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1 Introduction

1.1 Background and objectives

This residents’ survey follows on from a similar survey undertaken in 2014/15, which provides a benchmark against which the 2016/17 results will be judged. The survey was designed to assess residents’ perceptions of their local area, Council services, community safety, the local economy and health and well-being issues. The findings of this survey will be used to further develop Council services in the future.

Oxford City Council is responsible for a wide range of services in Oxford, including planning, housing, Council Tax collection, housing benefits, business rates, environmental health, licensing, refuse and recycling collection, leisure services and parks, tourism, and cemeteries. However, other public services are the responsibility of Oxfordshire County Council – schools, safeguarding children, social care for the elderly, the fire service, roads, libraries and the museums service, trading standards, land use, transport planning and waste management.

The Residents’ Survey focuses mostly on issues relating to Oxford City Council, although it also includes questions relating to services provided or supported by Oxfordshire County Council (e.g. libraries, museums and the local transport network). We know from our work with other two-tier local authorities that residents rarely make the distinction between the two service providers and it is important in any such resident survey to address issues which have greatest impact (of which the road network is one such issue).

Results have been analysed at a local area level. The local areas in Oxford City Council are defined as below:

- North
- Central South & West
- North East
- East
- Cowley
- South East.

1.2 The approach

The research took place through a postal survey of residents across the local authority area. Ipsos MORI drew a random sample of 4,000 addresses from the Royal Mail postcode address file (PAF).

An 8-page questionnaire and covering letter were sent out to each address in the sample on 4th November 2016. Subsequently, a reminder mailing was sent out to households who had not responded to the initial mailout. Fieldwork closed on the 6 January 2017.

There were 997 valid responses from the original sample of 4,000 addresses, which enables us to undertake robust analysis at sub-group level. This is a response rate of 24.9% which compares with 24.7% in 2014/15.
Data were weighted back to the known population profile of the area to counteract non-response bias. Data are weighted by age within gender bands, and ethnicity. The weighting profile was based on a combination of 2011 Census information and the latest available mid-year estimates. Further information on the sampling approach can be found in the technical report.

1.3 Benchmarking

This report summarises the key findings of the research, however a full set of data tables are held by the Council under separate cover. In order to provide context to the results, data from Welwyn Hatfield and Stratford-on-Avon residents’ surveys have been included. This data has been extracted from the Local Government Association’s LG Inform benchmarking website.1

Welwyn Hatfield was chosen because it is considered to be statistically similar to Oxford under the CIPFA ‘Nearest Neighbours’ model and on consultation with the Council, Stratford-on-Avon is considered to be similar in terms of geography, population size and demographics.

1.4 Statistical reliability and margins of error

The respondents to the questionnaire are only samples of the total “population”, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been surveyed. But we can predict the variation between the sample results and the “true” values from knowing the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that a particular answer is given.

It is important to note that margins of error relate only to samples that have been selected using strict random probability sampling methods. However, in practice it is reasonable to assume that these calculations provide a good indication of the confidence intervals relating to this survey and the sampling approach used.

Unless otherwise stated, all comparisons made in the report commentary between Oxford City Council’s data and the previous year, benchmark local authorities, or between sub-groups in Oxford, are based on statistically significant differences. Please see the technical report for more details.

Data points which appear as asterisks denote a figure of less than 0.5% but greater than zero.

1.5 Acknowledgements

Ipsos MORI would like to thank Hamera Plume at Oxford City Council for her assistance throughout this project. We would also like to thank the 997 residents who took the time to participate in the survey.

1.6 Publication of the data

As Oxford City Council has engaged Ipsos MORI to undertake an objective programme of research, it is important to protect both organisations’ interests by ensuring that the findings are accurately reflected in any press release or publication of the findings.

---

1 LG Inform benchmarking [http://lginform.local.gov.uk/](http://lginform.local.gov.uk/)
As part of our standard terms and conditions, the publication of the findings of this report is therefore subject to the advance approval of Ipsos MORI. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy or misrepresentation.
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2 Summary of key findings

2.1 Key performance indicators

Overall, 84% of residents are satisfied with their local area as a place to live, compared to 8% who are dissatisfied. These results are broadly in line with those seen in the 2014/15 survey, when 81% were satisfied.

However, this year we have seen a decline in residents’ overall satisfaction with Oxford City Council, falling from 71% in 2014/15 to 65% this year. The proportion of residents who are dissatisfied with the Council has also risen over the year, from 12% to 16%. This fall in satisfaction is most prominent in Cowley and South East, and these local areas may be driving the fall in overall satisfaction.

Through our key driver analysis, we have identified that the key driver of satisfaction with the Council is the belief that the Council provides value for money. This year we have seen levels of disagreement with regards to the Council providing value for money increasing, from 17% to 21%, at a time when Oxford residents have seen their Council Tax increase by 4%\(^2\). This increase in disagreement is seen across all local areas.

2.2 Economic optimism

Residents’ overall economic optimism of Oxford is positive, with a higher proportion of residents feeling that the economy is thriving or on the way up (46%), compared to feeling that the economy is not doing well or struggling (26%). Economic optimism is also linked with positivity towards the Council. Those who are positive about the state of the economy in Oxford are significantly more likely to be satisfied with the Council and to feel that the Council provides value for money.

Despite this overall optimism, residents’ perceptions of their own personal financial circumstances are less positive; the proportion who feel that their personal finances will improve over the next 12 months has fallen from 19% in 2014/15 to 15% this year. Likewise, the proportion of residents’ who feel that their personal financial circumstances will get worse has risen from 19% to 23% this year.

Respondents were asked how both the current economic climate, and their current housing costs, may affect their personal finances. At an overall level, the impact appears to be on non-essential aspects of living. In both cases, the biggest impact was felt to be on the inability to buy a home or move house, followed by not being able to afford to go on holiday. However, residents in the South East are more likely to feel the current economic climate and cost of housing is affecting their ability to pay for fundamentals, such as paying fuel and energy bills and affording to buy food.

---

\(^2\) [https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/council-spending](https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/council-spending)
2.3 Affordability of housing

The affordability of housing is a key issue in Oxford, and has been identified by residents as the most important factor in making somewhere a good place to live. However, it has also been identified by residents as the issue in most need of improvement in Oxford, a sentiment that has strengthened over the year – from 48% in 2014/15 to 54% this year. Those in the East are particularly more likely to feel that affordable housing needs improving (69% vs. 54%).

2.4 Street cleanliness and upkeep

Clean streets and park areas are important issues across the city for residents and are particularly important amongst older residents. Satisfaction with the cleanliness of both residential streets and the city centre has fallen since 2014/15, particularly for those in the East and North of the city. Rubbish or litter lying around, dog fouling and pavement staining or dropped chewing gum are all within the top five issues that residents feel are a problem in their local area. We also see that the percentage of respondents who feel that fly tipping is a problem has increased from 2014/15.

2.5 Health

Residents’ self-assessed health has fallen since 2014/15 with significantly less respondents assessing their health as good or very good (73% vs. 77% in 2014/15). This fall is particularly pertinent amongst young people aged between 18-34. The data and other responses do not provide any further insight into why young people’s health has reduced in particular.

2.6 South East

Those living in the South East are significantly more negative across the board. Residents are less satisfied with their local area and in comparison to the Council overall, residents in the South East feel that there are more issues in need of improvement. There is a particular focus on crime as an issue in need of improvement and residents identify more anti-social behavioural issues as a big problem in the local area.

Echoing these sentiments residents in the South East are also significantly less likely to feel safe after dark in their local area, and are less likely to feel that there is social cohesion in the area. We also see that those in the South East are significantly more negative about their personal financial circumstances. Negativity around these areas may be impacting residents’ opinion of the Council, as those in the South East are significantly less satisfied with the way that Oxford City Council runs things.

---

3 Living in Oxford

This section of the report examines overall attitudes towards the local area and residents’ priorities for their area.

Summary

- Most residents are satisfied with their local area (84%) in line with the results of 2014/15 (81%). Levels of satisfaction are higher in Oxford than in Welwyn Hatfield where 72% of residents are satisfied, but lower than Stratford-upon-Avon (89%).
- Overall satisfaction with the Council is a key driver for satisfaction with the local area. Demographically, those aged 65+ are more positive about their local area, whilst those aged 55–64 and social tenants are significantly less satisfied.
- Levels of satisfaction are generally consistent across the city, with the exception of the South East who are significantly less likely to be satisfied at 74%.
- Affordable decent housing, the level of crime and clean streets are seen as the most important aspects in making somewhere a good place to live.
- Affordable decent housing is also seen as the aspect most in need of improvement, (selected by 54% of residents), a significant increase from 2014/15 where 46% felt this was an area in need of improvement. Other issues that residents feel need improving are traffic congestion (50%), and road and pavement repairs (49%).
- Those in the South East are more likely than average to identify a number of issues as needing improvement, including levels of crime and activities for teenagers.
- Satisfaction regarding street cleanliness has fallen since 2014/15. Two in three (65%) are satisfied with the way the Council keeps residential streets clear of litter (compared to 71% in 2014/15), whilst a similar proportion (66%) are satisfied with the way the Council keeps the city centre clear of litter (compared to 72% in 2014/15).

