SOUTH LANARKSHIRE CITIZENS' PANEL

Report on Fifth Quality Of Life Survey

by

Craigforth Consultancy and Research

January 2005

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The findings from the 2004 are different from the 2002 in aspects such as the slightly lower ratings of neighbourhood and the wider local area. Despite this positive ratings of services were appreciably higher as were the perceived seriousness of local problems. Satisfaction with housing, levels of recycling, levels of training and general health also increased. All other findings were generally consistent with those in 2002.

Most were satisfied with their neighbourhood and wider local area. Those in East Kilbride and Hamilton were the most likely to be satisfied with their neighbourhood and wider local area.

There were marked increases in the proportions rating services/ issues as good from 2002. There were no reductions in positive ratings. Consistent with 2002, the ratings for education in primary and secondary settings, and for services for the under 5s continue to attract the highest ratings. The condition of roads and pavements continue to have the lowest positive ratings. Things for young people to do attracted the lowest positive ratings of any service.

The issue most likely to be seen as a major problem in South Lanarkshire was dog fouling. The other main problems concerned young people hanging about, litter, drinking in public, people using or dealing in drugs, the loss of woodland/ open space and graffiti/ vandalism. Consistent with 2002, those in Clydesdale and East Kilbride tended to report fewer neighbourhood problems. Those in Hamilton gave the highest ratings to many problems (e.g. car crime, threatening behaviour, people using or dealing in drugs, drinking in public, housebreaking, noise pollution and young people hanging around).

Most expressed satisfaction with all aspects of their homes. Less than one in twenty were planning to move home in the next twelve months. The main reasons for wanting to move were wishing a bigger or smaller house and concerns about anti-social behaviour problems in the neighbourhood.

There was an appreciable increase from 2002 in those who claimed to ‘always’ recycle glass, paper and other household waste and a decline in the percentage of those who never recycled. Only around a third said that they never recycled glass, plastic bags or bottles, or other household waste. Having a varied or wider range of recycling banks in the one place was the biggest factor that people said would help them recycle more often.

Only one in ten were interested in using allotments. Of those who were interested, three fifths would be willing to travel up to one mile to reach the site. In terms of facilities, most thought that a water supply, washing facilities and composting were essential.

Just under a third felt that they were involved in their communities ‘a fair amount’ or ‘a great deal’. Just over half were involved in volunteering activities and just under half were involved in one activity. Involvement in sports & exercise groups and hobbies & social clubs were the main forms of volunteer activity reported by respondents.

Nearly two fifths rated employment prospect as good. Those in East Kilbride were by far the most optimistic. The main barrier to getting a job concerned low wages. People are more willing to accept work if it is close to their homes.

Nearly three fifths were in paid employment and most travelled to work using a private motor vehicle. In the past year, just over two fifths undertook training directly related to their job, less than a fifth undertook non-job related training and less than one in ten of those not in paid employment had undertaken training. Other commitments/ time and lack of opportunities were the main barriers to undertaking learning and training opportunities.

While almost a quarter knew someone who had started a business in South Lanarkshire in the past two years, less than a fifth thought that good opportunities existed to start a business. This is despite almost a third believing that they had the knowledge, skills and experience to start a business and less than two fifths not being put off by fear of failure.

Most described their general health as good/ excellent. Over two fifths had felt calm and peaceful all or most of the time, just over a third felt that they had a lot of energy all or most of the time and less than one in ten said that they felt downhearted and low all or most of the time.

Only one in ten said that their social activities during the past four weeks had been affected by health or emotional problems all or most of the time. Most had access through their social networks to someone who would listen, help in a crisis, they could relax with, could offer comfort and who really appreciated them (66%). Consistent with their health profile, most found life interesting, enjoyable, full, fulfilling, full of fun, successful and happy.

Most were registered with a dentist (mainly NHS) and had visited in the past six months. Respondents were twice as likely to identify positive rather than negative quality of life effects associated with dental health. The main negative effects were the costs of treatment, eating, appearance and comfort. The main positive effects were appearance, eating and smiling.

Over a quarter reported that they had a long-term condition and/ or illness that interfered with their day to day activities. Most reported non-psychological conditions. There was a slight reduction in those reporting health problems made worse by work and visiting a doctor/ health professional.

Most rated local access to GPs, dentists and hospitals as good. Most reported difficulty in getting a GP appointment and particularly a home visit. A physiotherapy/ chiropractor and dental appointment were less difficult. Those most likely to experience least difficulty getting access to these services were in Rutherglen and Cambuslang.

While most felt that they were given adequate information and encouraged to participate in decisions about their treatment, they felt less involved in changes to local and especially national health services.

Only just over a quarter were daily/ weekly public transport users. Most were occasional or non-users. Most lived up to 1-2 miles from the nearest bus stop and train station. Most experienced no difficulties getting on/ off buses and trains.

The main disincentives to using public transport were infrequent/ unreliable services, safety concerns at terminal points and the lack of evening/ weekend services. The main suggested improvements were increasing the frequency/ reliability of services, enhanced evening/ weekend services and safety measures at bus stops/ stations. Increasing the frequency/ reliability of services was rated as the most important improvement.

The main desired changes to policing concerned more police and the speed of initial response. Nearly three fifths thought that crime levels had stayed the same. Most gave moderate ratings to the police service in South Lanarkshire. A fifth thought it was poor.

Overall, people had least confidence in national central government organisations such as the Scottish Parliament and UK Government. South Lanarkshire Council was the most trusted source of information. People were also mainly confident about information from NHS Services and the Police.

Most had glanced through the South Lanarkshire Council Forecast Plan. Over half found it interesting. Nearly three fifths had learned about council services from the plan.

The main desired improvements to quality of life in South Lanarkshire were on policing, the condition of the roads, public transport and play areas for children.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background and Objectives

1.1. South Lanarkshire Citizens' Panel was first established in 1998. At its launch it had 1,600 South Lanarkshire residents as members, with equal numbers in each of the four former council areas:

- Clydesdale;
- East Kilbride;
- Hamilton; and
- Rutherglen and Cambuslang.

1.2. Each year a percentage of the panel stand down and new members are recruited. A refreshment exercise was conducted in August 2004. At the start of September 2004 the total panel membership stood at 1947.

1.3. A Steering Group drawn from partner agencies is responsible for managing the Panel. The current members of the are:

- South Lanarkshire Council;
- Greater Glasgow NHS;
- South Lanarkshire Community Safety Partnership;
- Lanarkshire NHS; and
- Communities Scotland.

1.4. Craigforth Consultancy and Research currently manage the Panel on behalf of the Steering Group.

Methodology

1.5. Craigforth undertook this fifth survey on the Quality of Life in South Lanarkshire on behalf of the steering group. It was conducted towards the end of 2004, using a similar questionnaire to the previous survey in 2002.

1.6. The questions were largely identical in the sections on the neighbourhood and local area, housing and recycling (with the exceptions of an additional two items on recycling items). The section on health and well being, however, while largely similar, also asks new questions about access to health services. There are also new questions on transport, policing and organisations and information. Previous questions about use of the internet do not feature in 2004.

Sample

1.7. The research was undertaken by means of a postal self-completion survey. Questionnaires were issued to 1947 members of the panel during November 2004. A reminder letter was issued in early December. By cut off in early January 2005 a total of 1,394 completed responses had been received, or a 72% response rate. Of these 1,381 were analysable. This represents a drop in response from 87% in 2002, when the panel had just been refreshed. The response in 2004 however compares favourably with previous postal survey exercises using the panel and with 2000 Quality of Life survey (54% with no reminder issued).

1.8. The main socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents who completed returns were as follows in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Respondent Characteristics (n, %)[1]

Group	Returns (n)	% of Sample
Gender		
Male	491	36
Female	870	64
Base	**1,361**	**100**
Age (Years)		
18-44	432	32
45-64	655	49
65+	260	19
Base	**1,347**	**100**
Housing Tenure		
Own	1144	85
Rent	196	14
Other	12	1
Base	**1,352**	**100**
Area		
Clydesdale	294	21
East Kilbride	381	28
Hamilton	361	26
Rutherglen/ Cambuslang	333	24
Base	**1,369**	**99**

1.9. The achieved sample was reasonably representative of the balance in the overall panel membership in terms of these variables.

Analysis and Reporting

1.10. In the analysis we have focused on the main tables from the questions asked in the survey. We also conducted some additional cross-tabulations of key questions by gender, age and the residential location of respondents. All of these variables potentially highlighted important differences in how people view quality of life. The variables offer interesting ways of understanding the data in greater detail and looking at, for example, whether satisfaction with neighbourhoods varied across areas. Where differences arose between groups these are highlighted in the text accompanying the tables in each Section.

1.11. We have kept the analysis consistent with that in 2002 for purposes of comparison over time and monitoring change. Where possible we have also provided details on the change over time from 2000 to 2004.

[1] The numbers of respondents vary because not all completed all of the questions.

Impact of Scottish Household Survey on Quality of Life Research

1.12. When the first Quality of Life Survey was undertaken amongst members of the South Lanarkshire Citizens' Panel, the aim was to establish a baseline of public opinion, against which future surveys could be compared in order to monitor any shift in views and priorities.

1.13. Since that time, the Scottish Household Survey (SHS) has been established. This is undertaken on an almost continuous basis and gathers information on many of the issues covered by the Quality of Life Survey. It does this through very rigorous sampling and in-household interviews.

1.14. Results are now available for individual local authority areas. This forms a statistically reliable method of monitoring changes over time on the issues covered in that survey. Not all the issues in the QOL are covered in the same detail in the SHS.

1.15. In this most recent Quality of Life Survey, some questions were drafted using identical wording to that used in the SHS. This allows comparisons to be made between Panel members and the population as a whole of South Lanarkshire. Where possible we have made these comparisons in the report.

1.16. It may be sensible for the Steering Group to revisit the original aims of the Quality of Life Surveys, when considering this report.

2. NEIGHBOURHOOD AND LOCAL AREA

2.1. This section deals with Panel members' views about their neighbourhood and the wider local area in which they live. The usual pattern in such surveys is that people tend to be satisfied with their neighbourhood quite a lot and the wider local area somewhat less.

2.2. This is followed here (Table 2.1). The differences are particularly striking when one focuses on those who were 'very satisfied'. Almost twice as many are 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood compared with their wider local area.

Table 2.1: Satisfaction with Neighbourhood and Wider Area

2004 Survey	Rating of Neighbourhood	Rating of Wider Local Area
Very satisfied	27%	14%
Fairly satisfied	55%	57%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6%	8%
Slightly dissatisfied	10%	17%
Very dissatisfied	3%	4%
Base	**1363**	**1362**

2.3. This section now examines the neighbourhood findings in greater detail, followed by the wider area and neighbourhood issues and services.

Rating of Neighbourhood

2.4. No definition of "neighbourhood" was offered to respondents although people are usually able to judge what they mean by this term and there is likely to be reasonable consistency in questions of this type over time even if individuals may make different judgements about its scale. People have been asked to make this same judgement in succeeding years, so there is likely to be reasonable consistency.

2.5. There has however been a change in the way this question was asked. In previous surveys people were asked to rate their neighbourhood and the wider local area in terms of 'very good', 'fairly good', 'neither good nor bad', 'fairly poor' and 'very poor'. Although we asked about *satisfaction* with these in the 2004 survey the results are generally comparable with the questions in previous surveys. It should be noted also that this point applies in Tables 2.2 and 2.3.

2.6. The great majority were satisfied with their neighbourhood (82%) and wider local area (71%). If we compare these results with those who rated their neighbourhood as good, the 2004 figures represent a 4% decrease from the previous survey and an 8% decrease in those who thought 'very good' in 2000 (Table 2.2). However, there has been no overall change in levels of positive responses since the second QOL survey in 1999. It should be noted that, as in previous years, within this mainly positive picture those who were 'fairly satisfied' considerably outnumbered the 'very satisfied'.

2.7. The other interesting aspect is that 13% were dissatisfied with their neighbourhood, just over twice as many as the 6% in 2002 who thought their neighbourhood was poor.

Table 2.2: Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Over Time

Rating of Neighbourhood	All 2004	All 2002	All 2000
Very satisfied	27%	35%	34%
Fairly satisfied	55%	51%	50%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6%	8%	10%
Slightly dissatisfied	10%	4%	5%
Very dissatisfied	3%	2%	1%
Base	**1,363**	**847**	745

2.8. We also compared the 2004 figures for each area with those in the 2002 survey (Tables 2.3 A, B, C and D). In these tables we have highlighted in bold the % change (+ or -) in the figures compared to analagous ratings in the 2002 survey for each area.

Table 2.3A: Rating of Neighbourhood in Clydesdale Over Time

Rating	04	02	
Very satisfied	28%	37%	***-9***
Fairly satisfied	51%	50%	***+1***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6%	9%	***-3***
Slightly dissatisfied	11%	2%	***+9***
Very dissatisfied	4%	1%	***+3***

Table 2.3B: Rating of Neighbourhood in East Kilbride Over Time

Rating	04	02	
Very satisfied	31%	38%	***-7***
Fairly satisfied	56%	55%	***+1***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5%	6%	***-1***
Slightly dissatisfied	7%	1%	***+6***
Very dissatisfied	1%	<1%	***-***

Table 2.3C: Rating of Neighbourhood In Hamilton Over Time

Rating	04	02	
Very satisfied	27%	34%	***-7***
Fairly satisfied	55%	46%	***+9***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5%	11%	***-6***
Slightly dissatisfied	11%	6%	***+5***
Very dissatisfied	2%	2%	***-***

Table 2.3D: Rating of Neighbourhood In Rutherglen & Cambuslang Over Time

Rating	04	02	
Very satisfied	23%	30%	***-7***
Fairly satisfied	55%	53%	***+2***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6%	5%	***+1***
Slightly dissatisfied	11%	7%	***+4***
Very dissatisfied	5%	4%	***+1***

2.9. Those in East Kilbride (87%) and Hamilton (82%) were most likely to be satisfied with their neighbourhood. Those in East Kilbride were also less likely to be dissatisfied compared to those in other areas (8%). Conversely, those in Clydesdale (79%) and Rutherglen &Cambuslang (78%) were slightly less likely to be satisfied and more likely to be dissatisfied (15% and 16% respectively).

