



Best Value User Satisfaction Surveys 2006-07

General Survey National Report



Best Value User Satisfaction Surveys 2006-07

General Survey National Report

Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 020 7944 4400
Website: www.communities.gov.uk

© *Crown Copyright, 2007*

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp, or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ.
Fax: 01603 723000 or email: HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Communities and Local Government Publications
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7NB
Tel: 08701 226 236
Fax: 08701 226 237
Textphone: 08701 207 405
Email: communities@twoten.com
or online via the Communities and Local Government website: www.communities.gov.uk

May 2007

Product Code: 07LGSR04610

Introduction

Background

All English local authorities are statutorily required to undertake surveys on a three-yearly basis to collect data for Best Value Performance satisfaction indicators. The first round of these surveys ran in 2000-01, the second in 2003-04 and this report publishes national results from the third round in 2006-07.

These survey-based measures form part of the wider suite of BVPIs, which councils are statutorily required to report. Local authorities collect these survey data following a methodology and a timetable prescribed by Communities and Local Government and the Audit Commission. Following data collection, authorities submit their data to the Audit Commission for collation and further analysis at national and regional aggregate levels.

There are five BVPI surveys: a general household survey; a survey of local authority benefit claimants, a survey of local authority tenants, a survey of planning applicants, and a survey of library users. This report publishes an initial set of results for all authorities from the General Survey only.

This report updates an earlier report which presented results for single tier and upper tier authorities, as these authorities were asked to submit their data earlier than usual so that it could be used for Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) 2006. This report includes results for District and single and upper tier councils and reports the national averages for those indicators which Districts are required to report.

General Survey

Fieldwork for the General Survey took place in authorities across England between September and November 2006. This survey focuses on four key areas: Corporate Health, Environment & Waste, Transport and Cultural & Recreational Services. The General Survey collects thirteen Best Value Performance Indicators. To reflect the responsibilities of different authority types, some indicators are not relevant to all authorities (**Table 1, Annex A**). Authorities collect data for the General Survey using a standardised questionnaire template.

In addition to questions used to collect data for BVPIs, there are several non-statutory indicators and questions. These include question modules on quality of life in the local area, anti-social behaviour and respect, and participation and local decision making. National results are presented for these questions, some of which constitute indicators for Local Area Agreements.

About this report

This report publishes nationally aggregated BVPI results, using data from 387 English local authorities¹. The report includes an indicator by indicator commentary of 2006-07 results for eleven BVPIs collected by the General Survey². It also includes time-series comparisons with 2000-01 and 2003-04 results, as well as results by authority type and regional breakdowns. All relevant BVPI data is presented in tables in **Annex A**. A brief technical note of the methodology can be found at **Annex B**.

The report updates the *General Survey Initial Topline Report for Single and Upper-Tier Local Authorities*, published on the 15th February 2007³ to include results from District Councils. Where trends presented in the Single and Upper Tier Local Authorities report are significantly different from the national results, the differences are highlighted in this report. The report presents regional statistics for the BVPI user satisfaction indicators in the General Survey. This report does not repeat the transport indicators (BVPI103 and BVPI104), for which national results were presented in a previous report for Single and Upper Tier Local Authorities.

This report also presents key results for questions in the BVPI General Surveys used as indicators for Local Area Agreements (LAAs)⁴. These questions cover anti-social behaviour, quality of life and participation and local decision making.

¹ The Isles of Scilly did not conduct the survey

² National results for transport indicators BVPI 103 and BVPI104 are published in a previous report

³ Available from <http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1506089>

⁴ Indicators used in Round 3 of Local Area Agreements are described in Appendix A of guidance published at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1164930>


Results

Summary of Best Value Performance Indicator Results

- **54%** satisfied with the **overall service** provided by the local authority – *a decline of 1 percentage point since 2003-04.*
- **34%** of complainants satisfied with the **handling of their complaints** – *an improvement of 1 percentage point since 2003-04.*
- **68%** satisfied with the **cleanliness standard (keeping land clear of litter and waste)** in their area – *an improvement of 8 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **79%** satisfied with **household waste collection** – *a decline of 5 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **70%** satisfied with **waste recycling (local facilities)** – *an improvement of 2 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **79%** satisfied with **waste disposal (local tips)** – *an improvement of 4 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **58%** satisfied with **sports and leisure facilities** – *an improvement of 4 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **73%** satisfied with **libraries** – *an improvement of 6 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **41%** satisfied with **museums and galleries** – *a decline of 1 percentage point since 2003-04.*
- **41%** satisfied with **theatres and concert halls** – *a decline of 6 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **73%** satisfied with **parks and open spaces** – *an improvement of 2 percentage points since 2003-04.*