3.1 General satisfaction with the area

In total, 84% of respondents are satisfied with their local area as a place to live compared to 8% who are dissatisfied. These results are in line with those in 2014/15 when 81% were satisfied.

Looking at the benchmarking data available, Oxford City Council compares significantly better than Welwyn Hatfield where 72% of residents were satisfied with their local area, albeit significantly lower than Stratford-upon-Avon (89%)

Satisfaction with the local area is significantly lower among residents living in the South East of the city (74% satisfied).
Figure 3.1: Satisfaction with the local area

A common finding of residents’ surveys is that generally satisfaction with the local area is closely linked to perceptions of the Council. The vast majority of people who are satisfied with the Council are satisfied with the local area (94% vs. 55% of those who are not satisfied with the Council). A similar relationship appears across a number of measures of the Council’s performance, such as value for money, how well informed people feel about the Council, or how satisfied respondents are about the Council dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime. This is a common theme across many attributes in the survey.

Attitudes also vary by people’s economic outlook on the state of the local economy. Nine in ten (89%) of those who think the local economy is improving are satisfied with their local area compared with three-quarters (75%) who believe it is getting worse.

There are some differences in opinion dependent upon the type of person who responds. For example, residents aged 55 – 64 years are significantly less likely to state that they are satisfied with their local area (74% vs. 84% overall) as are social tenants (73% vs. 84% overall). Conversely, older residents aged 65+ years are significantly more positive (86% are satisfied with their local area) as are private tenants (92% vs. 84% overall).
3.2 Key drivers of satisfaction

The local area satisfaction question was subjected to regression analysis, also known as key drivers’ analysis, to establish which elements have the most influence on the way residents answered this key satisfaction question.

It is important to note that with these models we are only able to ‘predict’ a small percentage of residents’ behaviour because of the nature of the outcomes we are looking to predict. As the following figure demonstrates, through the regression analysis we have been able to predict 34% of the change and variation in people’s levels of satisfaction with the local area. The regression analysis arrived at this figure by establishing how often the variables included in the analysis correctly predicted the degree of variation.

There are a range of different factors driving satisfaction with the local area upwards as well as downwards. Out of the 34% that we can predict, residents’ satisfaction with the Council is the most dominant factor – i.e. the thing most likely to influence perceptions within the model. To a lesser extent anti-social behaviour issues play a key part with feeling safe being a key driver. Other key drivers include agreement that the Council provides value for money, feelings of community cohesion and satisfaction with local tips/ household waste recycling centres. These key drivers remain fairly consistent with those of 2014/15.

### Key Driver: Satisfaction with the local area

**Positive drivers**
- Satisfied with the way Oxford City Council runs things: 22%
- Feel safe in your local area during the day: 7%
- Anti-social behaviours got better over last 12 months - Speeding vehicles or motorbikes / dangerous driving: 7%
- Agree that your local area is a place where people from different ethnic, and national backgrounds get on well together: 6%
- Satisfied with community recycling facilities: 6%
- No problem with vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to vehicles: 6%
- No problem with rubbish or litter lying around: 5%
- Satisfied with museums: 5%
- No problem with people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation: 5%
- The state of the economy in Oxford in thriving/on the way up: 5%
- No problem with groups hanging around the streets: 4%

**Negative drivers**
- Antisocial behaviours got worse over last 12 months - Fly-posting: -4%
- Antisocial behaviours got worse over last 12 months - People using or dealing drugs: -5%
- Dissatisfied with recycling and refuse collection: -5%
- Problem with scam/nuisance selling on doorstops: -9%

**34% of the variance explained by the model**

Source: Ipsos MORI

**Figure 3.2: Key Driver Analysis: Satisfaction with local area**
3.3 Which issues are most important?

Residents were given a list of factors which make somewhere a good place to live and asked which they consider to be most important. The most mentions relate to:

- Affordable decent housing (48%);
- The level of crime (47%); and
- Clean streets and park areas (39%).

Least important are:

- Facilities for older people (11%);
- Facilities for young children (14%); and
- Community activities and events (14%).

Respondents were shown the same list and asked to consider which services they felt were most in need of improvement. The following bar chart contrasts the percentage of Oxford respondents who say a particular factor is important, against the percentage who say it needs improving.

3.4 Issues in need of improvement

Figure 3.3: Important vs improvement

Base: All valid responses (any number selected) Q8 (981); Q9 (933) : Source: Ipsos MORI
Fieldwork dates: 4 November 2016 to 6 January 2017
It is positive to note that those issues deemed as most important have generally fewer respondents stating that they need improved, however, this is not the case for affordable housing (54% believe that this needs improving vs. 48% important) and the proportion who state that this issue needs improving has increased significantly since 2014/15 (46%).

Other infrastructure issues including traffic congestion (50% needs improving vs. 23% important) and road and pavement repairs (49% needs improving vs. 21% important), although it should be noted that the proportion who state that traffic congestion is an issue has decreased significantly from 62%.

Finally, it is wage levels and the cost of living which are another priority as 37% of residents believe this is in need of improvement.

The following quadrant analysis helps illustrate local priorities more clearly. Issues closest to the top right hand corner of the figure are priority areas to address because they are identified as both ‘most important’ and ‘in need of improvement’ by sizeable proportions of residents. It can be seen that affordable decent housing is the biggest priority for local residents of Oxford.

Residents’ priorities – important vs. improvement

Figure 3.4: Residents’ priorities: importance vs. improvement

Issues nearer to the bottom left hand corner are both less important to the quality of the local area (relative to other things) and less in need of improvement. For Oxford, numerous issues (including job prospects, community cohesion, and facilities for teenagers or young children) can be found in this part of the figure.
Although the main priorities identified above are consistently seen as important across the borough, we also note that some issues are more important for residents living in particular areas as illustrated below. It is worth noting that compared to Oxford residents overall, those from the South East are more likely than average to identify a higher number of issues that need improving in their local area.

**Q8. And thinking about this local area, which of the things below, if any, do you think most need improving?**

**North**
- Road and pavement repairs (67% vs. 49% overall)

**North East**
- The level of traffic congestion (60% vs. 50% overall)
- Shopping facilities (19% vs. 13%)

**South East**
- The level of crime (29% vs. 20% overall)
- Activities for teenagers (28% vs. 18%)
- Facilities for young children (25% vs. 13%)
- Community activities and events (18% vs. 11%)
- Access to nature (10% vs. 5%)

**Central South & West**
- No significant differences

**East**
- Affordable decent housing (69% vs 54% overall)
- Wages levels/cost of living (53% vs. 37%)

**Cowley**
- Sport and leisure facilities (27% vs. 15% overall)

Base: All valid responses (933) : Fieldwork dates: 4 November 2016 to 6 January 2017

Source: Ipsos MORI

**Figure 3.5: Issues which are significantly more likely to need improving compared to Oxford overall**
3.5 Satisfaction with the cleanliness of the area

Residents were asked how satisfied, or dissatisfied, they were with the cleanliness of the residential streets, city centre and formal parks respectively.

Around two-thirds of residents are satisfied with the way the Council keeps the residential streets (65%) and the city centre (66%) clear of litter which is a significant decrease when compared to the results from 2014/15 (71% and 72% respectively). A further seven in ten (71%) state that they are satisfied with the cleanliness of the formal parks, which is in line with the previous wave (74%).

Figure 3.6: Cleanliness of the area

There are some inconsistencies in perceptions by local area, with residents in the East of the city being more likely than others to be dissatisfied with the cleanliness of the residential streets (40% vs. 23% overall) and those in the North of the city being more critical of the appearance of the city centre (25% vs. 16% overall).

Conversely, residents who reside in the North East of the city are significantly more satisfied with the upkeep of the parks than others (81% vs. 71% overall).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above) : Fieldwork dates: 4 November 2016 to 6 January 2017

Source: Ipsos MORI
Community life
4 Community life

This section examines different aspects of community life in Oxford, such as the extent to which people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together, whether people are seen to treat each other with respect and consideration, and how engaged residents are with their local communities in terms of giving unpaid help or support to groups, clubs or organisations on a regular basis.

Summary

- Seven in ten (71%) agree that their local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together, remaining consistent with 2014/15 (72%). Those in the South East of the city are significantly less likely to feel this way (56%).
- Demographically, those aged 65+ are less likely to feel that there is community cohesion in their local area (65%) in comparison to those aged 18-34 (76%).
- Just over a quarter (27%) give unpaid help to groups, clubs or organisations at least once a month, in line with the findings of 2014/15 (30%) and the national average of 27%.
- Those in the North of Oxford are more likely to volunteer once a month as are older residents and owner-occupiers.
- Those in the South East of Oxford are less likely to be positive about, or engaged in, the different aspects of community life covered in this chapter. They are more likely to see problems with a lack of respect and consideration in their local area, less likely to think people from different ethnicities get on well together, and are less likely to give unpaid help or support on a regular basis.

