

Appendix 1

Moray Citizens' Panel

Survey 8: Contacting Local Agencies

Report

by

Craigforth

APRIL 2008

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Background and Study Objectives | 1 |
| | Methodology and Response..... | 1 |
| | Reporting Conventions..... | 3 |
| 2. | EXTENT OF CONTACT WITH LOCAL AGENCIES | 5 |
| | Extent of Contact with Agencies..... | 5 |
| | Frequency of Contact..... | 6 |
| | Internet Contact..... | 6 |
| 3. | CONTACT WITH COUNCIL SERVICES | 9 |
| | Reason for Contact | 9 |
| | Method of Contact..... | 11 |
| | Views on Service Received..... | 14 |
| 4. | CONTACT WITH HEALTH SERVICES | 17 |
| | Urgency of Contact..... | 17 |
| | Method of Contact..... | 17 |
| | Experience of Visit/Consultation..... | 18 |
| | Views on Service Received..... | 21 |
| 5. | CONTACT WITH THE EMERGENCY SERVICES | 23 |
| | Reason and Urgency of Contact | 23 |
| | Method of Contact..... | 25 |
| | Requesting a Visit from the Emergency Services | 27 |
| | Views on Service Received..... | 28 |
| 6. | CONTACT WITH VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS | 31 |
| | Awareness of Local Voluntary Organisations..... | 31 |
| | Organisation Most Recently Contacted and Reason for Contact..... | 33 |
| | Method of Contact..... | 34 |
| | Views on Service Received..... | 35 |
| | Perceived Barriers to Volunteering..... | 37 |
| 7. | EXPERIENCES OF THE CITIZENS' PANEL | 39 |
| | View of Being on the Panel | 39 |
| | Future Panel Surveys/ Operation of the Panel..... | 41 |

INDEX OF TABLES

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1: Profile of Survey Respondents, Panel Members and Moray overall..... | 3 |
| Table 2: Frequency of Contact With Local Agencies 2008 | 6 |
| Table 3: Frequency of Visits to Local Agency Websites in Past 2 years 2008 | 8 |
| Table 4: Main reason for most recent contact with Council service | 10 |
| Table 5: Purpose of Most Recent Contact with The Moray Council..... | 10 |
| Table 6: Main Council Contact During Most Recent Contact..... | 11 |
| Table 7: How was contact made with the Council?..... | 11 |
| Table 8: Experience of telephone contact..... | 12 |
| Table 9: Experience of visit in person | 13 |
| Table 10: Response to contact in writing | 13 |
| Table 11: Resolution of enquiry, request or complaint..... | 16 |
| Table 12: Urgency of most recent contact | 17 |
| Table 13: Type of service contacted most recently..... | 18 |
| Table 14: Nature of Contact with Health Services | 18 |
| Table 15: Had Appointment Prior to Consultation?..... | 19 |
| Table 16: Making an Appointment for a Consultation | 19 |
| Table 17: Method of travel | 20 |
| Table 18: Waiting time on Arrival | 20 |
| Table 19: Views on Waiting Time..... | 21 |
| Table 20: Emergency Service most recently contacted..... | 23 |
| Table 21: Main reason for most recent contact with Emergency Service | 24 |
| Table 22: Purpose of most recent contact with Emergency Services | 25 |
| Table 23: Urgency of Most Recent Contact with Emergency Services..... | 25 |
| Table 24: How was contact made with the Emergency services | 25 |
| Table 25: Experience of telephone contact..... | 26 |
| Table 26: Made Appointment Prior to Visit..... | 26 |
| Table 27: Waiting Time Upon Arrival | 27 |
| Table 28: Requesting a Visit from the Emergency Service..... | 28 |
| Table 29: Resolution of enquiry, request or complaint..... | 30 |
| Table 30: Voluntary Organisation Most Recently Contacted | 33 |
| Table 31: Main reason for most recent contact with Voluntary Service | 34 |
| Table 32: Method of contact..... | 34 |
| Table 33: Experience of visit in person | 35 |
| Table 34: Resolution of enquiry and Likelihood of Recommending | 37 |
| Table 35: Opinion of Being Panel Member | 39 |
| Table 36: Views on Panel Surveys | 40 |
| Table 37: Potential Future Survey Topics | 41 |
| Table 38: Potential Improvements to Panel | 42 |

INDEX OF FIGURES

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 2.1: Extent of Contact with Local Agencies..... | 5 |
| Figure 2.2: Visited Local Agency Websites in past 2 years | 7 |
| Figure 3.1: Net Satisfaction with Aspects of Council Service..... | 15 |
| Figure 4.1: Net Satisfaction with Aspects of the Health Service | 22 |
| Figure 5.1: Net satisfaction with aspects of the emergency services..... | 29 |
| Figure 6.1: Awareness of voluntary organisations | 32 |
| Figure 6.2: Satisfaction with service received | 36 |
| Figure 6.3: Barriers to Volunteering | 38 |
| Figure 7.1: Satisfaction with key Aspects of Panel | 40 |

1. INTRODUCTION

Background and Study Objectives

- 1.1. The Moray Citizens' Panel was established by the Moray Community Planning Partnership (MCP) in April-May 2005, and the MCP are also responsible for the ongoing management of the Panel. Current MCP members are:
- The Moray Council;
 - Communities Scotland;
 - Grampian Fire and Rescue;
 - Grampian Police;
 - NHS Grampian;
 - Highlands and Islands Moray;
 - Joint Community Councils;
 - Moray Citizens Advice Bureau;
 - Moray Chamber of Commerce;
 - Moray College;
 - Moray Volunteer Service Organisation;
 - Royal Air Force; and
 - The Volunteer Centre Moray.
- 1.2. At the time a total of 1329 Moray residents joined the Panel as a result of the recruitment process. There have been a number of further additions and deletions since the initial recruitment; at the time of the survey the total Panel membership stood at 1088 spread across the following areas:
- Buckie;
 - Elgin;
 - Fochabers;
 - Forres;
 - Keith;
 - Lossiemouth; and
 - Speyside.

Methodology and Response

- 1.3. Craigforth undertook this survey on behalf of the Moray Community Planning Partnership (MCP) in March and April 2008. Questionnaires were issued to all 1088 current Panel members in early March 2008, with reminder letters sent to non-respondents in late March 2008.
- 1.4. The survey was similar in scope to the first full Panel survey conducted in 2005 and sought to update findings in relation to Panel members' level of contact with local agencies involved in the MCP and their views on the quality of services received.
- 1.5. The questionnaire asked specifically about contact with the Council, health services, emergency services and voluntary organisations, and covered the following topics:

- The extent and frequency of contact;
 - The reason for and urgency of contact;
 - How contact was made; and
 - Views on the service received.
- 1.6. An additional section was added to the survey asking members to evaluate their experience of the Panel to date. This included their views on survey topics covered, completion of survey forms, topics for potential inclusion in future surveys and any changes they would like to see made to the running of the Panel.
- 1.7. A copy of the questionnaire used in the survey is provided as an appendix to this report.
- 1.8. At the time of survey close in mid April 2008, 744 completed questionnaires had been returned to Craigforth¹, representing a response rate of 68%. This is a strong response, and indeed is somewhat higher than the 66% response achieved in the most recent Panel survey.
- 1.9. The profile of survey respondents in terms of gender, age, housing tenure and administrative area is provided in the following table.
- 1.10. Respondents were broadly representative of the Panel as a whole in terms of the five main indicators presented. However, differences in the profile of the current Panel and the broader Moray population mean that there is some over and under representation of specific sectors of the Moray population.
- There is a slight overrepresentation of females (+4%) and corresponding under-representation of males;
 - As is common among survey groups of those type those aged under 40 are underrepresented – in this case by -15%. The only age group notably over represented was those aged 50-59 (+11%);
 - Owners were over-represented by survey respondents (+19%), again a common feature of this type of consultation mechanism. Those in social rented accommodation are correspondingly under represented (-11%).
 - The achieved sample over-represented Speyside area residents (+10%), and under represented the Elgin population (-12%). This is in part a reflection of the initial Panel recruitment strategy which sought to ensure a minimum number of Panel members within each of the seven areas to support robust survey analysis. However it may now be appropriate to refresh the Panel to achieve a more even geographic balance.

¹ Of the 744 responses 704 were analysable. Figures throughout this report are based on these 704 completed analysable responses.

Table 1: Profile of Survey Respondents, Panel Members and Moray overall

| | Survey Respondents (Total 704) | | Panel Members (Total 1088) | | Moray ² |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| | Num | % | Num | % | % |
| GENDER | | | | | |
| Male | 320 | 46% | 494 | 45% | 50% |
| Female | 383 | 54% | 594 | 55% | 50% |
| Base (n) | 703 | | 1088 | | - |
| AGE | | | | | |
| Under 40 | 133 | 19% | 272 | 25% | 34% |
| 40-49 | 157 | 22% | 245 | 23% | 19% |
| 50-59 | 197 | 28% | 292 | 27% | 17% |
| 60 plus | 214 | 31% | 274 | 25% | 29% |
| Base (n) | 701 | | 1083 | | - |
| HOUSING TENURE | | | | | |
| Owner occupied | 585 | 84% | 870 | 80% | 65% |
| Social rented | 72 | 10% | 128 | 12% | 21% |
| Private rented/ Other | 43 | 6% | 86 | 8% | 14% |
| Base (n) | 700 | | 1084 | | - |
| GEOGRAPHIC AREA | | | | | |
| Buckie | 95 | 14% | 132 | 12% | 16% |
| Elgin | 85 | 12% | 132 | 12% | 24% |
| Fochabers | 109 | 16% | 156 | 14% | 11% |
| Forres | 100 | 14% | 161 | 15% | 18% |
| Keith | 91 | 13% | 152 | 14% | 8% |
| Lossiemouth | 91 | 13% | 152 | 14% | 14% |
| Speyside | 132 | 19% | 203 | 19% | 9% |
| Base (n) | 703 | | 1088 | | - |

Reporting Conventions

- 1.11. In the analysis we have focused on the questions asked in the survey form. Overall frequency counts and percentages are presented for each question, with the exception of open-ended questions where the main issues and suggestions are highlighted in the text of the report. Additional tables with data on questions not presented in tabulated form within the main report are included at Appendix 2.
- 1.12. Where appropriate “net” figures are presented which are produced by subtracting the percentage of “negative” responses (e.g. fairly/very dissatisfied) from the percentage of “positive” responses (e.g. fairly/very satisfied). The result is presented as a positive or negative percentage rating.
- 1.13. We also conducted cross tabulations of some questions by key demographic indicators, including gender, age, tenure and the residential location of respondents (based on the seven geographical areas in Moray).

