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Foreword

I am committed to the highest standards of evidence-based research to develop policies which will enable residents to build their personal, community and economic resilience.

The Newham Household Panel Survey (NHPS) is an example of how we use quality research to understand our residents, their household circumstances and the issues they face.

This report features important information about; income and personal finances, poverty levels, education and employment, housing, family makeup, health and wellbeing, political and civic engagement and attitudes to welfare. In addition, the report offers insight into how well residents are coping in these tough economic times.

The headline findings show positive satisfaction with council services, especially refuse collection. Residents whose first language is not English say they speak it well and residents generally are becoming more confident about their basic literacy and numeracy skills. Satisfaction with life has also increased since previous NHPS waves.

Cohesion is strong in the borough with most residents getting on well with people from different backgrounds. Reflecting the diversity, around half our residents have friends from different backgrounds.

The success of initiatives such as Workplace is demonstrated by the fall in the proportion of residents who are unemployed. Newham’s residents are aspirational and more believe their financial situation will improve in the future rather than get worse.

The report also highlights economic issues of concern to which the Council is responding including difficulty affording goods and services, low levels of pay and household poverty.

These findings are informing the development of new policies and will help us target resources towards the issues of most concern to residents to build a resilient and thriving community.

Through listening and responding to residents and continuing to accept nothing less than the very highest standards of service we will deliver our vision to make Newham a place where people choose to live, work and stay.

I hope you find this report interesting.

Sir Robin Wales
Mayor of Newham
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1 Executive summary

Newham Council has a vision for the Borough: “that Newham will become a major business location where people choose to live, work and stay”. In 2011, pre-Olympics, it published ‘Quid pro quo, not status quo’, which explains the Council’s belief in building resilience to achieve that goal.

It is against this backdrop that Newham Council commissioned independent researchers Ipsos MORI to conduct the latest wave of the Newham Household Panel Survey (NHPS), also known as Understanding Newham. The NHPS is a longitudinal panel survey that has run for ten years. It aims to understand changes in the resident population of the Borough and the consequent demands placed on Council services at what is a very challenging time for local government. For the Wave 7 survey Ipsos MORI spoke to 1,019 residents aged 16+ between May and September 2013.

In keeping with the Council’s 2012 performance framework to deliver resilience (‘Resilience: Making it happen’), the Wave 7 survey has focused on three themes of resilience - personal, community and economic - plus a number of questions relating to the Council’s own services. Headline findings are set out in the remainder of this Executive summary.

1.1 Council satisfaction and attitudes to services

Despite the unprecedented financial pressures facing local authorities, views about the Council and its services on the whole do not appear to be suffering. Although we have seen a small dip in satisfaction ratings for the Council overall since Wave 6, over the longer-term satisfaction appears to be holding steady at two-thirds satisfied.

Ratings for most Council services remain better than they did during Wave 5 and earlier, although we have witnessed poorer ratings for refuse collection and housing services this wave.

The Borough certainly seems to have felt the benefits of regeneration and also the Olympics investment, with positive and improved ratings for local shops and public transport since Wave 6.

1.2 Personal resilience

Newham remains a very diverse borough, and its population profile has largely stabilised compared to the greater shifts witnessed during previous waves.

Newham has a far lower proportion of residents who have English as their first language compared to the capital overall (40% compared to 70%), although the great majority of residents whose first language is not English say they do speak English well (89%). The results also suggest that residents are feeling more confident about the basic literacy and numeracy skills they have.
A significant proportion of households struggle to afford goods and services and inability to afford things is greater amongst harder-pressed groups.

Childcare is a core component of Newham’s personal resilience agenda. **Almost two-fifths of residents with children under 16 use childcare of some form**, whether formal or informal. This is in line with the London average, but there are some indications that the cost of childcare in the Borough may be limiting some residents from fulfilling their potential (16% of residents who are not in employment say that the cost of childcare prevents them from getting a job).

There is a mixed picture in terms of the health of the Borough’s residents. **Just two-fifths of residents say they are following NHS guidelines and eating five portions of fruit and vegetables per day**, and there is a distinctive ethnic dimension to this. Positively, however, Newham may be seeing the effect of the Olympic legacy thanks to an increase in the proportion of active people in the Borough, with the proportion of residents who do at least 30 minutes of moderate physical activity a week doubling since Wave 6.

There are some positive signs for the Council’s personal resilience agenda. **Satisfaction with life overall (now at 77%), and various aspects of personal life, have increased since previous waves of NHPS.** However, the proportion of residents who assess their quality of life as ‘good’ overall has dropped since Wave 6 from 82% to 75%.

### 1.3 Community resilience

**Newham is still seen as a cohesive community by most residents.** The great majority (87%) agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together locally, in line with what we see nationally.

Reflecting the Borough’s wider diversity, **residents have diverse relationships in their communities**: almost half say that at least half of their friends come from a different ethnic background to them- with age and work status important factors here.

Around **three-fifths of residents agree that if they needed advice about something, they could go to someone in their neighbourhood**. However, the **frequency with which residents socialise with friends and relatives has declined since Wave 6** – and is a particular issue amongst more vulnerable and low income groups. Furthermore, whilst only **a minority (18%) of households received financial help from friends and family** during Wave 7, they were more likely to be from these same harder-pressed groups. This highlights the lower levels of community resilience amongst some key communities in the Borough.

Overall, **levels of unpaid voluntary work are unchanged** this Wave, at about one-sixth of residents. In thinking about how best to encourage volunteering, it is worth considering what motivates residents most: primarily
wanting to improve things, helping people and meeting new people. Of note, is the growing group of residents who are now looking after a sick, disabled or elderly person who does not live with them (a jump from one per cent to five per cent between Waves 6 and 7).

Newham, like other places, faces a ‘perceptions gap’ in the way residents feel about crime and anti-social behaviour in their local area. Whilst we know actual crime to be decreasing in the Borough, more residents than during Wave 6 are worried they or a household member will be a victim of crime (up from 41% to 51%). Furthermore, whilst the great majority (87%) continue to feel safe during the day, less than half feel safe after dark – and this has been slowly declining over time. This demonstrates the challenges faced by councils and police forces the country over in demonstrating the positive impact they are having on improving local safety.

Wave 7 has identified some changes to the housing and tenure composition of the Borough. As in previous waves of the NHPS, most Newham residents rent their homes, but there has been a significant increase in owner-occupation since Wave 6, and correspondingly a drop in the numbers in privately rented housing. These patterns may feel somewhat contradictory to what is being witnessed on the ground in Newham, and will likely be influenced by the changing profile of NHPS panellists (residents who left the panel after Wave 6 were much more likely be private renters than those who continued into Wave 7) however, results reflects trends over time.

Encouragingly, satisfaction with accommodation remains steady, and the incidence of overcrowding is low.

1.4 Economic resilience

Efforts to improve employment levels in Newham, such as the Council’s Workplace service, appear to have shown some limited success since the previous wave of the NHPS. There has been a significant decrease in the proportion of residents who are currently unemployed (down four percentage points, to seven per cent). Whilst in line with the London average, unemployment in Newham remains slightly higher than the UK average (where it is five per cent).

Of those in employment, the majority of workers have permanent full-time (82%) or permanent part-time (12%) contracts, with just one per cent who identify themselves as working on temporary or permanent ‘zero hours’ contracts.

The majority (73%) of working age people in Newham have worked in the last 12 months. However, a sizeable minority (23%) have not. Those

---

1 Previous research by Shelter has found that Newham is the most overcrowded area of the country with 25% of households overcrowded. The NHPS figure uses a simplified measure, based on the number of people per room in the household. See [http://bit.ly/UJUcac](http://bit.ly/UJUcac) for analysis of Shelter’s report, and [http://bit.ly/K9BjzY](http://bit.ly/K9BjzY) for Shelter’s definition of overcrowding.  
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working in the retail, wholesale and personal services, and in the leisure and accommodation industries are most likely to say they have worked for less than 12 months in the last year.

Newham residents are more likely to suffer from deprivation, low incomes and poverty than nationally. **Pay remains low**, with half of residents working for less than the London living wage, and just under one-fifth of employed residents working for less than the minimum wage based on data provided on earnings and hours worked¹.

**Median equivalised incomes are significantly below the national median** – at only 71% of the national median before housing costs are accounted for, and 64% after. This highlights a significant issue in the Borough of needing to make work pay, especially at a time when residents are dealing with an increased cost of living.

Linked to this, **two-fifths (41%) of households in Newham find themselves in relative poverty**, and almost three-tenths (28%) of households are in fuel poverty. On both these measures this is around double the national figure - underlining the extent of poverty in Newham.

Newham’s children also face greater hardship, with **half (55%) of the Borough’s children living in households in poverty** (before housing costs), compared to 17% nationally. **As such**, children in Newham are half as likely as their peers nationwide to have their own bedroom. While Newham Council has implemented plans to improve the opportunities available to children, the findings show how the relative low incomes of Newham residents is still impacting on the opportunities afforded to children living in the Borough.

Given poverty levels in the Borough it is not surprising to learn that the increased costs of living, combined with stagnating incomes, are having an impact of Newham residents. **Some residents have difficulties in keeping up with some of their bills**, with one-eighth of households (12%) finding themselves more than two months behind with their rent or mortgage (higher among low income households). Private renters, in particular, are seeing their incomes fall as a proportion of the national median after housing costs are accounted for.

Furthermore, **a quarter (26%) of residents say that they are finding it difficult to manage financially these days**, and a third (32%) that they are just about getting by. One in eight (11%) say they are living comfortably. Among those residents who say that they are worse off than two years ago, two-thirds (68%) say that high bills are at least partly responsible.

All this said, looking forward, **the majority of residents in Newham feel that in two years’ time their financial situation will be about the same as it is currently (58%)**, and among those who feel that their position will

---

¹ This includes full-time and part-time employed residents aged 21 and over. Self-employed residents and those working unpaid for a family business are not included.
change, residents are more likely to be positive (27%) than they are negative (15%). However, despite this, and in thinking about economic resilience, residents' have mixed attitudes towards saving, with a significant minority who do not see saving money for the future as a priority. The majority of Newham residents (63%) still receive some form of benefit payment⁵ - although there has been a marginal reduction in the proportion of residents receiving at least one benefit. Housing benefit claimants have increased by five percentage points since Wave 6, with one quarter of residents now in receipt of this benefit. Moreover, this increase appears to be led by individuals who rent their homes privately. There has also been a slight rise in the proportion of residents claiming child benefit (32% compared to 28% in Wave 6).

Perhaps reflecting the higher number of residents in receipt of benefits, Newham residents are split in their attitudes towards the benefits system, but are generally more positive towards welfare payments and recipients than people nationally.

---

⁵ This includes unemployment, sickness and means tested benefits. For a full list of benefit payments, see footnote 88 (p. 92).
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2.1 Overview

This report contains the findings from Wave 7 of the Newham Household Panel Survey (NHPS), also known as Understanding Newham. Understanding Newham is a longitudinal panel survey that has run for ten years. Independent researchers Ipsos MORI carried out Wave 7 of the survey on behalf of the London Borough of Newham.

As with previous waves, the research aims to understand changes in the resident population and the consequent demands placed on Council services. The survey results will inform the Council and enhance its understanding of Newham and the way it supports residents’ needs.

Specifically, the Council will use findings of Understanding Newham to identify and evaluate:

- the impact and value of Newham’s policies and services;
- inequalities in Newham and gaps in provision;
- trends in society to inform the design of policy and services, and improve residents’ quality of life;
- changes in the composition the population; and
- change for individuals and households living in Newham; in particular, the survey measures the personal, community and economic resilience of Newham residents over time.

Furthermore, because the NHPS is a longitudinal panel survey, it is able to give insight into trends in Newham and can be used to explore changes in opinion, behaviour and the social and economic circumstance of cohorts of residents.

The survey is partly modelled on the design of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), which is now incorporated into Understanding Society⁶. This enables Newham to analyse and benchmark against national data in some instances.

---

⁶ Understanding Society is an academic study that captures important information every year about the social and economic circumstances and attitudes of people living in 40,000 UK households. Adults are interviewed every 12 months either face-to-face or over the phone. For more information visit: [https://www.understandingsociety.ac.uk/](https://www.understandingsociety.ac.uk/)
2.2 Background

The London Borough of Newham is one of the youngest and most diverse boroughs in the country. It is also one of the most deprived with low levels of employment, and high levels of income poverty. There are currently nine Community Forums in Newham with varying population sizes and ethnic profiles. As public services are increasingly responding to address local issues at the Community Forum level or lower, there is a growing need to understand residents’ lifestyles, needs, circumstances and characteristics at these levels.

Newham Council has a vision for the Borough – “that Newham will become a major business location where people choose to live, work and stay”. In 2011, it published ‘Quid pro quo, not status quo’, which explains the Council’s belief in building resilience to achieve that goal. It has now developed a performance framework to deliver resilience (‘Resilience: Making it happen’). The framework is evidence-based with clear performance targets and accountability split into the three themes of resilience: personal, community, and economic.

The NHPS enhances the information available to assist with determining local priorities and the content of the survey reflects this focus on personal, community and economic resilience. The information and analyses produced from the NHPS is used as evidence of residents’ needs and feeds into the development of commissioning plans. It is, therefore, critical the survey is carried out to a strict timeframe, and is comparable to previous NHPS surveys and with Understanding Society, and that a high quality of service is provided.

NHPS shares key features with Understanding Society: a household focus and broad interdisciplinary topic coverage. The key difference is NHPS is repeated every two years, whereas Understanding Society is an annual survey.

Coverage of the NHPS Wave 7 draw on a combination of questions from previous waves (to enable tracking over time), and new question areas to reflect the Council’s latest priorities. Question areas covered by Wave 7 include:

- Satisfaction with local services and facilities, including Newham Council.
- Literacy and numeracy, education, training skills, work and earnings.
- Standard of living and poverty measures (net income, consumption, material deprivation, expenditure, savings, debt, plans for retirement and financial well-being).
- Housing issues such as affordability, ownership, problems and satisfaction.
• Family and childcare, social networks, membership of groups or clubs and interactions, social support, technology and social contacts, length of stay in the Borough.

• Crime and fear of crime, victimhood, and anti-social behaviour.

• Lifestyle including leisure activities, religious affiliation, civic participation, and various dimensions of life satisfaction.

• Well-being and psychological attributes and behaviour.

• Health outcomes and health related behaviour such as exercise and eating habits.

• Beliefs, values, attitudes and expectations about various issues including future housing, the benefits system and economic prospects.

2.3 Methodology

The fieldwork for the Wave 7 survey took place between 13 May and 2 September 2013, with 1,019 interviews conducted face-to-face in-home using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (for adults aged 16+). The survey contained two different questionnaires:

1. An individual questionnaire, asked of a single randomly selected adult (16+) in each household.

2. A household questionnaire, asked of the household reference person or their partner. In 84% of households, this was the same person as the individual selected to answer the individual questionnaire. In those households where this was not the case, a separate household interview was conducted with the household reference person or their partner.

The survey, therefore, provides robust survey estimates for both adults resident in Newham, as well as for households in Newham.

The primary sample frame was the Newham Household Panel Database which consists of those members of the Newham Panel who joined the panel in Wave 6 (when the panel was completely refreshed) and who still remain on the panel. These individuals were initially selected from addresses sampled from the Post Office’s small user Postcode Address File (PAF) at Wave 6.

Due to panel attrition, we also interviewed households at fresh addresses across Newham to ensure that interviews were completed in at least 1,000 households overall. For this fresh sample, we also used the PAF as the sampling frame. This replicated both previous Newham Household Panel and Understanding Society methodologies, which have used PAF samples. We achieved interviews in 556 existing panel households recruited at Wave 6, and 463 fresh households using a random probability sampling approach.
This allows both cross-sectional and longitudinal survey estimates to be computed.

The questionnaires were designed in conjunction with the Council and used questions from previous waves of the Newham Household Panel Survey, as well as from the BHPS, Understanding Society and other relevant national and local studies. Data were weighted to be representative of age, gender, and community forum area in Newham.

See Appendix A for more technical detail about the methodology.

2.4 Interpretation of the data

The final survey data is based on a sample, rather than the entire population of Newham residents. Therefore, results are subject to sampling tolerances. This report only identifies statistically significant differences. A guide to statistical reliability is found in Appendix A.

In some cases, where indicated, results are based on all valid responses. This omits respondents who have not given an answer from the base size.

Where percentages do not sum to 100 per cent, this may be due to computer rounding, or when questions allow multiple answers. An asterisk (*) denotes any value less than ½ per cent but greater than zero. For some questions, we refer to “net” figures. These represent the balance of opinion on a particular statement, e.g. the proportion agreeing minus the proportion disagreeing.

A number of derived variables were calculated by combining answers to individual questionnaire answers for the purposes of reporting. For instance, a variable was computed to illustrate residents’ proficiency at English, and another to categorise overcrowding in households, drawing on the definition of overcrowding provided by the housing charity Shelter. A list of these derived variables is found in Appendix A.

Throughout the report the data for Wave 7 has been compared to previous waves.
Table 2.1 – Previous waves of NHPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Fieldwork dates</th>
<th>Households interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td>June 2002 - Dec 2002</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>June 2003 - Dec 2003</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
<td>June 2004 - Dec 2004</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 4</td>
<td>Nov 2005 - April 2006</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 5</td>
<td>August 2007 - Feb 2008</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 6</td>
<td>April 2011 - June 2011</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 7</td>
<td>April 2013 - August 2013</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Structure of the report

The remainder of this report has been structured around the key thematic areas of the questionnaire and the Council’s resilience themes as published in ‘Quid pro quo, not status quo’.

Section 3: Council satisfaction and satisfaction with services – reports on satisfaction with Newham Council and with a number of local services, some of which are provided by other organisations operating within the Borough. It not only covers changes in opinion from Wave 1 of the survey, but also explores whether there have been changes in opinion among cohorts of residents, i.e. longitudinally what is influencing a change of opinion about the Council.

Section 4: Personal resilience – reports on a number of distinct subsections. The first is ‘Equality, diversity and inclusion’ and this examines length of stay in Newham, ethnicity, first languages of Newham residents, and faith and religion. The second subsection is ‘Education and qualifications’ and this covers proficiency at English and numeracy and qualifications held. The third subsection is ‘Families and childcare’ and this covers childcare arrangement and costs, access to the internet and broadband, and child material poverty. The final subsection is ‘Health and wellbeing’ which examines healthy behaviours (exercise, smoking, drinking and eating habits), BMI, life satisfaction and the psychological health of residents, and the drivers of mental wellbeing.

Section 5: Community resilience – reports on a number of distinct subsections. The first is ‘Cohesion’ examining the perceptions of community cohesion and what drives these perceptions. The second subsection is ‘Relationships in the community’ and this covers who has left Newham (previous panel members) and who has recently settled into the borough, views on community networks and how diverse they might be, isolation and frequency of meeting friends and family. The third subsection is ‘Community support’ and covers unpaid or voluntary work, caring responsibilities and community involvement such as leisure activities. This is followed by a subsection on ‘Housing’ which looks at tenure, housing conditions, overcrowding and satisfaction with housing. The final subsection is ‘Crime
and anti-social behaviour and covers perceptions of crime, safety and anti-social behaviour, fears and worries about crime, what drives worry and victimhood.

Section 6: Economic resilience – reports on employment, work status and wages, net household income including benefits, household finances including expenditure, household debt and savings and financial management. It also covers poverty including fuel poverty, material deprivation and child poverty.

Appendix A: This is the technical report which outlines the survey methodology, response rates and an analysis of panel attrition. It also includes a list of all derived variables referenced in this report, and a guide to statistical reliability.

Appendix B: These are data tables or charts which are referenced, but not featured in the main report.
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Section summary

- Satisfaction with Newham Council has fallen significantly since Wave 6, by four percentage points to two-thirds (66%), but remains in line with findings from Waves 4 and 5, and remains higher than previous waves. The proportion of residents that are ‘very’ satisfied with Newham Council (eight per cent) has remained consistent since Wave 4. Active dissatisfaction has gone up since Wave 6, but it still remains below the level recorded before that time.

- The most highly rated Council services continue to be schools and refuse collection, followed by street cleaning and social services. Ratings are lowest for housing services.

- Ratings for refuse collection and housing services show a significant decline since Wave 6, but importantly ratings for most other services remain better than those from Wave 5 and earlier.

- For other amenities, ratings are most positive for local shops and public transport, which have both improved since Wave 6. This may relate to the investment in the Borough that accompanied the 2012 London Olympics. However, ratings have fallen significantly for local advice centres and health and medical services.

- Across the Borough, satisfaction with the Council is generally consistent, but is above average in East Ham (76% compared with 66% overall). Ratings for services are most often above average in Stratford and West Ham and most often below average in Custom House and Canning Town.
3.1 Council satisfaction

Satisfaction with Newham Council appears to be holding steady when taking a longer-term view.

Two-thirds of Newham residents (66%) are satisfied with how well the Council runs things, compared with one-seventh who are dissatisfied (14%). Since Wave 6, there has been a fall in satisfaction of four percentage points, which is statistically significant. However, this only takes satisfaction down to the average level witnessed during Waves 4 and 5. Satisfaction still remains significantly higher than it was before Wave 4. This may suggest that the positive satisfaction results from Wave 6 could have been a blip or a reflection of something else, such as the positive feeling in the build-up to the Olympics.

As shown in Figure 3.1, the proportion of residents that are ‘very’ satisfied with Newham Council (eight per cent) has remained consistent since Wave 4. Active dissatisfaction with Newham Council has gone up since Wave 6 (by a statistically significant three percentage points), but it is still below the levels recorded in earlier waves.

Figure 3.1 – Overall satisfaction with the way Newham Council runs things

Satisfaction is below average among long-term residents who have lived in the Borough for at least ten years (62% are satisfied compared with 66% of residents overall) and among those of a Black Caribbean background (50% compared with 66% overall). No other ethnic group is more or less satisfied than Newham residents overall, although when comparing between some ethnic groups satisfaction appears greater among Pakistani residents (74%) than those who are Indian (55%) or Black Caribbean (50%).

Satisfaction with Newham Council is also lower among unemployed residents (47% compared with 64% of those in any type of work) and those who have a limiting health condition (51% compared with 67% of those who do not have one). On the other hand, satisfaction is considerably above average in East Ham (76% compared with 66% overall).
Analysis shows a number of factors could be causing residents to stop feeling satisfied, including how they feel about certain local services and if they live in Manor Park. To understand changes in satisfaction between Waves 6 and 7, in particular what seems to cause residents who took part in both waves (i.e. the NHPS panellists) to become dissatisfied with the Council, Ipsos MORI conducted logistic regression modelling on residents who, between these waves, changed their minds on how satisfied they were with the Council.

These logistic regression models (a number of which appear in this report) are presented through odds ratios rather than probabilities. Odds ratios show the probability that an event will occur against the probability that it will not. A ratio of ‘1’ means that something is as equally likely to happen as it is not to happen. If the ratio is greater than ‘1’, it means something is more likely to happen than otherwise, whereas a ratio below ‘1’ means that something is more likely not to happen than to happen.

The following table (Table 3.1) looks at those who were satisfied with Newham Council in Wave 6, but gave a different answer in Wave 7 (i.e. they became dissatisfied with the Council or neutral about it). The three columns of analysis on the dependent variable (i.e. satisfaction with the Council) are shown in the three columns, from left to right. The first on the left shows all the factors which are significant before any adjustment is made for demographic data. The second column shows results for a model only for the demographic data. The third column shows the results for attitudinal questions after they have been adjusted for the three significant demographic variables. If you follow the data from left to right in the table, you see how the results are filtered to determine only those which are significant. These are highlighted in coloured cells.

Throughout all analysis charts, red highlighting indicates a significantly positive relationship with the dependent variable. Therefore, in the table below, the figures highlighted in red are negative factors, i.e. they are strongly associated with residents ceasing to be satisfied with the Council. Any highlighted in green are positive, i.e. strongly associated with residents remaining satisfied with the Council.

The model shows there are a number of factors that appear to be linked to residents becoming dissatisfied with the Council, including if they live in Manor Park (odds ratio of 3.7) or if they never married or are divorced (2.0). In addition, residents who are unhappy about a number of key services are also more likely to have become dissatisfied, including those who are now dissatisfied with their accommodation (1.6), or give poor ratings for local further education (1.8), local medical or health services (1.6) or local shops (1.5).

