

**Answering the Really Difficult Questions: the Role of Local  
Social Surveys in Assessing the Impact of Regeneration  
Initiatives**

**by**

**Bobby Duffy, John Rhodes, Peter Tyler, Rachel Williams and Angela  
Brennan<sup>1</sup>**

**January 2002**

**Discussion Paper No 121**

**Department of Land Economy  
University of Cambridge  
19 Silver Street  
Cambridge  
CB3 9EP  
Tel: (01223) 337147**

---

<sup>1</sup> Bobby Duffy and Rachel Williams from MORI. John Rhodes, Peter Tyler and Angela Brennan from the Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.

## **1. The evolution of Area Based Initiatives (ABI's)**

During the last twenty years there has been a significant increase in the number of Area Based Initiatives (ABIs) used by Government to regenerate areas that are experiencing relative decline. In the 1980s these initiatives included Task Forces, UDCs and Enterprise Zones. These policies were targeted on tightly defined geographical areas and the hope was that the socially disadvantaged in and around these areas would benefit.

In the 1990s ABI's began to focus more closely on the needs of particular disadvantaged groups and individuals at the local level and this was a feature of City Challenge and then the Single Regeneration Budget approach to local area regeneration. These programmes have attempted to bring about holistic, multi-faceted, economic and social regeneration in often relatively small neighbourhood areas. As the 1990s progressed the emphasis was on getting local players to work in partnership to address the problems of their local area. The regeneration delivery mechanism was thus one that encouraged local, devolved decision making in the management and disbursement of regeneration funds.

More recently there have been further developments in the policy arena with the New Deal for Communities and the implementation of the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund. Alongside Area Based Initiatives operated by DETR there have emerged initiatives operated by individual mainstream Departments like Education Zones, Health Action Zones and Employment Zones.

Against a background of rapid policy development a number of key research questions have emerged. Some commentators have questioned the effectiveness of ABIs and have pointed to the fact that a considerable number of those who are amongst the ranks of the socially excluded are not concentrated geographically at all (Kleinman (1999)). It has also been argued that even for the socially excluded who are geographically concentrated their proximity to others experiencing similar problems is perhaps of relatively minor importance and that individual and family characteristics are of much more direct relevance to the problems that they face.

A further issue has been that the ABIs targeted on local areas may only be helping a relatively small number of disadvantaged people who then move out of the area concerned. Genuine improvements in the quality of life of those who choose to both live and work in run-down areas may be more elusive.

In the face of this debate one thing has been clear. We know too little about what causes local areas and the people who live in them to be socially and economically disadvantaged and how, and to what extent, Area Based Initiatives are helping to improve things. Just in so far as we need radical policies to tackle the problems it would seem that we need radical changes to the way in which we research the problems. However, new research is helping to improve our understanding. One such piece of research is the national evaluation of SRB (Land Economy, 1996). This programme of research began in 1996 and has adopted a research approach that has sought to address some of the more difficult research questions. This paper presents findings from the research in relation to the use of local area based social surveys. Key issues are examined drawing upon evidence from an extensive survey of households in neighbourhoods that have received regeneration funding under the Single Regeneration Budget since 1995.

## **2. The key research questions and the need for local social surveys**

A recent review of the evidence base for regeneration policy and practice commissioned by DETR (DETR 2001) identified three important questions that it would be desirable to have answers to in relation to the issue of social exclusion at the local level and the most appropriate way to tackle it. These were;

- Does geographical concentration of social exclusion matter in the sense that social exclusion and multiple deprivation are more deep-seated and difficult to remove because of its geographical concentration?
- What evidence is there that ABIs have successfully targeted benefits to concentrations of the most deprived households and are the most appropriate way to reach these concentrations?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of targeting on neighbourhoods?

In order to answer these questions it is necessary to obtain a considerable amount of information about individuals and households both at a point in time and also through time. The information is 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 allows an assessment to be made of the breadth and depth of the social exclusion that they may be experiencing and how this has been changing through time.

