

Introduction

Metropolis Research was commissioned by the Local Government Association of Tasmania to undertake this *Community Satisfaction Survey* to explore a range of issues around satisfaction with and expectations of local government in Tasmania.

The survey has been designed to measure community satisfaction with a range of Council provided services and facilities, as well as to explore community sentiment across a range of additional issues of concern in the community.

This research builds on satisfaction research previously conducted by the LGAT in previous years, with the last research being conducted in 2015.

The 2019 survey is significantly different in structure and content than the surveys conducted previously. Some comparisons to previous results have been provided where appropriate, however it is important to bear in mind that some variation is likely to result from the different structure, content, and question wording in 2019 compared to previous years. This is despite the fact that the survey has been conducted using the same methodology as has been employed in previous years.

The 2019 survey is comprised of the following components relevant to local government:

- ⊗ Satisfaction with Council's overall performance and aspects of governance and leadership.
- ⊗ Importance of and satisfaction with a broad range of Council services and facilities.
- ⊗ Satisfaction with aspects of Council's customer service.
- ⊗ Perception of safety in the public areas of the local area.
- ⊗ Issues of importance to address in the local municipality at the moment
- ⊗ Respondent profile.

This report provides results to the majority of the questions included in the survey, with a focus on the questions that related to satisfaction with the performance of local government. Additional information is available on request from the Local Government Association of Tasmania.

Methodology

The survey was conducted as a telephone interview style survey of 1,200 randomly selected residents contacted at random from across Tasmania in January, February and early March 2019.

The sample was stratified by council to ensure that each region and type of council in Tasmania contributed proportionally to the sample of 1,200 respondents. The sample of

telephone numbers included approximately equal numbers of landline and mobile phone numbers.

Trained Metropolis Research survey staff conducted telephone interviews of approximately twenty minutes duration with residents.

Staff in the first instance asked if there was a younger person (aged 18 to 34 years) in the household who may wish to participate in the survey, in an attempt to increase the participation from this particularly hard to reach group. Telephone surveys have consistently been found to under-represent younger persons. The sample did under-represent young persons, and the final sample has therefore been weighted by age and gender, based on the 2016 *Census of Population and Housing*. This ensures that the overall results reflect accurately the views of the underlying population of Tasmania.

Response rate and statistical significance

A total of 11,094 residents were contacted by Metropolis Research with a view to inviting them to participate in the survey. Of these, 5,893 either did not answer or asked that they be called back at a later time, 3,650 refused to participate, and 1,200 completed the surveys.

This provides a response rate of 24.7% (of those invited to participate in the survey). Including all attempted contacts, whilst the non-response rate was 89.2%.

The 95% confidence interval (margin of error) of these results is plus or minus 2.8%, at the fifty percent level. In other words, if a yes / no question obtains a result of fifty percent yes, it is 95% certain that the true value of this result is within the range of 45.4% and 54.5%. This is based on a total sample size of 1,200 respondents, and an underlying population Tasmania of 520,830.

Glossary of terms

Measurable and statistically significant

A measurable difference is one where the difference between or change in results is sufficiently large to ensure that they are in fact different results, i.e. the difference is statistically significant. This is due to the fact that survey results are subject to a margin of error or an area of uncertainty.

Significant result

Metropolis Research uses the term *significant result* to describe a change or difference between results that Metropolis Research believes to be of sufficient magnitude that they may impact on relevant aspects of policy development, service delivery and the evaluation of performance and are therefore identified and noted as significant or important.

Somewhat / notable / marginal

Metropolis Research will describe some results or changes in results as being marginally, somewhat, or notably higher or lower. These are not statistical terms rather they are interpretive. They are used to draw attention to results that may be of interest or relevant to policy development and service delivery. These terms are often used for results that may not be statistically significant due to sample size or other factors but may none-the-less provide some insight.

Ninety-five percent confidence interval

Average satisfaction results are presented in this report with the 95% confidence interval included. These figures reflect the range of values within which it is 95% certain that the true average satisfaction falls.

In this report, average scores (satisfaction, importance and agreement) are presented in graphs that display the average score and the 95% confidence interval. The confidence interval is represented by the blue vertical bar for each score. This has been done to assist readers in identifying scores that are measurably different.

The 95% confidence interval based on a one-sample t-test is used for the mean scores presented in this report. The margin of error for state-wide results in this report is plus or minus 2.8%. The confidence interval is larger for the region and council type breakdowns, as well as for the respondent profile breakdowns. Reference to statistical significance (measurable variation) is included in the analysis throughout the report.

Satisfaction categories

Metropolis Research typically categorises satisfaction results to assist in the understanding and interpretative of the results. These categories have been developed over many years as a guide to the scores presented in the report and are designed to give a general context, and are defined as follows:

- ⊗ **Excellent** - scores of 7.75 and above are categorised as excellent
- ⊗ **Very good** - scores of 7.25 to less than 7.75 are categorised as very good
- ⊗ **Good** - scores of 6.5 to less than 7.25 are categorised as good
- ⊗ **Solid** - scores of 6 to less than 6.5 are categorised as solid
- ⊗ **Poor** - scores of 5.5 to less than 6 are categorised as poor
- ⊗ **Very Poor** - scores of 5 to less than 5.5 are categorised as very poor
- ⊗ **Extremely Poor** – scores of less than 5 are categorised as extremely poor.