Conversely, renting accommodation has a positive effect. This means a lower probability that residents in rented housing, both social and private, have ceased being satisfied with the Council since Wave 6.
Table 3.1 – Longitudinal analysis of those who ceased to be satisfied with the Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odds ratios</th>
<th>Model for demographics</th>
<th>Attitudinal data adjusted by demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadjusted</td>
<td>0.493**</td>
<td>0.402**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live in rented</td>
<td>0.493**</td>
<td>0.402**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>0.493**</td>
<td>0.402**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live in Manor Park</td>
<td>3.717**</td>
<td>3.744**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced/never married</td>
<td>2.065**</td>
<td>2.032**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>1.844*</td>
<td>1.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor rating of local</td>
<td>1.772*</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor rating of local</td>
<td>1.483*</td>
<td>1.621**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP/medical/health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor rating of local</td>
<td>1.484*</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor rating of local</td>
<td>1.727**</td>
<td>1.462*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shopping facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor rating of local</td>
<td>1.8**</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leisure facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor rating of local</td>
<td>2.253**</td>
<td>1.844*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>further education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree you</td>
<td>1.422**</td>
<td>1.407**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>could go to someone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 5%  ** significant at 1%

For information, there were too few relevant residents to conduct analysis of those who were dissatisfied with the Council in Wave 6, but either became satisfied or neutral in Wave 7. There are some indicative findings, but these should be interpreted with caution. Indications are that panellists are more likely to have become satisfied with the Council between Waves 6 and 7 if they live in Plaistow, are living comfortably in financial terms, or give an ‘excellent’ rating to local medical services, street cleaning or rubbish collection.

\footnote{The following variables were tested in the model and found not to be significant: age, gender, having English as a second language, household composition, qualifications, work status, ethnicity, disability, intensity of leisure activity, time living in Borough, use of childcare, satisfaction with life overall, receipt of Housing/Council Tax Benefit, financial management, being behind with bills, voting behaviour, attitudes to welfare, household income, being a victim of crime, perceptions of the level of crime/ASB, whether Council Tax is overdue and internet access. Also not significant is satisfaction with these services: social services, housing service, advice centres, police, street cleaning and rubbish collection.}
3.2 Satisfaction with key services

The most positive Council service ratings are for local schools and refuse collection. There have been some declines since Wave 6, but services continue to be seen in a better light than they were prior to this time.

As shown in Figure 3.2, the local authority services that are most often considered ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ by residents continue to be local schools (64%) and rubbish collection (63%). Half of residents say this about street cleaning in the Borough (52%), followed by social services (47%). Residents are least likely to rate housing services as ‘excellent’ or very good’ (36%).

Compared with Wave 6, significantly fewer residents give a positive rating about local housing services (down six percentage points) or refuse collection (down five percentage points) – shown in Figure 3.2. Nonetheless, the ratings given to these services are still much higher than in earlier waves of the NHPS. For example, even though ratings have fallen with refuse collection, residents are still much more likely than in Wave 5 to rate it positively (63% compared with 43%).

Figure 3.2 – Ratings of Newham Council services

The most consistent trend is for residents in full-time employment to give lower ratings to Newham Council services. For example, they are more likely than the Newham average to rate as only ‘fair’ or ‘poor’ local housing services (75% compared with 64%), schools (45% compared with 36%) and social services (66% compared with 53%).

Across other key groups of residents, those who are White British or Indian are more likely to rate schools as ‘fair’ or ‘poor’ (47% and 49% respectively compared with 36% overall). On the other hand, schools are more often rated as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ by those more likely to use them – i.e. residents with at least three children in the household or who are looking after their home or family (78% and 80% respectively, compared with 64% overall).
Older people aged 65+ are the most likely to say local housing services are ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ (58% compared with 36% overall), but this service has very low ratings in Manor Park, where the great majority say it is just ‘fair’ or ‘poor’ (84% compared with 64% overall).

There have been improved ratings for other services including shops and public transport.

Of the other services and amenities asked about in Newham, as in Wave 6, residents are the most positive about local shops and public transport (82% and 80% respectively say these are ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’). Three-fifths give this positive rating to local medical or health services (62%), centres of further education (62%), leisure facilities (60%) and the local police (58%). Residents are least likely to give a positive rating to local advice centres (37%).

Figure 3.3 shows that, since Wave 6, ratings have improved significantly for shops (up 11 percentage points) and public transport (up nine percentage points), which may relate to the investment in the Borough that accompanied the 2012 London Olympics. On the other hand, ratings have fallen sharply for local advice centres (down 13 percentage points) and, to a lesser degree, for medical and health services (down six percentage points).

Attitudes to some services and amenities vary significantly across the Community Forum areas of Newham:

- Compared to the Newham average (82%), residents are more likely to rate local shops positively if they live in Forest Gate (96%) or Stratford and West Ham (90%), but less so in Canning Town and Custom House (70%).

- Compared with the Newham average (60%), residents are more likely to rate leisure facilities positively if they live in Plaistow (77%) or East Ham (76%), but this figure is much lower in Forest Gate (only 34%).
• Compared with the Newham average (62%), positive ratings for further education and skills training facilities are more common in Stratford and West Ham (80%) and Green Street (75%), but least so in Canning Town and Custom House (49%).

• Compared to the Newham average (62%), Canning Town and Custom House residents are less likely to rate medical and health services positively (53%).

Across other key groups of residents, those who have lived in Newham for at least ten years are less likely than the Borough average to give a positive rating about the local police (49% compared with 58%) or public transport (76% compared with 80%). On the other hand, older residents aged 65+ are more likely to rate medical and health services positively (72% compared with 62% overall, and only 53% of those aged 25-34).

Pakistani and Bangladeshi residents are also very positive about local shops (92% and 90% respectively say these are ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’, compared with 77% of White British and 74% of Indian residents).
4. Personal resilience
4 Personal resilience

Section summary

- Newham’s population profile has largely stabilised compared to the greater shifts witnessed during previous waves. Ethnic and religious profiles are similar to Wave 6. However, Newham remains a very diverse borough with significant population churn at an individual level; even though fewer residents have moved into the Borough in the last five years (27%, compared with 32% in Wave 6), this proportion remains considerable.

- Newham has a far lower proportion of residents who have English as their first language compared to the capital overall (40% compared to 70%), although the great majority of residents whose first language is not English say they speak English well (89%).

- Newham has seen an overall improvement in the level of qualifications of its residents: more residents have a formal qualification at Wave 7 than at Wave 6 (64% with 55%). More generally, residents are more confident about the basic literacy and numeracy skills they have than in Wave 6.

- In line with what we see nationally, a fifth of Newham households do not access the internet inside or outside of the home, and access is low amongst older and lower income residents.

- A significant proportion of households struggle to afford goods and services, and inability to afford things is greater for those who are harder-pressed. Almost two-fifths of Newham residents with children under 16 use childcare of some form.

- Just two-fifths of residents say they are following NHS guidelines and eating five portions of fruit and vegetable per day. There is a distinctive ethnic dimension to this, with residents of Pakistani heritage being least likely of all to eat the recommended daily amount.

- Positively, however, Newham may be seeing the effect of the Olympic legacy thanks to an increase in the proportion of active people in the Borough, with the proportion of residents who do at least 30 minutes of moderate physical activity a week doubling since Wave 6.
4.1 Equality, diversity and inclusion

In terms of ‘in migration’ to the Borough, and ethnic and religious profiles, Newham’s population composition appears to be stabilising.

One-tenth (12%) of people have moved into Newham since 2011 and a quarter (27%) have been in the Borough for less than five years (Figure 4.1). There appears to be a reduced degree of population churn in Newham in Wave 7: in Wave 6, a greater proportion of residents (32%) had lived in the Borough for less than five years, compared to just 27% of the population this Wave.

Figure 4.1 – Length of time lived in Newham

- Smoking amongst Newham residents has remained consistent over time, with a fifth of residents saying they smoke. But, there is a far lower prevalence of alcohol consumption within Newham compared to the rest of the England (linked in part to the ethnic diversity of the Borough).

- There are positive signs for the Council’s personal resilience agenda. Satisfaction with life overall (now at 77%), and various aspects of personal life, have increased since previous waves of NHPS. However, the proportion of residents who assess their quality of life as ‘good’ overall has dropped since Wave 6 from 82% to 75%. While this may be linked to problems with the mental wellbeing of residents (i.e. reported ability to cope with day-to-day challenges in life), the survey shows mental wellbeing to be no more of an issue in Newham than in London overall.
After some significant shifts in the ethnic profile between Waves 5 and 6, Newham’s ethnic composition has largely stabilised\(^6\) (see Figure 4.2). The proportions of residents who say they are from an Asian, White or Black background have not changed significantly since Wave 6. It is notable that the proportion of Indian residents in Newham has dropped by a statistically significant margin since Wave 6 (from 16% to 13%). However, this is very likely to reflect changes in the make-up of the panel, as Indian panel members were more likely to leave after Wave 6\(^9\).

The significant drop in the White British population between Waves 5 and 6 may be linked to the phenomenon of “White Flight” that has been observed in the capital\(^10\). However, the Wave 7 results seem to indicate that the migration of White British residents out of Newham has stabilised.

Similarly, religious affiliation has not changed significantly since Wave 6, suggesting that the diverse profile of the Borough has stabilised (Figure 4.3), at least for the present. Over four-fifths of residents (83%) regard themselves as belonging to a particular religion, which, as reported in Wave 6, is far higher than both the London (61%) and the national averages (52%)\(^11\). Just 17% say they have no religion. Christianity is still the largest religion in Newham (37% residents say they are Christian), followed by Islam (32%) and Hinduism (10%).

It is also still the case that the high proportion of residents who belong to a religion reflects the large ethnic diversity of the Borough: almost all Asian residents (97%) and Black residents (92%) belong to a particular religion.

---

\(^6\) It must be noted that the question wording for ethnicity has changed between Wave 6 to Wave 5 through the addition of new codes for certain ethnicities and nationalities. This means some caution is needed when making comparisons between waves.

\(^9\) Of panel members who completed Wave 6, 19% of those who left were Indian, compared with 12% of those who remained members.

\(^10\) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk/21511190 (accessed 05/11/13)

\(^11\) London and national figures from Understanding Society Wave1
As in Wave 6, a majority of Newham residents do not have English as their first language (60%), but there are signs that residents whose first language is not English are becoming more confident speaking it.

Figure 4.4 shows that two-fifths of Newham residents have English as their first language, which is a far lower proportion compared with the national average (where it is 91%) and the figure across London (70%)\textsuperscript{12}. One-eighth of residents (13%) have Bengali as their first language, which is far above the London average of two per cent\textsuperscript{13}.

More specifically, 86% of Asian residents do not have English as their first language, which compares to 89% at Wave 6. Residents who are not in work because they are looking after their home or their family are also particularly unlikely to have English as their first language (84%).

There is no significant difference in the proportion of men and women who have English as a first language. This is a marked contrast to the gender divide in the Borough at Wave 6. The proportion of men who do not have English as their first language has reduced by six percentage points from 68% at Wave 6 to 62% at Wave 7. In contrast, the proportion of women who do not have English as a first language has not changed since Wave 6 (57%).

\textsuperscript{12} Understanding Society (Year 2 2011)
\textsuperscript{13} Understanding Society (Year 2 2011)
Figure 4.4 – First languages spoken by Newham residents

Q What is your first language, that is the main language spoken in your home when you were a child?

- English: 40% in Wave 7, 38% in Wave 6
- Bengali: 13% in Wave 7, 11% in Wave 6
- Urdu: 6% in Wave 7, 7% in Wave 6
- Gujarati: 5% in Wave 7, 6% in Wave 6
- Hindi: 2% in Wave 7, 3% in Wave 6
- Punjabi: 3% in Wave 7, 3% in Wave 6
- Polish: 2% in Wave 7, 2% in Wave 6

Base: All respondents; Wave 7: (1,019), 13 May - 2 September 2013; Wave 6: (1,153), 18 April - 28 June 2011

The fact that large proportions of residents do not have English as a first language does not necessarily mean a challenge for inclusion: in fact, the vast majority of this group feels they can speak it ‘well’ or ‘very well’ (89%) and have little or no difficulty reading formal letters or documents (86%) 14.

Compared to Wave 6, the proportion of residents who do not have English as a first language, but who feel they speak English well, has changed very little15. However, the impact of policies such as the ‘chatterbox’ sessions that Newham Council has put in place to increase confidence in spoken English, may have raised the confidence of those who already feel they speak English well, but not very well. A comparison between waves shows that there is a significant rise in residents from this group who say they speak English ‘very well’ at Wave 7 (54%) compared to Wave 6 (40%).

4.2 Education and qualifications

As with English speaking skills, residents overall are more confident about the basic literacy and numeracy skills they have.

The proportion of residents who say they read or write English well has increased from Wave 6 (from 85% to 89% for writing, and from 89% to 93% for reading). The larger increase has been amongst those residents who say that they can read English ‘very well’ (up from 59% to 71%) and can write English ‘very well’ (from 56% to 66%).

Among those who do not have English as their first language, the proportion who say they can speak it well has remained steady at nearly nine-tenths

14 The base for reading formal letters and documents includes two residents who have English as a first language but who cannot read English or can hardly read formal English. These respondents will have little effect on the overall proportion of people who have difficulty reading formal letters.
15 This figure is not due to panel attrition as the data shows that non-panel members are more likely to speak English very well.
Findings from the Newham Household Panel Survey (Wave 7): Final report

(89% compared with 86% in Wave 6). Furthermore, the great majority of those who do not speak English as their first language, or who read English barely or not at all, say they have only a little difficulty, at most, with reading letters and formal documents in English (86%).

Meanwhile, nine-tenths (93%) of all residents say they are confident with numbers, in line with Wave 6. However, two-thirds (67%) now claim to be ‘very confident’ with numbers, which is considerably more than in Wave 6 (when it was 48%).

Residents’ confidence in their reading and writing proficiency can be seen in all ethnic groups. The most marked increase has been for Asian residents, with seven-tenths (68%) claiming to read English well, and two-thirds (63%) claiming to write English ‘very well’. This is up from only half of Asian residents who claimed to read English well (50%) or write English well (47%) in Wave 6.

Having said this, more may need to be done to develop the English writing skills of White non-British residents. The vast majority of this group claim that they are confident in their ability to read English (89%), and they are confident with numbers (96%). However, over a quarter of this ethnic group say that they cannot write English ‘very well’, or ‘at all’ (27% compared to 11% of residents overall).

Residents with a disability are also more likely to have significantly lower levels of proficiency with these basic skills. A quarter of them say they cannot read English very well or at all (25% compared to seven per cent of residents overall), almost a third say they cannot write English very well (32% compared to 11% overall), and almost a third say they are not confident dealing with numbers (31% compared to seven per cent). Yet, only five per cent of disabled people self-report that they have a learning disability or difficulty. For most disabled people in Newham, this suggests that lower levels of confidence in numeracy and literacy are less about their disability; rather, there are other likely barriers preventing disabled people from gaining or improving these basic skills.

English proficiency and confidence with numbers are correlated with some other key aspects of life in the Borough.

- **Employment status**: Seventy-one per cent of residents have strong English proficiency scores, but this figure is considerably above average for the retired (85%), the unemployed (81%) and those in paid work (76%). It is lower than average among those who are looking after the home or family (44%) or who are self-employed (52%). The groups most likely to lack confidence with numbers are the long-term sick (27%) and the retired (15%) compared with seven per cent overall.

---

16 The ethnicity question changed from Wave 6 to Wave 7 so comparison between waves must be treated with caution
• **Qualifications:** One-seventh (14%) of those with no formal qualifications have weak, poor or no English proficiency, compared with only two per cent of those with formal qualifications. Similarly, one-eighth (13%) of those with no formal qualifications lack confidence with numbers compared with only three per cent of those who do have qualifications.

• **Length of time lived at the current address:** Those who have lived in their current address longer are more likely to have high English proficiency (84% of those who have lived there since before 2001, compared with 59% of those who arrived after 2009). Conversely, the trend appears to be the opposite with regards to confidence in their numerical ability; those who have lived in their current address since before 2001 are more likely to lack confidence with numbers (11% compared with seven per cent overall).

• **Household income:** Those with high English proficiency have a higher mean gross household income (£33,826 compared with £26,607 for those with weak, poor or no English skills). So do those who are very confident with numbers (£35,447 compared with £24,353 for those quite confident with numbers and £31,291 for those who lack confidence).

• **Frequency of meeting friends and relative:** This increases with English proficiency. Among those with strong English skills, three-fifths (62%) meet friends and relatives at least once a week, which is more than those with moderate English skills (51%) or who have weak, poor or no English proficiency (46%). The same trend applies to skills with numbers. Only one-seventh (15%) of those very confident with numbers only meet friends and relatives less than once a month or never. The figure is more than twice as high (34%) among those who lack confidence with numbers.

Newham has seen an overall improvement in the level of qualifications of its residents.

A greater proportion than in Wave 6 is qualified at least to GCSE/NVQ1 level (64% compared with 55%), and the proportion not qualified to this level has correspondingly fallen (from 45% to 36%). However, the proportion without qualifications (36%) is still well above the levels across the UK and London (21% in UK and 17% in London).

The improvement in qualifications levels speaks well of aspiration in the Borough to equip more residents with the skills and qualifications needed to achieve their potential. In particular, Table 4.1 shows there are more residents with A-levels or equivalent qualifications as their highest qualification (25% compared with 18% at Wave 6). It is important to note here that this is not just due to people with A-levels entering the Borough: residents who have only lived in the Borough for two years are proportionally

---

17 The following variable was also analysed, but no significant relationships were found: Perceived quality of life.

18 These figures are based on all 16+ residents.
less likely to have A-levels as their highest qualification (20%) than the average Newham resident (25%). The change is principally to be accounted for by panel attrition. Those who have remained in the panel since Wave 6 are as likely as fresh members to have A-levels as their highest qualification (25% compared with 26%), but the figure was much lower among those who left the panel after Wave 6 (13%) and their departure has boosted the figure. Meanwhile, the proportion of residents with a GCSE/ O-Level or equivalent as their highest qualification has remained relatively static between waves.

Table 4.1 – Formal qualifications amongst Newham residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest qualification (derived)</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
<th>Wave 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal qualifications</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE/O Level/NVQ1 and 2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level or equivalent</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Masters/PhD</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An asterisk (*) denotes any value less than ½ per cent but greater than zero

However, there are still groups of residents that lack the formal educational tools that will allow them to fulfil their potential. Following on from the finding that residents with disabilities have a low confidence in their basic skills, three-quarters of them (77%) do not have any formal qualifications. Furthermore, more than four-fifths (85%) of residents who are not in work due to long-term sickness, and almost half (49%) of residents who are looking after their home or family, have no formal qualifications.

4.3 Families and childcare

Use of childcare in Newham is in line with the London average, and involves a mix of provision.

Childcare is a core component of Newham’s personal resilience agenda. Almost two-fifths of residents (37%) with children under 16 use childcare of some form. At Wave 6 it was reported that only nine per cent of main carers used childcare, whether formal or informal, which was not recorded. For Wave 7 the question was adapted to firstly ask any resident with a child what childcare was used, and secondly to ask the respondent about the specific forms for childcare they may use. For these reasons we are unable to compare use of childcare between the different waves reliably. In Wave 7, the proportion of residents using childcare in Newham is very close to the proportion of people using it across the London (38%), and to an extent the national average (41%).

See section 7.9.4( p134 ) for definitions of highest qualifications – those with no formal qualifications say they have none of these qualifications.
Residents in Newham use a mix of childcare provision. Of the residents with children, almost one-fifth (17%) are using nursery school or nursery class, almost one-tenth (nine per cent) are using breakfast clubs, after school clubs or holiday schemes, and a similar proportion (eight per cent) are using a friend or relative. Looking just at those residents with children aged 0-4 years, they are most likely to use a nursery school or class (26%), followed by a playgroup (12%) and the help of a friend or relative (12%). Other childcare provision used by those residents with children aged 0-4 years include a breakfast club (eight per cent) and a day nursery or crèche (seven per cent).

Residents are also less likely to use informal methods of childcare than formal methods. Almost one-third of residents (33%) with children use formal childcare compared to one-tenth (9%) who use informal childcare. A quarter of those who use formal childcare (26%) pay for at least one service.

It is not just people in employment who use childcare. Two-fifths (39%) of those who use childcare are not in employment. Moreover, being in employment does not affect whether formal childcare is used. A third (33%) of residents in employment use formal childcare compared to 31% for residents who are not in employment. Those in work are more likely to use breakfast clubs as a form of childcare (12% compared to five per cent of those not in work), as well as their friends or relatives (11% compared to four per cent of those not in work).

There are no significant differences in formal or informal childcare use in relation to ethnicity or by income quartiles, which suggests that childcare uptake is consistent across these groups. However, there are indications that the cost of childcare in the Borough may be limiting some residents from fulfilling their potential: 16% of residents who are not in employment say that the cost of childcare prevents them from getting a job.

4.4 Internet access

One-fifth (21%) of Newham households do not access the internet inside or outside of the home, and access is low amongst older and lower income residents (see Figure 4.5).

This is in line with the most recent data Ipsos MORI collects through its quarterly Tech Tracker, which reports that 20% adults in Great Britain do not have access to the internet.

---

20 Informal childcare includes using a nanny, a babysitter or a friend or relative for childcare.
21 Formal childcare includes using a child minder, sending a child to nursery school or nursery class; special day school or nursery or unit for children with special educational needs; day nursery or crèche; playgroup; breakfast club; after school club, or holiday scheme on or off school/ nursery school site.
22 Note that residents may use both formal and informal childcare. These residents will be counted in both categories.
23 The following variables were also analysed, but no significant relationships were found: Types of childcare arrangements, whether paid for childcare or not.
24 Ipsos MORI Tech Tracker Q2. It must be noted that the Tech Tracker reports a different unit of analysis: adults in Great Britain, rather than households.
Age and income are important factors for internet access, again reflecting national data. Older members of the Newham population are far less likely to have internet access either in or away from the home: nearly two-thirds (65%) of residents aged 65+ say that their household does not have internet access. Almost half the households (48%) in the lowest quartile of household income are also without internet access, and half of residents with a disability are in households that do not have internet access.

Of those households who use broadband, the majority only access broadband in the home (86%). One-eighth (13%) of them have access to broadband both in the home and outside it, but this figure is significantly higher among those aged 16-24 (30%) and the highest income quartile (21%). Households made up of a couple and at least three children are more likely to access broadband only at home (96% compared with 89% overall).
**Figure 4.5 – Internet access in Newham**

Q. Thinking about both in and outside the home, which ways do the people in your household access the internet? Do they use ...?

![Bar chart showing internet access](chart)

- **76%** Broadband connection (including wifi)
- **21%** No internet access
- **5%** Mobile network, Dial-up internet for example on a smartphone
- **Don't know**
- **Refusal**

* An asterisk (*) denotes any value less than ½ per cent but greater than zero

### 4.5 Affordability of goods and services

A significant proportion of households struggle to afford goods and services, although ownership of consumer goods generally has increased.

Households are most likely to say they cannot afford but would like a week’s holiday away from home (47%), and this has increased by five percentage points since Wave 6 (Table 4.2). Almost as many (45%) cannot afford to but would like to visit relatives abroad, and this proportion has also gone up (by six percentage points).

As in Wave 6, a third of residents cannot afford but would like household contents insurance (36%) or to replace worn out furniture (35%), as shown in Table 4.2. One-quarter are unable but would like to keep their home in a decent state of decoration (28%), and another fifth (20%) cannot afford to invite family or friends over for a drink or meal at least once a month. Residents are least likely to say they cannot keep their home warm enough, regularly eat meat or fish, or consume fruit and vegetables (six per cent in each case). That these more common items have not increased since Wave 6 is perhaps reassuring given the current national backdrop of the increased cost of living and high cost of utility bills.
Table 4.2 – Inability of households to afford goods and services that they would like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% would like this but cannot afford it</th>
<th>Wave 5</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
<th>Wave 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base (All):</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for a week’s holiday away from home, not including visits to relatives</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit relatives abroad regularly</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have household contents insurance</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace worn our furniture</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have enough money to keep your home in a decent state of decoration</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have friends or family for a drink or meal at least once a month</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy new, rather than second hand, clothes</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat vegetarian meals, vegetarian protein alternatives to meat (e.g. soya, lentils) at least every other day</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep your home adequately warm</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat meat, chicken or fish at least every second day</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat fresh fruit and vegetables at least every second day</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might be expected, inability to afford things is greater for those who are harder pressed. For example, households in the lowest income quartile group are more often unable to afford but would like a holiday away from home for a week (60% compared with 27% in the highest income quartile), or to keep their home adequately warm (nine per cent compared with two per cent in the highest income quartile). And those who are disabled or have a limiting health condition also report more problems. For example, they are more likely than those without a disability or health condition to be unable but would like to be able to replace old furniture (46% compared with 32%) or to visit relatives abroad regularly (50% compared with 43%).

Lone parents generally struggle more to afford things they would like to have. For example, they are more likely than average to be unable to afford household contents insurance (68% compared with 36%) or to keep their home in a decent state of decoration (52% compared with 28%).

Inability to afford things is also more common among Black residents, who are more likely than average to be unable to afford to replace furniture (48% compared with 35% of residents overall) or to buy new rather than second hand clothes (28% compared with 17%).

As might be expected, residents in the lowest income quartile are more likely to say they would like to afford something but cannot afford it. This applies to: visiting relatives abroad, replacing worn out furniture, buying new clothes, having friends or family over for dinner, having home contents insurance, having a hobby and replacing broken electrical goods.
Since Wave 6, ownership of consumer goods has generally increased (see Table 4.3). In particular, more households now own a compact disc player (up 11 percentage points to 38%), a home computer (up eight percentage points to 76%) and a tumble drier (up seven percentage points to 22%). Mobile phone ownership is also up (by six percentage points to 91%).

