neighbourhoods covers a handful of wards whilst published data is for a whole District. Another difficulty is that the data is often available only relatively infrequently, as is the case with Census data. Data are also often relatively aggregative in nature and constrained by confidentiality restrictions and the like. Individual Departments within Government do not co-ordinate their endeavours so that the data that is required is actually pulled together in one place.

A.3.9 As a result of its work PAT 18 has recommended that there should be a set of standard neighbourhood statistics produced annually covering the social exclusion characteristics of a neighbourhood and that the key lead in doing this should be undertaken by the Office for National Statistics. The PAT 18 recommendations suggest that evidence might be collected for nine major domains and some 51 sub themes, which are summarised in Table A3.1. Clearly, bringing information on line which describes the situation in a number of deprived areas across England is a considerable task and requires many changes to the way in which data is currently collected and the mechanisms by which Government departments and others share data. It also requires a considerable investment of time and resources to put the required data management systems in place. PAT 18 has helped to initiate a process by which the evidence base will be progressively strengthened over the years ahead.

Table A3.1: Neighbourhood Statistics – domains and sub-themes

<p>Access to services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Accessibility of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GP/hospital/other health care Legal advice Leisure facilities Post Offices Schools Shops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ School exclusions ■ Special needs in schools ■ Staying on in education ■ Young people not in education, work or training
<p>Community well-being/social environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Caring responsibilities ■ Participation in community organisations ■ Perceptions of neighbourhood and service provision ■ Population turnover ■ Voting turnout 	<p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Accident and emergency statistics ■ Disability ■ Drug and alcohol misuse ■ Healthy lifestyles ■ Maternal, infant and early child health ■ Mortality ■ Physical and mental health ■ Social services caseloads ■ Teenage pregnancies
<p>Crime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fear of crime ■ Numbers of crimes of different types, including domestic burglary, auto crime and violent crime ■ Offender data 	<p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Affordability, including house prices and rents ■ Composition of dwelling stock ■ Homelessness ■ Houses in multiple deprivation ■ Overcrowding ■ Stock turnover ■ Unfit housing and disrepair ■ Vacant properties
<p>Economic deprivation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Dynamic measures of low income ■ Indebtedness ■ Low income ■ Wealth/assets 	<p>Physical environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Air quality ■ Land use, including dereliction ■ Traffic volume and speed
<p>Education, skills and training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Absenteeism ■ Adult learning ■ Driving licences ■ Early child development ■ Numbers achieving qualifications ■ Numbers without qualifications ■ Pre-school provision ■ Progress through education 	<p>Work deprivation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Availability of child care ■ Dynamic measures of worklessness (duration, persistence and turnover) ■ Employment ■ Job losses/notifies redundancies ■ Measures of worklessness ■ Workless households

Source: Policy Action Team 18: Better Information

A.3.10 While the post PAT 18 future looks promising at the present time, if the questions described in this section are to be addressed there is very little alternative to carrying out customised local social surveys in those areas deemed to be characterised by social and economic deprivation. And even if all the recommendations currently contained in PAT 18 were to be implemented in full, then it would still be necessary to gain up to date information about the attitudes, perceptions and the characteristics of those who move in and out of the areas concerned. In short, there remains a clear need for social surveys to be conducted at the household level in the areas that are the subject of policy interest.

Undertaking a local area social survey: key methodological issues

A.3.11 Surveys can be expensive and also very time consuming for both those doing the survey and those responding to it. It was therefore essential that the survey was planned well from the beginning. A number of key issues arise and in this section we examine the main ones. These are:

- i. asking the right questions;
- ii. the importance of benchmarking and normative data;
- iii. obtaining a representative sample;

- iv. sample size;
- v. quota versus random sampling;
- vi. statistical reliability;
- vii. establishing a sample frame;
- viii. conducting the household survey;
- ix. key sub-groups and booster interviews;
- x. response rates, costs and gaining value for money;
- xi. cross sectional versus longitudinal samples;
- xii. being able to model change on the basis of the evidence received.

A.3.12 In the rest of this section we provide a brief discussion as to some of the key issues that arise under each of these headings and use recent experience from the national evaluation of SRB to illustrate key points.

i. Asking the right questions

A.3.13 In order to undertake the national evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget an extensive evaluation framework was devised (which is described in the Land Economy (1997) report *An Evaluation of Regeneration Activities Funded under the SRB Challenge Fund Bidding Framework - the Evaluation Framework*). The resident social survey component of the evaluation was based on a longitudinal design that explored residents' socio-economic status (including work status and benefit dependency) and views on their home and area before and after the SRB Challenge Fund activity in their area. Following extensive workshop-based discussions for the national evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget, the key data and variables identified in Table A3.2 below were selected.

A.3.14 Overall, the SRB evaluation tracked progress in twenty case-study areas that benefited from SRB funding and, from these, seven areas were selected for detailed resident surveying (Land Economy 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999b, 2000). The resident survey areas were chosen to reflect different types of area and the broad range of regeneration objectives covered under the SRB programme. These were:

- ♦ *Chalkhill* - an estate covering some 6,000 people mainly living on one local authority estate in the London Borough of Brent;
- ♦ *Hangleton and Knoll* - an area covering two local authority housing estates in the North of the Borough of Hove;
- ♦ *Bradford* - a complex of three housing estates in the Royds area on the south periphery of Bradford;
- ♦ *Rochdale* - an area encompassing the Canalside area of Rochdale which is situated half a mile south of the town centre;
- ♦ *Swadlincote* - an area with a population of 31,000 in the district of Derbyshire and including the communities of Swadlincote, Church Gresley, Castle Gresley, Newhall, Midway and Woodville;
- ♦ *Sunderland* - encompassing an area of Sunderland City Centre, Houghton Hetton coalfield and the Henden-East Maritime Zone;
- ♦ *Nottingham* - covering three priority areas within the City of Nottingham, namely Radford, Hyson Green and Forest Fields estates.