² Gender and age based on GRO(S) population estimates as at 30 June 2006; housing tenure based on the 2001 Census; geographic area based on the 2004 Moray Community Health Index (therefore not directly comparable to 2001 Census or GRO(S) population estimates).

- 1.14. These variables offer helpful ways of understanding the survey data in greater detail and where significant differences between these groups were evident, these are highlighted in the report text. It should be noted that in cases where the affected group is underrepresented (e.g. those in social rented housing) the difference is likely to be exacerbated when applied to Moray as a whole rather than just survey respondents.
- 1.15. Due the relatively low sample numbers in some of the categories being used, we must be cautious about generalising from some of the cross tabulated data. Overall numbers of respondents are sufficiently high to provide reliable analysis, and cross tabulations are only presented and reported on where numbers are high enough to ensure that results are reasonably robust.
- 1.16. Where presented percentage values are rounded up or down to the nearest whole number. Consequently, for some questions this means that percentages may not sum to 100%. Certain questions provide the respondents with the opportunity to select multiple answers. Consequently the sum of the percentages of these responses will be greater than 100%.


2. EXTENT OF CONTACT WITH LOCAL AGENCIES

- 2.1. The survey began by asking Panel members about which of the Moray Community Planning Partnership member agencies they had been in contact with and how frequent that contact had been.

Extent of Contact with Agencies

- 2.2. The profile of respondents' contact with services was similar to that seen in 2005, with significant variation in the level of contact with each agency. Respondents being most likely to have been in contact with their GP surgery/ district nurse (92%) and the Moray Council (84%) in the last 2 years, although there has been a slightly drop in the proportion of respondents making contact with the two services (-2% and -5% respectively).
- 2.3. A substantial portion of survey respondents had been in contact with other NHS services – between 6 in 10 and 7 in 10 having been in touch with Accident and Emergency and/or other hospital services in the past 2 years. Again this is similar to 2005 findings.
- 2.4. The Police was the only other agency listed to have been contacted by more than half of respondents in the past 2 years (54%). In terms of other emergency services, around 1 in 4 (27%) had been in touch with Ambulance Services and 1 in 8 (13%) with Fire and Rescue Services.
- 2.5. Around a third had been in contact with Moray College (35%) and local voluntary organisations (33%), while nearly a quarter had contacted the Citizens' Advice Bureau in the past 2 years (24%).
- 2.6. As was found in 2005, respondents were least likely to have contacted Moray Chamber of Commerce (5%) and (as was) Communities Scotland (3%).

Figure 2.1: Extent of Contact with Local Agencies



Frequency of Contact

- 2.7. Respondents were also asked about the frequency of their contact with local agencies.
- 2.8. Contact was by far most frequent with GP surgeries, nearly 2 in 3 respondents having been in touch three or more times in the past two years (65%). Respondents also had relatively frequent contact with local voluntary organisations (36% three or more times), other (non A&E) hospital services (35%) and the Moray Council (34%). It is interesting to note that although the **level** of contact with voluntary organisations was relatively low, contact tended to be fairly frequent.
- 2.9. Contact with emergency services was generally less frequent; where respondents had been in contact with these services this was generally only once in the past two years. For example around 2 in 5 had been in touch once with the Ambulance service or Accident & Emergency hospital services. Around 1 in 3 had been in contact with the Police once in the last two years.
- 2.10. Nearly half (45%) of those who had contacted the Citizens' Advice Bureau had done so just once in the past two years. An almost equivalent percentage (43%) had not been in contact with the CAB in the past two years but had done so previously.

Table 2: Frequency of Contact With Local Agencies 2008

| Agency | Contact in Past 2 Years | | | Not in past 2 years, but previously | Base (n) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| | Once | 2-3 times | 3+ times | | |
| The Moray Council | 22% | 29% | 34% | 15% | 568 |
| NHS - A&E | 41% | 23% | 9% | 26% | 376 |
| NHS - Other Hospital | 23% | 27% | 35% | 16% | 444 |
| NHS – GP surgery | 9% | 22% | 65% | 5% | 622 |
| Ambulance service | 42% | 10% | 10% | 39% | 163 |
| Police | 33% | 25% | 16% | 25% | 334 |
| Fire and Rescue services | 38 | 3 | 3 | 42 | 86 |
| Local voluntary organisations | 21% | 23% | 36% | 20% | 197 |
| Citizens Advice Bureau | 45% | 10% | 3% | 43% | 145 |
| HIE Moray | 30 | 12 | 18 | 26 | 86 |
| Moray Chamber of Commerce | 10 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 26 |
| Moray College | 26% | 21% | 19% | 33% | 216 |
| Communities Scotland | 8 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 22 |


Internet Contact

Extent and Frequency of Contact

- 2.11. The survey questionnaire also asked the extent to which Panel members had used the internet to make contact and/or to find out about local agencies over the past two years, and how often they had done so.

- 2.12. The extent to which respondents had accessed agency websites varied considerably, with the level of access generally low. The Council website was by far the most commonly accessed by respondents, as many as 3 in 5 having done so in the past two years (61%). Moreover, this represents a +14% increase on the level of website access reported in 2005.
- 2.13. Moray College and NHS Grampian were the only other websites accessed by a substantial proportion of respondents, by 1 in 4 (25%) and c1 in 5 (22%) respectively. The proportion of respondents accessing the NHS Grampian website has increased +7% since 2005.
- 2.14. The only other websites accessed by more 1 in 10 of respondents were the Moray Community Planning Partnership (15%), Grampian Police (13%) and HIE Moray (10%). It is notable that the proportion of respondents having accessed the MCPP website has more than doubled from 7% in 2005.

Figure 2.2: Visited Local Agency Websites in past 2 years



- 2.15. Those who had accessed agency websites in the past 2 years were also asked to indicate the frequency of their contact. Due to the relatively small numbers of respondents having visited some agency websites, robust results are available only for The Moray Council, Moray College and NHS Grampian websites.
- The majority accessing the Council website had done so more than once or twice in the past two years (79%), including around a third who described themselves as “regular” visitors to the website (34%). This represents a substantial increase in the frequency of accessing the Council website (+12% in regular visitors).
 - Similarly, most of those visiting the NHS Grampian website had done so more than once or twice (68%), although respondents were less likely to be “regular” visitors than to the Council website.

- Visitors to the Moray College website were somewhat less likely to access the website on an occasional or regular basis (57%) and around 1 in 10 indicated that they were regular visitors.

Table 3: Frequency of Visits to Local Agency Websites in Past 2 years 2008

| Agency website | Once or twice | Occasionally | Regularly | Base (n) |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| The Moray Council website | 21% | 45% | 34% | 403 |
| NHS Grampian website | 32% | 51% | 17% | 136 |
| Grampian Police website | 42 | 42 | 9 | 93 |
| Grampian Fire and Rescue website | 20 | 10 | 7 | 37 |
| Citizens Advice Bureau website | 22 | 19 | 3 | 44 |
| HIE Moray website | 34 | 28 | 9 | 71 |
| Moray College website | 43% | 46% | 11% | 166 |
| Communities Scotland website | * | * | * | 27 |
| Moray Community Planning Partnership website | 25 | 60 | 11 | 96 |

3. CONTACT WITH COUNCIL SERVICES

- 3.1. The questionnaire moved on to ask Panel members about their **most recent** contact with specific agencies, including:
- The reason for and urgency of contact;
 - How contact was made; and
 - Views on the service received.
- 3.2. These questions were asked in relation to contact the Council's services, health services, emergency services and voluntary organisations in turn. This section looks specifically at the responses received regarding contact with the Moray Council.

Reason for Contact

- 3.3. Respondents were first asked what their most recent contact with the Council was regarding.
- 3.4. As was found in 2005, respondents gave a wide range of reasons for contacting the Council. The most common single response was again queries relating to refuse and bin collection; around 1 in 5 citing this as the subject of their most recent contact (19%), a drop of -7% in 2005. Indeed including street cleaning and environmental health, more than 1 in 4 respondents indicated that their most recent contact with the Council was in relation to an environmental or cleansing issue.
- 3.5. Housing and planning were also relatively common reasons for making contact. Around 1 in 5 respondents had made contact about a housing issue (19%), including queries relating to Council Tax, tenant issues or to apply for housing. In addition around 1 in 6 (17%) indicated that their contact was in relation to a planning or building control matter, and this was a particularly common reason for contact amongst male respondents.
- 3.6. The only other area mentioned by a substantial proportion of respondents were roads; just over 1 in 10 reported that their most recent contact had been regarding road repairs, street lighting, pavements or winter maintenance.

