

Overall numbers of reported direct payments users in the UK – rank order and sampling issues

Mark Priestley
April 2004

[Draft working paper: not for quotation without permission]

Where do the numbers come from?

This summary is simply a rank ordered list of relevant authorities by number of reported DP users (divided into bands and annotated with thoughts on research questions and sampling). See Debbie's paper for more on variables etc. The exact figures here may not exactly match Debbie's revised (revised!) working paper so please do not treat them as definitive.

The basic units of analysis, or 'cases', are the 215 public authorities with devolved responsibility for the implementation of Central Government policy on direct payments for disabled people. These are the Local Authorities of England and Wales, the Scottish Local Authorities and the Trusts in Northern Ireland. As convenient shorthand we refer to these as 'relevant authorities' (except where we are using specific case examples or distinguishing between arrangements in different countries). We also use the term 'locality' to describe the geographical area defined by the jurisdiction of a relevant authority. The term 'direct payments user' refers to disabled people using direct payments and (for the purposes of this analysis, users exclude other entitled groups unless otherwise specified).

NB: the figures are based on reports while implementation of DP was discretionary. The key tasks are to look for evidence of uneven discretionary implementation and to generate potential questions for further research.

Some headline figures

The large majority of relevant authorities in the UK (88.7%) reported disabled people using direct payments in their locality. The mean average number per authority was 44.4. However, there is considerable variation between cases, both by authority and by country. The median average is in fact only half the mean (at 22).

NB: a better indication of 'mean' might be achieved by excluding the two extreme cases with 600+ reported direct payments users?

The highest number of recorded DP users in England was Essex (642); the highest in Scotland was Fife (120); in Wales, Cardiff (47); and in Northern Ireland, Armagh and Dungannon (47).

Authorities reporting no direct payments users

There were 19 localities with no reported direct payments users. Eleven of these were in Scotland, five in Wales and two in Northern Ireland, plus the Isles of Scilly. All of the English mainland authorities reported at least one direct payments user.

In considering a discretionary implementation process, those authorities reporting no direct payments users several years after the initial Act might be considered as a subgroup of ‘extreme cases’ meriting further investigation within a purposive sample. There are a number of potential explanations for a reported figure of zero: (a) the relevant authority did not make direct payments available to disabled people as an option; (b) direct payments were made available but either disabled people were not aware of this option or no-one requested it; (c) there was demand for direct payments but this was satisfied by alternative payment scheme options (not recorded as ‘direct payments’ within the terms of policy and legislation); (d) the zero figure was an artefact of misreporting.

By comparing the reporting data from the relevant authorities with information on the existence of direct payments support schemes within localities we can see that there are clearly some anomalies that may favour explanation (c) above. Amongst the 19 localities with no reported direct payments users, there at least nine where a direct payments support scheme operates (four in Wales and five in Scotland). For example, although the relevant authorities in Gwynedd and Midlothian return a figure of zero for direct payments users, there are CILs with direct payments support schemes in both localities. Similarly, while the authorities in Conwy, Dundee City, Flintshire and Torfaen also reported no direct payments users there are charitable or voluntary direct payments support schemes operating in all three localities. In North Ayrshire there is the apparent anomaly of a local authority operated direct payments support scheme but no reported direct payments users. [there appears to be no information about the type of support schemes existing in East Dumbartonshire, Stirling or West Dumbartonshire].

Research questions: can we confirm whether each of these 19 authorities really had no direct payments users during the discretionary phase of implementation? In which authorities were direct payments made available to disabled people and were there any cases in which a purposeful decision was made not to do so?

Suggestions for sampling: any case where the relevant authority chose purposefully not to make direct payments an option for disabled people; any case where there are no reported direct payments users but where a number of disabled people are known to use a support scheme in the locality; the North Ayrshire anomaly; at least one from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Table 1: relevant authorities reporting no direct payments users

Locality	Country	support	type
ARGYLL AND BUTE	Scotland		
CAUSEWAY HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST	N Ireland		
CONWY	Wales	Yes	Charity
CRAIGAVON AND BANBRIDGE COMMUNITY HSS TRUST	N Ireland		
DUNDEE CITY	Scotland	Yes	Charity