4.1 Community cohesion

Seven in ten Oxford residents (71%) agree that their local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together, a further 8% disagree. These results remain consistent with those in 2014/15.

When looking at these results at a local area level, it can be seen that there is least agreement that there is community cohesion in the South East of the city (56% agree vs. 71% overall). It should be noted that this is the part of the city where significantly more residents are likely to state that there is an issue with the level of crime and there is greater dissatisfaction with the local area generally.
Figure 4.1: Community cohesion

There are some significant differences in perceptions when the data is analysed by key demographic groups. Those aged 65+ years are significantly less likely to believe there is community cohesion in their local area than other groups (65% vs. 76% of those aged 18 – 34 years). Social tenants are also less positive (59%) compared to private tenants (77%) and owner occupiers (72%).

There are no significant differences between white and BME residents.
4.2 Participation in regular volunteering

In order to gauge levels of community involvement and engagement across Oxford, residents were asked how often they have given unpaid help to any groups, clubs or organisations over the last 12 months. In total, 27% volunteer at least once a month, which is in line with the findings in 2014/15 (30%), and on a par with the national average (27%).

Almost half (49%) have not given any unpaid help at all over this period (a proportion which was 46% in 2014/15).

**Figure 4.2: Volunteering in the last 12 months**

As was the case in 2014/15, it is residents in the North of Oxford who are more likely to volunteer at least once a month (35%), whereas those in the South East – where there is less community cohesion – are less likely (15% vs. 27% overall).

Older residents and owner occupiers are most likely to state that they volunteer at least once a month. Four in ten (40%) of those aged 65-74 do so with this frequency as do 30% of those who either own their home or do so on a mortgage.

---

4 Community Life Survey, 2015-2016
Feeling safe
This section considers residents’ perceptions of safety, crime and anti-social behaviour issues in Oxford. Also covered are residents’ awareness of Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs), as well as the Police and the Council’s record in dealing with the anti-social behaviour issues that matter.

Summary

- The vast majority of Oxford residents feel safe during the day both in their local area (93%) and in the city centre (91%), with figures remaining on a par with 2014/15. Residents feel less safe at night, with two in three (66%) feeling safe in their local area at night. The percentage of residents who feel safe in the city centre after dark has risen since 2014/15, from 56% to 62%.
- It is positive to see that across all anti-social behaviour issues mentioned in the survey, the majority of residents feel that the issue is not a problem in their local area.
- As we saw last year, the two biggest anti-social behaviour problems are car-related – speeding vehicles, motorbikes and dangerous driving (41%), and cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (38%). Other common problems relate to the appearance of the local area – rubbish or litter lying around (30%), and dog fouling (28%). Compared to 2014/15, more residents feel that fly tipping is a problem in their area, rising from 14% to 21% this year.
- The least problematic anti-social behaviour issues include abandoned or burned out vehicles (4%), conflicts or disputes between neighbours (6%), and people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (7%).
- Residents of areas to the south of the city centre (South East, East and Cowley) are more likely to see a range of anti-social behaviour issues as a big problem in their local area.
- The anti-social behaviour issues considered to have shown highest net increase in the last twelve months are noisy neighbours or loud parties (+5 ppts) and abandoned or burned out vehicles (+5 ppts).
- The issues with the lowest net increase scores are cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (-18 ppts) and speeding vehicles, motorbikes and dangerous driving (-12 ppts).
- 14% think there is a big problem with alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in Oxford city centre during the day consistent with 2014/15 levels. After dark, whilst 46% feel there is a problem, it is positive to see there has been a fall since 2014/15 where over half (52%) felt this way.
- The proportion who think alcohol-related anti-social behaviour has increased during the day has increased since last year, from 6% to 11%. At night, 18% think it has increased, in line with 2014/15 figures.
- Awareness of local Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs) has fallen this year from 14% to 10%.
- Under half of residents (46%) believe the City Council and the Police are dealing effectively with anti-social behaviour and crime.
5.1 Community safety

To gain further insight into residents’ views of their local area, survey respondents were asked whether they feel safe in their local area and the city centre, both during the day and at night.

During the day, the vast majority of residents feel safe, both in their local area (93%) and the city centre (91%). Of the minority who feel unsafe during the day there are no key common characteristics that tie this group together.

As expected, people feel less safe after dark. Although the proportion of residents stating that they feel safe in their local area after dark has remained consistent with 2014/15 results (66% vs. 69% previously). It should be noted that the proportion who feel unsafe has increased significantly from 15% to 19% in 2016/17. There is also a stark difference in perceptions dependent on where you live within the city. Residents in Cowley and the South East are significantly more likely to state that they feel unsafe after dark in their local area compared to residents elsewhere in the city (36% and 30% respectively vs. 19% overall).

The story, however, is more positive when residents consider safety in the city centre. Here the proportion of residents who state that they feel safe has improved significantly (from 56% to 62%) and the proportion who feel unsafe has decreased significantly (from 19% to 14% in 2016/17).

---

**Figure 5.1: Feeling safe in your local area/the city centre**
Certain groups of people are more likely to report feeling unsafe either in their local area or the city centre, including:

- Women;
- Social tenants;
- Those with a disability or health problem; and
- Those who disagree that the Police / the Council are dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime.

### 5.2 Dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour

Respondents were asked for their general views about whether the Police and Oxford City Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their local area.

In total, 46% of residents believe the City Council and the Police are being effective in this regard, a further 16% disagree. In the previous survey of 2014/15 residents were asked to consider the role of the City Council and the Police separately. Last year over half of residents (54%) agreed that the police were dealing with anti-social behaviour and a third (35%) agreed that the Council is dealing with anti-social and crime issues. Whilst these results are not directly comparable to this year’s results, they provide interesting context.

At a local area level, it can be seen that residents in the North East are significantly less likely to state that they disagree that the Police and the City Council are being effective in dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime (11% vs. 17% overall).

**Figure 5.2: Perceived record of the Police and Oxford City Council on anti-social behaviour**

![Chart showing perceived record of the Police and Oxford City Council on anti-social behaviour]
Home owners and white residents are both less likely than the average to agree that the Police and the City Council are dealing with the crime and anti-social behaviour issues that matter (40% and 44% respectively vs. 46% overall).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, those who feel unsafe after dark in their local area (26%) or within the city centre (27%) are also less likely to agree that anti-social behaviour and crime is being tackled.

Residents were asked about a broad range of different types of anti-social behaviour, and whether these are considered to be a problem in their local area. The findings have been split out over two charts with those perceived to be the biggest problems shown in the figure below.

It is positive to see that for all of the problems listed below the overall majority of residents feel that the issue is not a problem in their area.

As was the case in 2014/15, the two biggest anti-social behaviour problems in Oxford are car-related – speeding vehicles/motorbikes and dangerous driving (41%), and cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (38%). Other common problems relate more to the appearance of the area, such as rubbish or litter lying around (30%), dog fouling (28%) or pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (22%).

There has been very little movement in residents’ perceptions compared to 2014/15, although fly tipping is considered to be more of a problem – 21% compared to 14% in 2014/15.

**Figure 5.3: Most problematic anti-social behaviour issues**

In terms of age differences, those aged 65+ are more likely than average to think there is a big problem with pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (28% vs. 22% overall). Those aged 35-64 are more likely than average to think there is a big problem with vandalism and damage to property (15% vs. 13% overall).
Social renters are more likely than average to think that anti-social behaviour issues are a big problem in their area. They are more likely to think that there is a big problem with rubbish or litter lying around (43% vs. 30%), pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (32% vs. 22%), people using or dealing drugs (35% vs. 22%), fly tipping (31% vs. 21%), people being drunk or rowdy in public places (30% vs. 18%), and groups hanging around the streets (28% vs. 17%). Owner occupiers are more likely to feel that there is an issue with speeding vehicles or motorbikes/dangerous driving (44% vs. 41%).

White respondents are more likely to think there is a big problem with cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (40% vs. 25% of BME respondents).

Those who are disabled are more likely to feel that there is a big problem with pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (35% vs. 22% overall), fly tipping (30% vs. 21% overall), people being drunk or rowdy in public places (26% vs. 18% overall), or groups hanging around the streets (25% vs. 17% overall).

Women are also more likely to feel that there is a big problem of groups hanging around the streets (22% vs. 12% men).

From the list of 18 types of anti-social behaviour provided to respondents, the issues rated least problematic are detailed in the chart below, including abandoned or burned out vehicles (4%), conflicts or disputes between neighbours (6%) and people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (7%).

