
**NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde
2008 Health and Wellbeing Survey**

Trends 1999-2008

Final Report

Prepared for

NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde

February 2010

Traci Leven Research
2 Kirkhouse Avenue, Blanefield, Glasgow G63 9BT
www.levenresearch.co.uk

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 This Report	3
2	Trend Data	5
	2.1 People's Perceptions of their Health and Illness	5
	2.2 The Use of Health Services	8
	2.3 Health Behaviours	10
	2.4 Social Health	13
	2.5 Individual Circumstances	16
	2.6 Social Capital	20
3	Conclusions	23
	3.1 Introduction	23
	3.2 Positive Findings	23
	3.3 Negative Findings	24
	3.4 The Gap Between Most Deprived and Other Areas	24

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This report focuses on the trends that have emerged from a series of health and wellbeing surveys which took place in the former NHS Greater Glasgow area.

Each of the health and wellbeing surveys aimed to:

- to provide intelligence to inform the health promotion directorate;
- to explore the different experience of health and wellbeing in our most deprived communities¹ compared to other areas
- to provide information that would be useful for monitoring health promotion interventions.

There have been many policy changes over the decade the health and wellbeing study has been in operation. For example, the dissolution of social inclusion partnership areas (SIPs) as a focus of tackling area based deprivation and the emergence of using the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) as the main tool for measuring area based deprivation and focusing of resources; the emergence of Community Health (and Care) Partnerships as a vehicle for integrated planning and delivery of health (and social) care services at a local level and changes to the performance assessment framework have led to an increased focus on some health behaviours such as breastfeeding; use of alcohol; diet and exercise.

The health and wellbeing survey was formed around core questions which have remained the same and allow the monitoring of trends over time. However, the survey has also been adapted over time to take into account emerging health and wellbeing issues and new geographies.

The survey provides a snapshot in time of the views and experience of the resident adult population. Whilst we cannot attribute causal relationships between the findings and the changing policy context we can explore our findings alongside wider changes in NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde (NHSGGC).

Detailed findings from the 2008 survey are available at the link below:

<http://www.phru.net/rande/Web%20Pages/Health%20and%20Wellbeing.aspx>

This report focuses on trends over time for the area administered by the former NHSGG.

Thanks are due to the working group that led the survey:

Allan Boyd	Senior Analyst
Norma Greenwood	Head of Public Health Resource Unit
Margaret McGranachan	Information and Research Manager
Julie Truman	Senior Researcher

In addition the project benefited from the support and advice of the advisory group:

Nichola Brown	Glasgow South East, CHCP
Lara Calder	South Lanarkshire CHP (formerly)
Susan Coull	Glasgow South West CHCP (formerly)

¹ In 1999, our most deprived communities were given additional resources with the aim of reducing the gap between deprived and least deprived areas. The initiative was part of an umbrella programme of support which focused on Social Inclusion Partnership areas.

Heather Cunningham	Renfrewshire CHP
Linda de Caestecker	NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde
James Egan	Glasgow East CHCP
Suzanne Glennie	Glasgow North CHCP
Liz Holms	East Renfrewshire CHCP
Russell Jones	Glasgow Centre for Population Health
Irene Mackenzie	Corporate Inequalities Team
Kathleen McGill	East Dunbartonshire CHP
Clare McGinley	West Dunbartonshire CHP
Karen McNiven	Glasgow South West CHCP
David Radford	East Dunbartonshire CHP
Uzma Rehman	Glasgow West CHCP
Janice Scouller	Glasgow East CHCP (formerly)
John Thomson	Glasgow North CHCP
Greg Usrey	Glasgow South West CHCP (formerly)
Clare Walker	Renfrewshire CHP
Helen Watson	Inverclyde CHP

Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

- to continue to monitor the core health indicators
- to determine whether the changes found in the first two follow-ups were the beginning of a trend in the NHSGG area
- to compare attitudes and behaviour of those living in the bottom 15% SIMD areas and other areas and address whether changes in attitudes and behaviour apply across the board or just in the most deprived/other areas, thereby tracking progress towards reducing health inequalities
- to form a baseline of health and wellbeing measures for NHSGGC
- to provide intelligence for health improvement policy, programmes and information to enhance performance management.

The study involved face-to-face in home interviews with adults (aged 16 or over). The fieldwork was conducted by series of research agencies:

1999 MVA
 2002 RBA
 2005 RBA
 2008 MRUK

For full details of the sample sizes and response rate from each year of the study please refer to the main reports which can be viewed at:

<http://www.phru.net/rande/Web%20Pages/Health%20and%20Wellbeing.aspx>

Measuring Deprivation

Deprivation is measured by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) which is a relative measure used to identify the most deprived areas in Scotland. It is constructed using 37 indicators within 7 'domains' (Income, Employment, Health, Education, Skills & Training, Geographic Access, Housing and Crime) each of which describes a specific aspect of deprivation. The SIMD is a weighted combination of these domains.