Just as in Wave 6, households in Newham are most likely to own colour TVs, washing machines and microwave ovens (92% in each case), followed closely by mobile phones (91%). Four-fifths have a deep freeze or fridge freezer (82%) and three-quarters own a landline telephone (77%) and a home computer (76%). Households are least likely to own a compact disc player (38%), tumble drier (22%), dish washer (18%) or cable TV (13%).

Table 4.3 – Proportion of households that own consumer goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Could you please tell me which of the following items you have in your (part of the) accommodation?</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
<th>Wave 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base (All): 1,153</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour television</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing machine</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave oven</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile telephone (anyone in household)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep freeze or fridge freezer</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landline telephone</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home computer/PC (not games console)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recorder/DVD player</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite dish/Sky TV</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact disc player</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumble drier</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish washer</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable TV</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an age discriminator between the different types of consumer goods owned by households. Older residents (those aged 65+) are less likely to have access to modern technological goods:36% own a home computer compared with 76% of residents overall, and 74% own a mobile phone compared with 91% overall. In contrast, for 15-24 year-olds, the only goods that those aged 65+ are significantly more likely to own than residents overall are colour televisions (96% compared with 82% of young residents) and landline telephones (82% compared with 57% of young residents).

Once again, results vary strongly by income, with those in the upper income quartile significantly more likely than those in the lowest quartile to own almost every type of consumer good. The difference between these two groups is particularly great for ownership of home computers (93% in the highest quartile, but only 49% in the lowest) – the same patterns we see in internet access. Ownership of goods is also lower among those who have a disability or long-term limiting health condition. For example, they are less likely than those without a disability or limiting condition to own a mobile phone (82% for without disability and 86% for without a limiting condition.
compared with 92%) or a dish washer (11% for without disability and 10% for without a limiting condition compared with 20%).

4.6 Health and wellbeing

Being overweight and obese is common amongst Newham residents.

The average BMI\textsuperscript{25} scores for Newham show that residents verge on being overweight\textsuperscript{26}. However, a small proportion of residents are bringing the mean score up. The mean BMI across Newham is 26.2 (26.4 for men and 26 for women), suggesting that residents in Newham are on average slightly overweight according to World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines\textsuperscript{27}. The WHO classifies the normal ‘healthy’ BMI as lying between 18.5 and 25.

Newham’s BMI is consistent with London, where the mean BMI is 26.5 for both men and women. In England BMI is 27.2 for men and 27.1 for women. Looking at the median BMI for Newham, this comes out as 25.4 (25.9 for men and 24.8 for women), which is little changed from Wave 6 (25.1). It also suggests that the mean is being skewed by the high BMI scores of residents who are obese or morbidly obese. The BMI profile of residents has changed little since Wave 6, as shown in Table 4.4.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{25}BMI or Body Mass Index gives the ratio of a person’s weight compared to their height. BMI is the most commonly used indicator of being overweight or underweight. BMI has been calculated using the standard formula: weight in kilograms divided by height in metres squared (kg/m\textsuperscript{2}).
\textsuperscript{26}Measurements were self-reported and there is likely to be an element of reporting bias in the figures. There is a tendency to over report weight and underreport height largely as a consequence of social desirability. For more information see S. Gober et al. 2007 (http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2007.00347.x/abstract)
\end{footnotesize}
Table 4.4 – Proportion of residents falling into BMI category and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight Classification (20)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base size</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underweight (under 18.5kg/m(^2))</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal (18.5-25kg/m(^2))</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight (25-30kg/m(^2))</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese (30-40kg/m(^2))</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morbidly obese (over 40kg/m(^2))</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot give estimate</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obesity may be a particularly acute problem in the Black community. Almost a quarter of Black residents (24%) report a BMI that puts them in the obese or morbidly obese category. In contrast, just over one-tenth of Asian residents (12%) report a BMI that makes them obese. In fact, Asian residents more likely to be of a normal weight compared to the average resident (46% compared to 40%).

Problems with weight have some relationship with poverty, as only 30% of those in poverty have a healthy weight, compared with 42% of those not in poverty. Almost half (48%) of Newham residents who are in poverty are overweight or obese, which compares to 42% of residents above the poverty line.

The proportion of residents following NHS guidelines and eating five portions of fruit and vegetable per day has remained relatively constant over recent waves of the survey (see Figure 4.6).

This said, there are indications of a small downward trend in the proportions of residents eating five portions of fruit and vegetables at least five times a week since Wave 5, which will be important to monitor. In Wave 7, just two-fifths of residents (38%) say they eat five portions of fruit and vegetables at least five times a week.

Some residents are eating fruit and vegetables even less frequently. There has been a significant rise in the proportion of residents who are eating five portions of fruit and vegetables less than three times a week. At Wave 6, 27% of residents said they ate fruit and vegetables less than three times a week or never and this now has risen to 38%. The survey suggests that this is unlikely to be due to cost, rather some other factor: during both Wave 6 and Wave 7 just six per cent of residents say that they are not able to afford fruit and vegetables at least every second day. The proportion of people who eat the recommended amount of fruit and vegetables at least five times a week.

\(^{20}\) Weight Classification is adapted from Health Survey for England categories as follows: Underweight = less than 18.5kg/m\(^2\), Normal = 18.5 to less than 25kg/m\(^2\), Overweight = 25 to less than 30kg/m\(^2\), Obese = 30 to less than 40kg/m\(^2\), Morbidly Obese = 40kg/m\(^2\) or more. We have aggregated the Obese I and Obese II categories for simplicity into ‘Obese’. ‘Morbidly Obese’ is used for Obese III. [https://catalogue.ic.nhs.uk/publications/public-health/surveys/hsesurvey-eng-2011/HSE2011-All-Chapters.pdf](https://catalogue.ic.nhs.uk/publications/public-health/surveys/hsesurvey-eng-2011/HSE2011-All-Chapters.pdf) (accessed 05/11/13)
week has gone down most among long-term residents who have lived in the Borough more than ten years (down from 43% to 37%). It is has also gone down significantly among those economically inactive (from 45% to 33%)\(^2\).

The survey clearly identifies how poor diet manifests amongst certain communities in the Borough. Fewer Black residents say they consume the recommended amount of fruit and vegetables per day (31%) compared to other ethnic origins – which may be linked to the higher obesity levels recorded for this community described earlier.

And there are also differences within the Asian population of Newham: significantly fewer Pakistani residents consume the recommended amount of fruit and vegetables (20%) than those from other Asian backgrounds (48% for Indian Asians, 37% for Asian Bangladeshi and 49% for ‘Other’ Asian). However, because ethnicity is the main dynamic at play here, this may not be so easy to address given residents’ eating habits will be aligned heavily to cultural norms and customs.

There is a significant relationship between age and the frequency of eating five or more portions of fruit and vegetables a day. Adults aged 45-54 are more likely to eat less fruit and vegetables than other age groups with 56% eating these food types three or more times a week compared with 61% overall.

Quality of diet varies by household composition, as couples with three or more children and lone occupiers are less likely than average to eat the recommended amount of fruit and vegetables food types three or more times a week (54% and 57% respectively compared with 61% overall). Those who live on their own are also the most likely to have the recommended amounts less than once a week (27% compared with 15% overall).

Findings vary significantly by work status. The long-term sick and the self-employed are less likely than average to eat the recommended amount of fruit and vegetables three or more times a week (40% and 46% respectively compared with 61% overall). The long-term sick, those who look after the home or family, the self-employed and the unemployed are also the most likely groups to not be eating the recommended amounts more than once a week on average.

Fruit and vegetable consumption also varies significantly by Community Forum area. Residents in Forest Gate and Stratford and West Ham are less likely than average to eat the recommended daily amount three or more times a week (48% and 55% respectively compared with 61% overall). Those in Forest Gate and Beckton are also the most likely to not eat the recommended amounts more than once a week (30% and 20% respectively compared with 15% overall).

Looking at other key groups of residents, findings also vary by whether residents receive housing or council tax benefit. Those who do receive these

---

\(^2\) This means those who are looking after the home, long-term sick or disabled, or retired.
are less likely to have the recommended amount of fruit and vegetables three or more times a week (52% compared with 64% of non-recipients). Furthermore, a fifth (21%) of those receiving these benefits eat the recommended amount less than once a week, which is significantly more than for those not in receipt of these benefits (13%)\(^3\).

There is no significant relationship between levels of fruit and vegetable consumption and how well the household is managing financially.

**Figure 4.6 – Fruit and vegetable consumption within the Borough**

Looking at this card, can you tell me how often, on average, you eat five portions of fruit or vegetables a day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Wave 7</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
<th>Wave 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least five times a week</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times a week</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 times a week</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All: Wave 7: (1,019), 13 May - 2 September 2013; Wave 6: (1,153), 18 April - 28 June 2011; Wave 5: (1,485), August 2007 - February 2008

Levels of physical activity in Newham suggest some positive legacy from the Olympic Games of 2012.

Newham may be seeing the effect of the Olympic legacy thanks to an increase in the amount of active people in the Borough. As Figure 4.7 shows, the proportion of residents who do at least 30 minutes of moderate physical activity at least five times a week has doubled since Wave 6 (15% rising to 28%). There has also been a parallel, but less dramatic, drop in the proportion of residents who are ‘inactive’, i.e. they never do moderate exercise for 30 minutes or do so less than once a week (35% in Wave 6 reducing to 29% in Wave 7). It must be noted, however, that this effectively brings inactivity levels back those observed during Wave 5.

However, this improvement may be because the Olympic legacy could have brought more active people to the Borough: residents who are new to Borough are far more likely to exercise. Over two-fifths of residents who have lived in the Borough for two years or less exercise five times a week or more a week (43%), and only 15% are inactive.

Residents on lower incomes are less likely to exercise regularly. Almost two-fifths of residents who live in a household which is within the lower or second lowest quartile of income are inactive (38% for residents in the lowest

\(^3\) The following variables were also analysed, but no significant relationships were found: gender, health status
quartile and 39% for residents in the second lowest quartile of income compared to 29% overall).

**Figure 4.7 - Amount of exercise taken by Newham residents**

![Amount of exercise taken by Newham residents](chart)

Unlike the positive trend we have seen with exercise in the Borough, smoking amongst Newham residents has remained consistent over time, with one-fifth of residents saying they smoke.

As shown in Figure 4.8, the proportion of smokers in the Borough has not changed significantly since Wave 4 which took place in 2004/05 (21%) and is now 20%, and is in line with the England average, reported to be 21% of the population in 2011. Further research would need to be conducted to understand the reasons for this, but it suggests that many of the behaviour interventions from government have not affected smoking rates in Newham, although the context for Great Britain suggests the prevalence of smoking has been stable over the last decade after marked falls since the mid-1970s.

There is a far higher prevalence of smoking for residents of a White ethnic background (where it is 31%) compared to Asian (13%) or Black (14%) backgrounds. Among national groups, Eastern European residents are most likely to smoke, with 41% saying they smoke. Men are more than twice as likely to smoke than women, with almost three-tenths of males smoking (28%) compared to just over one-tenth of females (13%).

Unemployed people are also far more likely to smoke, with almost two-fifths saying they smoke (38%). However, there is no apparent relationship with poverty rates and smoking, which we might expect (relative poverty is calculated as being less than 60% of the national median household net

---

31 Health Survey for England 2011 trend tables (accessed 11/11/13)
32 Opinions and Lifestyle Survey. Smoking Habits Amongst Adults 2012, ONS, pp.2-3
33 The prevalence of smoking is above average for both White British (30%) and White non-British residents (33%).
34 This consists of residents who identify themselves as Polish, Lithuanian, Romanian or any other Eastern European. Romanians are unique among Eastern Europeans as being less likely to smoke than average.
Residents in poverty are just as likely to smoke (20%) as residents who are not in poverty (21%).

**Figure 4.8 – Prevalence of smoking in Newham**

There is a far lower prevalence of alcohol consumption within Newham compared to the rest of the England.

Just over three-fifths of Newham residents (63%) say they do not drink alcohol. In 2011 the Health Survey for England reported that three-fifths of adults (61%) drank alcohol in the last week. In comparison, only just over a third (37%) of Newham residents say that they drink alcohol. Furthermore, there has been no increase in the number of people who drink alcohol in Newham. At Wave 6, 36% of residents said that they drank alcohol.

This finding will in part be due to the ethnic and religious composition of the Borough. For example, two thirds of Black people do not drink alcohol (66%) and over four-fifths of Asians in Newham do not drink (84%). In contrast just over a third of residents from a White background say they do not drink alcohol (36%).

An examination of unhealthy behaviours in Newham shows that a majority of residents exhibit at least two unhealthy behaviours.

The figures collected for smoking, exercise and diet can be taken together to gain a sense of the health risks Newham residents take by not following the recommended guidelines. This is a method developed by the King’s Fund, which has looked at unhealthy behaviours nationally in the aggregate form. Each of these behaviours leads to a higher likelihood of illness and hence

---

36 Health Survey for England 2011 trend tables (accessed 11/11/13)
37 We cannot infer a health risk for the alcohol consumption figure, because health risks with alcohol consumption are based on the number of units consumed. Due to interview study constraints we were unable to collect this data
38 Clustering of unhealthy behaviours over time, The King’s Fund (2012). The King’s Fund aggregate four unhealthy behaviours: smoking, excessive drinking, and not following the NHS recommendations on exercise and fruit and vegetable consumptions. We have not collected level of alcohol consumption and hence our aggregate value is not directly comparable to the King’s Fund work
looking at the number of these behaviours per resident gives us a sense of the overall ‘healthiness’ of Newham residents, and what this may mean for targeted health and lifestyle interventions going forward.

Figure 4.9 shows the proportion of residents by the number of unhealthy behaviours they exhibit (smoking, not taking the recommended amount of exercise and not eating the recommended daily amount of fruit and vegetables). This shows that most residents - nine-tenths (92%) - exhibit at least one unhealthy behaviour and that a majority - three-fifths (61%) - exhibit at least two unhealthy behaviours. However, the position has improved since Wave 6. The proportion exhibiting any unhealthy behaviours has fallen five percentage points (from 97%) and fewer residents exhibit two or more unhealthy behaviours (down ten percentage points to 61%).

Figure 4.9 – Proportions of residents exhibiting unhealthy behaviours

- There is no significant difference between residents below the poverty line and above the poverty line in Newham, suggesting that the healthiness of people’s lifestyle is not necessarily affected by poverty levels. We already noted that the number of smokers does not differ between residents in poverty or out of poverty.

- Across NS-SEC bands, the proportion who exhibit three unhealthy behaviours is greatest among those who are self-employed (25%), or who have never worked or are long-term unemployed (21%), compared with the average for Newham (12%). It is lowest among those in lower managerial and professional occupations (six per cent).

- One-fifth of White residents (18%) exhibit three unhealthy behaviours, which compares to fewer than one-tenth of Asian residents (eight per cent) and only five per cent of Black residents.

- Nearly double the proportion of men exhibit three unhealthy behaviours (16%) compared with women (nine per cent).

---

38 Residents who said they ‘don’t know’ for one of the behaviours were excluded from the analysis
• The youngest and oldest residents are most likely to show unhealthy behaviours compared to the average resident. Only four per cent of 16-24 year olds and just two per cent of those aged 65+ exhibit no unhealthy behaviours, compared to eight per cent of residents overall.

• Satisfaction with health varies significantly by healthy behaviours. As might be expected, the great majority of those with no unhealthy behaviours (89%) are satisfied with their health, compared with seven-tenths (71%) of those who display at least three. Only four per cent of those with no unhealthy behaviours are dissatisfied with their health, compared with a much higher proportion among those who exhibit three (19%).

There are positive signs for Newham Council’s personal resilience agenda. Satisfaction with life overall, and various aspects of personal life, have increased since previous waves of NHPS.

Over three-quarters (77%) of the population of Newham say they are satisfied with their life overall (defined as a score of at least 5 on a scale of 1-7). Newham residents are also more satisfied with life overall compared with both the UK and London. As Figure 4.10 shows, Newham residents score an average of 5.42 for overall satisfaction with life (with a scale of 1 being ‘completely dissatisfied’ and 7 being ‘completely satisfied’). This is a small, but significant difference to the averages for the UK (5.22) and London (5.06).

Residents in Newham are significantly more satisfied with their social life now than they were during Wave 6. Almost three-quarters of residents (73%) say they are either ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’, which is up from two-thirds at Wave 6 (62%). Residents are also more satisfied with the amount of leisure time they get than they were during Wave 6 (59% compared to 50%), as well as with the way they spend their leisure time (62% compared to 54% at Wave 6).

Residents in the Green Street Community Forum area are the least likely to be satisfied (68%) with their life than for any other area in the Borough. Meanwhile, residents living in the Manor Park area are far more likely to be satisfied (87%).
Figure 4.10 – Satisfaction with aspects of life in Newham

Figure 4.11 shows that, of other aspects of life, three-quarters of residents (76%) are satisfied with their quality of health (a mean score of 5.35 out of 7). However, only just over half (54%) are satisfied with their household income (a mean score of 4.46, which is the lowest for any of the aspects of life covered in the survey).

Figure 4.11 – Satisfaction with life scores in Newham

Linear regression (or ‘key drivers’) analysis was conducted to better understand what is driving Newham residents’ overall satisfaction with life. Figure 4.12 explains 54% of variation in satisfaction with life overall, which is relatively strong for models of this kind. The model shows that satisfaction with social life and leisure time has the strongest correlation with people’s life satisfaction. This is followed by how well residents are doing financially and their satisfaction with their income, followed by satisfaction with their health.

The model also shows some less important, but still significant, negative contributors to life satisfaction. These include not being in work, being older and being from a Black ethnic background, as well as the increasing length of time that residents have lived in Newham.
Although residents are on average saying they are more satisfied with life overall, the proportion of residents who assess their quality of life as ‘good’ has dropped since Wave 6.

Then, four-fifths of residents (82%) said that their quality of life was good overall. Now, it has dropped to three-quarters (75%).

Mental wellbeing in Newham may itself have some bearing on residents’ overall assessment of their quality of life. To measure mental wellbeing six psychometric questions were selected from the General Health

---

39 The regression model also tested some factors that did not come out as significant and can be ruled out as contributors to life satisfaction. These included a resident’s religion, a resident having English as a second language, concern about crime/ASB, and being the victim of a physical attack.
Questionnaire and put to Newham residents. Notably, 18% of Newham residents in Wave 7 say they have been recently losing confidence in themselves, and 15% say they have not been able to face up to their problems. One-sixth (18%) say they have been less able to concentrate on what they are doing recently.

It is the harder-pressed groups who seem more affected by these mental wellbeing issues. For example, a quarter of residents (25%) in poverty say they have recently been losing confidence in themselves, which compares with one-seventh (14%) of those who are not below the poverty line. Meanwhile, of significant concern, is that just under two-fifths of disabled residents (37%) say that recently they have been less able to make a decision about things compared the average Newham resident (14%), and almost half (48%) say that they recently have been less able to face up to their problems compared to the average Newham resident (15%).

Table 4.5 on the following page shows a composite score for these questions which give a sense of ‘mental wellbeing’ in the Borough, i.e. their ability to cope with day-to-day challenges in life such as the need to make decisions or to overcome problems. If the respondent answers negatively to the questions, then this is counted as having an issue with mental wellbeing. This method was then applied to parallel questions in Wave 2 of the national Understanding Society survey to make comparisons.

In the UK as a whole, more people show no issues with mental wellbeing than in Newham. However, this may be related to life in London generally rather than Newham. The analysis shows that there is no significant difference between London and Newham in terms of mental wellbeing.

The only significant difference for Newham comes when comparing the Borough to the UK in terms of people who have at least one issue with mental wellbeing. But, at just over three percentage points, this difference is relatively minor, and so it is hard to draw any policy conclusions about the mental wellbeing of the Newham residents as a whole from this rating.

40 The General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) is a psychiatric assessment questionnaire developed by D Goldberg. Understanding Society uses 12 questions from the GHQ to measure psychiatric well-being nationally. For NHPS Wave 7 we selected six of these to help measure mental resiliency of Newham residents and compare this nationally.

41 The questions were as follows:

• Have you recently been able to concentrate on whatever you’re doing?
• Have you recently felt that you are playing a useful part in things?
• Have you recently felt capable of making decisions about things?
• Have you recently felt you couldn’t overcome your difficulties?
• Have you recently been able to face up to your problems?
• Have you recently been losing confidence in yourself?
Table 4.5 – Mental wellbeing in Newham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of issues with mental wellbeing</th>
<th>Newham (%) Base: 884</th>
<th>London (%) Base:4218</th>
<th>UK (%) Base 33486</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>68.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant difference compared to Newham
5. Community resilience
5 Community resilience

Section summary

- The great majority of Newham residents (87%) agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together locally; in line with what we see nationally.

- When it comes to relationships in the community, almost half of residents (47%) say that at least half of their friends come from a different ethnic background, and age and work status appear as important factors here. However, the frequency with which residents socialise with friends and relatives has declined since Wave 6.

- Levels of voluntary work are unchanged, at about one-sixth of residents, but more now say they help sick, infirm or elderly people.

- Around three-fifths of residents agree that if they needed advice, they could go to someone in their neighbourhood – an important factor for instilling a sense of community cohesion. Only a minority (18%) of residents have actually received financial help from friends and family during Wave 7, but they were more likely to be from harder pressed groups (a quarter).

- Most Newham residents continue to live in rented housing (69%), and the proportion owner-occupying has gone up since Wave 6 (from 27% to 31%). Fewer residents rent from private landlords (down from 40% to 33%), but much of this can be accounted for by changes in the composition of the Newham Household Panel since Wave 6. Residents’ satisfaction with their accommodation remains high (82%), and overcrowding stands at just two per cent of households.

- Newham, like other places, faces a ‘perceptions gap’ in the way residents feel about crime and anti-social behaviour in their local area. Whilst we know actual crime to be decreasing in the Borough, more residents than in Wave 6 are worried they or a household member will be a victim of crime (up from 41% to 51%). Furthermore, whilst the great majority continue to feel safe during the day (87%), less than half (45%) feel safe after dark, which continues the downward trend witnessed since Wave 2.
5.1 Community profile and cohesion in the Borough

Analysis of the composition of the Panel shows there are fewer Asian residents, private renters and recent movers into Newham.

As noted in the methodological chapter, nearly half of the respondents to this Wave of the NHPS are new joiners to the Panel to compensate for attrition. These changes are likely to have implications for the profile of the NHPS panel, and the following table (Table 5.1) shows how characteristics differ between those who left the panel after Wave 6, those who took part in both Waves 6 and 7, and lastly Wave 7 participants as a whole.

Table 5.1 shows that those who left the Panel after Wave 6 had generally moved into the Borough more recently than those who remain, and this shifts the Panel profile towards longer-term residence in the Borough. Those who left the Panel were also much more likely than continuing members to be private renters, at least at the time of Wave 6. This is important as it may well account for the marked fall in private renting across Newham between Waves 6 and 7 (which contradicts performance data).

Other differences between former and continuing panellists are that those who left the Panel are more likely to be Asian (especially Indian), and to have been unemployed or a full time student at the time of Wave 6. As a result, the Panel now has a slightly reduced proportion of Asian members.

Work status has also shifted away from students and jobseekers and towards the retired and those who look after the home and family.

There are no differences between those who left the Panel and those who stayed in terms of country of origin. However, tenants who stayed in the Panel are more likely to be in receipt of housing benefit than those who left.
Table 5.1 – Profile of former and continuing members of the Newham Household Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W6 respondents only (Base 688)</th>
<th>Respondents to both W6 and W7 (Base 556)</th>
<th>W7 respondents overall (Base 1,019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of time in Newham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years +</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupier</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rent</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rent</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In paid employment (full/part)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On maternity leave</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after home or family</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time student</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term sick/disabled</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receive Housing Benefit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of origin</strong>[^2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK/EU</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regions</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/no answer/Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NS-SEC 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial &amp; professional occupations</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate occupations</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small employers &amp; own account workers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower supervisory &amp; technical occupations</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine &amp; semi-routine occupations</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked &amp; long-term unemployed</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not classified</strong>[^3]</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newham is still seen as a cohesive community by most residents.

[^2]: The question on country of origin was not asked in Wave 7.
[^3]: The proportion of respondents ‘not classified’ by NS-SEC 2010 is considerably higher in 2013. This is because the 2013 questionnaire did not ask about previous employment people had if they were not currently in work. Without this data, it is not possible to categorise a respondent by NS-SEC 2010.
Reflecting on the views of participants to Wave 7 of the NHPS, the great majority of Newham residents (87%) who are able to offer an opinion agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together locally. The level of agreement has fallen slightly since Wave 6 (by three percentage points), but Figure 5.1 shows how agreement has held pretty steady over the last few waves of the NHPS. Just one-eighth (13%) of residents actively disagree their local area is cohesive. Agreement in Newham that people of different backgrounds get on well is the same as it is across England as a whole (87% in both cases)\(^{44}\).

