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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobpoints</td>
<td>Computer terminals available for Jobcentre Plus office visitors to use to search for job vacancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm-phones</td>
<td>Telephones available for Jobcentre Plus office visitors to use (free of charge) to enquire about job vacancies or to call various relevant Jobcentre Plus telephone services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-appointsed face-to-face contacts</td>
<td>Attended an appointment booked in advance of their visit to the Jobcentre Plus office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappointed non-face-to-face contacts</td>
<td>Did not have a pre-booked appointment (or had one but missed it) and did not speak to a member of staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappointed face-to-face contacts</td>
<td>Did not have a pre-booked appointment (or had one but missed it) and did speak to a member or staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Note: if visitors asked to be pointed in the direction of the warm-phones/leaflets/Jobpoint, etc. only (i.e. they did not speak to a member of staff for any other reason), they were classified as a non-face-to-face contact.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>Citizen’s Advice Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI</td>
<td>Computer Assisted Personal Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Employment and Support Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Incapacity Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Income Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>Jobseeker’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Black and minority ethnic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This report contains the findings of a research study conducted among Jobcentre Plus office visitors by Ipsos MORI Social Research Institute, on behalf of Jobcentre Plus.

Objectives

A key objective of the research was to provide Jobcentre Plus with data on the volume of people visiting Jobcentre Plus offices who fell into each of the following three categories: those who had attended a pre-booked appointment; those who had not attended a pre-booked appointment, who had spoken with a member of staff (i.e. an unappointed face-to-face contact); and those who had not attended a pre-booked appointment, who did not speak with a member of staff (i.e. an unappointed non-face-to-face contact).

Beyond quantifying the number of visitors falling into each of these categories, the research also aimed to establish the reasons for unappointed face-to-face contacts and uncover customer awareness and views of alternative ways of contacting Jobcentre Plus. This would help Jobcentre Plus find ways of raising awareness of other contact opportunities and ensure customers use the contact channels that are most appropriate to their needs, which may not necessarily be face-to-face in the Jobcentre Plus office, in order to improve customer experience by helping them through the benefit system more smoothly.

Jobcentre Plus has developed a number of strategies to make services easier to access for customers. This includes developing more self-service options and planned improvements to telephone-based services so that enquiries and changes of circumstance can be handled in one contact. Jobcentre Plus has recently introduced a model called ‘Accessing Jobcentre Plus Customer Services’ which is designed to help customers without pre-booked appointments use the contact channel that best meets their needs. Most customers are already encouraged to apply for benefit by telephone, and job search facilities are available through the Jobseeker Direct telephone line and on-line via the Jobcentre Plus and Directgov websites.
Furthermore, the research sought to identify ways to reduce any unappointed face-to-face contacts that could be handled more effectively through other channels, so as to improve customer service by enabling them to access services without the need to travel to the jobcentre and to enable Jobcentre Plus to channel face-to-face resources more effectively towards those most in need of them.

Methodology

The research was conducted across 100 Jobcentre Plus offices between 27 March and 13 May 2009 and comprised three key elements:

1. a footfall count to quantify the level of visitor traffic;
2. a short screener (contact sheet) interview to classify visitors as either a pre-booked appointed contact, an unappointed non-face-to-face contact, or an unappointed face-to-face contact; and
3. a full interview, conducted using Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI), with visitors who were identified as unappointed face-to-face contacts.

A total of 40,557 visitors (unweighted) took part in the screener interview and 1,760 took part in the full CAPI interview.

Summary of findings

Visitor footfalls

The footfall count established that an estimated total of 2,152,971 visitors passed through the Jobcentre Plus network of offices, per week, between 27 March and 13 May 2009. There was an even distribution in visitor flow across the days of the week and, on each day, visitor numbers peaked just prior to and after lunchtime, with a drop in numbers towards the end of the afternoon.

Data from the screener interviews revealed that three in five (59 per cent) of all visitors had used a Jobpoint and/or warm-phone during their visit, including a fifth (20 per cent) who came in purely to use these facilities. Overall, usage of the Jobpoints was considerably higher (53 per cent compared with 13 per cent usage of the warm-phones).

This data also showed that three in five Jobcentre Plus visitors (61 per cent or around 1.3 million visitors per week) had a pre-booked appointment. A further quarter (24 per cent or around 517,000 visitors per week) did not have a pre-booked appointment but did not speak to a member of staff, and the remaining 15 per cent did not have a pre-booked appointment and spoke to a member of staff. This latter group of visitors (i.e. the 15 per cent or around 323,000 visitors)

---

This estimate is derived from grossing up the weighted footfall counts across 100 Jobcentres. Refer to Appendix A for more details on the calculations and Appendix B for confidence intervals.
per week) were classified as ‘unappointed face-to-face contacts’ and were invited to take part in an interview about the reasons for their visit and their awareness of, and preferences for, alternative contact channels.

**Figure 1 Type of contact**

![Pie chart showing the distribution of contact types.](image)

Base: All screened respondents (40,557).

**Unappointed face-to-face contacts**

All of the findings within this section refer to the 15 per cent of overall footfall (which equates to 323,000 contacts per week) made up of visitors who did not have a pre-booked appointment and spoke to a member of staff (unappointed face-to-face contacts).

The full interviews with visitors having unappointed face-to-face contacts showed that the most common reason(s) for their visit was to apply for (or find out how to apply for) a benefit (16 per cent), followed by getting help with jobsearch (15 per cent). Around four in five spent less than ten minutes with a member of staff, including around one in six (17 per cent) who spent a minute or less. This suggests that the majority of queries were relatively straightforward or ‘fact-finding’ and could, therefore, have potentially been dealt with using alternative contact channels.

Only around a quarter had tried to deal with the main reason for their visit via another channel beforehand; three-quarters did not. Thus, there is significant scope for Jobcentre Plus to promote the use of alternative contact channels through effective communications, targeted at both current and potential users.

Among those who tried to resolve their main query prior to visiting the jobcentre, around three-fifths tried by telephone/textphone and around one in eight went on-line. The most common reason for still needing to visit in person was because of a desire to speak with someone face-to-face, but there was also some evidence of contact failure as around one in six said they had been advised to come in by
Jobcentre Plus staff or advisers\(^3\) and others reported that they had been unable to get the assistance they needed via alternative channels. For example, around one in ten said they could not find the information they required using other channels. However, there was also some evidence of opportunistic motives and a general lack of awareness of Jobcentre Plus contact channels: a fifth said they happened to be passing by and a similar proportion was simply unaware of alternative channels.

Although the majority of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors – seven in ten – had not been advised to go into the Jobcentre Plus office by anyone or anything they had seen, the remaining three in ten reported that they had been advised to visit. The main sources of this direction were family and friends (21 per cent) and Jobcentre Plus staff or advisers (22 per cent), suggesting that staff were unable to deal with certain types of queries. One in ten (12 per cent) reported that they were advised to visit by other organisations.

A small number were directed into Jobcentre Plus offices as a result of having been on the Jobcentre Plus and Directgov websites (six per cent and one per cent respectively). This could be due to a number of reasons and further research would be required to pinpoint the exact failures, which could include a lack of clarity on the websites about what actions customers should take to resolve their query and customers misinterpreting the information on the websites and/or feeling that their queries have not been addressed.

A lack of awareness of alternatives to face-to-face channels was apparent for a majority of visitors: only half claimed to know at least a fair amount about Jobcentre Plus services in general and significantly fewer said they had this level of awareness in relation to specific telephone and on-line services. In addition, significant minorities had not heard of the central Jobseeker Direct telephone line (33 per cent), the telephone line that processes benefits and deals with benefit queries (26 per cent), the Directgov website (40 per cent), the Jobcentre Plus claim line (37 per cent) and the Jobcentre Plus website (18 per cent).

An additional barrier to take-up of alternative contact channels is users’ preferences for face-to-face contacts: 82 per cent agreed that, given the choice, they would always prefer to speak to someone face to face. However, positively, 83 per cent said that they would be happy to use telephone services if they knew their query would be dealt with in one call. Visitors’ preference for face-to-face contacts cuts across a range of contact types, though face-to-face contact was particularly popular for providing proof of benefit entitlement, making a complaint and applying for a benefit.

Furthermore, a significant minority (32 per cent) admitted to finding the internet in general confusing and this will need to be taken on board in the promotion, design and testing of the websites. In particular, efforts need to be targeted at

---

\(^3\) That is, Jobcentre Plus claim line advisers, Jobseeker Direct advisers and/or Jobcentre Plus office staff.
visitors aged 45 plus and those with a disability or illness – these groups were most likely to say they find the internet, in general, confusing (42 per cent and 45 per cent, respectively, compared with 32 per cent overall).

A quarter (23 per cent) of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors had a long-standing health condition or disability. A substantial proportion of these visitors – 43 per cent – said their health condition impacted on their ability to use Jobcentre Plus services (equates to one in ten of all unappointed face-to-face contact visitors). Of those who reported an impact on their ability to use Jobcentre Plus services, 27 per cent said it was more difficult for them to get to a Jobcentre Plus office (equates to 6 per cent of all unappointed face-to-face contact visitors). However, those reporting that their condition affected their ability to use the various non-face-to-face contact channels were lower — between 9 per cent and 18 per cent of those who reported an impact on their ability to use Jobcentre Plus services, depending on the particular contact channel. This equates to between 2 per cent and 4 per cent of all unappointed face-to-face contacts, suggesting that the vast majority of visitors were able to access at least one form of non-face-to-face contact channels.

Recommendations

During the survey fieldwork period of 27 March to 13 May 2009, a fifth of all visitors to Jobcentre Plus offices came purely to use the Jobpoints and/or warmphones. This equates to around 421,000 visitors per week. Jobcentre Plus could consider extending its ‘Flexible Service Delivery’ sites which provide Jobpoint access to non-Department for Work and Pensions sites such as libraries, supermarkets and community learning centres as a way to reduce visitor traffic among this group of visitors who visit the Jobcentre purely to use Jobpoints and to give users greater opportunities to access these facilities.

Over seven in ten unappointed face-to-face contact visitors (73 per cent) did not attempt to deal with their main query using non-face-to-face channels beforehand, though there was wide support for telephone contacts if the user could be convinced that their query would be dealt with in one call. Jobcentre Plus should consider putting into place a Service Level Agreement which explicitly states the maximum time Jobcentre Plus will take to respond to customers’ queries correctly ‘first time round’. Jobcentre Plus’ performance against these measures should be monitored and made widely available to (potential) customers to instil confidence.

Customers who had attempted to deal with their query by telephone prior to visiting in person reported a number of contact failures, including being advised by staff and advisers to attend in person. Further follow-up work with staff is required to establish why, and at what point, visitors are re-directed and what can be done to encourage greater use of alternative contact channels. This could include focus groups with staff as well as mystery shopping research.
Visitors also mentioned being advised to visit Jobcentre Plus offices by ‘other organisations’. Jobcentre Plus should take steps to raise awareness of its telephone and on-line services among relevant organisations, reinforcing the use of these channels to ensure effective delivery of services to customers.

Another source of contact failure was the Jobcentre Plus and, to a lesser extent, Directgov websites. Although only a small number tried to deal with their enquiry via on-line channels (58 people), a number of these visitors reported that they were unable to find the information they needed. Thus, further follow-up work may prove useful, for example, website usability research, in pinpointing the exact sources of failure for different contact types and to explore how the websites could be improved to encourage greater use, particularly among customers aged 45 plus and those with a disability or illness – these users were more likely report that they found the internet generally confusing.

Awareness of alternative channels was low: two-fifths of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors had never heard of the Directgov website, which needs consideration given plans to switch the content and functionality of the Jobcentre Plus website to the Directgov website during 2010. Awareness of the two websites was lowest among those who were last in paid employment seven or more months previously and those who had never had a job. However, as significant minorities of all groups had not heard of the Directgov website, it will be important to publicise this as widely as possible.