2.10. The levels of positive response in East Kilbride were comparable with previous surveys where people in this area tended to be the most positive about their local area. Nevertheless, positive ratings generally decreased (particularly of those who were the most positive) while negative ratings increased. This is most apparent in Clydesdale where there was an 8% decrease in positive ratings and a 12% increase in negative ratings. However, it was least apparent in Hamilton where there was a +2% change in positive ratings and only a +5 increase in negative ratings.

2.11. Similar to 2002, but in contrast with the 2000 survey, there was no significant difference in views by gender. However, there were again differences in views according to age - similar to the findings in 2002 but not in 2000.

2.12. Older people, aged 65 and over, were by far the most positive about their neighbourhood but only slightly more satisfied overall (Table 2.4). Over a third were 'very satisfied' (35%) and just over half were 'fairly satisfied' (51%). This contrasted with the 26% of those aged 45-64 and 23% of those under 44 years who were 'very satisfied'.

Table 2.4: Rating of Neighbourhood by Age & Tenure

Age Group	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Base
44 and Under	81%	5%	14%	**431**
45 to 64	80%	6%	13%	**651**
65 and Over	86%	5%	9%	**255**
Rent	62%	12%	26%	**195**
Own	85%	4%	10%	**1135**
Other	83%	8%	8%	**12**

2.13. It is possible that many older people do live in what might be seen as "better" neighbourhoods, having progressed through changes in household formation and careers. It is often the case that people of all social backgrounds spend their younger years of adulthood living in less than ideal neighbourhoods, while starting or maintaining households and/ or careers.

2.14. However, it is also the case that younger people tend to be generally less easy to satisfy than older people. So these age differences may also reflect differences in expectations.

2.15. Again similar to 2002, there were appreciable differences by tenure. Panel members living in the rented sector were appreciably less likely to be satisfied (and more dissatisfied) with their neighbourhood than owner occupiers (62% compared to 85%).

2.16. Compared to 2002, there was a slight decrease in positive ratings among owner occupiers (91% in 2002 compared to 85% in 2004) and renters (69% in 2002 compared to 62% in 2004). Among renters in 2004 there was an increase of those who gave negative ratings (21% in 2002 compared to 26% in 2004).

2.17. As in 2002, tenure differences are confirmed in the Scottish Household Survey findings for South Lanarkshire.

Rating of the Wider Local Area

2.18. The term 'wider local area' was, as with the definition of neighbourhood, left to the respondent to define for themselves. It was intended to represent the town or settlement in which they lived. Since the term encompasses a larger area than neighbourhood, there is scope for an even wider variation in definitions to have been adopted by Panel members.

2.19. Nearly three quarters were satisfied with the wider local area (71%). However, although the results in 2002 were nearly identical with the results in 2000, the 2004 figures suggest a trend of slight decline in positive ratings of the wider local area (-2%) and an appreciable increase in levels of dissatisfaction (+11%).

2.20. If we compare these results with those who rated their wider local area as good, the 2004 figures represent a 2% decrease from the previous survey (Table 2.5). It should again be noted that although this is a mainly positive picture those who were ‘fairly satisfied’ greatly exceeded the ‘very satisfied”.

2.21. The other interesting aspect is that 21% are dissatisfied with their wider local area. Just over twice as many respondents were dissatisfied compared to the 10% in 2002 who thought their wider local area was poor.

Table 2.5: Satisfaction with Wider Local Area Over Time

Rating of Wider Local Area	**All 2004**	**All 2002**	**All 2000**
Very satisfied	14%	17%	19%
Fairly satisfied	57%	56%	57%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	8%	17%	15%
Slightly dissatisfied	17%	8%	7%
Very dissatisfied	4%	2%	2%
Base	**1362**		

2.22. We also compare in Tables 2.6A, B, C and D the 2004 figures for each area with those in the 2002 survey.

Table 2.6A: Rating of Wider Local Area in Clydesdale Over Time

Rating	**04**	**02**	
Very satisfied	12%	15%	***-3***
Fairly satisfied	56%	56%	***-***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	7%	20%	***-13***
Slightly dissatisfied	21%	9%	***+11***
Very dissatisfied	4%	1%	***+3***

Table 2.6B: Rating of Wider Local Area in East Kilbride Over Time

Rating	**04**	**02**	
Very satisfied	22%	23%	***-1***
Fairly satisfied	58%	63%	***-5***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6%	12%	***-6***
Slightly dissatisfied	12%	2%	***+10***
Very dissatisfied	2%	1%	***+1***

Table 2.6C: Rating of Wider Local Area in Hamilton Over Time

Rating	04	02	
Very satisfied	13%	17%	***-4***
Fairly satisfied	57%	56%	***+1***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11%	16%	***-5***
Slightly dissatisfied	16%	9%	***+7***
Very dissatisfied	4%	2%	***+2***

Table 2.6D: Rating of Wider Local Area in Rutherglen & Cambuslang Over Time

Rating	04	02	
Very satisfied	9%	10%	***-1***
Fairly satisfied	56%	49%	***+7***
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	9%	23%	***-14***
Slightly dissatisfied	21%	15%	***+6***
Very dissatisfied	5%	2%	***+3***

2.23. As with the local neighbourhood figures (Tables 2.3A, B, C and D), those in East Kilbride (80%) and Hamilton (70%) were most likely to be satisfied with their wider local area. Those in East Kilbride were also less likely to be dissatisfied compared to those in other areas (14%).

2.24. Conversely, those in Clydesdale (68%) and Rutherglen & Cambuslang (65%) were appreciably less likely to be satisfied compared to those in East Kilbride and more likely to be dissatisfied (25% and 26% respectively).

2.25. Although East Kilbride residents gave their area the highest satisfaction ratings (both overall and of the proportion who were 'very satisfied'), the levels of positive response in East Kilbride were slightly lower compared with 2002. Overall, postive ratings generally slightly decreased (particuarly of those who were the most positive) while negative ratings increased. Increases in negative ratings are most apparent in Clydesdale (a 14% increase in negative ratings) and East Kilbride (an 11% increase in negative ratings) compared to Hamilton and Ruthergen (a 9% increase in negative ratings respectively).

2.26. It should be apparent that East Kilbride is a relatively newer settlement and more compact area, whereas the other three subdivisions of South Lanarkshire each have more than one local centre or settlement. It is more than possible that within these other parts of South Lanarkshire there were considerable variatons, depending on exactly where respondents lived.

2.27. Similar to 2002, there was no significant difference in views by gender. Also similar to 2002 there were differences in views according to age[2].

2.28. Older people, aged 65 and over, were by far the most positive about their neighbourhood but only slightly more satisfied overall (Table 2.7). A fifth were 'very satisfied' (20%) compared to 13% of those aged 45-64 and those under 44 years respectively.

Table 2.7: Rating of Wider Local Area by Age & Tenure

Age Group	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Base
44 and Under	71%	9%	20%	**430**
45 to 64	70%	8%	23%	**650**
65 and Over	75%	7%	18%	**256**
Rent	64%	10%	26%	**195**
Own	72%	8%	20%	**1134**
Other	67%	8%	25%	**12**

2.29. Older respondents were once again somewhat more positive about the wider local area than other age groups (75%). As in the previous surveys, those aged 45-64 years were the least positive and the most dissatisfied, for reasons that are not readily apparent.

2.30. Analysis by housing tenure revealed that home owners were again more likely than renters to be satisfied with the wider local area (72% compared to 64%).

Rating of Area by Issue or Service

2.31. Respondents were next asked to rate their neighbourhood in terms of a number of issues. The issues asked about were identical to those in previous QOL surveys. In Table 2.8 we compare the 2004 findings with those from 2002 and 2000 in terms of those who said that the services were very or fairly good[3].

[2] For purposes of analysis, the panel members were divided into those aged 44 and under, those aged 45 to 64 and then those aged 65 and over.

[3] As in 2002 for purposes of comparison we eliminated those who were unable to offer a view from the analysis. If a third or more feel unable to comment on any service, it may appear that fewer people are satisfied with that service even though those able to comment are in fact happier with that than with other services. This is a more accurate way to compare perceptions of services.

2.32. It should be noted that on the one hand many of the “universal” services (the ones that just about everybody uses) have very similar findings to last time. The findings are presented by service, in descending order of rating.

Table 2.8: Rating of Service & Issues Over Time

Rating of Neighbourhood by Issues & Services	All 04 Good	% Change from 02 (+, -)	All 02 Good	All 00 Good
Education provided by primary schools	95%	***+7%***	88%	69%
Education provided by secondary schools	89%	***+7%***	82%	61%
Provision of nurseries & other services for under 5s	81%	***+17%***	64%	41%
Condition of street lighting[4]	77%	***+54%***	23%	23%
Availability of public transport	66%	***+16%***	50%	43%
Maintenance of common areas	66%	***+31%***	35%	28%
Cleanliness of the streets	64%	***+22%***	42%	41%
Quality of parks & open spaces	63%	***+26%***	37%	40%
Suitability of leisure facilities	60%	***+19%***	41%	41%
Community spirit	60%	***+22%***	38%	40%
Shopping facilities	59%	***+9%***	50%	56%
Availability of suitable housing	58%	***+11%***	47%	39%
Control & management of traffic	56%	***+22%***	34%	43%
Suitable places for children to play	40%	***+12%***	28%	31%
Condition of pavements	36%	***+13%***	23%	23%
Availability of arts/ entertainment & cultural activities[5]	36%			
Condition of roads[6]	30%	***+7%***	23%	23%
Things for young people to do	23%			

[4] This was previously asked as part of a combined question with roads and the comparative figures from 2002 and 2000 are presented for this combined item. These issues are now all asked about as three separate items and this should be borne in mind when evaluating change over time.
[5] Along with ‘Things for young people to do’ this is a new item not included in previous surveys.
[6] See footnote 7.

2.33. It should be noted in passing that one issue related to services or facilities for young people that nearly all feel competent to comment upon is "suitable places for children to play". Past research suggests that there are mixed reasons for seeing play provision as poor. For parents of children it may represent a straightforward aspiration for improved facilities whereas for many older people the provision of "suitable places" can sometimes imply the removal of children and young people from unsuitable places.

2.34. Since 2002 there have been marked increases in the proportions rating services/ issues as good. There were no reductions in positive ratings. Consistent with 2002, however, the ratings for education in primary (95%) and secondary settings (89%), and for services for the under 5s (81%) continue to attract the highest positive ratings. Also the condition of roads (30%) and pavements (36%) continue to have the lowest positive ratings. Things for young people to do attracted the lowest positive ratings of any service (23%).

2.35. If we exclude changes to the combined item on the condition of roads, pavements and street lighting in 2002, the largest % changes in positive ratings concerned the:

- Maintenance of common areas (+31%);
- Quality of parks and open spaces (+26%); and
- Cleanliness of the streets, community spirit and the control and management of traffic (all +22%).

Top Box Analysis

2.36. So far, the analysis we have focused on the overall percentages saying that a service is good, with the 'very' and 'fairly' categories combined. It is however, also helpful to separate the top category (very) from the lower category (fairly). When people say that they are only 'fairly satisfied' or something is 'fairly good', they usually have at least one major reservation about it. The combination of the top two categories can be misleading if people come to believe that both responses mean the same.

2.37. Focus on the highest score is sometimes called "Top Box Analysis". We compared the findings by the top two categories, disaggregating the scores for 2004 in Table 2.8 (Table 2.10). Services with the highest ratio of 'very good' scores (more than 1:2) are in bold. Those with the lowest ratios (less than 1:5) are bold and italicised.

2.38. It is notable that the lowest scoring services also tend to have the lowest ratio of those saying they are 'very good' amongst those with a positive view, not just the lowest number. Conversely, the more highly rated services and facilities tend to have higher proportions of those who say they are 'very good'. Similar to 2002, the differences between the highest and lowest rated services are stark when attention is focused on those saying 'very good'.

Table 2.10: Top Box Ratings of Service & Issues

Rating of Issues & Services	**All 2004**	
	Very Good	**Fairly Good**
Education provided by primary schools	**35%**	60%
Education provided by secondary schools	**28%**	61%
Provision of nurseries & other services for under 5s	14%	66%
Condition of street lighting	12%	65%
Availability of public transport	**15%**	51%
Maintenance of common areas	8%	58%
Cleanliness of the streets	8%	56%
Quality of parks & open spaces	8%	55%
Suitability of leisure facilities	12%	48%
Community spirit	7%	53%
Shopping facilities	14%	45%
Availability of suitable housing	8%	50%
Control & management of traffic	6%	50%
Suitable places for children to play	6%	34%
Condition of pavements	***2%***	34%
Availability of arts/ entertainment & cultural activities	6%	30%
Condition of roads	***2%***	28%
Things for young people to do	***2%***	21%

2.39. Next, the positive and negative ratings were netted off against each other.

Table 2.11: Net Score Change of Service & Issues Over Time

Rating of Issues and Services	**2004 Net Score (+, -)**	**2002 Net Score (+/-)**
Education – secondary schools	+79	+79
Education – primary schools	+90	+86
Nurseries etc for the under 5s	+60	+49
Condition of street lighting	+54	-36
The availability of suitable housing	+16	+21
Shopping facilities	+18	+18
The availability of public transport	+32	+18
Community spirit	+21	+11
Cleanliness of the streets	+28	+ 5
Maintenance of common areas	+32	+ 4
Suitability of leisure facilities	+20	+ 1
Quality of parks and open spaces	+26	0
Control & management of traffic	+12	-10
Suitable places for children to play	-20	-25
Availability of arts/ entertainment & cultural activities	-28	
Condition of pavements	-28	-36
Condition of roads	-40	-36
Things for young people to do	-54	

2.40. If we exclude changes to the combined item on the condition of roads, pavements and street lighting in 2002, the most notable positive net changes and perceived improvements concerned:

- Nurseries for the under 5s;
- Cleanliness of the streets;
- Maintenance of common areas;
- Suitability of leisure facilities;
- Quality of parks and open spaces;
- The control and management of traffic; and
- Community spirit.

