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I. Introduction

This document provides a summary of the key findings arising from the quantitative survey of individuals receiving Handyperson services. This work was part of the national evaluation of Handypersons services commissioned by the Department for Communities and Local Government and led by the University of York. The research contained in this document comprises one element of this evaluation and is based on a telephone survey with recipients of Handypersons surveys carried out by Qa Research, an independent research consultancy based in York.

The survey was designed to capture recipients views on the services and to understand how they found out about it, what work they've had completed through the service and to understand the impact this work has had on their lives, with particular regard to the impact on their ability to live independently. In addition, the survey explored what alternative provision recipients would have made to have the work completed had the Handypersons service not been available.

The survey was carried out between 1 December 2010 and 7 June 2011 and all interviews were conducted in Qa Research’s on-site contact centre using CATI technology.

---

1 The main evaluation report is published on the DCLG website and other supporting documents / technical annexes are available on the University of York website.
2. Methodology

Individuals were invited to take part in the survey via a letter sent out by each individual provider responsible for providing the handyperson service. Providers were asked to send the letters out to those individuals who had received the handyperson service in the previous few months.

Each letter contained a description of the research that was taking place along with an FAQ sheet to answer any concerns about taking part that individual respondents might have had. Should individuals wish to take part in the research they were asked to complete a permission slip contained within the letter pack and return it via a freepost envelope. The permission slip asked for a brief description of the work which had taken place (to allow interviewers to prompt respondents when making contact), and details of any times when it would be inconvenient to call.

The freepost envelope was addressed to return directly to Qa’s offices. An interviewer from Qa would then contact the respondent to arrange a telephone interview at a time convenient to the respondent. Each permission slip had details of the specific provider responsible for the Handyperson service, allowing Qa to match providers with each respondent for later analysis.

In total, 12 providers agreed to mail out letters to relevant individuals who had received the service. This was a purposeful sample of provider organisations chosen to represent a mix of different types of providers (including independent providers, services operated by a local authority often as part of a wider Home Improvement Agency, operated by Housing Associations including smaller local, regional and national organisations); different charging mechanisms for services; and providers serving rural and urban areas with different socio-economic and demographic profiles, located in different regions of England. As letters were sent out on a provider by provider basis, details of the number of letters which were sent out, and therefore an accurate calculation of response rates, is unavailable. However, Qa received a total of 212 returned letters from individuals, of these interviews were undertaken with 173 individuals who received the handyperson service, a conversion rate of 82%.

The following table breaks down these completed interviews by each provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: National Housing Association</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Regional Housing Association</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Local Authority HIA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Independent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Regional Housing Association</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Independent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Local Authority HIA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Regional Housing Association</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: National Housing Association</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Independent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: Local Authority</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: Local Housing Association</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Key findings

The following sections provide a summary of the key findings from the quantitative survey. A number of cross-tabulations were made on the data to try and understand differences by key responses and demographic groups. Where relevant, these differences have been highlighted.

Exploring differences between all providers is not feasible, given the low base sizes associated with responses from some specific providers. However, there are some comparisons of the differences between those providers where we received over 15 responses. These providers were as follows:

- Provider C, 24 responses
- Provider A, 28 responses
- Provider D, 21 responses
- Provider F, 18 responses
- Provider E, 21 responses
- Provider B, 25 responses

3.1 Paying for the service

As indicated below, over half of respondents indicated they currently pay to use the service (55%);

![Pie chart showing Q5: Do you have to pay to use the service?](chart.png)

Among those who pay to use the service, the average (mean) amount paid was £45.44, however this was skewed by one respondent who indicated they had paid £2000. Removing this respondent gives an average value of £20.05.
The following table demonstrates the average values that respondents would expect to pay [taken from Q7] and breaks this down among those respondents who currently pay for the service and those who don’t:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average amount expect to pay</th>
<th>Expect to pay among those currently paying</th>
<th>Expect to pay among those not currently paying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including all responses</td>
<td>£41.07</td>
<td>£45.80</td>
<td>£26.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding large outliers (i.e. one response over £2000)</td>
<td>£21.28</td>
<td>£19.39</td>
<td>£26.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents who don’t know what would be a reasonable amount to pay</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those respondents who currently pay for the handyperson service indicated they would expect to pay an average price (£19.39) similar to price they are currently paying (£20.05).

Respondents who do not pay for the service, gave a higher value for what would be a reasonable amount to pay than those already paying for the service. However, it is important to note that two thirds (66%) of those who do not currently pay for the service were unable to indicate what they felt would be a reasonable amount to pay.