Awareness of the services provided by Jobcentre Plus in general was particularly low among the newly unemployed – a quarter said they were unaware of alternatives to Jobcentre Plus offices. For some this may be their first ever spell of unemployment and, therefore, Jobcentre Plus should publicise its services and alternative contact channels more widely, ensuring that key communications reach potential users as well as those already familiar with its services. Jobcentre Plus could ensure that telephone and online channels are publicised in the Jobcentre Plus offices (for example through posters) to signpost customers to other channels. Jobcentre Plus could also consider using accessible mediums such as newspapers, television, radio and web links to related jobsearch and information sites.

Finally, a significant proportion of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors (around two-fifths) did not have easy access to a landline and/or the internet. Therefore, Jobcentre Plus should explore the possibility of extending the freephone function to non-BT landlines and mobile phones to encourage greater use of telephone channels. Jobcentre Plus could also publicise public sources of internet access that are available to customers including, for example, libraries, learning/community centres, UK on-line/Learndirect centres and local internet cafes.
1 Introduction

This report contains the findings of a research study conducted among Jobcentre Plus visitors by Ipsos MORI Social Research Institute on behalf of Jobcentre Plus.

1.1 Background

Jobcentre Plus’ services can be accessed through a range of channels, including telephone, face-to-face via Jobcentre Plus offices, postal and electronically via websites and Jobpoints. Those wishing to contact Jobcentre Plus are encouraged to use the contact channels considered by Jobcentre Plus to be the most efficient, effective and appropriate to customer needs in order to improve customer experience by helping them through the benefit system more smoothly.

Jobcentre Plus has developed a number of strategies to make services easier to access for customers. These include developing more self-service options and planned improvements to telephone-based services so that enquiries and changes of circumstance can be handled in one contact. Jobcentre Plus has recently introduced a model called ‘Accessing Jobcentre Plus Customer Services’ which is designed to help customers without pre-booked appointments use the contact channel that best meets their needs. Most customers are already encouraged to apply for benefit by telephone and job search facilities are available through the Jobseeker Direct telephone line and on-line via the Jobcentre Plus and Directgov websites. The aim is to improve the customer experience by reducing the number of ‘no value’ contacts, thus enabling Jobcentre Plus to channel face-to-face resources more effectively towards those most in need of them. Face-to-face contact in Jobcentre Plus offices is primarily recommended for appointments, complex queries, harder-to-help customers and customers who experience a barrier to using other channels.

These are defined as contact that is of no value to both the customer and Jobcentre Plus.
1.2 Research objectives

The aim of this research was to provide Jobcentre Plus with information on the volume of people visiting Jobcentre Plus offices without an appointment, the reasons for these visits and what can be done to encourage the use of alternatives to face-to-face contact in order to improve customer experience.

The key objectives were, therefore, to:

• quantify the level of visitor traffic through Jobcentre Plus offices nationally;
• quantify the proportion of visitors with unappointed face-to-face contact with Jobcentre Plus staff;
• explore the reasons for unappointed face-to-face contacts; and
• explore visitors’ levels of awareness of, and preference for, alternative contact channels.

1.3 Methodology

The research was conducted across 100 Jobcentre Plus offices from 27 March to 13 May 2009. The 100 offices were selected at random from a database of Jobcentre Plus offices supplied by Jobcentre Plus. The full list of Jobcentre Plus offices was stratified (i.e. ordered) by region and volume of meetings attended\(^5\) prior to selection of the 100 Jobcentre Plus offices, to ensure that selected offices were representative of Jobcentre Plus offices nationally.

Each Jobcentre Plus office was allocated four interview days over the fieldwork period (on four different days of the week), ensuring that, overall, there was a roughly equal number of interview days for each day of the week.

The research involved three key elements:

• a footfall count to quantify the level of visitor traffic; for a five-minute period every half an hour the number of visitors who exited the Jobcentre Plus office were counted. The footfall counts from the 100 offices were weighted and ‘grossed-up’, using data on the number of meetings attended, to provide an estimate of the total footfall volume across Jobcentre Plus’ national network of 767\(^6\) Jobcentre Plus offices. The footfall count sheet can be found in Appendix C;

---

\(^5\) From April to December 2008, according to Jobcentre Plus management information.

\(^6\) This number is based on the number of offices that had booked and attended appointments recorded between April and December 2008, according to Jobcentre Plus management information.
• a short **screener interview** to classify visitors as either an appointed contact, an unappointed non-face-to-face contact (e.g. collecting leaflets or using a jobpoint/warm-phone only)\(^7\) or an unappointed face-to-face contact. The screener interviews were conducted between the footfall counts. Respondent selection was based on the ‘next person’ to exit the jobcentre. A total of 40,557 visitors (unweighted) took part in a contact sheet interview. The contact sheet questionnaire can be found in Appendix D;

• a full **Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI)** was conducted with visitors who were identified from the contact sheet interview as unappointed face-to-face contacts (i.e. those who did not have a pre-booked appointment and who spoke to a member of staff). This interview established the reason(s) for their visit, awareness of alternative channels, whether or not these alternatives had been used prior to their visit and what could be done to encourage the use of alternative channels. A total of 1,760 visitors (unweighted) took part in a CAPI interview. A Welsh version of the CAPI interview was available for respondents who preferred to do the interview in Welsh, although this option was not requested. A copy of the CAPI questionnaire can be found in Appendix E.

Full technical details of the survey can be found in Appendix A and a list of all 100 Jobcentre Plus offices surveyed can be found in Appendix G.

### 1.4 Response rates and non-response bias

In total, 4,548 visitors (15 per cent) who took part in a contact sheet interview were classified as having had an unappointed face-to-face contact, meaning that they were eligible to take part in the ten-minute CAPI interview. A total of 1,760 CAPI interviews were conducted, giving a response rate of 39 per cent (the remaining 61 per cent chose not to take part).

As no demographic information was collected as part of the screener interview (to minimise interview length and data protection concerns), it is not possible to assess whether the visitors identified as unappointed face-to-face contacts who took part in the full survey were different in any way to those who chose not to take part and/or to calculate non-response bias.

### 1.5 Interpretation of the data

As highlighted above, the full survey findings are based on interviews with a sample of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors. This means that all results are subject to sampling tolerances and not all differences are statistically significant. This report only comments on findings that are statistically significant. A guide to statistical reliability can be found in Appendix B.

---

\(^7\) Note: if visitors asked to be pointed in the direction of the warm-phones/leaflets/Jobpoint, etc. **only** (i.e. they did not speak to a member of staff for any other reason), they were classified as a **non-face-to-face contact**.
Where percentages do not add up to 100, this is due to computer rounding, the exclusion of ‘don’t know’ categories or multiple answers. An asterisk (*) denotes values above zero but less than half a per cent.
2 Levels of visitor traffic and type of contact

2.1 Introduction

This chapter details the level of visitor traffic through Jobcentre Plus offices (established via the footfall exit count) and the proportion classified into each of the three key categories of: (pre-booked) appointed contact, unappointed non-face-to-face contact or unappointed face-to-face contact.

2.2 Visitor traffic

Between 27 March and 13 May 2009, an estimated total of 2,152,971 visitors passed through the Jobcentre Plus network of 767 offices per week. This estimate is based on weighted, grossed-up footfall volumes for the 100 Jobcentres included in the research (for further details, see Appendix A and Appendix B for the statistical reliability information).

Visitor volumes vary significantly by region, ranging from 105,614 per week in the North East to 320,364 per week in London (see Table 2.1 for full regional analysis). Overall, it was, however, evenly distributed across the days of the week. Two-thirds of all visitors were male and a third was female, as shown in Figure 2.1.

---

* The number of Jobcentres is derived from Jobcentre Plus Management Information on meetings attended between April and December 2008.
The flow of visitors was also consistent by day of the week, with the exception of the noticeably lower numbers between 9 and 10am on Wednesdays, as shown in Figure 2.2. This was due to the majority of Jobcentres opening at 10am on Wednesdays at the time of the fieldwork, due to a staff training hour. Peaks in visitor numbers occurred just prior to, and just after, lunchtime, with fewer visitors passing through in the late afternoons.
2.3 Type of contact

The majority (61 per cent or around 1.3 million visitors per week) of Jobcentre Plus visitors had a pre-booked appointment (which they attended), meaning that the remaining 39 per cent did not have a pre-booked appointment.

Of those without a pre-booked appointment, less than half (38 per cent) actually spoke to a member of staff (this equates to 15 per cent of all visitors or around 323,000 visitors per week – these were those eligible for the Computer Assisted Personal Interview). The remaining 62 per cent did not speak to staff (this equates to 24 per cent of all visitors or around 517,000 visitors per week), because, for example, they may have come into the office simply to use the Jobpoint or warm-phone as discussed later in this chapter.

As Table 2.1 shows, although the total weekly visitor volume varies significantly by region, the nature of visits is generally consistent across regions: the majority of visitors had a pre-booked appointment (around three in five, though rising slightly to two-thirds in Yorkshire and the Humber).

There is greater regional variation in the distribution of unappointed contacts: the majority of unappointed contacts in Wales did not involve interactions with Jobcentre Plus staff; by contrast, almost half of unappointed contacts in the North East involved contacts with staff.

Note: if visitors asked to be pointed in the direction of the warm-phones/leaflets/Jobpoint, etc. only (i.e. they did not speak to a member of staff for any other reason), they were classified as a non-face-to-face contact.
Figure 2.3  Type of contact

Table 2.1  Breakdown of weekly visitors, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total visitors No.</th>
<th>Total visitors %</th>
<th>Unappointed non-face-to-face contact %</th>
<th>Unappointed face-to-face contact %</th>
<th>Pre-booked appointment %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>320,364</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>311,212</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>227,540</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>215,829</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>201,377</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>199,155</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>173,529</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>140,330</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>130,861</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>127,157</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>105,614</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National total</td>
<td>2,152,968</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This figure is slightly different to the 2,152,971 quoted elsewhere in this report, due to rounding.

Base: All screened respondents (40,557).

Table 2.1  Breakdown of weekly visitors, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total visitors No.</th>
<th>Total visitors %</th>
<th>Unappointed non-face-to-face contact %</th>
<th>Unappointed face-to-face contact %</th>
<th>Pre-booked appointment %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>320,364</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>311,212</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>227,540</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>215,829</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>201,377</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>199,155</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>173,529</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>140,330</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>130,861</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>127,157</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>105,614</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National total</td>
<td>2,152,968</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This figure is slightly different to the 2,152,971 quoted elsewhere in this report, due to rounding.

Base: 100 Jobcentres.

Source: Footfall count and contact sheet interviews, conducted across 100 Jobcentre Plus offices, from 27 March to 13 May 2009.

Jobcentre Plus offices contain Jobpoints, which are computer terminals available for visitors to use in order to search for job vacancies, and warm-phones, which
visitors can use, free of charge, to enquire about job vacancies or to access various relevant Jobcentre Plus telephone services.

Figure 2.4 shows that three in five visitors reported using a Jobpoint and/or warm-phone during their visit, including a fifth who came in purely to access these services (16 per cent came in purely to use the Jobpoints and 6 per cent purely to use the warm-phones). Jobcentre Plus could consider extending its Flexible Service Delivery sites which provide Jobpoint access to non-Department for Work and Pensions sites such as libraries, supermarkets and community learning centres as a way to reduce visitor traffic among those who come into Jobcentres purely to use the Jobpoints and, to a lesser extent, the warm-phones. This could give users greater opportunities to access these facilities, help to reduce the volume of ‘opportunistic’ face-to-face contacts with staff and help Jobcentre Plus to better manage overall visitor numbers to Jobcentres.

Overall, the Jobpoint was by far the most commonly accessed facility: just over half of visitors used this, compared with 13 per cent who used the warm-phone.

**Figure 2.4  Use of the Jobpoints and warm-phones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Used Jobpoint</th>
<th>Used warm-phone</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purely to use Jobpoint</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purely to use warm-phone</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All screened respondents (40,557).