Regions and types of council

The results of the survey have been presented at the state-wide level, as well as breakdowns by region and type of council.

In summary, the sample of 1,200 state-wide surveys is comprised of the following unweighted surveys from each region and type of council:

South	623 surveys	City	609 surveys
North / Northeast	320 surveys	Urban	281 surveys
West / Northwest	257 surveys	Rural	310 surveys

Region and type of council
LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents)

Region	Type	Council	Unweighted		Weighted	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent
South	City	Hobart	115	9.6%	146	12.2%
		Clarence	133	11.1%	138	11.5%
		Glenorchy	111	9.3%	118	9.8%
		Total	359	29.9%	402	33.5%
	Urban	Kingborough	94	7.8%	89	7.4%
		Brighton	39	3.3%	38	3.2%
		Total	133	11.1%	128	10.6%
	Rural	Sorell	34	2.8%	45	3.8%
		Huon Valley	39	3.3%	35	2.9%
		Derwent Valley	23	1.9%	28	2.3%
		Southern Midlands	13	1.1%	15	1.3%
		Glamorgan / Spring Bay	10	0.8%	12	1.0%
		Central Highlands	6	0.5%	11	0.9%
Tasman		6	0.5%	4	0.3%	
Total		131	10.9%	151	12.6%	
North / Northeast	City	Launceston	145	12.1%	132	11.0%
		Total	145	12.1%	132	11.0%
	Urban	West Tamar	52	4.3%	48	4.0%
		Meander Valley	45	3.8%	31	2.6%
		Total	97	8.1%	79	6.6%
	Rural	Northern Midlands	30	2.5%	23	1.9%
		George Town	16	1.3%	16	1.4%
		Dorset	16	1.3%	12	1.0%
		Break O'Day	14	1.2%	11	0.9%
		Flinders	2	0.2%	2	0.1%
Total		78	6.5%	64	5.4%	
West / Northwest	City	Devonport	60	5.0%	65	5.4%
		Burnie	45	3.8%	44	3.7%
		Total	105	8.8%	109	9.1%
	Urban	Central Coast	51	4.3%	46	3.9%
		Total	51	4.3%	46	3.8%
	Rural	Circular Head	19	1.6%	25	2.1%
		Latrobe	22	1.8%	21	1.8%
		Waratah / Wynyard	32	2.7%	21	1.7%
		West Coast	9	0.8%	10	0.8%
		Kentish	15	1.3%	9	0.7%
		King Island	4	0.3%	3	0.2%
		Total	101	8.4%	88	7.4%
	Tasmania			1,200	100%	1,200

Respondent profile

The following section provides details as to the demographic profile of respondents to the survey.

To ensure that the sample adequately represents the views of the community, the sample has been weighted by age and gender to ensure that each group contributes proportionally to the overall state-wide results.

The sample included a good representation of male and female respondents.

Age structure

Age structure (unweighted)
LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Age group	2019		2016
	Number	Percent	Census
Young persons (18 - 24 years)	19	1.6%	10.5%
Young adults (25 - 34 years)	44	3.7%	14.5%
Adults (35 - 44 years)	78	6.5%	14.9%
Middle-aged adults (45 - 59 years)	296	24.7%	26.8%
Older adults (60 - 74 years)	497	41.4%	23.0%
Senior citizens (75 years and over)	266	22.2%	10.3%
Total	1,200	100%	400,768

Gender

Gender (unweighted)
LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Gender	2019	
	Number	Percent
Male	542	45.2%
Female	656	54.8%
Other	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	2	
Total	1,200	100%

Housing situation

Housing situation
LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Situation	2019	
	Number	Percent
Own this home	710	60.9%
Mortgage (<i>paying-off this home</i>)	242	20.8%
Renting this home	176	15.1%
Other arrangement	37	3.2%
Not stated	35	
Total	1,200	100%

Language spoken at home

Language spoken at home
LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Language	2019	
	Number	Percent
English	1,126	93.7%
Hindi	10	0.8%
Urdu	7	0.5%
Tagalog	6	0.5%
Nepalese	5	0.4%
French	4	0.4%
Korean	4	0.4%
Mandrian	4	0.4%
Farsi	4	0.3%
Greek	4	0.3%
Multiple	4	0.3%
Punjabi	2	0.2%
Dutch	2	0.2%
German	2	0.2%
Japanese	1	0.1%
Gibirsh	1	0.1%
Kannada	1	0.1%
Thai	1	0.1%
Italian	1	0.1%
Gaelic	1	0.1%
Tamil	1	0.1%
Arabic	1	0.0%
Cantonese	1	0.0%
Chinese n.f.d	1	0.0%
Indonesian	1	0.0%
Maltese	1	0.0%
Sinhalese	1	0.0%
Danish	1	0.0%
Polish	1	0.0%
Hungarian	1	0.1%
Czech	1	0.1%
English	1	0.1%
Spanish	1	0.1%
Other n.f.d	1	0.0%
Total	1,202	100%