With this sort of information to hand it then becomes possible to investigate the inter-relationships that exist between different components of the problem i.e. how poor educational achievement may be 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 needs to include information on the perceptions of residents about the quality of their life including what they think about where they live and what their aspirations are for changing things in the future.

There is one other very important dimension to consider and this concerns the extent to which policy intervention affects 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 is that they can help to reintegrate individuals where mainstream policies might have failed and an obvious question then becomes how such policy intervention has actually helped 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.

Overall, for those individuals and households who live in deprived area 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 Area-Based Initiatives and, where relevant, mainstream delivery

Some of the evidence allows an assessment to be made about the degree of exclusion that an individual may be experiencing. This may be because they cannot gain employment, receive an adequate income or 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.

The amount of data that is available from existing secondary sources that can meet the evidence needs is relatively small. Table A1 in the annex to this document summarises the most obvious sources where some information might be found. 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).

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 may cover 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.

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 and these are summarised in table 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.

<b>Table 1 Neighbourhood Statistics – domains and sub-themes</b>	
<p><b>Access to services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Accessibility of:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GP/hospital/other health care</li> <li>Legal advice</li> <li>Leisure facilities</li> <li>Post Offices</li> <li>Schools</li> <li>Shops</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Community well-being/social environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Caring responsibilities</li> <li>■ Participation in community organisations</li> <li>■ Perceptions of neighbourhood and service provision</li> <li>■ Population turnover</li> <li>■ Voting turnout</li> </ul> <p><b>Crime</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Fear of crime</li> <li>■ Numbers of crimes of different types, including domestic burglary, auto crime and violent crime</li> <li>■ Offender data</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic deprivation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Dynamic measures of low income</li> <li>■ Indebtedness</li> <li>■ Low income</li> <li>■ Wealth/assets</li> </ul> <p><b>Education, skills and training</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Absenteeism</li> <li>■ Adult learning</li> <li>■ Driving licences</li> <li>■ Early child development</li> <li>■ Numbers achieving qualifications</li> <li>■ Numbers without qualifications</li> <li>■ Pre-school provision</li> <li>■ Progress through education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ School exclusions</li> <li>■ Special needs in schools</li> <li>■ Staying on in education</li> <li>■ Young people not in education, work or training</li> </ul> <p><b>Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Accident and emergency statistics</li> <li>■ Disability</li> <li>■ Drug and alcohol misuse</li> <li>■ Healthy lifestyles</li> <li>■ Maternal, infant and early child health</li> <li>■ Mortality</li> <li>■ Physical and mental health</li> <li>■ Social services caseloads</li> <li>■ Teenage pregnancies</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Affordability, including house prices and rents</li> <li>■ Composition of dwelling stock</li> <li>■ Homelessness</li> <li>■ Houses in multiple deprivation</li> <li>■ Overcrowding</li> <li>■ Stock turnover</li> <li>■ Unfit housing and disrepair</li> <li>■ Vacant properties</li> </ul> <p><b>Physical environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Air quality</li> <li>■ Land use, including dereliction</li> <li>■ Traffic volume and speed</li> </ul> <p><b>Work deprivation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Availability of child care</li> <li>■ Dynamic measures of worklessness (duration, persistence and turnover)</li> <li>■ Employment</li> <li>■ Job losses/notifies redundancies</li> <li>■ Measures of worklessness</li> <li>■ Workless households</li> </ul>

Source: Policy Action Team 18: Better Information

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.

### **3. Undertaking a local area social survey: key methodological issues**

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

- asking the right questions
- the importance of benchmarking and normative data
- obtaining a representative sample
- sample size
- quota versus random sampling
- statistical reliability
- establishing a sample frame
- conducting the household survey
- key sub-groups and booster interviews
- response rates
- costs and gaining value for money
- cross sectional versus longitudinal samples
- being able to model change on the basis of the evidence received

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.

#### **Asking the right questions**

In order to undertake the national evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget an extensive evaluation framework was devised and this is described in an 'Evaluation of Regeneration Activities Funded under the SRB CF Bidding Framework-the Evaluation Framework' (Land Economy, 1996). The resident social survey component of the evaluation is based on a longitudinal design that explores residents' socio-economic status (including work status and benefit dependency) and views on their home and area before and after the SRB CF 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 2 were selected.