Corporate Health Indicators

Figure 1: Corporate health: public satisfaction 2000-01 to 2006-07



Overall satisfaction

Average overall satisfaction with local authorities has fallen by one percentage point, from 55% satisfied in 2003-04 to 54% in 2006-07. This represents an 11 percentage point decline on 2000-01 levels (**Figure 1**). Between 2003-04, overall satisfaction declined by 4 percentage points in Counties, by 2 percentage points in Unitary authorities and Metropolitan Boroughs, and by 1 percentage point in District councils; London Boroughs have however seen an improvement of 2 percentage points (**Table 2**).

Within this overall picture, 77 authorities show statistically significant improvement since 2003-04, whilst 121 authorities show statistically significant decline. 189 authorities show no significant change since 2003-04⁵.

Overall satisfaction varies by age, gender, ethnicity, and stated disability (**Table 3**). Older age groups are more likely to express satisfaction with their local authority than younger age groups, and women are more likely to express satisfaction than men. Variation by ethnicity is more complex: respondents identifying themselves as Black are slightly more likely to be satisfied than the average, and those identifying themselves as Mixed, Asian or other non-White ethnicities are slightly less likely to be satisfied than the average⁶. The Department is undertaking more detailed analysis to understand these trends and determine whether other factors (such as concentration of particular ethnic groups in particular areas) are involved.

Complaints handling


Satisfaction with complaints handling shows a 1 percentage point increase since 2003-04, previously this indicator had seen a drop of 7 percentage points between 2000-01 and 2003-04 (**Figure 1, Table 4**).

⁵ Change in each authority tested using a t-test; statistical significance is reported at the 95% confidence level.

⁶ White mirrors the average due to the high proportion of those identifying as White in the population.

Environment and Waste Indicators

Figure 2: Environment and waste services: public satisfaction 2000-01 to 2006-07



Three of the four environment and waste indicators show increased public satisfaction: satisfaction with keeping land clear of litter and refuse and local recycling facilities and waste disposal (local tips) now exceed 2000-01 levels (**Figure 2**). Satisfaction with waste collection shows a 5 percentage point decline since 2003-04.

The most marked increases in satisfaction with environment and waste are seen in London Boroughs, which show improvement in all environment and waste indicators and greater improvement than other types of authority, although in absolute terms residents of London Boroughs remain least satisfied with waste services (**Tables 5 to 8**). There are considerable variations in performance on these indicators for different types of authority, for example satisfaction with waste collection in London Boroughs has risen by 4 percentage points, whilst in Districts satisfaction has declined by 7 percentage points.

Transport Indicators

National figures have already been reported in the Initial Topline Report for Single and Upper Tier Local Authorities⁷ as District councils do not report transport indicators.


Cultural and Recreational Service Indicators

Of the cultural and recreational service indicators, three indicators show an increase in satisfaction (sports and leisure facilities, libraries, and parks and open spaces). The other two indicators show declines (**Figure 3**).

Levels of satisfaction with sport and leisure facilities, parks and open spaces and with libraries have increased for single and upper tier authorities overall since 2003-04 and now exceed the 2000-01 levels of satisfaction for these indicators (**Tables 9, 10 and 13**).

Satisfaction with museums and galleries shows a slight decline (**Table 11**). Satisfaction with theatres and concert halls has declined by 6 percentage points since 2003-04, reflecting a considerable decline of 8 percentage points for District councils (**Table 12**).

⁷ Available from <http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1506089>



Local Area Indicators

The survey includes a number of questions relating to the local area, including indicators on quality of life, social cohesion, respect and anti-social behaviour (**Table 14**). These indicators form part of the set of indicators for Local Area Agreements.

Quality of life

75% are satisfied with their area as a place to live. There is some variation regionally, with the South West achieving highest average levels of satisfaction and London registering the lowest.

Social cohesion

An indicator of social cohesion was also included which reports that nationally, 79% of people definitely or tend to agree that their local area is a place where people of different backgrounds get on well together. Initial analysis of this question indicates that variation is more likely to occur on smaller geographical levels than presented in this report.

Respect and anti-social behaviour

Nationally, there is considerable variation in peoples' perceptions of anti-social behaviour in their area. 62% of residents feel parents not taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children is a very or fairly big problem, whilst 57% identify teenagers hanging around on streets and 43% identify people using or dealing drugs as problems in their local area.