**Figure 5.4: Least problematic anti-social behaviour issues**

Again there are some significant sub-group differences in perception. For example, those aged 65+ are more likely to think there is a big problem with fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (16% vs. 13% overall). Those aged between 35-64 are more likely to feel that there is a problem with conflicts or disputes between neighbours...
(7% vs. 6%). This year, we asked residents whether they felt there was a problem with scam/nuisance selling on doorsteps. Both those aged between 35-64 (16%) and those 65+ (18%) are more likely to feel like this is a big problem, compared to 13% overall.

Again, social tenants are more likely to feel that more of the anti-social issues listed above are a big problem. They are more likely to feel that there is a big problem with noisy neighbours or loud parties (29% vs. 15%), fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (23% vs. 13% overall), vandalism, graffiti and deliberate damage to vehicles (18% vs. 11%), people being attacked or harassed because of ethnicity, religion or sexual orientation (16% vs. 7% overall), or conflicts or disputes between neighbours (13% vs. 6%). Owner occupiers are more likely to feel that there is a big problem with scam/nuisance selling on doorsteps (16% vs. 13%).

Those who are disabled are more likely to feel that there is a big problem with fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (21% vs. 13% overall) and scam/nuisance selling on doorsteps (21% vs. 13%).

The chart below shows any anti-social behaviour issues significantly more likely to be perceived as a problem in each local area of Oxford.

Q18. For each type of antisocial behaviour, please tell us if this is a problem in your area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property (19% vs. 13% overall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Central South & West | Rubbish (46% vs. 30% overall)  
                      | People being drunk or rowdy in public places (44% vs. 18%)                                           |
| South East    | Dog fouling (40% vs. 28% overall)                                                                     |
|               | Fly tipping (33% vs. 21%)                                                                            |
|               | People using or dealing drugs (31% vs. 22%)                                                          |
|               | Groups hanging around the streets (28% vs. 17%)                                                       |
|               | Fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (20% vs. 13%)                       |
|               | Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to vehicles (18% vs. 11%)                            |
|               | People being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (15% vs. 7%) |
| Cowley        | Cars parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (56% vs. 38% overall)                           |
|               | Speeding vehicles or motorbikes/dangerous driving (53% vs. 41%)                                      |
|               | Fly tipping (33% vs. 21%)                                                                            |
| East          | Rubbish (46% vs. 30% overall)                                                                          |
|               | People being drunk or rowdy in public places (44% vs. 18%)                                           |
|               | People using or dealing drugs (35% vs. 22%)                                                          |
|               | Noisy neighbours or loud parties (30% vs. 15%)                                                       |

Figure 5.5: Anti-social behaviour by local area

Residents living in the areas to the south of the city centre (South East, East and Cowley) consider more anti-social behaviour issues as a big problem compared to residents living in the areas north of the city (North, North East, Central South & West).

Overall, seven of the eighteen anti-social behaviour issues are considered to be more of a problem by those in the South East compared with the overall average, in particular dog fouling (40% vs. 28% overall), fly tipping (33% vs. 21%) and people using or dealing drugs (31% vs. 22%). Residents in the South East are significantly more likely to be social tenants.
(26% vs. 15% overall). We saw before that social renters are more likely to feel that anti-social behaviour issues are a big problem and this may be as consequence of the area they reside in rather than their tenure.

Those in Cowley are particularly more likely to feel that car-related issues are a problem, including cars parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally as a problem (56% vs. 38% overall), and speeding or dangerous driving (53% vs. 41% overall).

Those in the East are significantly more likely to feel that there is a big problem with rubbish and litter lying around (46% vs. 30% overall), people being drunk and rowdy in public places (44% vs. 18%), people using or dealing drugs (35% vs. 22%) and noisy neighbours and loud parties (30% vs. 15% overall).

Residents of the North perceive vandalism, graffiti and deliberate damage to property as a big problem (19% vs. 13% overall), whilst those in the Central South & West areas are more likely to feel that there is a problem with noisy neighbours and loud parties (25% vs. 15% overall). There are no anti-social behaviour issues considered to be more of a problem in the North East.

To gauge the direction of travel over the last twelve months, respondents were also asked whether the different anti-social behaviour issues had got better, worse or stayed the same over this time period. These findings have been split out, with those in the table below showing the types of anti-social behaviour that are perceived to have shown highest net improvement in the last year – that is, the proportion saying ‘better’ minus the proportion saying ‘worse’.

The anti-social behaviour issues showing greatest improvement in the last twelve months are noisy neighbours and loud parties (+4 ppts) and abandoned or burned out vehicles (+5 ppts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Better (%)</th>
<th>Worse (%)</th>
<th>Net improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burned out vehicles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scam/nuisance selling on doorsteps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts or disputes between neighbours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti &amp; other deliberate damage to vehicles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti &amp; other deliberate damage to property</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly posting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that where the net improvement score appears to not be equal to the better score minus score this is as a result of rounding

**Table 5.1: Anti-social behaviour issues with highest net improvement scores**
The table below shows the types of anti-social behaviour that received negative net improvement scores – that is, the proportion saying that an issue has got worse over the last year outweighs the proportion saying it has got better.

Overall, the issues with the lowest net improvement scores are cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (-18 ppts) and speeding vehicles, motorbikes and dangerous driving (-12 ppts). These issues had the lowest net improvement scores in 2014/15 indicating a continued downward trend in these issues.

When comparing net improvement scores with those of 2014/15 we can see that last year residents felt that the problem of groups hanging around the streets had improved over the last 12 months (+2), however this year residents feel like this issue has got worse (-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Better (%)</th>
<th>Worse (%)</th>
<th>Net improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People being attacked or harassed (skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement staining or dropped chewing gum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy in public places</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog fouling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding vehicles/motorbikes/dangerous driving</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars parked inconveniently dangerously or illegally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that where the net improvement score appears to not be equal to the better score minus score this is as a result of rounding.

**Table 5.2: Anti-social behaviour issues that are getting worse**

Residents who are aged 65+ are more likely to feel that the problems of speeding vehicles/motorbikes/dangerous driving, cars parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (22% vs. 19% overall) and scam/nuisance selling on doorsteps (8% vs. 5% overall) has got worse over the last 12 months. Residents aged between 35-64 are more likely to feel that the problems of rubbish or litter lying around (17% vs. 15% overall), people using or dealing drugs (12% vs. 10%) and fly tipping (10% vs. 8% overall) are getting worse.

Those residents who are owner occupiers are more likely than average to perceive the problem of speeding vehicles/motorbikes/dangerous driving as an issue that is getting worse (24% vs. 19% overall) as with the problem of scam/nuisance selling on doorsteps (9% vs. 5% overall).

The chart below shows any types of anti-social behaviour that are significantly more likely to have been perceived to improve or get worse over the last twelve months across the local areas of Oxford.
### Areas where antisocial behaviour has got worse over the last 12 months

Q19. In your opinion have the following types of antisocial behaviour got better, worse or stayed the same over the last 12 months?

Figure 5.6: Anti-social behaviour issues that are getting worse by area

Residents living in the **South East** are more likely to perceive the problems of dog fouling (23% vs. 14% overall) and fly posting (11% vs. 5% overall) as issues that have got worse over the last 12 months. Residents in the **East** are more likely to feel that the problem of people using or dealing drugs has got worse (20% vs. 10% overall), whilst those living in **Cowley** believe that the problem of cars parking inconveniently, dangerously or illegally has got worse (37% vs. 22% overall). There are no significant differences in the North, North East, or **Central South & West** areas of the city.

### 5.3 Alcohol-related anti-social behaviour

It can be seen in an earlier question that one in five (18%) residents considered people being drunk or rowdy in public to be a big problem, particularly those living in the **East** (44%). However, respondents were asked more specifically about the prevalence of alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in Oxford city centre. A small minority (14%) think this is a big problem during the day, remaining in line with the 2014/15 figure; 46% think this is a problem at night – a figure that has fallen since 2014/15 where 52% felt it was a big problem.
Figure 5.7: Alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in Oxford city centre

Again, a number of demographic sub-groups are more likely to consider alcohol-related anti-social behaviour to be a problem in Oxford city centre. As we saw last year, during the day, those aged 35-64 (17% vs. 14% overall), social tenants (23% vs. 14% overall) and those with a disability (23% vs. 14% overall) are all more likely to consider alcohol-related anti-social behaviour to be a big problem in Oxford city centre.

At night, women (50% vs. 46% overall), those aged 35-64 (51% vs. 46% overall) and those who are BME (57% vs. 46% overall) are more likely to think this is a big problem. Perhaps unsurprisingly, another group more likely to think alcohol-related issues are a big problem at night are those saying they feel unsafe in the city centre at this time (74% vs. 46% overall).

As with the previous questions on different types of anti-social behaviour, respondents were then asked whether they think alcohol-related anti-social behaviour has increased, decreased or stayed the same in the last year.