**Figure 5.1 – Agreement that people of different backgrounds get on well locally**

Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 4</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 6</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 7</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are few significant differences between key groups of Newham residents, with none by age, gender or ethnicity. Those in Custom House and Canning Town are less likely to agree that people of different backgrounds get on well (76% compared with 87% overall). So too are those who are disabled (80% compared with 88% of those without a disability or limiting health condition) or unemployed (77% compared with 87% overall).

Long-term residents are more likely to disagree their local area is cohesive (15% of those who have lived in Newham for more than ten years, compared to four per cent of those who moved to Newham in the last two years).

Since Wave 6, there have been no changes by age. Among panellists who took part in Wave 6, a decline in perceived levels of cohesion is visible, but the level remains high; 85% of them agree that local people of different backgrounds get on well, compared with 90% in Wave 6.

Another important factor that correlates with perceptions of cohesion is whether people in the area are seen as approachable and supportive. Those residents who agree they can approach someone in the neighbourhood for advice are significantly more likely to say that residents of differing backgrounds get on well (91% compared with 79% of those who disagree that they could approach someone). The more willing residents are to seek

---

\(^{44}\) The national figure comes from the August 2012 – January 2013 data for the Community Life Survey.
help from others nearby, the more positively they view community relations. However, there are no significant differences according to how many friends residents have in other ethnic groups.

Linear regression (or ‘key drivers’) analysis was used to find the factors most closely correlated with the belief that people of different backgrounds get on well together in the local area. Figure 5.2 explains 21% of variation in agreement that people of different backgrounds get on well, which is relatively low for models of this kind. That said, it points to views about cohesion being most closely correlated to whether or not residents feel they can go to someone else in the neighbourhood for advice. This underlines the importance of relationships between residents to overall perceptions of community cohesion.

Attitudes to local public services also emerge as important. The second strongest correlation is with satisfaction with Newham Council; the more satisfied residents are with the local authority, the more likely they are to say that local people of differing backgrounds get along well. So too are those who give positive ratings to a range of services, particularly public transport, shops, rubbish collection and schools.

Negative correlations include a high perception of crime and anti-social behaviour, living in Canning Town or Custom House and the length of time people have lived in Newham, with long-term residents being less positive about the level of cohesion in the Borough\(^45\).

\(^45\)The following variables were included in the model but were not significant: age, gender, household composition, work status, ethnicity, health status, proportion of friends of same ethnicity, proficiency of reading English, and frequency of attending meeting for local groups, playing sport, doing unpaid voluntary work, doing evening classes, and using leisure centres, voting behaviour, religion, NS-SEC, disability.
5.2 Relationships in the community

Younger residents and those in work or education have most friends from different ethnic groups.

Half of residents (50%) say that more than half or more of their friends are from the same ethnic background as they are, but a similar proportion (47%) says that half or more than half of their friends belong to a different ethnic group.

Age and works status appear to be important factors when it comes to mixing with others from different ethnic backgrounds, arguably because work, job-seeking or education brings residents into greater contact with those of different backgrounds. To illustrate, younger residents aged 16-24 have the most ethnically diverse friendships; three-fifths (62%) say that half...
or more of their friends belong to a different ethnic group to their own, compared with just over a third of residents aged 65+ (37%). Two-thirds of those in full-time education say that half or more of their friends come from a different ethnic group (65%). So do most of those in full-time or part-time work (54%) or who are unemployed (55%). The figure is just 36% among retired residents, those who are looking after the home or family (25%) and the long-term sick or disabled (22%).

There are very few differences between ethnic groups. The only significant difference is that those of an ‘Asian – other’ background are most likely to say that more than half of their friends come from a different ethnic group to themselves (67% compared with 47% overall).

Across Newham, sharing the same ethnic group as most of one’s friends is most common in Green Street (56%) and Manor Park (55%), which also have the highest Asian populations in the Borough. Sharing the same ethnic group as most of one’s friends is least common in Canning Town and Custom House (40%), which has a much lower share of Asian residents in its population. It is unclear whether this is coincidental as findings do not vary greatly between ethnic groups themselves.

Residents in Plaistow are most likely to say they have no friends at all (eight per cent compared with three per cent overall). This confirms that social life is particularly constrained in this part of the Borough; residents here are also the most likely never to meet friends or relatives (21% compared with six per cent overall). There is no obvious explanation from the survey findings in Plaistow, so this may be a possible area for further research.

Community cohesion does not seem to be affected by whether or not people have friends of different ethnic backgrounds. Of those who agree that local people of different backgrounds get on well together, half (51%) say they have the same ethnic group as more than half of their friends. This is similar to the figure among those who disagree (46%).

Linear regression analysis was then used to find factors associated with residents having all their friends as the same ethnic group as them. The model is not very strong in that it only explains only 13.6% of the variation. Nonetheless, Figure 5.3 suggests that satisfaction with the police is the factor most strongly correlated with sharing the same ethnic group as all one’s friends. Most other factors relate to how active people are. Those who are inactive (e.g. never do DIY, go to the cinema, play sport or visit libraries) are more likely to have the same ethnic group as all their friends. This suggests that an active social life or range of pastimes encourages a more ethnically diverse range of friendships.

---

46 This group is composed of Chinese, Sri Lankan Tamil, Asian British and ‘Asian other’ residents.
47 Asians account for 72% of respondents in Green Street, and 65% in Manor Park, compared with 42% across the Borough.
48 Only 13% of respondents in this area are Asian.
Factors which mitigate against having the same ethnic groups as all one’s friends include having a higher education degree and being of a mixed ethnic background.  

Figure 5.3 – Key drivers analysis of having all friends of the same ethnic group

Residents now meet friends and relatives less often.

Three-fifths of residents (59%) say they meet friends or relatives at least once a week, which is significantly lower than in Wave 6 when it was 68%. Instead, more residents say they meet friends or relatives only once or twice a month or less often (up from 28% to 34%). The numbers who never meet friends or relatives has also gone up since Wave 6 (from three per cent to six per cent).

---

49 The following variables were included in the model, but were not significant: gender, tenure, community forum area, time living in Newham, religion, concern about crime/ASB
Frequency of socialising varies most by age and income. Younger residents appear the most social, with one-third aged 16-24 meeting friends or relatives most days (36%), compared with only one-sixth of those aged 65+ (16%). Harder-pressed residents on lower incomes are also less likely to socialise. Three-tenths of residents in the lowest income quartile rarely meet friends or relatives (30% say they do this less than once a month or never) compared to just one-sixth (16%) of those in the highest income quartile.

Disabled residents seem to find it harder to meet friends or relatives: one-fifth (19%) meet them less than once a month, compared with one-eighth of residents overall (12%).

In terms of where people go to socialise or enjoy pastimes, they are most likely to visit a park at least once a month or once a week (63%). This is followed by a meal in a restaurant, pub or café (44%), a visit to a library (26%), or a trip to the cinema (20%). They are least likely, at least once a month or once a week, to go to a theatre or concert (five per cent), attend meetings of a local group (seven per cent), go to a community event (seven per cent) or do unpaid voluntary work (seven per cent).

5.3 Community support

Levels of voluntary work are unchanged, but more now say they help sick, infirm or elderly people.

The level of unpaid voluntary work is unchanged in Newham. The proportion of residents that do unpaid voluntary work has remained consistent since Wave 5, at about one-sixth of residents (16% in Wave 5, 19% in Wave 6 and 17% now). Only seven per cent of residents do it at least once a month. This is considerably below the latest national figure (36%), although some caution should be made with this comparison due to the differences in question wording.

The proportion who ever do unpaid voluntary work is greater among Black residents (26% compared with 17% overall) and longer-term residents; those who have lived in the Borough more than eight years (21% compared with four per cent of those who moved into Newham during the last two years). It is also greater among young people aged 16-24 (25%) than those aged 65+ (12%).

Across Community Forum areas, the proportions who ever do unpaid voluntary work are highest in Plaistow (28%) and Canning Town and Custom House (25%), especially compared with Manor Park (only eight per cent).

Among those who do unpaid voluntary work, the most common motive is chiefly to improve things and help people (41%). One-quarter (27%) want to

---

50 The national figure comes from the August 2012 – January 2013 data for the Community Life Survey.
meet new people and for one-fifth (22%) it is because the cause is very important to them.

In thinking about giving help to those most in need, the proportions of residents who say they do this increased since Wave 6. Five per cent of Newham residents now provide regular help to a sick, disabled or elderly person who does not live with them; significantly more than in Wave 6, when only one per cent provided this help.

The proportion who offer help in this regard is greatest among middle-aged residents (ten per cent of 45-54 year olds), those who are White British (also ten per cent), and residents who have lived for in the Borough for at least 10 years (eight per cent).

A majority of residents feel they could seek advice from local people.

Three-fifths of residents (58%) agree if they needed advice about something, they could go to someone in their neighbourhood. This is important considering how closely linked it is to how cohesive residents perceive their community. One-fifth (20%) actively disagrees this would be the case, and a further fifth has no opinion either way (19%).

Linear regression (or ‘key drivers’) analysis on this question reinforces the earlier messages – that there is a strong correlation between whether people feel they could go to someone in their neighbourhood if they needed advice and how cohesive residents feel their local area is. (Please note the following model shown in Figure 5.4 explains only 15% of variation in results, which is relatively low for models of this kind.)

Other things that appear to impact on whether people feel they could get advice from someone in their community include being from an Asian background (65% compared with 58% of residents overall) and, separately, being a long-term resident of the Borough (63% of those who have lived in the Borough for more than ten years say they could approach someone in the neighbourhood for advice, compared with 47% of those who moved in during the last two years). Satisfaction with their accommodation, feeling able to make decisions and agreeing that the benefits system is targeted at those who need it also appear to be important factors for residents.

The groups least likely to agree they could go to someone nearby for advice are those from a household consisting of a couple with no resident children, or who have no religion, or who belong to the lower managerial socio-economic grade.

Correspondingly, residents who report specific financial problems are less positive. Those who have fallen behind on their rent or mortgage are less

---

[51] The following variables were included in the model but were not significant: age, gender, English as a second language, perceived problems with about crime/ASB, frequency of playing sport, managing financially, health status, Community Forum area, work status, being a victim of crime and highest qualification.
likely to say they could seek advice in the neighbourhood (42% compared with 59% of those who have not fallen behind). So too are those who are just about getting by financially (51% compared with 61% of those living comfortably or doing alright).

**Figure 5.4 – Key drivers analysis of agreement that residents can go to someone in the neighbourhood if they needed advice about something**

Separate to the regression model, the findings also show how disabled residents (47% compared with 59% of those without a disability or health problem) and those who live in the Canning Town and Custom House area (48% compared with 58% overall) are more negative about being able to seek advice from someone in their neighbourhood; the same groups who are less likely to agree their local area is cohesive.

**Only a minority of residents received financial help from friends and family during Wave 7, but they were more likely to be from harder-pressed groups.**

In the last 12 months, one-sixth of households (18%) had financial help from family or friends. Most often, family or friends have helped them to buy food (eight per cent) or pay their household bills (eight per cent). Six per cent of...
household had accepted money from friends or family to help pay their rent or mortgage, and six per cent had also been lent up to £500 for an emergency.

There are marked differences in these findings according to ethnicity. Compared with the average for Newham (18%), those most likely to have had some financial help are those of ‘Asian – other’ ethnicity (32%) and mixed ethnicity (29%).

There are also differences for harder-pressed residents with around one-quarter seeking financial support. Twenty-eight per cent of residents who are disabled, 26% who in the lowest income quartile and 25% who have a limiting health condition are more likely to have received financial help from friends and family. Whilst this implies that these groups may be struggling more financially, it does suggest they are able to access support from friends and family. Although, it is worth remembering that, more widely, disabled residents feel less networked to the wider local community when we consider they are less positive about cohesion levels in the local area and are less likely to feel that they could seek advice from someone in their neighbourhood (47% compared with 59% of those without a disability or health problem).

Residents are increasingly likely to have had assistance if they find it hard to get by. Only five per cent of those living comfortably had some kind of financial help in the last 12 months. This compares with a quarter of those who are finding things quite difficult (24%) and two-fifths of those who are finding it very difficult (40%). Similarly, only one-sixth of those who are not behind with any bills have received financial help (17%), compared with two-fifths of those behind with all their bills (40%).

It is a positive comment on community cohesion that feeling you can seek advice from other people in the neighbourhood correlates with receiving financial help. Of those who strongly agree that they can go to someone in the neighbourhood for advice, three-tenths (29%) have had some kind of financial help from friends and family in the last 12 months, compared with one-sixth (18%) overall.

5.4 Voting

Just over half of residents (54%) say they voted in either the 2010 UK General Election or the concurrent local election. Almost all those who voted did so in both the national and local elections in May 2010 (96%).

Voting patterns vary widely between groups of Newham residents. Reported voting is much higher among those aged at least 35 (68%) than 16-34 year-olds (39%). It is also higher among Asian residents (65%) than those who are Black (50%) or White (42%). However, the low level of voting among White residents mainly reflects the very low level among those who are White but not British (only 20%).
Long-term residents are much more likely to have voted than those who have only recently arrived in the Borough (68% of those who have lived in Newham at least 10 years compared with 18% of those who moved in during the last two years). This may be partly related to ethnicity, because those who are White but not British are the most likely to have moved into Newham in the last two years. Generally, there is no relationship between voting patterns and either satisfaction with the Council or the frequency of voluntary work. However, those who do voluntary work at least once a week are more likely to have voted in the May 2010 elections (74% compared with 54% overall).

---

52 43% compared with 27% of residents as a whole.
53 This finding should be viewed cautiously because of the low base size for those who do voluntary work at least once a week (39 respondents).
5.5 Housing

Owner-occupation has increased and private renting has fallen in Newham during Wave 7.

As in previous waves of the NHPS, most Newham residents rent their homes (69%). However, there has been a significant increase in owner-occupation since Wave 6 (from 27% to 31% of residents) and correspondingly a drop in the numbers in privately rented housing (from 40% to 33% of residents). The proportion in social housing has stayed broadly consistent (34% in Wave 6 compared with 36% now).

Changes in housing tenure in Newham should be seen in the context of wider changes across the country. Census data show that between 2001 and 2011, the proportion of households in England and Wales that rent privately has gone up from nine per cent to 15%, and owner-occupation has correspondingly declined from 69% to 64% of households. In Newham, the increase in owner-occupation has been particularly great, from 20% of households in 2001 to 34% ten years later. However, in recent months there has been some limited evidence of a revival in the national mortgage market and therefore in owner-occupation across the country.

The drop in private renting appears to contradict some of the Council’s own data on housing tenure in the Borough. Changes should also be seen in light of the changing profile of NHPS panellists. As noted earlier, residents who left the panel after Wave 6 were much more likely to be private renters than those who continued into Wave 7. This may well account for some of the marked fall in private renting we have witnessed across Newham this time around. Furthermore, looking in the round at NHPS trend data for housing tenure, Wave 6 may be something of a statistical ‘blip’, with an acute spike in private renting (40% of residents).

If we put this finding to one side and look only at the numbers in private rented housing in Waves 5 and 7 (26% and 33% respectively in Figure 5.5), the increase between the two is what we could expect to see, based on Census data for Newham. The change is very likely caused by alterations in the panel profile noted earlier. Those members who left the Panel after Wave 6 were much more likely to have been private renters. As a result, the profile of the Panel has now shifted away from private renting and towards owner-occupiers.

---


56 UK housing market shows signs of revival, BBC News 15 February 2013: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business/21385919
Owner-occupation increases markedly with age and income. Almost half of 55-64 year olds are owner-occupiers (47%), compared with only one in six 16-34 year olds (18%). Similarly, owner-occupiers are much more common in the highest income quartile (47%) than the lowest (14%). Owner-occupation also varies by ethnicity, being highest among White British (41%) and Asian residents (39%), and lowest among those who are Black (20%), of mixed ethnicity (15%) or who are White but not British (15%).

Owner-occupation also increases with length of residence, from only eight per cent of those who moved into Newham in the last two years, to two-fifths (40%) of those who have lived in the Borough for at least ten years.

Household composition may also be a factor, as half of childless couples are owner-occupiers (50%) compared with only a tenth of single parents (ten per cent).

Compared with residents overall (69%), those more likely to live in any type of rented housing include young people aged 16-34 (81% of all those in this age group) and those who moved into Newham during the last two years (92%). Renting in any form is also highest among groups who are neither in work nor retired, which includes those in full-time education (89%), the long-term sick (88%), the unemployed (80%) and those who are looking after their home or family (80%). Renting any type of housing is also very high among those who are Black African (90%), White non-British (85%) or of mixed ethnicity (85%).

Looking just at those residents who rent, the proportion who rent from any type of private landlord (e.g. an individual or a company) has declined since Wave 6 (from 54% of all tenants to 47% now). Figure 5.6 shows this is mainly because fewer tenants rent from an individual person (down from 41% to 26%), although there has been a rise in numbers who rent from a property company (from seven per cent of all tenants to 18%).

Just over half of all tenants interviewed in Newham (53%) rent from a social landlord, which is significantly more than in Wave 6 (46%). Figure 5.6 shows
that most often this social landlord is Newham Council itself (36% of all tenants) rather than a housing association (16%).

Figure 5.6 – Changes in rented accommodation within Newham

Across those in all types of rented housing, social renting (i.e. renting from a Local Authority or Housing Association) is more common among older tenants than it is for younger tenants (77% of those aged 45+ compared with 28% of 25-34 year olds). It is also more common among those who are White British or Black (79% and 73% respectively compared with 53% overall) and those who have either a disability or a limiting health condition (83% compared with 44% of those who do not).

In contrast, renting from an individual, company or other private landlord is very common among young tenants aged 16-34 (71% compared with 48% overall). It is also higher among Asian tenants (67%) and particularly those who are White but not British (79%). The great majority of tenants who moved into Newham in the last five years also rent from some type of private landlord (85% compared with 16% of those who have lived in Newham for at least ten years).

Satisfaction with accommodation remains steady, and the incidence of overcrowding is low.

Four-fifths of Newham households (82%) are at least fairly satisfied with their accommodation (as shown in Table 5.2), which is line with the results from Waves 5 and 6 although it is lower than the latest figure for England as a whole (91%)\(^{57}\).

Only a tenth of households (11%) are actively dissatisfied with their accommodation. Again, this figure is consistent with the findings of Waves 5 and 6, but dissatisfaction is higher in Newham than it is nationally (where it is six per cent)\(^{58}\).

\(^{57}\) 2011-12 results for the English Housing Survey, released in July 2013.
\(^{58}\) 2011-12 results for the English Housing Survey, released in July 2013.
Table 5.2 – Satisfaction with accommodation within the Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% satisfied with accommodation</th>
<th>Wave 5</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
<th>Wave 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base (All households):</strong></td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned on a mortgage</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from local authority</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from housing association</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from private landlord</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes to accommodation vary widely between types of tenure. Satisfaction with it is almost universal among those who own either outright (96%) or on a mortgage (97%). Four-fifths of those who rent from a housing association are satisfied with their accommodation (82%). Satisfaction is lowest among those who rent from the Council (75%) or some type of private landlord (74%).

Since Wave 6, there has been no change among owner-occupiers or social tenants, except that satisfaction has gone up by five percentage points among those who own a mortgage. The slight decline in overall satisfaction ratings (from 85% to 82%) is entirely caused by a statistically significant drop in satisfaction among private renters (from 84% in Wave 6 to 74% now). The proportion of private renters who are actively dissatisfied with their accommodation has correspondingly gone up significantly (from seven per cent to 16%).

Older residents are generally more satisfied with their accommodation (89% of those aged 45+ compared with 76% of those aged 16-44), but that may well be because they are likely to be owner-occupiers. In contrast, 35-44 year olds are the most dissatisfied (18% compared with 11% overall).

Satisfaction is also higher among men than women (85% compared with 80%) and among White British residents (92%) than those who are Bangladeshi (70%) or especially Black African (61%). These variations by ethnicity may well be explained by housing type, as White British residents are the most likely of all to be owner-occupiers, while Bangladeshi and Black African residents are particularly likely to rent their accommodation.

Satisfaction is greater among long-term residents who have lived in Newham for at least ten years (86% compared with 71% of those who moved to Newham between two and five years ago). Again, this is likely in part to be because they are more likely to be owner-occupiers. Satisfaction is also greater among lone occupiers (90%) than couples with children (73%) and lone parents (67%).
Across England, three per cent of households are overcrowded. Only two per cent of Newham residents live in overcrowded households in terms of whether various inhabitants have separate bedrooms, although this does not take account of floor space within homes.

However, overcrowding is more likely to be an issue among those who rent from a property company (six per cent). It is also more common than average among Bangladeshi (five per cent) or Black African residents (four per cent). It is highest of all among young residents aged 16-24 (seven per cent) and households that contain three or more children (nine per cent). Across the Borough, the proportion is also significantly above average in Manor Park (four per cent).

5.6 Crime and anti-social behaviour

Perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour in Newham should be seen in the context of apparent decreases in crime levels across the country. The 2012-13 figures from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) show a nine per cent decrease in crimes compared with the previous year’s survey. This latest estimate is the lowest since the survey began in 1981 and is now less than half its peak level in 1995. These declines are also visible in Newham: the total number of crimes recorded in the borough fell by eight per cent between the 12 months before June 2011 and the 12 months before June 2013.

Personal experience of crime has remained steady in Newham.

When prompted with a list of certain types of crime, only one-sixth of residents have experienced any in the last 12 months (16%), and this figure is in line with Wave 6 (15%). It is also just about in line with the latest national figures (in 2012-13, 14% of households had experienced a crime such as burglary or vandalism and five per cent of individuals had been a victim of crime to their person such as assault or robbery).

Of the crimes asked about, Newham residents are most likely to say either they or someone in their household has been a victim of street robbery (five per cent), broken entry into their car (four per cent) or the burglary of their home (four per cent) in the past 12 months. They are least likely to say this about car theft, the vandalism of their home or a physical attack (all two per cent).

The only significant change since Wave 6 is increased personal experience of household burglary (up two percentage points from two per cent to four

---

51% of residents are worried they or a household member will be a victim of crime (up from 41% in Wave 6). Furthermore, less than half of residents (45%) now feel safe after dark.

---

60 Using a definition by Shelter, a home may be overcrowded if it cannot provide a separate bedroom for each of the following: a couple, single adult aged 21 or older, two young people of the same sex aged 10-20, and two children under 10 (but not if there is only one child under ten). However, the definition used in this survey does not take account of actual floor space which is a factor within the Shelter definition.
61 Crime in England and Wales, Year Ending March 2013
62 Down from 34,361 recorded offences in 2010-11 to 31,666 in 2012-13. Crimes recorded by Metropolitan Police
63 Figures from the Crime Survey for England and Wales, 2012-13
per cent). This corresponds with the growing number of residents who perceive house-breaking to be a common local problem (up from 24% in Wave 6 to 28% now).

The highest income quartile has the greatest personal experience of crime; a quarter (26%) has experienced at least one of them in the last 12 months, compared with one-sixth overall (16%). Across other sub-groups, Indian residents are more likely to have experienced street robbery (15% compared with five per cent of residents overall). There are relatively few differences between Community Forum areas, except that those in Beckton are more likely to have had their car stolen (eight per cent compared with two per cent overall). Those in Stratford and West Ham are the least likely to have experienced any crimes in the last 12 months (92% have not experienced a crime compared with 84% of residents overall).

Longitudinal analysis suggests that some panellists’ households have been repeat victims of crime. Among those panellists who said in the Wave 6 survey that they or a member of their households was a victim of crime, one quarter (26%) also reported in the Wave 7 survey that they or a member of their household was a victim of crime.

**Most residents still feel safe during the day, but fewer do so after dark.**

Figure 5.7 shows the great majority of Newham residents feel safe in their local area during the day (87%), and only one-eighth (13%) feel unsafe. Overall perceptions of safety during the day have reduced slightly since Wave 4, but the Wave 7 results show the same trends as in Waves 5 and 6. The proportion of residents who feel ‘very safe’ is actually higher than in Wave 6 (up from 39% to 44%).
Among residents who go out after dark, just under half (45%) feel safe in their local area after dark (see Figure 5.8), and most say they feel unsafe (55%). On this measure we appear to be witnessing a downward trend; whilst statistically speaking perceptions have held steady since Wave 6, when taking a longer-term view, we see that overall perceptions of safety after dark have been slowly but consistently on the decline since Wave 3. The proportion of residents who feel safe after dark in their part of Newham is now 12 percentage points lower than it was in Wave 3 (45% compared with 57%).

Perceptions of safety have only a few geographic variations. The proportion of residents who feel ‘very safe’ during the day is below the average of 44% in Canning Town and Custom House (where it is 34%) and Plaistow (32%). Feeling safe after dark is below average in Beckton (27% compared with 45% overall).