---

10 The term ‘purely’ in Figure 2.4 refers to visitors who had used either the Jobpoints or the warm-phones and not spoken to a member of staff. Therefore the total figure is not simply the sum of the ‘purely to use Jobpoint’ and the ‘purely to use warm-phone’ figures, as some used both the Jobpoint and the warm-phone (without speaking to a member of staff).
3 Unappointed face-to-face contacts

This chapter focuses on the experiences of visitors who had face-to-face contact with a member of staff without a pre-booked appointment. This group represents 15 per cent of all visitors, or around 323,000 visitors per week between 27 March and 13 May 2009. These visitors, referred to as unappointed face-to-face contacts, took part in a full Computer Assisted Personal Interview to explore the reason(s) for their visit as well as their awareness of, and preferences for, alternative contact channels.

3.1 Profile of unappointed face-to-face contacts

Visitors having unappointed face-to-face contacts were predominantly male (65 per cent), which is in-line with the gender profile of all visitors to Jobcentre Plus offices (i.e. 66 per cent male and 34 per cent female).

The age distribution is fairly evenly spread though, as would be expected, due to approaching retirement age, visitors aged 55 plus are in the minority, as shown in Figure 3.1.
The largest group of visitors by far is the registered unemployed – 46 per cent described this as their main activity. An additional one in eight (12 per cent) were not registered unemployed but were seeking work and a similar proportion (11 percent) said they were long-term sick or disabled.

Eight per cent were working full-time. This group is likely to comprise people who either had concerns about their job security, were anticipating changing jobs and/or who had recently found work and were reporting a change of circumstance (see Figure 3.2).

Approaching half (45 per cent) of all unappointed face-to-face contacts were receiving Jobseekers’ Allowance (JSA), which is consistent with the percentage reporting they were registered unemployed. Around one in ten each was in receipt of Child Benefit (12 per cent), Income Support (IS) (10 per cent) or Child Tax Credit (9 per cent). Three in ten (29 per cent) were not receiving any benefits. It is interesting that JSA customers account for a substantial proportion of unappointed face-to-face footfall, as it indicates that some JSA customers are visiting the Jobcentre in addition to their Fortnightly Job Reviews (pre-booked appointments).

A fifth (22 per cent) of JSA recipients were recently unemployed – that is, they have worked in the last three months. Just over a third (35 per cent) were last employed between three and six months previously and two-fifths (38 per cent) had been out of work for seven or more months.
Male visitors were more likely to be registered unemployed and in receipt of JSA (52 per cent compared with 31 per cent females). By contrast, female visitors were three times more likely to be in part-time employment (15 per cent compared with...
five per cent males) or not seeking work due to childcare responsibilities (seven per cent compared with one per cent males). They were also more likely to be in receipt of benefits more commonly associated with these activities: IS (16 per cent compared with seven per cent males), Child Benefit (22 per cent compared with six per cent males), Child Tax Credit (19 per cent compared with four per cent males) and/or Working Tax Credit (5 per cent compared with two per cent males).

The majority of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors were white (87 per cent); 13 per cent were from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds (BME).

One in ten (9 per cent) of all visitors reported that their first language was not English or Welsh; 39 per cent of BME visitors reported that their first language was not English or Welsh; and five per cent of white visitors reported that their first language was not English or Welsh.

**Figure 3.4 Ethnicity and language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First language</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English or Welsh</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other language</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760).

White visitors were more likely than those from BME backgrounds to be registered unemployed (47 per cent compared with 36 per cent). By contrast, visitors whose first language was not English or Welsh were more likely to be working part-time for less than 16 hours per week (9 per cent compared with 3 per cent of white visitors).

A quarter (23 per cent) of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors had a long-standing health condition or disability; a significant proportion of these visitors – 43 per cent – said their health condition impacted on their ability to use Jobcentre services – this equates to one in ten of all the unappointed face-to-face contact visitors. The key characteristics of visitors who reported an impact on their ability to use Jobcentre services are:

- over half (54 per cent) classified themselves as long-term sick or disabled (compared with 7 per cent of all others);
• approaching three-fifths (58 per cent) had been out-of-work for at least seven months (compared with 40 per cent of all others);

• over two-fifths (44 per cent) were aged 45 plus (compared with 33 per cent overall);

• 93 per cent were white (compared with 87 per cent of all visitors);

• significant minorities were in receipt of IS (23 per cent); Incapacity Benefit (IB) (29 per cent); and Disability Living Allowance (25 per cent).

The most commonly reported impact of their health condition was more difficulty in getting to the Jobcentre Plus offices (reported by 27 per cent of those with a health condition or disability which equates to six per cent of all unappointed face-to-face contact visitors). However, fewer reported that their condition affected their ability to use the various non face-to-face channels: telephone access (12 per cent, which equates to three per cent of all unappointed face-to-face contact visitors); internet/Jobpoints (nine per cent, which equates to two per cent of all unappointed face-to-face contact visitors); and reading/writing (18 per cent, which equates to four per cent of all unappointed face-to-face contact visitors). This suggests that the vast majority of visitors, including those with a health condition or disability, are able to use at least one form of contact channel other than face-to-face.

Figure 3.5 Longstanding illness/disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-standing illness/disability (including learning difficulty/disability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of illness/disability on access to Jobcentre Plus services

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affects ability to use telephone</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects ability to use the internet/Jobpoint</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty getting to office</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects reading/writing</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of these: 56%

Base: All respondents (1,760); all with a longstanding illness or disability (417).

The vast majority of unappointed contact visitors had ‘easy’ access to a mobile phone (92 per cent). Easy access to a landline and the internet was significantly lower (60 per cent and 61 per cent, respectively) and just over half (56 per cent) had access to email, as shown in Figure 3.6.
Incidence of easy access to the internet declined with age: 71 per cent of those aged 16-24 reported easy access compared with 61 per cent of those aged 25-44 and 55 per cent of those aged 45 plus. By contrast, easy access to landline telephones was higher among older visitors: 69 per cent of those aged 45 plus had easy access compared with 55 per cent of those aged 25-44 and 56 per cent of those aged 16-24.

The recently unemployed were more likely than average to have easy access to a landline (69 per cent compared with 60 per cent overall), the internet (69 per cent compared with 61 per cent overall) and email (66 per cent compared with 56 per cent overall). There was no significant difference for mobile phone access (94 per cent and 92 per cent overall).

These findings have significant implications for future take-up of telephone and on-line contact channels, particularly as Jobcentre Plus’ freephone numbers only benefit users with a BT landline. Greater publicity on the warm-phone and Jobpoints will go some way towards addressing these barriers. This could be complemented with the provision of illustrative examples of the types of queries that could be dealt with using the warm-phones to encourage take-up. In the longer term, Jobcentre Plus should consider expanding the freephone benefits to non-BT landlines and mobile phone users. Jobcentre Plus could also publicise public sources of internet access that are available to customers, including for example libraries, learning/community centres, UK On-line/Learndirect centres and local internet cafes.

As already discussed, Jobcentre Plus could also consider expanding access to both the warm-phones and Jobpoints, for example by extending its ‘Flexible Service Delivery’ project which provides Jobpoint access at non-DWP sites such as libraries,
supermarkets and community learning centres. In addition to giving users greater opportunities to access to these facilities, this move could also help Jobcentre Plus to better manage overall visitor numbers to Jobcentres.

3.2 Reasons for visit

Visitors who had contact with Jobcentre Plus office staff without a prior appointment reported a range of reasons for their visit. The most commonly cited reasons were to apply for, or to find out about, a benefit and/or to get help with jobsearch. One in ten said that the reasons for their visit were to report a change of circumstance and to get information about benefit/pension entitlement.

Figure 3.7 Reasons for visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q What were your reasons for needing to speak with someone here today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To apply for a benefit/find out how to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get help with looking for a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To report a change of circumstance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get information about benefit/pension entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To hand in a completed form or other documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get help with completing a form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To re-arrange an existing appointment with a member of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To report a wrong/missed payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask the jobcentre to do something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To check on the progress of an application/claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760).

Some contact drivers were more common among certain groups than others, as indicated in the boxes on the right hand side of Figure 3.7. In summary:

• the newly unemployed (i.e. less than three months) were more likely than average to have visited the Jobcentre Plus office in order to apply, or to find out how to apply, for a benefit (24 per cent compared with 16 per cent overall). The continuous rise in unemployment over the past months means that this group is likely to comprise people who had never experienced unemployment and are, therefore, unaware of the full range of Jobcentre Plus contact channels and services. Consequently, Jobcentre Plus’ messages for this group should highlight the full range of services available and how they can be accessed;
visitors working 16 hours or more a week were particularly likely to have been reporting a change of circumstance (15 per cent compared with nine per cent overall), such as their change in employment status;

non-jobseekers were more likely to have requested information about their benefit/pension entitlement (13 per cent compared with nine per cent overall) and/or twice as likely to have checked on the progress of an application or claim (nine per cent compared with five per cent overall); and

IB/ESA claimants were more likely to have handed in a form or other documentation (14 per cent compared with six per cent overall), while JSA claimants were more likely than average to have reported re-arranging an existing appointment with a member of staff (nine per cent compared with five per cent overall).

Figure 3.8 shows that, when the reasons for unappointed face-to-face contacts are grouped into DWP’s ‘contact drivers’11, the most common drivers are ‘Help me’ and ‘Tell you’. The former includes, for example, help with completing a document or form, help with looking for a job or with using the website, Jobpoint or warm-phone. The latter comprises reporting a change of circumstance or a wrong/missing payment or handing in a form or other documentation. Each contact driver is defined in Appendix F.

Figure 3.8 Drivers of unappointed face-to-face contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q What were your reasons for needing to speak with someone here today?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help me</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell you</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need you to do something</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check what’s happening</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t understand</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760).

11 DWP has classified the most common reasons for using Jobcentre Plus services into a number of ‘contact drivers’, see Appendix F.
Again, there are some variations in the contact drivers by visitor characteristics:

- **Help me**: Those visiting for this reason were more likely than average to be non-benefit recipients (26 per cent compared with 21 per cent overall) and the newly unemployed (28 per cent), who were less familiar with Jobcentre Plus services overall.

- **Tell you**: Non-jobseekers, for example, the retired, carers, those looking after children or the long-term sick or disabled, were more likely to cite this reason (27 per cent compared with 20 per cent overall), as were IB/ESA and IS claimants (35 per cent and 29 per cent, respectively).

- **Apply**: As might be expected, this reason was also more likely to be cited by non-benefit recipients (30 per cent compared with 16 per cent overall) and the newly unemployed (24 per cent).

- **Question**: Visitors who were working full-time were most likely to fall into this category (26 per cent compared with 10 per cent overall), as it includes visits to ask questions around what to do if made redundant and finding out about benefit/pension entitlement.

- **Check what’s happening**: This includes checking on the progress of a claim or application and was most commonly cited by those in receipt of IS (10 per cent compared with five per cent overall) and those not seeking work (10 per cent).

3.3 **Time spent with Jobcentre Plus staff**

Figure 3.9 indicates that the majority of visitors who had unappointed face-to-face contact with staff said that they spent less than ten minutes with them (79 per cent overall) and one in six (17 per cent) spent a minute or less with staff. This suggests that the majority had requests or queries that were fairly straightforward and could, therefore, potentially have been resolved using other contact channels.

There were some interesting differences in the time different groups of visitors spent with staff:

- Visitors who came in to ‘apply’ for a benefit were more likely than average to spend less than 10 minutes with staff (87 per cent compared with 79 per cent overall), while those who came in to ‘check what was happening’ spent longer (29 per cent spent 10-19 minutes compared with 15 per cent overall)\(^{12}\) though just five per cent of visitors came in for this reason.

- Reflecting the difference noted above, non-benefit recipients were most likely to spend less than 10 minutes with staff (86 per cent compared with 79 per cent overall), while JSA claimants were more likely to spend between 10 and 19 minutes (20 per cent compared with 15 per cent overall).