The SIMD is based on small geographical areas called datazones. The average population of a datazone is 750 and unlike previous deprivation measures, which were based on much larger geographies (e.g. postcode sectors, average population 5,000), they enable the identification of small pockets of deprivation. In order to compare the most deprived small areas with other cut-off points, the most deprived 15% datazones are used. There are 6,505 datazones in Scotland. They are ranked from 1 (most deprived) to 6,505 (least deprived). The NHSGGC area contains the most deprived datazone in Scotland and in total 48% of the most deprived 15% datazones in Scotland lie within it.

The SIMD has been applied to each year the survey has taken place.

1.2 This Report

In this report, results from all indicator questions that represent a statistically significant change between 2008 and 2005, 2008 and 2002 or 2008 and 1999 are shown. Detail on changes between 2002 and 2005 and 1999 and 2002 can be found in the 2002 and 2005 reports and are not repeated here.

The data presented here for 2008 relate only to **Greater Glasgow** and not the whole NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde area. This is because previous surveys were undertaken in the Greater Glasgow area only. In 2008, 5,496 of the interviews were in the Greater Glasgow area.

Data are presented for bottom 15% (most deprived) areas and other areas. These are based on the **2004 SIMD classifications** of deprivation, rather than the 2006 SIMD classifications used for the analysis in the main report.

The formula used to test for significant change is a hypothesis test for two proportions. The 'null hypothesis' is that there is no change since 1999, since 2002 or since 2005. The following formula yields a 'test statistic' (z):

$z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_p(1 - \hat{p}_p) \left[\left(\frac{1}{n_1} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{n_2} \right) \right]}}$	<p>p_1 = proportion observed in 2008 p_2 = proportion observed in 1999/2002/2005 n_1 = sample size in 2008 n_2 = sample size in 1999/2002/2005</p>
$\hat{p}_p = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{n_1 p_1 + n_2 p_2}{n_1 + n_2}$	

If the value of z falls outside of the range (-1.96 to 1.96), we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there has been significant change since 1999 (at the 95% confidence level).

For those results that show significant change, we have also calculated a confidence interval for the difference between any two sets of results.

$$\left(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2 \right) \pm 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1)}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{p}_2(1 - \hat{p}_2)}{n_2}}$$

For example, the confidence interval for the first result shown in Table 1 is (1.0 to 5.8). This means that we can be 95% confident that, had we interviewed the entire population of Greater Glasgow in the surveys, the actual difference between the two sets of results would be between 1.0 and 5.8 percentage points.

The tables show the results, and also show p values. Where p is less than 0.05, the change is considered to be significant. P values are reported as one of three levels of significance: <0.05, <0.01 and <0.001. A p value of <0.05 means that we can be 95% confident that a 'real' change has taken place. A p value of <0.01 means that we can be 99% confident, and a p value of <0.001 means that we can be 99.9% confident.

Only significant changes over time have been mentioned in the text. Where a change is not significant, the size of the change is not shown in the table, and no p value is shown.

It should be noted that the formulae used in this chapter only strictly apply to simple random samples, whereas this survey uses a complex multi-stage sample design. For this reason, results of tests should be interpreted with caution, particularly if the result is on the margins of statistical significance.

2 Trend Data

2.1 People's Perceptions of their Health and Illness

Overall, the proportion of respondents giving a positive view of their general health was greater in 2008 than in 2005, with the bottom 15% areas showing the biggest increase.

Table 1: Positive Perceptions of General Health

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	69.3%	62.0%	74.9%
2002	66.9%	52.4%	75.6%
2005	68.4%	60.3%	72.7%
2008	71.8%	66.4%	75.1%
Change (2005-2008)	+3.4%	+6.1%	n/a
P	<0.01	<0.01	n/a
Confidence Interval	+1.0 to +5.8	-1.9 to +10.3	n/a

There was a significant increase in the proportion of respondents who were positive about their physical wellbeing between 2002 and 2008, although this was only the case among those in the bottom 15% areas and not other areas.

Table 2: Positive Perceptions of Physical Wellbeing

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	78.9%	70.7%	85.1%
2002	77.0%	64.8%	84.3%
2005	80.2%	74.6%	83.2%
2008	80.7%	77.2%	82.9%
Change (2002-2008)	+3.7%	+12.4%	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.001	n/a
Confidence Interval	+1.5 to +5.9	+8.4 to +16.4	n/a

In the bottom 15% areas, there was an increase between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who were positive about their mental or emotional wellbeing. In other areas, the proportion has remained stable since 2002, but shows an overall decrease since 1999.