Table A3.2: Key variables in the survey of households on estates

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Household characteristics, including structure, age, dependency, educational attainment, occupation, social class and ethnicity. ◆ Satisfaction with local area as a place to live, key features found to be attractive, problems with area that affect quality of life, factors that would most improve physical appearance of the area, availability of key services and perceptions of changes in overall quality of local environment in recent times. ◆ Involvement in the local community, as defined as other people living within 10 to 20 minutes walk of home/estate concerned. ◆ Satisfaction with housing, length of stay in local area, reasons for moving to local area, tenure, likelihood and willingness of moving from local area during next two years. ◆ Work characteristics, length of time spent at present job, duration of time out of work, features of commuting, reasons for not being able to get a job, constraints on getting a job, participation in training schemes. ◆ Perceived quality of health, use of local health services, stress associated with particular activities and events, child-care, factors affecting truancy, time spent helping children with homework, perceived good and bad features associated with local area, quality of local area for bringing up children. ◆ Features of local area in relation to safety, security and crime, existence and fear of crime. ◆ Sports and leisure, availability and use of key sports and leisure facilities in local area. ◆ Finance, questions relating to earnings including benefits received, perceptions of adequacy of income, meeting financial obligations, debt. ◆ Perceptions of local policy initiatives.

ii. The Importance of Benchmarking and Normative Data

A.3.15 One further aspect that is critical in understanding the nature of the problems faced by those who live in deprived areas is to ensure that the findings of social surveys can be benchmarked relative to experience elsewhere. Indeed, this is now required in the guidelines given to regeneration partnerships when setting up baselines. Benchmarking provides context and a greater understanding of the particular problems that residents in an area face. It also helps to identify the additionality of local programmes and projects by demonstrating whether an area has changed to a greater or lesser extent than elsewhere.

A.3.16 There are generally three levels at which benchmarking proves most useful for local regeneration areas. Firstly, as highlighted in the SRB evaluation and also the regeneration partnerships' guidelines, it is useful to compare the area with relevant national data (Land Economy 1999a). This includes the Census, but also other large-scale national Government surveys such as the General Household Survey, the Survey of English Housing, British Crime Survey, the People's Panel, the Family Resources Survey and British Social Attitudes. It is important to be familiar with each of these surveys to ensure that benchmarked questions are used wherever possible.

A.3.17 Secondly, it is useful to make comparisons with the wider local area, in particular the local authority as a whole. This includes making use of data from previous surveys in the district, although these are often very general or focus on mainstream service provision. Many of the national surveys mentioned above provide data for regions as a whole, and this can provide some useful information where district level information is not available.

A.3.18 Thirdly, it is possible to construct databases of key results from a range of regeneration areas. The value of this has been somewhat limited for SRB, given the very wide range of area types and sizes, and the different stages projects are at.

However, there are a number of issues that need to be borne in mind when making these comparisons:

- ◆ question wording and structure – clearly, to make direct comparisons we need to ask questions in exactly the same way as the benchmark source. However, this is not always possible, and questions are adapted to add the most value to the local survey. This is a difficult aspect to gauge. Some changes are unlikely to have a large impact. For example, the Survey of English Housing includes a number of general rating questions asking satisfaction with area. However, they use a “slightly dissatisfied” category, rather than the “fairly dissatisfied” more widely used. We suggest that this will not greatly affect responses and the comparison can be used, as long as the variation is noted;
- ◆ related to this we need to be aware that the comparisons generally come from specialist surveys that ask a large number of questions on a small number of topics. Given the wide-ranging aims of regeneration partnerships the survey in the regeneration area needs to cover a number of topics in much less depth. For example, we can make income comparisons using data from the Family Resources Survey, but we need to treat these with a great deal of caution, given the very great differences in how the information is collected;
- ◆ there are also issues to consider around the order and context in which questions are asked. This may not appear that important, but responses to an overall rating of the area as a place to live are likely to vary depending on whether, for example, a number of questions are asked beforehand about problems in the area;
- ◆ it is also important to note the respondent group that is being reported in the benchmark survey. For example, it is often figures for the Head of Household/Household Reference Person that are reported in national government survey results. These would clearly have different views to a sample of the adult population as a whole (who would be younger and more likely to be women), and direct comparisons could not be made;
- ◆ it is of course also critical to have some understanding of how the surveys have been conducted – the sampling method, respondent selection, the data editing and weighting etc.

A.3.19 There is a further, less obvious issue with using national or wider area data to contrast with a regeneration area, i.e., regeneration areas are likely to have a very different profile to the areas we are comparing them with. On one level this is obvious in that regeneration areas are selected because they are different, and generally because they have greater needs. However, profile differences can cause some problems with interpreting attitudinal comparisons.

A.3.20 For example, in the national evaluation of the SRB some 28% of Chalkhill Estate residents felt that racial harassment was a problem in their area, compared with 5% in Hangleton and Knoll. However, when interpreting this we need to be aware that 62% of residents in Chalkhill are from minority ethnic groups, compared with 2% in Hangleton and Knoll – and so this difference may not be as striking as it might first appear.