\(^{12}\) Caution: small base size (93 visitors) – indicative only.
• BME visitors spent more time with staff compared with white visitors – 81 per cent of white visitors spent less than 10 minutes with staff compared with 68 per cent of BME visitors. In total, 80 per cent of those with either English or Welsh as a first language spent less than 10 minutes with Jobcentre Plus staff, which is not significantly different to those without either English or Welsh as a first language (72 per cent of this group spent less than 10 minutes with staff), suggesting that language is not a key explanatory factor in the time difference.

Figure 3.9 Time spent with staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Approximately how long did you spend with member(s) of jobcentre staff (in total) today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Less than 10 minutes  □ 10-19 minutes  □ 20 minutes +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t understand**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need you to do something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check what’s happening*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Caution: small base (72 visitors).
* Caution: small base (93 visitors).
Base: All respondents (1,760).

3.4 Source of advice to visit the Jobcentre Plus office in person

The majority (71 per cent) of unappointed visitors who had a face-to-face contact with a member of staff said they were not advised to go into the Jobcentre Plus office by anyone or anything they had seen, meaning that they visited the Jobcentre on their own accord, prompted by their own preferences and habits, a lack of awareness of alternative contact channels, a lack of trust in other channels and opportunistic reasons (for example, they were passing by). This suggests that Jobcentre Plus needs to both communicate and educate customers and potential customers on the range of contact channels available and how they can be used to access Jobcentre Plus services in order to improve customer experience.
Among the three in ten (29 per cent) visitors who had been prompted by someone or something to visit the Jobcentre, 22 per cent said they were advised by Jobcentre Plus advisers (i.e. Jobcentre Plus claim line advisers, Jobseeker Direct advisers and/or Jobcentre Plus office staff), as shown in Figure 3.10. This indicates that around six per cent of all unappointed face-to-face contacts are the result of Jobcentre Plus adviser/staff advice. In moving forward, Jobcentre Plus could consider qualitative research with staff to establish the exact reasons for these contact failures and how they should be addressed, for example, whether staff training and/or greater clarity in communications with staff is required or, indeed, whether there are particular types of queries that necessitate face-to-face contacts. Mystery shopping research could also be undertaken to identify, from the customer perspective, failures within the customer journey which facilitate unappointed face-to-face contacts.

A number of visitors also reported coming into the Jobcentre Plus office because of advice/information provided by ‘other organisations’. Therefore, Jobcentre Plus should ensure that key organisations, for example the Citizens’ Advice Bureaus (CABs), local authorities, and Jobcentre Plus’s provider organisations are aware of its telephone and on-line services to ensure that they direct people towards the most appropriate channels.

A small minority (nine per cent) reported that they had come into the Jobcentre as a result of something they had seen on a website, including Jobcentre Plus (six per cent), Directgov (one per cent) and other websites (two per cent). Similarly, web usability research could be undertaken as a next step, to identify potential shortcomings on the websites.

**Figure 3.10 Source of advice to visit in person (main reason for visit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Did someone, or something you read or saw, lead you to come into the jobcentre?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Where did you see this/who suggested this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre Plus advisers/staff 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend/colleague/family member 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another organisation 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre Plus/Directgov/other websites 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760); all respondents who saw something/ was advised to visit (518).
3.5 Attempts to use alternative channels

Just over a quarter (27 per cent) of visitors who spoke to a member of Jobcentre Plus staff without a prior appointment tried to deal with the reason for their visit beforehand.

**Figure 3.11 Attempts to use alternative contact channels (main reason for visit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Did you try to deal with this reason for your visit before coming into the jobcentre today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q How did you try to do this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned this/another Jobcentre Plus office directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned central Jobcentre Plus claim line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned benefit processing/query service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned another number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned Jobseeker Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited the Jobcentre Plus website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760); all respondents who tried to deal with reason prior to visit (496).

There were some notable differences by contact reason – those giving the contact reasons shown in the boxes on the right hand side of Figure 3.11 were more likely than others to have tried to deal with their query via the channel(s) on the left (which align with that box):

- Visitors looking for help (i.e. contact driver ‘help me’) were most likely to have already tried to deal with the issue beforehand (34 per cent compared with 27 per cent overall).

- Visitors wanting to ‘tell’ Jobcentre Plus something and JSA claimants were most likely to have tried telephone channels prior to their visit (80 per cent and 69 per cent compared with 60 per cent overall).

- In contrast, on line channels were more likely to have been tried by non-benefit recipients (32 per cent compared with 13 per cent overall) and those looking for help (contact driver ‘help me’ – 34 per cent), who were predominantly the newly unemployed. This suggests that on-line channels tended to be the first port of call for visitors new to Jobcentre Plus but, for some, these channels had failed to fully meet their needs.
3.6 Sources of contact failure

Those who had tried to deal with the reason for their visit before coming into the Jobcentre Plus office were asked why they still needed to visit (see Figure 3.12). A quarter (26 per cent) said that they simply wanted to speak to someone face to face, but a significant minority said they were directed to come into the Jobcentre (16 per cent) or that an adviser told them to come in (10 per cent). Others had not received appropriate help – they could not find the information that they needed (11 per cent), their call was not answered (seven per cent) or the adviser could not answer their query (six per cent).

Among those who had tried to deal with their enquiry by telephone or textphone, the most common reasons for still needing to go into the Jobcentre Plus office in person were: they wanted to speak to someone face to face (18 per cent), the adviser told them to come in (17 per cent), they were directed to come in (16 per cent) or they had to wait too long to speak with someone/their call was not answered (12 per cent).

As the number who tried to deal with their enquiry via on-line channels was relatively small (58 people), the reasons why this group in particular still needed to visit in person should be interpreted as indicative only. Nevertheless, it is interesting that the most common reason was, again, that they wanted to speak with someone face to face (33 per cent), followed by not being able to find the information they needed (19 per cent) and the website not working (12 per cent).

Figure 3.12 Sources of contact failure (main reason)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Why did you still need to come into the jobcentre today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to speak to someone face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was directed/told to come into the jobcentre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adviser told me to come into the jobcentre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not find the information I needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The call was not answered/I had to wait too long to speak with someone so I gave up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adviser couldn’t answer my query</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who tried to deal with reason prior to visit (496).
Some groups were more likely than average to cite particular contact failures – those giving the contact reasons shown in the boxes on the right hand side of Figure 3.12 were more likely than others to have cited the contact failures on the left (which align with that box):

- Visitors with a health condition which affected their ability to access Jobcentre Plus services were especially likely to say they weren’t sure how to complete the forms or what they needed to do (11 per cent compared with three per cent overall). It is likely that visitors encountering these difficulties will continue to require the option of face-to-face support and this is recognised by Jobcentre Plus.

- Again, the recently unemployed appeared to need more help to navigate the system initially - this group was more likely to say they weren’t sure how to complete the forms or what they needed to do (10 per cent compared with three per cent overall).

- Those who had come in to ‘apply’ and those who wanted to get help with something (contact driver ‘help me’) were more likely to say they wanted to speak with someone face to face (both 38 per cent compared with 26 per cent overall). This would suggest either that the other channels failed to help them or that they perceived the initial contacts as a precursor to face-to-face engagement with staff.

- Visitors wanting to ‘tell’ Jobcentre Plus something said the adviser had told them to go in (24 per cent compared with 10 per cent overall), which indicates that there may be certain tasks that cannot be completed using alternative channels or that some advisers are unaware that the use of unappointed face-to-face contacts should be minimised wherever possible.

Whilst it is clearly more challenging to change people’s natural inclinations and preferences, there is, nevertheless, considerable scope for encouraging visitors to use alternative contact channels by, for example, ensuring that self service channels are communicated effectively by Jobcentre Plus staff to customers, and putting in place a Service Level Agreement for telephone and on line services to provide users with assurances that they will receive a response within a set timeframe and that their queries will be dealt with first time round. Jobcentre Plus’ performance on these key measures should be made widely available to build users’ trust. Additional follow-up work with both staff and customers, including mystery shopping research and web usability testing (particularly among older customers who were more likely to report finding the internet confusing) will also be useful in pin-pointing specific examples of failures and how they can be overcome.

### 3.7 Reasons for not using alternative contact channels

Among the three-quarters of visitors who did not attempt to deal with their main reason for visiting the Jobcentre Plus office beforehand, by far the most common reason offered was they preferred face-to-face contact (32 per cent), as shown in Figure 3.13.
A fifth (20 per cent) said they came into the Jobcentre because they were passing by and 13 per cent did it through habit – it was what they have done in the past. These customers need to be re-briefed on how they can interact with Jobcentre Plus in moving forward. Visitors in full-time employment were more likely to cite opportunistic motives (30 per cent said they visited the Jobcentre because they were passing by compared with 19 per cent overall). In contrast, IS recipients and non-jobseekers were more likely to have been motivated by habit (22 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, compared with 13 per cent overall).

A similar proportion (18 per cent) said they did not know there was any alternative to visiting, rising to 24 per cent of the recently unemployed (see Section 3.7 for more details on awareness of specific contact channels).

Some groups were more likely to give particular responses than others – those giving the contact reasons shown in the boxes on the right hand side of the Figure 3.13 were more likely than others to have cited the reasons on the left (which align with that box).

Those visitors who wanted to ‘tell’ Jobcentre Plus something were more likely than others to say they did not try to deal with their query via other channels because they deemed their query to be urgent (16 per cent compared with nine per cent overall) and/or because they needed to hand in a form or document (16 per cent compared with seven per cent overall). Thus, communications messages will need to convey and reassure customers that alternative contact channels are effective at handling ‘urgent’ queries. Again, this message could be reinforced by having in place a Service Level Agreement.

**Figure 3.13 Reasons for not trying alternative channels (main reason)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Did you try to deal with this reason for your visit before coming into the Jobcentre today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Why did you come into the Jobcentre today rather than use possible alternatives, such as telephoning, using the website or returning documents or forms by post?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to speak to someone face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was passing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t know there was any alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My first thought was to come in/ I have always come in, in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My query was urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to hand in a form/document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760); all respondents who did not try to deal with reason prior to visit (1,264).
3.8 Awareness of alternative contact channels

Awareness of Jobcentre Plus services was generally low, with just half claiming to know at least a fair amount about the services provided by Jobcentre Plus generally. Detailed awareness of the Jobcentre Plus website and the different telephone services was significantly lower, as shown in Figure 3.14. For example, visitors were twice as likely not to have heard of the Jobcentre Plus claim line and the Directgov website at all as to know at least a ‘fair amount’ about these services. This clearly restricts visitors’ ability to use alternatives to face-to-face contacts.

Four in ten had never heard of the Directgov website, which is of concern given plans to switch the content and functionality of the Jobcentre Plus website to the Directgov website during 2010. A similar proportion (37 per cent) had never heard of the central Jobcentre Plus claim line which goes some way to explaining why the top reason for visiting without an appointment is to apply for a benefit.

**Figure 3.14 Awareness of Jobcentre Plus services and alternative contact channels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Could you tell me how well, if at all, you feel you know each of the following services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The services provided by Jobcentre Plus in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre Plus website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct line telephone number at this/ another jobcentre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone line for the team that processes benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central Jobseeker Direct telephone line (0845 number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Directgov website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central Jobcentre Plus claim line (0800 number)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760).

The newly unemployed were least likely to feel familiar with the services provided by Jobcentre Plus overall.
In addition, awareness of a number of the alternative contact channels was particularly low among certain groups:

- People with health conditions which affected their ability to access Jobcentre Plus services had low awareness of Jobcentre Plus website and the Directgov website. Non-benefit recipients, non-jobseekers and IS recipients also had lower than average awareness of these channels. Interestingly, the 45 plus age group were more likely than average to never have heard of the Jobcentre Plus website but they were no less likely to know about the Directgov website than any other age groups.

- Non-benefit recipients generally had the lowest levels of awareness of the telephone services.

- BME visitors had lower levels of awareness than white visitors of the benefit processing telephone line, the central Jobcentre Plus claim line and the Directgov website.