Table 3: Positive Perceptions of Mental or Emotional Wellbeing

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	85.1%	78.8%	89.9%
2002	81.9%	73.9%	86.7%
2005	83.6%	76.5%	87.4%
2008	84.8%	81.1%	87.0%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	+4.6%	n/a
Change (2002-2008)	+2.9%	n/a	n/a
Change (1999-2008)	n/a	n/a	-2.9%
P	<0.01	<0.05	<0.05
Confidence Interval	+0.9 to +4.9	+1.0 to +8.2	-5.1 to -0.7

The proportion of respondents who definitely felt in control of their life decreased overall between 2005 and 2008, but **increased** for those in the bottom 15% areas.

Table 4: Feeling Definitely in Control of Decisions Affecting Daily Life

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	58.9%	42.2%	71.8%
2002	81.6%	73.6%	86.4%
2005	70.9%	59.6%	76.9%
2008	66.4%	66.5%	66.3%
Change (2005-2008)	-4.5%	+6.9%	-10.6%
P	<0.001	<0.01	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-6.9 to -2.1	+2.6 to +11.2	-13.4 to -7.8

There was an increase in the proportion of respondents who were positive about their overall quality of life between 2005 and 2008, although this was only the case for those in the bottom 15% areas. In fact, the proportion decreased for those in other areas between 2002 and 2008.

Table 5: Positive Perception of Overall Quality of Life

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	83.5%	72.3%	92.1%
2002	85.1%	74.6%	91.4%
2005	83.2%	77.0%	86.5%
2008	85.4%	80.8%	88.3%
Change (2005-2008)	+2.2%	+3.8%	n/a
Change (2002-2008)	n/a	n/a	-3.1%
P	<0.05	<0.05	<0.01
Confidence Interval	+0.3 to +4.1	+0.2 to +7.4	-5.0 to -1.2

Overall there was a significant decrease in the proportion of respondents who had a limiting illness/condition between 2005 and 2008. In the bottom 15% areas, there was a significant decrease between 2002 and 2008.

Table 6: Illness/Condition Affecting Daily Life

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	21.9%	29.3%	16.2%
2002	23.4%	33.5%	17.3%
2005	21.7%	26.9%	18.8%
2008	19.5%	24.2%	16.6%
Change (2005-2008)	-2.2%	n/a	n/a
Change (2002-2008)	n/a	-9.3%	n/a
P	<0.05	<0.001	n/a
Confidence Interval	-4.3 to -0.1	-13.3 to -5.3	n/a

The proportion of respondents receiving treatment for at least one condition fell between 2005 and 2008. This was true in both bottom 15% areas and other areas.

Table 7: Receiving Treatment for One or More Condition

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	41.0%	44.9%	37.9%
2002	43.8%	56.2%	36.5%
2005	41.8%	43.7%	40.7%
2008	36.1%	38.3%	34.8%
Change (2005-2008)	-5.7%	-5.4%	-5.9%
P	<0.001	<0.05	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-8.2 to -3.2	-9.7 to -1.1	-9.0 to -2.8

There was an increase in the proportion of respondents with some or all of their own teeth between 2005 and 2008.

Table 8: Proportion with Some/All of their Own Teeth

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	84.0%	80.9%	86.3%
2002	84.1%	79.7%	86.7%
2005	85.8%	84.3%	86.7%
2008	88.9%	87.1%	89.9%
Change (2005-2008)	+3.1%	n/a	+3.2%
Change (2002-2008)	n/a	+7.4%	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.01
Confidence Interval	+1.4 to +4.8	+4.0 to +8.4	+1.1 to +5.3

There was a sizeable increase between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who brushed their teeth twice or more per day. This was particularly the case for those in the bottom 15% areas, and a narrowing of the gap between bottom 15% areas and other areas is observed for this measure.

Table 9: Proportion Brushing Teeth at Least Twice a Day

Base: Those with at least some of their own teeth

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	75.5%	67.5%	81.3%
2002	74.7%	61.9%	81.9%
2005	66.9%	53.4%	73.9%
2008	80.0%	76.9%	81.9%
Change (2005-2008)	+13.1%	+23.5%	+8.0%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+10.8 to +15.4	+19.3 to +27.7	+5.3 to +10.7

2.2 The Use of Health Services

The proportion of respondents who had seen a GP in the last year has remained stable since 2002, but overall has decreased since 1999.

Table 10: Proportion Seen a GP in the Last Year

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	88.1%	89.3%	87.1%
2002	80.1%	84.0%	77.7%
2005	78.0%	80.8%	76.6%
2008	79.9%	83.9%	77.5%
Change (1999-2008)	-8.2%	-5.4%	-9.6%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-10.0 to -6.4	-8.1 to -2.7	-12.1 to -7.1

The proportion of respondents who had been to accident and emergency in the last year decreased between 2005 and 2008.

Table 11: Proportion Been to A&E in the Last Year

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	14.5%	12.4%	16.0%
2002	14.9%	16.8%	13.7%
2005	14.4%	18.8%	12.1%
2008	8.3%	9.3%	7.8%
Change (2005-2008)	-6.1%	-9.5%	-4.3%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-7.8 to -4.4	-12.7 to -6.3	-6.3 to -2.3

The proportion of respondents who had been to hospital as an outpatient in the last year decreased between 2005 and 2008.