The following chart demonstrates the breakdown between paid for and non paid for services based on the work undertaken by the handyperson;

![Chart demonstrating the breakdown between paid for and non paid for services based on the work undertaken by the handyperson.](chart.png)
Paid for work is more common when the handyperson is providing services such as putting up shelves or undertaking gardening. These activities could be said to be contributing to the achievement of more general outcomes related to retaining independence in the home.

Those activities related more directly to the achievement of health-related outcomes, such as installation of falls prevention equipment and hazard removal, etc, were more likely to be delivered free of charge.

There was a general trend for services which may be seen as non essential and more likely to contribute to the appearance and amenity of the home (such as putting-up curtains & blinds, putting up shelves, gardening etc.) to have been paid for (although at a subsidised rate), whereas more essential services which are directly related to an individuals’ health, safety and security were more likely to be provided free of charge.

There were no apparent significant differences in those paying for the service between individuals with differing demographic profiles. For example, respondents who indicated they were disabled were no more likely to pay for the service than those without a disability. Similarly, monthly income was not associated with a difference in the likelihood of respondents having to pay for the service.

However, there were differences in paid for work by provider;

![Provider, Q5. Comparing paid for and non paid for services by provider](chart.png)

Source: Qa Research 2011   Base: Variable (minimum 17)
3.2 Services provided

The following chart demonstrates the different services that respondents indicated they had received. The results combine the responses to Q9 (asked only to those who have used the service more than once) and individuals’ responses on the returned permission slip that indicated the work they had done;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services provided</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falls prevention installing equipment</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installing equipment (spy holes, chains, locks, etc)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing problem</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up curtains/ blinds</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work done on gutting</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls prevention carpet securing/ hazard removal</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up shelves</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical problem</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work or repair done to a door</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire prevention installing equipment (smoke alarms)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing light bulbs</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry work</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking appliances (for fire/ electrical hazards)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting work</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking equipment (doors, windows, gates, etc)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair or putting up of fence or railings</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window installation or repair</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorating or similar work</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixing or modification of toilet</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me know about other services that were available to me</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving furniture</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work relating to clothes line or post</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up or taking down a mirror pictures or similar object</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work or repair done to a tap</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation or repair of a step</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning or washing work</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to roof</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiling or other work on a floor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation or repair of central heating</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draught excluder fitted</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit supplied during the winter</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of a light</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided advice about the maintenance of my home</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing furniture</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing appliances</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No work done</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Qa Research 2011  Base: 170 (excludes don’t know)

Positively there was a wide range of services being delivered. Among those respondents who have received the service on more than one occasion, the average number of different services
provided was just under 3 per individual. One of the aims of the service was to provide holistic support to individuals. The range of different activities taking place, coupled with the finding that handypersons are undertaking multiple activities, adds weight to the evidence that the service is being delivered in a holistic fashion [taken from Q9].

Around two thirds of respondents (63%) indicated they suggest the work that is undertaken to the handyperson [taken from Q11].

There were some differences in response to this question depending on the work that had been undertaken. Among respondents receiving services that contributed more to the safety and security of the individual, the proportions who suggested the work or services which need to take place were lower. Suggesting that the handyperson(s) has been proactive in introducing safety and security features to respondents homes.

Unsurprisingly, those respondents who pay for the service were significantly more likely to suggest the work that should be undertaken compared to those receiving the service free of charge (81% compared to 38%).

### 3.3 Contacting the Service

The most often mentioned singular method for first hearing about the service was through a relative, friend or neighbour, which was mentioned by a quarter of respondents (25%). However, across all respondents a diverse range of sources were mentioned as raising awareness of the service [taken from Q8]. Some of the main ways of first hearing of the service were as follows:

- From Social Care services (16%)
- Leaflets and other forms of promotion (such as magazines, newspaper articles, etc) (13%)
- From the Council (10%)
- From an individual charity (9%)

Just under three quarters of respondents (70%) had contacted the service directly, whereas a quarter (27%) indicated that the handyperson service was contacted on their behalf [taken from Q10].

Those respondents on the lowest monthly income (£0-£250 per month) were significantly more likely to have contacted the service directly (92%) than those with higher monthly incomes. Suggesting that lower income individuals recognised the service as an opportunity to benefit from services they would otherwise be unable to afford.