2.41. On the other side of the balance sheet, there was a reduction in the net score for:

- the availability of suitable housing;

2.42. There was also a reduction in the net minus score for:

- the provision of suitable places for children to play.

2.43. Now the findings are presented by each of the four areas (Table 2.9). In the table we have highlighted (in bold) those figures which are lower in each area relative to others.

Table 2.9: Good Ratings by Area

Good Rating of Issues & Services	**Analysis by Area 2004 - % Good**			
	Clydesdale	**East Kilbride**	**Hamilton**	**Rutherglen & Cambuslang**
General Services and Facilities				
Shopping facilities	**39%**	83%	**60%**	**50%**
Suitability of leisure facilities	**43%**	78%	**58%**	**54%**
Quality of parks and open spaces	**58%**	73%	**57%**	**64%**
Availability of arts/ entertainment & cultural activities	**24%**	73%	**26%**	**14%**
Services for Children and Young People				
Provision of nurseries etc for the under 5s	85%	82%	81%	**72%**
Education provided by primary schools	97%	95%	94%	96%
Education provided by secondary schools	92%	92%	86%	88%
Suitable places for children to play	52%	51%	**29%**	**30%**
Things for young people to do	**16%**	39%	**21%**	**16%**
Transport and Roads				
Control & management of traffic	**52%**	63%	**47%**	59%
Availability of public transport	**57%**	**61%**	**67%**	79%
Condition of roads	**12%**	35%	34%	35%
Condition of pavements	**27%**	35%	42%	39%
Condition of street lighting	77%	**72%**	82%	78%
Cleanliness of the streets	63%	69%	64%	62%
Community spirit				
Community spirit	64%	61%	60%	59%
Housing				
Availability of suitable housing	55%	58%	60%	59%
Maintenance of common areas	72%	66%	64%	63%

2.44. The main points are:

- Some issues and services showed little or no variation amongst the four areas. This was most evident in aspects of the perceived quality of primary and secondary education, housing (both availability and maintenance of common areas), the cleanliness of streets and community spirit;

- Those in East Kilbride gave the highest ratings to all aspects of general services and facilities (i.e. shopping, leisure, open spaces and arts/ entertainment). Those in Clydesdale had the lowest opinion of local shopping, open space and leisure facilities. Those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang had the lowest opinion of arts/ entertainment facilities;

- Regarding services for children and young people, there was little variation between areas. The exceptions were the lower opinion of those in all areas except East Kilbride on things for young people to do. Those in Hamilton and Rutherglen & Cambuslang had lower opinions of suitable places for children to play, and those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang of provision for the under 5s; and

- Regarding transport and roads, those in Clydesdale had lower opinions of the condition of pavements and roads, the management of traffic (and also in Hamilton) and the availability of public transport (and also in East Kilbride and Hamilton).

Seriousness of Neighbourhood Problems

2.45. Respondents were next asked to rate a number of issues or problems as ‘major’, fairly major’, ‘it happens but not a problem’ or “no problem at all” in their neighbourhood. These are also compared with findings in previous surveys[7] (Table 2.12)

Table 2.12: Major Problems: Comparison over time

Major Problem	**2004**	**2002**	**2000**	**% Change 02-04**	**% Change 00-04**
Graffiti/vandalism	39%	30%	28%	**+9**	**+11**
Car crime	34%	24%	31%	**+10**	**+3**
Threatening behaviour	27%	18%	19%	**+9**	**+8**
People using or dealing in drugs[8]	41%	31%	36%	**+10**	**+6**
Drinking in public	42%	35%	39%	**+7**	**+3**
Fire raising	10%	7%	7%	**+3**	**+3**
Racial harassment	7%	4%	4%	**+3**	**+3**
House breaking	29%	19%	25%	**+10**	**+4**
Illegal dumping of waste	36%	25%	27%	**+11**	**+9**
Air pollution	20%	10%	12%	**+10**	**+8**
Pollution of land and rivers	25%	15%	19%	**+10**	**+15**
Noise pollution	25%	16%	16%	**+9**	**+9**
Loss of woodland/ open space	40%	26%	35%	**+14**	**+5**
Problems with Neighbours	12%	7%		**+5**	

2.46. Over 2002-2004 (and 2000-2004) there have been increases in the perceived importance of all these issues. Unlike the period 2000-2002 where there were perceived drops in car crime, drug activity, drinking in public, housebreaking the dumping of waste air pollution and the loss of woodland and open spaces as major problems, in 2002-2004 there were increases in all of these issues.

2.47. Environmental issues were the most likely to be identified as major problems over time. Over the period 2002-2004 the loss of woodland, the illegal

[7] In previous surveys people were asked to rate problems as ‘major’, minor or ‘not at all’. For purposes of comparison we have combined the ‘major’ and ‘fairly major’ categories. In Table 2.12 we only compare those categories used in 2002.
[8] Labelled as drug activity in 2002.

dumping of waste, air pollution and the pollution of land and rivers all showed the largest percentage increase.

2.48. Car crime, people using and dealing in drugs and housebreaking were other issues that showed relatively large percentage increases between 2002 and 2004.

2.49. Over the period 2000-2004 the pollution of land and rivers and graffiti/ vandalism showed the largest percentage increase.

2.50. The overall findings for 2004 are as follows.

Table 2.13: How Serious are the Following Neighbourhood Issues?

Issue	Major	Fairly Major	Happens but not a problem	No Problem
Graffiti/vandalism	9%	30%	49%	12%
Car crime	7%	27%	53%	13%
Threatening behaviour	5%	22%	44%	29%
People using or dealing in drugs	14%	27%	33%	27%
Drinking in public	14%	28%	37%	22%
Fire raising	2%	8%	29%	61%
Racial harassment	1%	6%	28%	65%
House breaking	4%	25%	49%	21%
Illegal dumping of waste	9%	27%	33%	30%
Air pollution	4%	16%	36%	48%
Pollution of land and rivers	4%	21%	37%	37%
Noise pollution	7%	18%	41%	35%
Loss of woodland/ open space	11%	29%	26%	35%
Problems with Neighbours	4%	8%	29%	59%
Young people hanging around	16%	29%	36%	19%
Rubbish/ litter lying about	13%	29%	39%	19%
Dog fouling	21%	34%	32%	12%
Abandoned vehicles	2%	9%	34%	55%
Derelict land	2%	7%	24%	66%
Being able to trust people	4%	11%	25%	61%

2.51. Derelict land (66%), racial harassment (65%), trust (61%), fire raising (61%), problems with neighbours (59%) and abandoned vehicles (55%) were not seen as problems at all by most respondents.

2.52. As in 2002, it is interesting to note that only 7% of respondents mention racial harassment as a major problem in 2004, the same proportion as in 2000, with a further 28% saying it happens but is not a problem. As in 2002 this may conceal as much as it reveals as most panel members are white.

2.53. The issue most likely to be seen as major (combining ‘major’ and ‘fairly major’) problems was dog fouling (65%). This was identified as a ‘major’ problem by 21%.

2.54. The other main problems concerned young people hanging about (45%), litter (42%) drinking in public (42%), people using or dealing in drugs (41%), the loss of woodland/ open space (40%) and graffiti/ vandalism (39%).

2.55. We also looked at these issues by area (Table 2.14). In the table we have highlighted (in bold) those figures which are higher in each area relative to others.

Table 2.14: Major Problems by Area

Issue	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen & Cambuslang
Graffiti/vandalism	32%	37%	**41%**	**46%**
Car crime	26%	28%	**43%**	35%
Threatening behaviour	23%	24%	**33%**	27%
People using or dealing in drugs	44%	33%	**48%**	37%
Drinking in public	39%	41%	**47%**	39%
Fire raising	7%	9%	14%	10%
Racial harassment	6%	6%	8%	7%
House breaking	33%	19%	**38%**	31%
Illegal dumping of waste	**45%**	26%	39%	34%
Air pollution	16%	18%	21%	**26%**
Pollution of land and rivers	20%	23%	28%	**32%**
Noise pollution	19%	20%	**29%**	**29%**
Loss of woodland/ open space	23%	**45%**	43%	32%
Problems with Neighbours	11%	11%	15%	12%
Young people hanging around	43%	39%	**50%**	**49%**
Rubbish/ litter lying about	**46%**	37%	40%	44%
Dog fouling	**60%**	45%	**58%**	**63%**
Abandoned vehicles	11%	8%	15%	13%
Derelict land	8%	4%	13%	13%
Being able to trust people	14%	13%	16%	16%

2.56. The main points are:

- Some issues showed little or no variation across the four areas. This was most evident in perceptions of the scale of fire raising, racial harassment, problems with neighbours, abandoned vehicles, derelict land and trust;

- Consistent with 2002, those in Clydesdale and East Kilbride tended to report fewer neighbourhood problems than those living in Hamilton and in Rutherglen & Cambuslang;

- There were some land related issues salient in Clydesdale and especially East Kilbride such as the loss of woodland/ open space. Unlike other areas however, this along with dog fouling this was the joint top problem for those in East Kilbride (45%). Loss of woodland was also reported by 15% and 12% more respondents in 2004 compared to 2002 in Clydesdale and East Kilbride respectively. In Clydesdale, problems such as the illegal dumping of waste and rubbish/ litter were more highly rated problems than elsewhere; and

- Those in Hamilton gave the highest ratings to many problems (e.g. car crime, threatening behaviour, people using or dealing drugs, drinking in public, housebreaking noise pollution and young people hanging around). In East Kilbride, respondents were the least likely to mention drug activity. Nevertheless, the largest percentage increases from 2002 in issues such as housebreaking and drugs were in Clydesdale (22% and 11% respectively) and in graffiti/ vandalism in East Kilbride (14%). Those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang had the highest ratings to problems of graffiti, air pollution, the pollution of land/ rivers, noise pollution and dog fouling.

Summary

2.57. The main points were:

- The great majority were satisfied with their neighbourhood (82%) and wider local area (71%). Positive ratings of neighbourhood and the wider local area highlighted a trend of slight decline over the period 2000-2004. Over 2002-2004 there was a 4% drop in positive satisfaction with neghbourhoods and a 6% increase in dissatisfaction. Over the same period there was a 2% drop in positive satisfaction with the wider local area and a 6% increase in dissatisfaction;

- Those in East Kilbride (87%) and Hamilton (82%) were most likely to be satisfied with their neighbourhood. Those in East Kilbride were also least likely to be dissatisfied (6%). Levels of neighbourhood dissatisfaction were higher in Clydesdale (15%) and Rutherglen & Cambuslang (16%);

- Those in East Kilbride (80%) and Hamilton (70%) were most likely to be satisfied with their wider local area. Those in East Kilbride were also least likely to be dissatisfied (14%). Levels of neighbourhood dissatisfaction were higher in Clydesdale (25%) and Rutherglen & Cambuslang (26%);

- Since 2002 there have been marked increases in the proportions rating services/ issues as good. There were no reductions in positive ratings. Consistent with 2002, however, the ratings for education in primary (95%) and secondary settings (89%), and for services for the under 5s (81%) continue to attract the highest positive ratings. Also the condition of roads (30%) and pavements (36%) continue to have the lowest positive ratings. Things for young people to do attracted the lowest positive ratings of any service (23%);

- The largest % changes in positive ratings concerned the maintenance of common areas (+31%), the quality of parks and open spaces (+26%), the cleanliness of the streets, community spirit and the control and management of traffic (all +22%);

- Those in East Kilbride gave the highest ratings to all aspects of general services and facilities (i.e. shopping, leisure, open spaces and arts/ entertainment). Those in Clydesdale had the lowest opinion of local shopping, open space and leisure facilities. Those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang had the lowest opinion of arts and entertainment facilities;

- Regarding services for children and young people, those in East Kilbride were more likely to give higher positive ratings on things for young people to do. Those in Hamilton and Rutherglen & Cambuslang had lower opinions of suitable places for children to play, and those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang of provision for the under 5s;

- Regarding transport and roads, those in Clydesdale had lower opinions of the condition of pavements and roads, the management of traffic (and also in Hamilton) and the availability of public transport (and also in East Kilbride and Hamilton);

- Unlike the period 2000-2002 where there were perceived reductions in the seriousness of car crime, drug activity, drinking in public, housebreaking the dumping of waste air pollution and the loss of woodland and open space. Over 2002-2004 there were increases in the seriousness all of these issues;

- Environmental issues were the most likely to be identified as major problems over time. Over the period 2002-2004 the loss of woodland, the illegal dumping of waste, air pollution and the pollution of land and rivers all showed the largest percentage increase in seriousness;

- Car crime, people using and dealing in drugs and housebreaking were other issues that showed relatively large percentage increases in seriousness between 2002 and 2004. Over the period 2000-2004 the pollution of land and rivers and graffiti/ vandalism showed the largest percentage increase;

- The issue most likely to be seen as a major problem in South Lanarkshire was dog fouling (65%). The other main problems concerned young people hanging about (45%), litter (42%) drinking in public (42%), people using or dealing in drugs (41%), the loss of woodland/ open space (40%) and graffiti/ vandalism (39%);

- Consistent with 2002, those in Clydesdale and East Kilbride tended to report fewer neighbourhood problems than those living in Hamilton and Rutherglen & Cambuslang;

- The loss of woodland/ open space along with dog fouling was the joint top problem for those in East Kilbride. In Clydesdale, problems such as the illegal dumping of waste and rubbish/ litter were more highly rated problems than elsewhere; and

- Those in Hamilton gave the highest ratings to many problems (e.g. car crime, threatening behaviour, people using or dealing drugs, drinking in public, housebreaking noise pollution and young people hanging around). Those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang had the highest ratings to problems of graffiti, air pollution, the pollution of land/ rivers, noise pollution and dog fouling.

3. HOME, RECYCLING, ALLOTMENTS & COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

3.1. This section looks at Panel members' views on their own home, their attitude and behaviour on recycling and levels of involvement in the community, including volunteering.