Residents are also less likely to feel ‘very safe’ during the day if they have a disability or limiting health condition (32% compared with 44% overall).
After dark, women say they feel more unsafe than men (64% compared with 45%), as do Asian residents (61%) compared with those who are White (51%) or Black (47%). Perhaps linked to the high levels of concern about teenagers hanging around on the streets (it is the most commonly cited crime/anti-social behaviour in the Borough), across other groups of residents it is couples with children in their household who feel more unsafe after dark (68% compared with 55% overall). This figure is especially high among those who look after the home or family (77%).

**Overall perceptions of the level of commonality of different crimes and anti-social behaviours have gone down or are holding steady in most instances.**

Since Wave 6, there have been varied changes in perceived levels of commonality of different types of crimes and anti-social behaviours. Figure 5.9 shows the problems which are still seen to be just as common a problem – if not more so – as they were during Wave 6.

Teenagers hanging around continues to be the most widespread issue: two-thirds of residents (66%) think this is a common local problem. This is followed by drunkenness in the street or public places (46%) and drug dealing (38%). All of these problems remain as commonly perceived now as in Wave 6 (with no significant differences by Community Forum area). There has also been an increase in the perception amongst residents that burglary is common locally (up from 24% to 28%), as well as prostitution (up from eight per cent to 12 per cent).

**Figure 5.9 – Perceived levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (1)**

[Diagram showing perceived incidence of crime and anti-social behaviour]

However, it is positive to note that poor perception about other crimes and anti-social behaviours has continued to fall. Figure 5.10 shows that fewer residents than in Wave 6 now say their area has a common problem with cars being broken into or stolen (down from 33% to 28%) or graffiti (down from 27% to 20%).

Perception of racially motivated attacks and insults in the local area has continued to fall and is now considerably lower than in Wave 5 (17%).
compared with 26%). The perceived problem with abandoned cars has gone down marginally since Wave 6 (by two percentage points) and is much lower than in Wave 5 (13% compared with 45%). So is the perceived problem with vandalism (down three percentage points since Wave 6, and 22 percentage points since Wave 5).

Figure 5.10 – Perceived levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (2)

There are some differences in terms of how residents view crime and anti-social behaviour issues locally. The main difference between sub-groups is by ethnicity, with greater concerns among Indian residents. For example, they are more likely than average to perceive a common problem with graffiti (32% compared with 20%), drug dealing (56% compared with 38%) and drunkenness (61% compared with 46%). This may help explain why Asian residents are generally more afraid they will be a victim of crime (62% compared with 51% overall).

In contrast, White non-British residents perceive there to be less of an issue with crime and anti-social behaviour. For example, they are less likely than average to say there is a common problem with racial attacks (eight per cent compared with 17%) or house breaking (17% compared with 28%). This may in part be due to length of residence: White non-British residents are generally newer to the Borough, and may still be forming a view of their area. It may also be that they moved from an area where they perceived a higher level of crime and therefore they compare their new neighbourhood favourably with it.

Across other key groups, long-term residents are more likely to perceive problems. Compared with those who arrived in the last two years, residents who have lived in Newham for at least ten years more often say there are common problems with abandoned cars (17% compared with two per cent), racial insults or attacks (19% compared with seven per cent) and attacks on people in the street (25% compared with seven per cent).

Older people also have fewer negative perceptions about crime and anti-social behaviour. For example, those aged 65+ are less likely than average to say there are common problems with teenagers on the streets (53%
compared with 66%) or attacks on people in the street (16% compared with 24%).

Logistic regression modelling was conducted on panel members who thought that the different types of crime and anti-social behaviour asked about in the survey had increased between Waves 6 and 7. Table 5.3 shows in the highlighted coloured cells the significant factors correlated with increased perception of crime and ASB. It shows that residents who had their car broken into in the last 12 months are very likely to have an increased perception that these various crimes and anti-social behaviours are common in their area (odds ratio of 4.4). This is followed by those who have ceased to be satisfied with the Council (2.8), residents in Manor Park and East Ham (2.7), and residents where someone in the household has been a victim of any type of crime (2.1). Feeling unsafe after dark and poor ratings for local police and street-scene services also emerge as significant factors (odds ratios of between 1.7 and 1.8).

64 The dependent variable is produced by looking at the combined score for how common crime/ASB are perceived to be (on the answer scale, very common = 4, and not at all common = 1). The model looks at those with a low score in Wave 6 but who had a high score in Wave 7.
65 The following variables were used in the model but were not significant: age, gender, tenure, household status, ethnicity, disability, English as second language, highest qualification, religion, NS-SEC, fear of crime, feeling safe during the day, satisfaction with life, whether different backgrounds get on well, proportion of friends from same ethnic group as respondent, level of income, frequency of meeting friends and relatives, time living in Borough and satisfaction with accommodation.
Table 5.3 – Longitudinal analysis of those with greater perception of crime and ASB\textsuperscript{66} from Wave 6 and 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odds ratios</th>
<th>Attitudinal data adjusted by community forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadjusted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park + East Ham</td>
<td>2.675**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the Council</td>
<td>2.744**</td>
<td>2.767**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has decreased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the Council</td>
<td>1.605</td>
<td>1.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone in household is victim of</td>
<td>2.078*</td>
<td>2.148*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crime\textsuperscript{67}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car broken into</td>
<td>5.633*</td>
<td>4.392*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel very unsafe after dark</td>
<td>1.682**</td>
<td>1.677**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to face up to problems</td>
<td>1.742*</td>
<td>1.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more so than usual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor rating for street cleaning</td>
<td>1.748**</td>
<td>1.753**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor rating for rubbish collection</td>
<td>1.743**</td>
<td>1.653**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor rating for local police</td>
<td>1.76**</td>
<td>1.794**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* significant at 5\% ** significant at 1\%

Table 5.4 examines perceptions of the different crime and anti-social behaviour problems among those who are afraid they or someone in their household may become a victim of crime. As might be expected, those who say crime is a ‘big worry’ for them are more likely to say all these problems are common, compared with those who only worry a bit. The difference between these two groups is greatest when it comes to perceptions of attacks on people in the street (39 percentage points difference), and especially drunkenness in streets and public places (46 percentage points).

\textsuperscript{66} All of the 12 crime and anti-social behaviour forms asked about in NHPS Wave 7 were included in the model.

\textsuperscript{67} This includes street robbery, having their car stolen or broken into, home burglary, vandalism or deliberate damage to their house, a physical attack, or an other crime.
Table 5.4 – Perceived level of crime and ASB problems according to fear of being a victim of crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Overall (1,019)</th>
<th>A big worry (201)</th>
<th>Bit of a worry (247)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% who say these are common problems:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around on streets</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy on the streets or in other public places</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People dealing drugs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism and deliberate damage to property</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes being broken into</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars being broken into or stolen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attacked on the streets</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti on walls or buildings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insults or attacks to do with someone’s race, colour or religion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned cars</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution, curb crawling and other sexual acts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire setting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite personal experience and perceived incidence of crime remaining consistent, fear of crime is going up.

Despite personal experience of crime remaining consistent with Wave 6 levels, and general perceptions of safety along with perceived commonality of crimes and anti-social behaviours holding steady (or in many cases improving), this wave we see fear of crime increasing. Half of residents (51%) now worry that either they or someone in their household might be a victim of crime - up ten percentage points since Wave 6. Furthermore, almost four-fifths (38%) of residents now say this is a ‘big worry’ – up from 30% during Wave 6.

Worry about crime is significantly higher among Asian residents (57% compared with 51% overall), but lowest among those who are Black (39%). It is also significantly higher in Beckton (68%), but below average in Stratford and West Ham (33%).
In terms of understanding who from existing panel members are more likely to have become worried about being a victim since Wave 6, it appears actual experience of crime is a big factor. The logistic regression model shown in Table 5.5 shows a strong correlation between becoming worried about being a victim of crime in Wave 7, and whether a panel member or a member of their household has been a victim of crime themselves between the two waves: those who did are very likely to worry now about crime when they had not in Wave 6 (odds ratio of 2.4). Age is another factor, as those most likely to have become afraid of crime include those aged 26-35 (1.9) and especially 36-44 (2.7).

Furthermore, those who say they now feel unsafe during the day or after dark are more likely to have become afraid of being a victim of crime (by a ratio of 1.7 in both cases). So too are those who say that teenagers hanging around are a common problem in the local area (1.7). Teenagers hanging around is also the issue most commonly cited as a problem in the local area by residents.

On the other hand, panel members are less likely to have become afraid of crime since Wave 6 if they live in East Ham, Manor Park, Plaistow or Stratford and West Ham. Whilst Beckton did not appear to show a significant correlation in this model, we note elsewhere that the residents most likely to worry about being a victim during Wave 7 live in Beckton (68% worry compared with 51% overall).

68 The following variables were used in the model but were not significant: gender, tenure, household status, time living in Borough, fear of crime, ethnicity, disability, English as a second language, highest qualification, religion, NS-SEC, satisfaction with life, whether different backgrounds get on well, proportion of friends in the same ethnic group as respondent, satisfaction with the Council, satisfaction with the police, emotional wellbeing, income and frequency of meeting friends.
Table 5.5 – Longitudinal analysis of those who have become worried about being a victim of crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odds ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26-35</td>
<td>1.954*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 36-44</td>
<td>2.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs House and Canning</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>0.272*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow</td>
<td>0.379*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and West Ham</td>
<td>0.266*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling very unsafe during the</td>
<td>1.685**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling very unsafe after dark</td>
<td>1.618**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around the</td>
<td>1.658**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streets is very common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone in household is victim</td>
<td>2.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of crime&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 5%  ** significant at 1%

Ultimately, this shows there is still a perceptions gap in Newham that needs to be tackled—residents perceive there to be issues that crime statistics show are not necessarily as problematic as residents think<sup>70</sup>. Other crime issues addressed by the survey – namely, feelings of safety and commonality of different types of crime - have changed little since Wave 6 and in many cases have improved. This suggests that worry about crime may well be linked to wider factors outside of the control of Newham Council and the local police, such as national and local media coverage.

<sup>69</sup>See footnote 67 (p. 78) for a list of crimes included.

<sup>70</sup>For instance, the number of domestic burglaries in Newham recorded in the 12 months before 30 June 2013 was 1,979, which is fewer than the 2,327 recorded in the 12 months before 30 June 2011. This is despite the fact that residents are more likely now than in 2011 to consider house-breaking to be common locally.
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Section summary

- Employment in Newham has increased marginally (although not significantly), with paid employment increasing by three percentage points to 43%. There has been significant decrease in the proportion who are currently unemployed (by four percentage points, to seven per cent).

- The majority of workers have permanent full-time (82%) or permanent part-time (12%) contracts, with just one per cent who identify themselves as working on temporary or permanent zero hours contracts.

- Pay remains low however, with half of residents working for less than the London living wage, and just under one-fifth of employed residents working for less than the minimum wage.

- Housing benefit claimants have increased by five percentage points, with one quarter of residents now in receipt of this benefit.

- Median equivalised incomes are significantly below the national median – at only 71% of the national median before housing costs are accounted for, and 64% after housing costs.

- Two-fifths of Newham households (41%) are in relative poverty, and almost three-tenths (28%) of households are in fuel poverty.

- Housing costs are having a noticeable impact on Newham residents, with private renters in particular seeing their incomes fall as a proportion of the national median after housing costs are accounted for.

- More than one-tenth of households send remittances abroad, with their yearly total payments averaging £1,076.

- Newham’s children face greater hardship than nationally. More than half (55%) of Newham’s children live in households in poverty.
6.1 Employment and wages

Overall, there has been little change in the employment status of Newham residents since Wave 6, although there has been a small drop in unemployment.

Efforts to improve employment levels in Newham, such as the Council’s Workplace service, appear to show some limited success since the previous Wave of the NHPS. Employment in Newham has increased marginally (although not significantly), with paid employment up three percentage points to 43% and self-employment increasing one percentage point to nine per cent (as shown in Figure 6.1). Despite this increase, the proportion of residents in either full or part-time employment is lower than the rate for the UK and London (both 47%).

There has been a corresponding, and significant, decrease in the proportion who are currently unemployed (by four percentage points, to seven per cent). In light of this, unemployment in Newham is in line with the London average\textsuperscript{71}, although still slightly higher than in UK\textsuperscript{72} (where it is five per cent).

Two-thirds of residents who moved to the Borough in the last two years are in employment, which suggests the migration of workers into the Borough may be having more effect on the employment figures.

---

\textsuperscript{71} Understanding Society Wave 2 (Year 2 2011)
\textsuperscript{72} Understanding Society Wave 2 (Year 2 2011)
Some differences emerge in the employment status of different demographic groups.

Whereas 50% of men are in paid employment, this falls to 36% of women. Conversely, one-quarter of women in Newham (25%) are looking after the home or family, compared with only one per cent of men. There are also differences in the employment status of ethnic groups: residents of Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds and Black African residents are more likely to be looking after their home and/or family than average (25%, 29% and 23% respectively, compared with 14% of residents overall). Again, reflecting the overall trend, these figures are led by women.

Overall, patterns of employment are relatively consistent across Community Forum areas. However, unemployment is significantly higher than average in Custom House and Canning Town (13%, compared with seven per cent overall), while residents of Forest Gate are more likely to be long term sick or disabled (11%, compared with four per cent overall).

As would be expected, the proportion of residents who are employed increases across income quartiles. Whereas two-thirds of residents in households in the highest quartile of incomes (66%) are in employment, this falls to an eighth (13%) of those in households in the lowest quartile of incomes.

Reflecting the minor changes between waves, the work status of individual panellists is largely consistent.

Nine-tenths of panellists who were in paid employment in Wave 6 are still in work (88%), while ten per cent of these people are now out of work (three per cent looking after home or family, two per cent unemployed, two per cent retired, and one per cent in long term sickness or absence).
panellists who were unemployed at Wave 6, a third (33%) are now in paid employment.\(^3\)

Some unemployed panellists faced greater difficulties in finding work: more than a quarter (29%) of panellists who rent their properties privately and who were out of work at Wave 6 are now in work. However, this figure falls to 15% of owner occupiers and eight per cent of social renters who were out of work at Wave 6. Part of this can be explained by the fact that social renters and owner occupiers are more likely to be retired than private renters (and hence less likely to re-enter the workforce). However, unemployment is highest among panellists who are social renters at 13%, compared with four per cent of private renters and owner occupiers, suggesting that this group in particular has struggled to find work.

Notably, residents who speak English as a second language are more likely to have started working since Wave 6 than residents whose first language is English. Whereas only six per cent of native speakers who were unemployed in Wave 6 have now found work, this rises to 20% among residents who speak English as a second language. It could be that language skills are not the dominant reason limiting the possibility of employment.

Among those not in work at the moment (except retirees), the things which do most to prevent them looking for work or getting a job are the fact they are still studying or on a training course (19%), the cost of childcare (16%) and an illness or disability that they have (16%). The cost of childcare is mentioned more often by those aged 25-44 (32% compared with 16% overall) and women (22% compared with four per cent of men), whereas illness or disability is more of a barrier for those aged 45-54 (37% compared with 16% overall). As might be expected, 16-24 year olds are by far the most likely to say ongoing studies or training makes it harder for them to look for or get a job (54% compared with 19% overall). Across other key groups of residents, those who are Asian are more likely to say the cost of childcare is a barrier (22% compared with 16% overall).

Of the 80 (weighted) respondents who have looked for work in the last four weeks, the most common way has been to approach an employer directly (57), to go to a job centre or private employment agency (38) or to look at adverts (31) and to ask friends and contacts (29).

**Employment among working age people in Newham is below the national average.**

Two-thirds (65%) of Newham residents aged 25-54 are in work (whether full-time or part-time employment, or self-employed), compared with three-quarters (72%) nationally.\(^4\). Overall, over half of residents of working age are in paid employment (54%), while a further 11% are self-employed.

---

\(^3\) Indicative finding only – small base size (n=49) among Wave 6 unemployed panellists
\(^4\) National figures from April - June 2013 from ONS labour market statistics
Noteworthy are some of the differences in employment status between different groups of residents. The employment status of working age residents differs between the sexes, as shown in Figure 6.2. Men aged 25-54 (54%) are more likely than women of the same age (29%) to be full-time employment, while women (17%) are more likely than men (10%) to be in part-time employment. More than one-third (36%) of women of working age say they are currently looking after their home or family.

Asian residents are more likely to be working under either temporary, seasonal or zero hours contracts compared to the average Newham resident. It is likely that far more young people do part-time or seasonal work (42%) than any other resident because of study commitments and the fact that the fieldwork period took place over the summer holidays.

Educational levels also seem to have an impact on employment status: two-thirds (65%) of residents aged 25 and over with a first degree or higher qualification are in paid employment. This compares with three-fifths (58%) of those whose highest qualifications are A-Levels or equivalent, half (53%) of those whose highest qualifications are GCSEs, and only two-fifths (42%) of those with no formal qualifications. Among those with no formal qualifications, nine per cent are long-term sick or disabled, compared with only four per cent overall.

Self-employment among men has steadily increased since Wave 3. This may be due to the arrival of White non-British workers into the Borough since Wave 5. In Wave 7, one-fifth of White non-British residents (21%) are self-employed, compared with one-tenth of residents overall.

Figure 6.2 – Work status by gender of those aged 25-54

There are more day-time workers in Newham than during Wave 6.

As with the number of residents in full-time employment, there appears to be a move towards UK and London norms for day-time working. In Wave 6,

---

75 The non-British White group comprises mainly of Lithuanian, Romanian and people from other eastern Europe.
only half of Newham residents (50%) who were employed worked during the day. This has now moved up to three-fifths (59%), which is close to the national average of 62% for during the day work.76

The majority of workers have permanent full-time (82%) or permanent part-time (12%) contracts. That leaves only six per cent working to other arrangements: this includes one per cent who identify themselves as working on temporary or permanent zero hours contracts — in line with 2012 ONS estimates at the prevalence of zero hours contracts nationally (0.84%)77. It should be noted, however, that some employees may not identify themselves as employed on zero hours contracts, particularly where they work a full-time week. This figure may therefore under-estimate the true proportion working to such arrangements78.

There are few significant differences between different groups of residents, whether by age, household composition, ethnicity or disability. However, women are more likely to work part-time than men, with almost one in five (17%) doing so, compared with one in ten men (9%).

Breaking down contract types by NS-SEC occupation code79 gives a clearer view of how contract types differ by sector and occupation (see Table 6.1). Almost all those in managerial, administrative and professional occupations (95%) are in full-time and permanent positions. Those in semi-routine and routine occupations are far more likely to have permanent part-time positions.

Though temporary zero hours jobs are uncommon in Newham, they are more likely to exist among small employers and those who are self-employed. Five per cent of residents working in this type of occupation will be on a temporary zero hours contract.

There are no significant differences in the prevalence of zero hours contracts by sector, although those working in retail, wholesale and personal services are significantly more likely to say they are employed on a part-time contract (23%, compared with 13% of all employees).

---

76 Understanding Society Wave 2 (Year 2 2011)
77 Data on the frequency of zero hours contracts from 2000-2012 is available on the ONS website
78 CIPO research released August 2013
79 The NS-SEC classifies people based on their job and level within that job and this classification is now used in all official statistics and surveys. There are eight broad employment categories with many sub-categories beneath which can be aggregated into three tiers. We are using the five sub-category version of NS-SEC. For more information on NS-SEC go to http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/classifications/current-standard-classifications/soc2010/soc2010-volume-3-ns-sec-rebased-on-soc2010-user-manual/index.html
Table 6.1 – Contract types vs NE SEC occupation in Newham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS-SEC category</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Managerial admin &amp; professional occupations</th>
<th>Intermediate occupations</th>
<th>Small employers/own account workers</th>
<th>Lower supervisory/technical occupations</th>
<th>Semi-routine and routine occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base size</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of these best describes your main job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent, full time (16 or more hours per week)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent, part-time (less than 16 per week)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent, zero hours contract (no guarantee of fixed hours)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary (under a fixed contract / through an agency)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary (seasonal work)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary, zero hours contract (no guarantee of fixed hours)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual work</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else (describe)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three-fifths of employees in Newham (59%) say they work during the day, while fewer than one-twentieth work evenings only (four per cent) or at night (three per cent).

Asian residents are more likely to work during the day (64%, compared with 59% of all residents in work), and this is particularly so among those of an Indian background (79%). Within ethnic groups, some differences in working patterns emerge between men and women. Whereas 74% of White men work during the day, only 44% of White women do so. Conversely, White women are more likely to work in the mornings only (17%, compared with seven per cent of White men). By contrast, Asian women are more likely than Asian men to work during the day (74% and 60% respectively). Instead, Asian men are more likely to work in the evenings only (eight per cent, compared with two per cent Asian women).

There are also significant differences in the working patterns of residents who work in particular industry sectors. Workers in the business and
financial services sector are most likely to work during the day only (74%, compared with 58% of all workers), while those in leisure and accommodation are more likely to work at night (21%, compared with three per cent of all workers). Residents who work in public services, transport and utilities (13%), leisure and accommodation (12%) and research and education (12%) are all more likely to work rotating shifts.

Trends in working patterns by NS-SEC occupation codes reflect the different contractual terms on which residents are employed. Nearly all workers in managerial and professional occupations are employed on permanent, full-time contracts; as such, 70% of this group works in the daytime. In contrast, workers in routine and semi-routine occupations are more likely to work to part-time, seasonal and temporary contracts; only 53% of this group say they work during the day.

Nine-tenths of Newham residents (88%) who were potentially able to work in the last year (excluding residents who were retired, students, long-term sick or on maternity leave) worked as much as they were able to in the last year. Only five per cent of working aged resident adults worked less than 20% of their total potential during the previous year. This compares favourably with national statistics, which find that 11.5% of people under the age of 60 live in a household where the adults worked less than 20% of their total potential during the previous year. It should be noted, however, that the NHPS asked about the work intensity of the main respondent only, and findings are therefore not directly comparable with national figures.

The majority of working age people (bar those who are retired, on maternity leave, in full time education or long term ill) have worked in the last 12 months (73%).

However, a sizeable minority (23%) have not worked at all in the last 12 months, and this rises to 39% of women, 43% of Bangladeshis, 38% of Black Africans, 42% of residents who are in a couple with three or more children and half of households (52%) in the bottom quartile for household income.

Analysis of the number of months worked in the last year reveals that employees in particular sectors have less stability in their employment. Whereas four-fifths of workers (80%) say that they worked 12 months in the last year, this figure is only 72% among those employed in retail, wholesale and personal services, and 73% among those employed in leisure and accommodation. Similarly, 88% of residents employed in professional occupations worked for all 12 months of the last year, compared with only 71% of those in routine and semi-routine occupations. This reflects the fact that the latter group have less stability in their contractual working arrangements.

Among those who worked less than 12 months in the previous year, a quarter (24%) could have worked the full year, but did not – rising to 42% of

---

80 National data from ONS data on poverty and social exclusion
men and 43% registered unemployed. Almost half (46%) of those who worked fewer than 12 months in the previous year reported that they could not have worked during the previous year. This figure consists of residents who are looking after their home/family and those who are unemployed. As such, groups more likely to say they could not have worked in the last 12 months are typically determined by their employment status. For example, 59% of women, 68% of Bangladeshis, 57% of households living in poverty and 84% of those looking after the home or family say they could not have worked in the last year.

On average, employed residents work just over a full-time week (mean 36.55 hours worked; median 37 hours worked\(^{81}\)). This compares with a national mean of 32.00 hours\(^{82}\). Those working in construction and manufacturing work the longest hours per week (mean 44.20 hours; median 43.56 hours), while those working in retail, wholesale and personnel services typically work the fewest hours per week (mean 31.93 hours; median 35.00 hours).

**Levels of median gross pay are lower in Newham than nationally, with half of residents working for less than the London living wage.**

The median gross monthly pay among employed residents in Newham (including the self-employed) is £1,409 per month (mean £1,657).

There are some demographic differences at play here. For example, the median income of White residents is higher than that of Black residents (£1,500, compared with £1,378), while the median income of Asian residents varies between different groups, with Indian residents having the highest median income of Asian residents (£1,464), and Bangladeshi residents the lowest income (£68\(^{83}\)). Median monthly incomes are higher among men than women. However this is likely to reflect the fact that a higher proportion of women work part-time.

**Median gross weekly pay** among employed Newham residents is £323.08 (mean £418). ONS data from April 2012 gives a median national weekly income for all employees of £405, suggesting that the median income of Newham residents is just 80% of the national median.

Dividing residents’ gross weekly pay by the number of hours worked per week provides an approximate figure for **gross hourly pay**. According to this measure, the median hourly pay among Newham residents is £8.65 per hour (mean hourly pay £15.93). This compares with a national median hourly pay of £11.46\(^{84}\) (from ONS figures), and a median hourly pay in London of £14.53. It should be noted that this derived figure will not be directly comparable with national figures, since the number of hours worked includes

---

81 Calculated using the total number of hours worked excluding meal breaks, in a normal week, plus the number of hours of overtime worked in a normal week.
82 National data to June 2013 from [ONS labour market statistics](https://www.ons.gov.uk).
83 Caution – the higher unemployment rate among Bangladeshi residents means that income data is based on a small sample size (n=31).
84 National and London medians from the [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2012](https://www.ons.gov.uk).
unpaid overtime. However, using this unofficial calculation suggests that 33% of working Newham residents earn above the national median.