Overall, the SRB evaluation has been tracking progress in twenty case study areas that have benefited from SRB funding and from these 7 areas where 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. The areas chosen for the SRB analysis 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 31000 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) and Nottingham (covering three priority areas within the City of Nottingham, namely; Radford, Hyson Green and Forest Fields estates).

<b>Table 2</b> <b>Key variables in the survey of households on estates</b>
<b>Household characteristics</b> including structure, age, dependency, educational attainment, occupation, social class and ethnicity.
<b>Satisfaction with local area as a place to live.</b> 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.
<b>Involvement in the local community</b> as defined as other people living within 10 to 20 minutes walk of home/estate concerned.
<b>Satisfaction with housing,</b> 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.
<b>Work characteristics,</b> 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.
<b>Perceived quality of health,</b> 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.
<b>Features of local area in relation to safety, security and crime.</b> Existence and fear of crime.
<b>Sports and leisure.</b> Availability and use of key sports and leisure facilities in local area.
<b>Finance.</b> A number of questions relating to earnings including benefits received, perceptions of adequacy of income, meeting financial obligations, debt.
<b>Perceptions of local policy initiatives.</b>

### **The Importance of Benchmarking and Normative Data**

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 NDC 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.

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 NDC 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.

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.

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, it will be possible to do a lot more with the NDC areas, given their relatively similar size, nature and aims.

The National evaluation of the SRB illustrates how the findings from social survey work can be benchmarked against respective national comparator benchmarks to gain a picture of the breadth and depth of the problems that exist in deprived areas. Table 3 illustrates how the social and economic position of households in SRB areas has been benchmarked in relation to the respective national equivalent. The footnotes to the table describe the national sources that have been used to provide the national benchmarks.

<b>Table 3 Bringing the evidence together; the breadth and depth of social exclusion</b>			
	<b>Worst estate</b>	<b>Average estate (seven areas)</b>	<b>National average</b>
<i>Head of household</i>			
Working full or part time	43	54	80
Unemployed seeking work	25	16	9
At home not seeking work	17	16	6
Long term sick	15	14	6
% income below £100 (a week)	40	37	22
% on Income Support, Unemployment Benefit, Incapacity Benefit	61	46	28
% on Income Support only	40	26	15
% on Housing Benefit	50	34	20
% of lone parents	27	13	6
% social housing <sup>1</sup>	94	53	32
Dissatisfied with area	28	13	5
Very dissatisfied with dwelling	23	9	2
Area very unsafe after dark	50	42	11
Likely to move	46	23	17
Do not feel closely involved with the community	80	72	

<sup>1</sup>Social housing is accommodation provided by Housing Associations

Source: SRB social survey. Benchmark sources: English Housing Survey (SHE), The General Household Survey (GHS), the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), the British Crime Survey and the English House Condition Survey (EHCS). A module of questions was also included on the ONS Omnibus Survey so that a timely set of data would be available at the relevant time across a range of issues.

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 will not always be possible, and questions should be 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 will need 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 will clearly have different views to a sample of the adult population as a whole (who will be younger and more likely to be women), and direct comparisons cannot 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.

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 have a very different profile to the areas we are comparing them with. On one level this is obvious; regeneration areas are selected because they are different, and generally because they have greater needs. However, profile differences can cause some problems with interpretation attitudinal comparisons.

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 we interpret this we need to be aware that 62% of residents in Chalkhill were 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.

This is a very obvious example, but there are a large number of instances where attitudes will be related to demographic characteristics, and one set of demographics will be 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 can 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.

### **Obtaining a representative sample; Sample Size**

The decision as to the most appropriate sample size is dependent on a range of factors. These include not only the precision with which you want to measure views - both for the overall sample as well as the sub-groups by which you want 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.

The good practice guidance for collecting baseline information in NDC 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.

### **Quota versus Random Sampling**

In deciding upon the most appropriate sampling method, there are two broad options to consider - 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.

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.

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 call-backs (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.

