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Karen Spencer (Central England People First)
Ian Davies (Central England People First)
Nigel Lott (Central England People First)
Liz Harkness (National Forum)
Simon Cramp Formerly of National Forum now independent Consultant
Ian Berry (Department of Health)
Richard Bond (Department of Health)
Catherine Baines (Consultant for the Department of Health)
Zoe Porter (Department of Health)
Sheila Hollins (Department of Health)
John O’Shea (Department of Health)
Michael Sweetland (Department of Health)
Kathleen Kelly (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister)
Andrew Holman (Community Living Welfare)
Michelle Chinery (Learning difficulties Task Force)
Penny Mendonca (Support worker)
Justin Wilson (Learning difficulties Consultant)
Martin Routledge (Valuing People Support Team)
Eric Emerson (University of Lancaster)
Sue Brooker (BMRB Ltd)
Sally Malam (BMRB Ltd)
Lucy Joyce (BMRB Ltd)
Penny Tapp (BMRB Ltd)
Appendix 2 – “Thank You”

The research team would like to thank some of the people who helped on the project. Many other people also helped who are not named here.

At Central England People First (CEPF):

- Nigel Lott who was part of the team when the project started;
- For their support:
  - Neil Morris, Joan Walker at Central England People First;
  - Ian Buchanan of the Open University.

At the University of Lancaster:

- Professor Chris Hatton.

At BMRB

- The research team, especially Sue Brooker, Jim Muir, Christine Carey, Kathryn Warrener, Ruth Gosling, Jonathan Pickup and Tracy Mackey;
- The operations team, especially Caroline Evans and Jo Knott.
Appendix 3: Getting More Information

You can see (and download) a copy of the questionnaire we used from http://www.dh.gov.uk/PublicationsAndStatistics/PublishedSurvey/ListOfSurveySince1990/GeneralSurveys/GeneralSurveysArticle/fs/en?CONTENT_ID=4081207&chk=u%2Bd5fv

You can get a copy of our raw data from the UK Data Archive (www.data-archive.ac.uk).

There are also a number of detailed technical reports you can see (and download) from http://www.dh.gov.uk/PublicationsAndStatistics/PublishedSurvey/ListOfSurveySince1990/GeneralSurveys/GeneralSurveysArticle/fs/en?CONTENT_ID=4081207&chk=u%2Bd5fv

These include reports on:

- The full ‘Dress Rehearsal’ that we did for the survey
- The response rates for the final sample
- The way we weighted the data to make it as representative as possible
Appendix 4: Working Out Why Good and Bad Things Were More Likely to Happen to Some People Rather Than Others

We wanted to find out why good or bad things were more likely to happen to some people rather than others. For example, we wanted to find out why some people were more likely to have a paid job, and why other people were less likely to have a paid job.

One way of doing this would be to see whether people in some groups were more likely to have a job than people in other groups. So, for example, we could compare young and old people. Then we could also compare people with low support needs and people with high support needs, and so on.

If we did this we would find that

- younger people are more likely to have jobs than older people
- and
- people with lower support needs are more likely to have jobs than people with higher support needs.

This causes us a big problem because we also know that younger people have lower support needs. So, we then need to ask …

- Are younger people more likely to have jobs because they are younger or because they have lower support needs than older people?
• OR
• Are people with lower support needs more likely to have jobs because they are more able or because they are younger?

To help us work out the answers to these kinds of questions we used a statistical procedure called logistic regression.38 We used a programme called SPSS v12.01.

This way we can work out which things are independently related to getting a job. This means that a particular thing (e.g., age) is related to the chances of someone getting a job even when we take into account the possible impact of all the other things we are looking at (e.g., support needs, ethnicity, how poor people are).

We did these kinds of sums for each of the good or bad things that we were interested in (e.g., having a job, being a victim of crime). Each time we did this we looked at many things that might be important.

In most of the analyses, the things we looked at were:

• The person’s age, gender, ethnicity and level of support needs
• Whether they had a long standing illness or disability and whether they had good or poor general health
• How poor they were
• How deprived the neighbourhood was in which they were living
• Whether they were living in supported accommodation or not and, if so, the type of supported accommodation they were living in (Supporting People, Registered Residential Care Home, NHS provision)
• Whether they had a paid job
• How many people they were sharing their home with
• How often they saw friends (with and without Learning difficulties) and family
• How many different leisure activities they did in the last month

In some of the analyses (who gets placed in supported accommodation, peoples’ experiences of their schooldays) we just looked at:

• The person’s age, gender, ethnicity and level of support needs
• Whether they had a long standing illness or disability and whether they had good or poor general health
• How poor they were
• How deprived the neighbourhood was in which they were living
Notes


4 Since our survey was done, NCSC has been replaced by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI)

5 In the BMRB Household Sample we asked people whether they themselves had ‘Learning difficulties’ or whether someone they lived with or supported had ‘Learning difficulties’. Because we just asked people, we realised that we might end up interviewing some people who did not have Learning difficulties as such, but who may have other difficulties (e.g., dyslexia). We decided to exclude people if they had been awarded a GCSE at grade C or above, an O level, an A level, a degree or HND qualification. This led to us excluding 76 people. Of these, 58 were from the BMRB Household Sample, 8 from the Supporting People sample, 6 from the National Care Standards Commission sample, three from the Social Services sample and one from the NHS sample.


See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.

See note 7.


See Section 6 (Money) to see how we measured how poor people were.

See Section 8 (Being Part of the Community) to see how we measured how poor the areas were in which people were living.

See Section 9 (Health & Well-Being) to see how we measured people’s general health.

We used the definition of ‘working age’ used by the Department of Work and Pensions: men aged 16-64; women aged 16-59.

Data extracted from *Social Trends 35* (Note 8).

Data extracted from *Social Trends 35* (Note 8).

See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.
See Section 7 (Families, Friends & Relationships) to see how we measured how often people saw friends.

See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.


http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/

See note 21.

See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.
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See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.

See note 21.

http://www.caci.co.uk/acorn/


http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_urbanpolicy/documents/page/odpm_urbpol_028470.hcsp

See note 28.

http://www.statistics.gov.uk/timeuse/default.asp

See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.


http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/citizensurvey.html

See note 21.


http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/bcs1.html
See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.

Data extracted from Social Trends 35 (Note 8).

See Appendix 3 for more information about how we did this.

Forward stepwise conditional variable entry (p entry <0.05; p exit p >0.1).

---
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You can also download a copy of this report at:

www.friendlyreports.org.uk

This booklet was designed by Sally Ferguson from Speakup Self Advocacy.

Pictures are from 'Change Picture Bank' and 'Valuing People' Clip Art.
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