Table 4: Main reason for most recent contact with Council service

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Environmental/ cleansing | 142 | 26% | 287 | 32% |
| <i>Refuse/ bin collection</i> | 103 | 19% | 233 | 26% |
| <i>Street cleaning/ dog fouling</i> | 13 | 2% | 12 | 1% |
| <i>Environmental health</i> | 26 | 5% | 42 | 5% |
| Roads | 65 | 11% | 72 | 8% |
| <i>Road repairs</i> | 34 | 6% | 40 | 4% |
| <i>Street lighting</i> | 18 | 3% | 19 | 2% |
| <i>Pavements</i> | 6 | 1% | 4 | 0% |
| <i>Winter maintenance (e.g. gritting)</i> | 7 | 1% | 9 | 1% |
| Housing | 100 | 19% | 174 | 19% |
| <i>Council tax or housing benefit</i> | 47 | 9% | 98 | 11% |
| <i>Housing (tenants enquiries e.g. repairs, rents)</i> | 44 | 8% | 52 | 6% |
| <i>Housing application enquiries</i> | 9 | 2% | 24 | 3% |
| Social services or community care | 19 | 3% | 25 | 3% |
| Education, inc further/higher and careers | 20 | 4% | 53 | 6% |
| Planning/ building control | 91 | 17% | 116 | 13% |
| Trading standards/ consumer protection | 11 | 2% | 10 | 1% |
| Registration of births, deaths or marriages | 5 | 1% | 16 | 2% |
| Leisure | 41 | 8% | 63 | 7% |
| Leisure services | 15 | 3% | 19 | 2% |
| Libraries | 26 | 5% | 44 | 5% |
| Don't know/ can't say | 8 | 1% | 7 | 1% |
| Other | 48 | 9% | 78 | 9% |
| Base (n) | 550 | | 901 | |

- 3.7. Panel members were next asked about the motivation for their most recent contact with the Council.
- 3.8. Findings were very similar to those of 2005, with nearly half indicated that they were requesting a service or for something to be done (49%). In addition, around 2 in 5 indicated that they were asking for information only (38%). Fewer than 1 in 10 were giving information to the Council (8%) and 1 in 20 were making a complaint about a particular service (5%).

Table 5: Purpose of Most Recent Contact with The Moray Council

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|----------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Asking for information | 205 | 38% | 329 | 37% |
| Giving information | 44 | 8% | 77 | 9% |
| Asking for a service or something to be done | 264 | 49% | 421 | 47% |
| Making a complaint about a service | 27 | 5% | 65 | 7% |
| Base (n) | 540 | | 892 | |

Method of Contact

- 3.9. Next respondents were asked about who their main contact had been within the Council, and how they had made first contact.
- 3.10. A member of staff at the Council headquarters was by far the most common point of initial contact (around 3 in 5, 61%). This is similar to findings in 2005, although the proportion of respondents using the Council Headquarters as point of first contact has fallen somewhat from 69%.
- 3.11. In addition, around 1 in 5 (21%) contacted someone at a local Council office, a slight increase on 2005 (+3%). A member of staff at other Council premises such as a library or leisure centre was the only other point of contact mentioned by a notable number of respondents (8%).
- 3.12. It is interesting to note that owner occupiers were more likely than other to use the Council Headquarters as their first point of contact (64% compared to 39% of social renters). In contrast, those in social rented housing were more likely to contact someone at a local Council office (52%, 18% of owners).

Table 6: Main Council Contact During Most Recent Contact

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Someone at the Council Headquarters in Elgin | 330 | 61% | 613 | 69% |
| Someone at a local Council office | 116 | 21% | 157 | 18% |
| Someone at a local Community Centre | 7 | 1% | 6 | 1% |
| Someone at other Council premises (eg library, leisure centre) | 43 | 8% | 60 | 7% |
| Someone at a school, college, university or careers service | 9 | 2% | 13 | 1% |
| A local Councillor | 15 | 3% | 12 | 1% |
| Other | 20 | 4% | 25 | 3% |
| Base (n) | 540 | | 886 | |

- 3.13. In terms of how respondents contacted the Council, telephone was by far the most common method with more than 3 in 5 using this (64%). Looking at other means of making contact, around 1 in 5 (22%) visited the Council in person while 1 in 10 (10%) wrote a letter or used email.
- 3.14. There was some correlation between the point of contact with the Council and the means of communication used. In particular, those using local Council offices were more likely to visit in person, while those making contact with the main headquarters were more likely to do so by phone, letter or email.

Table 7: How was contact made with the Council?

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| By phone | 343 | 64% | 607 | 69% |
| In person | 120 | 22% | 184 | 21% |
| By letter or fax | 46 | 9% | 74 | 8% |
| By email | 30 | 6% | 21 | 2% |
| Base (n) | 539 | | 886 | |

Contact by telephone

- 3.15. Those who had contacted the Council by telephone were next asked to give further details on their experience in terms of how their call was handled.
- Most got through the first time they rang - 71%, similar to 2005. Around 1 in 7 (14%) got through at the second attempt while fewer than 1 in 10 had to try three or more times before getting through (8%, down slightly on 2005).
 - Reasons for not getting through first time were varied. Around 3 in 10 indicated that the phone rang out (29%), while around 1 in 4 reported the line being engaged or an answering machine being used (25% and 27% respectively).
 - More than half of respondents indicated that they were dealt with straight away when they got through on the telephone (54%). More than 1 in 3 were transferred to someone else or given an alternative number to call (36%) while 1 in 10 were told they would be called back later or were asked to call back (10%).

Table 8: Experience of telephone contact

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| If you telephoned, how quickly did you get through? | | | | |
| First time I rang | 71% | 246 | 433 | 71% |
| Second time I rang | 14% | 48 | 81 | 13% |
| After three or more attempts | 8% | 26 | 59 | 10% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 7% | 25 | 38 | 6% |
| Base (n) | 539 | | 611 | |
| If you did not get through first time, why was this? | | | | |
| The line was engaged | 24% | 20 | 50 | 32% |
| There was no reply - the phone 'rang out' | 29% | 24 | 50 | 32% |
| There was an answering machine on | 27% | 23 | 31 | 20% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 20% | 17 | 23 | 15% |
| Base (n) | 84 | | 154 | |
| Once you got through on the telephone, were you: | | | | |
| dealt with straight away | 54% | 182 | 335 | 55% |
| transferred to somebody else or asked to call another number | 36% | 121 | 219 | 36% |
| asked to telephone back later | 2% | 6 | 16 | 3% |
| told you would be telephoned later | 8% | 26 | 37 | 6% |
| Base (n) | 335 | | 607 | |

Contact in Person

- 3.16. Similarly, those making contact in person were asked more detailed questions about their experience.
- Most indicated that they did not have an appointment before visiting the service (73%), up +16% on 2005. Fewer than 1 in 5 (17%) had made an appointment for their visit.

- Around 2 in 3 were seen as soon as they arrived or at their appointment time (64%), similar to 2005. One in five (20%) had to wait for up to 15 minutes and fewer than 1 in 20 waited for more than 15 minutes.
- Reflecting the relatively small proportion required to wait a substantial period of time, the great majority indicated that their waiting time was not a problem (84%). Fewer than 1 in 20 indicated that the waiting time was a major inconvenience for them (4%).

Table 9: Experience of visit in person

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Had you made an appointment? | | | | |
| Yes | 33 | 17% | 212 | 40% |
| No | 144 | 73% | 306 | 57% |
| Can't remember/ can't say | 21 | 11% | 15 | 3% |
| Base (n) | 198 | | 533 | |
| How quickly were you seen once you had arrived? | | | | |
| As soon as I arrived, or at my appointment time | 112 | 64% | 206 | 66% |
| After waiting up to 15 minutes | 36 | 20% | 71 | 23% |
| After waiting between 15 and 30 minutes | 6 | 3% | 5 | 2% |
| After waiting over 30 minutes | 1 | 1% | 4 | 1% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 21 | 12% | 26 | 8% |
| Base (n) | 176 | | 312 | |
| And would you say this was: | | | | |
| far too long, a major inconvenience | 6 | 4% | 9 | 3% |
| longer than I would have liked, but not a major inconvenience | 20 | 12% | 27 | 10% |
| not a problem | 141 | 84% | 240 | 87% |
| Base (n) | 167 | | 276 | |

Contact in Writing


- 3.17. Finally, those who had made contact by letter, fax or email were asked whether they had received a response to their enquiry.
- 3.18. The great majority (85%) of those who contacted the Council in writing reported that they had received a reply, and increase of +5% on 2005. A further 8% indicated that they had not yet received a reply but were expecting one and 7% did not expect to receive a reply.

Table 10: Response to contact in writing

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Yes | 62 | 85% | 74 | 80% |
| No, but I am expecting to receive a reply | 6 | 8% | 5 | 5% |
| No, and I am not expecting to receive a reply | 5 | 7% | 13 | 14% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Base (n) | 73 | | 92 | |

Views on Service Received

- 3.19. Finally in this section respondents were asked a series of questions around their rating of the service received by the Council at the time of their most recent contact. This included satisfaction with aspects of the service, and the extent to which they felt their enquiry or problem had been resolved.
- 3.20. The figure below presents “net” satisfaction levels for aspects of the Council service received during most recent contact.
- 3.21. In terms of the overall service received, satisfaction was high with more than 7 in 10 indicating that they were very or fairly satisfied (72%), including nearly 4 in 10 who were “very satisfied”. A total of 15% indicated that they were dissatisfied with the service received, giving a net rating of +57%. These findings are very similar to those of 2005.
- 3.22. The profile of satisfaction with key aspects of the service received was also broadly similar to that reported in 2005. All aspects of the service received positive ratings overall, with satisfaction being highest in relation to ease of contacting the right person and with staff attitude and knowledge.
- Satisfaction levels were high in relation to the ease with which respondents could contact the right person. A total of 79% were satisfied with this including 44% very satisfied. The net rating was +70%, very similar to the +72% reported in 2005.
 - Respondents also reported high satisfaction levels with service staff. At least 3 in 4 were satisfied with staff friendliness (80%), helpfulness (78%) and knowledge (77%), including up to half of respondents who were very satisfied. Again net satisfaction ratings were similar to those reported in 2005, with a +4% increase in relation to staff knowledge being notable.
 - Nearly 3 in 4 were satisfied with staff understanding of (73%) and ability to deal with (73%) respondents’ request. Although net ratings are very similar to those reported in 2005 (+61% understanding, +59% ability to deal with request), it is notable that they remain somewhat lower than for other aspects of service staff as discussed above.
 - As was found in 2005, satisfaction was lowest in relation to how well respondents were kept informed of what was happening following their initial contact. Although more than half were satisfied (56%), dissatisfaction was highest for this aspect of service (19% dissatisfied) giving a net rating of +37%. This represents a drop from the +45% net rating in 2005.