Results may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Household structure

Household structure

LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Structure	2019	
	Number	Percent
Two parent family total	347	30.1%
youngest child 0 - 4 years	94	8.1%
youngest child 5 - 12 years	75	6.5%
youngest child 13 - 18 years	104	9.0%
adult children only	74	6.4%
One parent family total	58	5.0%
youngest child 0 - 4 years	4	0.3%
youngest child 5 - 12 years	8	0.7%
youngest child 13 - 18 years	10	0.9%
adult children only	36	3.1%
Couple only household	384	33.3%
Other / extended family households	7	0.6%
Group household	104	9.0%
Sole person household	254	22.0%
Not stated	46	
Total	1,200	100%

Period of residence in the municipality

Period of residence in current municipality

LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Period	2019	
	Number	Percent
Less than one year	30	2.6%
One to less than five years	143	12.3%
Five to less than ten years	117	10.0%
Ten years or more	876	75.1%
Not stated	34	
Total	1,200	100%

Local Council

The unweighted sample accurately reflected the distribution of population across the municipalities within Tasmania. The weighting of the sample by age and gender naturally altered this marginally, reflecting the fact that each municipality has a unique age structure.

Municipality of residence
LGAT - 2019 Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Location	Unweighted		Weighted*	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Launceston	145	12%	132	11%
Clarence	133	11%	138	12%
Hobart	115	10%	146	12%
Glenorchy	111	9%	118	10%
Kingborough	94	8%	90	8%
Devenport	60	5%	65	5%
West Tamar	52	4%	48	4%
Central Coast	51	4%	46	4%
Burnie	45	4%	44	4%
Meander Valley	45	4%	31	3%
Brighton	39	3%	39	3%
Huon Valley	39	3%	35	3%
Sorell	34	3%	45	4%
Waratah / Wynyard	32	3%	21	2%
Northern Midlands	30	3%	23	2%
Latrobe	22	2%	21	2%
Derwent Valley	23	2%	28	2%
Circular Head	19	2%	25	2%
Dorset	16	1%	12	1%
George Town	16	1%	16	1%
Kentish	15	1%	9	1%
Break O'day	14	1%	11	1%
Southern Midlands	13	1%	15	1%
Glamorgan / Spring Bay	10	1%	12	1%
West Coast	9	1%	10	1%
Tasman	6	1%	4	0%
Central Highlands	6	1%	11	1%
King Island	4	0%	3	0%
Flinders	2	0%	2	0%
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	100%

() weighted by respondents' age and gender to reflect 2016 Census results*

Summary of satisfaction with local government

The following outlines the average satisfaction (from zero to ten) with each aspect of Council performance.

	<i>Satisfaction</i>	<i>Category</i>
Overall performance		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance of Council across all areas of responsibility 	6.81	"good"
Governance and leadership		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsiveness of Council to local community needs Council making decisions in the interests of the community Council maintaining the trust and confidence of the local community Council's community consultation and engagement Council's representation, lobbying, advocacy on behalf of community 	6.62	"good"
	6.61	"good"
	6.59	"good"
	6.51	"good"
	6.48	"solid"
Customer service		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Courtesy, professionalism, and attitude of staff Provision of information on the Council Overall satisfaction with the customer service experience 	7.66	"very good"
	7.30	"very good"
	6.90	"good"
Services and facilities		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular garbage collection service Museums / galleries / public art Community events and festivals Parks, gardens and playgrounds (provision and maintenance) Regular recycling / green waste recycling services Community support services / social welfare assistance Street lighting Emergency and disaster management and recovery Recreation / Aquatic Centres / sporting facilities Provision and maintenance of cycle paths The maintenance and cleaning of public areas Footpaths / pedestrian areas (provision and maintenance) Environmental protection The provision of information from Council Drains / stormwater maintenance and repairs Council's website / social media Promoting local economic development / tourism Public toilets (provision and maintenance) Provision of adequate / affordable parking Planning for what types of buildings should be developed and where Local roads (provision and maintenance) The management of local traffic Council planning and building permit processes 	8.15	"excellent"
	8.07	"excellent"
	7.89	"excellent"
	7.83	"excellent"
	7.83	"excellent"
	7.70	"very good"
	7.70	"very good"
	7.57	"very good"
	7.56	"very good"
	7.33	"very good"
	7.30	"very good"
	7.23	"good"
	7.19	"good"
	7.03	"good"
	6.99	"good"
	6.97	"good"
	6.90	"good"
	6.86	"good"
	6.80	"good"
	6.66	"good"
	6.49	"solid"
	6.49	"solid"
	5.57	"poor"

Planning and population change

- The change to the population of your municipality over the last 4 years 6.80 “good”
- Planning for population change by local and state government 6.16 “solid”

Housing

- The availability of housing that meets the needs of the community 5.08 “very poor”
- The affordability of housing 5.00 “very poor”

Image of local government

- Image of local government more broadly 6.21 “moderate”.