EAST DUMBARTONSHIRE	Scotland	Yes	No info
EAST RENFREWSHIRE	Scotland		
FALKIRK	Scotland		
FLINTSHIRE	Wales	Yes	Charity
GWYNEDD	Wales	Yes	CIL
ISLES OF SCILLY	England		
MERTHYR TYDFIL	Wales		
MIDLOTHIAN	Scotland	Yes	CIL
NORTH AYRSHIRE	Scotland	Yes	LA
SHETLAND	Scotland		
SOUTH LANARKSHIRE	Scotland		
STIRLING	Scotland	Yes	No info
TORFAEN	Wales	Yes	Voluntary
WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE	Scotland	Yes	No info

Authorities reporting one direct payments user

Three authorities reported only a single direct payments user (two? authorities in Wales and one in Scotland). All of the English mainland authorities reported more than one direct payments user.

Another interesting case may be offered by those authorities reported only one direct payments user. In Blaenau Gwent there appears to be one direct payments user and no known support scheme; in Orkney there is one reported direct payments user and a charitable scheme. There appears to be an error in the data for Caerphilly, where the total direct payments user figure is reported as one but where there are two older people reported as direct payments users, one mental health user and seven with physical or sensory impairments (bringing the total to 10?). Cases with only one direct payments user might indicate: (a) a very recent decision to implement direct payments for disabled people in the locality; (b) strong advocacy to provide direct payments to an individual against authority policy; (c) a unique or unusual provider arrangement in response to individual circumstance or service failure; (d) very low demand for direct payments from disabled people; (e) an error in reporting.

Research questions: is there only one direct payments user in Blaenau Gwent? Is there only one direct payments user in Orkney? What are the correct figures for Caerphilly? If the reported data is correct then there are issues of research confidentiality for individual disabled people who might be identifiable in any case study of the relevant authority.

Suggestions for sampling: Blaenau Gwent and Orkney

Table 2: relevant authorities reporting one direct payments user

Locality	Country	DP support	Scheme type
BLAENAU GWENT	Wales		
CAERPHILLY?	Wales	Yes	Charity
ORKNEY	Scotland	Yes	Charity

Authorities reporting lower than average numbers of direct payments users

There were 85 authorities reporting more than one DP user but not more than the median average number (22). Of these, 54 were in England, 13 each in Wales and Scotland, and 5 in Northern Ireland.

There are no extreme cases amongst this group of authorities (i.e. the numbers increase fairly evenly from 2 to 22). Support schemes are identified in the large majority (67), including several CILs and user-led schemes, although at least 16 localities in this group appear to have no support scheme.

Research questions: what factors contribute to low take up? Is there low demand for DP in such authorities? Are there difficulties in supply or available PA labour force? Were DP restricted to certain sub-groups (selectively or as pilot projects)?

Suggestions for sampling: cases with smaller numbers from the lower end of this group (with and without locality based support schemes); Bracknell Forest or Slough have the lowest figures in England (2)

Table 3: relevant authorities reporting lower than average numbers of DP users

Locality	Country	support	type	#DP users
ANGLESEY	Wales	yes	CIL	2
BRACKNELL FOREST	England	yes	user led	2
CARMARTHENSHIRE	Wales	no		2
NORTH AND WEST BELFAST HSS TRUST	N Ireland	yes	CIL	2
SLOUGH	England	yes	Vol	2
FOYLE	N Ireland	no		3
HOMEFIRST COMMUNITY TRUST	Scotland	no		3
RENFREWSHIRE	Scotland	yes	LA	3
RUTLAND	England	yes	user led	3
SPERRIN LAKELAND (TYRONE)	N Ireland	no		3
SUNDERLAND	England	no		3
YORK	England	yes	user led	3
SOUTH TYNESIDE	England	yes	SSD	4
SWANSEA CITY AND COUNTY	Wales	yes	charity	4
COMHAIRLE NAN ELLEAN SIAR	Scotland	no		5
BROMLEY	England	no		6
BURY	England	yes	user led	6
CEREDIGION	Wales	no	Disability org	6
RHONDDA CYNON TAFF	Wales	yes	CIL	6
BARNSLEY	England	yes	charity	7
BRIDGEND	Wales	yes	charity	7
DENBIGHSHIRE	Wales	yes	charity	7
EAST LOTHIAN	Scotland	yes	CIL	7
MORAY	Scotland	yes	charity	7
NORTH TYNESIDE	England	yes	user led	7
SOUTH AND EAST BELFAST HSS TRUST	N Ireland	yes	CIL	7
WOKINGHAM	England	yes	user led	7