Figure 3.1: Net Satisfaction with Aspects of Council Service

3.23. Satisfaction with the overall service received from the Council was high across all key demographic groups. Nevertheless, some notable variations were evident.

- Those contacting local Council offices tended to report higher satisfaction levels (more than 8 in 10 satisfied) than those making contact through the Council headquarters (around 2 in 3 satisfied).
- However, this may be linked to variations in how these respondents made contact - those making contact in person tended to be more satisfied than those who made contact by phone.

3.24. Panel members were finally asked whether they felt that their enquiry, request or complaint had been resolved.

3.25. The majority of respondents (75%) felt that the reason for their contact had been resolved, an increase of +4% from 2005. This included nearly 2 in 5 who reported that their query was resolved within 24 hours of their contact (38% of all respondents) and a further 1 in 4 (25%) within two weeks. In total nearly 2 in 3 of all respondents reported that their query had been resolved within 2 weeks (63%). Around 1 in 7 indicated that they had to wait longer than 2 weeks for resolution.

- 3.26. Around 1 in 5 indicated that they did not feel their situation had been resolved (21%), similar to 2005. Most of these respondents indicated that they did not expect to achieve resolution, again similar to 2005.

Table 11: Resolution of enquiry, request or complaint

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Yes, it was resolved | 393 | 75% | 625 | 71% |
| <i>immediately/within 24 hours of my contact</i> | 200 | 38% | 276 | 31% |
| <i>within 2 weeks of my contact</i> | 119 | 23% | 217 | 25% |
| <i>two weeks to a month after my contact</i> | 37 | 7% | 70 | 8% |
| <i>a month or longer after my contact</i> | 37 | 7% | 62 | 7% |
| No, it has not been resolved yet | 108 | 21% | 200 | 23% |
| <i>but it will be</i> | 46 | 9% | 93 | 11% |
| <i>and I do not expect it to be</i> | 62 | 12% | 107 | 12% |
| Don't know/ can't say | 27 | 5% | 52 | 6% |
| Base (n) | 528 | | 877 | |

- 3.27. There appears to be a close correlation between perceived resolution of an enquiry and overall satisfaction with the service received. Indeed those reporting resolution were more than twice as likely to be satisfied with the overall service received than those whose enquiry had not yet been resolved.
- 3.28. Moreover, the length of time taken to resolve an enquiry also seems to have an impact on satisfaction levels; satisfaction levels where enquiries are resolved within 2 weeks are 30%+ higher than were enquiries took longer than 2 weeks to resolve.

4. CONTACT WITH HEALTH SERVICES

- 4.1. Those who had been in touch with health services in Moray were next asked about their experiences in relation to their most recent contact.

Urgency of Contact

- 4.2. The majority of respondents indicated that they had contacted health services on their own behalf (82%), similar to 2005 survey findings. A little less than 1 in 5 indicated that they had made contact on behalf of someone else (18%), most commonly those aged under 45 (eg those making contact on behalf of children).
- 4.3. Nearly half of respondents indicated that their most recent contact with local health services had been “non-urgent” (49%), with a further 2 in 5 describing their contact as “worrying, but not urgent” (39%). As was found in 2005, nearly 9 in 10 respondents described the reason for their most recent contact with health services as non-urgent. A total of 13% indicated that the contact was “very urgent”.

Table 12: Urgency of most recent contact

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Very urgent | 85 | 13% | 139 | 14% |
| Worrying, but not urgent | 258 | 39% | 376 | 38% |
| Non-urgent | 327 | 49% | 462 | 47% |
| Base (n) | 770 | | 977 | |

Method of Contact

- 4.4. GP practice based services were by far the most commonly contacted by respondents; nearly 3 in 4 indicated that their most recent contact had been with such a service (83%). This is broadly in line with the profile of contact reported in 2005.
- 4.5. In addition nearly 1 in 10 indicated that their most recent contact had been with hospital outpatient services (8%), and around 1 in 20 with A&E services (6%) or dental services (5%).
- 4.6. Unsurprisingly, those making contact with Accident and Emergency services were more likely to describe their contact as urgent - more than half indicating this. Fewer than 1 in 10 of those contacting GP surgeries felt that their contact was urgent.

Table 13: Type of service contacted most recently

| | Num | % |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------|----------|
| GP Practice during surgery hours | 494 | 73% |
| Out of hours GP Service | 6 | 1% |
| Community nurse, health visitor, community midwife | 22 | 3% |
| Accident & Emergency department at hospital | 44 | 6% |
| Other hospital – as outpatient | 53 | 8% |
| Other hospital – as inpatient | 8 | 1% |
| NHS 24 | 11 | 2% |
| Dentist | 36 | 5% |
| Other | 6 | 1% |
| Base (n) | 680 | |

- 4.7. Panel members were also asked about the nature of their contact with health services, and in particular whether it had involved a face to face visit or consultation.
- 4.8. As was found in 2005, a sizeable majority of respondents indicated that their contact with the health service had involved a visit or consultation (87%). The great majority had taken place at a hospital, practice or clinic (85%), although this represents a slight fall of -4% since 2005.
- 4.9. Around 1 in 7 respondents indicated that their contact had not involved a consultation (14%), with nearly all of these making contact by phone only. Most of those making contact by phone indicated that they got through at the first attempt (around 2 in 3), although given the relatively small number of respondents involved results are indicative only.

Table 14: Nature of Contact with Health Services

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Yes, at a hospital, practice or clinic | 563 | 85% | 853 | 89% |
| Yes, at home | 10 | 2% | 23 | 2% |
| No - by phone | 85 | 13% | 80 | 8% |
| No - by letter, fax or email | 5 | 1% | 4 | <0.5% |
| Base (n) | 663 | | 960 | |

Experience of Visit/Consultation

- 4.10. Respondents whose most recent contact with health services involved a visit or consultation were asked a series of questions around their experience of that visit, including making an appointment, modes of travel and waiting times.
- 4.11. The great majority of respondents indicated that they had made an appointment prior to their consultation (87%) while around 1 in 8 did not make an appointment. This is broadly in line with previous survey findings.
- 4.12. Appointments were typically made by phone (around 7 in 10 of all respondents, 69%), indeed the proportion making an appointment by phone has increased +10% since 2005. Around 1 in 5 indicated that they had made an appointment in person, most at an earlier visit (19%).

Table 15: Had Appointment Prior to Consultation?

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Yes, by phone | 387 | 69% | 535 | 59% |
| Yes, at an earlier visit | 71 | 13% | 162 | 18% |
| Yes, by visiting the service | 35 | 6% | 74 | 8% |
| No, I just turned up | 71 | 13% | 134 | 15% |
| Base (n) | 564 | | 905 | |

- 4.13. Those who had made an appointment were also asked about their experience of doing this.
- 4.14. More than 3 in 5 of those making an appointment by phone indicated that they got through at the first attempt (62%), a +6% increase on 2005. The proportion reporting three or more attempts to get through has fallen by -10% since 2005 to around 1 in 7 (15%).
- 4.15. The length of time that respondents had to wait for an appointment was generally fairly short. Most were seen within a week (69%) including more than 1 in 3 who were seen the same day or next day (35%), broadly similar to 2005.
- 4.16. Nevertheless, there remained more than 1 in 10 respondents who were required to wait for a month or more (11%) although the majority of these were for matters which respondents described as “non urgent”. Indeed those who felt the matter was “very urgent” were twice as likely to be seen on the same day or next day than those making “non-urgent” contact.
- 4.17. Possibly linked to the urgency of contact, there was also some variation in waiting times for an appointment across health services. For example, those contacting GP surgery based services were generally seen within the week while respondents contacting a dentist had to wait longer.

Table 16: Making an Appointment for a Consultation

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| If by telephone, how quickly did you get through? | | | | |
| First time I rang | 234 | 62% | 305 | 56% |
| Second time I rang | 68 | 18% | 91 | 17% |
| After three or more attempts | 57 | 15% | 134 | 25% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 21 | 6% | 13 | 2% |
| Base (n) | 380 | | 543 | |
| Waiting time for appointment | | | | |
| Given appointment for same day or next day | 173 | 35% | 320 | 41% |
| Up to a week | 165 | 34% | 213 | 27% |
| Between one and two weeks | 64 | 13% | 86 | 11% |
| Between two weeks and one month | 34 | 7% | 55 | 7% |
| Between one and three months | 27 | 6% | 45 | 6% |
| Between three and six months | 19 | 4% | 26 | 3% |
| More than six months | 3 | 1% | 27 | 3% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 5 | 1% | 15 | 2% |
| Base (n) | 490 | | 787 | |

- 4.18. As was found in 2005, travel by car was by far the most common way of getting to a consultation; 77% of those whose contact involved a consultation (70%). Around 1 in 6 (17%) walked to their appointment, and this was the only other mode of transport used by a substantial proportion of respondents.

Table 17: Method of travel

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| In your own car | 384 | 70% | 624 | 70% |
| On foot | 93 | 17% | 146 | 16% |
| Driven by someone else | 38 | 7% | 74 | 8% |
| By bus or train | 13 | 2% | 18 | 2% |
| By bicycle | 5 | 1% | 6 | 1% |
| By taxi | 7 | 1% | 9 | 1% |
| Hospital transport | 4 | 1% | 11 | 1% |
| Other | 4 | 1% | 6 | 1% |
| Base (n) | 548 | | 894 | |

- 4.19. The majority of respondents were seen within 15 minutes of their arrival or appointment time (73%), including more than 1 in 3 who were seen as soon as they arrived or at their appointed time (35%). Nevertheless, more there remained more than 1 in 4 who had to wait for longer than 15 minutes, including 8% who waited for more than 30 minutes. These results are broadly similar to the previous contactors' survey.
- 4.20. Reflecting the typical waiting times reported by respondents most indicated that the length of time they had to wait was not a problem (65%), although this was down somewhat on 2005 (-6%). In total more than 1 in 3 indicated that the waiting time was longer than they would have preferred (35%). However, relatively few described this as a "major inconvenience" (6%).
- 4.21. Respondents who indicated that they had to wait for longer than 30 minutes to be seen by the service were also asked whether an explanation was given.³ Around 1 in 3 (32%) indicated that they had been given an explanation for the length of time they had to wait for their appointment. This represents a -16% drop from 2005 although it should be noted that the number of individuals involved is relatively small.