Information Provision

Nationally, 47% of residents feel their council keeps residents very or fairly well informed about the services and benefits it provides, which represents a decline of 9 percentage points from 2003-04 (**Table 18a**). People who feel more informed, tend to be more satisfied with their council overall (**Table 18b**).

Participation and Local Decision Making

For the first time, questions concerning the opportunities for participation and local decision making have been included in the survey (**Table 17**). Nationally, 32% of people agree that they can influence decisions affecting their local area; 28% are satisfied with opportunities for participation in decision making, whilst 26% would like to be more involved in decisions the council makes that affect their local area. Londoners are more likely to agree that they can influence local decision making, and more likely to want to be more involved in local decision making. These early results suggest that there appears to be a relationship between overall satisfaction with the authority as a whole, opportunities for participation and the degree to which respondents agree they can influence local decisions (**Table 19**).

Initial observations and further analysis

Overall satisfaction with local government has declined by a small amount since 2003-04, following greater decline between 2000-01 and 2003-04. In contrast, many specific services have seen significant improvements in public satisfaction from 2000-01.

The relationship between satisfaction and service performance, as measured by objective performance indicators and assessments is complex. Looking across councils, satisfaction correlates with measures of performance such as Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) – better councils achieve higher levels of public satisfaction. Over time however, whilst objective measures show significant improvement from 2000-01⁸, this has not been reflected in the public's view of local government.

There are a wide range of factors that may affect how people feel about their local authority and its services. Some of these, such as demographic characteristics, how informed people are, and views on participation and local decision making have been initially explored in this report. Other factors may include:

- Service use & direct experience
- Perceived value for money
- Expectations in relation to other public and private services
- Characteristics of the area – for example deprivation or ethnic diversity
- Performance on particular issues – for example liveability

The Department is conducting further analysis to establish what the most important factors are in determining the public's views of local government and their local area, and why some people are more satisfied than others. This work will contribute to understanding about how councils and their partners can respond to public views and concerns, and how to improve reputations in line with services.

⁸ <http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/cpa/stcc/stccscores.asp>

Annex A

Introduction

The questions on which the General Survey Best Value Performance Indicators are based all include a 5-point satisfaction response scale (very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, fairly dissatisfied and very dissatisfied). BVPIs are based on those who indicate that they are satisfied. All figures included in the tables for the BV indicators show those satisfied (i.e. % very satisfied plus % fairly satisfied) as a percentage of those responding to the question. Those who did not answer are excluded from the base number. Results at a national, authority type or regional level are based on average scores for authorities within those groups with a requirement to report the relevant indicators. For questions that do not use the satisfied scale given above, the derivations of the % figures are given in notes at the base of the table. The numbers of councils reporting each indicator is given, reflecting differences in the types of authority required to report each indicator and missing or qualified data.

List of Tables

1. Best Value Performance Indicators collected by the General Survey.
2. Overall Satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results.
3. Overall Satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 by demographic characteristics – age, gender, ethnicity and disability.
4. Satisfaction with complaints handling BVPI4 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
5. Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land BVPI89 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
6. Satisfaction with household waste collection BVPI90a – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
7. Satisfaction with waste recycling (local facilities) BVPI90b – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results and by authority type.
8. Satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips) BVPI90c – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
9. Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities BVPI119a – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
10. Satisfaction with libraries BVPI119b – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
11. Satisfaction with museums and galleries BVPI119c – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
12. Satisfaction with theatres and concert halls BVPI119d – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.

13. Satisfaction with parks and open spaces BVPI119e – 2000-01 to 2006-07 national results.
14. Satisfaction with area, respect and social cohesion – 2006-07 national results.
15. Anti-social behaviour 2006-07 national results (1).
16. Anti-social behaviour 2006-07 national results (2).
17. Information provision and local decision making – 2006-07 national results.
- 18a. Information provision overall – 2003-04 and 2006-07
- 18b. A comparison of information provision and overall satisfaction BVPI3 – 2003-04 to 2006-07.
- 19 (a,b,c). Levels of satisfaction (BVPI3) by participation and local decision-making – 2006-07.