Home

3.2. The majority of residents expressed satisfaction with their homes (Table 3.1). Over three fifths were very satisfied with the general condition inside their home (62%), but this dropped to half when commenting about the outside of their property (50%). The proportions who were very satisfied increased from 2002, most notably regarding the external condition of their property (+7%).

3.3. While relatively few expressed outright dissatisfaction with any aspect - 7% in the case of the external condition - it should be noted that those who say that they are merely "fairly satisfied" with anything have at least one significant reservation about it. Put another way, no fewer than 48% were less than entirely satisfied with the outside condition of their home.

3.4. This is a common finding in such studies. In recent years, most homes have the basic amenities and much more inside the property. People in all forms of housing go to great lengths to create warm attractive interiors, but they may have less control over external conditions.

3.5. There were big differences by tenure. Owners were 66% very satisfied with the internal conditions of their home (64% in 2002), compared with only 37% for those in rented accommodation.

3.6. Similar to 2002, on external conditions the difference between owner-occupiers and renters was even starker. While 55% of owners were very satisfied with the external conditions (+6% compared to 2002), only 20% of those in the rented sector were similarly satisfied (-1% compared to 2002). In other words, four fifths of tenants were less than entirely satisfied with the external conditions of their home.

3.7. Similar to 2002, satisfaction with size and type of home was generally high in comparison. Moreover, the contrast between owners and tenants was much less pronounced though relative to 2002, satisfaction levels had decreased. Sixty three percent of owners were very satisfied with the size of their home (-5% compared to 2002), compared to 58% of tenants (-11% compared to 2002). The gap was somewhat wider on satisfaction with the type of home - 65% of owners were very satisfied (-5% compared to 2002) compared to 47% of tenants (-7% compared to 2002).

3.8. People were asked "How satisfied are you with the home you live in?" and the overall responses are given in Table 3.1A. The percentage changes from 2002 are given in Table 3.1B.

Table 3.1A: Satisfaction with Home)

All 2004	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Fairly unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	Base
General condition – inside	62%	32%	2%	2%	1%	**1,352**
General condition – outside	50%	37%	5%	4%	3%	**1,352**
Size of home	61%	29%	6%	3%	1%	**1,351**
Type of home	62%	26%	9%	2%	1%	**1,351**

Table 3.1B: Changes in Satisfaction with Home

All 2004	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Fairly unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	Base
General condition – inside	+3	-3	+1	0	0	**1,352**
General condition – outside	+7	-4	0	-1	0	**1,352**
Size of home	-3	+2	+4	0	0	**1,351**
Type of home	-1	0	+5	+1	0	**1,351**

3.9. The changes over time are shown in the following table (Table 3.2). The differences are likely to be accounted for by the increase in the proportion of owners in this year's survey.

Table 3.2: Change over time in those Very Satisfied with Home

Very Satisfied With Home	2004	2002	2000
General condition - inside	62%	59%	53%
General condition - outside	50%	43%	40%
Size of home	61%	64%	58%
Type of home	62%	63%	60%

3.10. Next, findings for each of the four areas in South Lanarkshire are given in Table 3.3A. The percentage changes from 2002 are given in Table 3.3B.

Table 3.3A: Satisfaction with Home by Area

Very Satisfied With Home - By Area	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen/ Cambuslang
General condition - inside	60%	60%	62%	62%
General condition - outside	57%	48%	50%	47%
Size of home	67%	60%	58%	60%
Type of home	69%	61%	59%	59%

Table 3.3B: Changes in Satisfaction with Home by Area

Very Satisfied With Home - By Area	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen/ Cambuslang
General condition - inside	+5	-1	+2	+9
General condition - outside	+11	+6	+7	+8
Size of home	0	-2	-5	-3
Type of home	0	0	-3	-1

3.11. When analysed by area, those in Clydesdale and East Kilbride were slightly less satisfied with the general condition of the interior of their homes, with only 60% very satisfied in these areas compared to 62% elsewhere. This marked a change from 2002, when those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang were the least likely to be very satisfied.

3.12. Comparable to 2002, those in Clydesdale residents were the most satisfied with the general condition of the outside of their homes: 57% very satisfied an increase of 11% from 2002. Rutherglen & Cambuslang and East Kilbride respondents were slightly less satisfied with the exterior of their homes than residents of other areas.

3.13. Again similar to 2002, Clydesdale residents also tended to be more satisfied with the size and type of their homes. The other areas had broadly similar findings. There were no substantive changes in these figures from 2002.

3.14. We also asked about whether people intended to move home in the near future (Table 3.4)[9]. The results are displayed by age and tenure.

Table 3.4: Intentions to Move Home in Near Future by Age and Tenure

Intent	All	18-44	45-64	65+	Own	Rent
Yes (next 6 months)	2%	4%	2%	0%	3%	1%
Yes (next 12 months)	2%	4%	2%	1%	3%	2%
Yes (when possible)	13%	20%	11%	5%	11%	26%
No	66%	53%	69%	82%	68%	55%
Don’t know	16%	19%	16%	12%	16%	16%
Base	**1,341**	**432**	**651**	**258**	**1,140**	**194**

3.15. Only 4% were planning to move home in the next twelve months and a further 13% when possible. Although there was relatively little variation in movement within the next twelve months in terms of age and tenure, differences arose when considering people’s general intention to move home when possible: prospective mobility was higher among those aged 18-44 years (20%) and among those in rented accommodation (26%) who were twice as likely as other groups to want to move.

[9] This was a new question added in 2004 and no comparable figures are available over time.

3.16. Those who said that they intended to move were asked why they did so.

Table 3.5: Reasons for Wanting to Move Home

Reason	%	n
Need a bigger house	24%	56
Need a smaller house	15%	35
To be near family/ relatives	7%	17
Problems with neighbours	7%	16
Because of ASB in neighbourhood	11%	27
Change of job	6%	14
To own home	6%	15
Better area/ neighbourhood	6%	13
Health disability	6%	15
Other	12%	28
Base		**236**

3.17. Interestingly, the main reasons for wanting to move concerned a bigger house (24%), downsizing to a smaller house (15%) and because of anti-social behaviour problems in the neighbourhood (11%).

Recycling

3.18. Panel members were asked how often, if at all, they made a point of recycling glass, paper, plastic bags, plastic bottles or other household waste: see Table 3.6A. Where applicable, the percentage change from the 2002 figures is given in Table 3.6AB.

3.19. There was an appreciable increase from 2002 in those who claimed to 'always' recycle glass, paper and other household waste and a decline in the percentage of those who never recycled. Only around a third said that they never recycled glass, plastic bags or bottles, or other household waste[10].

3.20. Nearly three fifths claimed that they always or usually recycled paper, while this was the case for nearly a half for glass, plastic bags and plastic bottles.

Table 3.6A: Recycling of Domestic Waste in 2004

Recycling 2004	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Glass	33%	12%	17%	10%	31%
Paper	48%	11%	11%	8%	22%
Plastic bags	30%	14%	14%	12%	31%
Plastic bottles	36%	10%	10%	13%	32%
Other household waste	24%	14%	18%	12%	32%

[10] The rates for the recycling of domestic waste are higher than the last available national figures. These suggested that between 40-50% of people in Scotland recycle glass and paper (see Scottish Environment Survey 2002: Scottish Executive, Edinburgh). The SHS 2003 now asks about recycling in the past month within households not among adults. At least 55% of all households had recycled at least some waste in the past month and households were most likely to recycle paper and glass rather than plastic.

Table 3.6B: Changes Recycling of Domestic Waste from 02 to 04

Recycling 2004	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Glass	+12	0	0	-7	-4
Paper	+31	+1	-8	-11	-11
Plastic bags	0	0	0	0	0
Plastic bottles	0	0	0	0	0
Other household waste	+17	+5	0	-10	-9

3.21. Respondents were then asked what would help them to recycle household waste more often (Table 3.7). The findings are compared with the previous surveys. While in 2002 and 2000, the balance of views put the emphasis on the amount of recycling sites; in 2004 the emphasis is now on providing a more varied range of recycling banks.

Table 3.7: Recycling of Domestic Waste (%, n)

Ideas to Help Recycling	2004	2002	2000
More recycling centres	44%	59%	50%
More varied/wider range of recycling banks in one place	51%	53%	44%
More information on recycling	33%	40%	33%
Other	35%	39%	N/A

3.22. We also asked an additional question in 2004 about whether people would recycle more if they had the Blue Bin system to enable recycled waste to be uplifted direct from their home. Thirty-seven percent told us that they already had such a system and the responses for the reminder are set out below (Table 3.8).

Table 3.8: Recycle More if had Blue Bin?

Recycle More?	All
Yes	86%
No	6%
Not sure	8%
Base	**856**

3.23. Over four fifths thought that they would recycle more if a Blue Bin was provided (86%). Only 6% would not do so.

3.24. Of those who thought that they would recycle, this included 83% of those who do *not* currently recycle glass, 82% of those who do not currently recycle paper, 85% of those who do not currently recycle plastic bags, 84% of those who do not currently recycle plastic bottles and 84% of those who do not currently recycle other household waste.

Allotments

3.25. In 2004, we also asked three questions about people's use of allotments (Table 3.9).

Table 3.9: Potential Use of Allotments (%, n)

Interest in using allotments	**%**
Yes	10%
No	82%
Not sure	8%
Base	**1355**
Travel Distance	
Under 1 mile	27%
1 mile	33%
2 miles	18%
3 miles	22%
Base	**139**
Facilities	
Toilet/ wash hand basins	76%
Water supply	96%
Electricity	47%
Composting	59%
Communal office	36%
Base	**137**

3.26. Only 10% were interested in using allotments. These were more attractive to males (15%) compared to females (8%) and among those aged less than 54 years.

3.27. Of those who were interested in allotments, three fifths would be willing to travel up to one mile to reach the site (60%). In terms of facilities, most thought that a water supply (96%) washing facilities (76%) and composting (59%) were essential.

Community Involvement & Volunteering

3.28. Panel members were also asked about how involved they felt in their local community (Table 3.10). The findings from the Scottish Household Survey for those saying that they were involved a great deal or a fair amount is given alongside.

Table 3.10: Level of Involvement in Community

Level of Involvement	2004	2002	2000 SHS South Lanarkshire	2000 SHS Scotland
A great deal	3%	5%	29%	26%
A fair amount	28%	29%		
Not very much	52%	50%		
Not at all	15%	16%		
Don't know	2%	<1%		

3.29. Just under a third felt that they were involved in their communities 'a fair amount'/'a great deal' (31%). Only 3% felt that they were a great deal involved. These findings suggest that Panel members in 2004 still feel somewhat more, but not significantly more, involved in their community than a cross-section of the South Lanarkshire population.

3.30. The questionnaire also asked about volunteering for charities and local groups. The question was consistent with the Scottish Household Survey. The results can be compared with the SHS findings for the population of South Lanarkshire as a whole.

Table 3.11: Rates and Level of Volunteering in Community

Volunteering	2004	2002	2003 SHS South Lanarkshire	2003 SHS Scotland
Yes	52%	60%	22%	24%
No	46%	37%	78%	76%
Don't know/can't remember	2%	2%		
Level				
One	49%	48%	-	-
More than one	51%	52%	-	-

3.31. This shows that Panel members are not typical of the general population, since they are three times as likely to have volunteered. This is consistent with their volunteering to join the Panel, so it should not come as a surprise. Volunteering is somewhat lower in South Lanarkshire than in the whole of Scotland.

3.32. Those who volunteer were next asked if that was for one particular club or charity etc or for more than one. Comparable to 2002, about half said that it was for one organisation (49%) with the other half saying more than one (51%).

3.33. In 2004, people were next asked what types of voluntary activities they had taken part in (Table 3.12).

Table 3.12: Voluntary Activities in Past Year

Activity	**%**	**n**
Hobbies/ social clubs	23%	309
Health, disability & welfare groups	9%	120
Sports/ exercise groups	35%	471
Political groups	4%	49
Local community/ neighbourhood groups	13%	176
Trade Union groups	3%	47
Groups for children/ young people	15%	204
Religious groups	18%	248
Adult education groups	6%	79
Environmental groups	3%	36
Groups for older people	8%	114
Others	7%	98
None	31%	420
Base (no. of responses)		**2,371**

3.34. Involvement in sports/ exercise groups (35%) and hobbies/ social clubs (23%) were the main forms of volunteer activity reported by respondents.

Summary

3.35. The main points were:

- The majority of residents expressed satisfaction with their homes. Over three fifths were very satisfied with the general condition inside their home (62%), but this dropped to half when commenting about the outside of their property (50%). The proportions who were very satisfied increased from 2002, most notably regarding the external condition of their property (+7%);

- Most were also satisfied with the size (90%) and type of home (88%). Satisfaction levels with size and type of homes were relatively unchanged from 2002;

- Owner-occupiers were more satisfied than renters with the internal and external condition of their home, and with size and type;

- Only 4% were planning to move home in the next twelve months and a further 13% when possible;

- The main reasons for wanting to move home concerned a bigger house (24%), downsizing to a smaller house (15%) and because of anti-social behaviour problems in the neighbourhood (11%);

- There was an appreciable increase from 2002 in those who claimed to ‘always’ recycle glass, paper and other household waste and a decline in the percentage of those who never recycled. Only around a third said that they never recycled glass, plastic bags or bottles, or other household waste;

- Nearly three fifths claimed that they always or usually recycled paper, while this was the case for nearly a half for glass, plastic bags and plastic bottles;

- Having a varied/ wider range of recycling banks in the one place (51%) was the biggest factor that people said would help them recycle more often;

- Only 10% were interested in using allotments. Of those who were interested, three fifths would be willing to travel up to one mile to reach the site (60%). In terms of facilities, most thought that a water supply (96%) washing facilities (76%) and composting (59%) were essential;

- Just under a third felt that they were involved in their communities ‘a fair amount’/ ‘a great deal’ (31%). Only 3% felt that they were a great deal involved;

- Over half were involved in volunteering activities (52%): a reduction of 8% from 2002. Just under half were involved in one activity (49%); and

- Involvement in sports/ exercise groups (35%) and hobbies/ social clubs (23%) were the main forms of volunteer activity reported by respondents.