Table 18: Waiting time on Arrival

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| As soon as I arrived, or at my appointment time | 196 | 35% | 330 | 36% |
| After waiting up to 15 minutes | 209 | 38% | 371 | 41% |
| After waiting between 15 and 30 minutes | 101 | 18% | 142 | 16% |
| After waiting over 30 minutes | 46 | 8% | 58 | 6% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 4 | 1% | 9 | 1% |
| Not relevant - the service visited me in my home | 0 | 0% | 5 | 1% |
| Base (n) | 556 | | 915 | |

³ Some respondents waiting a shorter period of time also appeared to have provided a response to this question, although their responses are not significantly different to those who did wait for more than 30 minutes.

Table 19: Views on Waiting Time

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Was this a problem? | | | | |
| far too long, a major inconvenience | 31 | 6% | 41 | 5% |
| longer than would have liked, but not major inconvenience | 156 | 29% | 212 | 25% |
| not a problem | 347 | 65% | 609 | 71% |
| Base (n) | 534 | | 862 | |
| Explanation given? | | | | |
| Yes | 34 | 32% | 76 | 48% |
| No | 51 | 48% | 59 | 37% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 21 | 20% | 24 | 15% |
| Base (n) | 106 | | 159 | |


Views on Service Received

- 4.22. As with Council services, respondents were asked to rate various aspects of the service received during their most recent contact with health services. The figure below presents “net” satisfaction levels for each of these aspects service.
- 4.23. Satisfaction levels were high across all aspects, with a number showing moderate improvement on 2005. In terms of the service overall as many as 90% indicated that they were satisfied, including 3 in 5 who were “very satisfied” with the overall service. The net rating of +85% is broadly similar if slightly higher than that reported in 2005 (+83%).
- 4.24. Turning to specific aspects of the service satisfaction was highest in relation to the attitude of medical or nursing staff, medical/ nursing information and advice provided and the standard of treatment provided:
- 95% of respondents were satisfied with the attitude of medical and nursing staff, giving a net rating of +94%. This represents a +4% increase in net satisfaction since 2005.
 - 90% were satisfied with information and advice given, and the same proportion were satisfied with the standard of medical or nursing treatment. This produces net ratings of +88% and +87% respectively, very similar to those reported in 2005.
- 4.25. While the above mentioned were the aspects for which satisfaction was highest, satisfaction levels were also very high in relation to other key aspects of service:
- 89% were satisfied with the ease of contacting the right service, giving a net rating of +85% and representing a +6% increase in net satisfaction since 2005.
 - 87% were satisfied with the attitude of reception staff, the net rating of +82% being very similar to 2005.

- 86% were satisfied with the efficiency of the service in arranging an appointment giving a net rating of +80%. This is a +6% increase in net satisfaction from 2005.
- 84% were satisfied with clarity about future treatment, similar to 2005 findings.

4.26. There was no significant variation in overall satisfaction based on the respondent's geographic location. However, it is notable that Elgin residents tended to find it easier to access the right service while those in Forres tended to be somewhat less satisfied with this aspect of service (although even here satisfaction remained high at around 70%). This is likely to reflect the geographical pattern of service delivery in the area (eg the location of Dr Gray's Hospital in Elgin).

Figure 4.1: Net Satisfaction with Aspects of the Health Service



5. CONTACT WITH THE EMERGENCY SERVICES

- 5.1. Respondents who had been in contact with the emergency services over the past 2 years were asked more detailed questions about their most recent contact.
- 5.2. As was found in 2005, most of these respondents indicated that their most recent contact had been with the Police (70%). Nearly 1 in 4 indicated that their most recent contact had been with the Ambulance service (23%) while the remaining 7% had their most recent contact with the Fire & Rescue service.
- 5.3. There was some minor variation in the profile of emergency service contact across areas. For example, Speyside respondents were more likely than others to have most recently contacted the Police, while those in Buckie were more likely than others to have contacted the Ambulance service.
- 5.4. Due to the relatively small number of respondents making contact with Ambulance and Fire & Rescue services, results presented in this section will reflect in large part respondents' experience of the Police service. Cross-tabulations have therefore been produced for each question looking at differences in experience and views between the Police and Ambulance services⁴. Notable variations are highlighted in the text.

Table 20: Emergency Service most recently contacted

| | Num | % | Num | % |
|-------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| Police | 185 | 70% | 298 | 73% |
| Fire and rescue service | 19 | 7% | 22 | 5% |
| Ambulance service | 62 | 23% | 86 | 21% |
| Base (n) | 266 | | 406 | |

Reason and Urgency of Contact

- 5.5. Respondents were first asked to indicate the reason for and urgency of their most recent contact with emergency services.
- 5.6. A wide range of reasons for contact with the emergency services were mentioned by respondents, although there was relatively little overlap in reasons for contacting each of the three services. The table below therefore presents results for the Police, Fire & Rescue and Ambulance services separately.
- 5.7. Respondents contacted the Police for a variety of reasons, most common being to report a crime that had been committed: more than 1 in 3 cited this as their reason for contact (35%) including around 1 in 6 where the crime involved the respondent or a family member. Including a further 7% making contact regarding the threat of crime, more than 2 in 5 had contacted the Police about a specific crime (42%). This is a +8% increase on 2005.

⁴ The number of respondents having contacted Fire & Rescue services is too small to permit specific analysis.

- 5.8. A substantial proportion of respondents had made contact with the Police about antisocial behaviour (20%), similar to 2005. Road traffic was the only other reason for contact mentioned by a substantial proportion of respondents (14%), although this was down somewhat on 2005.
- 5.9. Contact with the Ambulance service was primarily regarding an accident or emergency matter or to request urgent transfer to hospital, with a fairly even split between the two (47% and 42% respectively).
- 5.10. Only 19 contacted Fire & Rescue services, with most of these being in relation to a fire already in progress or fire safety issues.

Table 21: Main reason for most recent contact with Emergency Service

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Police | | | | |
| A crime which had been committed - involving yourself or a member of your family | 31 | 17% | 44 | 15% |
| A crime which had been committed - involving someone else | 33 | 18% | 31 | 11% |
| The possibility or threat of a crime being committed | 13 | 7% | 25 | 9% |
| Crime prevention | 8 | 4% | 11 | 4% |
| To report anti-social behaviour | 37 | 20% | 63 | 22% |
| A road traffic matter | 26 | 14% | 61 | 21% |
| A license matter | 2 | 1% | 12 | 4% |
| A community, charity or local even | 1 | 1% | 5 | 2% |
| Urgent transfer to hospital | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% |
| An accident or emergency matter | 4 | 2% | 7 | 2% |
| A fire already in progress | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% |
| A potential risk of fire | 1 | 1% | 2 | 1% |
| Something else | 28 | 15% | 27 | 9% |
| Base | 184 | | 291 | |
| Ambulance service | | | | |
| The possibility or threat of a crime being committed | 1 | 2% | | 0% |
| A road traffic matter | 2 | 3% | 1 | 1% |
| Urgent transfer to hospital | 25 | 42% | 42 | 49% |
| Request for patient transport (not an emergency) | 1 | 2% | 2 | 2% |
| An accident or emergency matter | 28 | 47% | 40 | 47% |
| Something else | 3 | 5% | 1 | 1% |
| Base | 60 | | 86 | |
| Fire & Rescue service | | | | |
| A crime which had been committed - involving someone else | 1 | - | 0 | - |
| An accident or emergency matter | 0 | - | 1 | - |
| A fire already in progress | 6 | - | 13 | - |
| A potential risk of fire | 1 | - | 3 | - |
| Fire regulations | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Fire safety or fire risk assessment | 5 | - | | - |
| Something else (please specify) | 3 | - | 4 | - |
| Base | 17 | | 22 | |

- 5.11. As may be expected for contact with emergency services, and as was found in 2005, the majority of respondents were requesting a service or for something to be done (61%). Around 3 in 10 were giving information to the service (29%), and this rises to around 4 in 10 of those contacting the Police specifically. Around 1 in 10 (9%) of all those contacting emergency services were asking for information.

Table 22: Purpose of most recent contact with Emergency Services

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|----------------------------------------------|------------|-------|------------|-------|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Asking for information | 24 | 9% | 39 | 9% |
| Giving information | 75 | 29% | 117 | 28% |
| Asking for a service or something to be done | 159 | 61% | 260 | 62% |
| Making a complaint about the service | 1 | <0.5% | 1 | <0.5% |
| Base (n) | 259 | | 417 | |

- 5.12. Around 2 in 5 respondents described their most recent contact with the emergency services as “very urgent” (39%), very similar to 2005 findings. A similar proportion described the contact “worrying but not urgent” (39%), and around 1 in 5 indicated that it was a “non urgent or routine” matter (22%).
- 5.13. Unsurprisingly, most of those contacting the Ambulance Service described their contact as urgent. In contrast, nearly all of those with a “routine” enquiry had contacted the Police (49 out of 55).

Table 23: Urgency of Most Recent Contact with Emergency Services

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Very urgent | 103 | 39% | 165 | 39% |
| Worrying, but not urgent | 104 | 39% | 173 | 40% |
| Non-urgent or a routine matter | 57 | 22% | 90 | 21% |
| Base (n) | 264 | | 428 | |

Method of Contact

- 5.14. The profile of contact with emergency services in terms of method of contact was very similar to that reported in 2005. Telephone with by far the most common method of initial contact, used by 3 in 4 respondents (75%). A further 17% visited the service in person, while just 2% used letter, fax or email. Around 1 in 14 (7%) made contact through an intermediary.