- Those who had last been in paid employment seven or more months previously and those who had never had a job\(^{13}\) were the most likely to say they had never heard of the Jobcentre Plus or Directgov websites.

Thus, awareness raising activities will need to reach both current and potential customers given that the latter group is increasingly likely to comprise younger visitors and those who have never experienced unemployment as the result of the recession. This means that more traditional modes of communications, through organisations such as CABs and council offices, may be unlikely to be sufficient and should be complemented with more popular venues (for example, leisure centres) and mediums such as television, newspapers and radios as well as web links through related organisations (for example, jobsearch websites). It would also be useful to ensure Jobcentres put up poster notices to inform customers of the alternative channels available.

3.9 Drivers of channel preference

Whilst it is clear that there is a need to increase visitors’ awareness of the range of non-face to face contact channels available, factors such as users’ preference will also need to be addressed.

Indeed, as shown in Figure 3.15, the vast majority of visitors (82 per cent) agreed that, given the choice, they would always prefer to speak to someone face to face; this is a recurring theme throughout this report. More positively, despite this preference, a similarly high proportion (83 per cent) said they would be happy to use telephone services if they knew their query would be dealt with in one call. Young visitors, aged 16-24, were most open to using telephone services with this proviso (87 per cent compared with 83 per cent overall).

\(^{13}\) Caution: small base size (86) – indicative only.
Around a third (32 per cent) agreed that they found the internet in general confusing and this will need to be taken on board in the promotion, design and testing of the websites. In particular, efforts need to be targeted at visitors aged 45 plus and those with a disability or illness which affects their access to Jobcentre Plus services – these groups were most likely to find the internet confusing (42 per cent and 45 per cent, respectively, compared with 32 per cent overall). Male visitors and those aged 45 plus were significantly more likely to want face to face contacts if given the choice (84 per cent and 87 per cent, respectively, compared with 82 per cent overall).

**Figure 3.15 Drivers of channel preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages:</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the choice, I would always prefer to speak with someone face to face</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I knew my query could be dealt with in one call I would be happy to use telephone services/call centres</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find using the internet confusing</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (1,760).

**3.10 Contact channel preferences by type of contact**

Visitors’ preference for face-to-face contacts cuts across a range of contact types though face-to-face contact was particularly popular for providing proof of benefit entitlement, making a complaint and applying for a benefit (as shown in Figure 3.16). Jobcentre Plus could consider prioritising these as illustrative examples of how different contact queries can be addressed by telephone and on line.

Telephone was as popular a choice as face-to-face contact for checking on the progress of a claim, and significant numbers said they would prefer to use the internet to look for training and job opportunities. This is positive given that getting help with a job search was one of the most common reasons for unappointed face to face contact.
Overall, men and visitors aged 45 plus are likely to prove the most challenging in moving away from face-to-face contacts, as are people who want to apply for a benefit, check the progress of their claim and make a complaint. Given the predominance of male visitors, it would be useful to explore further with this group on possible ways of encouraging them to use on-line and telephone contact channels more widely.

**Figure 3.16 Contact channel preferences by type of contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Which of the options on this card would you most prefer to use if you needed to do each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No preference and ‘other’ not shown on chart so percentages may not total 100%.
Base: All respondents (1,760).
4 Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The footfall count established that a total of 2,152,971 visitors passed through the Jobcentre Plus network of offices, per week, between 27 March and 13 May 2009\(^4\). The majority (61 per cent or around 1.3 million visitors per week) of Jobcentre Plus visitors had a pre-booked appointment (which they attended), meaning that the remaining 39 per cent did not have a pre-booked appointment.

Of those without a pre-booked appointment, less than half (38 per cent) actually spoke to a member of staff (this equates to 15 per cent of all visitors or around 323,000 visitors per week – these were those eligible for the Computer Assisted Personal Interview). The remaining 62 per cent did not speak to staff (this equates to 24 per cent of all visitors or around 517,000 visitors per week\(^5\)).

A fifth of all visitors to Jobcentre Plus offices came purely to use the Jobpoints and/or warm-phones. This equates to around 421,000 visitors per week. Jobcentre Plus should explore the possibility of extending its Flexible Service Delivery sites which provide Jobpoint access at non-Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) sites such as libraries, supermarkets and community learning centres as a way to reduce visitor traffic among this group of visitors and give users greater opportunities to access these facilities.

Unappointed face-to-face contact visitors comprised 15 per cent of all visitors to Jobcentre Plus offices. This equates to around 323,000 visitors, per week. The majority did not attempt to deal with their query via other channels beforehand (73 per cent) for a number of reasons, including: a preference for face to face contact, opportunistic reasons (because they were passing by) and

---

\(^4\) This estimate is derived from grossing up the weighted footfall counts across 100 Jobcentres. Refer to Appendix A for more details on the calculations.

\(^5\) Note: if visitors asked to be pointed in the direction of the warm-phones/leaflets/Jobpoint etc, only (i.e. they did not speak to a member of staff for any other reason), they were classified as a non-face-to-face contact.
habit – it’s what they’ve done in the past. These personal preferences will perhaps be the most difficult to shift, but some may well have been informed by negative experiences (both personal and hearsay) of alternatives such as telephone services. Indeed there was evidence of a lack of confidence in the effectiveness of telephone services, with some reporting calls being unanswered or being kept waiting and advisers unable to deal with their query.

More positively, though, there was evidence of a general willingness to use telephone contacts if customers can be convinced that their query would be dealt with in one call. Therefore, it will be important to ensure that any future attempts made by users to access these services are positive. As a first step, Jobcentre Plus should consider putting in place a Service Level Agreement which explicitly states the maximum time Jobcentre Plus will take to respond to queries correctly ‘first time round’. Jobcentre Plus’ performance against these measures should be monitored and made widely available to (potential) customers to instil confidence.

There was also evidence of contact failure on the part of Jobcentre Plus staff and advisers: among the minority of visitors who tried alternative contact channels before visiting in person, staff and advisers were reported to play a significant role in re-directing visitors to jobcentres. There is scope to ensure staff are directing customers to alternative channels to face-to-face when appropriate to customer needs. Further work with staff and customers would be useful in establishing why, and at what point, visitors are re-directed and what can be done to encourage greater use of alternative contact channels. This could include focus groups with staff as well as mystery shopping research.

A number of visitors reported coming into the Jobcentre Plus office because of advice/information provided by other organisations. While Jobcentre Plus cannot directly control the advice given by other organisations, it should take steps to ensure that key organisations, for example the Citizens’ Advice Bureaus (CABs), local councils and Jobcentre Plus’s provider organisations, are aware of its services and contact channels and are directing people towards telephone or on-line services wherever possible and appropriate.

Another source of direction into Jobcentres was the Jobcentre Plus website and, to a lesser extent, the Directgov website, though these were less commonly cited than advisers and staff. There are a number of possible reasons for this, for example, insufficient or unclear information on the websites and/or lack of trust in the information provided on the part of customers. Again, further follow-up work would be useful, for example, website usability research, in pinpointing the exact sources of failure for different contact types. Customers aged 45 plus and those with a disability or illness which affects their access to Jobcentre Plus services were most likely to say that they found the internet generally confusing and thus, these groups should be prioritised.
Awareness of alternative channels was low: for example, 18 per cent of unappointed face-to-face contact visitors had not heard of the central Jobcentre Plus website and two-fifths had never heard of the Directgov website, which needs consideration given plans to switch the content and functionality of the Jobcentre Plus website to the Directgov website during 2010. Awareness of the two websites was lowest among those who were last in paid employment seven or more months previously and those who had never had a job. However, as significant minorities of all groups had not heard of the Directgov website, it will be important to publicise this as widely as possible.

In addition, as those new to the Jobcentre Plus system (i.e. the newly unemployed for whom this may be their first ever spell of unemployment) felt less familiar with the services provided by Jobcentre Plus in general, and around a quarter said they did not know there was any alternative to going into the Jobcentre Plus office, there is a need to publicise these more widely via newspapers, television, radio and web links to popular related jobsearch and information sites. Jobcentre Plus could also ensure that telephone and on-line channels are publicised in offices (for example through posters) to signpost customers to other channels.

Finally, while the vast majority said they had easy access to a mobile phone, a significant proportion (around two-fifths) did not have easy access to a landline and/or the internet. Therefore, Jobcentre Plus should explore the possibility of extending the freephone function to non-BT landlines and mobile phones to encourage greater use of telephone channels. Jobcentre Plus could also publicise public sources of internet access that are available to customers including, for example libraries, learning/community centres, UK On-line/Learndirect centres and local internet cafes.
4.2 Summary of recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and awareness</strong></td>
<td>Explore possibility of extending its ‘Flexible Service Delivery’ sites which provide Jobpoint access at non-DWP sites such as libraries, supermarkets and community learning centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fifth of all visitors to Jobcentre Plus offices came purely to use the Jobpoints and/or warm-phones.</td>
<td><strong>Access and awareness</strong> Jobcentre Plus should explore the possibility of extending the freephone function to non-BT landlines and mobile phones to encourage greater use of telephone channels. Jobcentre Plus could also publicise public sources of internet access that are available to customers including, for example libraries, learning/community centres, UK On-line/ Learndirect centres and local internet cafes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Publicise these services more widely via newspapers, television, radios and web links to popular related jobsearch and information sites to ensure ‘reach’ to both current and potential users. Provide illustrative examples of how different queries are dealt with using different channels – and consider prioritising requesting proof of benefit entitlement, making a complaint and applying for a benefit/making a claim as illustrative examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low awareness of Jobcentre Plus services and contact channels.</td>
<td><strong>Contact failure and awareness</strong> Further work with staff and customers to establish why, and at what point, visitors are re-directed and what can be done to encourage greater use of alternative contact channels. This could include focus groups with staff as well as mystery shopping research. Ensure that relevant organisations such as CABs and provider organisations are aware of and promote Jobcentre Plus telephone and internet services. Conduct web usability research to pinpoint the exact sources of failure for different contact types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors’ preference for face-to-face contacts cuts across a range of contact types, though face-to-face contact was particularly popular for providing proof of benefit entitlement, making a complaint and applying for a benefit.</td>
<td><strong>Contact failure</strong> Customers being directed into Jobcentre Plus offices via the Jobcentre Plus website (and to a lesser extent the Directgov website) and also being unable to find the information they require on-line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A
Detailed methodology (including weighting)

A total of 100 Jobcentre Plus offices across England, Wales and Scotland were surveyed, over a period of four days each, between 27 March and 13 May 2009.

The research involved three key elements;

• A footfall count (Appendix C) to quantify the level of visitor traffic; for a five-minute period every half an hour the number of visitors who exited the Jobcentre Plus office were counted. Interviewers were instructed to conduct this count on the hour and at half past the hour, or as close as possible to these times if they were part-way through a full Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) interview for example (the exact time of the count was recorded). In Jobcentre Plus offices with two exits, two interviewers were allocated so that each exit would be covered. These figures were subsequently ‘grossed up’ to provide an estimate of the weekly footfall count across all 767 Jobcentre Plus offices contained in the original data file of meetings attended between April and December 2008 (see weighting section for details).

• A two minute (paper) contact sheet interview (Appendix D) to classify visitors as either an appointed contact, an unappointed non-face-to-face contact (e.g. collecting leaflets or using a jobpoint/warm-phone only\textsuperscript{16}) or an unappointed face-to-face contact; throughout the time in between each footfall count period visitors exiting the Jobcentre Plus office were invited (on a random ‘next person to exit’ basis) to take part in a contact sheet interview. The date, time and day of the week that the contact sheet was completed was recorded to allow each contact sheet to be linked to a footfall count period/slot.