Those respondents living alone were also significantly more likely to have contacted the service directly (77%), possibly because those living alone were more likely to see the scheme as an opportunity to have work done they would be unable to undertake themselves. However, it may be that those who live alone have a greater ability to be more proactive in searching out relevant support, compared to those who live with other individuals (because those living with other individuals may be doing so as they are unable to cope on their own). Notably, there is nothing in the data to suggest that those who live with another person are more likely to have heard about the service from the person they live with.
3.4 Satisfaction with various elements of the service

Respondents were asked to indicate their satisfaction with a number of statements related to their perceptions of the Handyperson service. As the following chart demonstrates, the vast majority of respondents indicated very high levels of satisfaction with the service;

![Chart showing satisfaction levels for various elements of the service]

Respondents were also asked about their attitudes towards the handyperson who undertook the work. As three quarters (75%) of those respondents who had more than one visit from a handyperson, indicated that it was not always the same individual who undertook the work [taken from Q16], respondents were asked to provide their opinion on the individual who most recently undertook the work, as detailed below;

![Survey questions and results for attitude towards handyperson]

Source: Qa Research 2011 Base: Variable 168-172 (excludes don’t know)
Again, the vast majority of respondents demonstrated a very high level of satisfaction with the handyperson undertaking the work.

Overall satisfaction with the service was overwhelmingly positive. Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction on a scale of 1-10, just 2 respondents (1%) indicated they were dissatisfied (i.e. gave a ranking of 1-4), while 97% of respondents gave a ranking of 7-10, with 24% of respondents giving the top ranking (10). Notably, satisfaction levels did not vary between those who paid for the service and those who did not [taken from Q21].

Unsurprisingly, given the high satisfaction levels, the vast majority of respondents would be very likely to recommend the service to a friend (97%) [taken from Q22].

Two thirds (64%) of respondents indicated there were no improvements they would make to the service [taken from Q23]. The most often stated improvements related to the following:

- The service offering more services/ more varied service (11%)
- The work being done quicker (6%)
- The work being more affordable (6%)

Those respondents describing their health as ‘good’ were more likely to have no improvements to suggest (77%) than other respondents, although this difference was not significant.

3.5 Impacts on individuals

A number of questions were designed to ascertain respondents’ opinions of the impacts of the programme on various areas related to outcomes that the Handypersons scheme was designed to address. The chart below details certain aspects that respondents feel may have got better or worse:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q24. Have the following areas become better or worse as a result of the work being undertaken, or has there been no difference.?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has made no difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feeling your home is a safe environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You being able to maintain your independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to undertake all the activities you would like to do within your own home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The comfort of your home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feeling your home is more secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appearance of your home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Qa Research 2011   Base: Variable 169-171 (excludes don’t know)
The proportion of respondents who actually think the scheme has led to a worsening of any of these areas was very small and highest for their home’s appearance, where 3% said this had got worse.

Across all respondents, 69% felt that their ability to maintain their independence was better as a result of the programme. Around three quarters (72%) indicated the feeling that their home is a safe environment is better as a result of the programme.

There was a high degree of correlation between all of these indicators, so those responding better for one were more likely to provide a similar response for the others.

Unsurprisingly responses to these questions were strongly linked to the work that was undertaken. Those who had spy holes, chains, locks, etc installed were significantly more likely to feel the security of their home had become better as a result of the service (83%).

Those with falls equipment installed or who had their appliances checked were more likely to feel their home has become a safer environment (93% and 100% respectively).

In terms of maintaining independence, there were no major differences in responses depending on the work the respondents had done. The general feeling of improvement in this area would suggest that all these activities are contributing in a general way to individuals being able to maintain independence within their home.

Male respondents were significantly more likely to feel their home is a safer environment as a result of the service than females (88% compared to 66), although no significant differences in the work undertaken for males and females were recorded.

Respondents on the lowest monthly incomes (£0-£250 per month), were significantly more likely to feel the appearance of their home had become better as a result of the service (83%).

Respondents living alone were significantly more likely to feel the service made no difference to their feeling of security than those living with other individuals (46% compared to 29%).
3.6 Counterfactual

An important element of the survey was to try and ascertain the extent to which work would have been undertaken anyway in the absence of the Handyperson service. Respondents were asked how likely they would have been to have had the work done had the service not been available, with responses shown below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>Quite likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, 58% of respondents indicated they would have been at least quite likely to have been able to get the work done without the Handyperson service.

