Summary of Survey Approach – LCRA

# Introduction

The Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSM) Standard requires all registered providers to generate and report TSMs as specified by the Regulator of Social Housing. The questions, and much of the methodology, is prescribed in the Regulator’s [Tenant](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/632af26de90e07371e5e585c/20220913_Annex5_TSM_Tenant-Survey-Requirements.pdf) [Satisfaction Measures – Tenant Survey Requirements](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/632af26de90e07371e5e585c/20220913_Annex5_TSM_Tenant-Survey-Requirements.pdf) document. However, providers do have a degree of flexibility so, to provide maximum transparency, they must summarise their approach to conducting the surveys alongside any published results. That is the purpose of this document – so it is clear how Curo went about gathering customer feedback through the TSM perception survey framework.

Copies of the questionnaires that were completed with customers are available on our website. There are multiple versions because we are keen to understand more about the reasons behind customers’ responses to different questions. So, between April and September we asked for more information about what we can do to make a positive contribution to the neighbourhood; from October to March we asked about how we can best keep communal areas clean and well maintained. Changing these probing questions during the year allows us to respond more quickly to customer feedback.

# Summary of Achieved Sample

We received 1068 responses to the survey.

# Timing of Survey

We took a ‘phased’ approach, with customers contacted in four principal waves – in May, August, November and January – plus a small postal campaign in March.

# Collection Method(s) and Rationale

We used a phone-first approach because it allows us to reach out to a wide customer base and correct any imbalance in responses by setting quotes for the telephone interviews. However, this is supplemented by a web survey and postal mop-up survey to ensure nobody is excluded because they don’t have a phone number or email address. In total, 1040 (97.38%) of surveys were completed on the telephone; 23 (2.15%) by post; the 5 remaining (0.47%) were filled in online.

# Sample Method

We provided a database of our Low Cost Rental Accommodation customers to our contractor, TLF Research, before each wave of research began. TLF Research then used a stratified random sampling approach, meaning that all contacts supplied in the database are given the opportunity to be selected to take part in the TSM survey.

# Representativeness Assessment

Using the database we provided, TLF Research set quotas by age group and tenure type, as these are the categories identified by the Regulator of Social Housing to have the biggest influence on satisfaction scores. Sampling is also monitored by local authority, property type and ethnicity, to ensure the sample is representative of the overall tenant population.

With 11,875 customers in the survey ‘population’ we had to achieve a confidence level of at least +/- 3%. Reliability was achieved. Using the average satisfaction score and sample size, we are 95% confident that the overall % satisfied is within

+/-2.6%.

A full version of TLF’s Statement of Research Reliability and Representativeness is available in Appendix A.

# Weighting

No weighting was required as we achieved a representative sample.

# Contractors

We engaged TLF Research to collect, generate and validated the perception measures we have reported to the Regulator of Social Housing.

# Exclusions

Customers from seven Stepdown properties were excluded from the perception survey due to the very short-term nature of the property tenure. Customers in Stepdown properties use the units after leaving hospital before returning home and have minimal interaction with Curo as a landlord, so it was thought that surveying them would not be appropriate in such circumstances.

# Sample Size

The required sample size was met.

# Incentives

No incentives were offered.

# Methodological Issues

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

# Excluded Responses

Curo has not undertaken any tenant perception surveys which include TSM questions that were not included in the calculation of the TSMs.

# Visual Features

No visual features were included alongside the required response options.

**Appendix A**

**Curo Q4 TSM Year 2 – Statement of Research Reliability and Representativeness Statistical accuracy**

At the end of FY24/25, we collected 1068 LCRA responses (includes 41 partial completes).

The statistical accuracy is currently:

LCRA = ±2.6%

The aim at the end of the year is to achieve accuracy levels of:

LCRA = ±3% (based on ~11,875 LCRA tenants in the Q1 client database) We have hit the required statistical accuracy required for LCRA. **Representativeness**

**LCRA summary**

Tenure, age, ethnicity – as is stated in the TSM documentation, we need these representation criteria to be as close as possible to the proportions seen in the database. The outputs for these criteria look like this:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tenure** | Q4 Sample | Database |
| General Needs (884) | 82.8% | 83.1% |
| Sheltered (167) | 15.6% | 14.7% |
| Independent Lives (17) | 1.6% | 2.2% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | Q4 Sample | Database |
| 16-24 (30) | 2.8% | 3.2% |
| 25-34 (158) | 14.8% | 14.5% |
| 35-44 (201) | 18.8% | 18.9% |
| 45-54 (190) | 17.8% | 18.5% |
| 55-64 (214) | 20.0% | 19.9% |
| 65+ (271) | 25.4% | 24.5% |
| Unknown (4) | 0.4% | 0.5% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ethnicity** | Q4 Sample | Database |
| White (823) | 77.1% | 76.0% |
| Unknown (161) | 15.1% | 17.9% |
| Black, Black British, Caribbean or African (38) | 3.6% | 2.3% |
| Mixed or multiple ethnic groups (21) | 2.0% | 1.9% |
| Other ethnic group (16) | 1.5% | 0.9% |
| Asian or Asian British (9) | 0.8% | 1.0% |

We can also compare representativeness across the following criteria - building type, property size, local authority:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Type** | Q4 Sample | Database |
| Flat (473) | 44.3% | 39.9% |
| House (416) | 39.0% | 42.5% |
| Bungalow (117) | 11.0% | 10.9% |
| Maisonette (39) | 3.7% | 3.7% |
| Other (23) | 2.2% | 3.0% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Local Authority** | Q4 Sample | Database |
| Bath & North East Somerset (789) | 73.9% | 77.5% |
| Bristol (105) | 9.8% | 8.2% |
| North Somerset (65) | 6.1% | 4.3% |
| Wiltshire (51) | 4.8% | 4.2% |
| South Gloucestershire (51) | 4.8% | 4.9% |
| Somerset (7) | 0.7% | 0.8% |
| Unknown (0) | 0.0% | 0.0% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of bedrooms** | Q4 Sample | Database |
| 0 (13) | 1.2% | 1.5% |
| 1 (367) | 34.4% | 30.2% |
| 2 (367) | 34.4% | 35.5% |
| 3 (258) | 24.2% | 26.0% |
| 4 (30) | 2.8% | 2.9% |
| 5 (1) | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| 6 (0) | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Unknown (32) | 3.0% | 3.9% |

The proportions captured in the sample are very close to the population (within +/- 5% difference) so weighting is not necessary.

**Note:** The most important thing for assessing representativeness is to understand whether weighting the data to bring it in line with the proportions seen in the database will have an impact on the overall scores or not. In instances where different groups clearly have different overall satisfaction scores (such as general needs vs sheltered housing), we would want to ensure the proportions of those groups are in line with those seen in the overall database (and thus might need to weight the data based on this criteria). If, however, overall sat scores were consistent across different groups within a criterion (such as number of bedrooms), weighting would not be considered beneficial. We would only recommend weighting on 1 to 2 criteria, as weights have a knock-on impact on other proportions seen in the database