In comparison to 2014/15, significantly more residents feel that that alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in the city centre during the day has increased over the last 12 months (11% this year vs. 6% last year). During the day, 4% feel that the issue has decreased whilst two in five (40%) feel that it has remained the same.

At night, however, while 3% think alcohol-related anti-social behaviour has decreased, 18% think it has increased – a net score of +15 percentage points. These levels remain on a par with those of 2014/15. A third feel it has stayed the same (32%).
Figure 5.8: Alcohol-related anti-social behaviour over the last year

During the day, residents who are social renters (19% vs. 11% overall) are more likely to feel that the problem of alcohol-related anti-social behaviour has increased over the last twelve months, as are those who are disabled (16% vs. 11%) and those that disagree that the police or Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter (23% vs. 11% overall).

At night, females (21%), those aged 35-64 (23%), aged 65+ (23%), social renters (28%) and those with a disability (24%) are all more likely to think the problem has increased (vs. 15% overall). This is also the case for those who feel unsafe in the city centre at this time (43%), as well as those who disagree that the police or the Council are dealing with anti-social behaviour issues and crime (36 vs. 18% overall).

5.4 Neighbourhood Action Groups

In Oxford, there are a number of Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs). Each group covers a part of the city and is made up of police officers, police community support officers (PCSOs), Oxford City Council’s Community Response Team, local councillors and other partner officers. These NAGs tackle the neighbourhoods’ community safety priorities.

Respondents were asked whether they know how to contact their NAG and, if not, whether they think they could find out or not. Overall, 10% say they know how to contact their NAG, which is significantly lower 2014/15 where 14% said they knew how to contact their NAG. Nine in ten (90%) say they don’t know, including half of respondents overall (52%) who think they could find out if they wanted to, three in ten (32%) who don’t know how they would find out, and 6% who say they don’t know and are not interested in NAGs.
Figure 5.9: Contacting your Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG)

There are no significant differences by local area with regard to awareness of NAGs.

Those aged between 35-64 (12% vs. 10% overall), and those aged 65+ (20% vs. 10% overall) are more likely to say they know how to contact their NAG, as are those who own their home outright (15% vs. 10% overall), social renters (18% vs. 10% overall), those who are disabled (16% vs. 10% overall) and those who are retired (21% vs. 10% overall). Furthermore, those who feel informed about the Council are more likely to know how to contact their NAG (15% vs. 5% who do not feel informed).
Health and well-being
6 Health and well-being

This section explores the physical health and well-being of residents.

Summary

- Residents’ self-assessed health has fallen since 2014/15, with significantly less respondents assessing their health as good or very good (73% vs. 77% in 2014/15). This fall may be driven by those aged between 18-34 where the percentage of those assessing their health as good or very good has fallen to 81% from 90% since 2014/15.
- Older respondents, social renters, and those with a disability are less likely to be in good health.
- One in five respondents (18%) report a long-term health condition or disability that limits their day-to-day activities, in line with 2014/15 results (19%). Residents in the North East are more likely to report a long-term health condition or disability whilst those in the North are less likely to.
- Just under one in five residents (17%) provide unpaid help or care to someone else with residents in the Central South & West area least likely to do so (9%). Those who are 35-64 (22% vs. 17% overall), owner occupiers (20%), retired (21%) or have disability of their own (24%) are all more likely to care for others.

6.1 Perceived health

Three-quarters (73%) of respondents rate their health as either very good or good. This has fallen from 2014/15 where 77% rated their health as either very good or good. One in five (21%) rate their health as fair, an increase from 2014/15 where 17% felt this way. The percentage of people who feel that their health is bad or very bad remains low at 7% (compared to 6% last year).

Results are consistent across the localities.
Q24. How is your health in general? Would you say it is...?

**Figure 6.1: Overall self-assessed health**

Whilst younger people are more likely to rate their health positively (81% vs. 73% overall), the percentage of those aged between 18-34 who rate their health as good or very good has fallen since 2014/15 (90%). This may be driving the decrease in perceptions of good health at an overall level. Three quarters of those aged 35-64 (73% vs. 90% of 18-34) rate their health as good, which drops to just half (51%) amongst those aged 65+.

Very good or good health is also less common among:

- **Social renters** (48%) compared to **owner-occupiers** (67%) or **private tenants** (85%); and
- Those with a **disability** (18%) compared to those with **no disability** (86%).

Assessments of personal health also vary by other factors or measures of lifestyle. Good or very good health is less widespread among:

- Those with a negative outlook on their personal finances (58% of those who believe their finances will get worse vs. 87% who believe their finances will improve);
- Those who disagree that people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well (59% disagree vs. 76% of those who agree).
6.2 Health problems or disabilities

One in five respondents (18%) report a long-term health condition or disability that limits their day-to-day activities, consistent with the results of the 2014/15 survey (19%). At a locality level, those in the North East are more likely to say that their activities are limited because of their long-term health condition or disability (24% vs. 18% overall), whilst those in the North are less likely to say this (13% vs. 18% overall).

**Figure 6.2: Limited activities**

The incidence of a long-term limiting health problem or a disability is much greater among those aged 65+ (44%) in comparison to younger respondents aged 35-64 (17%) or 18-34 (10%). A long-term limiting health problem or disability is more pronounced among social renters (34%) compared to owner-occupiers (17%) and private tenants (13%).
### 6.3 Care given to others

Just under one in five residents (17%) provide unpaid help or care to someone else. Most of these provide less than 20 hours of care a week (13% of all residents) and only a minority provide more (2% of all residents provide 20-49 hours a week and 2% of all residents provide 50 or more hours a week). At a local area level, residents in Central South & West are significantly less likely to provide unpaid help or care to someone else (9% vs. 17% overall).

**Figure 6.3: Support to family members, friends or neighbours**

Those more likely to care for others include older respondents aged between 35-64 (22% vs. 17% respondents overall), owner occupiers (20% vs. 17% overall), those with a disability of their own (24% vs. 17% overall) and those who are retired (21% vs. 17% overall). Conversely, younger residents aged 18-34 (10% vs. 17% overall) and private renters (10% vs. 17% overall) are less likely to provide care for others.
The economy
7 The economy

This section looks at the perceived economic performance of the local area and respondents’ outlook on their personal finances.

Summary

- It is encouraging to see that respondents in Oxford are more optimistic (46%) than pessimistic (26%) about the economy in Oxford with a ‘net optimism’ score of +20. This is contrary to national sentiment where ‘net optimism’ sits at -21.
- Over half of residents (56%) have been affected in some way by the current economic climate, with the percentage who feel that the economic climate has affected their ability to buy a home or move home increasing from 23% in 2014/15 to 28% this year. On average, those in the South East are more likely to mention a number of ways in which they have been affected by the current economic climate.
- Residents were asked about any financial problems that they feel they might face over the next year after paying for housing costs. Again, the ability to buy or move home is the problem that most residents feel they may encounter over the next year (30%).
- Overall optimism amongst residents with regards to their personal finances has fallen since 2014/15, with only 15% feeling that their personal finances will improve over the next year (compared to 19% 2014/15). Correspondingly, pessimism has increased over the year, with the percentage of residents who feel that their finances will get worse increasing from 19% in 2014/15 to 23% this year.

7.1 The state of the economy in Oxford

This year respondents were asked how they would describe the state of the economy in Oxford. It is positive to see that residents are more likely to feel positive about the economy (46%), rather than negative (26%) – a net positive score of +20. However, optimism is cautious, with only 15% feeling that the local economy is thriving and a third (31%) believing the economy is only on the way up.

Contrary to the economic ‘feel good factor’ in Oxford, economic optimism at a national level is less positive. Ipsos MORI’s own Economic Optimism Index shows that ‘net optimism’ – that is the proportion thinking the national economy will get better, less those thinking it will get worse – stands at -21 in January 2017 in comparison to +21 in March 2015.

At a local area level, those in the Central South & West are more optimistic than average (53% vs. 46% overall).
Q20. In your view which best describes the state of the economy in Oxford?

- Really thriving
- On the way up
- Not doing well
- Really struggling
- Don't know

**Figure 7.1: State of the economy**

Respondents aged 35–64 are significantly less positive about the local economy (28% vs. 46% overall), as are those who are disabled (35% vs. 46% overall).

Economic optimism is greater amongst those who are positive about their local area or the Council:

- Those who are satisfied with their local area (49% believe the economy in Oxford is thriving or on the way up vs. 37% of those who are dissatisfied);

- Those who are satisfied with the Council (50% vs. 35% of those who are dissatisfied);

- Those who agree that the Council provides value for money (57% vs. 37% of those who disagree); and

- Those who feel informed about the Council (54% vs. 36% who do not feel informed).
7.2 Financial security

Over half of residents (56%) believe they have been affected in some way by the current economic situation.

Residents are most likely to feel that the current economic climate has affected their ability to buy or move home (28%), with the number of residents feeling this way increasingly significantly since 2014/15 (23%).

