Appendix 4

YEAR ON YEAR COMPARISON

The following table shows the Key Satisfaction Indicators (KSI's) of the 2013, 2014 and 2015 surveys. The percentage satisfaction is displayed alongside the overall ranking for each question.

Kerbside Collection			
Question	***2013***	***2014***	***2015***
KSI 01 - Collection, Service Overall	84.9% (1)	84.3% (1)	83.3% (1)
KSI 02 - Collection, Aspects of Service	84.1% (1)	83.7% (1)	82.7% (1)
KSI 03 - Recycling Collection, Aspect of Service	77.6% (2)	76.0% (2)	75.7% (3)
KSI 04 - General Waste Collection	85.8% (1)	85.1% (1)	82.3% (1)
KSI 05 - Recycling Collection	86.7% (1)	84.8% (3)	83.6% (1)
KSI 06 - Food Waste Collection	80.6% (1)	79.2% (2)	79.6% (2)
KSI 07 - Garden Waste Collection	84.8% (4)	84.0% (2)	83.5% (2)
KSI 08 - Bulky Waste Collection	56.7% (2)	55.9% (2)	56.7% (1)
Recycling Centres			
Question	***2013***	***2014***	***2015***
KSI 09 - Recycling Centres, Service Overall	86.0% (2)	85.1% (2)	85.6% (2)
KSI 10 - Recycling Centres, Aspects of Service	84.5% (2)	83.9% (2)	84.5% (2)
Communication			
Question	***2013***	***2014***	***2015***
KSI 11 - Collection/Recycling Information Overall	71.8% (2)	72.5% (1)	71.0% (1)
KSI 12 - Collection/Recycling Information, Aspects	70.1% (2)	69.4% (2)	69.0% (1)
KSI 13 - Recycling Centre Information	71.8% (2)	72.9% (3)	73.2% (2)
Enquiries/Complaints			
Question	***2013***	***2014***	***2015***
KSI 14 - Collection Enquiry/Complaint Handling	74.0% (2)	74.1% (3)	71.2% (3)
KSI 15 - Recycling Centre Enq/Complaint Handling	80.7% (2)	80.8% (2)	76.1% (3)

HWR 2012 – weighting methodology

Why do we weight the data?

All surveys are estimates of the 'truth' i.e. the views/behaviours of the 'universe' – in this case, every 16+ year old resident in a particular local authority area. The findings derived from our surveys are generated from a sample of residents and we will use the data to draw conclusions about the 'universe' subject to sampling error, standard error, confidence intervals etc.

Weighting the data changes the sample profile to improve estimates of the attitudinal characteristics of the 'universe'. One of the circumstances where weighting is required is when there are variable response rates, for example from different sub-groups of the population. Weighting can be used to compensate for different levels of non-response in different sub-groups of the population.

Weighting is used to correct for any imbalances between the survey sample profile and the profile of the 'universe'. In the case of postal surveys such as this one, each respondent has been given a weight in order that the results are representative of the profile of residents in each local authority area. This is to ensure that we are drawing conclusions about the 'universe' from a sample which reflects it in terms of key demographic variables.

How do we weight the data?

Data for each participant local authority is weighted in line with the known population profile (using the latest available sources) and with design weights additionally applied in the few cases where disproportionate stratification has been employed. This is standard market research practice.

Responses from each individual completing the survey – i.e. each respondent – are given a weight in accordance with several categories:

- age – in three categories – 16-34, 35-54 and 55+;
- gender – male vs. female;
- ethnicity – 'white' vs. BME; and
- work status – working full-time vs. not working full-time.

This is done in order to correct for the differences between the survey sample profile (the aggregate profile for all respondents) and the actual known profile of the 'universe'. This is particularly important when it comes to postal-self completion methodologies where respondents are, by their nature, self-selecting and quotas cannot be used to control the achieved sample.

A weighting matrix from the Office for National Statistics Census Mid-Year Estimates is produced which includes the proportions of residents in each local authority which fall into the weighting categories described above (we will be able to use 2011 Census data for HWR 2013). We then look at the profile of respondents to the survey and weight those answering the questions related to the weighting categories. This is done so that the profile of respondents better matches that of the population profile of 16+ residents in each local authority. We then apply 'rim' weighting rather than interlace the target variables given above (as with 'cell' weighting), i.e. each is applied in an incremental way, one by one.

This year, we reviewed the variation in the size of weights and the potential effects of capping these at 5.0 (as per the Government's 2008-9 Place Survey methodology). Our review has taken into account statistical, ethical and comparability considerations as well as the stability of local authority-level data over time. The following changes have been made to weighting scheme, and will be applied to the 2012 data:

i) we have combined the 16-24 and 25-34 age categories; and

ii) we have imposed a weighting cap of 5.

We have also revised our approach to weighting cases with missing weighting variables. Any respondent who does not answer any of the weighting categories is weighted neutrally with a factor of 1.0 which is standard practice for weighting in a survey such as this; respondents must answer questions in all of the weighting categories in order for us to weight them. (Such an approach provides a good solution; the sample profiles and the data generated is more representative of the views of residents in each of the local authority areas than it would have otherwise been, while avoiding our re-assigning respondents into categories they ought not to be in, which itself could introduce biases). But in order to protect the stability of the data, we have applied an exception to this rule in respect of the age category 16-34.

Further detail?

If a local authority is interested in the weighted and unweighted profile of respondents and the effect of adding in those respondents who have been neutrally weighted, this will be possible by turning the weights in the raw data, which can be obtained from measure2improve on or off.

Further information is available from:

james.stannard@ipsos.com

ben.marshall@ipsos.com

Ipsos MORI, July 2012