A.3.21 This is a very obvious example, but there are a large number of instances where attitudes are related to demographic characteristics, and one set of demographics are related to other demographics. These clearly need to be borne in mind when interpreting benchmarking. If possible, further analysis should be conducted using simple cross-tabulations, multivariate techniques or re-weighting to match profiles.

This could help us untangle the extent to which differences relate to the profile of the local population or other factors that are specific to the area.

iii. Obtaining a Representative Sample: Sample Size

A.3.22 The decision as to the most appropriate sample size is dependent on a range of factors. These include not only the precision with which one wants to measure views - both for the overall sample as well as the sub-groups by which one wants to analyse the data - but also the size of the budget available. A common misconception is that the sample size should be determined as a proportion of the population -briefs from regeneration partnerships that request tenders for surveys of 10% of the local population are widespread. In fact, by far the most critical factor in determining the reliability of findings is the actual number of interviews. Having said that, conducting interviews with a very large proportion of the local population does have some benefit. For example, interviewing 500 residents from a population of 1,000 would provide results that are more statistically reliable than 500 interviews conducted across the whole of the country. However, this positive effect on reliability is only significant when the proportions involved are large.

A.3.23 The good practice guidance for collecting baseline information in regeneration areas suggests that partnerships consider conducting samples of between 500 and 700 interviews -and we would not disagree with this as a starting point. This size of sample will provide relatively reliable results at the aggregate level and allow a fair amount of sub-group analysis. Smaller samples would not allow partnerships to look at some key sub-groups reliably, while larger samples may not provide sufficient additional value to justify the extra costs.

iv. Quota versus Random Sampling

A.3.24 In deciding upon the most appropriate sampling method, there are two broad options to consider, namely quota or random sampling. Quota sampling uses data to set fixed quotas of people to be interviewed in each sampling point, which are generally enumeration districts (EDs). Setting quotas in relatively small areas allows much greater control over where interviews are conducted, and so the representativeness of the sample.

A.3.25 Quotas are then set to reflect the socio-demographic profile of residents on characteristics such as sex, age, ethnicity and work status. The critical drawback of this approach for these types of surveys is that the profile of residents is effectively set by Census data, which is the only source of information that can provide details on demographic variables at these geographic levels. This is now ten years old, and full data from this year's Census will not be available until spring 2003. This drawback clearly makes a quota approach inappropriate for these types of survey, given that collecting accurate, up-to-date profile information (on, for example, work status) is a key aim.

A.3.26 The other option - random sampling - avoids the problems associated with quota sampling by drawing actual addresses at random and allocating these to interviewers. Unlike a quota sample, for a random survey an interviewer has to make several callbacks (including evenings and weekends) to specific addresses until an interview is achieved, or the address is "exhausted" after the minimum number of calls. This minimum number of calls is frequently set at four or six. However, it is often necessary for addresses to be re-issued for further calls after this in order to maintain a high response rate. In our experience this can be particularly necessary in regeneration areas, and indeed a number of addresses in the SRB Evaluation

received eight or more calls. Where the regeneration area is small and we are interviewing a relatively high proportion of households, this can be relatively cost-effective, as additional calls can be made in a small amount of time while working on other addresses in the sample.

v. Statistical Reliability

A.3.27 Table A3.3 below shows the statistical reliability at the 95% confidence level for various sample sizes. For example, with a sample size of 500, if 50% of residents say their health has been good in the last twelve months, the chances are 19 in 20 that the "true" value (which would have been obtained if **all** residents had been interviewed) will fall within the range of ± 4 percentage points from the sample results. In fact, the true result is more likely to be closer to the centre (50%) than the extremes of the range (46% or 54%).

A.3.28 As the Table illustrates, the statistical reliability of the aggregate survey findings is relatively little affected by increasing the sample size from 700 to, say, 1,000. However, it also indicates the higher error associated with sub-samples of 50 and 100. For sub-group analysis, we generally recommend a minimum sub-sample size of around 100 interviews to ensure relatively reliable results. Therefore, the key benefit of a larger sample is that it enables detailed sub-group analysis at a higher level of statistical reliability. Any decision on sample size should include an assessment of the likely number of interviews we will achieve with the smallest sub-group we are interested in looking at separately.

Table A3.3: Approximate sampling tolerances

	Applicable to percentages at or near these levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
50	± 8	± 13	± 14
100	6	9	10
200	4	6	7
300	3	5	6
500	3	4	4
700	2	3	4
1,000	2	3	3

A.3.29 To test if the difference between sub-groups within the sample is a real one - i.e., if it is "statistically significant"- the differences between the two sub-sample results must be greater than the values given in Table A3.4. below.

A.3.30 This is best understood through examples. Say we have a total sample of 700 interviews, which is evenly split between male and female respondents, to give 350 interviews with each group. Table A3.4 below illustrates that if, for example, 46% of male respondents say their health has been good in the last twelve months, compared with 54% of females (both with a sub-sample size of 350), then the chances are that this eight point difference is statistically significant and could not have happened by chance.

A.3.31 The same principle applies for any sub samples. For example, where our sample contains 350 respondents with formal qualifications and 150 with none, from the table we can see that if 36% with qualifications say they would like to take part in further training, compared with 26% with none, then the chance is that this ten point difference is statistically significant (i.e. greater than nine) and could not have happened by chance.