It is positive to see that for some of the issues in the figure below the percentage of residents who feel that they have been affected by the current economic climate has fallen since 2014/15. Whilst almost a quarter (23%) feel that they are unable to afford to go on holiday as a result of the economic climate, the number of residents saying this has fallen since last year (30%). In comparison to 2014/15 fewer residents feel that they have difficulties paying fuel and energy bills as consequence of the economic climate (17% vs. 13% this year), that they may have difficulties affording to buy food (11% vs. 6% this year), or difficulties paying for childcare (8% to 5%).

Figure 7.2: Financial security

The mean number of financial problems that residents report is just under three (2.7) remaining unchanged from 2014/15. As we saw last year, the mean number of mentions increases significantly for the following groups:

- **Females** (2.9 vs. 2.5 for males);
- **Those with a disability** (3.3 vs. 2.5 for those with no disability);
- **Middle aged residents** (3 for those aged 35-64 vs. 1.5 for those aged 65+);
• Those with children in the household (3.3 vs. 2.4 for those living alone);
• Social renters (3.6 vs. 2.2 for owner occupiers);
• BME (3.2 vs. 2.5 for those who are white).

Those in the South East have a higher number of mean mentions than average (3.3 vs. 2.7 overall). Compared to the overall results, those living in the South East are more likely to feel that as consequence of the current economic climate they have been particularly affected by the following:

• Not being able to go on holiday (36% vs. 23% overall);
• Difficulties paying fuel and energy bills (20% vs. 13% overall);
• Difficulties repaying loans (18% vs. 10% overall);
• Difficulties caused by reduced benefit payments (16% vs. 5% overall);
• Difficulties getting access to credit (12% vs. 5% overall);
• Difficulties affording to buy food (11% vs. 6% overall); or
• Loss of job/redundancy (10% vs. 5% overall).

Those in the North are significantly more likely than average to feel that as consequence of the current economic situation they are unable to buy a home or move home (38% vs. 28% overall).

Housing costs in Oxford are generally above the national average. As of November 2016, the average house price in Oxford is £417,605 compared to a national average of £217,928. The average rent for a two-bedroom property in Oxfordshire is £944 a month, compared to a national average of £760 per month.

This year, residents were asked about the problems they may encounter in the next year after paying housing costs. Again we see that not being able to buy a home or move house (30%) and not being able to afford to go on holiday (25%) are the two problems residents feel that they are most likely to encounter after paying housing costs.

5 The UK House Price Index, November 2016
Figure 7.3: Impact on housing costs

The mean number of financial problems that residents report they may encounter after housing costs is around two (2.1). Following the trend of general financial problems as consequence of the economic situation, the mean number of mentions increases significantly for the following groups:

- Those with a disability (2.6 vs. 2 for those with no disability);
- Middle aged residents (2.4 for those aged 35-64 vs. 1.6 for those aged 65+);
- Those with children in the household (2.6 vs. 1.9 for those without children);
- Social renters (2.8 vs. 1.9 for owner occupiers).

Again, for those in the South East the number of mean mentions is higher than average (2.9 vs. 2.1 overall). Those in the South East are also significantly more likely to feel that they may face difficulties paying fuel or energy bills (25% vs. 12% overall), or difficulties affording to buy food (16% vs. 7% overall). Those in Central South & West are more likely than average to believe that they may be unable to buy a home or move home after paying for housing costs (42% vs. 30% overall).
7.3 Residents’ personal finances in the next 12 months

Residents were asked if they thought that their personal finances will get better or worse over the next 12 months. A quarter of residents (23%) feel that their personal finances will get worse over the year, a significant increase in the percentage of residents who felt this way last year (19%). The percentage of residents who feel that their personal finances will get better has fallen from 19% in 2014/15 to 15% this year. This overall trend may be driven by those in the South East who are significantly more likely to believe that their personal financial circumstances will get worse over the next 12 months (31% vs. 23% overall), increasing from 14% in 2014/15.

Q23. Do you think that your personal financial circumstances will improve, stay the same or get worse over the next 12 months?

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to Q23.]

### Local areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Improve</th>
<th>% Get worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North (191)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, South &amp; West (308)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East (286)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (87)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley (127)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East (153)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contextual data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% Improve</th>
<th>% Get worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford CC 2016/17 (952)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford CC 2014/15 (943)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ipsos MORI

**Figure 7.4: Personal finances**

Across other key-groups of residents, those most optimistic about their personal finances are aged 18-34 (24% vs. 15% overall), are private renters (26% vs. 15% overall), or are in good health (18% vs. 15% overall). Conversely, those who are less optimistic are aged 35-64 (11% vs. 15% overall), aged 65+ (3% vs. 15% overall), living alone (5% vs. 15% overall), owner occupiers (12% vs. 15% overall), social renters (6% vs. 15% overall), retired (3% vs. 15% overall), or care for other people (8% vs. 15% overall).
Council performance
8 Council performance

The final section of the report examines residents’ overall perceptions of the Council, as well as their views on the services it provides and the value for money it represents. Also included is whether residents feel they have been treated with respect and consideration by public services, and how informed they feel about both the services and benefits provided by the Council, and what to do in extreme weather conditions such as flooding.

Summary

- Overall satisfaction with the way Oxford City Council runs things has fallen since 2014/15, from 71% to 65% this year. This decline in satisfaction appears to be driven by residents of Cowley and South East, with satisfaction in these local areas both falling significantly since 2014/15.
- Key drivers of satisfaction with the Council include value for money, satisfaction with the local area and satisfaction with a range of environmental services.
- Two in five (40%) agree the Council provides value for money, remaining consistent with figures from 2014/15. However, the percentage who disagree with this statement has increased over the year from 17% to 21%. We also see a decline over the year in the proportion of social renters who feel that the Council provides value for money.
- Feeling informed about the services and benefits provided by the Council is a key driver of overall satisfaction of the Council and perceived value for money.
- The key driver of value for money is overall satisfaction with the way the Council runs things.
- Two thirds (67%) feel that they have been treated with respect and consideration by public services all or most of the time over the last year.
- The majority (56%) feel informed, which is in line with the results of 2014/15, Welwyn Hatfield and Stratford-upon-Avon.
- The number of residents who feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions has fallen since 2014/15 from 41% to 34% this year. Those in Central South & West are significantly more likely than average to feel informed – perhaps due to their proximity to the River Thames.
- As we saw in 2014/15, satisfaction with Council services is highest for parks and open spaces (84%) and recycling and refuse collection (80%). However, satisfaction with parks and open spaces has fallen since 2014/15 (88%). Levels of dissatisfaction are highest for indoor sport and leisure facilities (17%), the local bus service (14%) and libraries (14%).

8.1 General satisfaction with the Council

In order to gain insight into residents’ perceptions of Oxford City Council, respondents were asked for their overall view about the Council’s performance. Overall satisfaction with the Council has declined this year, with 65% stating that they are satisfied compared to 71% in 2014/15. Dissatisfaction has increased from 12% in 2014/15 to 16% this year.

Despite this fall, the proportion feeling satisfied with the Council (65%) remains significantly higher than Welwyn Hatfield (52%), albeit lower than Stratford-upon-Avon (75%).
Figure 8.1: Satisfaction with the Council

At a local area level, those in the North East are significantly more likely to feel satisfied with the way the Council runs things (72% vs. 65% overall). In comparison to last year, satisfaction has fallen significantly amongst residents in Cowley (73% in 2014/15 to 55% in 2016) and South East (74% in 2014/15 to 61% in 2016), which may be driving the decline in overall satisfaction levels.

Those aged 35-64 are significantly more likely to feel dissatisfied with the way Oxford City Council runs things (18% vs. 16% overall), as are residents who own their own homes (18% vs. 16% overall). Levels of dissatisfaction are also higher amongst those who feel that their personal financial circumstances will get worse next year (24% vs. 16% overall) and those who feel that they are in bad health (28% vs. 16% overall). Those aged 65+ are more likely than average to be satisfied with the Council (69% vs. 65% overall), as are those who are private renters (78% vs. 65% overall).

Residents who are satisfied with their local area are also more likely to be satisfied with the way the Council runs things generally (73% vs. 65% overall), as are those who believe the Council provides value for money (91% vs. 65% overall), those who feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides (79% vs. 65% overall), and those who think the Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their local area (79% vs. 65% overall).

Those with a more optimistic view about the state of the economy in Oxford are also more likely than average to rate the Council’s performance positively (73% of those who think it is thriving or on the way up are satisfied with the Council vs. 53% of those who think it is not doing well or really struggling).
8.2 Key drivers of Council satisfaction

To enable us to see what is driving satisfaction with the way the Council runs things, key driver analysis was undertaken to see what elements have the most influence on the way residents answered this question. Once again, it cannot account for all factors which may impact on impressions of the Council, simply those covered in the survey.

Out of the 55% that we can predict, the following figure shows that perceived value for money is the most dominant factor – i.e. the thing most likely to influence perceptions within the model. This is followed by overall satisfaction with the local area as a place to live. These factors remain consistent with those driving satisfaction with the Council in 2014/15.