In addition to the demographic variations in pay shown above, there are also differences in pay by industry sector. Only a fifth of residents who work in the retail, wholesale and personal services sector (20%) and two-fifths of leisure and accommodation workers (39%) earn above the London living wage.

In light of this median level of pay, just under a fifth (18%) of employed Newham residents are working for less than the minimum wage of £6.19 per hour for adults 21 and over, while 48% of residents are working for less than the London living wage of £8.55.

Three-fifths of Asian residents (58%) work for less than the London living wage. This compares with only two-fifths of white (41%) and black (39%) residents who do so. Among the Asian community, Pakistani and Bangladeshi residents are more likely to work for less than the London living wage than Indian residents (70% of Pakistani and 78% of Bangladeshi residents earn less than the London living wage, compared with 45% of Indian residents).

Looking specifically at employed residents aged 21 and over, suggests that some groups are more likely to be paid less than the minimum wage.

Residents who have moved to the borough more recently are more likely to earn less than the minimum wage. Almost one third (29%) of residents aged 21 and over who have lived in Newham less than two years are paid less than the minimum wage. By contrast, only seven per cent of residents who have lived in Newham between two and eight years are paid below the minimum wage.

Residents who work for small employers are more likely to be paid below the minimum wage. More than four in ten residents aged 21 and over who work for a company with 1-9 employees are paid the equivalent of less than the minimum wage (42%), compared with 17% of residents aged 21 and over overall.

Asian residents of Bangladeshi or Pakistani origin aged 21 and over are more likely to earn less than the minimum wage, with 35% and 22% respectively earning below this threshold.

Employment status has less impact on pay levels, however. Residents aged 21 and over who are self-employed are equally likely to be earning below the minimum wage as those who are employed (16% of self-employed residents

---

85 The National Minimum Wage was set at £6.19 between October 2012 and October 2013, and is therefore accurate for the period of the fieldwork.
86 The London Living Wage was set at £8.55 between November 2012 and November 2013, and is therefore accurate for the period of the fieldwork.
87 Hourly pay figures for all employees (excluding self-employed and unpaid workers in family businesses) were calculated by dividing gross weekly pay by total number of hours worked per week. It should be noted that this figure includes overtime hours, which may or may not be paid.
aged 21 and over earn the equivalent of less than minimum wage, compared with 17% of those in paid employment).

This reinforces Newham Council’s view that there is significant employment below not only the London living wage, but also the National Minimum wage, and highlights a significant issue in the Borough of needing to make work pay, especially at a time when residents are dealing with an increased cost of living.

6.2 Housing income and financial management

Housing benefits claimants have increased in Newham.

The majority of Newham residents receive some form of unemployment, sickness or means-tested benefit payment. However, there has been a marginal reduction in the proportion of residents receiving at least one benefit (63% at Wave 7 compared to 66% at Wave 6).

The percentage of residents receiving housing or council tax benefit is now 25% compared to 20% at Wave 6. This reflects an upwards trend nationally: the latest figures from the Department for Work and Pensions show that the number of housing benefit claimants rose by 40,526 to 5.1 million in the year to May 2013, an increase of 320,738 since May 2010. Of the total, nearly a million (987,610) are in work, a rise of 52% (337,059) since May 2010. Within Newham, the proportion of residents who are in employment and receive housing benefit has increased, marginally, but not significantly, by two percentage points, from nine percent to 11%.

While the proportion of residents claiming housing benefit has increased by five percentage points overall (to 25%), this increase is led by individuals who rent their homes privately, the proportion of whom claiming housing benefit has doubled from 12% in Wave 6 to 23% in Wave 7. There has also been a marginal, but not a statistically significant, increase in the proportion of working residents who claim housing benefit (from nine per cent in Wave 6, to 11%).

Related to this, over one-third of households (36%) in Newham who rent their property had a rental rebate or allowance deducted from their last payment (see Figure 6.3). This figure is led by payments to social tenants (50%), who are far more likely than private renters (23%) to receive a rental rebate or allowance.

---

68 Respondents were asked whether they received any of the following benefits: Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits; Income Support; Sickness, disability or incapacity benefits (including Employment Support Allowance); Any sort of pension including a private pension or the State pension; Child Benefit; Working Tax Credit; Child Tax Credit; Any other family related benefit or payment; Housing or Council Tax Benefit, other than the single person council tax discount; Income from any other state benefit
69 As reported in the New Statesman, August 2013
There has also been a slight rise in the proportion of residents claiming child benefit (32%, as compared to 28% in Wave 6).

Women are more likely to be claiming child benefit than men, and this is likely linked to results that show households with children and those looking after the home and family are more likely to be claiming one of the listed benefits.

As well as looking at the overall incidence of the receipt of benefit payments at each wave, Ipsos MORI also conducted longitudinal analysis to look at how individual panellists’ benefit payments have changed from Wave 6 to Wave 7. While the proportion of residents receiving benefit payments has not changed greatly, there have been some changes at an individual level. The greatest shift is seen in income-related benefits paid to residents who are working or are not registered unemployed. Almost half of panellists who received working tax credit at Wave 6 (44%) no longer do so, while just under two-thirds of panellists (65%) who were in receipt of income support at Wave 6 no longer receive it. A third of panellists (33%) who received sickness, disability or incapacity benefit at Wave 6 no longer do so.

There have also been changes in payments made to individuals for housing benefits: despite the increase in the proportion of residents receiving housing or council tax benefit from Wave 6, on a personal level one-fifth (22%) of panellists who previously received housing benefit no longer do.

There has been greater consistency in the receipt of child-related payments: only one-fifth of panellists (19%) no longer receive child benefit, and a quarter (28%) no longer receive child tax credit.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) All other benefit payments either see no significant change in individual’s status, or else had too few recipients to be able to analyse longitudinally.
Newham residents face greater financial difficulties than nationally. However, residents who claim unemployment-related benefits long-term risk being caught in a negative cycle of reliance, reducing their financial resilience. Understanding the outcomes of panellists who have received these benefits across multiple waves of the survey, and comparing them with those who have moved off benefits, will help the Newham Council to understand how long-term unemployment affects residents.

At Wave 6, 23% of panellists received either unemployment related benefits, income support or sickness, disability or incapacity benefits. Two-thirds of these panellists (65%) were still receiving at least one of these benefits at Wave 7. Of those panellists no longer receiving these benefits, one-quarter (27%) had moved into work by Wave 7. Panellists who had moved off these benefits by Wave 7 have a higher median net equivalised household income (£11,513) than those who are still claiming at least one (£9,644). This is echoed by panellists’ own perceptions about their financial circumstances. Half of panellists (48%) who have stayed on unemployment, sickness and income benefits between Wave 6 and Wave 7 say that they are worse off than two years ago. This falls to one third (31%) among those who have moved off these benefits.

To understand what factors influenced changes in the number of benefit payments received by Newham residents between Waves 6 and 7, Ipsos MORI conducted logistic regression modelling on panellists who received an increased or decreased number of benefit payments between Wave 6 and Wave 7, compared with those panellists who received the same number of payments across waves.

Table 6.2 looks at those panellists who received a different number of benefit payments in Wave 7 compared with Wave 6 (i.e. they received more or fewer types of payment). It shows panellists who live in Customs House and Canning Town or in Plaistow are less likely to have received an increased number of benefits since Wave 6. Panellists who classify themselves as disabled are significantly more likely to now receive a decreased number of benefits compared with Wave 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Risk ratios</th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th>Attitudinal data adjusted by community forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs House and Canning Town</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91 Other criteria were also tested within the model, but found not to have a significant impact on the number of benefits received. These factors are: age, sex, tenure, household composition, ethnicity, English foreign language, highest qualification, religion, NS-SEC.
Newham residents are split in their attitudes towards the benefits system, but are generally more positive towards welfare payments and recipients than people nationally.

On balance, more residents agree than disagree that the current benefits system targets benefits at those who really need them (49% agree compared to 20% who disagree). But, a sizeable minority have no view or are undecided on this matter (30%). Those most likely to agree include Asian residents (Bangladeshis in particular, at 60%) and the unemployed (64%). By contrast, residents in the upper income quartile (26%) and those in managerial and professional occupations (28%) are more likely to disagree that benefits are targeted to those in need compared with the average Newham resident (20%).

The British Social Attitudes Survey asks whether people agree or disagree with a number of statements about people in receipt of unemployment benefits, and these suggest that national attitudes towards benefits are more negative than those of Newham residents. Nationally, four-fifths (81%) agree that large numbers of people these days falsely claim benefits\(^\text{92}\), while a further third (35%) say that many people who get social security do not really deserve any help. While not directly comparable with the NHPS questions, these views suggest that residents in Newham are slightly more positive about welfare payments and their recipients than the British public at large.

When asked to what extent they agree or disagree that the current benefits system ensures people are better off in work than on benefits, even more residents have no view or are undecided on this matter (40%). The balance of opinion still tips towards agreement (38% agree compared to 22% who disagree), but it is less extreme than for the first attitudinal statement. Again, Asian residents are more likely to agree with the statement (Pakistanis in particular, at 57%), the unemployed (60%), and also those residents living in the Green Street Community Forum area (50%).

By comparison, nationally, around half of people (51%) believe that benefit payments are too high and discourage work, again suggesting that Newham residents are more positive towards the benefits system.

This split in attitudes towards welfare reflects long-term trends in the British public’s attitudes towards the benefits system. For example, whereas in 1985 four-fifths (81%) of participants in the British Social Attitudes Survey believed it was the job of government to provide a decent standard of living for the unemployed, by 2012 this figure had fallen to only three-fifths (59%)\(^\text{93}\). Similarly, the British Social Attitudes Survey has also found that the public is less likely to support increased government spending on welfare.

\(^{92}\) As reported in the British Social Attitudes Survey

\(^{93}\) See national data on attitudes towards welfare from the British Social Attitudes survey
benefits (34% of the public supported an increase in spending and taxation in 2012, compared with 63% in 2002).

Almost half of Newham residents have relatively low incomes, while private renters are particularly hard-hit by housing costs.

Newham suffers from high rates of deprivation. Median incomes in Newham are significantly below the national average\textsuperscript{94}. The median net equivalised household income before housing costs in Newham is £15,704 (mean £20,165), compared with a national median of £22,204. This equates to a median income of £302 per week (as shown in Figure 6.4), which is only 71% of the national median income before housing costs of £427\textsuperscript{95}.

The higher housing costs associated with living in London push net income after housing costs below the threshold for relative low income. Once housing costs are accounted for, the median net equivalised household income in Newham falls to £12,172 (mean £15,916). This means that the median weekly income after housing costs in Newham is £234, which is 64% of the national median income of £367. Income levels fall relative to the national median despite the fact an increased proportion of Newham residents are now in receipt of housing benefit.

Income is not consistent across Newham, and varies between Community Forum areas. In total, five of the nine Community Forum areas have median net equivalised household incomes after housing costs equal to or less than 60% of the national median (Manor Park, Customs House and Canning Town, East Ham, Stratford and West Ham, and Beckton). As such, the median income in these areas is below the relative poverty threshold.

Beckton residents have the lowest median income of all of the Newham Community Forum areas at £14,749 (mean £17,579)\textsuperscript{96}. At only 66% of the national median weekly income, this means that a high proportion of these residents have relatively low incomes. However, these residents are hit very hard by housing costs. The median net equivalised household income after housing costs for people living in Beckton is £9,385 (mean £11,832). This corresponds to a median weekly income after housing costs of £180 – only 49% of the national median, and therefore below the threshold of 50% of median income (£184) that marks households as suffering severe poverty.

As well as illustrating those areas of relatively greater deprivation, comparison of equivalised net income among different tenure holders shows the impact that private rental costs are having on Newham residents.

As expected, owner-occupiers enjoy the highest average incomes, with a median income before housing costs for this group of £22,389 (mean £25,931). Owner-occupiers in Newham therefore enjoy net incomes

\textsuperscript{94} It should be noted that income questions were not asked in a way that is directly comparable with national averages. As such, the findings below should be treated as indicative only.

\textsuperscript{95} 2011/12 data on incomes from the Department of Work and Pensions report on Households, Below Average Income

\textsuperscript{96} Indicative finding - low base size (only 42)
marginally higher than the national average (at 101% of the national median). Private renters are then worse off, with a median income before housing costs at 76% of the national median (£16,956, mean income £21,440). Social renters have the lowest equivalised incomes before housing costs, with a median income of only 52% of the national median (median income among this group is £11,623; mean income £13,917).

The income differential among social and private renters is greatly reduced by housing costs. Whereas the median income of owner occupiers after housing costs increases relative to the national median (to 105% of the national median income), and that of social renters stays at 52% of the national median, the median income of private renters falls from 76% of the national median to 62% after housing costs. Clearly, the cost of renting privately in Newham is having a significant impact on residents’ standard of living. Newham Council’s regulation of private landlords is critical to helping those residents most affected by housing costs to sustain a decent quality of life. Furthermore, plans for shared equity schemes should help private renters to gain access to the property market and thereby help to improve their financial resilience.

Income also varies according to demographics. White residents live in households with a higher median net equivalised income before housing costs (£20,411) than Asian (£15,587) and Black (£13,895) residents. This disparity is maintained once housing costs are accounted for, with white residents living in households with a median net equivalised income after housing costs of £13,988, compared with median incomes of £10,064 for the households of Asian residents and £10,093 for the families of Black residents.

Disabled residents also have lower household incomes than residents who do not consider themselves to be disabled. The median net equivalised household income of disabled residents is £11,641 before housing costs and £9,519 after. By contrast, residents who are not disabled have a median household income of £16,298 before housing costs and £11,916 after housing costs.

Residents aged 25-34 enjoy the highest median equivalised household incomes both before and after housing costs (£19,189 and £13,973 respectively). By contrast, those aged 35-44 have the lowest median household incomes, at £14,943 before housing costs and £11,248 after housing costs.
Newham residents have a number of different household expenditures that differ in many ways from what we see nationally.

This reflects both the relative deprivation in London as well as the different expenses that Londoners face compared with other people in the UK.

**Impact of bills:** Newham residents spend a median of 27% of their gross household income on utilities and food shopping. Unsurprisingly, bills take up a greater proportion of household income among lower incomes groups. Utility and food bills have a greater impact on people who consider themselves to be disabled. The median proportion of household income accounted for by bills is 36% among those residents who consider themselves to have a disability, compared with only 26% among people who do not consider themselves to have a disability. Similarly, while residents of Beckton pay a median 36% of their gross household income on utilities and food shopping, this falls to 22% among residents of Royals Docks.

**Housing costs:** The majority of Newham residents rent their property. However, the impact of rental expenditure differs greatly according to tenure. On average, residents who rent their properties privately pay 42% of their net household income in rent, while the median payment for private renters is 35% of income. By contrast, social renters pay a mean 25% and median 19% of their incomes as rent.

The financial impact of rental payments varies slightly between areas, with a median of around one third of net income being paid as rent by residents of Beckton (37%) and East Ham (32%), while the median figure among residents of Forest Gate (25%) and Customs house and canning Town (25%) is one-fifth of household income.

As might be expected, the impact of rental payments falls as residents get older (and, therefore, as average incomes could be expected to increase). Whereas the median rent as a percentage of net household income is 34%
among residents aged 25-34, this falls to thirteen per cent among those aged 65+. Although base sizes are too small to analyse the impact of rent on different types of households, families typically pay a higher proportion of their income in rent.

Among those residents who own their homes with a mortgage, the average mortgage payment is equivalent to 22% of the net household income, while the median mortgage payment is 21% of income. Given the small number of residents who own their property, no significant differences emerge between subgroups.

**Spending on food**: Newham residents spend just above the national average on food and grocery shopping, but spend around half the national average on eating out.

Households in Newham spend a mean of £74.62 per week on food and groceries in supermarkets, food stores and markets. At £298.48 over four weeks, this is broadly in line with the national mean of £280.61 per four weeks established in Understanding Society Wave 2. In addition to this spend on groceries; Newham households also spend approximately £39.22 every four weeks on snacks and meals outside the home. This compares to a national average of £72.42 every four weeks. Residents of the Royal Docks Community Forum area have the highest spend on food outside the home at a mean of £84.97 every four weeks, while no other forum area has a mean spend greater than £50 every four weeks.

Within their weekly spend of £74.62 on food and groceries; Newham residents say that their households spend an average of £18.79 on fruit and vegetables each week. This equates to one quarter (25%) of their total bills in supermarkets and other food outlets.

In total, Newham residents spend a mean 24% (median 19%) of their net incomes on groceries and eating out.

**Spending on travel to work**: Almost three-quarters (73%) of working Newham residents incur costs for going to work for either transport, childcare, clothing, equipment or tools, or some other expenditure. These residents spend a median £100 (mean £130) on these work-related expenses in a typical month. Newham workers spend a median 4% (mean 7%) of their net salaries on costs incurred for going to work.

**Spending on travel**: The majority of households in Newham have not spent any money on flights abroad in the last year (60%). On average, those households containing people who have travelled abroad in the last year spent an average of £1,146 on flights (median £700).

---

97Includes spending in shops, on meals purchased outside the home, and on fruit and vegetables (questions H55, H56 and H57).
98National figures from the second wave of Understanding Society.
99National figures from the second wave of Understanding Society.
Sending money to others abroad: Just over one-tenth (13%) of households in Newham send money to people in another country. These households sent an average of £1,076 overseas in the last year (median £500).

Asian residents are most likely to send money abroad: 21% of Asian residents say that someone in their household has sent money abroad in the last year. This tallies with estimates from the World Bank that suggest that India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, China and the Philippines are all among the top ten destinations of remittances from the UK.

Household bills: The majority of Newham residents pay their gas and electricity bills separately (65%) as opposed to in one bill (35%) and this has not changed since Wave 6. Groups more likely to pay in one bill include: men (44%), Asian residents (32%) and those classified as being in the top quartile for household income (43%).

Residents who pay for their gas and electricity in a single bill pay around £1,200 per year for their bills (mean £1,178; median £1,200). This falls below the national average bill of £1,315 per year for dual fuel customers.

Meanwhile, residents who pay for their electricity and gas separately pay more in total for their utilities (mean £744 and median £700 for gas; mean £620 and median £600 for electricity). These figures are in line with the national average split-bill payments of £755 for gas and £600 for electricity.

Given that those residents with higher incomes are more likely to pay a combined bill for utilities; this suggests that residents with lower incomes are likely to pay relatively more for their usage of electricity and gas.

Newham residents spend a mean 9% (median 6%) of their net incomes on utility payments.

Despite experiencing financial difficulties, the majority of residents have not fallen behind on bills.

Two-thirds of Newham residents (66%) say that they have not fallen behind in paying their bills in the last 12 months. One-sixth of residents (16%) say that they have fallen behind on bills. Those groups who are least optimistic about their current financial situation are most likely to have fallen behind on their bills. One quarter of Black residents (24%), two-fifths of residents with a limited health condition (41%), one-third who are unemployed (32%) and one-fifth of those employed part-time (22%) say they have fallen behind with bills.

These findings suggest that residents’ perceptions of their situation is generally reflected by the realities of their lives, and that while better

---

100 See the Guardian’s analysis of World Bank remittance data
101 2011-2013 energy price data from Ofgem
financial management can help residents to improve their situations, it is only one aspect of improving overall financial resilience.

**However, given the high levels of poverty in Newham, it is unsurprising that some households have difficulties in keeping up with some of their bills.**

One-eighth of households (12%) have found themselves more than two months behind with their rent/ mortgage, rising among residents of Black (17%) or mixed ethnic backgrounds (24%), those living in Manor Park (19%), the unemployed (21%), long-term sick (22%) and 17% of those living in households with the lowest incomes.

One quarter (23%) of those residents whose households have missed more than two months of rent/ mortgage payments say they had to borrow money to meet the payments, while two-thirds (67%) cut back on their spending.

One-tenth of residents (10%) have found themselves behind with paying their council tax, rising to 24% of those living in Royal Docks Community Forum area 102 and 20% of those residents who are unemployed. Perhaps surprisingly, there is little difference in the proportion of residents who have found themselves behind with their council tax bills based on income.

Nevertheless, the vast majority of residents (92%) are currently up to date with all their household bills, and almost none are behind with all bills. Less than one-tenth (7%) say they are behind on some bills, rising to 20% of lone parents with one to two children and 20% of unemployed residents.

Looking at panellists specifically, there has been little change in their ability to pay their bills over time. Almost nine-tenths of panellists either were behind on their bills at Wave 6 and still are, or else were not behind with their bills and are not currently. More panellists have resolved financial issues (eight per cent) since Wave 6 than have now fallen behind on their bills (four per cent), highlighting a slight increased economic resilience and ability to manage finances among Newham residents.

Social renters are the most likely to have seen a change in their bill arrears status. Even among this audience, who face lower incomes and typically exhibit less positive attitudes towards their finances, the overall picture is positive: seven per cent have now fallen behind in their bills, but 12% are no longer in arrears. There is some further evidence of economic resilience, with those panellists who ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ that they have no financial difficulties most likely to have got rid of any arrears with their bills (12% of panellists who disagree, and 14% of panellists who strongly disagree have stopped being behind in their bills).

**Illustrative case studies:** The case studies in Figure 6.5 look at two similar households within the NHPS and compare their lifestyles, expenditures and financial attitudes. Both these families have gross incomes near the median
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102 Indicative finding only – small base (n=36)
gross household income in Newham. The data contained within the case studies is drawn directly from respondents’ (anonymised) answers to the Wave 7 survey: the names provided are not the respondents’ own. These case studies demonstrate how differing household costs can impact on the things that families in Newham are able to provide to their children.
Sue is 28 and lives in East Ham with her husband and three children. The family’s gross household income is £18,719. This translates to a net equivalised household income of £11,699 before housing costs, and £6,599 after housing costs.

Sue and her husband own their house and their weekly mortgage payments total £680. In total, they have five rooms in their house. On top of their mortgage payments, they pay a dual fuel bill of around £880 a year.

Sue is looking for work, and in the last four weeks she has taken a number of steps to find work, including registering with Newham Workplace. She would like to work full-time, and is not particular about what type of work she would take. She is not concerned about her employability, although her English skills are only moderate, but she does feel that the cost of childcare is holding her back. The household receives child benefit, child tax credit and housing benefit.

She does not feel that she has any financial difficulties at the moment – her situation has not changed much in the last couple of years. She has positive financial management skills – she has money saved for a rainy day, and feels that she is financially organised. In the last year she has not missed any payments on her council tax, mortgage or household bills.

Sue likes to eat out occasionally and the family spend £80 per month to do so, on top of their £80 monthly spend at supermarkets. She has family overseas, and tries to see them once a year as well as sending them money regularly. In total, she manages to send them £300 per year, and spends £520 on flights to visit them.

Sue does not like her children to go without and ensures that they are able to have hobbies, pursue leisure activities and have friends round to dinner.

Shakib lives with his wife and three children in Plaistow. He is 38 and currently unemployed. Although he was born in Bangladesh, he speaks very good English and has lived in Newham for more than eight years.

His gross household income is £18,179, which translates to a net equivalised household income of £10,399 before housing costs and £2,866 after.

His family lives in a privately rented four-room house in Plaistow, for which they pay rent of £1,100 per month. They pay their utility bills separately, and pay £1,000 for gas and £770 for electricity per year.

In the last four weeks Shakib has contacted a private employment agency, but he feels that he does not have the skills or experience to get a job. He would like to take up training in the next year to help him gain work-related skills. His family currently receive Income support and child tax credit.

Shakib ensures that he is up to date with all of his bills, rent and council tax, but he cannot say that he has no financial difficulties. Overall, he feels worse off than two years ago, and neither agrees nor disagrees that he always has money saved for a rainy day.

Shakib and his family tend to eat at home, and they spend £100 per month on food at supermarkets and local markets. They spend about £30 on food bought outside the home. In the last year, his family have not travelled abroad, and he does not send any money to family abroad.

Shakib is not able to give his family everything, but they are able to have celebrations for special occasions and go on school trips, and they each have their own bedroom. While he generally thinks his children have what they need, he would like them to be able to have friends round more frequently.
Newham residents express some concern about their current financial situation.

A quarter of Newham residents say that they are finding it quite difficult (19%) or very difficult (seven per cent) to manage financially these days. A third (32%) says that they are just about getting by. Only 11% of residents say that they are living comfortably, while 31% say they are doing alright.

Compared with Wave 6, there has been an increase in the proportion of residents who say that they are living comfortably (plus three percentage points, to 11%). However, there has been a similar, although not significant, increase in the proportion of residents who are finding it quite difficult to manage financially (plus three percentage points, to 19%).