Table A3.4: Differences required for significance at or near these levels

	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	±	±	±
50 and 50	12	18	20
100 and 100	8	13	14
250 and 250	5	8	9
350 and 350	5	7	7
500 and 500	4	6	6
50 and 100	10	16	17
100 and 500	7	10	11
150	6	9	10

A.3.32 The example given above only shows simple cases where we are comparing just two groups. It is possible to test for significant differences between three or more or sub-groups (such as different age groups) using repeated pairwise comparisons as outlined above, or further statistical methods that look at variation between a range of sub-samples. However, in these cases it is more usual to compare one sub-group against the sample as a whole – for example, comparing findings for 18-24 year olds with results from the survey population as a whole. This involves a slightly different significance test, but the principles remain exactly the same.

vi. Sampling frame

A.3.33 We generally recommend the Postal Address File (PAF), rather than the electoral register, as the appropriate sampling frame. The electoral register has a well-known tendency to under-represent certain households -particularly the more mobile and those from the minority ethnic groups- which was compounded by the introduction of the community charge/poll tax. Indeed, a study by ONS in 1993 showed that seven per cent of the population were not registered. This is clearly a concern, but more importantly non-registration varies greatly between groups; around 20% of young people are not registered, as are 38% of those who live in furnished privately rented homes.

A.3.34 The PAF is based on addresses to which the Post Office delivers mail -it is derived from information collected for each postal round. It can be restricted to "small user residential" addresses - i.e., omitting "large" users and "firms". In our experience, the PAF is generally a reliable and up-to-date sampling frame. However, there are a number of limitations which are important to note. PAF contains:

- ♦ "extra dwellings" at the sampled address. Sometimes an address listed as a single dwelling actually contains more than one dwelling, frequently because of conversion into flats;
- ♦ combined addresses. It is possible to find two dwellings combined since the PAF was compiled (updates of PAF are released quarterly but major reviews of its content are infrequent); two addresses listed but actually there is only one dwelling;
- ♦ addresses without dwellings (for example small businesses, workshops, community halls or other properties receiving small amounts of mail).

A.3.35 A 1987 study estimated an average number of households at PAF addresses as 1.02 throughout England and Wales, rising to 1.07 in London. However, since then the Royal Mail has made efforts to ensure each separate dwelling is separately listed on

the PAF, with Households in Multiple Occupation accounting for much of the discrepancy between households and PAF addresses.

vii. Conducting the household survey

A.3.36 In our experience, *face-to-face interview surveys* are the only suitable method for this type of research because of both the respondent group and subject matter. Interview surveys deliver more reliable data, as well as being more cost-effective in terms of the value of the research. Face-to-face interview surveys have a number of other specific advantages, including:

- ◆ flexibility in the questionnaire design, including the types of questions that can be included (unprompted and prompted) and the ability to use showcards and other show material;
- ◆ the interview process, for example, the ability of the interviewer to establish rapport with the respondent (and command their full attention), which can encourage response on potentially sensitive issues. Related to this respondents can be encouraged to give more detailed responses and fuller answers;
- ◆ greater confidence than the correct respondent is being interviewed, that they fit the right quotas or are resident in a selected household - although clearly this depends on the existence of rigorous survey management procedures.

A.3.37 However, there are also some disadvantages associated with face-to-face interviewing, including the bias that can be introduced, for example, through systematic bias in the way questions are asked and the way they are recorded. In addition, and perhaps of particular importance in areas undergoing regeneration, there can be issues of interviewer safety. This is an important issue, not only because interviewers are entitled to safe working conditions, but also because in situations where interviewers feel intimidated the quality of work and response rates can suffer. In some cases it may be necessary to offer “minders” to accompany interviewers. However, there are a number of other relatively simple actions that can be taken to increase safety in the field, such as notifying local police, interviewers working in pairs or meeting up at regular intervals and so forth.

A.3.38 *Postal self-completion surveys* generally have relatively poor response rates, and are known to bias the sample towards certain groups (the more active) and away from others (those with literacy problems and who do not read English). There is some evidence that respectable response rates can be achieved through postal surveys. For example, in the current wave of Best Value Performance Indicator postal surveys MORI is conducting for around 100 local authorities, response rates above 30% are widespread, and a significant minority have response rates around 40%. However, it is also apparent that in many cases the profile of respondents does not match the profile of the population as a whole. A postal approach is likely to raise greater problems with exclusion in regeneration areas, given the higher proportions of residents with poor literacy and English language skills. Further, the information required for the SRB Evaluation (and in surveys conducted by regeneration partnerships generally) is very detailed and fairly complex. It would not be possible to collect a similar set of data through self-completion surveys.

A.3.39 Telephone research gives a greater degree of control over the type, quality and complexity of information that we can collect. However, the interviews generally need to be shorter than can be completed face-to-face in peoples' homes, and we certainly could not complete a detailed 45-minute interview as required in the SRB Evaluation. Further, the sample frame for telephone surveys is less complete. In small areas we

would need to draw the sample from a telephone directory database, which excludes those who are ex-directory. In any case, telephone ownership is still not universal - approximately eight per cent of British households has no telephone at all, a figure that is clearly likely to be higher in deprived areas. Among those listed, just over three in five (64%) has a listed telephone number, while the other 36% are ex-directory.³ Again, figures suggest there is some geographical variation and systematic bias in the incidence of ex-directory numbers.

A.3.40 Consequently, the majority of telephone surveys conducted now use Random Digit Dialling (RDD) techniques, which aim to overcome some of the shortfalls of directories. RDD is based on the US developed Mitofsky-Waksberg method, which involves the generation of numbers at random, and so includes ex-directory households. RDD takes “seeds”, or an existing number, within an area –defined by postcode– and randomises the last digit. In theory, this should allow for the generation of very localised sample frames. However, the application of this method in the UK has been hampered by the inconsistent format of telephone numbers, the lack of information about the range of residential numbers in use and the portability of numbers, particularly in inner metropolitan areas.