Views on the Council’s environmental services remain important factors; satisfaction with the Council is tied in with keeping residential streets clear of litter, satisfaction with recycling/refuse collection, and with residents feeling that there is not a problem with dog fouling.

Other factors included in the model are feeling informed about the services and benefits that the Council provides, a sense of being treated with respect and consideration by public services, as well as a belief that issues of anti-social behaviour are diminishing.

Key Driver: Satisfaction with the council

Positive drivers

- Agree Oxford City Council provides value for money
- Satisfied with your local area as a place to live
- Satisfied with keeping residential streets clear of litter
- Satisfied with recycling and refuse collection
- Satisfied with keeping the city centre clear of litter
- Oxford City Council keeps residents informed about the services and benefits it provides
- No problem with dog fouling
- Been treated with respect and consideration by your local public service in the last year
- No problem with fly tipping
- Antisocial behaviours got better over last 12 months - Conflicts or disputes between neighbours
- Antisocial behaviours got better over last 12 months - People being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation

Negative drivers

- Dissatisfied with community recycling facilities
- Antisocial behaviours got worse over last 12 months - Noisy neighbours or loud parties
- Problem with pavement staining or dropped chewing gum

55% of the variance explained by the model

Base: All valid responses (989) : Fieldwork dates: 4 November 2016 to 6 January 2017
Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 8.2: Key drivers of satisfaction with the Council
8.3 Value for money

Value for money has long been known to be linked to satisfaction with local authorities and we already know it is a key driver of satisfaction with Oxford City Council. Since 2010, Oxford City Council has lost 47% of their grant from government with plans for funding to be withdrawn altogether by 2019\(^7\). Reductions in local government funding mean that authorities are having to find new ways to deliver and fund services, and councils will need to work hard to ensure residents still believe they are getting value for money.

Whilst the percentage of residents who agree that Oxford City Council provides value for money has remained consistent with last year at 40% (vs. 43% 2014/15) the percentage of residents who disagree has increased since 2014/15 from 17% to 21%.

The proportion agreeing that the Council provides value for money (40%) is significantly higher in Welwyn Hatfield (35%) and the levels of active disagreement significantly lower (21% vs. 28% Welwyn Hatfield. However, compared to Stratford-upon-Avon results are less positive, with significantly less agreeing that the Council provides value for money (35% vs. 47% Stratford-upon-Avon), and significantly more disagreeing (21% vs. 17% Stratford-upon-Avon).

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree that Oxford City Council provides value for money?

![Value for money survey results diagram]

**Local areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North (201)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, South &amp; West (111)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East (296)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (91)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley (133)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East (155)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contextual data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford CC 2016/17 (987)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford CC 2014/15 (967)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford-upon-Avon 2014 (757)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Hatfield 2014 (2091)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (987); Fieldwork dates: 4 November 2016 to 6 January 2017

**Figure 8.3: Value for money**

At locality level there is no differences between the areas across Oxford, however we do see differences by demographics.

\(^7\) Oxford City Council Corporate Plan, 2016-2020
Those aged between 35-64 are significantly more likely to disagree that the Council provides value for money (24% vs. 21% overall) as are those who own their own homes (24% vs. 21% overall) and those who feel that their personal financial circumstances will get worse over the next year (31% vs. 24% overall). In 2014/15 residents who were social renters were significantly more likely to agree that the Council provides value for money, and whilst agreement amongst this group remains on par with the Council average (40%) it has fallen significantly over the year from 57% in 2014/15 to 44% this year. This reflects the importance of the issue of housing in Oxford.

Those who are more likely to agree that the Council provides value for money include those 65+ (48%, rising to 51% of those aged 75+ vs. 40% overall), those with children (48% vs. 40% overall), and those who are retired (45% vs. 40% overall).

As we saw in 2014/15, those who are satisfied with the Council overall are more likely to think the Council provides value for money (56% vs. 40% overall), as are those who feel informed about the services and benefits it provides (54% vs. 40% overall) and those who think the Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter (58% vs. 40% overall).

Again, those with a more optimistic view of the economy in Oxford are more likely to have more positive perceptions about the value for money offered by the Council (51% of those who think the Oxford’s economy is doing really well or on the way up agree with the statement vs. 30% of those who think it is not doing well or really struggling).

### 8.4 Key drivers of value for money

To enable us to see what affects resident’s perceptions that the Council provides value for money, key driver analysis has also been conducted on results for this question. Once again, it cannot account for all factors which may impact on impressions of the Council, simply those covered in the survey.

Out of the 54% that we can predict, the following figure shows that overall satisfaction with the way the Council runs things is by far the most dominant factor – i.e. the thing most likely to influence perceptions in the model.

Other factors associated with perceived value for money include a sense of being treated with respect and consideration by local public services, feeling informed about the services and benefits the Council provides, and a view that the police and the City Council are dealing effectively with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their area.

We also see that those who are positive about their own personal financial circumstances are more likely to believe that the Council provides value for money.
### Key Driver: Satisfaction with value for money

#### Positive drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the way Oxford City Council runs things</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated with respect and consideration by your local public service in the last year</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that the police and the City Council are dealing effectively with the antisocial behaviour and crime issues that matter in your area</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City Council keeps residents informed about the services and benefits it provides</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial circumstances will improve over the next 12 months</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with recycling and refuse collection</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problem with rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with local bus services</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with parks</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviours got better over last 12 months - Noisy neighbours or loud parties</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problem with vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to vehicles</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions, such as flooding</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state of the economy in Oxford in thriving/on the way up</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Negative drivers

- Health in general is poor: -5%
- Problem with dog fouling: -6%
- Problem with people being drunk or rowdy in public places: -6%

**Satisfaction with value for money**

54% of the variance explained by the model

Source: Ipsos MORI

---

**Figure 8.4: Key drivers of value for money**
8.5 Perceived treatment by public services

A sense of being treated with respect and consideration by local public services is a key driver of satisfaction with the Council and perceived value for money. Over the last year, around two thirds (67%) think that this has been the case either all of the time (33%) or most of the time (35%). Encouragingly, just 4% think this has been the case either rarely (2%) or never (2%).

Figure 8.5: Respect and consideration from public services

Those in the South East area of Oxford are significantly less likely than average to say they are treated with respect all or most of the time by public services over the last year (57% vs. 67% overall). This perhaps reflects the less positive views of these residents around anti-social behaviour and community cohesion as well as lower satisfaction with their local area - as discussed in previous sections.

Those aged 65+ (75% vs. 67% overall) and those who are retired (73% vs. 67% overall) are significantly more likely than average to have been treated with respect and consideration all or most of the time, as are those who rent their home privately (75% vs. 67% overall). Those with a disability, however, are less likely to think this has been the case (64% vs. 67% overall), as are those aged between 35-64 (62% vs. 67% overall).

Those who are positive about other factors of Council performance are more likely to feel that they are treated with respect:

- Those who are satisfied with the way the Council runs things (75% feel they are treated with respect and consideration all or most of the time vs. 67% overall);
- Those who agree the Council provides value for money (81% vs. 67% overall);
• Those who feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides (76%) vs. 67% overall; and

• Those who agree that the police and Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their local area (82% vs. 67% overall).

8.6 Information provision

Good information and communication are important elements of service delivery for local authorities. For decades, a key finding in all of Ipsos MORI’s work has been that Councils which do better at keeping people informed about services tend to be better regarded. We also know that feeling informed is a key driver to both overall satisfaction with the Council and perceived value for money in Oxford.

Overall, 56% say they feel well informed about the services and benefits Oxford City Council provides, compared to 37% who say they do not feel informed. Figures remain on a par with the 2014/15 results and in line with both Stratford-upon-Avon and Welwyn Hatfield.

There are no significant differences across the local areas.

As we saw in 2014/15, those aged 65+ (62%) and those aged 35-64 (68%) are more likely to feel that they are kept up to date than those aged 18-34 (45%). Those who are retired are also more likely to feel informed (68% vs. 56% overall). As we saw last year, owner occupiers are more likely to feel informed (62%) in comparison to private renters (50%).

As we saw last year, those who are satisfied with the way the Council runs things (68%), those who think the Council provides value for money (76%) and those who think the Council are dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime issues

Q4. Overall, how well informed do you think Oxford City Council keeps residents about the services and benefits it provides?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local areas</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North (197)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, South &amp; West (112)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East (297)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (91)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley (132)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East (154)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (983) : Fieldwork dates: 4 November 2016 to 6 January 2017

Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 8.6: Keeping residents informed about services and benefits

There are no significant differences across the local areas.

As we saw in 2014/15, those aged 65+ (62%) and those aged 35-64 (68%) are more likely to feel that they are kept up to date than those aged 18-34 (45%). Those who are retired are also more likely to feel informed (68% vs. 56% overall). As we saw last year, owner occupiers are more likely to feel informed (62%) in comparison to private renters (50%).