\textsuperscript{16} Note: if visitors asked to be pointed in the direction of the warm-phones/leaflets/Jobpoint etc. only (i.e. they did not speak to a member of staff for any other reason), they were classified as a non-face-to-face contact.
A ten minute CAPI (Appendix E) was conducted with visitors who were identified from the contact sheet interview as unappointed face-to-face contacts. This interview established the reason(s) for their visit, awareness of alternative channels, whether or not these alternatives had been used prior to their visit and what could be done to encourage the use of alternative channels. Demographic information was also collected for analysis purposes.

Sampling

Department for Work and Pensions supplied Ipsos MORI with a list of all 767 Jobcentre Plus offices in Great Britain (with booked and attended appointments recorded between April and December 2008, according to Jobcentre Plus management information). Twelve offices were removed prior to sampling (as they were already taking part in the Accessing Jobcentre Services research project), leaving 755. From this, 100 offices were selected for the final sample using stratified (by region) random probability sampling, with probability proportional to the size of each office (in terms of the number of meetings attended17).

Each Jobcentre Plus office was allocated four interview days over the fieldwork period (on four different days of the week), ensuring that, overall, there was a roughly equal number of interview days for each day of the week. There were 400 days of fieldwork in total.

Weighting

The weighting was a relatively complex process, carried out with the aim of bringing the records in the contact (and also the CAPI interview) datasets to represent the total national footfall over a week across all 767 Jobcentre Plus offices (Jobcentres). Broadly speaking, the stages were:

1 Firstly, to relate contacts in a given time slot (one hour) up to the total footfall estimated for that slot for a given Jobcentre Plus office.

2 Secondly, to relate total footfall count for a given measured day for a Jobcentre Plus office, to that across a five-day week.

3 Finally, to relate weekly footfall for the surveyed Jobcentre Plus offices up to that of all 767 Jobcentres nationally.

The three weighting elements were multiplied together to form an overall grossing weight to apply to each contact record. Once this had been completed, the estimates of total national footfall (split by eligibility) could be determined by adding the final weights across all contact sheet records.

17 During April to December 2008, according to Jobcentre Plus management information.
Stage 1 – Applying slot-specific weights to the contact sheet records

In order to do this, we need to use the information on the Footfall Count database in order to estimate the footfall for each hour and each Jobcentre. This database lists the male and female footfall across a five-minute period within every ½-hour slot for each of the 100 surveyed Jobcentres. A count was conducted for five minutes for each 30 min slot; this was then converted to hourly slot estimates. This was done by multiplying the recorded counts by six.

In practice, we needed to combine the ½-hourly counts into hourly counts in order for the weighting to work in a more efficient and smoother way. A very small number of interviews were recorded (on the contact sheet) to have taken place during ½-hour slots where no footfall was recorded, causing difficulties in applying the weights. By combining the slots to be one hour, this issue was minimised.

That said, it was possible to keep the male and female footfall counts separate and hence be able to allow the weights to be gender-specific.

A weighting element for each hourly time slot was then applied as follows;

\[ w(ts) = \frac{f}{s} \]

Where the total hourly slot (ts) estimate is \( f \) (i.e. the sum of the footfall counted in two recorded five-minute periods within the hour) and we have \( s \) contact sheets for the same time slot.

As an example, Jobcentre X on the Monday, records eight males on the footfall count sheet between 10.05am and 10.10am, plus six males between 10.35am and 10.40am, whilst on the contact sheet, four contacts took place in Jobcentre X between 10am and 11am on that day.

The total estimated male footfall for Jobcentre X on Monday between 10am and 11am would thus be \((8+6)\times(30/5) = 84\).

\[ w(ts) = \frac{f}{s} = \frac{84}{4} = 21.0 \]

Therefore, the Stage 1 weights for all contacts which took place in Jobcentre X on the Monday between 10 and 11am on that day would be given Stage1 weights of 21.0.

As mentioned above, a small number of time slots existed where there was contact data, but no recorded footfall (e.g. if the footfall count had been missed due to an over-running CAPI interview). Therefore, 1.0 was imputed for \((S/s)\). This ensured that these contacts still contributed to the data, but the small weight minimised the extent of leverage of these records. Thus, in summary \( w(ts) \) was calculated \( w(ts) \) as follows:

- if slot estimate total = 0: \( w(ts) = 1 \)
- if slot estimate total > 0: \( w(ts) = \frac{S}{s} \)
Stage 2 – Relating footfall for a recorded day up to a full week

The next stage involved modifying this Jobcentre Plus office weight according to the number (and combination) of days of the week upon which surveying was carried out.

Four days of fieldwork took place at each office, but the days of the week covered by each varied from office to office. This needed to be balanced out by weighting. For example, if Monday was the busiest day for footfall, then those offices which were covered by fieldwork on a four day period of Tuesday to Friday would tend to show lower footfalls than those which included fieldwork on a Monday. Therefore, a weighing element would need to be applied to balance this out and compensate for uneven representation of the days in the week and, in this case, up-weight the Jobcentre Plus offices where fieldwork did not take place on a Monday. Note: interviews conducted in days and time slots which are the busiest and represent the highest footfall are considered in Stage 1.

Below is listed the number of interviewing days which took place for each day of the week. This adds to 400, which relates to 100 Jobcentres * four worked days per Jobcentre.

(a) Monday 79
(b) Tuesday 81
(c) Wednesday 80
(d) Thursday 81
(e) Friday 82

To get an overall footfall count for an entire Jobcentre, we could simply add up the footfall across all of its one-hour surveyed slots to get a four-day footfall. However, it would be more meaningful to present footfalls as if recording took place across an entire five-day week. One could simply apply a Stage 2 weight of \((5/4 = 1.25)\) for all contacts and Jobcentres to do this, although it would be more accurate to fine-tune this specific to the day of the week. Thus:

- all contacts which took place on a Monday would be given Stage 2 weights of\((100/79)\); and
- all contacts which took place on a Tuesday would be given Stage 2 weights of\((100/81)\), etc.
Stage 3 – Applying weights at Jobcentre level to scale results for surveyed Jobcentres to the population

In Stage 1, we created weights to bring the number of contacts within a particular time slot up to the total footfall for that time slot. In Stage 3, we created weights to bring the total footfall figures across the four days of interviewing up to a full week, for a single Jobcentre. In the sampling process, the 100 Jobcentre Plus offices were selected with probability proportional to the size of each office, in order to represent all 767 nationally. Therefore, to complete the weighting process, we now want to extrapolate (or gross) the results for a week of footfall for the 100 surveyed Jobcentres up to the national population of 767.

The sampling of Jobcentre Plus offices was carried out in a rigorous, random way, whereby the probability of selection was proportional to the number of meetings attended (which was supplied by Jobcentre Plus); the larger the Jobcentre Plus office, the greater the chance of selection. The Jobcentre Plus office weight used for each Jobcentre was based on the probability of it being selected; i.e. it was the reciprocal (i.e. 1/p) of its probability of selection.

As an example, if Jobcentre Plus office X had a 0.05 (i.e. 5 per cent) chance of appearing in the sample, then its weight would be 20 (=1/0.05). This makes sense as offices with lower chances of appearing in the sample need to be up-weighted more than those with higher chances.

Putting all of the stages together

The overall weight for each contact listed on the contact sheet can be derived by multiplying the three component weights together (one component representing each stage), i.e.:

\[
\text{Overall weight} = w(\text{ts}) \times w(\text{day}) \times w(\text{Jobcentre})
\]

Going back to the example of a male contact which took place between 10am and 11am on the Monday of surveying in Jobcentre X, the overall weight would be calculated as:

\[
\text{Overall weight} = 21.0 \times \left(\frac{100}{79}\right) \times \left(\frac{1}{0.05}\right) = 531.64
\]

The overall national footfall can be calculated from the footfall file, which records footfall across each day of interviewing for each surveyed Jobcentre, i.e:

**A: Overall National footfall = Sum of \([\text{total recorded footfall for Jobcentre on specific day}] \times w(\text{day}) \times w(\text{Jobcentre})\)**

Alternatively, one could simply (B) add up the sum of the final/overall weights across all contacts in the contact file. The footfall estimates A and B should be identical in theory, but in practice, they are not identical, yet still very close. Consequently a small adjusting weight was applied to each of the contact sheet weights (by multiplication) to ensure that the sum of the weights from the contact sheet was exactly the same as the estimated weekly footfall count from looking
at the footfall file alone. The source of the need for this balancing weight is believed to be the fact that there were a small number of time slots where there was contact data but no recorded footfall and such contacts were assigned a \( w(ts) \) of 1.0 (described above). The sum of the weighted contact prior (A) to this adjustment was about 1.7 per cent below the estimated footfall (B), and therefore this weight was minimal.

All analyses of the contact sheet data was then carried out after applying these contact sheet weights, including those which determined the proportion of footfall (and hence actual numbers) associated with un appointed face to face contacts.
Appendix B
Statistical reliability

Table B.1 shows the possible variation that might be anticipated because a sample, rather than the entire population, was interviewed. As indicated, sampling tolerances vary with the size of the sample and the size of the percentage result.

For example, in a question asked of all 1,760 visitors who took part in a Computer Assisted Personal Interview, where 30 per cent gave a particular answer, the chances are 95 out of 100 that the true value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed) will fall within the range of +/- two percentage points from the sample result. Other examples indicating the approximate sampling tolerances that apply to this survey are given in the Table B.1.

Table B.1 Possible variation because a sample, rather than the entire population, was interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels</th>
<th>10% or 90%</th>
<th>30% or 70%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,760 (visitors who took part in a CAPI interview)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 (CAPI participants who tried to deal with their main reason before visit)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,264 (CAPI participants who did not try to deal with their main reason prior to visit)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 (CAPI participants who saw something/were advised to visit)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ipsos MORI.

We have also calculated the 95 per cent confidence interval for the overall footfall figure of 2,152,971 and the unappointed face-to-face figure of 323,000, see Table B.2.
Table B.2  The 95 per cent confidence interval for the overall footfall and the unappointed face-to-face figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Footfall estimate</th>
<th>Upper limit</th>
<th>Lower limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unappointed face to face contact</td>
<td>323,000</td>
<td>370,465</td>
<td>262,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,152,971</td>
<td>2,470,633</td>
<td>1,834,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this means is that the chances are 95 per cent that the unappointed face to face figure would be within the upper and lower limits; and similarly so for the total footfall.
Appendix C

Footfall count sheet

IT IS CRUCIAL THAT ALL THE INFORMATION FROM THIS FORM IS TRANSFERRED IT TO THE TO CAPE LAPTOP AT THE END OF EACH DAY (PLEASE ALSO KEEP THE PAPER COPY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer name</th>
<th>Interviewer number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Point No:</td>
<td>Job centre number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Date:</td>
<td>Day of week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DP – PLEASE ADD SCREEN TO CONFIRM JOB CENTRE WHEN THE NUMBER IS ENTERED AND DATE WHEN DATE IS ENTERED

Insert number of exits at this Jobcentre Plus:  

Count the number of people exiting for 5 minutes every half an hour. Write down the start time for each count. Record the total number of people that you counted (split into males and females), in columns A and B. Use the stopwatch provided to ensure you count for exactly five minutes.

Also, you must keep a tally of the number of people (split into males and females) approached who refuse to answer the contact sheet questions. Record this in columns C and D. Make sure you use the correct row (ie. people who refused to answer the Contact Sheet questions following the first footfall count should be recorded in the first male/female rows)
### Footfall Count Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counting period</th>
<th>Time started counting</th>
<th>A Exit Count Males</th>
<th>B Exit Count Females</th>
<th>C Refused or unable to do contact sheet Qs Males</th>
<th>D Refused or unable to do contact sheet Qs Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of each day please record the number of contact sheets you have completed for that day

Number of contact sheets completed

Finally, at the end of each day please ask either your named contact or the floor manager from the Jobcentre if there have been any unusual events which could have affected the number of people coming in to the job centre (e.g. a large local employer announcing redundancies).
RECORD ANY UNUSUAL EVENTS

No unusual events reported

IT IS CRUCIAL THAT ALL THE INFORMATION FROM THIS FORM IS TRANSFERRED TO THE TO CAPI LAPTOP AT THE END OF EACH DAY.
Appendix D
Contact sheet interview

SAMPLE POINT NUMBER

JOB CENTRE REFERENCE NUMBER

JOB CENTRE NAME

UNIQUE REFERENCE NUMBER

Hello, my name is..........., and I am from Ipsos MORI, the research organisation. We are conducting a survey on behalf of Jobcentre Plus to find out how you have used the Jobcentre today. They will use the findings to help make sure that Jobcentre Plus offers the services people need. The survey will take around 10 minutes and I would be grateful if you would take part.