A.3.41 In addition to these problems, with telephone sample frames, around 10% of all residential subscribers are on the Telephone Preference Service (TPS) register. This is a list of all subscribers who do not wish to receive sales calls at home. Although it currently only applies to approaches by direct marketing agencies, there appears to be a strong chance this will be extended to research uses. Further, the proportion registered is rapidly increasing by around 30-40,000 every month – indeed the TPS service are having difficulty keeping their records updated.

viii. Key Sub-groups and Booster Interviews

A.3.42 The frequently low reliability of small sub-samples clearly creates some difficulties for projects evaluating the impact of regeneration programmes, as we are often interested in the views and behaviours of relatively small proportions of the local population. For example, even in areas of very high unemployment we will generally find ILO unemployment rates (those registered unemployed plus those seeking and available for work) below 15% (as a proportion of the total 16+ population). With a sample of 500 residents this would only provide around 75 interviews with this key target group -findings based on this sample size will clearly be subject to large sampling tolerances, and we will need to treat results with a great deal of caution.

A.3.43 This is also often the case when attempting to achieve representative sub-samples of minority ethnic groups. As the guidance issued to regeneration partnerships suggests, the fact that a minority ethnic group makes up a small proportion of the population does not mean that they are unimportant to the success of the regeneration project -indeed their minority status may result in them being in greater need of targeted help.

A.3.44 There are generally two options for increasing the number of interviews with particular sub-groups and so the reliability of results for these groups: increasing the sample size for the survey as a whole, or conducting booster surveys among the group.

A.3.45 In general, increasing the sample size is the most appropriate method to use if potential respondents in a particular sub-group cannot be identified in advance, and

³ All figures supplied by UK Changes at Direct Select.

they are roughly evenly spread throughout the population. However, when particular groups make up small proportions of the local population this may not be viable, as we would need to increase the sample size greatly to achieve reliable sub-sample sizes. For example, if we had a particular minority ethnic group we wanted to look at separately within an area that makes up around five per cent of the population, we would need to conduct interviews with a sample of around 2,000 residents to allow us to analyse data for this sub-group with the *minimum* level of reliability suggested.

A.3.46 On the other hand, booster interviews are more appropriate if potential respondents can be identified in advance, especially if they are clustered in particular areas –as can be the case with respondents from minority ethnic communities. Areas with a higher than average proportion of the target population can be selected and additional booster interviews carried out with respondents in specified sub-groups.

A.3.47 However, even if booster samples are feasible the cost can still be prohibitive, and alternative approaches to assessing their views may need to be considered such as, for example, more qualitative approaches such as focus groups.

ix. Response Rates

A.3.48 Although response rates in themselves cannot be said to be the sole measure of survey data quality, they are a crucial indicator of potential non-response bias. They are also an important part of the high quality image needed to ensure the widespread acceptance of, and use of, survey findings. The guidance to regeneration partnerships suggests that the representativeness of samples with a response rate below 65% should be questioned. We agree with this as a rule of thumb, but the general downward trend in response rates for surveys, and the particularly difficult nature of regeneration areas, needs to be taken into account. For example, a recent GSS report records a decline of around 4% or 5% during the 1990's in a number of major government surveys.

A.3.49 There are a number of approaches to enhancing response rates that are worth considering. Some key suggestions are outlined below:

- ♦ In small areas, working closely with local community representatives, for example those involved in local partnerships and Residents' Associations, can improve response rates. They are often seen as trusted figures in the local area, and can be very useful in encouraging participation. The impact of this is clearly difficult to measure, but anecdotal evidence from our work suggests it can be effective;
- ♦ The response rate may also be enhanced by sending an advance letter to all sample addresses. This explains the purpose and importance of the survey, as well as reassuring residents about anonymity and confidentiality, and should generally come from the partnership rather than from the research organisation. We have found that the letter appears more effective when it emphasises the opportunity for influencing how an amount of money will be spent. This does, however, need to be balanced against the possibility of creating unrealistic expectations. It should also be noted that a study by (then) Social and Community Planning Research (SCPR)⁴ estimates that there is only a relatively small difference between response rates where no letter has been sent out and where a simple informal letter has been sent (64% and 67% respectively). Where a complex letter is sent this has the reverse effect of lowering the response rate to 61%;

⁴ (1997) Survey Methods Centre Newsletter, Volume 17, No.3.