There was a correlation between the income of respondents and the likelihood of being able to get the work done elsewhere. Only 17% of respondents with a monthly income of £0-£250 indicated they would have been likely to have been able to get the work done without the service.

Among those respondents indicating they would have been unlikely to get the work done in the absence of the service (36%), the main reason for this was because they wouldn’t have been able to afford it (44%), followed by not knowing where to go (27%).

Among those who would have been likely to have got the work done had the service not been available (58%), the majority of these respondents indicated they would have paid somebody to undertake the repairs/ maintenance on their behalf (84%) or asked a friend or family (23%), just 3% of these respondents indicated they would attempt to carry out the work themselves.

Those respondents that were already paying to use the service were significantly more likely to have been able to get the work done without the service compared to those receiving the service free of charge (66% compared to 47%).
4. Summary

A range of services are being delivered, and services with a focus on safety and security were those most likely to be delivered. Arguably however, there is scope for greater delivery of those services which focus in this area, although there is a balance to be maintained between enabling individuals to choose the services they receive and forcing individuals to accept changes to their home they might not want. Interestingly the proportion of individuals indicating they have had falls prevention or security equipment installed was slightly higher among those who have had multiple visits than those who had received the service for the first time, suggesting that handypersons are building relationships with individuals by firstly undertaking work which may be seen as non essential and more likely to contribute to the appearance and amenity of the home, before introducing those changes which have a direct bearing on safety and security.

Among those paying for the service, there was little evidence to suggest that the cost of the service was restricting individuals from using it, and expected prices closely matched those that respondents indicated they were already paying. However, there were some major differences in the work provided and the proportion of individuals indicating whether or not they were paying for the service. This could be as a result of individual providers’ guidelines on what should be provided free of charge. Care needs to be taken to ensure the decision about which services are offered free of charge does not negatively influence the range of services being provided.

There were differences by income, with lower income respondents less likely to have felt they would have been able to get the work done elsewhere had the service not been available.

The findings suggest that respondents' views of the anticipated impacts of the service may be influenced by the work that had been undertaken. The service did appear to be having a positive impact on respondents' perception of safety and well-being.

The overwhelming majority of those interviewed as part of the survey indicated they were satisfied with the service received and satisfaction levels did not vary between those who paid for the service and those who did not. This high level of satisfaction makes exploring the impacts of different service provision on satisfaction difficult and it also makes exploring satisfaction between respondents from differing demographic groups difficult. This should not detract from the fact that in terms of satisfaction, these are positive findings.
5. **Appendix – The Questionnaire**

Good morning/ afternoon my name is ??? I am calling from Qa Research in York on behalf of the University of York. The university is currently undertaking a series of surveys with people who have received handyman services to help with home repairs or improvement. You may know this handyman service as [insert]. If respondent is unsure please prompt with info from sample [insert sample provider info]

You should have received a letter providing information about the survey and asking if you would like to take part. If you wanted to take part you were asked to return the letter to Qa Research.

S1: Do you remember receiving this letter?

PROMPT IF REQUIRED: TBC

Yes
Go to S2
No – Please prompt respondent with provider name [insert] and the rough date the letter was sent out to them [insert]

T&C

S2: Is now a convenient time for you to take part in the survey? All of your answers will remain completely confidential and your details will be kept anonymous. The interview should take around 15-20 minutes depending on your answers.

Yes
Go to q1
No
Continue

S3: Is there a more convenient time I could call back for you to complete the survey?

Yes – make appointment, thanks and close
No – Thank and close, please make sure correct call outcome is selected

Q1. In the letter, you told us that you have recently received help with [Import detail from sample] and it is that help that I would like to talk to you about today? Just so I am clear, could you briefly explain what the handyperson did for you please?

Q2. And when did this visit take place?

Within the last week
Over 1 week but up to and including 2 weeks ago
Over 2 weeks but up to and including a month ago
Over a month ago
Unsure/ Can’t Remember

Q3. Was this the first time you have used the service?