### **Statistical Reliability**

Table 4 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  $\pm 4$  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%).

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.

<b>Table 4      Approximate sampling tolerances</b>			
	<b>Applicable to percentages at or near these levels</b>		
	<b>10% or 90%</b>	<b>30% or 70%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$
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

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 the table below.

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 5 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.

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.

<b>Table 5      Differences required for significance at or near these levels</b>			
	<b>10% or 90%</b>	<b>30% or 70%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$
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
350 and 150	6	9	10

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.

### **Sampling frame**

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.

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 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.

### **Conducting the household survey**

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 question 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 that 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.

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.

*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.

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.<sup>2</sup> Again, figures suggest there is some geographical variation and systematic bias in the incidence of ex-directory numbers.

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.

---

<sup>2</sup> All figures supplied by UK Changes at Direct Select.

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.

### **Key Sub-groups and Booster Interviews**

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.

This is also often the case when attempting to achieve representative sub-samples of minority ethnic groups. As the guidance issued to NDC 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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, for example, more qualitative approaches such as focus groups.

## **Response Rates**

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 NDC 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 1990s in a number of major government surveys.

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)<sup>3</sup> 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%.
- 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 NDC 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> Survey Methods Centre Newsletter, Volume 17 No.3 (1997).

- 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 NDC 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.

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 6 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.

<b>Table 6 Numbers and Proportions of Interviews</b>			
	<b>Numbers</b>	<b>% main SRBs</b>	<b>Adjusted response rate</b>
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
<b>7 main survey SRB</b>	<b>3459</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>All areas</b>	<b>4198</b>	<b>100</b>	

## Costs and Value for Money

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.

## Cross-sectional and longitudinal samples

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.

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.

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 individual' 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

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:

<b>Table 7 Example of measuring change</b>		
	<b>Period 1</b>	<b>Period 2</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
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

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:

<b>Table 8 Shift (period 2 - period 1)</b>	
	<b>%</b>
+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

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

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 individual's responses have changed between surveys, and not just at how residents as whole have responded at two points in time.

This can be demonstrated by examples from the SRB Evaluation. The table below shows the overall cross-sectional findings from the two surveys (what is generally called the "net change") but also 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 have no workers; this has decreased 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.

<b>Table 10 Anyone working in household</b>			
	<b>1996</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>Change (99-96)</b>
<b>Net change</b>	%	%	±%
No-one working in household	35	33	-2
		<b>Gross change 1996-1999</b>	
<b>Gross change</b>		%	
No-one working in household to someone		7	
Someone working in household to no-one		9	

Source: SRB social survey

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

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

Source: SRB social survey

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 have experienced certain types of change. At present, we are limited in the amount of this analysis that can be conducted, given that only three areas have been followed-up and so base sizes are rather small. The table below gives an idea of the basic analysis that is possible. Those aged 35-44 years and workers are more likely than average to feel better able to cope than in the baseline. In contrast, older respondents and non-workers are more likely to report decreases.

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

## **Movers**

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.

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**

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.

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.

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.

From all of these approaches we finally identified 50 respondents who had definitely moved out of two of the SRB areas.<sup>4</sup> 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.

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

---

<sup>4</sup> One SRB area could not be included in this exercise as they were still in the process of a large-scale temporary decant.

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.

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.

### **Out-mover profile**

However, even given the shortcomings, this exercise has still provided some useful indications of how the populations in the areas may have changed, by comparing the characteristics of those we know moved out of the area during the SRB programme with those who took part in the baseline survey and still live in the area. Table (13) presents this. Some interesting differences are clear, with out movers being younger, more likely to have children, more likely to rent and more economically inactive. Qualifications and skills levels appear similar between the two groups, but out movers tend to have had lower incomes at the baseline. Many of these factors are also associated with higher levels of movement generally, as seen in national surveys such as the Survey of English Housing.

