



## TSM 2024 – our survey approach

As per the Regulator of Social Housing's Tenant Survey Requirements (Annex 5), below details our approach to running the tenant perception survey.

### Summary of achieved sample size (number of responses)

When the survey process was closed, we had over 3,450 responses. Following data cleansing, which involved deleting duplicate responses and incomplete responses, this meant that 3,407 results were used to calculate the Tenant Satisfaction Measure Results.

At the time of analysing the results from the closed survey and producing the housing management information measures, the relevant population (tenanted LCRA properties) was 20,866.

This is a high response rate and is statistically robust. The technical guidelines require larger landlords like Wigan Council to achieve a sample size that gives 95% confidence that the results reported are accurate to a margin of no more than +/- 3%. With over 3,400 responses, Wigan Council achieved a margin of +/- 1.5%, which provides a very robust level of accuracy. It gives us a high level of confidence that the results from this sample survey are representative of the views of all Wigan Council tenants.

### Timing of survey

The perception survey was run as a snapshot in a specified window in Autumn/Winter 2024.

Phase 1 – **18.10.24** digital surveys were issued to all tenants who had an email address or mobile phone number. This was followed by 2 reminder emails/texts.

Phase 2 – **14.11.24** postal surveys were sent to the remaining tenant population who did not have an email address or mobile phone number.

Survey closedown – **10.1.25**

### Collection methods

The survey took a digital first approach, but postal surveys were provided to tenants who did not have an email address or mobile telephone number, or who requested a postal survey.

In Phase 1 GovMetric sent out either an email or SMS survey to the main tenant in each household where we had a valid email address or mobile telephone number.

In Phase 2 GovMetric sent out a postal survey to the main tenant of the remaining households who could not receive the survey via email or SMS.

Throughout the process responses were monitored for age, gender, housing type (general needs / sheltered) and geographic area (neighbourhoods) to ensure that survey responses were representative. By monitoring responses, we were able to identify any groups who were under-represented compared to our tenant profile.

Throughout both phases of the survey window, a comprehensive communication plan was implemented, to explain to tenants why the survey was being conducted and to encourage responses. Staff and Elected Member communications were also circulated so that they could respond to any queries raised by tenants.

Of the 3,407 survey responses, the breakdown of survey methods is:

Method	Number of responses	% of responses
Email	2,714	79.7%
SMS text message	511	15%
Postal survey	182	5.3%

## Sample methods

We had previously determined that to achieve a margin of +/- 3%, which was recommended as our stock size fell in the 20,000 – 25,000 band, we required:

Tenant group	Population	Responses needed	Surveys to be sent out
All LCRA	20,866	1,016	3,387*

*\*This was based on a 30% response rate. On previous snapshot surveys we had achieved a 40% response rate.*

A decision was taken to maximise responses and rather than target surveys to a random sample of 3,387, a census method would be taken in Phase 1, with surveys sent out to all tenanted households where we had email or mobile contact details. At 20,866 tenanted households this provided a more robust approach and provided all tenants with the opportunity to provide feedback.

Whilst this meant most tenanted households received a survey in Phase 1, we wanted to ensure specific groups were not at a disadvantage due to the digital first approach and that the results were representative of the tenant population.

*As explained earlier in this document in Phase 2 Gov Metric sent out paper copies of the survey to all main tenants who had not received a survey via email or SMS text message, therefore this year we did not have to identify a sample of tenants to receive the survey.*

## Summary of representativeness

At the mid-point of the survey, we tested representativeness of responses against the relevant tenant population.

For the characteristics against which representativeness has been assessed, it was decided to focus on 4 characteristics:

- Tenant characteristics used – age profile and gender
- Stock characteristics – general needs or sheltered housing property
- Neighbourhood – Wigan is divided into 7 neighbourhoods with housing stock in each area

### Age profile:

The responses received at the mid-point of the survey were broadly representative of the population, except for tenants in the 25-34 age band where proportionately fewer responses were received (-3.2%) and tenants in the 65-74 age band where 5% more responses were received than the population.

Age Bands	Relevant Population		Mid-point survey responses		Diff
16-24	508	2.4%	46	1.4%	-1.0%
25-34	2510	12%	299	8.8%	-3.2%
35-44	4056	19.4%	582	17.1%	-2.3%
45-54	3773	18.08%	591	17.4%	-0.7%
55-59	2085	10%	398	11.7%	1.7%
60-64	1948	9.3%	384	11.3%	2%
65-74	3117	15%	679	20%	5%
75+	2865	13.7%	422	12.4%	-1.3%
	<b>20,862</b>		<b>3,401*</b>		

### Gender:

The responses received at the mid-point of the survey were representative of general population.

Gender	Relevant population		Mid-point survey responses		Diff
Female	13,017	62.38%	2,139	62.93%	0.52%
Male	7,834	37.54%	1,259	37%	-0.54%
Other*	15	0.08%	1	0.03%	-0.05%
	<b>20,866</b>		<b>3,399*</b>		

## Housing Type:

The responses received at the mid-point of the survey were representative of general population.

Housing type	Relevant population		Mid-point survey responses		Diff
General needs	19,534	93.6%	3,153	92.6%	-1%
Sheltered housing	1,332	6.4%	253	7.4%	+1%
	<b>20,866</b>		<b>3,406*</b>		

## Neighbourhood:

The responses received at the mid-point of the survey were representative of general population.

Neighbourhood	Relevant population		Mid-point survey responses		Diff
Leigh	3,590	17.2%	536	16%	-1.2%
Wigan North	930	4.5%	168	5%	0.5%
Wigan Central	4,468	21.4%	724	21%	-0.4%
South Wigan and Ashton North	1,486	7.1%	228	7%	-0.1%
Lowton and Golborne	1,854	8.9%	340	10%	1.1%
Ince, Hindley, Abram, Platt Bridge	5,228	25%	886	26%	1%
Tyldesley and Atherton	3,310	15.9%	527	15%	-0.9%
	<b>20,866</b>		<b>3,409*</b>		

\* Where data was captured

## Weighting

We did not apply any weighting to generate the reported perception measures, as representativeness was achieved across all measurable groups.

## The role of any external contractor in running the survey

We again worked in partnership with the external contractor GovMetric to design and manage the tenant satisfaction survey, in line with the RSH's requirements. The approach taken ensured the process remained without bias and results were kept confidential and independent.

Postal surveys were sent out by GovMetric and responses returned to them, with them responsible for validation and collation. Wigan Council's access was limited to viewing the actual results.

## **Tenants not included in the sample frame**

Annex 5 asks for the number of tenant households within the relevant population that have not been included in the sample frame due to the exceptional circumstances described in paragraph 63 with a broad rationale for their removal.

This is not applicable for Wigan's survey – there were no exclusions due to the exceptional circumstances, and a mixed methodology approach was used to provide an alternative way of responding for households who could not respond to the digital survey.

## **Reasons for not meeting the sample size**

This is not applicable; we achieved a high response rate to the survey.

## **Incentives**

A prize draw consisting of 1<sup>st</sup> place prize of £100 and 4 2<sup>nd</sup> place prizes of £50 each was offered as an incentive to tenants who completed the survey and gave consent to be entered the draw and contacted.

## **Any other methodology considerations**

There were no other methodological issues likely to have a material impact on the tenant perception measures reported.