As we saw last year, those who are satisfied with the way the Council runs things (68%), those who think the Council provides value for money (76%) and those who think the Council are dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime issues
that matter (66%) are all more likely than average to feel they are kept up to date about the services and benefits the Council provides (vs. 56% overall). Notably, those who say they know how to contact their Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) are also more likely to feel informed (79%).

Residents were also asked how informed they feel about what to do in extreme weather conditions, such as flooding. In addition to feeling informed about services and benefits the Council provides. This is a significant key driver of perceived value for money.

The percentage of residents who feel they are informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions has fallen since 2014/15, from 41% to 34%. Half of residents (50%) feel either not very well or not at all informed.

Figure 8.7: Feeling informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions

Those in the Central South & West area of Oxford are more likely than average to say they feel kept up to date about what to do in extreme weather conditions (57% vs. 34% overall), this may be geography related with the River Thames running through Central South & West. Those in Cowley are less likely to feel informed (24% vs. 34% overall).

Those aged 35-64 (37%) and those aged 65+ (40%) are more likely to say they feel knowledgeable about what to do in extreme weather conditions compared to those aged between 18-34 (29%).

In addition, those who feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides overall are more likely to feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions (48%), as are those who know how to contact their Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) (45% vs. 34% overall).
8.7 Satisfaction with Council services

Residents were also asked for their views on some of the services provided or supported by Oxford City Council and/or Oxfordshire County Council. As we saw last year, the services with highest levels of satisfaction include parks and open spaces (84%), recycling and refuse collection (80%) and museums (73%). In comparison to 2014/15 satisfaction with parks and open spaces has fallen significantly from 88% to 84% this year, as has satisfaction with libraries (60% to 53 this year).

Whilst the lowest satisfaction levels are with indoor sport and leisure facilities (39%), and community centres (39%), the varying proportion of those saying they ‘don’t know’ (most likely because they are non-users of the service), the Council services with lowest levels of satisfaction are not necessarily those rated the most negatively. Active levels of dissatisfaction are highest for indoor sport and leisure facilities (17%), local bus services (14%) and libraries (14%).

### Figure 8.8: Satisfaction with Council services

There are a number of significant differences by local area in terms of satisfaction with Council services:

- **Those in the North of Oxford** are more likely to be satisfied with museums (87% vs. 73% overall), theatres (80% vs. 67%) and indoor sports and leisure facilities (53% vs. 39% overall), but are more likely to be dissatisfied with local tips and household waste recycling centres (16% vs. 9% overall).

- **Those in the South East of Oxford** are more likely to be positive about indoor sports and leisure facilities (55% vs. 39% overall) and community centres (52% vs. 39% overall).

- **Those in the Central South & West** of Oxford are more likely to be satisfied with museums (84% vs. 73% overall).

- **Those in the North East** are more likely to be dissatisfied with museums (84% vs. 5% overall).
- There are no significant differences amongst residents in Cowley.

There are also a range of significant differences between demographic sub-groups. In terms of age, those 65+ are more likely to be satisfied with a range of Council services – including recycling and refuse collection (91% vs. 80% overall), local tips and household waste recycling centres (HWRCs) (64% vs. 57% overall) community recycling facilities (62% vs. 57% overall), local bus services (82% vs. 71% overall), local libraries (59% vs. 53% overall), and theatres (73% vs. 67% overall). Those aged 35-64 are more likely to be satisfied with community recycling facilities (60% vs. 57% overall), local tips and HWRCs (63% vs. 57% overall), community centres (41% vs. 39% overall) and both indoor (43% vs. 39% overall) and outdoor (56% vs. 53% overall) sport and leisure facilities. They are more likely to be dissatisfied with recycling and refuse collection (12% vs. 9% overall), local bus services (16% vs. 14% overall) and museums (6% vs. 5%). There are no significant differences amongst 18-34 year olds.

Owner occupiers are more likely to be positive about community recycling centres (60% vs. 57% overall), whilst more negative about parks and open spaces (6% vs. 5%). On the contrary, private tenants are more likely to be positive about parks and open spaces (93% vs. 84% overall). There are no significant differences amongst social renters.

Those who are retired are more likely to be positive about recycling and refuse collection (89% vs. 80%), community recycling facilities (65% vs. 57%) and libraries (61% vs. 53%) but more likely to be dissatisfied with outdoor sport and playing facilities (41% vs. 53% overall). Those who are working are more likely to be positive about outdoor sport and leisure facilities (58% vs. 53% overall) but are more likely to be dissatisfied with indoor sport and leisure facilities (21% vs. 17% overall)

Women are more likely to be satisfied with local bus services (74% vs. 71% overall), outdoor sport and leisure facilities (58% vs. 53% overall) libraries (57% vs. 53% overall), theatres (74% vs. 67% overall) and museums (79% vs. 73% overall). White respondents are more likely to be satisfied with parks and open spaces (86% vs. 84% overall), whilst BME respondents are more likely to be satisfied with community centres (55% vs. 39% overall) and local bus services (81% vs. 71% overall). Those who are disabled are more likely to be dissatisfied with theatres (10% vs. 4% overall).

Finally, those with children in the household are more likely than average to be positive about indoor sports and leisure facilities (48% vs. 39% overall) and community centres (51% vs. 39% overall) but more dissatisfied with parks and open spaces (9% vs. 5% overall).
9 Technical report

9.1 Respondent profile

The following figure shows the profile of respondents, both weighted and unweighted, and the key demographic profile of the Oxford population aged 18+. The unweighted sample of respondents is close to that of Oxford’s population by gender and ethnicity. However, as with almost all postal surveys, younger people are far less likely to take part which means the sample is biased towards older people aged 55+.

Figure 9.1: Respondent profile
9.2 Demographics

The following figures show that over a quarter (25%) have at least one child living in the household, while three in ten are in a single person household (29%). Over half of respondents are owner occupiers (53%), a third (29%) from a private landlord, whilst one in seven (15%) are social renters.

Figure 9.2: Household demographics
9.2 Local areas

It is reassuring to see that at a local area level, the profile of residents who responded to the survey matches the profile of Oxford residents overall. This can be seen in the chart below.

![Profile of Oxford Residents](image)

* based on 2014 estimates commissioned by the Oxfordshire County Council. It is believed that the County Council estimates are more reliable than the ONS estimates.

Base: All valid responses (997) : Fieldwork dates: 4 November 2016 to 6 January 2017

Source: Ipsos MORI

**Figure 9.3: Profile of Oxford Residents**

9.3 Sample frame and design

The Post Office Small User Address File (PAF) was used as the sampling frame for the survey. This was chosen as it comprises the most up-to-date source of addresses available.

Oxford is a university city, with students making up a significant proportion of the population. However, many students live in communal establishments (e.g. halls of residence) which are only represented by one address in the PAF, preventing surveys being sent to those living in individual rooms or student flats. We acknowledge that this limits the extent to which the survey can be considered representative of the entire population of Oxford.

However, student populations by their very nature tend to be transient and so the Residents’ Survey – which included questions around satisfaction with various Council services, and whether anti-social behaviour has got better or worse over time – may not have been seen as relevant (particularly amongst those in their first year of study, who may have only moved into the Oxford area in September/October 2016). Because of these factors, the decision was taken to consult with these students separately through an existing student forum.
9.4 Weighting

Data were weighted back to the known population profile of the borough to counter-act non-response bias. Data is weighted by age within gender bands, ethnicity and working status. The weighting profile was based on the 2011 Census information.

a. Data analysis, editing and coding

All completed postal questionnaires were processed through scanning and manual verification. The key advantages of scanning are that results can be turned around faster than manual keying in of data, making it less resource-intensive and therefore more cost effective. Our scanning software is programmed to ask for verification where it is not 100% certain, so errors are kept to a minimum.

b. Statistical reliability

The respondents to the questionnaire are only samples of the total “population”, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been surveyed and responded. But we can predict the variation between the sample results and the “true” values from knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually 95% - that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the “true” value will fall within a specified range.

The table below illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the “95% confidence interval”. An indication of approximate sampling tolerances is given in the table below. Strictly speaking, the tolerances shown here apply only to random samples, so the comparison with postal research is indicative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample on which the survey results are based</th>
<th>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% or 90% ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% or 70% ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 surveyed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 surveyed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 surveyed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997 surveyed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, with a sample of 997 where 30% give a particular answer, the chances are 19 in 20 that the “true” value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been surveyed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 3 percentage points from the sample result, which is very accurate.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be “real”, or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been surveyed). To test if the difference is a real one - i.e. if it is “statistically significant”, we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume the “95% confidence interval”, the differences between the two sample results must be greater than the values given in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample at sub-group level compared</th>
<th>Differences required for significance at or near these percentage levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 and 100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 and 200</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 and 400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 and 500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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