Table 12: Proportion Been to Hospital as an Outpatient to see a Doctor in the Last Year

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	32.9%	27.9%	36.7%
2002	24.6%	27.8%	22.6%
2005	22.7%	20.4%	24.0%
2008	18.5%	18.4%	18.6%
Change (2005-2008)	-4.2%	n/a	-5.4%
Change (2002-2008)	n/a	-9.4%	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-6.3 to -2.1	-13.2 to -5.6	-8.1 to -2.7

Overall, the proportion of respondents who were registered with a dentist fell between 2005 and 2008.

Table 13: Registered with a Dentist

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	79.9%	76.3%	82.9%
2002	73.6%	62.6%	80.1%
2005	79.3%	73.7%	82.3%
2008	74.5%	69.9%	77.4%
Change (2005-2008)	-4.8%	n/a	-4.9%
Change (2002-2008)	n/a	+7.3%	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-6.9 to -2.7	+3.1 to +11.5	-7.4 to -2.4

A higher proportion of respondents had visited the dentist in the last six months in 2008 than in 2005.

Table 14: Been to a Dentist in the Last Six Months

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked		
2002	49.6%	36.0%	57.6%
2005	44.8%	36.2%	49.4%
2008	48.6%	40.9%	52.9%
Change (2005-2008)	+3.8%	+4.7%	+3.5%
P	<0.01	<0.05	<0.05
Confidence Interval	+1.2 to +6.4	+0.5 to +8.9	+0.3 to +6.7

2.3 Health Behaviours

The proportion of respondents who were current smokers decreased between 2005 and 2008, with the biggest proportional decrease observed in the bottom 15% areas.

Table 15: Proportion Currently Smoking (On Some or Every Day)

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	37.2%	49.7%	27.5%
2002	33.2%	48.4%	24.0%
2005	37.4%	49.6%	31.0%
2008	32.0%	40.7%	26.8%
Change (2005-2008)	-5.4%	-8.9%	-4.2%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.01
Confidence Interval	-7.9 to -2.9	-13.3 to -4.5	-7.1 to -1.3

There was a sizeable decrease in the proportion of respondents who were exposed to second hand smoke some or all of the time between 2005 and 2008. (The ban on smoking in public places was introduced in Scotland in 2006).

Table 16: Proportion Exposed to Smoke (Some or All the Time)

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked in a comparable way		
2002	57.3%	67.7%	51.2%
2005	54.8%	64.9%	49.4%
2008	38.6%	47.3%	33.3%
Change (2005-2008)	-16.2%	-17.6%	-16.1%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-18.7 to -13.7	-21.8 to -13.4	-19.2 to -13.0

There was a decrease between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who exceeded the recommended weekly limit for alcohol consumption in the preceding week.

Table 17: Proportion Exceeding Recommended Alcohol Limit in Preceding Week (Based on old estimates of units)

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	17.6%	20.2%	15.7%
2002	13.1%	13.1%	13.1%
2005	17.7%	18.0%	17.6%
2008	10.9%	9.9%	11.6%
Change (2005-2008)	-6.8%	-8.1%	-6.0%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-8.7 to -4.9	-11.3 to -4.9	-8.3 to -3.7

Fewer respondents had been binge drinking in the preceding week in 2008 than in 2005.

Table 18: Proportion Binge Drinking in the Preceding Week (Based on old estimates of units)

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	24.1%	27.2%	21.7%
2002	23.0%	23.1%	22.9%
2005	25.9%	24.3%	26.8%
2008	18.2%	15.6%	19.8%
Change (2005-2008)	-7.7%	-8.7%	-7.0%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-9.9 to -5.5	-12.3 to -5.1	-9.7 to -4.3

The proportion of respondents who met the target for physical activity fell sizeably between 2005 and 2008, particularly in the bottom 15% areas.

Table 19: Proportion Meeting the Physical Activity Target

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	54.7%	44.8%	62.5%
2002	57.9%	60.2%	56.6%
2005	58.9%	63.9%	56.2%
2008	42.9%	37.2%	46.4%
Change (2005-2008)	-16.0%	-26.7%	-9.8%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-18.5 to -13.5	-30.9 to -22.5	-12.9 to -6.7

There was an increase in the proportion of respondents who consumed five or more portions of fruit/vegetables per day between 2005 and 2008.

Table 20: Proportion Meeting the Fruit and Vegetable Consumption Target

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	24.5%	19.0%	28.8%
2002	34.1%	25.8%	39.0%
2005	30.0%	23.8%	33.0%
2008	37.6%	30.2%	42.1%
Change (2005-2008)	+7.6%	+6.4%	+9.1
P	<0.001	<0.01	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+5.2 to +10.0	+2.6 to +10.2	+6.1 to +12.1

The proportion of respondents who ate two or more portions of oily fish per week fell between 2005 and 2008. This was true in both the bottom 15% areas and other areas.