Table 24: How was contact made with the Emergency services

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| By phone | 197 | 75% | 328 | 78% |
| In person | 44 | 17% | 65 | 15% |
| By letter or fax | 2 | 1% | 3 | 1% |
| By email | 3 | 1% | 2 | 0% |
| Through another person | 18 | 7% | 25 | 6% |
| Base (n) | 264 | | 423 | |

Contacting the Emergency Services by Telephone

- 5.15. Nearly 3 in 10 of those making contact by phone indicated that they had dialled '999' (28%), slightly lower than in 2005 (32%). The remaining 72% dialled another number.
- 5.16. Most reported that their call was dealt with straight away (76%), although this is down slightly on 2005. Of those who were not dealt with straight away, most were transferred to someone else or given another number to call.
- 5.17. More than 2 in 5 (41%) reported that their enquiry had been resolved over the phone. A further 46% indicated that the enquiry had been resolved after in person contact with the services. Around 1 in 8 indicated that the matter remained unresolved.

Table 25: Experience of telephone contact

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| How telephone call handled | | | | |
| Dealt with straight away | 146 | 76% | 261 | 81% |
| Transferred to someone else/ asked to call another number | 28 | 15% | 50 | 15% |
| Asked to telephone back later | 3 | 2% | 0 | 0 |
| Told you would be telephoned later | 14 | 7% | 13 | 4% |
| Base (n) | 191 | | 324 | |
| Resolved over the phone? | | | | |
| Yes, it was resolved over the phone | 77 | 41% | 136 | 42% |
| No, resolved after I visited the service | 6 | 3% | 15 | 5% |
| No, resolved after the service visited me | 81 | 43% | 148 | 46% |
| No, not yet resolved | 24 | 13% | 23 | 7% |
| Base (n) | 188 | | 322 | |

Visiting the Emergency Services in Person

- 5.18. Relatively few respondents indicated that their most recent contact with the emergency services had involved a visit to the service (just 57) and as such survey findings are indicative only. Nevertheless, most visited the service without making an appointment beforehand, and were seen as soon as they arrived or at their appointment time if they had one.

Table 26: Made Appointment Prior to Visit

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Yes | 5 | 9% | 25 | 31% |
| No | 49 | 86% | 52 | 65% |
| Can't remember/ can't say | 3 | 5% | 3 | 4% |
| Base (n) | 57 | | 80 | |

Table 27: Waiting Time Upon Arrival

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| As soon as I arrived, or at my appointment time | 31 | 66% | 54 | 72% |
| After waiting up to 15 minutes | 8 | 17% | 12 | 16% |
| After waiting between 15 and 30 minutes | 3 | 6% | 3 | 4% |
| After waiting over 30 minutes | 0 | 0% | 2 | 3% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 2 | 4% | 1 | 1% |
| Not relevant - service visited me at home | 3 | 6% | 3 | 4% |
| Base (n) | 47 | | 75 | |

Requesting a Visit from the Emergency Services

- 5.19. Respondents were also asked about their experience of requesting a visit from the emergency services if they had done so.
- 5.20. Nearly half indicated that the service arrived within 30 minutes (47%) including more than 1 in 5 who indicated that the service arrived within 15 minutes (22%), similar to 2005. A further 12% were visited between 30 and 60 minutes, meaning that in total around 6 in 10 respondents were visited within the hour (69%), down somewhat on 2005.
- 5.21. Nevertheless, around 1 in 5 indicated that the service took more than a day to visit them (22%), an increase on 2005.
- 5.22. There were notable variations in waiting time dependent on the type of service requested; unsurprising and in line with findings in 2005. In particular:
- those contacting the Ambulance service reported shorter waiting times than those contacting the Police. More than 3 in 4 of the former were visited within 30 minutes, compared to fewer than 1 in 4 of those contacting the Police.
 - These differences in waiting times are likely to reflect typical differences in the urgency of contact with the Ambulance service and the Police. The correlation between the urgency of contact and waiting time was clearly evident, with around 2 in 3 of those making urgent contact visited within 30 minutes.
- 5.23. Most respondents indicated that the length of time they waited for a visit was not a problem (60%). Nevertheless, there remained around 1 in 6 who indicated that the waiting time was "far too long" (17%), representing a +8% increase on 2005. This may in part reflect the somewhat higher proportion of respondents reporting a wait of more than a day.

Table 28: Requesting a Visit from the Emergency Service


| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Length of wait for service visit | | | | |
| Under 15 minutes | 26 | 22% | 43 | 24% |
| Between 15 and 30 minutes | 30 | 25% | 44 | 25% |
| Between 30 and 60 minutes | 14 | 12% | 37 | 21% |
| Between 1 and 3 hours | 14 | 12% | 19 | 11% |
| Between 3 hours and a day | 8 | 7% | 11 | 6% |
| Between 1 day and 2 weeks | 21 | 18% | 17 | 10% |
| Between 2 and 4 weeks | 2 | 2% | 0 | 0% |
| More than 4 weeks | 3 | 3% | 0 | 0% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 2 | 2% | 5 | 3% |
| Base (n) | 120 | | 176 | |
| Was this a problem? | | | | |
| far too long, a major inconvenience | 23 | 17% | 20 | 9% |
| longer than would have liked, but not major inconvenience | 33 | 23% | 56 | 26% |
| not a problem | 86 | 60% | 137 | 64% |
| Base (n) | 144 | | 213 | |

Views on Service Received

- 5.24. Finally, respondents were asked to rate key aspects of the service received during their most recent contact with the emergency services, including the extent to which they felt the issue had been resolved.
- 5.25. Satisfaction overall was relatively high, although levels had fallen from 2005 across all aspects of service.
- 5.26. Overall around 2 in 3 were satisfied with the service received (66%), including 39% who were "very satisfied". Nevertheless, there remained 1 in 5 who were dissatisfied with the service received (20%), and the net rating of +46% represents a drop of 17% on 2005.
- 5.27. In terms of specific aspects of the service received, satisfaction was highest in relation to staff friendliness (84% satisfied), staff helpfulness (79%) and ease of contacting the right person (79%). While these satisfaction levels are high, it is notable that satisfaction has fallen for each of these aspects - net ratings have fallen by between 9% and 14% since 2005.
- 5.28. Satisfaction was also high in relation to staff knowledge (75% satisfied) and staff understanding of respondents' situation (70% satisfied). Nevertheless, satisfaction levels have dropped in relation to these aspects also, net ratings having fallen by as much as -19% in relation to staff understanding.
- 5.29. It is also interesting to note in relation to rating of emergency service staff, that satisfaction with staff ability to deal with respondents' request was somewhat lower than in relation to staff attitude. Around 2 in 3 were satisfied with this aspect of the service received (64%), and again a significant drop in net satisfaction since 2005 is evident (drop of 16%).

- 5.30. As was found in 2005, satisfaction was lowest in relation to how well the service kept respondents informed of progress with their request. Despite more than half being satisfied with this aspect of the service (54%), there remained 1 in 4 who were dissatisfied (25%). Moreover, the net rating of +29% represents a significant 22% drop since 2005.

Figure 5.1: Net satisfaction with aspects of the emergency services



- 5.31. Respondent numbers are insufficient to permit analysis of satisfaction across the seven geographical areas. However, in terms of demographic groups it is notable that satisfaction levels were generally higher amongst younger respondents. In particular around 3 in 4 of those aged under 45 were satisfied with the overall service received, compared to fewer than 2 in 3 older respondents.
- 5.32. Even more striking are variations in satisfaction across the services contacted. While around 6 in 10 were satisfied with the overall service received from the Police, as many as 9 in 10 were satisfied with the service received from the Ambulance service. Moreover, it is notable that those indicating that their reason for contact was “worrying but non urgent” tended to be less satisfied than others.
- 5.33. Finally, respondents were asked whether they felt that their enquiry, request or complaint had been resolved, and if it had been resolved how long this had taken.

- 5.34. Most respondents indicated that their enquiry, request or complaint had been resolved (57%). However, this does represent a slight drop from 2005 (-6%), and there remain nearly 1 in 4 who indicated that they were awaiting resolution (24%). Most of these indicated that they did not expect their enquiry, request or complaint to be resolved at all (18% of all respondents).
- 5.35. The great majority of those who felt their enquiry had been resolved indicated that this had been achieved within 24 hours of their contact, 45% of all respondents. Only around 1 in 20 respondents (6%) indicated that they had to wait for 2 weeks or more for the service to resolve their enquiry, request or complaint.

Table 29: Resolution of enquiry, request or complaint


| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Yes, it was resolved | 57% | 148 | 264 | 63% |
| <i>immediately/within 24 hours of my contact</i> | 45% | 117 | 210 | 50% |
| <i>within 2 weeks of my contact</i> | 6% | 16 | 34 | 8% |
| <i>two weeks to a month after my contact</i> | 3% | 7 | 8 | 2% |
| <i>a month or longer after my contact</i> | 3% | 8 | 12 | 3% |
| No, it has not been resolved yet | 30% | 78 | 98 | 24% |
| <i>...but it will be</i> | 5% | 14 | 25 | 6% |
| <i>...and I do not expect it to be</i> | 25% | 64 | 73 | 18% |
| Don't know/ can't say | 13% | 35 | 55 | 13% |
| Base (n) | 261 | | 417 | |

6. CONTACT WITH VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS

- 6.1. Here we look at Panel members' awareness of local voluntary organisations, including their experiences of contacting them and opinions on the service received.