4. WORK

4.1. The next part of the survey asked about respondents' work and training.

Employment Prospects in South Lanarkshire

4.2. A slightly different question was asked about employment prospects in 2002 and 2004. In 2002 and 2004 Panel members were asked "Overall, how do you rate employment prospects in this part of Scotland?" compared with a question in 2000 about employment prospects in South Lanarkshire. Being situated where it is, South Lanarkshire is a far from self-contained labour market, and significant numbers of residents are employed in Glasgow, North Lanarkshire or elsewhere (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Perceptions of Employment Prospects Over Time

Employment Prospects	2004	2002	2000
Very good	3%	3%	4%
Fairly good	35%	32%	36%
Neither good nor poor	46%	35%	36%
Fairly poor	14%	25%	19%
Very poor	3%	6%	5%

4.3. Only nearly two fifths rated employment prospect as good (38%). Despite the changes in wording, the results are very similar, but only slightly less pessimistic than in 2002. Compared to 2002, there was a slight increase in the proportions who rated prospects as good but those who saw prospects as poor appreciably reduced from 31% to 17%.

4.4. While there were no differences by gender in perceptions of employment prospects, there were age differences: those in key socio-economic groups aged 18-44 were more likely to rate prospects as good (42%) compared to those aged 45-64 (36%) and 65+ (29%). There were no differences in terms of the proportions rating prospects as poor.

4.5. As in 2002, those in East Kilbride were by far the most optimistic, with almost half rating employment prospects to be good (47% but -3% compared to 2002). Those in Hamilton also reasonably optimistic and appreciably more so compared to 2002 (41% and +14% compared to 2002). In contrast, in those in Clydesdale and Rutherglen & Cambuslang residents were much less optimistic, at 28% (+1% on 2002) and 30% (+2% on 2002) respectively.

Barriers to Employment

4.6. Panel members were asked to say if they have experienced any barriers to getting a job (Table 4.2).

4.7. The top two "barriers" are the same as in previous surveys. However, as in 2002, the percentage mentioning each of these has gone down in 2004. This is consistent with the finding that 65% never experienced any of these problems. The findings have been presented in the same way as in 2002, as a percentage of all respondents to the questionnaire and not as a percentage of those answering this question.

Table 4.2: Barriers to Employment Experienced Over Time

Barriers to Employment Experienced	2004	% Change from 02	2002	2000
Wages too low	10%	-6	16%	24%
Lack of job opportunities	6%	-6	12%	20%
Availability of public transport	4%	-8	12%	18%
Caring for children	5%	-5	10%	11%
Travel costs	3%	-6	9%	16%
Lack of computer skills			11%	11%
Lack of information about job opportunities	3%	-5	8%	13%
Lack of experience	6%	-2	8%	11%
Long term sickness	6%	-1	7%	10%
Disability	5%	-1	6%	
Lack education or training[11]	3%	-3	6%	7%
Lack of skills in general	6%	+1	5%	7%
Caring for a dependent adult relative	2%	-3	5%	4%
Discrimination	4%	-1	5%	
Age barriers				4%
Physical accessibility	1%	0	1%	
	0%			
Other	8%	+1	7%	2%
Never experienced any of above	65%	+23	42%	

Willingness to Work in Different Locations

4.8. Willingness to work in different locations has not changed significantly since 2000, or indeed since the first survey in 1998 (Table 4.3). Again, in 2004, residents are more willing to accept work if it is close to their homes: 69% would definitely be willing to work within a mile from home, and a further 49% would definitely be willing to work within their own homes. The two main centres in South Lanarkshire, East Kilbride and Hamilton, had nearly half saying they would definitely work there. Rutherglen & Cambuslang and Clydesdale were relatively less attractive locations, as in 2002.

Table 4.3: Willingness to Work in Different Locations Over Time[12]

Locations where willing to work in suitable job	2004				2002		
	Base	Definitely	Perhaps	Never	Definitely	Perhaps	Never
Own home	**830**	49%	22%	29%	61%	29%	10%
Within a mile from home	**829**	69%	9%	22%	87%	11%	2%
East Kilbride	**828**	46%	20%	34%	63%	23%	14%
Hamilton	**829**	44%	25%	31%	58%	29%	13%
Rutherglen & Cambuslang	**828**	35%	24%	41%	46%	30%	24%
Lanark/Clydesdale	**830**	26%	26%	48%	36%	33%	31%
North Lanarkshire	**830**	25%	30%	45%	32%	43%	25%
Glasgow	**830**	35%	26%	39%	45%	33%	22%
Elsewhere	**801**	12%	21%	67%	30%	30%	40%

[11] This item was previously listed as ‘Time needed for Education and Training’.
[12] Those who described themselves as retired were excluded from the analysis.

Employment and Travel to Work

4.9. There was no substantive change in the proportions of those in paid employment over 2002 to 2004 (Table 4.4). People were also asked about their methods of travel to work.

4.10. Working respondents were asked to give their main method of travel to work. More than three-quarters of those in paid employment 76% usually travel to work by private motor vehicle, an increase of 2% from 2002, which was in turn an increase of 4% from 2000.

4.11. This small change may be to do with changes in Panel membership, and in terms of Panel composition the relative increase in the proportion of owners compared to tenants.

Table 4.4: Paid Employment and Travel to Work Over Time

In Paid Employment	2004	2002	2003 SHS South Lanarkshire	2003 SHS Scotland
Yes	56%	58%	51%	52%
No	44%	42%	49%	48%
Base	**1349**			
Travel to Work		**2002**	**2003 SHS South Lanarkshire**	**2003 SHS Scotland**
Private motor vehicle/motorbike	76%	74%	72%	65%
On foot	9%	7%	12%	15%
Bicycle	2%	1%	1%	2%
Bus	7%	9%	9%	13%
Train	6%	3%	4%	3%
Other	3%	4%	3%	2%

4.12. Those in paid employment are more likely to travel to their jobs by car and less likely to travel on foot or by bus than the employed population of South Lanarkshire as a whole. A slight increase in travel to work by bicycle is reflected in 2004. This may reflect increased safety measures on roads for cyclists.

4.13. Car use is greater in parts of Scotland like South Lanarkshire than in the major cities, where it is more feasible for a larger percentage of the working population to walk to work or to take the bus.

Recent Education or Training

4.14. Respondents were next asked if they had undertaken any education or training during the past year. Panel members were first asked if they had received training directly related to their jobs (Table 4.5). There was an increase from 2002 in most categories, particularly in training that does not lead to a qualification. The 2004 figures for training leading to a qualification were consistent with those in 2000.

Table 4.5: Job Related Training Over Time

Training directly related to job	2004	2002	2000
Yes – leading to a qualification	14%	11%	13%
Yes – not leading to a qualification	28%	23%	37%
Yes – both	4%	4%	8%
No	53%	62%	42%
Base	**1083**		

4.15. Next we asked people about training not related to their job (Table 4.6). Again they were asked if they undertaken any such education or training during the past year. The responses are set out in the table below

Table 4.6: Non-Job Related Training Over Time

Training not related to job	2004	2002	2000
Yes – leading to a qualification	6%	3%	7%
Yes – not leading to a qualification	9%	3%	5%
Yes – both	1%	<1%	1%
No	84%	93%	87%
Base	**754**		

4.16. Levels of training were both leading to and not leading to qualifications was increased from 2002, especially in training not leading to a qualification.

4.17. Finally, those who were not in paid employment while undertaking training were asked if they had undertaken any education or training during the past year (Table 4.7). The reported levels of training were higher than in 2002.

Table 4.7: Training While Not Employed Over Time

Training not related to job	2004	2002	2000
Yes – leading to a qualification	5%	3%	7%
Yes – not leading to a qualification	4%	3%	5%
Yes – both	1%	<1	1%
No	90%	93%	87%
Base	**720**		

Barriers to Training Opportunities in South Lanarkshire

4.18. The main perceived barriers to taking up learning and training opportunities were similar to those identified in 2002 (Table 4.8). However, in 2004 in general, more mentioned each of these barriers.

Table 4.8: Perceived Barriers to Training Over Time

Barriers to taking up training opportunities	2004	% Change from 02	2002	2000
Other commitments	40%	+8	32%	35%
Not enough time				33%
Lack of information about opportunities	30%	+9	21%	29%
Lack of finance	18%	-1	19%	26%
Lack of guidance/advice about opportunities	19%	+4	15%	18%
Courses not available for what you want to do	16%	+2	14%	16%
Not interested	17%	+8	9%	8%
Disability	9%	+2	7%	
The colleges/training facilities are not user friendly	3%	+1	2%	6%
Not eligible for the course you want to do	3%	0%	3%	5%
Language difficulties	0%			
Childcare	9%			
Adult care	2%			
Other	16%	+7	9%	2%

Attitudes to Starting a Business
In 2004, we asked for views on a four statements about business start up (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Attitudes to Business Start Up)

Statement	Yes	No	Don't know	Base
Do you know personally someone who has started a business in South Lanarkshire in the last two years	24%	70%	6%	**1,327**
Do you think there are good opportunities to start a business in this area in the next six months	19%	16%	65%	**1,313**
Do you think you have the knowledge, skills and experience to start a business	32%	42%	26%	**1,295**
Would fear of failure prevent you from starting business	42%	37%	21%	**1,283**

4.19. While almost a quarter knew someone who had started a business in South Lanarkshire in the past two years (24%), less than a fifth thought that good opportunities existed to start a business (19%). This is despite almost a third believing that they had the knowledge, skills and experience to start a business (32%) and less than two fifths not being put off by fear of failure (37%). Fear of failure was psychological barrier for 42%.

4.20. Not surprisingly, the self-employed were the most likely to know someone who had started a business in the last two years (43%) but despite being the most likely to think that there were good opportunities to start a business, only nearly a third thought so (32% compared to 18% of the full-time employed). Again the self-employed were the most likely to think that they had the knowledge, skills and experience to start a business (75% compared to 38% of the full-time employed and 45% of the part-time employed), and the least likely to be put off by fear of failure (28% compared to 52% of the full-time employed).

4.21. In terms of age, and among active socio-economic groups, there were no appreciable differences in terms of knowing people who had started businesses, knowledge and skills to start a business, or perceptions of opportunities. However, those aged 18-44 years were less confident and more likely to report fear of failure (52% compared to 43% among those aged 45-64 years).

4.22. The area variations are shown below (Table 4.10). Those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang were the least likely to know someone who had started a business, that there were good opportunities and that they had appropriate knowledge and skills to start a business.

Table 4.10: Attitudes to Business Start Up by Area

Statement – Yes Responses	**Clydesdale**	**East Kilbride**	**Hamilton**	**Rutherglen & Cambuslang**	**Scotland (GEM)**
Do you know personally someone who has started a business in South Lanarkshire in the last two years	29%	25%	24%	19%	30%
Do you think there are good opportunities to start a business in this area in the next six months	17%	21%	23%	15%	37%
Do you think you have the knowledge, skills and experience to start a business	35%	30%	35%	27%	53%
Would fear of failure prevent you from starting business	43%	40%	44%	40%	34%

4.23. The figures for the four areas of South Lanarkshire are compared to the findings from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor survey undertaken across Scotland in 2004. (Indeed, the questions were taken from the GEM survey.) In every area of South Lanarkshire, attitudes are less "entrepreneurial" than for Scotland as a whole.

Summary

4.24. The main points were:

- Only nearly two fifths rated employment prospect as good (38%). The results are very similar, but only slightly less pessimistic than in 2002. Compared to 2002, there was a slight increase in the proportions who rated prospects as good but those who saw prospects as poor appreciably reduced from 31% to 17%;
- Those in key socio-economic age groups aged 18-44 were more likely to rate prospects as good (42%) compared to those aged 45-64 (36%) and 65+ (29%);
- As in 2002, those in East Kilbride were by far the most optimistic, with almost half rating employment prospects to be good (47%). Those in Hamilton also reasonably optimistic (41%). In contrast, in those in Clydesdale (28%) and Rutherglen & Cambuslang (30%);
- The main barrier to getting a job was similar to 2002 and concerned low wages (10%);
- As in 2002, residents are more willing to accept work if it is close to their homes: 69% would definitely be willing to work within a mile from home, and a further 49% would definitely be willing to work within their own homes;
- 56% were in paid employment and 76% travelled to work using a private motor vehicle;
- 42% undertook training directly related to their job in the past year (14% leading to a qualification, 28% leading to no qualification);
- 16% undertook non-job related training in the pasty year (6% leading to a qualification, 4% leading to no qualification);
- 9% of those not in paid employment had undertaken training in the past year (6% leading to a qualification, 9% leading to no qualification);
- Other commitments/ time (40%) and lack of opportunities (30%) were the main barriers to undertaking learning and training opportunities; and
- While almost a quarter knew someone who had started a business in South Lanarkshire in the past two years (24%), less than a fifth thought that good opportunities existed to start a business (19%). This is despite almost a third believing that they had the knowledge, skills and experience to start a business (32%) and less than two fifths not being put off by fear of failure (37%). Fear of failure was a psychological barrier for 42%.

5. HEALTH AND WELLBEING

5.1. Panel members were asked a series of questions about their current state of health. The questions asked in 2004 were largely consistent with those in 2002 enabling comparisons to be made.

General Health

5.2. As in 2002, there were no differences in general health by gender, although there were age differences. Respondents' views on their general health, by age band, are given in Table 5.1A. The percentage changes from 2002 are given in Table 5.1B.

Table 5.1A: Perceptions of General Health by Age

Perceptions of Health	<44	45 - 64	65>	All
Excellent	24%	11%	5%	12%
Very good	43%	37%	28%	37%
Good	20%	28%	33%	26%
Fair	7%	16%	27%	7%
Poor	5%	9%	7%	7%

Table 5.1B: Changes in Perceptions of General Health Over Time

Perceptions of Health	<44	45 - 64	65>	All
Excellent	+4	+1	+1	+2
Very good	0	+9	+1	+2
Good	-5	+3	-1	-3
Fair	+1	-1	-3	-9
Poor	0	-1	+2	0

5.3. There was little change in overall ratings from 2002 and three quarters described their general health as between good and excellent (75%). Only 7% described their health as poor.