Table 21: Proportion Eating the Recommended Amount of Oily Fish

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	27.2%	24.7%	29.1%
2002	29.4%	25.4%	31.9%
2005	29.6%	28.7%	30.0%
2008	21.9%	20.1%	23.1%
Change (2005-2008)	-7.7%	-8.6%	-6.9%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-10.0 to -5.4	-12.4 to -4.8	-9.8 to -4.0

There was an increase between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion who ate two or more high fat and sugary snacks per day.

Table 22: Proportion Eating More than the Recommended Amount of High Fat and Sugary Snacks

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	54.0%	66.8%	44.1%
2002	32.5%	32.7%	32.3%
2005	32.3%	35.8%	30.5%
2008	37.8%	44.4%	33.7%
Change (2005-2008)	+5.5%	+8.6%	+3.2%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.05
Confidence Interval	+3.1 to +7.9	+4.4 to +12.8	+0.3 to +6.1

Between 2005 and 2008, there was an increase in the bottom 15% areas of the proportion who were overweight (BMI of 25 or over) or obese (BMI of 30 or over). However, in other areas there was a reduction in the proportion who were overweight.

Table 23: Body Mass Index

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
BMI of 25 or over			
1999	39.7%	38.4%	40.8%
2002	42.8%	45.5%	41.2%
2005	42.2%	36.3%	45.3%
2008	42.8%	44.8%	41.6%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	+8.5%	-3.7%
Change (1999-2008)	+3.1%	n/a	n/a
P	<0.05	<0.001	<0.05
Confidence Interval	+0.5 to +5.7	+4.3 to +12.7	-6.8 to -0.6
BMI of 35 or over			
1999	2.6%	3.3%	2.0%
2002	2.6%	4.1%	1.7%
2005	2.7%	2.6%	2.7%
2008	3.0%	3.6%	2.6%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	n/a	n/a
P	n/a	n/a	n/a
Confidence Interval	n/a	n/a	n/a
BMI indicting obese/extremely obese			
1999	10.5%	11.9%	9.3%
2002	11.1%	14.8%	9.0%
2005	11.8%	9.5%	13.0%
2008	12.5%	14.7%	11.2%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	+5.2%	n/a
Change (2002-2008)	n/a	n/a	+2.2%
Change (1999-2008)	+2.0%	n/a	n/a
P	<0.05	<0.001	<0.05
Confidence Interval	+0.3 to +3.7	+2.5 to +7.9	+0.3 to +4.1

2.4 Social Health

Between 2002 and 2008 there was a drop in the proportion of respondents who said they felt isolated from family and friends.

Table 24: Proportion Isolated from Family and Friends

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	17.5%	23.9%	12.5%
2002	14.7%	19.5%	11.8%
2005	8.2%	7.5%	8.6%
2008	8.4%	9.1%	8.0%
Change (2002-2008)	-6.3%	-10.4%	-3.8%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-8.1 to -4.5	-13.6 to -7.2	-5.9 to -1.7

Between 2005 and 2008 there was an increase in the bottom 15% areas of the proportion who said they felt they belonged to the local areas. However, in other areas the proportion fell.

Table 25: Proportion Feeling they Belong to Local Area

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	73.0%	73.2%	72.9%
2002	72.2%	72.1%	72.3%
2005	71.8%	64.2%	75.9%
2008	69.9%	69.3%	70.3%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	+5.1%	-5.6%
Change (1999-2008)	-3.1%	n/a	n/a
P	<0.05	<0.05	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-5.5 to -0.7	+0.9 to +9.3	-8.4 to -2.8

In the bottom 15% areas there was an increase in the proportion of respondents who felt valued as members of their community.

Table 26: Proportion Feeling Valued as Member of their Community

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked in a comparable way		
2002	54.8%	53.6%	55.6%
2005	52.7%	44.5%	57.1%
2008	52.8%	50.5%	54.2%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	+6.0%	n/a
P	n/a	<0.01	n/a
Confidence Interval	n/a	+1.6 to +10.4	n/a

There was an increase between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of people who felt that local people could influence local decisions. The largest increase was observed in the bottom 15% areas.

Table 27: Proportion Feeling Local People Can Influence Decisions

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked		
2002	58.1%	62.9%	61.3%
2005	60.2%	48.9%	66.2%
2008	65.6%	59.2%	69.4%
Change (2005-2008)	+5.4%	+10.3%	+3.2
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.05
Confidence Interval	+2.9 to +7.9	+5.9 to +14.7	+0.2 to +6.2

A larger proportion of respondents felt safe in their own home in 2008 than in 2005.