Yes -
Go to q5
No
Go to q4
Q4. How many visits from the service have you had?
(INTerviewer: please try to ensure that the respondent is talking about the handyman service only).
1
2
3
4
5
6-10
11-20
21+
Can’t remember

Q5. Do you have to pay to use the service?
Yes
Continue
No
Go q7
Depends what work I have done
Continue

Q6. How much do you usually have to pay?
Allow numeric response only
Can’t remember
Rather not say

Q7. What do you think would be a reasonable amount to pay to use the service?
Allow numeric response only
Don’t Know

Q8. How did you first hear about the handyperson service?
From the police or community support officer
From a community health worker
From a hospital service
From a charity
From social care services
Via the Fire Service
Via a relative or friend or neighbour
Leaflet through your door
Advertisement seen somewhere
The council
Other (please state)
Unsure/ Can’t remember
Services received

I would now like to talk about the types of services you have received

Ask the following questions only to those who have used the service more than once at q4, all other respondents go to q10

Q9. On previous visits what did the service do? (select all relevant responses)

- Repair of a specific problem
- Plumbing problem
- Electrical problem
- General maintenance
- Gardening
- Replacing light bulbs
- Replacing appliances
- Putting up shelves
- Putting up curtains/blinds
- Moving furniture
- Removing furniture
- Safety
  - Falls prevention – carpet securing/hazard removal
  - Falls prevention – installing equipment
  - Fire prevention – installing equipment (smoke alarms)
  - Checking appliances (for fire/electrical hazards)
- Security
  - Installing equipment (spy holes, chains, locks, etc)
  - Checking equipment (doors, windows, gates, etc)
- Advice
  - Provided advice about the maintenance of my home
  - Let me know about other services that were available to me
- Other (please state)

Q10. Did you first contact the service directly, or did someone contact them on your behalf?

- Contacted them directly
- They were contacted on my behalf

Q11. Do you suggest the work or services that need to take place or are they suggested to you?

- Respondents suggested them
- They are suggested to the respondent
- Both

Q12. On average how long does it generally take for the service to come to your house after you have requested the service or been told it would be coming?

- Under 1 week
- Under 2 weeks
- Under 3 weeks
- Under a month
- A month or longer
- Unsure/ don’t remember

Q13. Do you think this length of time is reasonable?
Yes
Go to q15
No
Continue

Q14. What do you feel would be a reasonable time to wait to receive the service?
Under 1 week
Under 2 weeks
Under 3 weeks
Under a month

Satisfaction and outcomes

Q15. I am now going to read out a list of different aspects of the handypersons service. Thinking about the most recent time they visited, for each of the following areas could you tell me how satisfied you are with the service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very dissatisfied and 5 is very satisfied. So how satisfied were you with...

1 – Very Dissatisfied
2
3
4
5 – Very Satisfied
Not applicable

The handyperson did what was required
The quality of the equipment installed
The quality of the workmanship
The friendliness of the individual carrying out the service.
The time taken to do the job.
The appearance of the work after it was complete
How well the handyperson cleaned up after themselves
The flexibility of the times they were able to come to your house
Whether they undertook the work when they said they would

Q15a. Is there anything else that you think has got better or worse that I have not asked you about?
INTERVIEWER: Write in verbatim but be sure to record if better or worse.

Q16. Is it always the same individual who comes to undertake the work?
Only ask to those who have indicated they have used the service on multiple occasions at q3
Yes
No
Q17. It would now be useful if you could tell me your opinion of the person who completed the work. Please remember that all your responses are completely anonymous and we will not be feeding back any of your answers to any of the people involved in the service. So, how would rate the individuals politeness on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is very polite and 1 is not very polite at all?

5-very polite
4
3
2
1- not very polite at all

Q18. On a similar scale, how trustworthy did you feel the individual was?

5-very trustworthy
4
3
2
1-very untrustworthy

Q19. How professional was the individual?

5-very professional
4
3
2
1-very unprofessional

Q20. How easy were they to get along with?

5-very easy to get along with
4
3
2
1-very difficult to get along with

Q21a. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is completely dissatisfied and 10 is completely satisfied, how satisfied were you with the service overall?

1- Completely dissatisfied
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 – Completely satisfied

Q22. On a scale of 1 to 3 where 1 is not at all likely and 3 is definitely likely, how likely is it you would recommend the service to a friend?

1- not at all likely, no chance of recommendation
2 – Quite likely to recommend to a friend
3 – Very likely, would almost certainly recommend to a friend
Q23. Are there any improvements you would make to the service?