Health over last four weeks

5.4. Next we asked about general health over the past four weeks. Respondents' views are given in Table 5.2A. The percentage changes from 2002 are given in Table 5.2B. (Table 5.2). .

Table 5.2A: Health Over Last Four Weeks

Have You…	All of the Time	Most of the Time	A Good Bit of the Time	A Little of the Time	None of the Time
Felt calm and peaceful	4%	39%	30%	23%	4%
Had a lot of energy	4%	31%	34%	25%	7%
Felt downhearted and low	2%	6%	12%	54%	27%

Table 5.2B: Health Over Last Four Weeks - Changes Over Time

Have You…	All of the Time	Most of the Time	A Good Bit of the Time	A Little of the Time	None of the Time
Felt calm and peaceful	+1	+9	+9	+10	+1
Had a lot of energy	0	+9	+12	+11	0
Felt downhearted and low	0	+2	+3	+15	+8

5.5. Over two fifths had felt calm and peaceful all or most of the time (43%). There were differences by age but not gender. As in 2002, while only 32% of those aged 18-44 had felt calm all or most of the time, this was the case for 43% of those aged 45-64 and 63% of those aged 65 and over.

5.6. Just over a third felt that they had a lot of energy all or most of the time (35%). Again there were differences by age but not gender. As in 2002, 39% of those aged 18-44 had felt energetic all or most of the time. This was the case for 35% of those aged 45-64 and 29% of those aged 65 and over.

5.7. On feeling downhearted and low, 81% said that they felt this way a little or none of the time.

5.8. A similar scale was used to ask how much of their time over the last 4 weeks their health or emotional problems had interfered with their social activities (Table 5.3). The percentage change from 2002 is in brackets.

5.9. On this indicator, 10% said that they had been affected all or most of the time. The figures were consistent with those in 2002.

Table 5.3: Impact of Health Problems and Changes Over Time (%)

Have you had health or emotional problems interfere with your social activities	All of the Time	Most of the Time	Some of the Time	A Little of the Time	None of the Time
	4%	6%	18%	17%	52%
	-1	+1	+1	0	+2

Support Networks

5.10. Next, respondents were asked whether, if they felt the need, they had somebody they could approach for emotional support. Their views are given in Table 5.4A. The percentage changes from 2002 are given in Table 5.4B.

Table 5.4A: Access to Social Support Networks

Know someone who…	Definitely	Probably	Not sure	Probably not	Definitely not
will listen	72%	20%	4%	2%	2%
will help in crisis	73%	20%	4%	2%	1%
you can relax with	71%	17%	4%	2%	1%
really appreciates you	66%	21%	8%	3%	2%
you can count on to comfort you	73%	18%	5%	3%	2%

Table 5.4B: Access to Social Support Networks - Changes Over Time

Know someone who…	Definitely	Probably	Not sure	Probably not	Definitely not
will listen	+1	-1	+1	-1	0
will help in crisis	+2	+1	+1	0	0
you can relax with	+4	-1	-1	-1	0
really appreciates you	+1	0	+2	0	0
you can count on to comfort you	+2	+1	0	0	0

5.11. On each indicator, as in 2002, females were more likely to say that they definitely had somebody to whom they could turn than males (by 12% on listening and helping in a crisis). On other issues issue the gap was relatively closer (between 7-8%).

5.12. While younger age groups (18-44) were more likely to report that they definitely had somebody to whom they could turn than older age groups, the differences were only slight. This is not surprising as networks are likely to diminish by age because of mortality.

Feelings about Life

5.13. Then a question was asked about how respondents felt about life “just now”. They were given a series of opposites, such as “boring” and “interesting” and were asked about how they felt on a five-point scale. Respondents’ views are given in Table 5.5A. The percentage changes from 2002 views are given in Table 5.5B.

Table 5.5A: Feelings About Life

Feeling about life just now	Very Much the Former	A Bit the Former	Neither Nor	A Bit the Latter	Very Much the Latter
Boring/interesting	3%	15%	26%	27%	30%
Enjoyable/miserable	35%	32%	18%	10%	3%
Tied down/free	8%	24%	33%	16%	17%
Full/empty	43%	23%	25%	7%	2%
Easy/hard	15%	21%	36%	23%	6%
Frustrating/fulfilling	6%	22%	28%	26%	19%
Full of fun/no fun at all	13%	39%	32%	10%	2%
Unsuccessful/successful	3%	8%	31%	38%	20%
Unhappy/happy	2%	10%	23%	28%	37%

Table 5.5B: Feelings About Life – Changes Over Time

Feeling about life just now	Very Much the Former	A Bit the Former	Neither Nor	A Bit the Latter	Very Much the Latter
Boring/interesting	0	+3	+3	+2	0
Enjoyable/miserable	+2	+1	+2	+1	0
Tied down/free	-1	+2	+5	0	+2
Full/empty	+6	-3	+4	0	0
Easy/hard	+3	+2	+2	+2	0
Frustrating/fulfilling	-1	0	+8	0	+2
Full of fun/no fun at all	+2	0	+4	+1	-1
Unsuccessful/successful	-1	-1	+6	+1	+2
Unhappy/happy	+2	0	+5	-5	+6

5.14. As in 2002, most found life interesting (57%), enjoyable (67%), full (66%), fulfilling (45%), full of fun (52%), successful (58%) and happy (65%). The sample was evenly split about whether they were tied down/ free and whether life was easy/ hard.

5.15. Differences by gender were marginal. There were some differences by age. As in 2002, older people aged 65 and over felt life was more enjoyable (77%), free (46%), very much easier (55%) and fulfilling (51%) than other age groups. Those aged 45-65 found life more enjoyable (38%) and full (37%) than younger age groups. These age differences may be explained by less domestic and working commitments among older age groups.

Dental Hygiene

5.16. In 2004 we asked three questions about dental hygiene. Firstly, whether people were registered and had visited a dentist by gender (Table 5.6).

Table 5.6: Previous Visit to Dentist by Gender

Registered	All	Male	Female
Yes (NHS)	73%	70%	75%
Yes (Private)	14%	14%	14%
No	13%	17%	12%
Base	**1,338**	**486**	**852**
Time Period			
Within past 6 months	64%	59%	66%
6-12 months ago	14%	14%	14%
Over 12 months ago	22%	27%	19%
Base	**1,341**	**484**	**857**

5.17. Most were registered with a dentist (87%), mainly NHS (73%) and had visited a dentist in the past six months (64%) and year (14%). Given that regular dental visits are usually scheduled in six monthly intervals the figures would suggest that nearly four fifths are in regular contact with a dentist (although we do not know this for certain and directly because of the likelihood of some making one-off visits for problems that arise incidentally).

5.18. Females were slightly more likely to be registered with a dentist compared to males (89% compared to 84%) and to have made visits within the past six months (66% compared to 59%) Although a majority in both groups had made visits over the past year, males were also slightly more likely to have made their last visit more than twelve months ago. These gender differences would suggest the likelihood of better oral health among females than males.

5.19. We would also expect dental registration and visits to diminish with age. This was confirmed in the data. Those aged 18-44 were more likely to be registered with a dentist (94% compared to 87% among those aged 45-64 and 75% among those aged 65 and over) and to have visited a dentist within the last six (71% compared to 64% among those aged 45-64 and 52% among those aged 65 and over) and twelve (19% compared to 13% among those aged 45-64 and 10% among those aged 65 and over) months.

5.20. We also asked about the costs and benefits of dental health on people's quality of life (Table 5.7).

Table 5.7: Costs and Benefits of Dental Health on Quality of Life

Impact	Negative	Positive
Eating/ enjoyment of food	39%	64%
Ability to socialise	8%	32%
Comfort	37%	48%
Smiling and laughing	29%	61%
Embarrassment	23%	
Appearance	39%	69%
Bad breath	27%	
Cost of treatment	44%	
General health and well-being	20%	56%
Ability to work/ do jobs	4%	16%
Confidence	28%	55%
Romantic relationships	12%	22%
Speech	10%	25%
Ability to relax/ sleep	10%	17%
Personality	13%	28%
Mood	14%	29%
Base (no. of responses) Multiple responses allowed	**2,369**	**5,378**

5.21. Respondents were twice as more likely to identify positive than negative quality of life effects associated with dental health. The main negative effects were the costs of treatment (44%), eating (39%), appearance (39%) and comfort (37%). The main positive effects were for appearance (69%), eating (64%) smiling (61%).

Long-term Illness

5.22. We asked a few questions about illness: about whether people had a long-term condition and/or illness that interfered with their day to day activities and what this condition was (Table 5.8).

Table 5.8: Incidence of Illness and Type by Age

Long-term condition/ illness	All	18-44	45-64	65+
Yes	28%	17%	30%	40%
No	72%	83%	70%	60%
Base	**1327**	**431**	**654**	**257**
Type				
Mental/ emotional problem	19%	32%	20%	8%
A long-term illness (not psychological)	59%	49%	63%	60%
Other	29%	30%	25%	37%
Base (no. of responses)	**391**	**82**	**204**	**100**

5.23. Over a quarter reported that they had a long-term condition and/ or illness that interfered with their day to day activities (28%). As expected, the reported incidence of illness increased with age and was higher among older groups.

5.24. Most reported non-psychological conditions (59%), though mental and emotional problems were almost a fifth (19%). Non-psychological conditions were most reported by those aged 45-64 years (63%) and over 65 years (60%), while psychological conditions were most reported by those aged 18-44 years (32%).

Work and Health

5.25. We asked about whether people had a health problem made worse by the work they did and whether they had seen a doctor in the past four weeks because of this (Table 5.9).

Table 5.9: Health Problems Caused by Work

Health Problem (work)	**2004**	**2002**
Yes	11%	11%
No	58%	48%
Not in work	31%	38%
Base	**1,324**	**817**
Visited a Doctor/ health professional in past 4 weeks		
Yes	11%	15%
No	89%	76%
Base	**1,276**	**478**

5.26. The 2004 figures were consistent with 2002 and there was a slight reduction in those reporting health problems made worse by work (16% of those in work in 2004 and 18% in 2002) and visiting a doctor/ health professional (11% in 2004).

Access to Health Services

5.27. In 2004, we asked two questions about access to health services. Firstly, we asked about local access to health sites (Table 5.10) and about difficulties in getting access to professionals in these settings (Table 5.12).

Table 5.10: Local Access to Health Sites

Rating	**GPs**	**Hospitals**	**Dentists**
Very good	46%	22%	31%
Fairly good	41%	46%	44%
Fairly poor	8%	18%	10%
Very poor	4%	10%	5%
Don’t know	2%	4%	10%
Base	**1,373**	**1373**	**1,372**

5.28. Most rated local access to GPs as good (87%) and almost half as ‘very good’ (46%). Only 12% thought local access was poor. A similar picture emerged for dentists (75%) where nearly a third rated access as ‘very good’. Nevertheless, over a quarter rated local access as poor

5.29. Hospitals however serve a wider population base than these other services but despite this 68% rated local access as good and over a fifth as 'very good'. Unlike dentists however, only 15% rated access as poor.

5.30. We also looked at views on local access by area (Table 5.11).

Table 5.11: Access to Health Services by Area

GP Rating	**Clydesdale**	**East Kilbride**	**Hamilton**	**Rutherglen/ Cambuslang**
Very good	38%	46%	43%	56%
Fairly good	40%	42%	44%	36%
Fairly poor	14%	7%	8%	4%
Very poor	7%	3%	4%	2%
Don't know	1%	2%	1%	2%
Base	**294**	**381**	**361**	**333**
Hospitals Rating				
Very good	15%	40%	17%	15%
Fairly good	46%	48%	50%	38%
Fairly poor	22%	7%	21%	26%
Very poor	14%	2%	8%	16%
Don't know	3%	3%	3%	5%
Base	**294**	**381**	**361**	**333**
Dentists Rating				
Very good	20%	33%	29%	15%
Fairly good	43%	43%	47%	38%
Fairly poor	15%	9%	11%	7%
Very poor	10%	5%	5%	2%
Don't know	12%	9%	8%	10%
Base	**294**	**381**	**361**	**333**

5.31. The main points arising from these figures were:

- Those most likely to rate access to GPs as good were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (92%), East Kilbride (88%) and Hamilton (87%). In more rural parts of South Lanarkshire in Clydesdale less thought access to GPs was good (78%) and over a fifth rated access as poor (21%);

- Those most likely to rate access to hospitals as good were in East Kilbride (88%). Those in Hamilton (67%), Clydesdale (61%) and Rutherglen & Cambuslang (57%) were far less likely to rate access as good. Over two fifths in Rutherglen & Cambuslang rated local hospital access as poor (42%) compared to only 9% in East Kilbride; and

- Those most likely to rate access to dentists as good were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (82%), East Kilbride (76%) and Hamilton (76%). In more rural parts of South Lanarkshire in Clydesdale far less thought access to dentists was good (43%) and over a third rated access as poor (35%).

5.32. Those who reported long-term medical conditions (Table 5.8) and had dependent children gave similar ratings to service access for to GPs and hospitals. We then asked about perceived difficulties accessing health professionals (Table 5.12).

Table 5.12: Difficulties in Access to Health Professionals[13]

Rating	Getting a GP Appointment	GP Home Visit	Physio/ Chiropodist Appointment	Dental Appointment
Great difficulty	10%	27%	12%	5%
Some difficulty	43%	28%	36%	25%
No difficulty	47%	45%	45%	70%
Base	**1,325**	**739**	**937**	**1,178**

5.33. Most reported difficulty in getting a GP appointment (53%) and particularly a home visit (56%). A physiotherapy/chiropractor (48%) and dental (30%) appointment were less difficult. While local access to health services was largely unproblematic (Table 5.9), we have evidence here of the pressures on GP services and problems of user access.