Awareness of Local Voluntary Organisations

- 6.2. Panel members were first asked about their awareness of, and contact with a range of voluntary organisations operating in the Moray area. The figure below presents the percentage of respondents having visited and/or heard of each organisation.
- 6.3. Respondent awareness was broadly similar in profile to that reported in 2005, being generally most aware of regional or national voluntary organisations, rather than organisations which are based and operate locally to Moray. In particular, awareness was very high for the Red Cross (98% heard of), SSPCA (97%), Oxfam (96%), Shelter (91%) and Age Concern (88%). Alzheimer Scotland was the only national voluntary organisation for which awareness was lower, although there remained 3 in 4 respondents who had heard of the organisations (75%), and increase of +5% since 2005.
- 6.4. Awareness was somewhat lower for local voluntary organisations, although the majority of respondents were aware of most organisations listed. Of these local organisations awareness was highest for Moray Carer's Project (73%) and the Aberlour Childcare Trust (70%). Indeed both organisations have seen a moderate increase in awareness since 2005 (+5%). Respondent awareness was also relatively high for the Moray Voluntary Service Organisation (MVSO) at 62%, also up on 2005 (+4%).
- 6.5. As was found in 2005, awareness was lowest in relation to the Volunteer Centre Moray (44% heard of) and Moray Carer's Project (38%). Indeed these were the only organisations which the majority of Panel members did not know about.
- 6.6. While awareness was generally high, and very high in relation to some organisations, Panel members report relatively little direct contact with voluntary organisations in Moray. None of the named voluntary organisations had been visited by more than one in four survey respondents.
- 6.7. Respondents were generally more likely to have visited national or regional organisations, although the difference is less pronounced than it is in relation to awareness of organisations. The Red Cross and Oxfam were most likely to have been visited - by 24% and 20% of respondents respectively - although both show a reduction in contact from 2005. Just over 1 in 10 had visited each of the SSPCA (12%) and Shelter (12%) while very few respondents reported contact with Alzheimer Scotland and Age Concern.
- 6.8. The MVSO was the only local voluntary organisations to have been visited by a substantial proportion of respondents; just over 1 in 10 (11%). Around 1 in 10 had visited each of Moray Carers Project, the Moray Volunteer Centre and Aberlour Childcare Trust. Just 1% had visited Moray Against Poverty.

Figure 6.1: Awareness of voluntary organisations

6.9. Awareness of voluntary organisations, and in particular local voluntary organisations, varied somewhat across key respondent groups:

- Awareness of the MVSO was highest in Fochabers, Lossiemouth and Elgin with more than 7 in 10 respondents aware. In Buckie awareness of the MVSO stood at just over half. Respondents in Buckie were also the least likely to be aware of the Volunteer Centre Moray and the Aberlour Childcare Trust.
- Elgin respondents were by far the most likely to be aware of Moray Against Poverty, unsurprising given the organisation is based in Elgin.
- Females were consistently more aware than males of local voluntary organisations. The difference was most significant for the Moray Carers Project – more than 4 in 5 females were aware of this organisation compared to just over half of males.
- Those in paid employment tended to be less aware of local voluntary organisations than those who were unemployed, students or looking after home and family. This was particularly the case for the Volunteer Centre Moray and Moray Against Poverty.

Organisation Most Recently Contacted and Reason for Contact

- 6.10. The survey moved on to ask respondents about their most recent contact with a voluntary organisation within the last two years.
- 6.11. Only around half of respondents indicated that their most recent contact with a voluntary organisation had been with one of the specific organisations listed (54%). The MVSO and Red Cross were the only two listed organisations with which a substantial proportion of respondents had been most recently in contact.
- 6.12. "Other" organisations with which respondents had recently been in contact included Cancer Research, the Citizens' Advice Bureau and WRVS.

Table 30: Voluntary Organisation Most Recently Contacted

| Organisation | Num | % | Num | % |
|---------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| Moray Voluntary Service Organisation (MVSO) | 29 | 13% | 31 | 9% |
| The Volunteer Centre Moray | 7 | 3% | 3 | 1% |
| Aberlour Childcare Trust | 5 | 2% | 7 | 2% |
| Age Concern | 0 | 0% | 5 | 2% |
| Alzheimer's Scotland | 7 | 3% | 8 | 2% |
| Moray Against Poverty | 0 | 0% | 4 | 1% |
| Moray Carers Project | 14 | 6% | 31 | 9% |
| Oxfam | 17 | 8% | 27 | 8% |
| Red Cross | 28 | 13% | 46 | 14% |
| SSPCA | 8 | 4% | 10 | 3% |
| Shelter | 3 | 1% | 5 | 2% |
| Other | 101 | 46% | 154 | 47% |
| <i>Cancer Research</i> | 3 | 1% | 8 | 2% |
| <i>Citizens' Advice Bureau</i> | 5 | 2% | 5 | 2% |
| <i>Crossroads</i> | 4 | 2% | 6 | 2% |
| <i>Grampian Society for the Blind</i> | 3 | 1% | | |
| <i>The Oaks</i> | 3 | 1% | | |
| <i>PDSA</i> | 3 | 1% | | |
| <i>WRVS</i> | 8 | 4% | 15 | 5% |
| <i>Other</i> | 72 | 33% | 119 | 36% |
| Base (n) | 219 | | 331 | |

- 6.13. As was found in 2005, the most common reason for respondents' most recent contact with a voluntary organisation was to ask for information – this was the case for just under half of all respondents (45%). Around a further 3 in 10 indicated that the main reason for their contact was to give information (31%), and this represents a +9% increase on 2005. Nearly 1 in 4 (23%) indicated that they were asking for a service or for something to be done.

Table 31: Main reason for most recent contact with Voluntary Service

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Asking for information | 86 | 45% | 148 | 49% |
| Giving information | 58 | 31% | 67 | 22% |
| Asking for a service or something to be done | 43 | 23% | 82 | 27% |
| Making a complaint - about the organisation itself | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% |
| Making a complaint - about another organisation | 1 | 1% | 3 | 1% |
| Base (n) | 190 | | 300 | |

Method of Contact

- 6.14. More than half of respondents indicated that they had contacted the voluntary organisation in person (55%). This is similar to 2005 findings, and is notable higher than was found in relation to Council, health and emergency services. In addition, more than 1 in 3 telephoned the organisation (37%), while a little under 1 in 10 made contact by letter, fax or email.

Table 32: Method of contact

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| By phone | 75 | 37% | 144 | 43% |
| In person | 112 | 55% | 173 | 52% |
| By letter or fax | 5 | 2% | 10 | 3% |
| By email | 12 | 6% | 7 | 2% |
| Base (n) | 204 | | 334 | |

- 6.15. A large majority of those who had contacted the organisation by telephone indicated that their call was answered first time (70%). Around 1 in 5 got through at the second attempt (18%) while just 1 in 20 respondents had to try three or more times to get through by telephone (5%).
- 6.16. Turning to those whose most recent contact with a voluntary organisation had been in person, around 3 in 4 had not made an appointment prior to their visit (76%). This represents a +13% increase on 2005, although it should be noted that numbers involved are relatively small. Only around 1 in 5 respondents had made an appointment (22%).
- 6.17. As was found in 2005, the great majority of respondents were seen either as soon as they arrived or at their appointment times (88%). Only 8 respondents indicated that they had to wait to be seen. It is therefore unsurprising to see that nearly all respondents felt that the wait they had to be seen was not a problem.

Table 33: Experience of visit in person


| | Num | % | Num | % |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| Had you made an appointment? | | | | |
| Yes | 37 | 22% | 102 | 37% |
| No | 129 | 76% | 163 | 59% |
| Can't remember/ can't say | 3 | 2% | 12 | 4% |
| Base (n) | 169 | | 277 | |
| How quickly were you seen once you arrived? | | | | |
| As soon as I arrived, or at my appointment time | 106 | 88% | 185 | 87% |
| After waiting up to 15 minutes | 7 | 6% | 11 | 5% |
| After waiting between 15 and 30 minutes | 1 | 1% | 0 | 0% |
| After waiting over 30 minutes | 0 | 0%- | 1 | 0% |
| Can't remember/ don't know | 7 | 6% | 15 | 7% |
| Base (n) | 121 | | 212 | |
| And would you say this was | | | | |
| Far too long, a major inconvenience | 1 | 1% | 2 | 1% |
| Longer than I would have liked, but not a major inconvenience | 5 | 4% | 2 | 1% |
| Not a problem | 111 | 95% | 184 | 98% |
| Base (n) | 117 | | 188 | |

Views on Service Received

- 6.18. In line with previous sections on Council, health and emergency services, respondents were asked to rate key aspects of the service received during their most recent contact with a voluntary organisation. This included whether they felt their enquiry was resolved and how likely they would be to recommend the service to others.
- 6.19. As the figure below indicates, overall satisfaction was high. More than 4 in 5 respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the overall service (85%), including 3 in 5 who were very satisfied (60%). These findings are very similar to those of 2005, although the net overall satisfaction rating has fallen slightly to 80% (-5% on 2005).
- 6.20. Satisfaction levels were also generally very high for specific aspects of the service provided, although some variation was evident:
- Satisfaction was highest for the ease with which respondents were able to contact the right person (+94%) and staff friendliness (+93%), with ratings being very similar to 2005.
 - Respondents also reported high satisfaction levels for other aspects of staff attitude, in particular staff helpfulness (+89%), staff knowledge (+84%) and staff understanding of respondents' situation (+80%). Nevertheless, despite these strong ratings there appears to have been a slight drop in satisfaction with these aspects of service since 2005.
 - Satisfaction was somewhat lower, although still high, for the ability of staff to deal with respondents' request or problem (+74%). This is consistent with findings in relation to Council, health and emergency services.

- As was found in 2005, and has been found in relation to other services, the aspect of service which received the least positive rating was how well respondents were kept informed of what was happening. Nevertheless, more than 7 in 10 were satisfied with this, giving a net rating of +66%, down -8% on 2005.