Q24. Have the following areas become better or worse as a result of the work being undertaken, or has there been no difference.
Better
Worse
Has made no difference
You feeling your home is more secure
You feeling your home is a safe environment
You being able to maintain your independence
Your ability to undertake all the activities you would like to do within your own home
The comfort of your home
The appearance of your home

Q25. If the service had not been available how likely do you think you would have been to get the work done?
Very likely
Go to q27
Quite likely
Go to q27
Not likely
Go to q27
Definitely not
Go to q26
Unsure/ Don’t know
Go to q27

Q26. Why do you think you wouldn’t have been able to get the work done without the service? (Do not prompt, code as appropriate)
Wouldn’t have known where to go
Couldn’t have afforded it
Wouldn’t have trusted anyone to come into my home
Wouldn’t have thought to have this work done
Other (please state)
Go to q34

Q27. If you hadn’t have been able to receive the service what would you have done instead? (read out and select all that apply) CODE ALL THAT APPLY
Undertaking the work yourself
If this option is selected ensure question 28 is asked
Paying somebody else to undertake the repairs/ maintenance for you
If this option is selected ensure question 30 is asked. If not selected please ensure question 33 is asked
Asking a friend family member to undertake the services on your behalf
Is there anything else you may have considered doing? (please record)
None of these
Would not have done anything – the work would not have been completed
Don’t Know
Q28. What, if any, concerns would you have had if you were to undertake the work yourself?
(do not read out, code all that apply)
Falling down
Damaging your property
Electrocution
Injuring yourself
Other (please record)

Ask the following question only to those who have at least one concern at q28
Q29. Do you think these concerns would be enough to put you off undertaking the work yourself?
Yes
No
Don’t know

Ask only to those indicating they would consider paying somebody to undertake the work at q27, if not go to q33
Q30. What, if any, concerns would you have had about paying somebody to undertake the work? (do not read out, code all that apply):
It would be too expensive
You wouldn’t know how to go about finding somebody
You would be concerned about having a stranger in your home
Other (please state)

Ask the following question only to those who have at least one concern at q30
Q31. Do you think these concerns would be enough to put you off paying somebody to complete the work?
Yes
No
Don’t Know

Q32. How would you have gone about finding somebody able to undertake the work?
Ask a friend or family member
Used the internet
Used a directory service (yellow pages, etc)
Other (please state)

Only ask to those who would not consider paying anybody at q27
Q33. You mentioned that you would not consider paying anyone to undertake the service.
Why is this? (please read out and select all that apply)
It would be too expensive
You wouldn’t know how to go about finding somebody
You would be concerned about having a stranger in your home
Other (please state)
Ask All

Demographics

I would now like to ask a few questions about you. This is to make sure we are speaking to a broad range of individuals.

Q34. Which of the following age brackets do you fall into?
Under 46
46-55
56-65
66-75
76-85
86-95
96+
Rather not say

Q35. Would you describe your general health as Good, average or poor?
Good
Average
Poor

Q36. Would you say you have any of the following?
Learning difficulty / disability
Mental health condition
Visual impairment
Hearing impairment
Physical impairment
Speech impairment
Long term health condition
Other (write in below)
Refused
Don’t know

Q37. Would you describe yourself as disabled?
Yes
No
Don’t know/ unsure

Q38. Interviewer to code gender
Male
Female
Q39. Which ethnic group would you say you belong to?
- White British
- White European
- White Other (please record)
- Black British
- Black Caribbean
- Black African
- Black Other (please record)
- Asian British
- Asian Indian
- Asian Pakistani
- Asian Other (please record)
- Chinese
- Mixed heritage
- Other (please record)
- Prefer not to say

Q40. Which of the following best describes your monthly household income?
- £0-250
- £251-500
- £501-1000
- £1001-1250
- £1251-1500
- £1501-1750
- £1751-2000
- £2001+
- Rather not say

Q41. The following question is designed purely to allow the university to explore the differences between different type of homeowners and home occupiers, and individuals responses will not be reported on. You do not have to answer this question if you do not want to. Which of the following best describes you: I live...?
- Alone
- With my spouse or partner only
- With my family
- With other adults
- Other (specify)
- Rather not say

Q42. What type of accommodation do you live in?
- Ground floor Flat
- Terrace house
- Detached house
- Semi-detached house
- Other
Q43. How old is your house? (a best estimate will suffice)
Under 5 years old
Under 10 years old
Under 25 years old
Under 50 years old
Under 100 years old
100 years old +
Don’t Know

Q44. Do you live in sheltered accommodation?
Yes
No

Q45. About where you live at the moment, is it...
Owned outright
Being bought on mortgage
Shared ownership
Rented from council/ALMO
Rented from Housing Association/Trust
Rented from private landlord
Shared housing
Care/support facility
Mobile accommodation (e.g. caravan or trailer)
Other (write in below)

Q46. Do you have any questions about the research? (please record, if answers can’t be provided on the phone please inform respondent that someone will get back to them with an answer)

Thanks and Close