- ◆ Further publicity methods such as inclusion in newsletters, local papers and posters in the area can also help encourage participation, again by putting the research in context and explaining how it will be used;
- ◆ The response rate may also be enhanced in any blocks that have entry phones by making arrangements for interviewers to gain access to the block - for example, through locally-based staff. This can be very important, given the much greater ease of refusing to participate on entry phones;
- ◆ The guidance issued to regeneration partnerships suggests they consider the use of incentives for respondents. There have been a large number of studies on the impact of incentives on response rates and other elements of surveys. While these provide some useful pointers, there are a number of contradictory results, and the impact appears to vary greatly depending on the audience involved and the approach chosen (direct payments before or after the interview, entry into prize draws, charitable donations, non-monetary gifts, etc). We have therefore recently been assessing the use of financial incentives to encourage participation in survey research in deprived areas by conducting follow-up research with respondents to a survey conducted for West Central Hartlepool NDC. We offered respondents entry into a prize draw in this survey (with prizes around £200) and, on balance, it appears this did have some small positive impact on response;
- ◆ In many regeneration areas it will be necessary for some interviews to be conducted with respondents whose first language is not English - clearly it is critical to ensure that potential respondents are not excluded because of language difficulties. No fieldwork supplier will be able to cover all languages that may be needed in an area, but it is important that they cover the main likely languages, and have procedures to employ interpreters where necessary. We have found it very effective to use local community members to accompany interviewers to translate.
- ◆ Recent research indicates that one of the factors most correlated with high response rates is the experience interviewers already have of that particular survey. This makes measures such as personal briefings and full instructions/background materials key.
- ◆ Each of these measures can be useful, but the most important factor in determining response is the quality and experience of interviewers. Good interviewers who have been thoroughly trained will be able to make contact and secure co-operation with a much greater proportion of residents than relatively inexperienced interviewers. This has been seen in work we have conducted for individual regeneration partnerships, where we have recruited and trained local residents to complete some of the interviewing. While this has a number of positive outcomes (in involving residents more directly in the consultation process and raising their skill levels and employment prospects), it does in our experience have some negative effects on the quality of the information collected. In particular, despite extensive training and continued support, the response rates achieved by local residents tend to be significantly lower than experienced interviewers.

A.3.50 In the SRB social survey in Chalkhill, St Raphael's, Hangleton & Knoll, Bradford, Rochdale and Nottingham 750 addresses were initially issued in each. In Swadlincote and Sunderland (given their ED based sample) 850 addresses were initially issued. In all areas the reserve addresses were also issued -125 addresses in Swadlincote and Sunderland, 100 in the other areas. In Rochdale an additional 200 addresses were drawn and issued. The evidence presented in Table A3.5 below indicates that in the case of the SRB survey an overall adjusted response rate of 64% was achieved, ranging from 51% in Hangleton Knoll to 76% in Bradford.

Table A3.5: Numbers and Proportions of Interviews

	Numbers	% main SRBs	Adjusted response rate
Chalkhill	465	13.4	61
St Raphaels (c)	512	-	68
Hangleton & Knoll	384	11.1	51
Bradford	523	15.1	76
Rochdale	480	13.9	56
Swadlincote	605	17.5	69
Sunderland	564	16.3	66
Nottingham	438	12.7	66
7 main survey SRB	3459	100	64
All areas	4198	100	

x. Costs and Value for Money

A.3.51 In our view, conducting a survey as outlined above provides the greatest value for money. The alternative options that we do not recommend (a quota survey conducted face-to-face, and postal and telephone surveys) are all less expensive, but will not provide useful or reliable information. Random face-to-face surveys using the approach outlined above would cost around £25,000-30,000 for 500 interviews lasting an average of 30 minutes.

xi. Cross-sectional and longitudinal samples

A.3.52 The above sections have discussed how to ensure the results from a survey of households provide an accurate representation of the area, the profile of residents and their needs –such as would be required for a baseline survey. This, however, is only part of what survey work can do. It can also help measure change in an area and the impact of local projects and the regeneration programme as a whole.

A.3.53 When considering how to conduct follow-up surveys the first choice that needs to be made is between conducting two *cross-sectional* samples, where a fresh sample is interviewed at the follow-up stage to give an overview of the area at two points in time, or conducting a *longitudinal* survey, by returning to interview the same respondents that took part in the baseline survey. In fact, it is possible to combine both methods by attempting to interview as many of the original respondents as possible, while incorporating an additional cross-sectional element. This has been the approach used in the SRB Evaluation. In the SRB evaluation, within a target sampling frame of 600 households per area the aim was to make the 'panel element' as large as possible.

A.3.54 There is quite a significant amount of additional work involved in incorporating a panel element into the design. However, there are a number of benefits when it comes to measuring and understanding change. The key benefits are the general statistical power of the longitudinal approach, the ability to look at how the individuals' circumstances and attitudes have changed, the ability to look at the characteristics of

those who have moved out of the area and last but not least, the ability to compare responses to retrospective and current rating questions. We examine the merits of each of these briefly.

The Power of Longitudinal Studies

A.3.55 Assuming there is no conditioning (i.e. where participating in the research in itself makes respondents unrepresentative of the wider population), longitudinal surveys generally have large statistical advantages over independent or cross-sectional samples when it comes to measuring change. This is best demonstrated by an example. Let us suppose that a measure of satisfaction with an area is collected within two time periods as follows:

Table A3.6: Example of measuring change

	Period 1	Period 2
	%	%
Very satisfied (5)	20	24
Fairly satisfied (4)	20	23
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)	20	17
Slightly dissatisfied (2)	20	21
Very dissatisfied (1)	20	15
Mean	3.00	3.20
Variance	2.00	1.96

Source: MORI

A.3.56 If the two periods are measured from cross-sectional samples then each survey would have required around 380 interviews before such a shift in the mean could be considered statistically significant at the 95% confidence interval. However, the power of longitudinal samples is shown in the example below, where the same shift has been measured from longitudinal surveys and is distributed as follows:

Table A3.7: Shift (period 2 - period 1)

	%
+4 (a shift from very dissatisfied to very satisfied)	0
+3	0
+2	5
+1	17
0 (no change in attitudes)	72
-1	5
-2	1
-3	0
-4 (a shift from very satisfied to very dissatisfied)	0
Mean	0.2
Variance	0.42

Source: MORI

A.3.57 In this case a sample size of just 40 respondents would be all that is necessary to say that the shift is statistically significant. The implication, therefore, is that you need smaller samples and/or to see smaller shifts in results to say that changes are significant with longitudinal surveys than would be required with cross-sectional samples. However, this does rely on there being a degree of consistency in the direction of the shift.