Figure 6.2: Satisfaction with service received




- 6.21. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they felt that their enquiry, request or complaint had been resolved, and how long it had taken to resolve.
- 6.22. A large majority of respondents indicated that their enquiry had been resolved (77%), with most of these reporting that the issue had been resolved within 24 hours. Indeed fewer than 1 in 10 respondents indicated that the issue took more than 2 weeks to resolve from the point of contact with the service.
- 6.23. Only 21 respondents indicated that their enquiry had not yet been resolved, around 1 in 10 of all those reporting on their contact with voluntary organisations.
- 6.24. Perhaps reflecting strong satisfaction ratings discussed above, most respondents indicated that they would be “very likely” to recommend the service used (68%). Indeed fewer than 10 respondents felt that they would be unlikely to recommend the service.

Table 34: Resolution of enquiry and Likelihood of Recommending

| | 2008 | | 2005 | |
|--------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Num | % | Num | % |
| Resolution | | | | |
| Yes, it was resolved | 142 | 77% | 239 | 79% |
| <i>immediately/within 24 hours of my contact</i> | 99 | 54% | 178 | 59% |
| <i>within two weeks of my contact</i> | 30 | 16% | 46 | 15% |
| <i>two weeks to a month after my contact</i> | 8 | 4% | 10 | 3% |
| <i>a month or longer after my contact</i> | 5 | 3% | 5 | 2% |
| No, it has not been resolved yet | 21 | 11% | 45 | 11% |
| <i>but it will be</i> | 13 | 7% | 16 | 5% |
| <i>and I do not expect it to be</i> | 8 | 4% | 19 | 6% |
| Don't know/ can't say | 20 | 11% | 29 | 10% |
| Base (n) | 183 | | 303 | |
| Recommendation | | | | |
| Very likely | 131 | 68% | 239 | 73% |
| Fairly likely | 43 | 22% | 65 | 20% |
| Neither/ Nor | 11 | 6% | 15 | 5% |
| Fairly unlikely | 4 | 2% | 3 | 1% |
| Very unlikely | 5 | 3% | 5 | 2% |
| Base (n) | 194 | | 327 | |

Perceived Barriers to Volunteering

- 6.25. Finally Panel members were asked about what they perceived as being potential barriers to people volunteering in Moray, and how significant these may be for local people.
- 6.26. As was found in 2005, work commitments and family commitments were seen as the most significant potential barriers to people volunteering in Moray, with a net significance rating of +89% and +88% respectively. Moreover, it is worth noting that work commitments in particular was the only barrier which the majority of respondents described as "very significant".
- 6.27. Lack of motivation, and to a lesser extent lack of awareness of organisations were also seen as significant barriers to volunteering. Lack of motivation was given a net rating of +67% being up slightly on 2005 (+4%), while lack of awareness was given a net rating of +52%, down -7% on 2005. In terms of the latter, the generally strong awareness of voluntary organisations discussed earlier in this section suggests that lack of awareness may be a potential barrier only for some local voluntary organisations.
- 6.28. Lack of transport and lack of support for volunteers were less likely to be seen as significant barriers to volunteering (+45% and +35% respectively), although it is notable that those not in paid employment were more likely than others to feel that lack of support to volunteers would be a barrier. Similarly, few felt that the type of work that voluntary organisations do would be a significant negative issue for participation in volunteering activity (+30%).

Figure 6.3: Barriers to Volunteering

7. EXPERIENCE OF THE CITIZENS' PANEL

- 7.1. Finally, Panel members were asked about their experience to date of being involved in the Panel. This was a new section, and asked members for their opinions on being on the Panel, how interesting they had found the questionnaires, suggestions for future topic areas that could be covered and further changes that may be made to the Panel.

View of Being on the Panel

- 7.2. Respondents were first asked the extent to which they had found their involvement in the Panel enjoyable. A large majority felt that the experience had been enjoyable to some degree (76%), including around 1 in 6 who had found the experience "very enjoyable" (17%). Only around 1 in 10 felt that they had not enjoyed being a Panel member (12%).

Table 35: Opinion of Being Panel Member


| | Num | % |
|----------------------|------------|-----|
| Very enjoyable | 121 | 17% |
| Fairly enjoyable | 408 | 59% |
| Not very enjoyable | 75 | 11% |
| Not at all enjoyable | 7 | 1% |
| No opinion | 85 | 12% |
| Base (n) | 696 | |

- 7.3. Panel members were also asked about their opinion of the survey topics covered during the first 3 years of the survey, and again results were generally positive.
- 7.4. More than 8 in 10 had found survey topics interesting to some degree (84%), including 1 in 4 who thought they were "very interesting" (25%). Again only around 1 in 10 did not find survey topics interesting.
- 7.5. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there is considerably overlap between those who enjoyed being on the Panel and those who found survey topics interesting - nearly 9 in 10 of those who found topics interesting also enjoyed being a Panel member. This suggests that the choice of survey topics could be a significant factor in the extent to which individuals enjoy being a Panel member.
- 7.6. In addition to their interest in survey topics, the great majority of respondents indicated that they had found survey questionnaires easy to complete (91%), including around 3 in 10 who found them "very easy". These are broadly similar findings to those from other Panels managed by Craigforth. Only around 1 in 14 indicated that they had experienced difficulties completing survey forms (7%).
- 7.7. It is interesting to note that there were no significant variations in respondent interest in Panel survey topics or ease with which respondents were able to complete survey forms across key demographic groups such as age, gender, location and housing tenure.

Table 36: Views on Panel Surveys

| | Num | % |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----|
| Interest in survey topics | | |
| Very interesting | 172 | 25% |
| Fairly interesting | 411 | 59% |
| Not very interesting | 70 | 10% |
| Not at all interesting | 9 | 1% |
| No opinion | 35 | 5% |
| Base (n) | 697 | |
| Interest in survey topics | | |
| Very easy | 213 | 31% |
| Fairly easy | 415 | 60% |
| Fairly difficult | 42 | 6% |
| Very difficult | 5 | 1% |
| No opinion | 20 | 3% |
| Base (n) | 695 | |

- 7.8. Panel members were also asked to rate key aspects of their experience of the Panel. These included experience of telephone and email contact with Craigforth or the Council regarding the Panel. Very few respondents indicated that they had experience of this, and we have excluded these aspects from the findings presented below.
- 7.9. Overall satisfaction with the Panel was high with 8 in 10 respondents satisfied (80%), including more than 1 in 4 who were “very satisfied”. Fewer than 1 in 20 were dissatisfied with their experience of the Panel.
- 7.10. Ratings were also positive in relation to key aspects of Panel membership. Satisfaction was highest in relation to the clarity of survey forms and Panel correspondents, more than 9 in 10 being satisfied (91%). Ratings of other aspects were broadly similar, with around 4 in 5 being satisfied with each of Panel feedback newsletters (81%), the range of survey topics (80%), the relevance of survey topics (80%), the frequency of surveys (79%) and the overall Panel (80%).

Figure 7.1: Satisfaction with key Aspects of Panel

Future Panel Surveys/ Operation of the Panel

- 7.11. Finally, Panel members were asked about the kinds of topics they would like to see covered in future Citizens' Panel surveys, and any other changes they would suggest in relation to operation of the Panel.
- 7.12. Crime, policing and anti-social behaviour was by some distance the most commonly suggested future survey topic, with half of respondents suggesting this (50%). A further 1 in 4 suggested surveys on community safety, meaning that in total around 3 in 5 respondents would like to see future surveys to cover aspects of crime, policing and safety. These were particularly common suggestions for those aged 60 and over, males and those in the Elgin area.
- 7.13. Traffic and transport was also a common suggestion, by more than 1 in 3 respondents (37%). This was more commonly suggested by males and those in the Speyside area than other respondents.
- 7.14. In addition the following topics were each suggested by around 1 in 4 respondents: Council services and local government (28%), the quality of local environment (27%), jobs and the economy (27%) and health and social care (23%).
- 7.15. Respondents also suggested a number of other potential topics for use in future surveys. These included tourism issues, specific topics related to young people and flooding problems.

Table 37: Potential Future Survey Topics

| | Num | % |
|------------------------------------------|------------|----------|
| Crime, policing, & anti-social behaviour | 343 | 50% |
| Traffic & transport | 252 | 37% |
| Council services & local government | 192 | 28% |
| Quality of local environment | 186 | 27% |
| Jobs & the economy | 185 | 27% |
| Community safety | 172 | 25% |
| Health & social care | 158 | 23% |
| Housing | 113 | 17% |
| Sports & recreation | 115 | 17% |
| Education & adult learning | 109 | 16% |
| Wider environmental issues | 86 | 13% |
| Arts & entertainment | 72 | 11% |
| Volunteering | 56 | 8% |
| Equal opportunities | 27 | 4% |
| Base (n) | 680 | |

- 7.16. The survey closed by asking Panel members what if any improvements they would like to see made to the Panel. A total of around 3 in 4 respondents suggested potential changes to the Panel (74%).
- 7.17. The most common response was for survey topics that were more relevant or interesting to members; this was mentioned by 2 in 5 respondents (41%). This perhaps reflects the range of potential topics that members would like to see covered in future surveys.

- 7.18. In addition, around 1 in 3 respondents felt that feedback on the survey results could be better and more frequent (33%). Given the very small number of respondents expressing dissatisfaction with the standard of feedback newsletters (see Figure 7.1 above), this may suggest that it is the frequency of feedback that is an issue for some Panel members.
- 7.19. Around 1 in 4 respondents would like to see shorter survey questionnaires (24%), and a little over 1 in 5 would prefer more space to write in their own answers to questions (22%). It is also interesting to note that around 1 in 6 would like to see more focus group and telephone interview consultation with Panel members.

Table 38: Potential Improvements to Panel

| | Num | % |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------|----------|
| Topics that are more relevant/ interesting to me | 211 | 41% |
| Better/ more feedback on survey results | 169 | 33% |
| Shorter questionnaires | 126 | 24% |
| More space to write in my own answers | 112 | 22% |
| More focus groups and telephone interviews | 89 | 17% |
| More frequent surveys | 74 | 14% |
| Less frequent surveys | 66 | 13% |
| Longer questionnaires | 27 | 5% |
| Other | 93 | 18% |
| Base (n) | 518 | |

* * *