SAY AS NECESSARY – All replies are completely confidential and cannot be linked to individuals. We will not record your name and the results are given to Jobcentre Plus as anonymous statistics only. The study will not affect any benefits you may be claiming.
ASK ALL

Q1. Which, if any, of the following did you use in the Jobcentre today? CODE ALL THAT APPLY.
   1. A job point
   2. A free phone / warm-phone
   3. None of these

Q2. Did you come in for an appointment which was arranged in advance of today (i.e. pre-booked), either to sign on, to make a claim, or to speak to a member of Jobcentre staff? SINGLE CODE ONLY

   NOTE: IF VISITOR DID NOT HAVE AN APPOINTMENT WHEN THEY ARRIVED, BUT ARRANGED ONE WHILE THEY WERE IN THE OFFICE TODAY PLEASE CODE AS NO (CODE 3) – I.E. DID NOT HAVE A PRE-BOOKED APPOINTMENT
   1. Yes, had a pre-booked appointment (inc. to sign on/make a claim), which was attended > GO TO Q6 + CLOSE INTERVIEW
   2. Yes, had a pre-booked appointment (inc. to sign on/make a claim), but missed it (e.g. wrong day/time/too late) > CONTINUE
   3. No, did not have a pre-booked appointment > CONTINUE

IF CODE 1 AT Q2 GO TO Q6. ALL OTHERS (I.E. CODES 2 OR 3 AT Q2) CONTINUE

ASK IF CODE 2 OR 3 AT Q2

Q3. Did you speak with a member of staff here today? SINGLE CODE ONLY
   1. Yes > CONTINUE
   2. No > GO TO Q6 + CLOSE INTERVIEW

ASK IF YES (CODE 1) AT Q3

Q4. Why did you need to speak with them? CODE ALL THAT APPLY. DO NOT READ OUT
   1. Needed directions only - to warm-phone > GO TO Q6 UNLESS MULTICODED WITH OTHER IN WHICH CASE GO TO Q5
   2. Needed directions only - to job point > GO TO Q6 UNLESS MULTICODED WITH OTHER IN WHICH CASE GO TO Q5
   3. Needed directions only - to location of information leaflets - > GO TO Q6 UNLESS MULTICODED WITH OTHER IN WHICH CASE GO TO Q5
   4. Needed directions only - to anywhere else (e.g. toilet, interviewer area, another building/organisation etc) > GO TO Q6 UNLESS MULTICODED WITH OTHER IN WHICH CASE GO TO Q5
   5. Any other reason > CONTINUE TO Q5.
ASK IF CODE 5 (ANY OTHER REASON) AT Q4

Q5. We would like to ask you a few more questions about your experiences of using Jobcentre plus services. Please rest assured that we will not be recording any personal information, such as your name or address, and that your replies will be treated totally confidentially. Is this ok?

IF ASKED – The interview should only last around 10 minutes.

IF ASKED/PROMPTED – Before we begin, I’d like to inform you that Ipsos MORI is a member of the Market Research Society. All information that you give us will be treated in the strictest confidence and your responses will not impact in any way on any benefits you may be receiving.

1. Yes > COMPLETE Q6 + THEN GO TO CAPI TO CONTINUE WITH MAIN INTERVIEW

2. No > COMPLETE Q6 + CLOSE INTERVIEW

EVERYONE MUST COMPLETE Q6

Q6.

Date: date, month, year (XX/XX/XX)

Day of week (please tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Time – hr, min (XX/XX)

IF NECESSARY READ OUT TO THOSE SCREENED OUT - For this particular survey we need to interview people who spoke to an member of staff without a pre-booked appointment, so we do not need to conduct the full 10 minute interview with you today, but thank you for you time.

BAR CODE TO BE ADDED HERE
Appendix E
Unappointed face-to-face contact questionnaire

INTERVIEWER TO RECORD:
SAMPLE POINT NUMBER
JOB CENTRE REFERENCE NUMBER (DP – ADD SCREEN TO CONFIRM CORRECT JOB CENTRE FROM SAMPLE)
UNIQUE REF NUMBER FROM CONTACT SHEET (DP – PLEASE AUTOMATICALLY INSERT THE THREE DIGIT JOBCENTRE REF NUMBER, THEN LEAVE SPACE FOR 3 ADDITIONAL DIGITS - AND ONLY ALLOW 3 EXTRA DIGITS TO BE INPUT)
ALL
CONFIRMATION OF CONSENT
INTERVIEWER : PLEASE CONFIRM THAT THE RESPONDENT GAVE THEIR PERMISSION TO TAKE PART IN THIS INTERVIEW (I.E. AT Q5 OF THE SCREENER QUESTIONNAIRE).
DP TO ADD TICK/YES BOX
ASK ALL
Q1. Did you come into the office today mainly on behalf of... READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY. PROBE FOR MAIN REASON
1. Yourself
2. Your partner
3. A dependent (e.g. child)
4. Parent/other family member
5. A friend (e.g. as support/translator)
6. A client (e.g. this might apply to a representative from Citizens Advice Bureau)
Q2. What were your reasons for needing to speak with someone here today? WRITE IN FULL VERBATIM RESPONSE AND THEN CODE.

NOW CODE ALL THE VERBATIM REASONS MENTIONED (i.e. reasons for needing to speak with someone at the Jobcentre today). MULTICODE OK.

USE A SEPARATE “OTHER” FOR EACH REASON GIVEN

NOTE: DO NOT USE CODE 1 FOR APPLYING FOR A LOAN – USE “OTHER SPECIFY”

DO NOT READ OUT.

1. To apply for a benefit / find out how to apply (e.g. Jobseekers allowance, incapacity benefit etc) (SPECIFY BENEFIT TYPE)
2. To make an appointment with a member of staff
3. To re-arrange an existing appointment with a member of staff
4. To ask what I should to do if I was made redundant in future
5. To get an explanation of documents/information I have received
6. To get help with looking for a job
7. To get help with completing a form
8. To get help with using the website, job point or free phone
9. To report a change of circumstance (e.g. change of address, family situation)
10. To report a wrong/missed payment
11. To ask the Jobcentre to do something - send a form/letter, replace a cheque, make a photocopy, provide written proof of benefit entitlement etc
12. To hand in a completed form or other documentation
13. To check on the progress of an application/claim
14. To speak with someone because I was not called back as promised
15. To get information about my benefit/pension entitlement/what benefits I might be entitled to
16. Other reason 1 (SUMMARISE ONE REASON HERE ONLY AND USE AN ADDITIONAL OTHER IF NEEDED)
17. Other reason 2 (SUMMARISE ONE REASON HERE ONLY AND USE AN ADDITIONAL OTHER IF NEEDED)
18. Other reason 3 (SUMMARISE ONE REASON HERE ONLY AND USE AN ADDITIONAL OTHER IF NEEDED)
ASK IF Q2 IS MULTICODED

Q3 – What is your main/most important reason for coming here today?
LIST ANSWERS GIVEN AT Q2, INC. OTHER RESPONSES. SINGLE CODE
ASK IF MORE THAN 2 ANSWERS GIVEN AT Q2

Q4. And what is the next most important reason?
LIST ANSWERS GIVEN AT Q2, INC OTHER RESPONSES (EXCLUDE THE RESPONSE GIVEN AT Q3). SINGLE CODE

START OF LOOP (Q5 TO Q10)

ASK ALL

Q5. Did someone, or something you read or saw, lead you to come into the Jobcentre <<INSERT MAIN REASON HERE>>? SINGLE CODE
   1. Yes
   2. No
ASK IF YES AT Q5, OTHERS GO TO Q7

Q6. Where did you see this/who suggested this? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK
   1. The Jobcentre Plus website
   2. The Directgov website
   3. Another website (PLEASE SPECIFY)
   4. A telephone adviser – at the central Jobcentre Plus claim line (0800 number)
   5. A telephone adviser – at Jobseeker Direct (0845 job search service)
   6. A telephone adviser – at the benefit processing/query service (0845 number)
   7. A member of Jobcentre staff - either face to face or by telephone (at this or another Jobcentre) NOTE: DO NOT USE THIS CODE FOR THE CENTRAL CLAIM LINE OR JOBSEEKER DIRECT
   8. Other telephone adviser/unspecified number
   9. Another organisation (e.g. Citizens Advice Bureau, Local Authority, Health Authority) (SPECIFY ORGANISATION)
   10. A friend/colleague/family member
   11. Advertising (e.g. poster, leaflet, TV advert, radio advert)
   12. Had noticed the Jobcentre when passing
   13. Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)
14. Don’t know/can’t remember
15. No one (SKIP BACK TO Q5 AND CODE ‘NO’)

ASK ALL

Q7. Did you try to deal with this reason for your visit, i.e. <<INSERT MAIN REASON HERE>>, before coming in to the Jobcentre today? SINGLE CODE
1. Yes
2. No

ASK IF YES AT Q7, OTHERS GO TO Q10

Q8. How did you try to do this? PROMPT FROM LIST IF NECESSARY. PLEASE PROMPT FOR SPECIFIC TELEPHONE NUMBER – USE UNSPECIFIED ONLY IF ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY
1. Telephoned - the central Jobcentre Plus claim line (0800 number)
2. Telephoned - Jobseeker Direct (0845 number – central job search service)
3. Telephoned - benefit processing/query service (0845 number)
4. Telephoned - this/another Jobcentre office directly
5. Telephoned - another number / number not specified
6. Textphoned
7. Visited the Jobcentre Plus Website
8. Visited the Directgov website
9. Emailed Jobcentre Plus
10. Wrote to this/another Jobcentre directly
11. Asked the Citizens Advice Bureau
12. Other (SPECIFY)

ASK IF YES AT Q7, OTHERS GO TO Q10

Q9. Why did you still need to come into the jobcentre <<INSERT MAIN REASON HERE>> today? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

OPTIONS FOR THOSE WHO SAID TELEPHONE/TEXT PHONE AT Q8 (CODES 1-6)
1. The call was not answered/I had to wait too long to speak with someone so I gave up
2. The number I had did not work
3. I kept getting passed from person to person so I gave up
4. I got cut off
5. The adviser couldn’t answer my query
6. I did not want to give information over the telephone
7. I was worried about the cost of the call
8. The adviser told me to come in to the Jobcentre

OPTIONS FOR THOSE WHO SAID ONLINE/EMAIL AT Q8 (CODE 7, 8 OR 9)
9. I did not want to give information/complete forms online
10. The website stopped working/did not work
11. I did not get a reply to my email

OPTION FOR THOSE WHO SAID WROTE AT Q8 (CODE 10)
12. I did not get a reply to my letter

OPTIONS FOR ALL
13. I wanted to speak to someone face to face
14. English (or Welsh) is not my first language/difficulty communicating/reading in English (or Welsh)
15. I could not find the information I needed
16. I did not understand the information I was given/that was available
17. I was directed/told to come into the Jobcentre
18. I wasn’t sure how to complete the forms / what I needed to do
19. I needed to hand in a form in person
20. I needed written proof of my benefit entitlement
21. Other (SPECIFY)

ASK IF NO AT Q7, OTHERS GO TO Q11

Q10. Why did you come into the Jobcentre today rather than use possible alternatives, such as telephoning, using the website or returning documents or forms by post? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