Table 1: Best Value Performance Indicators collected by the General Survey

Best Value Performance Indicators	Authority Types
BVPI3 – Overall satisfaction with the authority as a whole	All
BVPI4 – Satisfaction with complaints handling (of those making complaints)	All
BVPI89 – Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land	Districts, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI90a – Satisfaction with household waste collection	Districts, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI90b – Satisfaction with waste recycling (local facilities)	Districts, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI90c – Satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips)	County Councils, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI103 – Satisfaction with transport information	County Councils, Metropolitan Boroughs*, London Boroughs**, Unitaries, City of London**.
BVPI104 – Satisfaction with bus services	County Councils, Metropolitan Boroughs*, London Boroughs**, Unitaries, City of London**.
BVPI119a – Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities	All
BVPI119b – Satisfaction with libraries	All
BVPI119c – Satisfaction with museums/galleries	All
BVPI119d – Satisfaction with theatres/concert halls	All
BVPI119e – Satisfaction with parks and open spaces	All
* On behalf of PTA	
** On behalf of Transport for London	

Table 2: Overall Satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Taking everything into account, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way the authority runs things?

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	65	55	-10	54	-1
Number of councils reporting indicator	370	385	–	387	–
Local Authorities					
County Councils	62	54	-8	50	-4
Unitary Authorities	62	52	-10	50	-2
Metropolitan Boroughs	62	54	-8	52	-2
London Boroughs	55	52	-3	54	+2
District Councils	68	56	-12	55	-1
Regions					
East	67	55	-12	54	-1
East Midlands	65	53	-12	54	+1
North East	66	55	-11	53	-2
North West	64	53	-11	50	-3
South East	68	58	-10	55	-3
South West	66	55	-11	54	-1
West Midlands	66	55	-11	54	-1
Yorkshire & Humber	63	56	-7	51	-5
London	55	52	-3	54	+2
Percentiles					
25th percentile	60	50	-10	49	-1
50th percentile	66	55	-11	53	-2
75th percentile	71	60	-11	58	-2

Table 3: Overall Satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 by age, gender, ethnicity and disability

Taking everything into account, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way the authority runs things?

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	65	55	-10	54	-1
Number of councils reporting indicator	370	387	–	387	–
18-24 years	59	50	-9	49	-1
25-34 years	59	50	-9	50	No change
35-54 years	62	53	-9	51	-2
55-64 years	67	57	-10	56	-1
over 65 years	72	64	-8	64	No change
Men	63	52	-11	52	No change
Women	67	57	-10	55	-2
White	65	55	-10	54	-1
Mixed	57	49	-8	52	+3
Asian	58	50	-8	53	+3
Black	57	54	-3	57	+3
Other ethnicities	56	51	-5	50	-1
No long term illness	65	55	-10	53	-2
Long term illness that does not limit activities	67	55	-12	52	-3
Long term illness that limits activities	66	56	-10	56	No change

Note: Results are weighted by age, gender and ethnicity to correct for differential response bias. Results are also weighted to account for differential sample sizes between authorities; this does not adjust for different population sizes or for different proportions of particular groups between authorities.

Table 4: Satisfaction with complaints handling BVPI4 - 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results*How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way in which your complaint(s) was (were) handled?**

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	40	33	-7	34	+1
Number of councils reporting indicator	362	385	-	387	-
County Councils					
County Councils	38	32	-6	34	+2
Unitary Authorities	40	32	-8	32	No change
Metropolitan Boroughs	39	32	-7	32	No change
London Boroughs	40	29	-11	31	+2
District Councils	40	33	-7	35	+2
Regions					
East	41	32	-9	36	+4
East Midlands	39	33	-6	34	+1
North East	41	31	-10	34	+3
North West	40	32	-8	33	+1
South East	41	34	-7	35	+1
South West	39	34	-5	34	No change
West Midlands	38	34	-4	35	+1
Yorkshire & Humber	40	33	-7	32	-1
London	40	29	-11	31	+2
Percentiles					
25th percentile	36	29	-7	31	+2
50th percentile	40	33	-7	34	+1
75th percentile	44	36	-8	37	+1
*This indicator relates only to those respondents that have made a complaint in the last 12 months					

Table 5: Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land BVPI89 – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

<Authority> has a duty to keep clear of litter and refuse all open public land which it controls. How satisfied are you that the authority has kept this land clear of litter and refuse?