<b>Table 13</b>	<b>Out-mover profile</b>	
	<b>Panel sample 1996</b>	<b>Out-movers 1996</b>
<i>Base:</i>	<i>(399)</i>	<i>(50)</i>
	%	%
<b>Age of head of household</b>		
18-34	14	36
35-44	19	30
45-64	38	20
65+	28	12
<b>Lone parent</b>	9	16
<b>Adults responsible for children</b>	37	62
<b>Tenure</b>		
Owner occupied	71	42
Social and private rented	29	58
<b>Economic activity</b>		
Economically active	51	56
Economically inactive	19	30
Retired	29	14
<b>Socio-economic group</b>		
Professional/intermediate	19	20
Skilled/semi-skilled	46	45
Partly skilled	25	18
Unskilled	6	12
Never worked	2	2
<b>No qualifications</b>	53	50
<b>Income</b>		
Under £100 per week	23	34
£300 + per week	20	14
<b>Housing benefit</b>	20	40

Source: SRB social survey

## Attitudes of out movers

It is also clear that out-movers were not particularly dissatisfied with the key aspects of the area, compared with those who have remained. Table (14) shows the relevant results. They were slightly less involved in the community, but not markedly so. This analysis does give some indications of why this may be; they were much more likely to say they wanted to move out of their *current home*, but they were no more likely to say they want to move out of *area*. Their motivations for wanting to move were more likely to be property and employment related.

<b>Table 14 Attitudes of out-movers</b>		
	<b>Panel sample 1996</b>	<b>Out- movers 1996</b>
<i>Base:</i>	(399)	(50)
	%	%
<b>Satisfied with accommodation</b>	88	82
<b>Satisfied with area</b>	74	72
<b>Area safe when out at night alone</b>	38	38
<b>If alone could rely on friends/relatives in the area to help – agree</b>	88	78
<b>Could count on friends/relative in the area to keep an eye on home, if home was empty – agree</b>	91	78
<b>Could turn to friends/relatives in the area for advice or support</b>	82	70
<b>Feel closely involved in the community</b>	29	22
<b>Done voluntary work in the last 12 months</b>	21	23
<b>Likely to move in next 2 years</b>	12	32
<b>Want to move out of current accommodation</b>	23	46
out of area	75	65
within area	18	35
<b>Reasons for wanting to move:</b>	(93)	(23)
Property related	40	57
Area related	50	48
Personal reasons	19	17
Work reasons	1	13

Source: SRB social survey

## In-movers

In movers also provide a very useful insight into change in the SRB areas. The tables below show comparisons of those who have moved into the area in the last three years with the panel sample responses from the follow-up survey in 1999.

## In mover profile

Overall, the picture is of movers into the area sharing some characteristics with those who have moved out. We clearly need to be cautious about this given the small and indicative nature of samples, but again in movers are younger than “stayers”, they are more likely to have children, less likely to be owner-occupiers and more likely to rent, more economically inactive and more likely to receive housing benefit. They do, however, seem to be less well qualified, not as highly skilled and on lower incomes than both long-term residents and out movers.

<b>Table 15 Profile of In movers</b>		
	<b>Panel sample 1999</b>	<b>In movers 1999</b>
<i>Base:</i>	<i>(399)</i>	<i>(134)</i>
	%	%
<b>Age of head of household</b>		
18-34	9	46
35-44	19	25
45-64	37	19
65+	35	14
<b>Lone parent</b>	8	17
<b>Adults responsible for children</b>	31	46
<b>Tenure</b>		
Owner occupied	72	38
Social and private rented	28	76
<b>Economic activity</b>		
Economically active	35	40
Economically inactive	14	25
Retired	36	13
<b>Socio-economic group</b>		
Professional/intermediate	20	28
Skilled/semi-skilled	47	27
Partly skilled	22	23
Unskilled	6	8
Never worked	3	10
<b>No qualifications</b>	51	39
<b>Income</b>		
Under £100 per week	20	19
£300 + per week	27	29
<b>Housing benefit</b>	18	31

Source: SRB social survey

## Attitudes of in movers

The attitudes of in movers are again fairly similar to out movers – with similar general ratings of the area, and only slightly lower feelings of community involvement.