White residents are more confident in their financial situation than Asian and Black residents, with 17% of White residents saying that they are living comfortably, compared with only ten per cent of Asian and four per cent of Black residents. Within the Asian ethnicity sub-group, there are noticeable differences in the financial outlooks of residents of different heritage. While 10% of Asian residents overall say that they are living comfortably, that figure is 17% for Indians, but only four per cent for Bangladeshis. By contrast, one-third of Bangladeshi residents say that they are finding it quite difficult to manage financially these days (32%, compared with 17% of Indians, and 19% of all residents).

Disabled residents are slightly less positive in their outlook than residents without a disability or limiting health condition: Only 21% of residents with a disability say that they are doing alright these days, compared with 30% of residents without a disability or health condition. Conversely, 42% of disabled residents say they are just about getting by, compared with 30% of residents without a disability or health condition.

Reflecting their lower net incomes, residents in Beckton show the greatest concern about their current financial situation (16% say that they are finding it very difficult to manage financially).
Only two-fifths of Newham residents agree that they have no financial difficulties (41%), while a third (35%) disagree. As might be expected, this measure is closely linked to income, with those residents’ with the highest incomes more likely to say that they currently do not have financial difficulties (51%, compared with 24% of those in the lowest quartile). Residents with a limiting health condition or who are disabled are also more likely to disagree that they currently have no financial difficulties (53% of each), as are residents who are unemployed (56%) or employed part time (49%). Age also impacts on people’s perception that they have financial difficulties. Half of residents aged 25-34 (49%) and those aged 65+ (46%) agree that they have no financial difficulties (compared with 41% overall). By contrast, half of residents aged 35-44 (47%) disagree, compared with 35% overall.

Furthermore, while more than half of residents (55%) say that they are managing about the same financially as two years ago, a sizable minority (31%) feel that they are worse off. By contrast, only 14% of residents say they are better off than two years ago. Again, residents who are unemployed or on long-term sickness absence are most likely to say that they are now worse off (57% and 44% respectively).

There are a great many factors that increase the likelihood of someone seeing themselves as being in a worse financial situation now than two years ago.

Ipsos MORI conducted logistic regression modelling on residents within the Wave 7 survey to understand what factors influence perception of altered financial circumstances. The statistical models first identified demographic factors linked to positivity and negativity, and then looked at the impact of a series of independent variables, controlling for demographics.

Separate analyses were undertaken among panellists who feel that their financial situation had worsened, and on those who feel their situation had improved, in the last two years. Table 6.3 looks at those panellists who feel that their financial situation has worsened in the last two years. It shows that,
in particular, social renters, workers across a range of unskilled and semi-skilled areas, and residents of Beckton, Customs House and Canning Town, Manor Park, Plaistow, Stratford and West Ham are all significantly more likely to feel that their situation has worsened.

Panellists who have become more pessimistic about their current situation typically show lower financial management ability/skills, saying that they have financial difficulties, they do not have money saved, and that they have fallen behind on bills. They are also less likely to save currently.

This analysis shows that vulnerable residents (such as social renters, lower-skilled workers and residents of more deprived forum areas) have been harder hit by the economic downturn. However, it also suggests that limited financial management and economic resilience restricts people’s ability to cope with more challenging financial times.
Table 6.3 – Longitudinal analysis of those panellists with *worsened* self-perceived financial situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odds ratios</th>
<th></th>
<th>Attitudinal data adjusted by demo-graphics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadjusted</td>
<td>Model for demo-graphics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social renter</td>
<td>4.292**</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private renter</td>
<td>1.907*</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton, Customs House and Canning Town, Manor Park, Plaistow, Stratford and West Ham</td>
<td>3.101**</td>
<td>3.615**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.577*</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal qualifications, GCSE/O Level/NVQ12, Other qualification</td>
<td>1.987*</td>
<td>2.377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate occupations, Small employers and own account workers, Semi-routine occupations, Routine occupations, Never worked and long-term unemployed, Not classified</td>
<td>4.425**</td>
<td>3.751*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in satisfaction with social life (ref = no change in satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less satisfied with social life</td>
<td>2.727*</td>
<td>5.429**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in satisfaction with life overall (ref = no change in satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less satisfied with life overall</td>
<td>3.244*</td>
<td>6.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no financial difficulties (strongly disagree)</td>
<td>2.146**</td>
<td>1.906**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always make sure that I have money saved for a rainy day (strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1.709**</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months I have fallen behind on paying bills (strongly agree)</td>
<td>1.627**</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your accommodation? (very dissatisfied)</td>
<td>1.621*</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>0.997**</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 5% ** significant at 1%

Table 6.4 shows the findings from logistic regression modelling of those residents who feel that their financial situation has *improved* in the last two years.

In addition to the factors listed in the main text, we also tested a number of other criteria within the statistical model (including age, gender, disability, financial factors, leisure, health and dietary factors, and satisfaction with social networks, quality of life, finances, accommodation, health and lifestyle), but these were found not to be significant. Noticeably, weekly pay was not found to be a significant factor linked to worsened financial situations.
Unsurprisingly, residents who are more satisfied with their household income are also more likely to feel that their financial situation has improved in the last two years. Similarly, residents with no dependents (whether single, couples with no children, or older/retired people) are also more likely to feel that their situations have improved.

Financial habits are also very important. In contrast to the model in Table 6.4, those residents who say that their financial situations have improved are more likely to display positive financial management strategies. They are more likely to be up to date with their bills and to not have fallen behind with them, more likely to view themselves as organised with managing their money and more likely to have savings.

In light of these findings, inculcating economic resilience, and helping residents to gain stronger skills of financial management, will be central to helping them improve their financial situations in the future.

Table 6.4 – Longitudinal analysis of those with improved self-perceived financial situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Odds ratios</th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th>Model for demo-graphics</th>
<th>Attitudinal data adjusted by demo-graphics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.199*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single person/ elderly/couple no children</td>
<td>2.364**</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate/ Green street/Stratford</td>
<td>2.005*</td>
<td>1.864*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2.867**</td>
<td>2.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no financial difficulties (strongly agree)</td>
<td>1.832**</td>
<td>1.821**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months I have fallen behind on paying bills (strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1.923**</td>
<td>1.732**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very organised when it comes to managing my money day to day (strongly agree)</td>
<td>1.439*</td>
<td>1.376*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t start to worry about crime (W6 to W7)</td>
<td>2.364*</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6-W7 improvement in satisfaction with HH income</td>
<td>2.367*</td>
<td>3.081**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104 In addition to the factors listed below, we also tested a number of other criteria within the statistical model (including gender, tenure, ethnicity, disability, highest qualification, time living in the borough, English as a foreign language, financial and employment factors, leisure, health and dietary factors, and satisfaction with life and the Council, various expenditures, having central heating, health, future financial outlook and lifestyle), but these were found not to be significant.
Where residents feel they are managing better than two years ago, they typically say that this is because their incomes have increased (67%)\textsuperscript{105}. Other reasons cited involve reduced outgoings, whether because of a change in household circumstances (18%), having paid off previous debt (16%) or simply spending less (15%).

The reasons for improving circumstances differ between different groups of residents. Whereas men are more likely than women to say that they are better off because their income has increased (78% compared with 53%), women are more likely to say that they are now spending less on their children (14%, compared with no men).

Increased costs of living, combined with stagnating incomes are having an impact of Newham residents. Among those residents who say that they are worse off than two years ago, two-thirds say that high bills are at least partly responsible (68%). A further 41% mention increased spending.

**Looking at attitudes towards spending, Newham residents generally display positive management skills.**

Half of residents (54%) would rather cut back than put spending on credit cards they could not repay in full.

Finally, two-thirds of residents (66%) say that they are very organised when managing their money day-to-day. This proportion is lower among residents who are disabled (52%) or have a limiting health condition (53%). These groups have lower incomes and are generally more likely to express concern about their future. They may therefore benefit from greater help in managing their finances.

However, debt is becoming a burden for some. One third (34%) of residents who currently have debts say that the repayments are a heavy burden on their household. Black residents are more likely to view their debt repayments as a burden (46%), as are those with a limiting health condition (51%). Newham residents are more likely to view their debts as a serious problem than elsewhere in the country: a BIS report into the level and impact of consumer indebtedness found that 12% of all people nationally, and 18% of those with unsecured credit, consider that keeping up with bills and credit

---

\textsuperscript{105} Separate analysis of those who say they manage things better or worse than two years ago (Questions H96 and H97)
commitments was a heavy burden for their family. Figure 6.7 provides a case study example of a household in debt.

**Figure 6.7– Illustrative Newham household case study for a household in debt**

Jane is 38 and is a lone parent of her son. She works 16 hours a week, earning under £10,000 per year. She feels that her income is not enough to support her family and has difficulty paying her bills – she is currently behind with a few of them. She has asked for help from family and friends on a number of occasions in the last year.

She has also borrowed money to help her meet her bills. In total, she owes £4,300 on loans, cards and late bills. She has £3,000 on a credit card, and is at the limit of her overdraft, but was still struggling to make ends meet, so she took out a payday loan for £800.

While Jane is happy with her life overall, she feels that she doesn’t have enough leisure time, and isn’t happy with the way she is able to spend that leisure time she does have. She would like to be able to afford to buy a few more things for her home and for her son. In particular, she would like to have family holidays, to be able to replace her things a bit more frequently, and to be able to give her son access to more leisure activities.

Despite her money issue, Jane does not worry and she is in good health. She feels that over the last 12 months, she has not been losing confidence in herself, and feels able to face up to her problems.

**Most residents expect their financial situation to remain the same in two years’ time.**

Looking forward, the majority of residents feel that in two years their financial situation will be about the same as it is currently (58%). Among those who feel that their position will change, residents are more likely to be positive (27%) than negative (15%).

Positivity is strongly linked to age, with 43% of those aged 25-34 believing they will be better off, and only nine per cent thinking they will be worse off. By contrast, only three per cent of those aged 65+ think they will be better off financially in two years time, while 20% think they will be worse off. While no ethnic group is more negative about their future economic circumstances, Asian and Black residents are more likely to believe they will be better off (31% and 30% respectively, compared with 21% of White residents).

Residents with no disability or limiting health condition are far more positive about their futures. One-third (31%) of residents without a health condition think they will be better off in two years, compared with only eight per cent of residents with a limiting health condition and 12% of disabled residents.

---

106 National data from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills’ report into Credit, Debt and Financial Difficulty in Britain, 2012
6.3 Financial resilience: who struggles most?

Looking over time at changes between Wave 6 and 7, panellists’ ratings of their financial circumstances were compared to see if they had improved, got worse or stayed the same. The findings show that panellists’ predictions in Wave 6 were not generally accurate. Only one-twentieth of panellists (six per cent) who said in Wave 6 that they would be ‘better off’ in two years provided a more positive rating of their economic situation in Wave 7. By contrast, more than one-tenth (13%) of panellists who thought they would be ‘worse off’ provided a more positive rating of the economic situation in Wave 7.

Changes in panellists’ ratings of their financial situation are related to their financial management skills. Whereas one-fifth of panellists (21%) who ‘strongly agree’ that they have fallen behind in their bills in the last 12 months provide a worse rating of their financial situation in Wave 7, this falls to one-fifteenth of panellists (seven per cent) who ‘strongly disagree’ that they have fallen behind with their bills.

Black and Asian panellists are more likely to offer a more negative view of their financial situation in Wave 6 than Wave 7 compared with White panellists (17% of Asian and Black panellists provided a more negative rating in Wave 7, compared to just eight per cent of White panellists).

Some residents express concerns about their current financial situation that mean they are struggling to meet financial commitments. One-tenth of residents (9%) agree that they have fallen behind in paying their bills in the last 12 months and also disagree with the statement that they have no financial difficulties. Residents aged 35-44 are more likely than average to say they have financial worries and have fallen behind on bills (14%, compared with 9% overall). There are also differences along ethnic lines, with Black residents (14%) more likely than White (5%) or Asian (8%) residents to disagree they have no financial difficulties and say they have fallen behind on bills.

Around half of Newham residents have money saved for a rainy day, while just one-third regularly save.

Reflecting their financial instability, Newham residents are not always able to regularly save money, and many have no savings at all. This is exacerbated by mixed attitudes towards saving that suggest a significant minority of residents do not see saving money for the future as a priority.

Around half of Newham residents (56%) say they have some money saved for a rainy day. Residents in less secure financial situations are less likely to have any money saved: those with higher incomes are more likely to say they ensure they have money saved for a rainy day (65% of residents in the upper quartile say this compared to 40% on the lowest income quartile).

Two-fifths of Newham residents either ‘disagree’ (20%) or ‘neither agree nor disagree’ (21%) that they have money saved for a rainy day. This is broadly in line with the national figures established in a report commissioned by
Legal and General, which found that 37% of households in the UK have no savings\textsuperscript{167}.

Newham residents are split in their attitudes towards spending versus saving. One-third agrees that they find it more satisfying to spend money than to save it for the long term (33%). A third disagrees with this statement (33%), while a further third neither agrees nor disagrees (32%). Men are more likely to say that they prefer to spend money (37%, compared with 29% of women). There is also a difference in views between income groups. Only one quarter (23%) of the lower income quartile agree they find it more satisfying to spend than to save compared with 41% of the upper quartile. Comparing this with the proportions who say they always have money saved for a rainy day suggests it is their financial situation, rather than any negative attitudes towards saving that determines whether residents save money.

More than a third of residents (37%) say they would rather have a good standard of living today than save for retirement. Only a quarter of residents (26%) disagree with this statement. No group of residents is significantly more likely to hold this view, suggesting this is a broader attitude held by society as a whole (and wider polling suggests that a large proportion of the public does not give that much thought to planning for old age).

In line with their attitudes towards saving, only 36% of residents say they manage to regularly save money, while a half of Newham residents say they do not manage to save any money monthly, as illustrated by the Figure 6.8.

Those residents who do save, save a mean 18% of their net income (median 10%). Asian and Black residents who save money regularly, tend to save more money as a proportion of their income compared with white residents (a mean of 23% and 19%, compared with 13% for white respondents).

It is noticeable that the proportion of residents who say they regularly save money (36%) is lower than the proportion who says they always have money saved (56%). These two measures are strongly related, however. Only 18% of those who strongly agree they always have money saved for a rainy day say they do not save money every month, while 82% of those who strongly disagree they always have money saved say they do not regularly save.

\textsuperscript{167}National data from Legal and General Deadline to breadline report
Those in the lower quartile of income are most likely to say that they do not save anything each month (71%). By contrast, only 29% of those in the upper quartile of income do not manage to save anything each month.

Residents who are disabled or who have a limiting health condition also struggle to regularly save money. Two-thirds (66%) of those who are disabled and 60% of those who have a limiting health condition do not save any money each month. Those disabled people who do save money save less on average than other residents, with only four per cent saving more than £50 per month. By comparison, one quarter (24%) of all residents saves more than £50 per month.

Other demographic differences also emerge. For example, women are less likely to save money regularly than men (55% of women do not save any money each month, compared with 44% of men). Residents in the Manor Park Community Forum area are also less likely to save money, with 61% saying they save nothing each month.

The ability to save decreases with age. Whereas residents aged 16-24 who save, save 28% of their gross pay on average, this falls to 12% of those aged 45-54 and seven per cent of those aged 55-64. Reflecting their greater financial confidence and security, Asian residents who save money save the highest proportion of their income, at 23%.

Residents who are saving have a range of goals. Around a third say they are saving for each of the following: long term goals (30%), short term goals (32%) and a mixture of both (33%). No group of residents are more likely to say they are saving for either short or long term goals.
6.4 Poverty and deprivation

Twice as many Newham households are in relative poverty than nationally, while fuel poverty also exceeds national levels.

Two-fifths (41%) of households in Newham are in relative poverty (defined as having an income before housing costs of less than 60% of the national median income for that year)\(^{108}\). This is more than double the national figure in 2011/12 of 16% of households with relative low income, underlining the extent of poverty in Newham\(^{109}\). Poverty levels among vulnerable and disadvantaged groups are far in excess of this figure, with residents who are disabled or have a long term health condition, or who are unemployed or long-term sick all more likely to be in poverty.

Household composition has a major impact on the likelihood a household will be in poverty. Indicatively, single parent households and households containing couples with three or more children are all more likely to be in poverty (these figures are not statistically significant, however, given the low base sizes involved).

Relative poverty levels also differ depending on the demographic profile of household members. Black and Mixed race residents\(^{110}\)(45% and 60% respectively), and women (44%) are more likely to live in households in poverty. Furthermore, over half of Newham residents with a disability (55%) or limiting health condition (56%) have incomes before housing costs that place them in poverty.

Absolute poverty levels\(^{111}\) in Newham are higher still. More than two fifths (44%) of Newham residents are in absolute poverty (someone is considered in absolute poverty if they receive less than 60% of the national median income before housing costs for 2010/11 adjusted by inflation). This compares to a national figure of 17% of households in absolute poverty.

Overall, three-tenths of households are in fuel poverty (28%), i.e. more than 10% of their income is spent on fuel. This is almost double the national figure of 15% of all households\(^{112}\), again, underlining the lower incomes of Newham residents. Groups more likely to be in fuel poverty include residents aged 55+, the disabled and those with a limiting health condition, lone parents, families with children and (unsurprisingly) those classified as being in the lowest income quartile.

\(^{108}\) Calculated for all households (n=946) where we have net equivalised household income data.
\(^{109}\) Data for 2011/12 from the DWP investigation of Households Below Average Income.
\(^{110}\) Indicative finding only - low base (n=41).
\(^{111}\) Calculated for all households (n=946) where we have net equivalised household income data.
Newham’s children face greater hardship than nationally.

Poverty affects children in Newham disproportionately. Whereas 41% of households are in poverty, 55% of Newham’s children aged 16 and under live in households in poverty (before housing costs)\textsuperscript{113}. Nationally, 17% of children are in households in poverty. Child poverty rates vary by community forum area, with two-thirds of children in Manor Park (66%) living in households in poverty. Child poverty is lowest in Green Street – even in this area, however, two in five children (39%) live in poverty.

The analysis below demonstrates what impact child poverty has, and shows how the opportunities available to children in Newham are limited.

Parents of children were asked which items from a list their children have, and which they would like to provide, but cannot afford to give them. Comparing responses from parents in Newham against national data from the Understanding Society survey suggests that children in Newham are less likely to have the majority of these items than their peers in the rest of the country\textsuperscript{114}.

As shown in Figure 6.9, four-fifths of parents in Newham say that their children have celebrations on special occasions (83%), while ten per cent of parents said they cannot afford this for their child(ren)\textsuperscript{115}. This is lower than what we see nationally: 98% of parents in the Understanding Society survey said their children have celebrations, making it the most mentioned item in both surveys. Going on school trips was the second most mentioned item in both lists, but again this was lower in Newham than nationally (67% in NHPS and 96% in Understanding Society).

Children in Newham are significantly less likely than their peers across the country to have their own bedroom. Whereas 44% of parents in Newham say they have enough rooms for every child over ten to have their own bedroom, 89% of parents say this nationally.

In addition, children in Newham are less likely to have leisure equipment (53%, compared with 92% nationally), swimming lessons (47%, compared with 63% nationally), or a hobby or leisure activity (54%, compared with 82% nationally).

\textsuperscript{113}This figure is calculated by dividing the number of children in residents’ households by the number of children in living in households with an income before housing costs less than 60% of the national median

\textsuperscript{114}Comparative data from Wave 2 of Understanding Society

\textsuperscript{115}At this series of questions, parents were first asked which items from a list their children have. For those items that the children did not have, the parents were then whether they wanted their children to have those items, but could not afford them.
Affordability is a key component in terms of children having various items or activities. As Figure 6.10 shows, a majority of Newham residents say they simply cannot afford to give their child(ren) a week away with their family at least once a year. Only one third of parents in Newham (32%) say their child(ren) do this, while half of parents (53%) say that they would like their child(ren) to do this, but cannot afford it. By comparison, two-thirds of parents (65%) in Understanding Society are able to give their child(ren) a holiday away for at least one week, while less than a third would like their children to have this, but cannot afford it (29%).

While Newham Council has implemented plans to improve the opportunities available to children, these findings show how the relative low incomes of Newham residents still impacts on the sporting and leisure opportunities afforded to children living in the Borough. Linked to the overweight and obesity levels we note earlier, promotion and subsidisation of sporting activity for children such as free swims may need to remain a priority for the Council.
The relative poverty of children in Newham is reinforced by data from the Department for Education\textsuperscript{116} which suggests that 40.5% of children at state secondary schools in Newham are eligible for, and claiming, free school meals. This is almost triple the national average (15.1%), almost double the London average (23.4%), and five percentage points higher than the Inner London average (35.4%).

\textbf{Figure 6.11 – Illustrative Newham household case study for a household in debt}

John is 42. He is married, and lives with his wife and two children in East Ham. He is employed full-time in research and education and works 35 hours a week. The family’s net equivalised household income is £12,814 before housing costs. They own their home, and this has a significant impact on their finances. Their net equivalised household income falls to £5,528 after housing costs.

John feels that his family are just about getting by, and says they are doing about the same compared with two years ago. Looking forward to the next two years, he thinks the family will be better off. He is generally very happy with his life and home, but is very dissatisfied with his household income. Despite this, he does not feel that he is having financial difficulties, and has not fallen behind on his bills.

John’s children each have their own bedroom, and they are able to have friends round for dinner, and also have hobbies. There are a few things that he cannot afford for his children, however – he would like them to be able to have a holiday away from home once a year and would also like them to be able to have more leisure equipment.

The family eat the recommended portions of fruit and veg one to two times a week, but John does not feel that he could not afford to provide this more often.

\textsuperscript{116}Data for January 2013 from the Department for Education's report on \textit{Schools, pupils and their characteristics; January 2013}
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7.1 Methodology

This section outlines details of the methodological approach to Wave 7 of the Newham Household Panel Survey (NHPS).

7.1.1 Sampling

The 2013 (Wave 7) sample consisted of two different sample types; panel and fresh cases.

Panel sample

The panel sample consisted of households who had been interviewed at Wave 6\(^{117}\). All panel cases with a productive outcome (i.e. an interview) at Wave 6 were eligible for the Wave 7 study, with the exception of those who explicitly asked not to be re-contacted at the end of the Wave 6 interview.

A total of 1,084 panel cases were issued.

Fresh sample

In addition to the panel sample a fresh sample was selected in order to ensure an adequate sample size for analysis.

Initially 934 fresh cases were issued. Additional reserve sample was issued during fieldwork consisting of 192 cases. In total 1,126 fresh cases were issued.

The panel sample (at Wave 6) and the fresh sample (at Wave 7) both used the Post Office Small User Address File (PAF) as a sampling frame. This was chosen as it provides high coverage of the population and is the most up-to-date source of addresses available. It is also the same sample frame used on previous waves of the Newham Household Panel and on Understanding Society.

Given the relatively small size of Newham a one-stage unclustered random probability sample design was employed. The sample was stratified by i) forum area, ii) the proportion of household reference persons with non-manual occupations (NS SEC 1 and 2), and iii) ethnic minority density (replicating the Understanding Society approach), although as the sample was unclustered the stratification would have very little effect.

The eligible population for NHPS comprises of two distinct groups:

\(^{117}\) At Wave 6 the sample was completely refreshed. Respondents from Waves 1 to 5 of the study were not approached.
1. Adults (16+) resident in Newham for at least six months

2. Households in Newham, containing an adult who has been resident for at least six months

In fresh households an adult was selected at random from those aged 16+ in the household. This selection was administered by interviewers using a Kish grid selection method. In panel households the adult respondent was the person who responded to the adult interview in Wave 6. They had been selected randomly at Wave 6 using the same method described for the fresh sample.

In order to collect data about households in Newham it was necessary to interview the Household Reference Person (HRP) or their partner. In the majority of households the randomly selected individual was the HRP or partner and was eligible to respond to the individual questionnaire and the household questionnaire. In households where this was not the case the selected individual answered the individual questionnaire and the household interview was conducted separately with the HRP or HRP’s partner.

The HRP was defined by the following criteria:

- The adult who owns/rents the property.
- If the property is owned/rented by multiple adults, the one with the highest income.
- If multiple adults own/rent the property and have equal incomes, the oldest of these adults.

This was established in the Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) script. In panel cases there was no assumption that the current HRP was the same as at Wave 6.

7.1.2 Questionnaire development

The survey comprised of four separate questionnaires:

1. The CAPI household grid questionnaire, asked of the randomly selected adult (16+) in each household.

The household grid section captured basic information about all individuals (including children aged under 16) in the household and the relationships between them. For panel households the household grid established any changes to the household composition since the previous wave. It asked whether anyone had left or joined the household and confirmed the sex, DOBs and relationships collected at the last wave.

The Kish grid uses a preassigned table of random numbers to find the person to be interviewed. Interviewers first list the eligible respondents alphabetically. They then refer to the selection table which tells them the number of the respondent to be interviewed.
2. The CAPI individual questionnaire, asked of the same randomly selected adult (16+) in each household.