How Individuals' Responses Change

A.3.58 The benefits of a longitudinal approach are not, however, limited to their ability to provide a more powerful measure of change -they also allow us to look at the nature of this change in more detail. We are able to look at how individuals' responses have

changed between surveys, and not just at how residents as a whole have responded at two points in time.

A.3.59 This can be demonstrated by examples from the SRB Evaluation. Table A3.8 below shows the overall cross-sectional findings from the two surveys (what is generally called the “net change”), as well as the extent of change in individual responses (“gross change”). From comparing overall results at the two points in time (the net change) there appears to have been very little change in the proportion of households who had no workers, experiencing a decrease by two per cent, which is not statistically significant. However, this clearly hides a greater degree of gross change, with seven per cent of households moving from having a worker to having none, and nine per cent becoming households without workers.

Table A3.8: Anyone working in household

	1996	1999	Change (99-96)
Net change	%	%	±%
No-one working in household	35	33	-2
		Gross change 1996-1999	
		%	
Gross change			
No-one working in household to someone		7	
Someone working in household to no-one		9	

Source: SRB social survey

A.3.60 Similarly, there appears to have been little change in residents’ ability to cope on their household income when comparing how they responded in aggregate between the two years. However, when we look at gross change we can see that the movement was in fact quite large, with half of respondents recording some form of change.

Table A3.9: Ability to cope on household income

	1996	1999	Change (1999-96)
	%	%	±%
Net change			
Comfortable	20	22	+2
Coping	44	44	0
Fairly difficult to cope	19	22	+3
Very difficult to cope	16	11	-5
		Gross change 1996-99	
		%	
Gross change			
Increase in ability to cope		29	
Decrease in ability to cope		21	

Source: SRB social survey

A.3.61 This provides some useful additional insight into the amount of change taking place in an area. However, the real benefit of this is being able to look at the characteristics of those who had experienced certain types of change. At present, we are limited in the amount of the analysis that can be conducted, given that only three areas have been followed-up and so base sizes are rather small. Table A3.10 below gives an idea of the basic analysis that is possible. Those aged 35-44 years and workers were more likely than average to feel better able to cope than in the baseline. In contrast, older respondents and non-workers were more likely to report decreases.

Table A3.10: Change in ability to cope on income

	Increase in capacity to live on current income	Decrease in capacity to live on current income
Base:	(153)	(112)
	%	%
Total	29	21
Gender		
Male	27	25
Female	31	19
Age		
18-34	32	10
35-44	37	21
45-54	27	19
55-64	30	23
65+	24	26
Work Status		
Working	35	12
Unemployed	28	25
Retired	24	26
Economically inactive	30	28
Ethnicity (head of household)		
White	27	20
Black	37	20

Movers

A.3.62 Another key aspect of understanding change in an area is assessing the movement into and out of the area. Ideally, we would like to follow those who have moved out of the area to understand their reasons and their current situation, as well as looking separately at those who have moved in. This will help us determine whether those who move out have improved their situation, and whether those who replace them have similar needs or not. It will also provide an insight into how the task facing the area-based initiative is changing, as the profile of the area changes.

A.3.63 It is relatively easy to accurately look at the views and profile of those who have moved in since the SRB partnership has been in place; these can be identified by looking at length of residence. However, it is not as straightforward to follow-up, or even identify those who have moved out of the area. It is to the problems involved in doing this that we now turn.

Tracking out movers

A.3.64 As part of the SRB Evaluation follow-up study interviewers asked for a forwarding address at all addresses where the panel respondent was no longer living. If this was not known, interviewers went on to ask whether current residents knew whether the original respondent had moved out of the SRB area or not. Finally, they asked at immediate neighbours (or any other local addresses suggested by current residents) for this information.

A.3.65 It is very clear from this exercise that both those who have moved into properties previously occupied by baseline residents and those who live in neighbouring properties are very unlikely to have, or be willing to supply, details of the original respondents' current address. In fact, from around 150 addresses where we know the baseline respondent was no longer living, interviewers could only identify 19 current addresses. From these, we conducted 12 follow-up interviews. This clearly cannot be said to be a representative sample of out-movers.

A.3.66 However, there were additional addresses where partial information was provided, that was sufficient to allow us to conclude that the original respondent was no longer

living in the SRB area. We also approached local authorities and local partnerships to ask them to identify those they know have moved out of the area. In fact local authorities and RSLs do hold forwarding address information for a significant proportion of tenants who have moved out of the defined areas. However, it is not possible for them to pass on this information within the terms of the Data Protection Act, which states that the passing of personal data for use by a third party requires the permission of the data subject.

A.3.67 From all of these approaches we finally identified 50 respondents who had definitely moved out of two of the SRB areas.⁵ It is clearly difficult to be confident that these will be an accurate reflection of the true profile of out movers, as we estimate that we have identified around half. We know that around 3-5% will have died in the intervening years, and that around 20-30% of moves will have been to other addresses within the SRB areas (the proportion of “local” movers in fact increases significantly among social renters). This suggests that around 100 of the 150 that we know are no longer at their baseline address have actually moved out of the area; this leaves around 50 we have not been able to confirm as out movers.