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	63	60	-3	68	+8
Number of councils reporting indicator	339	350	–	353	–
County Councils	County Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
Unitary Authorities	58	57	-1	64	+7
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	54	No change	61	+7
London Boroughs	53	52	-1	65	+13
District Councils	67	63	-4	69	+6
East	67	62	-5	71	+9
East Midlands	65	59	-6	67	+8
North East	58	60	+2	67	+7
North West	58	55	-3	62	+7
South East	66	63	-3	70	+7
South West	67	65	-2	70	+5
West Midlands	64	62	-2	67	+5
Yorkshire & Humber	60	59	-1	66	+7
London	53	52	-1	65	+13
25th percentile	56	54	-2	62	+8
50th percentile	64	61	-3	68	+7
75th percentile	71	67	-4	73	+6

Table 6: Satisfaction with household waste collection BVPI90a - 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the service, which we provide...the waste collection service overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	86	84	-2	79	-5
Number of councils reporting indicator	336	350	–	353	–
County Councils	County Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
Unitary Authorities	84	85	+1	79	-6
Metropolitan Boroughs	85	85	No change	82	-3
London Boroughs	74	71	-3	75	+4
District Councils	88	86	-2	79	-7
East	88	84	-4	81	-3
East Midlands	88	84	-4	76	-8
North East	88	87	-1	83	-4
North West	87	85	-2	78	-7
South East	86	84	-2	78	-6
South West	89	88	-1	81	-7
West Midlands	88	85	-3	81	-4
Yorkshire & Humber	87	87	No change	80	-7
London	74	71	-3	75	+4
25th percentile	84	80	-4	74	-6
50th percentile	88	86	-2	81	-5
75th percentile	90	89	-1	85	-4

Table 7: Satisfaction with recycling (local facilities) BVPI90b – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the service which we provide...the provision of local recycling facilities overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	66	68	+2	70	+2
Number of councils reporting indicator	336	349	–	353	–
County Councils	County Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
Unitary Authorities	64	66	+2	69	+3
Metropolitan Boroughs	59	62	+3	67	+5
London Boroughs	56	52	-4	61	+9
District Councils	69	71	+2	72	+1
East	70	69	-1	71	+2
East Midlands	68	69	+1	69	No change
North East	59	67	+8	70	+3
North West	64	68	+4	70	+2
South East	70	70	No change	71	+1
South West	72	72	No change	73	+1
West Midlands	69	69	No change	71	+2
Yorkshire & Humber	61	67	+6	69	+2
London	56	52	-4	61	+9
25th percentile	60	63	+3	66	+3
50th percentile	68	69	+1	70	+1
75th percentile	73	74	+1	75	+1

Table 8: Satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips) BVPI90c – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the service which we provide...the local tip overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	71	75	+4	79	+4
Number of councils reporting indicator	140	149	–	149	–
County Councils					
County Councils	76	82	+6	83	+1
Unitary Authorities					
Unitary Authorities	71	77	+6	80	+3
Metropolitan Boroughs					
Metropolitan Boroughs	75	78	+3	82	+4
London Boroughs					
London Boroughs	60	61	+1	71	+10
District Councils					
District Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator					
East					
East	71	80	+9	81	+1
East Midlands					
East Midlands	72	75	+3	80	+5
North East					
North East	71	80	+9	83	+3
North West					
North West	76	81	+5	83	+2
South East					
South East	72	76	+4	79	+3
South West					
South West	74	81	+7	81	No change
West Midlands					
West Midlands	77	79	+2	83	+4
Yorkshire & Humber					
Yorkshire & Humber	72	78	+6	82	+4
London					
London	60	61	+1	71	+10
25th percentile					
25th percentile	65	70	+5	76	+6
50th percentile					
50th percentile	72	78	+6	80	+2
75th percentile					
75th percentile	78	83	+5	84	+1

Table 9: Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities BVPI119a – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or support by <Authority>...sports/leisure facilities and events.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	53	54	+1	58	+4
Number of councils reporting indicator	345	376	–	387	–
County Councils	54	53	-1	57	+4
Unitary Authorities	58	56	-2	57	+1
Metropolitan Boroughs	56	54	-2	55	+1
London Boroughs	45	44	-1	48	+4
District Councils	52	55	+3	60	+5
East	53	53	No change	59	+6
East Midlands	52	52	No change	55	+3
North East	53	55	+2	60	+5
North West	55	57	+2	59	+2
South East	55	57	+2	60	+3
South West	52	55	+3	60	+5
West Midlands	53	53	No change	58	+5
Yorkshire & Humber	53	56	+3	56	No change
London	45	44	-1	48	+4
25th percentile	47	48	+1	54	+6
50th percentile	54	54	No change	58	+4
75th percentile	59	60	+1	63	+3