5.34. We also looked at views on local difficulties by area (Table 5.13).

Table 5.13: Difficulties in Access to Health Professionals by Area

GP Appointment	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen/ Cambuslang
Great difficulty	13%	9%	13%	6%
Some difficulty	41%	47%	49%	34%
No difficulty	46%	44%	38%	59%
Base	**288**	**362**	**353**	**322**
GP Home Visit				
Great difficulty	26%	30%	30%	19%
Some difficulty	30%	28%	32%	24%
No difficulty	44%	42%	38%	56%
Base	**172**	**185**	**206**	**176**
Physio/ Chiropractor Appointment				
Great difficulty	14%	14%	13%	9%
Some difficulty	38%	39%	33%	33%
No difficulty	48%	48%	54%	58%
Base	**206**	**237**	**261**	**233**
Dental Appointment				
Great difficulty	9%	5%	5%	2%
Some difficulty	31%	30%	21%	20%
No difficulty	60%	66%	74%	78%
Base	**249**	**323**	**320**	**333**

[13] We excluded those who did not know or for whom the question was not applicable from the analysis because of the relatively high numbers choosing this option.

5.35. The main points arising from these figures were:

- Those most likely to experience least difficulty getting a GP appointment were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (59%). While most in East Kilbride (56%) and Clydesdale (54%) reported difficulty, this was most acute for those in Hamilton (62%);

- Those most likely to experience least difficulty getting a GP home visit were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (56%). While most in East Kilbride (58%) and Clydesdale (56%) reported difficulty, this was most acute for those in Hamilton (62%);

- Those most likely to experience least difficulty getting a physiotherapy/ chiropractor appointment were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (58%) and Hamilton (54%) compared to East Kilbride (48%) and Clydesdale (48%); and

- Those most likely to experience least difficulty getting a dental appointment were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (78%) and Hamilton (74%) compared to East Kilbride (66%) and Clydesdale (60%).

5.36. Those who reported long-term medical conditions (Table 5.8) and had dependent children gave similar ratings to service access for to GPs.

5.37. Finally we asked people to give us their views about their experience of using health services (Table 5.14).

Table 5.14: Views on Health Services

Statement	Definitely	To Some Extent	No	Don't know
Given adequate information about condition/ treatment	48%	40%	7%	5%
Encouraged to participate in decisions about your health	47%	39%	7%	7%
Consulted/ made aware of changes in local health services	10%	32%	49%	9%
Consulted about wider changes in NHS	5%	18%	68%	10%

5.38. While most felt that they were given adequate information (88% and almost half, 48%, were definite), and encouraged to participate in decisions about their treatment (86% and almost half, 47%, were definite), they felt less involved in changes to local (42%) and especially national (23%) health services.

5.39. There were no area differences in people's views on using services.

5.40. Those who reported long-term medical conditions (Table 5.8) gave similar ratings to service information and involvement compared to those with no conditions.

Summary

5.41. The main points were:

- Three quarters described their general health as good/ excellent (75%). Only 7% described their health as poor;
- Over two fifths had felt calm and peaceful all or most of the time (43%);
- Just over a third felt that they had a lot of energy all or most of the time (35%);
- Only 8% said that they felt downhearted and low all or most of the time;
- Only 10% said that their social activities during the past four weeks had been affected by health or emotional problems all or most of the time;
- Nearly three quarters had someone they could who would listen (72%), help in a crisis (73%), who they could relax with (71%) and could offer comfort (73%). Two thirds had someone who really appreciated them (66%);
- As in 2002, most found life interesting (57%), enjoyable (67%), full (66%), fulfilling (45%), full of fun (52%), successful (58%) and happy (65). The sample was evenly split about whether they were tied down/ free and whether life was easy/ hard.
- Most were registered with a dentist (87%), mainly NHS (73%) and had visited a dentist in the past six months (64%) and year (14%);
- Respondents were twice as more likely to identify positive than negative quality of life effects associated with dental health. The main negative effects were the costs of treatment (44%), eating (39%), appearance (39%) and comfort (37%). The main positive effects were for appearance (69%), eating (64%) smiling (61%);
- Over a quarter reported that they had a long-term condition and/ or illness that interfered with their day to day activities (28%). Most reported non-psychological conditions (59%), though mental and emotional problems were almost a fifth (19%);
- There was a slight reduction in those reporting health problems made worse by work (16% of those in work in 2004 and 18% in 2002) and visiting a doctor/ health professional (11% in 2004);
- Most rated local access to GPs as good (87%) and almost half as ‘very good’ (46%). Only 12% thought local access was poor. A similar picture emerged for dentists (75%) where nearly a third rated access as ‘very good’. Nevertheless, over a quarter rated local access as poor;
- 68% rated local access to hospitals as good and over a fifth as ‘very good’ (22%). Only 15% rated access as poor;

- Those most likely to rate access to GPs as good were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (92%), East Kilbride (88%) and Hamilton (87%) compared to Clydesdale (78%) where over a fifth rated access as poor (21%);

- Those most likely to rate access to hospitals as good were in East Kilbride (88%) compared to Hamilton (67%), Clydesdale (61%) and Rutherglen & Cambuslang (57%);

- Those most likely to rate access to dentists as good were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (82%), East Kilbride (76%) and Hamilton (76%) compared to Clydesdale (43%) where over a third rated access as poor (35%);

- Most reported difficulty in getting a GP appointment (53%) and particularly a home visit (56%). A physiotherapy/ chiropractor(48%) and dental (30%) appointment were less difficult;

- Those most likely to experience least difficulty getting a GP appointment (59%), a GP home visit (56%), a physiotherapy/ chiropractor appointment (58%) and a dental appointment (78%) were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (59%); and

- While most felt that they were given adequate information (88%) and encouraged to participate in decisions about their treatment (86%), they felt less involved in changes to local (42%) and especially national (23%) health services.

6. TRANSPORT

6.1. In 2004, we asked about people's views on public transport.

Use of Public Transport

6.2. Respondents were asked how often they normally used public transport in the past six months (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1: Frequency of Use of Public Transport

Frequency	%
Daily	13%
Once or twice a week.	14%
Fortnightly	4%
Monthly	5%
Now and again	37%
Never/ not at all	27%
Base	**1,365**

6.3. Only 27% were daily/ weekly public transport users and most were occasional or non-users (64%). The figures were generally consistent with what we already know of typical travel patterns in the area and the greater reliance on private motor vehicles[14] (see also Table 4.4).

6.4. Those using public transport daily/ once per week were more likely to be:

- Living in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (41%) and East Kilbride (31%) compared to Hamilton (24%) and especially rural areas such as Clydesdale (15%);
- Aged 65 and over (41% compared to those aged 45-64 (25%) and 18-44 (23%); and
- Among renters (52%) as opposed to home owners (24%). Tenure in this instance is a proxy for social class, with greater public transport usage among lower socio-economic groups.

Proximity & Ease of Access to Services

6.5. We also asked about how far people lived from transport services (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2: Proximity to Public Transport

Service Point	1-2 miles	3-4 miles	5+ miles
Nearest bus stop	99%	1%	0%
Nearest train station	65%	18%	17%

[14] See for example, Statistical Bulletin Trn/ 2002/ 6: Household Transport in 2001: Scottish Household Survey Results. Scottish Executive: Edinburgh.

6.6. Most lived up to 1-2 miles from the nearest bus stop (99%) and train station (65%). Those with the most proximity to a train station were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (94%) and Hamilton (63%) compared to East Kilbride (57%) and Clydesdale (48%). These responses are largely consistent with those concerning the availability of public transport in Table 2.9 and travel to work patterns (Table 4.4).

6.7. More of those who described the availability of public transport as 'very' (80%) and 'fairly' (70%) good were likely to live 1-2 miles from the nearest train station compared to those who described transport as 'fairly' (52%) or 'very' (46%) poor. Similarly most of those who used the train to travel to work lived 1-2 miles from the nearest station (88%).

6.8. We asked about whether people had difficulty getting on or off public transport (Table 6.3)[15].

Table 6.3: Perceived Difficulty Getting On or Off Public Transport

Mode	Great difficulty	Some difficulty	No difficulty	Base
Bus	4%	14%	82%	**1,244**
Train	2%	10%	87%	**1,218**

6.9. Most experienced no difficulties getting on/ off buses (82%) and trains (87%). Where difficulties arose they were largely associated with:

- Increasing age and buses were seen as more difficult than trains. Those aged 65 and over reported appreciably more difficulty with getting on/ off a bus (35%) compared to those aged 45-64 (17%) and 18-44 (9%). Similarly, those aged 65 and over reported appreciably more difficulty with getting on/ off a train (23%) compared to those aged 45-64 (12%) and 18-44 (8%); and

- But especially those with long-term condition/ illness and again buses were seen as more difficult than trains. Those with these problems reported appreciably more difficulty with getting on/ off a bus (44%) compared to others (6%). Similarly, those with these problems reported appreciably more difficulty with getting on/ off a train (37%) compared to others (5%).

Barriers to Using Public Transport

6.10. Given that use of public transport services in South Lanarkshire was likely to be relatively low we asked about what factors discouraged people from making more use of these services. Respondents were asked about the main issues that prevent people from using public transport in South Lanarkshire (Table 6.4).

[15] We excluded those who did not know or for whom the question was not applicable from the analysis.

Table 6.4: Factors that Discourage Use of Public Transport

Negative Factors	**%**
Lack of evening/ weekend services	55%
Services that are infrequent or unreliable	61%
Lack of access for disabled/ elderly	33%
Safety concerns at bus stop/ train station	58%
Cost	23%
Safety concerns travelling	46%
Lack of accurate information (timetables/ routes)	47%
Location/ accessibility of bus stops/stations	28%
Other	17%
Base (no. of responses) Multiple responses allowed	**4,937**

6.11. The main disincentives to using public transport were infrequent/ unreliable services (61%), safety concerns at terminal points (58%) and the lack of evening/ weekend services (55%). Costs were only a disincentive for 23%.

6.12. Interestingly, quality issues (in services, their reliability and in waiting facilities) were less prominent, indicating that these were not significantly influential factors as reasons for not using public transport services.

Improving Public Transport

6.13. We asked respondents whether there were improvements that could be made to existing public transport services (Table 6.5).

Table 6.5: Perceived Improvement to Public Transport*

Improvement	**%**	**Most Important**
Enhanced evening/ weekend services	60%	13%
More frequent/ reliable bus services Improved access to train/ bus Safety measures at bus stops/ stations	65% 37% 57%	31% 3% 13%
Cheaper fares	40%	7%
Safety measures on board bus/ train	50%	8%
Improved signage/ information	38%	4%
More accessible bus stops/ stations	28%	3%
Community mini-bus	27%	2%
Dial-a-ride	20%	1%
More varied routes	39%	11%
Other	12%	3%
Base (no. of responses) Multiple responses allowed in first column	**6,186**	**1,155**

6.14. The main suggested improvements (and consistent with the main factors discouraging use in Table 6.4) were increasing the frequency/ reliability of services (65%), enhanced evening/ weekend services (60%) and safety measures at bus stops and bus stations (57%).

6.15. There is a distinction in the proportions of people who identify an improvement, such as increasing the frequency of services, and the degree of importance people attach to any one aspect. Consequently, we asked respondents what were the most important of these improvements. Increasing the frequency/ reliability of services was rated as the most important improvement (31%).

6.16. The most important suggested improvements overall concerned direct service issues such as the frequency of services, the costs of transport and direct services to main terminal destinations.

Summary

6.17. The main points were:

- Only 27% were daily/ weekly public transport users and most were occasional or non-users (64%);
- Most lived up to 1-2 miles from the nearest bus stop (99%) and train station (65%). Those with the most proximity to a train station were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (94%) and Hamilton (63%) compared to East Kilbride (57%) and Clydesdale (48%);
- Most experienced no difficulties getting on/ off buses (82%) and trains (87%);
- The main disincentives to using public transport were infrequent/ unreliable services (61%), safety concerns at terminal points (58%) and the lack of evening/ weekend services (55%). Costs were a disincentive for only 23%;
- The main suggested improvements were increasing the frequency/ reliability of services (65%), enhanced evening/ weekend services (60%) and safety measures at bus stops/ stations (57%); and
- Increasing the frequency/ reliability of services was rated as the most important improvement (31%).

7. POLICING

7.1. In 2004, we asked a number of questions about policing in South Lanarkshire.

Changes to Policing

7.2. We firstly, asked people what one main change they would make to policing in South Lanarkshire (Table 7.1). There were no differences by age or gender and the results are presented for each area.

Table 7.1: Main Change to Policing in South Lanarkshire

Change	All	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen & Cambuslang
Speed of initial response	31%	26%	31%	31%	34%
Getting hold of the police	9%	15%	8%	8%	5%
Information provided by the police	2%	2%	8%	2%	1%
How you are treated	3%	3%	4%	1%	3%
More police in general	47%	43%	46%	52%	47%
Other	9%	11%	8%	6%	10%
Base	**1,361**	**293**	**377**	**358**	**329**

7.3. The main desired changes concerned more police (47%) and the speed of initial response (31%). All other desired changes were appreciably smaller in comparison.

7.4. The main area variations concerned the 15% in Clydesdale who mentioned getting hold of the police and the higher desire in Hamilton for more police (52%).

Crime Levels

7.5. We then asked about people's perceptions of change in the level of crime over the past twelve months in South Lanarkshire (Table 7.2). There were no differences by age and the results are presented for each area.

Table 7.2: Change in Crime Levels Over Past Year by Area

Change	All	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen & Cambuslang
A lot more	12%	15%	12%	12%	11%
A little more	21%	21%	22%	24%	17%
About the same	58%	58%	60%	54%	62%
A little less	7%	5%	5%	9%	9%
A lot less	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Base	**1,314**	**163**	**359**	**347**	**319**

7.6. Nearly three fifths thought that crime levels had stayed the same. A third thought that they had increased (33%), mostly by only a little (21%).

7.7. Those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang were least likely to think that crime had increased, 28%. This compared to 34% in East Kilbride and 36% respectively in Clydesdale and Hamilton.