Table 28: Proportion Feeling Safe in Their Own Home

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked		
2002	93.1%	91.7%	94.0%
2005	92.4%	89.1%	94.2%
2008	96.4%	94.7%	97.4%
Change (2005-2008)	+4.0%	+5.6%	+3.2%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+2.7 to +5.3	+3.0 to +8.2	+1.8 to +4.6

Feelings of safety on public transport also increased between 2005 and 2008.

Table 29: Proportion Feeling Safe Using Public Transport

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked		
2002	79.2%	76.3%	80.9%
2005	79.2%	77.2%	75.7%
2008	87.0%	85.9%	87.5%
Change (2005-2008)	+7.8%	+8.7%	+11.8
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+5.7 to +9.9	+5.2 to +12.2	+9.2 to +14.4

There was also a rise in the proportion who felt safe walking alone after dark between 2005 and 2008.

Table 30: Proportion Feeling Safe Walking Alone After Dark

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	52.6%	44.6%	58.9%
2002	62.1%	55.1%	66.3%
2005	59.8%	53.3%	63.4%
2008	63.1%	55.0%	67.9%
Change (2005-2008)	+3.3%	<i>n/a</i>	+4.5%
Change (1999-2008)	<i>n/a</i>	+10.4%	<i>n/a</i>
P	<0.01	<0.001	<0.01
Confidence Interval	+0.8 to +5.8	+6.2 to +14.6	+1.5 to +7.5

2.5 Individual Circumstances

The proportion who were married or living as married fell between 2005 and 2008.

Table 31: Proportion Cohabiting/Married etc

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	54.3%	48.4%	58.9%
2002	54.1%	45.2%	59.5%
2005	61.0%	52.3%	65.7%
2008	53.5%	45.9%	58.2%
Change (2005-2008)	-7.5%	-6.4%	-7.5%
P	<0.001	<0.01	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-10.0 to -5.0	-10.8 to -2.0	-10.5 to -4.5

The proportion of respondents who had children under 14 in the household also fell between 2005 and 2008.

Table 32: Proportion with Children Under 14

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	28.1%	28.7%	27.7%
2002	36.3%	37.1%	35.7%
2005	32.3%	37.5%	29.5%
2008	21.1%	21.7%	20.7%
Change (2005-2008)	-11.2%	-15.8%	-8.8%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-13.5 to -8.9	-19.9 to -11.7	-11.6 to -6.0

Fewer respondents in 2008 than in 2005 were lone parents of children under 14. This biggest change was in the bottom 15% areas.

Table 33: Proportion who Are Lone Parents of Children Under 14

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	5.2%	8.9%	2.3%
2002	4.9%	8.3%	2.8%
2005	9.8%	15.6%	6.8%
2008	3.0%	4.3%	2.1%
Change (2005-2008)	-6.8%	-11.3%	-4.7%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-8.2 to -5.4	-14.2 to -8.4	-6.2 to -3.2

There was a sizeable increase between 2005 and 2008 of the proportion of respondents who had internet access at home.

Table 34: Proportion with Internet Access at Home

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	20.6%	10.4%	28.6%
2002	37.3%	21.4%	46.8%
2005	44.6%	33.0%	50.8%
2008	55.4%	43.8%	62.6%
Change (2005-2008)	+10.8%	+10.8%	+11.8%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+8.3 to +13.3	+6.6 to +15.0	+8.7 to +14.9

In areas other than the bottom 15% areas there was a drop between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who lived in car owning households.

Table 35: Proportion with a Car

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	59.7%	38.2%	76.1%
2002	59.9%	37.6%	73.4%
2005	59.2%	39.8%	69.6%
2008	56.8%	42.2%	65.7%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	n/a	-3.9%
Change (2002-2008)	-3.1%	+4.6%	n/a
P	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05
Confidence Interval	-5.7 to -0.5	+0.4 to +8.8	-6.8 to -1.0

There was a sizeable drop between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who had no qualifications.

Table 36: Proportion with No Qualifications

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	39.8%	53.7%	29.0%
2002	26.2%	39.5%	18.3%
2005	39.1%	55.6%	30.3%
2008	21.1%	31.6%	14.7%
Change (2005-2008)	-18.0%	-24.0%	-15.6%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-20.4 to -15.6	-28.3 to -19.7	-18.4 to -12.8

Between 2005 and 2008 the proportion of respondents who received all household income from state benefits fell.

Table 37: Proportion with all Income from State Benefits

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	24.5%	40.5%	11.6%
2002	28.4%	50.6%	14.9%
2005	27.0%	43.5%	18.3%
2008	23.9%	37.6%	15.5%
Change (2005-2008)	-3.1%	-5.9%	-2.8%
P	<0.01	<0.01	<0.05
Confidence Interval	-5.4 to -0.8	-10.2 to -1.6	-2.5 to -4.9

Overall there was a drop between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who had a positive perception of their household income. However, this was only the case for those not in the bottom 15% areas.