Table 10: Satisfaction with libraries BVPI119b – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or support by <Authority>...libraries.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	70	67	-3	73	+6
Number of councils reporting indicator	142	149	–	372	–
County Councils	72	69	-3	74	+5
Unitary Authorities	70	68	-2	72	+4
Metropolitan Boroughs	72	68	-4	72	+4
London Boroughs	64	61	-3	67	+6
District Councils	73	69	-4	74	+5
East	74	69	-5	75	+6
East Midlands	70	67	-3	72	+5
North East	76	68	-8	74	+6
North West	74	73	-1	76	+3
South East	72	68	-4	72	+4
South West	69	68	-1	75	+7
West Midlands	71	67	-4	75	+8
Yorkshire & Humber	65	66	+1	70	+4
London	64	61	-3	67	+6
25th percentile	65	63	-2	70	+7
50th percentile	70	69	-1	73	+4
75th percentile	75	72	-3	77	+5

Table 11: Satisfaction with museums and galleries BVPI119c - 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or support by <Authority>...museums and galleries.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	49	42	-7	41	-1
Number of councils reporting indicator	263	323	-	382	-
County Councils	49	42	-7	40	-2
Unitary Authorities	53	47	-6	46	-1
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	49	-5	49	No change
London Boroughs	41	35	-6	34	-1
District Councils	48	41	-7	39	-2
East	48	40	-8	41	+1
East Midlands	47	39	-8	36	-3
North East	53	43	-10	41	-2
North West	51	48	-3	44	-4
South East	49	40	-9	39	-1
South West	49	46	-3	46	No change
West Midlands	52	46	-6	42	-4
Yorkshire & Humber	53	48	-5	48	No change
London	41	35	-6	34	-1
25th percentile	41	31	-10	29	-2
50th percentile	49	42	-7	39	-3
75th percentile	56	50	-6	51	+1

Table 12: Satisfaction with theatres and concert halls BVPI119d – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or support by <Authority>...theatres and concert halls.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	52	47	-5	41	-6
Number of councils reporting indicator	238	316	–	386	–
County Councils	53	45	-8	42	-3
Unitary Authorities	57	53	-4	50	-3
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	49	-5	46	-3
London Boroughs	44	38	-6	37	-1
District Councils	51	47	-4	39	-8
East	52	44	-8	40	-4
East Midlands	49	42	-7	37	-5
North East	52	45	-7	38	-7
North West	50	49	-1	40	-9
South East	56	51	-5	44	-7
South West	54	50	-4	43	-7
West Midlands	50	51	+1	43	-8
Yorkshire & Humber	57	50	-7	46	-4
London	44	38	-6	37	-1
25th percentile	43	36	-7	29	-7
50th percentile	52	47	-5	41	-6
75th percentile	61	56	-5	52	-4

Table 13: Satisfaction with parks and open spaces BVPI119e – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 national results

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or support by <Authority>...parks and open spaces.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	63	71	+8	73	+2
Number of councils reporting indicator	347	375	–	387	–
County Councils	67	70	+3	73	+3
Unitary Authorities	69	74	+5	74	No change
Metropolitan Boroughs	61	67	+6	68	+1
London Boroughs	65	69	+4	73	+4
District Councils	62	72	+10	73	+1
East	66	72	+6	75	+3
East Midlands	60	70	+10	70	No change
North East	55	68	+13	69	+1
North West	62	71	+9	71	No change
South East	67	76	+9	76	No change
South West	63	72	+9	74	+2
West Midlands	62	70	+8	72	+2
Yorkshire & Humber	60	68	+8	70	+2
London	65	69	+4	73	+4
25th percentile	57	66	+9	68	+2
50th percentile	63	72	+9	74	+2
75th percentile	70	77	+7	77	No change