7.8. Females were slightly more likely to think that crime had increased (36%) compared to males (30%).

Quality of Policing

7.9. Finally, we asked whether people thought that the police in their area did a good job (Table 7.3). The results are presented for each area.

Table 7.3: Ratings of Police in South Lanarkshire by Area[16]

Rating	All	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen & Cambuslang
Very good	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%
Good	25%	24%	22%	29%	26%
Okay	51%	50%	53%	48%	52%
Poor	15%	16%	16%	17%	12%
Very poor	5%	6%	5%	4%	7%
Base	**1,251**	**267**	**344**	**333**	**303**

7.10. Most gave moderate ratings to the police in South Lanarkshire: just over half thought that policing was 'okay' (51%). Just over a quarter thought policing was good (28%) while a fifth thought it was poor (20%).

7.11. Those in East Kilbride were least likely to rate the police as good (26%) and the most likely to provide okay ratings (53%). In East Kilbride and Clydesdale nearly just as many rated the police as good (26% and 28% respectively) as they were poor (21% and 22% respectively).

7.12. Those in Hamilton were the most likely to rate the police as good (32%), while those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang were the least likely to rate them as poor (19%).

7.13. Males were more likely to rate the police as poor (26%) compared to females (17%). Similarly, those aged 65 and over were more likely to rate the police as good (35%) compared to those aged 45-64 (27%) and 18-44 (29%).

7.14. There was also a link between perceptions of crime levels and ratings of the police. Over two fifths of those who thought that crime had increased a lot also thought that policing was poor (42%). Also, a quarter of those who thought that crime had increased a little thought that policing was poor (25%).

[16] We excluded those who expressed no opinion from the analysis.

Summary

7.15. The main points were:

- The main desired changes concerned more police (47%) and the speed of initial response (31%). All other desired changes were appreciably smaller in comparison;

- Nearly three fifths thought that crime levels had stayed the same. A third thought that they had increased (33%), mostly by only a little (21%);

- Most gave moderate ratings to the police in South Lanarkshire: just over half thought that policing was ‘okay’ (51%). Just over a quarter thought policing was good (28%) while a fifth thought it was poor (20%); and

- Those in East Kilbride were least likely to rate the police as good (26%) and the most likely to provide okay ratings (53%). In East Kilbride and Clydesdale nearly just as many rated the police as good (26% and 28% respectively) as they were poor (21% and 22% respectively).

8. ORGANISATIONS AND INFORMATION

8.1. In 2004, we asked a number of questions about information from a range of organisations including South Lanarkshire Council.

Confidence in Information from Organisations

8.2. Firstly we asked people how much confidence they had in the information and guidance provided by a number of organisations (Table 8.1).

Table 8.1: Confidence in Information from Organisations

Organisation	A lot	Enough	Not much	None	Don't know	Base
UK Government	2%	23%	51%	19%	4%	**1,373**
Scottish Parliament	2%	23%	48%	22%	5%	**1,373**
NHS Services	6%	44%	38%	7%	5%	**1,373**
Police	5%	46%	33%	8%	7%	**1,372**
SLC	6%	48%	32%	8%	6%	**1,373**
Communities Scotland	1%	18%	22%	11%	47%	**1,373**

8.3. There were appreciable proportions who felt unable to comment on information from Communities Scotland (47%) and Citizen Panel Partners (35%). Of those who commented on Communities Scotland most had little or no confidence in the information they provided (33%).

8.4. Overall, people had least confidence in national central government organisations such as the Scottish Parliament and UK Government (70% had little or none respectively). By comparison they had far more confidence in South Lanarkshire Council (54% thought a lot or enough against 40% who had not much or none). South Lanarkshire Council was the most trusted source of information in the table above.

8.5. People were also mainly confident about information from NHS Services (50% thought a lot or enough against 45% who had not much or none) and the Police (51% thought a lot or enough against 41% who had not much or none).

8.6. We also looked at the findings for South Lanarkshire Council by area (Table 8.2).

Table 8.2: Confidence in Information from Organisations by Area

SLC	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen & Cambuslang
A lot	3%	8%	6%	6%
Enough	42%	47%	51%	52%
Not very much	38%	33%	30%	26%
None	12%	7%	9%	6%
Don't know	5%	4%	4%	9%
Base	**294**	**381**	**361**	**333**

8.7. Those in Rutherglen & Cambuslang (58%), Hamilton (57%) and East Kilbride (55%) had the most confidence in South Lanarkshire Council, while those in Clydesdale had the least (45%).

South Lanarkshire Council Forecast Plan

8.8. We asked a number of questions about people's awareness of this plan (Table 8.3). This was distributed to every household in September 2003.

Table 8.3: Awareness of SLC Forecast Plan

Awareness	**%**
Glance through	51%
Read only certain information	15%
Not read any of it	3%
Not seen it	31%
Base	**1,362**
Was the plan?	
Useful	27%
Interesting	52%
Comprehensive	10%
Waste of time	11%
Don't know	21%
Base	**887**
Impact of plan?	
Learned about services	59%
Didn't learn anything	23%
Don't know	18%
Base	**862**

8.9. Although nearly a third claimed to have never seen the Forecast Plan (31%), most had glanced through the document (51%) and 15% had read certain information. Only 3% were aware of it but had not read any of it.

8.10. Only 11% of those who had glanced or read information in the plan found it a waste of time. Over half found it interesting (52%) and a further 27% thought it was useful.

8.11. Nearly three fifths had learned about council services from the plan (59%) and only 23% thought that had not learned anything.

Summary

8.12. The main points were:

- Overall, people had least confidence national central government organisations such as the Scottish Parliament and UK Government (70% respectively). By comparison they had far more confidence in South Lanarkshire Council (54%). South Lanarkshire Council was the most trusted source of information;
- People were also mainly confident about information from NHS Services (50%) and the Police (51%);
- Although nearly a third claimed to have never seen the Forecast Plan (31%), most had glanced through the document (51%) and 15% had read certain information. Only 3% were aware of it but had not read any of it;
- Only 11% of those who had glanced or read information in the plan found it a waste of time. Over half found it interesting (52%) and a further 27% thought it was useful; and
- Nearly three fifths had learned about council services from the plan (59%) and only 23% thought that had not learned anything.

9. IMPROVEMENTS TO QUALITY OF LIFE

9.1. We finally asked people what things they would like to see done that would improve their quality of life in their neighbourhood (Table 9.1). In the appendix these comments in detail are presented in full by area. The table groups these into general categories and focuses on the main two things that people reported. We then derived rank scores for the scale of these issues.

Table 9.1: Desired Improvement s to Quality of Life (%, n)

Improvement	**First**		**Second**		**Overall Rank**
	%	n	%	n	
More policing/ less crime	18%	217	12%	136	**1**
Better road repairs/ links	6%	70	8%	87	**2**
Better public transport	6%	76	6%	68	**3**
Better/ more play areas for children	7%	88	4	49	**4**
More/ better quality of open space	6%	66	5%	51	**5**
More/ better activities for teenagers	4%	44	6%	67	**6**
Less litter/ rubbish	4%	42	6%	69	**7**
Traffic management/ control	5%	57	4%	50	**8**
Better leisure facilities	4%	42	5%	55	**9**
Improved pavements	5%	57	4%	39	**10**
Better shopping facilities	4%	45	4%	45	**11**
More/ better parking	4%	44	4%	43	**12**
Curb speeding	4%	51	3%	35	**13**
More/ better housing	4%	43	4%	39	**14**
Less dog fouling	2%	28	4%	49	**15**
More/ better lighting	3%	36	3%	33	**16**
More/ better local services	3%	38	2%	27	**17**
More community facilities/ spirit	2%	30	3%	35	**18**
Curb anti-social teenagers	2%	29	2%	21	**19**
Help business/ more employment	1%	16	1%	16	**20**
Tackle problems with neighbours	1%	17	1%	11	**=21**
More recycling facilities	1%	15	1%	13	**=21**
Less graffiti/ vandalism	<1%	6		17	**23**
Better schools	<1%	6		4	**24**
No school closures	<1%	9			**25**
Other	1%	23	3%	45	
Base (no responses)		**1,201**		**1,104**	

9.2. The main desired improvements were on policing, the condition of the roads, public transport and play areas for children.

Summary

9.3. The main desired improvements were on policing, the condition of the roads, public transport and play areas for children.

10. SUMMARY

10.1. The findings from the 2004 are different from the 2002 in aspects such as the slightly lower ratings of neighbourhood and the wider local area. Despite this positive ratings of services were appreciably higher as were the perceived seriousness of local problems. Satisfaction with housing, levels of recycling, levels of training and general health also increased. All other findings were generally consistent with those in 2002.

10.2. Most were satisfied with their neighbourhood and wider local area. Those in East Kilbride and Hamilton were the most likely to be satisfied with their neighbourhood and wider local area.

10.3. There were marked increases in the proportions rating services/ issues as good from 2002. There were no reductions in positive ratings. Consistent with 2002, the ratings for education in primary and secondary settings, and for services for the under 5s continue to attract the highest ratings. The condition of roads and pavements continue to have the lowest positive ratings. Things for young people to do attracted the lowest positive ratings of any service.

10.4. The issue most likely to be seen as a major problem in South Lanarkshire was dog fouling. The other main problems concerned young people hanging around, litter, drinking in public, people using or dealing in drugs, the loss of woodland/ open space and graffiti/ vandalism. Consistent with 2002, those in Clydesdale and East Kilbride tended to report fewer neighbourhood problems. Those in Hamilton gave the highest ratings to many problems (e.g. car crime, threatening behaviour, people using or dealing drugs, drinking in public, housebreaking noise pollution and young people hanging around).

10.5. Most expressed satisfaction with all aspects of their homes. Less than one in twenty were planning to move home in the next twelve months. The main reasons for wanting to move concerned wanting a bigger or smaller house and anti-social behaviour problems in the neighbourhood.

10.6. There was an appreciable increase from 2002 in those who claimed to ‘always’ recycle glass, paper and other household waste and a decline in the percentage of those who never recycled. Only around a third said that they never recycled glass, plastic bags or bottles, or other household waste. Having a varied/ wider range of recycling banks in the one place was the biggest factor that people said would help them recycle more often.

10.7. Only one in ten were interested in using allotments. Of those who were interested, three fifths would be willing to travel up to one mile to reach the site. In terms of facilities, most thought that a water supply, washing facilities and composting were essential.

10.8. Just under a third felt that they were involved in their communities ‘a fair amount’/ ‘a great deal’. Just over half were involved in volunteering activities and just under half were involved in one activity. Involvement in sports & exercise groups and in hobbies & social clubs were the main forms of volunteer activity reported by respondents.

10.9. Nearly two fifths rated employment prospect as good. Those in East Kilbride were by far the most optimistic. The main barrier to getting a job concerned low wages. People are more willing to accept work if it is close to their homes.

10.10. Nearly three fifths were in paid employment and most travelled to work using a private motor vehicle. In the past year, just over two fifths undertook training directly related to their job, less than a fifth undertook non-job related training and less than one in ten of those not in paid employment had undertaken training. Other commitments/ time and lack of opportunities were the main barriers to undertaking learning and training opportunities.

10.11. While almost a quarter knew someone who had started a business in South Lanarkshire in the past two years, less than a fifth thought that good opportunities existed to start a business. This is despite almost a third believing that they had the knowledge, skills and experience to start a business and less than two fifths not being put off by fear of failure.

10.12. Most described their general health as good/ excellent. Over two fifths had felt calm and peaceful all or most of the time, just over a third felt that they had a lot of energy all or most of the time and less than one in ten said that they felt downhearted and low all or most of the time.

10.13. Only one in ten said that their social activities during the past four weeks had been affected by health or emotional problems all or most of the time. Most had access through their social networks to someone who would listen, help in a crisis, they could relax with, could offer comfort and who really appreciated them (66%). Consistent with their health profile, most found life interesting, enjoyable, full, fulfilling, full of fun, successful and happy.

10.14. Most were registered with a dentist (mainly NHS) and had visited in the past six months. Respondents were twice as more likely to identify positive than negative quality of life effects associated with dental health. The main negative effects were the costs of treatment, eating, appearance and comfort. The main positive effects were appearance, eating and smiling.

10.15. Over a quarter reported that they had a long-term condition and/ or illness that interfered with their day to day activities. Most reported non-psychological conditions. There was a slight reduction in those reporting health problems made worse by work and visiting a doctor/ health professional.

10.16. Most rated local access to GPs, dentists and hospitals as good. Most reported difficulty in getting a GP appointment and particularly a home visit. A physiotherapy/ chiropractor and dental appointment were less difficult. Those most likely to experience least difficulty getting access to these services were in Rutherglen & Cambuslang.

10.17. While most felt that they were given adequate information and encouraged to participate in decisions about their treatment, they felt less involved in changes to local and especially national health services.

10.18. Only just over a quarter were daily/ weekly public transport users. Most were occasional or non-users. Most lived up to 1-2 miles from the nearest bus stop and train station. Most experienced no difficulties getting on or off buses and trains.

10.19. The main disincentives to using public transport were infrequent/ unreliable services, safety concerns at terminal points and the lack of evening/ weekend services. The main suggested improvements were increasing the frequency/ reliability of services, enhanced evening/ weekend services and safety measures at bus stops/ stations. Increasing the frequency/ reliability of services was rated as the most important improvement.

10.20. The main desired changes to policing concerned more police and the speed of initial response. Nearly three fifths thought that crime levels had stayed the same. Most gave moderate ratings to the police in South Lanarkshire. A fifth thought it was poor.

10.21. Overall, people had least confidence national central government organisations such as the Scottish Parliament and UK Government. South Lanarkshire Council was the most trusted source of information. People were also mainly confident about information from NHS Services and the Police.

10.22. Most had glanced through the South Lanarkshire Council Forecast Plan. Over half found it interesting. Nearly three fifths had learned about council services from the plan.

10.23. The main desired improvements to quality of life in South Lanarkshire were on policing, the condition of the roads, public transport and play areas for children.

* * *