Table 38: Proportion with a Positive Perception of Household Income

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	61.1%	44.7%	74.2%
2002	64.8%	51.9%	72.5%
2005	72.2%	55.3%	81.2%
2008	63.7%	55.1%	68.9%
Change (2005-2008)	-8.5%	n/a	-12.3%
Change (1999-2008)	n/a	+10.4%	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-10.8 to -6.2	+6.2 to +14.6	-14.9 to -9.7

The proportion of respondents who said they would find it impossible to find unexpected expenses of £20, £100 and £1,000 increased between 2005 and 2008.

Table 39: Proportion Having Difficulties Finding Unexpected Expenses

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
Difficulty finding £20			
1999	5.9%	10.2%	2.5%
2002	3.9%	7.5%	1.6%
2005	1.3%	2.1%	1.0%
2008	4.6%	6.5%	3.4%
Change (2005-2008)	+3.3%	+4.4%	+2.4%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+2.6 to +4.0	+2.9 to +5.9	+1.6 to +3.2
Difficulty finding £100			
1999	27.9%	42.2%	16.3%
2002	17.7%	34.1%	7.8%
2005	14.6%	25.6%	8.8%
2008	21.8%	32.0%	15.6%
Change (2005-2008)	+7.2%	+6.4%	+6.8%
P	<0.001	<0.01	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+5.3 to +9.1	+2.5 to +10.3	+4.9 to +8.7
Difficulty finding £1,000			
1999	64.4%	83.4%	49.0%
2002	47.4%	72.9%	32.1%
2005	46.0%	63.5%	36.8%
2008	59.4%	76.3%	49.0%
Change (2005-2008)	+13.4%	+12.8%	+12.2%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+10.9 to +15.9	+8.7 to +16.9	+9.1 to +15.3

Between 2005 and 2008 the bottom 15% areas saw a rise in the proportion of households in which the main wage earner is employed full time, while those in other areas saw a fall in the proportion employed full time.

Table 40: Proportion of Main Wage Earners Employed Full Time

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	50.0%	38.2%	59.3%
2002	52.3%	36.3%	62.0%
2005	54.6%	40.1%	62.3%
2008	53.1%	45.0%	58.0%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	+4.9%	-4.3%
Change (1999-2008)	+3.1%	n/a	n/a
P	<0.05	<0.05	<0.01
Confidence Interval	+0.4 to +5.8	+0.6 to +9.2	-7.4 to -1.2

In the bottom 15% areas there was a fall between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who were in households where no adults were in employment. However, for other areas there was an increase.

Table 41: Proportion of Households with No Adults in Employment

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	46.5%	61.8%	34.8%
2002	40.5%	55.4%	31.5%
2005	40.0%	53.4%	32.8%
2008	40.2%	47.0%	36.1%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	-6.4%	+3.3%
Change (1999-2008)	-6.3%	n/a	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.01	<0.05
Confidence Interval	-9.0 to -3.6	-6.4 to -10.8	+0.3 to +6.3

2.6 Social Capital

In the bottom 15% areas there was an increase between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who had a positive perception of their area as a place to live. In other areas there was a significant increase between 2002 and 2008.

Table 42: Proportion with a Positive Perception of Local Area as a Place to Live

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	78.9%	62.6%	91.6%
2002	72.8%	55.2%	83.3%
2005	82.7%	74.9%	86.9%
2008	85.1%	78.8%	88.9%
Change (2005-2008)	+2.4%	+3.9%	n/a
Change (2002-2008)	n/a	n/a	+5.6%
P	<0.05	<0.05	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+0.5 to +4.3	+0.2 to +7.6	+3.2 to +8.0

There was an overall increase between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion of respondents who had a positive perception of their local area as a place to bring up children.

Table 43: Proportion with Positive Perception of Local Area as a Place to Bring Up Children

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	63.7%	41.3%	81.0%
2002	64.4%	48.5%	73.9%
2005	75.7%	66.9%	80.5%
2008	80.5%	72.8%	85.2%
Change (2005-2008)	+4.8%	+5.9%	+4.7%
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Confidence Interval	+2.6 to +7.0	+1.8 to +10.0	+2.2 to +7.2

Between 2002 and 2008, there was an increase in the proportion of respondents who had a positive perception of reciprocity.

Table 44: Proportion with Positive Perception of Reciprocity

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked		
2002	66.5%	61.4%	69.7%
2005	72.3%	65.5%	75.9%
2008	70.9%	67.3%	73.1%
Change (2002-2008)	+4.4%	+5.9%	+3.4%
P	<0.001	<0.01	<0.05
Confidence Interval	+1.9 to +6.9	+1.7 to +10.1	+0.4 to +6.4

Of those out with the bottom 15% areas, there was a decrease between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion who had a positive perception of trust.