Table 14: Satisfaction with area, respect and social cohesion – 2006-07 national results				
	<i>Satisfaction with area as a place to live</i>	<i>Whether area is a place where people of different backgrounds get on well</i>	<i>Thinking about this local area, how much of a problem are...</i>	
			<i>...parents not taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children</i>	<i>...people not treating each other with respect and consideration</i>
	% satisfied	% agree*	% stating big or fairly big problem**	% stating big or fairly big problem**
National average	75	79	62	48
Number of councils reporting indicator	387	387	387	381
County Councils	78	81	59	44
Unitary Authorities	71	76	65	52
Metropolitan Boroughs	68	74	67	54
London Boroughs	69	79	64	54
District Councils	77	80	60	46
East	77	79	60	46
East Midlands	74	79	62	47
North East	72	77	67	52
North West	72	76	64	50
South East	76	80	62	48
South West	81	82	57	41
West Midlands	75	78	61	48
Yorkshire & Humber	75	75	60	46
London	69	79	64	54
25th percentile	69	76	56	41
50th percentile	76	80	62	47
75th percentile	81	84	69	55
<p>* % of those stating 'definitely agree' or 'tend to agree' out of those stating either 'definitely agree', 'tend to agree', 'tend to disagree' and 'definitely disagree'. Those stating 'don't know', 'too few people in local area' or 'all the same background' are excluded from the base.</p> <p>** % of those stating 'a very big problem' or 'a fairly big problem' out of those that answered any option except for 'don't know'.</p>				

Table 15: Anti-social behaviour – 2006-07 national results (1)

	<i>Thinking about this local area, how much of a problem are...</i>			
	<i>...noisy neighbours or loud parties</i>	<i>...teenagers hanging around on the streets</i>	<i>...rubbish and litter lying around</i>	<i>...people being drunk or rowdy in public spaces</i>
	% stating big or fairly big problem*	% stating big or fairly big problem*	% stating big or fairly big problem*	% stating big or fairly big problem*
National average	16	57	42	31
Number of councils reporting indicator	387	387	387	387
County Councils				
County Councils	14	54	39	28
Unitary Authorities				
Unitary Authorities	19	59	47	35
Metropolitan Boroughs				
Metropolitan Boroughs	20	64	51	33
London Boroughs				
London Boroughs	24	60	53	36
District Councils				
District Councils	15	55	39	29
East				
East	15	56	38	28
East Midlands				
East Midlands	15	58	42	29
North East				
North East	18	63	47	34
North West				
North West	17	61	46	33
South East				
South East	16	56	40	31
South West				
South West	13	50	38	31
West Midlands				
West Midlands	15	56	43	29
Yorkshire & Humber				
Yorkshire & Humber	16	56	42	29
London				
London	24	60	53	36
25th percentile				
25th percentile	12	50	35	25
50th percentile				
50th percentile	15	57	41	30
75th percentile				
75th percentile	19	64	49	35
* % of those stating 'a very big problem' or 'a fairly big problem' out of those that answered any option except for 'don't know'.				

Table 16: Anti-social behaviour – 2006-07 national results (2)				
	<i>Thinking about this local area, how much of a problem are...</i>			<i>How well informed do you feel about... what the council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour in your local area</i>
	<i>...abandoned or burnt out cars</i>	<i>...vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles</i>	<i>...people using or dealing drugs</i>	
	% stating big or fairly big problem*	% stating big or fairly big problem*	% stating big or fairly big problem*	% stating very or fairly well informed**
National average	10	38	43	23
Number of councils reporting indicator	387	387	387	387
County Councils	9	34	40	22
Unitary Authorities	12	42	46	23
Metropolitan Boroughs	10	42	47	23
London Boroughs	15	47	45	23
District Councils	9	36	42	24
East	10	37	40	23
East Midlands	11	38	44	23
North East	7	39	50	27
North West	8	38	46	23
South East	12	39	39	23
South West	9	33	42	22
West Midlands	9	36	44	23
Yorkshire & Humber	11	36	46	24
London	15	47	45	23
25th percentile	6	31	35	21
50th percentile	9	37	42	23
75th percentile	13	45	50	25
<p>* % of those stating 'a very big problem' or 'a fairly big problem' out of those that answered any option except for 'don't know'.</p> <p>** % of those stating 'very well informed' or 'fairly well informed' out of those that answered any option except for 'don't know'.</p>				

Table 17: Information provision and local decision making – 2006-07 national results

	<i>Overall, how well informed do you think your council keeps residents about the services and benefits it provides?</i>	<i>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the opportunities for participation in local-decision making provided by your council?</i>	<i>Do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions in your local area?</i>	<i>Generally speaking, would you like to be more involved in the decisions your council makes that affect your local area?</i>
	% very or fairly well informed*	% satisfied	% Definitely or tend to agree**	% want to be more involved regardless of the issue***
National average	47	28	32	26
Number of councils reporting indicator	386	387	387	387
County Councils	45	26	31	26
Unitary Authorities	42	27	32	25
Metropolitan Boroughs	41	28	33	26
London Boroughs	43	30	40	35
District Councils	49	29	32	24
East	49	29	31	26
East Midlands	46	29	32	24
North East	47	31	33	24
North West	42	27	31	25
South East	49	28	32	25
South West	47	28	31	24
West Midlands	46	28	32	24
Yorkshire & Humber	46	28	32	23
London	43	30	40	35
25th percentile	42	25	29	23
50th percentile	46	28	32	25
75th percentile	51	31	34	28
<p>* % of those stating 'very well informed' or 'fairly well informed' out of those that answered any option except for 'don't know'.</p> <p>** % stating 'definitely agree' or 'tend to agree' out of those answering any option except for 'don't know'</p> <p>*** % stating 'yes' out of those answering 'yes', 'no' or 'depends on the issue'.</p>				