A.3.68 There are other methods that could have been employed at the baseline stage that would have increased our ability to track residents for follow-up work; unfortunately providing a longitudinal measure was not a focus at the time of the baseline survey. These generally involve maintaining contact with original respondents (such as supplying them with postcards to notify us of changes of address, sending regular “panel” newsletters, organising panel member events etc) and offering incentives to provide up-to-date information on location.

A.3.69 This can also involve asking respondents for the names, addresses and telephone numbers of close friends or relatives at the time of the baseline interview (preferably contacts who are themselves not likely to move). These can then be contacted at the follow-up stage for those who have been identified as movers to collect the respondent’s new address. This needs to be handled sensitively, and the reasons for taking this approach explained fully. However, evidence from the British Household Panel Survey, run by Essex University, is that this is a vital part of maintaining contact with mobile panel members. In their experience, around ten per cent of panel members move each year, and of these around half provide notification through return of change of address cards. Of the other half around three-quarters are successfully traced through family and friend contacts.

Comparing Retrospective Questions

A.3.70 The results from the SRB Evaluation also provide some useful insights into how good different types of questions may be at measuring change in an area. In particular, there is some indication that people are more willing to say that an area has got better than give it a higher current rating than they did in the baseline survey.

A.3.71 This is seen in the following results from the longitudinal survey. It is clear from this that residents feel that the area has improved both generally and for bringing up children (statistically significant increases of +8 and +9 percentage points). However, this is not reflected in changes in current ratings (whether they are more or less dissatisfied with the area or rate the area as good or bad for children) between the two surveys; these ratings remain fairly constant.

⁵ One SRB area could not be included in this exercise as they were still in the process of a large-scale temporary decant.

Table A3.11: Retrospective versus rating questions

	1996	1999	Change (99-96)
Base:	(527)	(527)	
Area for bringing up children	%	%	±%
Good	60	58	-2
Bad	22	20	-2
Improved over last 3 years	9	18	+9
Worse over last 3 years	20	20	0
Area as a place to live			
Satisfied	72	70	-2
Dissatisfied	22	23	+1
Better	16	24	+8
Worse	25	24	-1

Source: SRB social survey

A.3.72 There are a number of possible interpretations of this, but the most likely is that residents have noticed some improvements, but these are not substantial enough to change their overall opinion of the area. However, this could also reflect the fact that the area has improved over the period, but that residents' *expectations* have also increased, perhaps because of promises made for the outcome of the regeneration project or generally rising conditions or improvements in wider areas.

A.3.73 This could have important implications for how we measure the impact of policies in area based initiatives, and could be explored further. It would, for example, be useful to ask follow-up questions of selected respondents, focusing on those who provide seemingly inconsistent answers to current rating and retrospective questions to explain the reasons for their responses. This would require the responses given by each individual from the baseline survey to be brought forward at the time of the follow-up interview; this can be costly, but would provide some very valuable information on how these responses should be interpreted. Further, it would be useful to use more detailed qualitative approaches, such as focus groups, among certain types of responders, again to understand in detail their motivations for their responses.

A.4 Publications to Date

Brennan A, Rhodes J and Tyler P (1999) "The distribution of the SRB Challenge Fund expenditure in relation to local-area need in England". *Urban Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 12, pp. 2069–84.

Brennan A, Rhodes J and Tyler P (2000) "The nature of local area social exclusion in England and the role of the labour market". *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 129–46.

Department of Land Economy (1996) *An examination of unsuccessful bids*, Discussion Paper 74.

Department of Land Economy (1997) *An evaluation of regeneration activities funded under the SRB Challenge Fund bidding framework: the evaluation framework*, Discussion Paper 83.

Department of Land Economy (1997) *The evaluation framework*, Discussion Paper 83.

Department of Land Economy (1998) *Expenditure in relation to local area needs in England*, Discussion Paper 91.

Department of Land Economy (1998) *Key results from the residents' baseline social surveys*, Discussion Paper 100.

Department of Land Economy (1998) *New findings on the nature of economic and social exclusion in England: implications for new policy initiatives*, Discussion Paper 101.

Department of Land Economy (1999) *An examination of baseline issues*, Discussion Paper 109.

Department of Land Economy (1999) *First final evaluation of three SRB short duration case studies. (Northumbria Community Safety, Brent and Harrow and Limes Farm Estate in Epping Forest District)*, Discussion Paper 111.

Department of Land Economy (2000) *Second final evaluation of two SRB short duration case studies (Engineering in Education in the West Midlands and the West Cornwall Initiative)*, Discussion Paper 114.

Department of Land Economy (2002) *Answering the really difficult questions: the role of local social surveys in assessing the impact of regeneration initiatives*, Discussion Paper 121.

Department of Land Economy (2002) *Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund: summary household survey results 1996-1999*, Discussion Paper 122.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (1998) *A partnership for regeneration - an interim evaluation*.

Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (2002) *Lessons and evaluation evidence from ten Single Regeneration Budget case studies – Mid Term Report*.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2002) "Turning Areas Around – The Impact of SRB on Final Outcomes". *Urban Research Summary No4*, 2002

Rhodes J, Tyler P and Brennan A (2003) "New developments in Area-Based Initiatives in England: the experience of the Single Regeneration Budget". *Urban Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 8, pp. 1399–426.

Rhodes J, Tyler P, and Brennan A (2005) "Assessing the effect of area-based initiatives on local area outcomes: Some thoughts based on the national evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget in England" *Urban Studies*, Vol 42, No. 11.

Department of Communities and Local Government (2007) *The Single Regeneration Budget: Final Evaluation Research Summary No. 25*.