<b>Table 16 Attitudes on In movers</b>		
	<b>Panel sample 1999</b>	<b>In movers 1999</b>
<i>Base:</i>	<i>(399)</i>	<i>(134)</i>
	%	%
<b>Satisfied with accommodation</b>	90	82
<b>Satisfied with area</b>	71	75
<b>Area safe when out at night alone</b>	42	49
<b>If alone could rely on friends/relatives in the area to help – agree</b>	86	81
<b>Could count on friends/relative in the area to keep an eye on home, if home was empty – agree</b>	93	80
<b>Could turn to friends/relatives in the area for advice or support</b>	85	74
<b>Feel closely involved in the community</b>	30	22
<b>Done voluntary work in the last 12 months</b>	18	10
<b>Likely to move in next 2 years</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>TBC</b>
<b>Want to move out of current accommodation</b>	32	34
out of area	61	67
within area	31	24
<b>Reasons for wanting to move:</b>		
Property related	52	29
Area related	44	62
Personal reasons	5	9
Work reasons	1	7

Source: SRB social survey

## Comparing Retrospective Questions

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.

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.

<b>Table 17 Retrospective versus rating questions</b>			
	<b>1996</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>Change (99-96)</b>
<i>Base:</i>	(527)	(527)	
<b>Area for bringing up children</b>	%	%	±%
Good	60	58	-2
Bad	22	20	-2
Improved over last 3 years	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>+9</b>
Worse over last 3 years	20	20	0
<b>Area as a place to live</b>			
Satisfied	72	70	-2
Dissatisfied	22	23	+1
Better	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>+8</b>
Worse	25	24	-1

Source: SRB social survey

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.

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.

#### **4. Teasing out the effects of regeneration initiatives**

Local surveys can provide insights into the impact that Area-Based Initiatives like SRB have had on the local areas on which they have been targeted. They can also be used to investigate the effects and limitations of existing mainstream service provision. In the national evaluation of SRB local social surveys are being combined with conventional evaluation approaches in order to assess the overall achievements of local Area-Based Initiatives and the mechanisms by which specific projects address social exclusion at the local level (Ox Rev 2000). The results from three case study areas can help to illustrate the broad approach.

As described above between November 1999 and February 2000 a repeat resident social survey was undertaken 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. Besides enabling the analysis of the characteristics of those people and households that move onto and off estates this survey has also enabled an assessment of what people believe SRB has been able to achieve and the degree to which the regeneration initiatives have been

able to affect outcomes. It thus provides useful statistical evidence on any possible regeneration outcomes that may have been caused, at least in part, by the SRB schemes.

Questions were asked in the social surveys about whether the respondents had heard of the SRB initiative. Across the three SRB areas, 17% of survey respondents had heard of the Single Regeneration Budget in 1999, compared with 10% in 1996. Awareness varied between areas, from 27% in Hangleton Knoll to 12% in Chalkhill and 13% in Rochdale. Panel respondents were more aware of SRB than the sample as a whole.

But higher proportions had heard of the key projects, given their local name, which SRB had funded. 45% of respondents in Chalkhill (57% of panel respondents) had heard of at least one key SRB funded project. This compares with a very high figure of 82% in Hangleton Knoll and a low of 41% in Rochdale.

Whilst we are not able to deduce, from the household survey evidence alone, issues like the value for money of SRB in these areas, useful insights are emerging of relevance to the regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods and help to enhance the evidence base. Some key findings are;

- There are early signs that SRB, in conjunction with mainstream programmes, is beginning to achieve some movement from welfare to work - but only amongst younger age groups;
- Parents in deprived neighbourhoods are increasingly recognising the importance of the quality of school education in their local areas;
- There is no evidence of improved health amongst residents of the three case studies - but the schemes did not directly address health issues;
- Small SRB funding in Chalkhill, combined with large scale mainstream housing renewal, has improved some regeneration outcomes in what was a highly deprived area with a concentration of ethnic minority groups;
- Improvements were lower in Rochdale where the design of the scheme, with its economic and physical bias may have helped the larger District as a whole, but brought relatively few short-term benefits to the deprived residents of the SRB area itself;
- The observed small net changes in outcomes are the small balancing item between larger proportions who experience improvements in outcomes and similarly large proportions who experience a deterioration in their circumstances.