1. I didn’t know there was any alternative
2. My first thought was to come in/I have always come in, in the past
3. I was passing
4. I wanted to speak to someone face to face
5. My query was urgent
6. I wanted to hand in a form/document
7. I needed written proof of my benefit entitlement
8. I wanted to get photocopies made
9. I was worried about the cost of calling/using the website/internet
10. Negative experience of using the Jobcentre Plus website in the past
11. Negative experience of calling Jobcentre Plus in the past
12. No access to a telephone
13. No access to the internet
14. English (or Welsh) is not my first language/difficulty communicating/reading in English (or Welsh)
15. Other (SPECIFY)

REPEAT QUESTIONS 5 TO 10 FOR THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT REASON (GIVEN AT Q4)

END OF LOOP

ASK ALL

Q11. SHOWCARD A (R) Using this card, could you tell me how well, if at all, you feel you know each of the following services? READ OUT STATEMENTS (DP – ROTATE OPTIONS)
1. The services provided by Jobcentre plus in general
2. The Jobcentre Plus website
3. The Directgov website
4. The central Jobcentre Plus claim line (0800 number)
5. The central Jobseekers Direct telephone line (0845 number)
6. The telephone line for the team that processes benefits and deals with benefit queries (0845 number)
7. The direct line telephone number at this/another Jobcentre

SHOWCARD OPTIONS
Know very well
Know a fair amount
Know just a little
Heard of but know almost nothing about
Never heard of
Don’t know
ASK ALL

Q12. SHOWCARD B (R) To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statements? READ OUT. (DP – ROTATE OPTIONS)

1. I find using the internet confusing

2. Given the choice, I would always prefer to speak with someone face to face than over the telephone

3. If I knew my query could be dealt with in one call I would be happy to use telephone services/call centres

SHOWCARD OPTIONS

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don’t know

ASK ALL

Q13. SHOWCARD C (R) Which of the options on this card would you most prefer to use if you needed to do each of the following? SINGLE CODE. READ OUT. (DP – ROTATE OPTIONS)

a. Apply for a benefit/make a claim
b. Check on the progress of a claim
c. Tell the Jobcentre about changes in your circumstances (e.g. if you were to change address, or start a new job etc)
d. Ask the Jobcentre to provide you with proof of your benefit entitlement
e. Make a general enquiry/get information about benefits
f. Make a complaint
g. Look for job opportunities
h. Look for training opportunities

SHOWCARD OPTIONS

Websites
Email
Telephone
Face to face
No preference (DO NOT SHOW)
Q14. Approximately how long were you in the Jobcentre today? PROBE FOR BEST ESTIMATE. DO NOT INCLUDE THE TIME SPENT DOING THIS INTERVIEW

[ ] [ ] Minutes

Q15. Approximately how long did you spend with member(s) of Jobcentre staff (in total) today? PROBE FOR BEST ESTIMATE

[ ] [ ] Minutes

DEMOGRAPHICS

The next few questions will be used for analysis purposes only.

REMIND/SAY IF NECESSARY – All replies to this survey are completely confidential and cannot be linked to individuals. We will not record your name and the results are given to Jobcentre Plus as anonymous statistics only. The study will not affect any benefits you may be claiming.

ASK ALL

Q16. Which of the following, if any, do you currently have easy access to, for example at your own home or at the home of a family member or friend? READ OUT. MULTICODE OK.

1. A landline
2. A mobile phone
3. The internet
4. Email
5. None of these (DO NOT READ OUT)

ASK ALL

Q17A. SHOWCARD D Which of the statements on this card apply to your present situation? Please select as many as apply and just read out the letters. MULTICODE OK. PROBE NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED FOR CODES A-C

A. Full-time work, including self-employment (31 hours or more a week)
B. Part-time work, including self-employment (16-30 hours a week)
C. Part-time work, including self-employment (less than 16 hours a week)
D. Local or government training scheme (including New Deal)
E. Registered unemployed/signing on for JSA
F. Not registered unemployed, but seeking work
G. Long-term sick or disabled
H. Retired
I. At home/not seeking work - caring for family member/friend who is ill or disabled
J. At home/not seeking work - looking after child(ren) at home
K. At home/not seeking work (other reason)
L. Full-time education
M. Part-time education

Other (SPECIFY)

Refused

ASK IF MC AT Q17A

Q17B. And which of these is your main activity? Please just read out the letter that applies. IF NEEDED the activity you spend the most time on.

LIST ANSWERS GIVEN AT Q17A, INC. OTHER RESPONSE. SINGLE CODE

ASK IF ANY ANSWER EXCEPT A, B OR C AT Q17A.

Q18. SHOWCARD E When were you last in paid work, including self-employment? Please just read out the letter that applies. PROMPT FOR AN APPROXIMATION. SINGLE CODE.

A. Less than 1 month ago
B. 1-2 months ago
C. 3-4 months ago
D. 5-6 months ago
E. 7-12 months ago
F. 13-18 months ago
G. 19-24 months ago
H. More than 24 months ago
I. Have never had a job

Don’t Know/Can’t remember

Prefer not to say
ASK ALL

Q19. SHOWCARD F (R) Which, if any, of the following benefits are you currently receiving? Please just read out the letters that apply. MULTICODE OK

A. Jobseekers Allowance
B. Income Support
C. Incapacity benefit
D. Disability Living Allowance/Attendance Allowance
E. Carers Allowance
F. Child benefit
G. Child tax credit
H. Working tax credit
I. Pension credit
J. State Retirement Pension
K. Employment and Support Allowance (ESA)
L. Government Training Allowance
M. Severe Disablement Allowance
N. Maternity allowance
O. Bereavement benefit
P. Industrial injuries disablement benefit
Other Benefits (PLEASE SPECIFY)
Not receiving benefits
Prefer not to say

ASK ALL

Q20. SHOWCARD G Please indicate which of these age groups you belong to by reading out the letter that applies. SINGLE CODE

A. 16-18
B. 19-24
C. 25-34
D. 35-44
E. 45-54
F. 55-64
G. 65+
Prefer not to say
ASK ALL

Q21. SHOWCARD H Which group on this card do you consider you belong to? Please read out the letter that applies. SINGLE CODE

WHITE
A - British
B - Irish
C - Any other white background

MIXED
D - White and Black Caribbean
E - White and Black African
F - White and Asian
G - Any other mixed background

ASIAN OR ASIAN BRITISH
H - Indian
I - Pakistani
J - Bangladeshi
K - Any other Asian background

BLACK OR BLACK BRITISH
L - Caribbean
M - African
N - Any other black background

CHINESE OR OTHER ETHNIC GROUP
O - Chinese
P - Any other background

Refused

ASK ALL

Q22. Do you have a long-standing illness, health condition, impairment or disability (including learning difficulty/disability)? By long-standing, I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time? SINGLE CODE.

1. Yes
2. No
ASK IF YES AT Q22.

Q23. SHOWCARD 1 (R) In which, if any, of the following ways does this illness, health condition, impairment or disability (including learning difficulty/disability) impact on you? Please just read out the letters that apply. IF NEEDED We are asking this question to find out how your access to Jobcentre services might be affected, not your ability to work. READ OUT OPTIONS IF NECESSARY
A. Affects your ability to use the telephone
B. Affects your ability to use the internet/Jobpoints in the centre
C. Makes it more difficult to get to the Jobcentre Plus office
D. Affects your reading or writing
   None of these (DO NOT READ OUT)
   Prefer not to say (DO NOT READ OUT)

ASK ALL

Q24.

IF JOB CENTRE IS IN ENGLAND OR SCOTLAND ASK Is English your first language?
IF JOB CENTRE IS IN WALES ASK Is either English or Welsh your first language?
  1. Yes
  2. No

ASK ALL

Q25. And approximately how far, in miles, do you live from this jobcentre? PROBE FOR BEST ESTIMATE
  1. Less than 1 mile
  2. around 1 mile
  3. around 2 miles
  4. around 3 miles
  5. around 4 miles
  6. around 5 miles
  7. around 6 or more miles
Don’t know (DO NOT READ OUT)
No fixed address (DO NOT READ OUT)

Thank you for taking part in this survey.
ALL
RECORD GENDER – DO NOT ASK
Male
Female
BEFORE CLOSING INTERVIEW, INTERVIEWER TO RECORD :
DATE (DP, SET UP SO THAT INTERVIEWER CONFIRMS DATE FROM SCREEN)
DAY OF THE WEEK (DP – TICK BOX FOR EACH DAY MON-FRI. SINGLE CODE)
TIME (DP, SET UP SO THAT INTERVIEWER CONFIRMS TIME FROM SCREEN)
Appendix F
Definition of contact drivers

The Department for Work and Pensions has classified the most common reasons for using Jobcentre Plus services into a number of ‘level 1 contact drivers’. Each of the ‘pre-code’ questionnaire response options (plus, where possible, responses coded from ‘other specify’) was classified into a level 1 contact driver as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 contact drivers</th>
<th>Example survey response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I need to tell you</td>
<td>To report a change of circumstance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To report a wrong/missed payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To hand in a completed form or other documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to check what’s happening with</td>
<td>To check on the progress of an application/claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To speak with someone because I was not called back as promised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need you to help me with</td>
<td>To get help with completing a document/form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get help in looking for a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get help using the website/Jobpoint/warm-phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need you to do something</td>
<td>To make an appointment with a member of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To re-arrange an existing appointment with a member of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ask the Jobcentre to do something (e.g. send a form, send a letter, replace a cheque, make a photocopy, provide written verification/proof of my benefit entitlement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a question about</td>
<td>To find out what I should to do if I was made redundant in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To find out information about my benefit/pension entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to apply for</td>
<td>To apply for a benefit (e.g. Jobseekers Allowance, Incapacity Benefit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t understand</td>
<td>To get an explanation of correspondence/documents/ information I have received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: DWP identified two additional level 1 contact drivers of ‘to complain’ and ‘I need money’. These options were not included in the pre-coded list as part of the questionnaire (as the list needed to be kept as concise as possible) and these responses were not given by sufficient numbers of visitors (as their ‘other specify’ response) to include/analyse as a separate category.*
Appendix G
Jobcentre Plus offices surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Boston Crown Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Derby Normanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Lincoln Orchard Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Swadlincote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Leicester Charles St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Glossop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Loughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Biggleswade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Clacton Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Southend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Grays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Wood Green Granta House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Dalston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Woolwich Nelson House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Hounslow Montague Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Clapham Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Plaistow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Walthamstow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Sutton Helena House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Fulham Waterford House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Region | Jobcentre Plus office
--- | ---
London | Bexley Westminster House
London | Stratford
London | Redbridge Jobcentreplus
London | Westminster
London | Stockwell
London | London Bridge
North East | Billingham
North East | Durham
North East | Newcastle City
North East | Spennymoor
North East | Alnwick
North East | Gateshead Shildon House
North West | Farnworth
North West | Stockport Heron House
North West | Warrington Nolan House
North West | Maryport
North West | Bolton Blackhorse St
North West | Everton
North West | Accrington
North West | Hyde Beech House
North West | Upton
North West | Wigan King Street
North West | Didsbury
North West | Wavertree
North West | Carlisle
Scotland | Wester Hailes
Scotland | Dumfries
Scotland | Airdrie
Scotland | Leith
Scotland | Cambuslang
Scotland | Newlands
Scotland | Saltcoats
Scotland | Girvan
Scotland | Perth
Scotland | Aberdeen Chapel St
Wales | Pontypool
Wales | Caerphilly
Wales | Pyle
Wales | Merthyr Tydfil
Wales | Cardiff Charles Street
South East | Winchester
South East | Maidstone County Gate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Folkestone Palting House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Slough Upton Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Ringwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Margate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Maidenhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Bedminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Bridgwater Hanover House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Honiton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Salisbury Summerlock Hse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Torquay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Poole Old Town Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Burton on Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Yardley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Sparkhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Wolverhampton Temple St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Telford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Evesham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Selly Oak Harborne Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Handsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Hull West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Hull Market Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Todmorden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Barnsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Leeds Southern House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>York Monkgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Doncaster Crossgate House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>Dewsbury Crown Buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>