Table 18a: Information provision overall – 2003-04 to 2006-07

Overall, how well informed do you think your council keeps residents about the services and benefits it provides?

	2003-04	2006-07	change 2003-04 to 2006-07
Very well informed	10	7	-3
Fairly well informed	46	40	-6
Not very well informed	30	36	+6
Not informed at all	14	18	+4

Table 18b: Levels of overall satisfaction with the authority (BVPI3) by information provision – 2003-04 to 2006-07

Overall, how well informed do you think your council keeps residents about the services and benefits it provides?

	BVPI3 – Overall Satisfaction with Authority (%)					
	2003-04			2006-07		
	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied
Very well informed	89	8	3	89	8	3
Fairly well informed	71	23	6	72	23	5
Not very well informed	38	41	21	44	40	16
Not informed at all	23	37	40	23	36	41

Table 19: Levels of overall satisfaction (BVPI3) by opportunities for participation and influencing local decision making 2006-07

19a	<i>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the opportunities for participation in local decision making provided by your council?</i>	% Satisfied with council overall (BVPI3)
	Very satisfied	88
	Fairly satisfied	79
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	50
	Fairly dissatisfied	36
	Very dissatisfied	21
19b	<i>Do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area?</i>	% Satisfied with council overall (BVPI3)
	Definitely agree	71
	Tend to agree	74
	Tend to disagree	51
	Definitely disagree	28
19c	<i>Generally speaking, would you like to be more involved in the decision your council makes that affect your local area?</i>	% Satisfied with council overall (BVPI3)
	Yes	49
	No	63
	Depends on the issue	54

Annex B

Technical Note

Authorities are required to carry out the Best Value User Satisfaction surveys to a standardised methodology. The methodological guidance specifies a postal research mode, a random or stratified random sample using the Small Users Postal Address File (PAF) as the sampling frame, and the requirements for questionnaire wording and maximising response rates. Each authority conducts a local survey and submits full data to the Audit Commission. Local surveys are audited by the Audit Commission, and for 2006-07 all single tier and county councils' General Surveys have been judged to be methodologically robust.

All data is weighted by age and gender by 2006 mid-year estimates and ethnicity by the 2001 census. An additional 'household size' weight is applied to account for the use of the PAF as the sampling frame. Data is weighted centrally by a contractor on behalf of the Audit Commission and the Department.

Following the 2003-04 topline report, the results presented in this report are weighted by age, gender and ethnicity to ensure that the achieved sample is representative of the target population. The data presented in this report is not weighted by household size, as the 2000-01 round allowed for different sampling frames to be used and so it is not possible to apply this weight across all three rounds of the survey.

Similarly, results presented here are an aggregate mean of the scores for the authorities reporting that indicator. This means that each authority is equally represented in the topline scores and the population size of each authority is not taken into account when calculating these scores.

Each authority is required to achieve a sample size of 1,100 resulting in a maximum confidence interval of +/-3% at the 95% confidence level. The sample sizes in these aggregate scores are therefore very large (with a total of over 500,000 responses in each year). This gives extremely high statistical power in determining change between years, even within subgroups, meaning that most of the changes over time will be statistically significant⁹.

Further analytical work is being conducted by the Department to understand the underlying factors that are responsible for the trends shown in this report.

BVPI user satisfaction results for single and upper tier authorities were published on the Audit Commission website on the 15th February 2007¹⁰. Data for all authorities will be made available on the same page. Data will also be made available on the BVPI website (www.bvpi.gov.uk) in due course. Please note that authority level scores are weighted by age, gender, ethnicity and household size and aggregate results may therefore differ slightly from the time-series results presented in this report, which do not apply the household size weight.

⁹ Testing for significance has not been applied on an authority type or regional level.

¹⁰ <http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/performance/dataprovision.asp>