Table 45: Proportion with Positive Perception of Trust

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked		
2002	68.6%	60.0%	73.7%
2005	71.4%	60.6%	77.1%
2008	69.1%	63.4%	72.6%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	n/a	-4.5%
P	n/a	n/a	<0.01
Confidence Interval	n/a	n/a	-7.2 to -1.8

Of those out with the bottom 15% areas, there was a decrease between 2005 and 2008 in the proportion who valued local friendships.

Table 46: Proportion Valuing Local Friendships

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	77.0%	78.2%	75.9%
2002	75.2%	74.1%	75.9%
2005	69.2%	63.9%	71.9%
2008	67.7%	66.2%	68.6%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	n/a	-3.3%
Change (2002-2008)	-7.5%	-7.9%	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.001	<0.05
Confidence Interval	-9.7 to -5.2	-11.8 to -4.0	-6.2 to -0.4

Between 2005 and 2008 there was an increase in the bottom 15% areas but a decrease in other areas in the proportion of respondents who had a positive perception of social support.

Table 47: Proportion with a Positive Perception of Social Support

Base: All

	Total Sample	Bottom 15% areas	Other areas
1999	Not asked		
2002	74.9%	77.4%	73.3%
2005	71.6%	62.9%	76.2%
2008	70.2%	69.3%	70.8%
Change (2005-2008)	n/a	+6.4%	-5.4%
Change (2002-2008)	-4.7%	n/a	n/a
P	<0.001	<0.01	<0.001
Confidence Interval	-7.0 to -2.4	+2.2 to +10.6	-8.1 to -2.7

3 Conclusions

3.1 Introduction

This chapter highlights some of the positive and negative findings emerging from the trend data (since 2005 or 2002), and the gaps between the bottom 15% most deprived areas and other areas.

3.2 Positive Findings

Overall, there has been an increase in positive perceptions of general health, physical wellbeing and mental/emotional wellbeing (particularly in the most deprived areas).

There has been a reduction in the proportion of respondents who were receiving treatment for at least one illness or condition.

There has been an increase in the proportion of respondents with some/all of their own teeth, and a very sizeable increase in the proportion who brushed their teeth twice a day. There was also an increase in the proportion of respondents who had visited the dentist within the last six months.

There has been a decrease in the proportion of smokers, and a very sizeable decrease in the proportion who were exposed to second hand smoke.

There has been a decrease in the proportion of respondents who exceeded the recommended weekly limit for alcohol consumption and the proportion who were binge drinkers in the previous week.

There has been an increase in the proportion of respondents who met the target for fruit/vegetable consumption.

There has been a decrease since 2002 in the proportion who felt isolated from family and friends.

There was an increase in the proportion who felt that local people can influence local decisions.

There was an increase in the proportion of respondents who felt safe in their own home, using public transport and walking alone in their area even after dark.

There was an increase in the proportion with internet access at home and a decrease in the proportion with no qualifications and the proportion who received all income from state benefits.

There was an increase in the proportion of respondents who had a positive perception of their area as a place to live or to bring up children.

There was an increase in the proportion of respondents who were positive about reciprocity in their area.

3.3 Negative Findings

There has been a decrease in the proportion of respondents who met the target for physical activity.

There has been a decrease in the proportion of respondents who met the target for oily fish consumption, and an increase in the proportion who exceeded the recommended limit for high/fat sugary snacks.

There has been a decrease in the proportion of respondents with a positive perception of the adequacy of their income, and an increase in the proportion who would find it difficult to find unexpected sums of £20, £100 or £1,000.

3.4 The Gap Between Most Deprived and Other Areas

The gap between the bottom 15% most deprived areas and other areas has widened in relation to the proportion who met the target for physical activity. However, trend data overall show a narrowing of the gap between the bottom 15% most deprived areas and other areas. Although findings for a number of indicators remain less favourable in the most deprived areas, the gap between bottom 15% areas and other areas has narrowed (or in some cases disappeared) in relation to:

- The proportion with a positive perception of their general health, physical wellbeing and mental/emotional wellbeing;
- The proportion who felt definitely in control of the decisions affecting their life;
- The proportion with a limiting condition or illness (since 2002);
- The proportion with all/some of their own teeth (since 2002);
- The proportion who brushed their teeth twice or more per day;
- The proportion who were registered with a dentist and the proportion who had visited the dentist within the last six months (since 2002);
- The proportion who were smokers (although there remains a sizeable gap);
- The proportion who felt isolated from family and friends (since 2002);
- The proportion who felt they belonged to the local area and the proportion who felt valued as a member of the community;
- The proportion who owned a car, since 2002 (although there remains a sizeable gap);
- The proportion with no qualifications (although there remains a sizeable gap);
- The proportion with a positive perception of their household income (although there remains a sizeable gap);
- The proportion of households where the main wage earner was in employment and the proportion of households where there were no adults in employment (although there remains a sizeable gap); and
- The proportion who value local friendships and the proportion with a positive perception of social support.