A further area of analysis being pursued is to compare the behaviour attitudes and characteristics of those who stated that they had participated in SRB funded projects with the panel and cross-section sample results as a whole. This should reveal how far SRB projects have been effectively targeted at the most disadvantaged households and how far this group show larger improvements in circumstances and satisfaction than the group who did not participate in SRB funded projects.

Thus household survey results are one important source of evidence in evaluating the achievements of local area-based initiatives. The household survey evidence can be combined with other evidence from local secondary statistical sources and with other fieldwork and data and analysis on projects and partnership activities funded by SRB with a view to disentangling the net additional contribution of SRB to improved economic and social conditions in each case study area - and hence the value for money achieved by SRB areas. It is hoped that this paper has wetted the appetite of those involved in the delivery of regeneration initiatives to use local social surveys as a way of both monitoring economic and social change as well as assessing the achievements of local area based regeneration initiatives.

<b>Table A1 Principal secondary data sources for constructing Baseline data</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Smallest geographical area</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Population and demographic and family structure	Age	EDs/Wards	Census of population	1981, 1991, 2001	Comprehensive but does not reflect current conditions
	Gender	ED/ Wards	Census of population		
	Ethnic	ED/ Wards	Census of population		
	Family structure	EDs/Wards	Census of population		
	Economic activity	EDs/Wards	Census of population		
Employment	Employment levels	TTWA areas and Districts, Wards	Census of Employment, now Annual Employment Survey	CofE every two years; replaced in 1995 by annual AES	
Claimant Unemployment	Nos. unemployed	Job centre area, wards	Job centres/employment service	Monthly	Restricted definition of unemployment
	Duration	Job centre area, wards			
	Sex	Job centre area, wards			
	Age	Job centre area, wards			
Housing	Local authority stock	Wards/groups of wards	Local authorities	(Varies)	Qualitative data lacking
	Housing Assoc. stock	(Varies)			
	Private sector rented	(No systematic data)			
	Owner occupied	(No systematic data)			
Crime and safety	Recorded crime	Division and beat areas	Police statistics	Annually	Possible variations in definitions between police forces
	Offences	Division and beat areas	Police statistics		
	Insurance premiums		Insurance company surveys		
Education	Examination attainment	By school and by LEA	LEA/League tables	Annually	
	Attendance figures	By school and by LEA	LEA		
	Staying on rates	By school and by LEA	LEA		
	Destination of school leavers	By school and by LEA	LEA		
Health	Standardised mortality rates (SMRs)	By ward	Health Authorities and Trusts	Annually	
	Below average birth-weight	By ward			
Benefit use	Number of claimants by type of benefit	By postcode, BA unit/district	DSS	Annually	Also need total population for areas
Commercial activity	No. of firms VAT registered	District	Customs and Excise	Annually	Does not cover business below VAT threshold
	No of firms	District	NOMIS		

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DETR 2001** A Review of the Evidence Base for Regeneration Policy and Practice. *Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, London.*
- Kleinman 1999** Include me out? The new politics of place and poverty: *CASE Paper 11, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion; London, London School of Economics.*
- Land Economy 1996** Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; The Evaluation Framework. *Discussion Paper 83, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.*
- Land Economy 1998a** Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; a Partnership for Regeneration - an interim evaluation. By Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge. *Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, London.*
- Land Economy 1998b** Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; Key results from the residents' baseline social surveys. *Discussion Paper 100, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.*
- Land Economy 1998c** Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; New findings on the nature of economic and social exclusion in England; implications for new policy initiatives. *Discussion Paper 101, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.*
- Land Economy 1999a** Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; An examination of baseline issues. *Discussion Paper 109, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.*
- Land Economy 1999b** Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; first final evaluation of three SRB short duration case studies. *Discussion Paper 111, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.*
- Land Economy 2000** Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; second final evaluation of two SRB short duration case studies. *Discussion Paper 114, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.*
- PAT18 2000** National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. Report of Policy Action Team 18: Better Information. *The Stationery office, London.*
- Ox Rev 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*