The individual questionnaire was made up of 14 sections, covering general information about the respondent, religion, values and opinions, health and caring, emotions (self-completion section), childcare, employment, training, crime, unearned income and state benefits, retirement and savings. Respondents were also asked to provide contact information and permission for future waves of the survey.

3. The CAPI household questionnaire, asked of the Household Reference Person or their partner.

The household questionnaire asked about housing tenure, housing conditions, accommodation costs and household expenditure and financial management.

4. The household income module.

The interview included the ONS harmonised question to collect Income as a Classificatory Variable\(^\text{119}\). This series of questions ask the respondent to provide an income bracket for each adult member of the household. This module was included as part of the individual questionnaire, however if the respondent was unable to provide answers for all adults in the households then the remaining adults would be asked directly. These data were collected in a separate income module.

The majority of questions in the questionnaires were taken largely from those used in the previous Newham Household Panel survey, which themselves were taken from questions used in the then British Household Panel Survey (now Understanding Society). This allowed for comparisons between the Newham Household Panel Survey Wave 6 data and data from Understanding Society. A number of new questions were also included.

To test the length and content of the interview a ‘live-pilot’ exercise was undertaken. After fifty interviews had taken place analysis of the length of the interviews was undertaken and a teleconference was conducted with a number of survey interviewers. No particular problems were identified with specific questions. However the interview length was significantly longer than planned and a number of questions had to be cut.

7.1.3 Fieldwork procedures

Twenty field interviewers worked on the survey. Interviewers posted advance letters prior to visiting each address, which included a leaflet explaining the study in greater detail. There were two versions of the letter – one for panel respondents (addressed to the relevant individual) and one for fresh respondents (addressed Dear Resident). Interviewers were required to make a minimum of six face-to-face calls to each address before coding a

final outcome of 'no-contact', with at least one call required in the evening (after 6pm), another on the weekend, and a further call on either an evening or weekend. The first and last calls needed to be at least three weeks apart.

Foreign language interviews were undertaken with interpretation either by the interviewer, or a household interpreter aged over 16. Incentives (£5 high street vouchers) were provided to each respondent on completion of an interview.

Fieldwork for the adult survey was conducted between 18 April and 8 August 2013. The average (median) total interview length per household was 47 minutes\(^{120}\) (i.e. summing the interview lengths across respondents in those households where different individuals answered the household and individual questionnaires). Interviews were conducted in 1022 households. In 1001 of these the individual questionnaire and household questionnaires were completed. In 21 only the individual questionnaire was completed and no household questionnaire was obtained.

\(^{120}\)This is the average interview length after cuts had been made to the questionnaire following the 'live-pilot'. Overall the average interview length was 50 minutes.
7.2 Response at Wave 7

Table 7.1 summarises response to the survey at Wave 7:

Table 7.1 – NHPS Wave 7 response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Fresh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total issued sample</strong></td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel member moved out of Newham</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel member deceased</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel member institutionalised</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadwood</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eligible respondent resident</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ineligible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown eligibility</strong></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel member moved, no follow-up address</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unknown eligibility</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productive</strong></td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and household interviews</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual interview only</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refusals</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office refusal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to interviewers</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken appointment</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other unproductive</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically / mentally unable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language difficulties</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away or in hospital throughout fieldwork period</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill at home throughout fieldwork period</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with selected respondent</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unproductive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey response rate</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-operation rate</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall the Wave 7 response rate\(^{121}\) was 51%. Among panel respondents it was 57% and among fresh cases it was 54%. The co-operation rate\(^{122}\) was 75% overall.

\(^{121}\) Response rate = productive/(productive+unproductive+uncertain eligibility)

\(^{122}\) Co-operation rate = productive/total issued sample
7.3 Panel attrition

During Wave 7 of the Newham Household Panel Survey, 556 existing panel members (51% of those issued) were again interviewed as can be seen in Table 7.2. Therefore, there was a substantial amount of panel attrition with 109 respondents becoming ineligible, primarily because they moved out of the Borough (10% of those issued), and with 266 cases resulting in unknown eligibility (25% of those issued). The latter refers to the cases where the respondent had moved since the previous survey but no follow up address was available or where no contact was made and eligibility could not be established. The number of refusals (95, 9% of those issued) was a fairly typical rate for a panel survey.

Table 7.2 – The final fieldwork outcomes for the panel sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
<th>Percent of issued</th>
<th>Percent of known to be eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not issued</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total issued</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent ineligible</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown eligibility</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total known eligible</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unproductive</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of the panel members who were ineligible at Wave 7 can be seen in Table 7.3. A small number of respondents were institutionalised or were found to be deceased as you would expect from any panel survey however by far the majority of the ineligible respondents were those who had moved home and had become ineligible by leaving the Borough (88, 8% of those issued). It is also certain that had contact been possible, a proportion of the non-contacted cases would have been found to be ineligible as well.

12Co-operation rate = productive/(productive+unproductive)
12Due to no re-contact permission
12Other unproductive outcome codes: Physically / mentally unable, Language difficulties, Away or in hospital throughout fieldwork period, Ill at home throughout fieldwork period, No contact with selected respondent, Other unproductive.
Table 7.3 – The final fieldwork outcomes of ineligible panel sample cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent moved out of Newham</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent deceased</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent institutionalised (e.g. care home / prison)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ineligible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ineligible</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Demographic profile of the Newham Household Panel

Table 7.4 compares the socio-demographic profile of the panel members who were interviewed at Wave 7, and those who could not be interviewed, in terms of their characteristics at Wave 6. The table shows many similarities and some small variations which are to be expected given the small sample sizes. However, the larger differences included respondents of ages 16-24, where 30% were interviewed (compared to 51% overall), and the age group of 25-34, where 36% were interviewed, and hence panel attrition was worst amongst younger respondents. Other groups that suffered greater than average panel attrition included those from households of two or more unrelated adults, respondents who rent from private landlords, those in full time education and those from Forest Gate, Manor Park and Stratford and West Ham. The first three groups are also those more likely to be younger respondents.

Table 7.4 – Proportion of Wave 6 respondents interviewed at Wave 7 by demographics profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Interviewed at wave 7</th>
<th>Unproductive at wave 7</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household composition</td>
<td>Single person HH: elderly</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single person HH: non-elderly</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couple: no children</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couple: children</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2+ unrelated adults</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (3+ with relations)</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social renter</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private renter</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS-SEC analytic classes</td>
<td>Higher managerial and professional occupations</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower managerial and professional occupations</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate occupations</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small employers and own account workers</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower supervisory and technical occupations</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-routine occupations</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine occupations</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never worked and long-term unemployed</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum area</td>
<td>Beckton</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custom House and Canning Town</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7.4: Distribution of respondents across wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Row %</th>
<th>31%</th>
<th>69%</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and West Ham</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Row %</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>55%</th>
<th>417</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In paid employment (full or part-time)</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after family or home</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.5 Further characteristics of the panel attrition

Table 7.5 below shows further comparisons between those who were interviewed at Wave 7 and those who were not. Unsurprisingly there was attrition of those who said they were either very or fairly likely to move in the next two years as it appears many did follow through with their intentions to move. The proportion interviewed across the categories of how well respondents are managing financially and satisfaction with the council, with the exception of very satisfied with the council, was in line with the overall figure of 51%. Three fifths (62%) of those receiving housing or council tax were interviewed, while there was much higher attrition amongst those who had lived in Newham for less than five years, with only 28% being interviewed.
Table 7.5 – Further characteristics of panel responders at Wave 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Derived variable</th>
<th>Interviewed at wave 7</th>
<th>Unproductive at wave 7</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How likely is it that you will move house in the next two years?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly likely</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How well would you say you yourself are managing financially these days?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living comfortably</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing alright</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just about getting by</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding it quite difficult</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or finding it very difficult</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way the council runs things in Newham?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied/dissatisfied</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you currently receiving housing or council tax benefit?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of time lived in Newham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6 Weighting

Weights were computed to account for both the design of the survey, and non-response to the survey.

Four separate weights were computed as follows.

Table 7.6 – Computed weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wv7_IND_longwt</td>
<td>A weight for longitudinal analysis of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wv7_HH_longwt</td>
<td>A weight for longitudinal analysis of household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wv7_IND_cxwt</td>
<td>A weight for cross-sectional analysis of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wv7_HH_cxwt</td>
<td>A weight for cross-sectional analysis of households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6.1 Weighting the longitudinal sample

The first step in the weighting was to generate a set of weights for the analysis of the individual longitudinal sample. The aim was to reduce bias arising from non-response. A range of variables (demographic variables and variables from the Wave 6 questionnaire) were examined for their relationship to response status and those most closely related to non-response were used to construct a non-response model. A logistic regression model was fitted, with the y-variable taken as the individual’s response status as the x-variables being:

- Forum area,
- age within gender,
- number of children in the household,
- number of adults in the household,
- the individual’s English language skills (Strong, Moderate or Weak/None),
- the accommodation type (Detached/Semi-Detached, Terraced or Flat/Other), and
- an indicator of whether the respondent had a Home computer in their accommodation.

The non-response weight was taken as the reciprocal of the predicted probability of response. A small number of large weights (three out of 557 responders) were trimmed to ensure no single individual was over-influential on the survey results. The non-response weight was then multiplied by the weight inherited from Wave 6 to give the individual longitudinal weight.

A separate model was used to obtain the household longitudinal weights. The household non-response model used the same variables as used in the individual non-response model, and an additional variable – the total number of rooms in the house. The six highest non-response weights were trimmed and then multiplied by the household weight inherited from Wave 6 to give the household longitudinal weight.
7.6.2 Weighting the cross-sectional sample

Cross-sectional estimates are obtained using the longitudinal and fresh samples. A household design weight was calculated for each household in the fresh sample to account for differing selection probabilities at the dwelling unit selection and household selection stages. This weight is simply the product of the number of dwelling units and the number of households within the dwelling unit (in each case capped to have a maximum values of three). An individual design weight was then calculated as the product of the household design weight and the number of eligible individuals within the household (capped at a maximum of four).

The longitudinal and fresh samples were then combined and calibrated to Newham population data using two rims:

- Rim 1 – sex by age
- Rim 2 – forum area

7.6.3 Use of the weights

The weights are designed to be used to make inferences about different populations. The longitudinal weights refer to the population resident in Newham at the time of Wave 6, and still resident at Wave 7. This population excludes all newcomers to Newham, and any young adult resident in Newham at Wave 7, but who was under 16 at Wave 6. The Cross-sectional weight refer to the current Newham population.

7.7 Longitudinal and cross-sectional samples used in analysis

The NHPS is a panel survey, whereby attempts are made to interview the same individuals at each wave. In Wave 6 the sample was completely refreshed with a new sample. Collecting data from individuals at more than one point in time enables change to be explored at the individual level, rather than to look at changes in the estimates for the whole population, which is the main purpose of repeated cross-sectional data. For this purpose the part of the sample which is of most interest is the longitudinal sample, i.e. those individuals who provide information at two waves.

In the Wave 6 report analysis is carried out on two different groups. The longitudinal sample contains those interviewed at Wave 6 and Wave 7; this sample consists of 556 individual respondents. A larger sample is available from a cross-sectional perspective, i.e. all those who responded at Wave 7.

7.8 Statistical reliability

The respondents to the survey are only samples of the total population, so the figures obtained will differ from those we would have obtained if everybody had been interviewed. We can, however, predict the variation between the sample results and the true values from knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the variability of the weights. We estimate the design effect due to weighting and calculate the
weighting efficiency as the reciprocal of the design effect. The effective sample size is then estimated as the product of the achieved sample size and the efficiency.

Tables 7.7 and 7.8 estimate the design effect due to weighting using the formula of one plus the coefficient of variation of the weights squared. This formula does not take into account any relationship between the response variable and the weighting variables (the relationship will be specific to each question) so for many questions the effective sample sizes are likely to be slightly larger than those given here.

Table 7.7 – Statistical reliability for different types of analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Achieved sample size</th>
<th>Design Effect</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effective sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual longitudinal</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household longitudinal</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual cross-sectional</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household cross-sectional</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between the effective sample size and the precision of estimates is shown in Table 7.8. The table shows the margin of error associated with estimates of different population proportions for various different effective sample sizes. Thus, for the individual cross-sectional analysis (having an effective sample size approximately equal to 600) our estimates could have a margin of error of approximately 4.0 percentage points (if the true population percentage is 50%) or as little as 2.4 percentage points (if the true population percentage is 10% or 90%).
Table 7.8 – Effective sample sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective sample size</th>
<th>Population proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.9 Derived variables

A number of variables used in the analysis are derived from a number of questions in the survey or, in the case of panel respondents, from a combination of Wave 6 and Wave 7 data. Details of the variable derivations are outlined below.

7.9.1 English proficiency

This variable sums the scores of A7, A8, A9 into one variable to identify English Language proficiency.

A7 How well do you feel you can speak English?

A8 How well can you read English?

A9 How well can you write English?

If < 5 = Strong English Skills; if 5 to 7 = moderate English skills; if 8 to 11 = Weak English Skills; if > 11 = Poor or no English Skills.

7.9.2 Monthly and weekly pay

This variable calculates weekly pay using questions E18 and E19 for paid employees, and questions E60- E63 for self-employed residents.

E18 The last time you were paid, what was your gross pay that is including any overtime, bonuses, commission, tips or tax refund, but before any deductions for tax, national insurance, or pension contributions, union dues and so on?

E19 How long a period did that cover?

E60 On average, what was your WEEKLY or MONTHLY income from this job/business over the last 12 months?

E61 Was that weekly or monthly income?
E62 Can I just check, is that figure before the deduction of income tax?

E63 And is that figure before the deduction of National Insurance?

7.9.3 Savings as a percentage of total income

This variable calculates savings (from question S2 below) as a percentage of total monthly pay (obtained for residents in paid employment or the self-employed).

S2. About how much on average do you personally manage to save a month?

7.9.4 Highest qualification

For the purpose of this analysis, highest qualification is derived from questions on higher education qualifications held (A16) and school qualifications held (A20). Details of this are as follows:

GCSE/O Level/NVQ12 qualifications

Youth training certificate/Skillseekers, Recognised trade apprenticeship completed, Clerical and commercial qualifications (e.g. typing/shorthand/book-keeping/commerce), City & Guilds Certificate - Craft/Intermediate/Ordinary/Part I/or Scotvec National Certificate Modules/or NVQ1/SVQ1, School Certificate or Matriculation, CSE grades 1-5/A-G, GCSE A-G, O level, GNVQ, SCE Ordinary Grade bands D-E or 4-5 (1973 or later), O grades, Standard Grade level 1-7, Higher Grade, and School Leaving Certificate.

A level or equivalent

A level A-G, City & Guilds Certificate (Advanced/Final/Part II/or Scotvec Higher National Units/or NVQ2/SVQ2 or Full Technological/Part III/or Scotvec Higher National Units/or NVQ3/SVQ3), Ordinary National Certificate (ONC) or Diploma (OND), BEC/TEC/BTEC/Scotvec National Certificate or Diploma/or NVQ3/S, Higher National Certificate (HNC) or Diploma (HND), BEC/TEC/BTEC/Scotvec Higher Certificate or Higher Diploma/or NVQ, Teaching qualifications (not degree), Higher School Certificate, AS level, and Certificate of 6th year studies.

Degree/Masters/PhD

Nursing qualifications (e.g. SEN, SRN, SCM, RGN), University diploma, University or CNAA First Degree (e.g. BA, B.Ed, BSc, University or CNAA Higher Degree (e.g. MSc, PhD).
7.9.5 Tenure
Households defined as owner-occupier include those owned outright, those owned or being bought on a mortgage, and those in shared ownership.

7.9.6 Monthly and weekly rent
Has been approximated based on H26 (How much was the last rent payment, including any services or water charges but after any rebates? and H27 What period did this cover?)

7.9.7 Housing status change
Compares current tenure (H16) with the tenure that respondents would like to have in five year’s time (H45) and codes households according to the following definitions: stable (no change), step up (move from rented to owner occupied accommodation), step down (move from owner occupied to rented accommodation), and other.

H16 Does your household own this accommodation outright, is it being bought with a mortgage, is it rented or does it come rent-free?

H45 In five year’s time, what type of accommodation do you see your household in?

7.9.8 Overcrowding
Calculated using the Shelter definition\(^{155}\) and divides the number of occupants by the number of bedrooms (H14) and other rooms excluding kitchens and bathrooms (H15). Note that this differs from the standard definition which includes kitchens. A home is overcrowded if it falls within the following criteria: 1 room = 2 people; 2 rooms = 3 people; 3 rooms = 5 people; 4 rooms = 7.5 people; and 5 or more rooms = 2 people per room.

H14 How many bedrooms are there here excluding any bedrooms you may let or sublet?

H15 And how many other rooms do you have in your accommodation, excluding kitchens and bathrooms?

7.9.9 Household composition
Households are defined according to the number of people in the household, as well as by the relationships between them. For instance, a ‘couple’ household contains exactly two adults, and may contain children (in the case of ‘couple: 1-2 children’ and ‘couple: 3+ children’) or not (in the case of ‘Couple: no children’). Households defined as ‘2+ unrelated households’ are where no household members are related, and where there are no children in the household. Households defined as ‘Other (3+ with relations)’ are those

\(^{155}\)http://england.shelter.org.uk/get_advice/repairs_and_bad_conditions/home_safety/overcrowding
where there are three or more adults in the household, with or without children, and at least two household members are relatives.

Children were defined as those aged 0-15 years old.

7.9.10 Intensity of leisure activity

Respondents were categorised by how frequently they engage in leisure activities from V7. At least 2 activities once a week or at least 6 activities once a month or at least 9 activities several times a year = Active Users; at least 1 activity once a week or at least 3 activities once a month or at least 6 activities several times a year = Moderate Users; at least 1 activity once a month or at least 3 several times a year or at least 9 activities once a year or less = Occasional Users; at least 1 activity several times a year or at least 1 activity once a year or less = Infrequent Users; all others = Non Users.

V7 We are interested in the things people do in their leisure time, I'm going to read out a list of some leisure activities. Please look at the card and tell me how frequently you do each one.

7.9.11 Fruit expenditure as a % of grocery bill

Household expenditure on fruit as a percentage of all household bills was calculated by dividing H57 by H55.

H55. About how much does your household spend in total on food and groceries each week from a supermarket or other food shop or market? Please do not include alcohol but do include non-food items such as paper products, home cleaning supplies and pet foods.

H57. And about how much do you and other members of your household spend in total on fruit and vegetables each week, including frozen, tinned and dried types?

7.9.12 Food at point of purchase expenditure compared to grocery bill

Calculates the ratio of household expenditure on food outside the home (H56) compared to that from a supermarket (H55).

H55. About how much does your household spend in total on food and groceries each week from a supermarket or other food shop or market? Please do not include alcohol but do include non-food items such as paper products, home cleaning supplies and pet foods.

H56. And about how much have you and other members of your household spent in total on meals or snacks purchased outside the home in the last four weeks? Please include food bought from takeaways, restaurants, sandwich shops, work or school canteens but do not include alcohol.

7.9.13 Health status

Respondents were categorised into one of three health status categories on the basis of their answers to questions M2, M3 and M6. Those who
considered themselves to be disabled, those who had a limiting long-term health problem (but didn’t consider themselves disabled) and those to whom neither of these categories was applicable.

M2 Do you have any of the health problems, disabilities or impairments listed on this card?

M3. Does this health problem or disability/Do these health problems or disabilities mean that you have substantial difficulties with any of the following areas of your life?

M6. Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

7.9.14 BMI (Body Mass Index)

BMI is a measure of respondents' weight relative to their height. It is a standard index used to measure healthy weight. It is derived using respondents’ self-reported height and weight from questions M27 and M28.

M27. I would like to ask you about your height and weight. There is interest in how people’s weight, given their height, is associated with their health. How tall are you without shoes?

M28. What is your current weight?

7.9.15 Total hours worked

The total number of hours respondents work is calculated from E8 (primary job core hours), E9 (primary job overtime) and E27 (second jobs).

E8. Thinking about your (main) job, how many hours, excluding overtime and meal breaks are you expected to work in a normal week?

E9. And how many hours overtime do you usually work in a normal week?

E27 How many hours do you usually work in a month in your second/odd job(s), excluding meal breaks but including any overtime you might do?

7.9.16 Perceived anti-social behaviour

Perceived anti-social behaviour (ASB) is derived using a similar method to the British Crime Survey. However the questions are not directly comparable. NHPS respondents are asked how common a number of ASB are in their area (CR5). Their answers are then coded (0-3) and summed. The lowest possible score is 0 (all items very uncommon) and the highest score is 36 (all items very common). Those with a score of 18 or higher were classified as having high perceived ASB.

CR5 Please can you tell me how common each of the following things are in your area?

Graffiti on walls or buildings
Teenagers hanging around on streets
People being drunk or rowdy on the streets or in other public places
Vandalism and deliberate damage to property
Insults or attacks to do with someone’s race, colour or religion
Homes being broken into
Cars being broken into or stolen
People attacked on the streets
Abandoned cars
People dealing drugs
Prostitution, curb crawling and other sexual acts
Fire setting

7.9.17 Income and poverty measures

Gross household income

Gross household income was collected using the ONS harmonised question for Income as a Classificatory Variable. This method is a relatively straightforward and brief way of collecting household income. However, it does not replicate specialist income surveys such as the Family Resources Survey (FRS) or the Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS) which collect thorough and complete information about household finances.

Complete income data was collected for 92% of households.

A numeric gross household income variable was created by combining the answers provided for each individual in the household, using the mid-points from the income bands used in the questionnaire. This was used to create a gross income quartiles variable and a banded gross income variable with 9 broad income bands.
**Net household income**

To estimate net household income a simple algorithm was applied to the gross income values. The algorithm is based on FRS data in which both gross and net income are collected. The method has been used on the *Understanding Society* data. The following was applied:

\[
\text{net income} = \text{gross income up to a threshold} + 63\% \text{ of gross income above that threshold}
\]

The threshold varies according to the size of the household and the age of its members, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household contains no pensioners</th>
<th>Household contains at least one pensioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One adult</td>
<td>£1,127 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults</td>
<td>£1,576 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three + adults</td>
<td>£2,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two income definitions, the first is net income before housing costs (BHC) are deducted, and the second is this same income after housing costs (AHC). We define housing costs simply as mortgage or net rent payments in line with previous NHPS reports.

**Poverty**

In keeping with government practice, poverty has been defined in terms of household income. The total household income is then equivalised to take account of the differential needs that different households have (i.e. adjusted for size and composition).

In calculating equivalised income for the Annual Households Below Average Income (HBAI) report, the DWP (Department for Work and Pensions) use the Modified OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) equivalisation method which we have adopted in our analysis.

The OECD Equivalisation Scale is a conversion factor to allow for the effects of household size and composition to enable more accurate income comparisons to be undertaken. There are two variations: before housing costs and after housing costs. The OECD Equivalisation Scale creates a weight for each household based on its composition. The conversion factor

---

127 Pensioners were defined as men over 65 or women over 60.
128 The HBAI series uses a wider definition of housing costs based on the detailed data collected in the FRS.
is the sum of the individual weights given to each household member in accordance with Table 7.10 below. The total household income is then divided by the OECD conversion factor.

Table 7.10 – OECD Equivalisation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before Housing Costs</th>
<th>After Housing Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First adult</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent adult/s</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14+ years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (under 14)</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example:

In a single person household the Before Housing Costs conversion factor would be 0.67. For a Household income of £1,250 a month the equivalised household income would be £1,866 \( \frac{1250}{0.67} = 1865.67 \).

In a lone parent household with two children the Before Housing Costs conversion factor would be 1.07. \( (0.67+0.2+0.2 = 1.07) \). For a Household income of £1,250 a month the equivalised household income would be £1,186 \( \frac{1250}{1.07} = 1186.22 \).

Households in relative poverty are defined as those with less than 60% of the national equivalised median income for the current year. Households in absolute poverty are defined as those with less than 60% of the national equivalised median income for the year 2010/11, adjusted for inflation.

The most recently published HBAI report provides figures for these measures. These figures were £1,108 BHC and £953 AHC. Households in Newham were defined as living in poverty if their equivalised income level fell below these thresholds.

It is important to bear in mind that the national figures have been calculated using a specialist income survey (the FRS) whereas Newham’s figures are based on a few questions within a much broader survey.

**Child poverty**

Children are considered to be in poverty if they live in a household that is in poverty. The child poverty rate is calculated by dividing the number of children in poverty by the number of children in all households.
Fuel poverty

The government has recently set out a new definition of fuel poverty\textsuperscript{129}. However we use the old definition whereby a household is in fuel poverty if it needs to spend more than 10% of its income on fuel.

We calculate this using the answers to questions H42a, H85 and H86 divided by gross household income. Anyone with a ratio greater the 0.1 is defined as being in fuel poverty.

H42a. In the last year, how much has your household spent on gas and electricity combined?

H85. In the last year, how much has your household spent on gas?

H86. In the last year, how much has your household spent on electricity?

\textsuperscript{129}https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/fuel-poverty-statistics
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