HAVERING	England	no		8
READING	England	yes	user led	9
WREXHAM	Wales	yes	Vol	9
NEATH PORT TALBOT	Wales	yes	charity	10
NEWRY AND MOURNE	N Ireland	yes	SSD	10
PEMBROKESHIRE	Wales	no		10
THURROCK	England	yes	Disability org	10
WANDSWORTH	England	yes	no info	10
ABERDEEN CITY	Scotland	yes	no info	11
ABERDEENSHIRE	Scotland	yes	no info	11
HARTLEPOOL	England	yes	LA	11
ISLINGTON	England	yes	charity	11
NORTH LANARKSHIRE	Scotland	no		11
TOWER HAMLETS	England	yes	LA	11
WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD	England	yes	user led	11
DUDLEY	England	yes	charity	12
NEWPORT	Wales	yes	Vol	12
PLYMOUTH	England	yes	charity	12
SANDWELL	England	yes	no info	12
WALSALL	England	yes	LA	12
LUTON	England	no info	no info	12
BRIGHTON AND HOVE	England	yes	LA	13
NEWHAM	England	yes	LA	13
REDCAR AND CLEVELAND	England	yes	LA	13
BEXLEY	England	no		14
NORTHUMBERLAND	England	no		14
BRADFORD	England	yes	SSD	15
GLASGOW CITY	Scotland	yes	CIL	15
KINGSTON UPON HULL	England	yes	CIL	15
ST HELENS	England	yes	SSD	15
VALE OF GLAMORGAN	Wales	yes	user led	15
WEST BERKSHIRE	England	yes	user led	16
WOLVERHAMPTON	England	yes	charity	16
BOURNEMOUTH	England	yes	LA	17
EAST AYRSHIRE	Scotland	yes	LA	17
HARROW	England	yes	user led	17
KNOWSLEY	England	yes	charity	17
MIDDLESBROUGH	England	yes	LA	17
NORTH YORKSHIRE	England	yes	Vol	17
PETERBOROUGH	England	yes	Vol	17
BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET	England	yes	CIL	18
CLACKMANNANSHIRE	Scotland	yes	no info	18
DARLINGTON	England	yes	no info	18
PERTH AND KINROSS	Scotland	yes	LA	19
POOLE	England	yes	LA	19
POWYS	Wales	no		19
SOLIHULL	England	yes	charity	19
SUTTON	England	yes	LA	19
WEST LOTHIAN	Scotland	yes	CIL	19
ROTHERHAM	England	yes	user led	20

ISLE OF WIGHT	England	yes	charity	21
ROCHDALE	England	yes	user led	21
BLACKBURN WITH DARWEN	England	yes	Disability org	22
NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	England	no	user led	22
OLDHAM	England	yes	LA	22
SOUTHEND ON SEA	England	no		22
STOCKTON-ON-TEES	England	yes	LA	22
BAMSLEY	England	no info	no info	22

Authorities reporting average numbers of direct payments users

There were 48 authorities reporting between the median and mean average numbers of DP users (23-44). One in Wales; two in Northern Ireland; five in Scotland and 40 in England. Of these, 42 are known to have a support scheme and at least five do not.

Research questions: (nothing really stands out here from the quantitative analysis)

Suggestions for sampling: at least one from this group from each of country (and possibly region). Cases with and without support schemes, and with different types of support schemes.

Table 4: relevant authorities with average numbers of reported DP users

Locality	Country	support	type	#DP users
CITY OF STOKE ON TRENT	England	yes	user led	23
DOWN LISBURN HSS TRUST	N Ireland	yes	CIL	23
ENFIELD	England	yes	user led	23
HALTON	England	yes	LA	24
TAMESIDE	England	yes	LA	24
WAKEFIELD	England	no		24
BARKING AND DAGENHAM	England	yes	user led	25
ULSTER COMMUNITY AND HOSPITALS HSS TRUST	N Ireland	yes	CIL	25
BRENT	England	yes	user led	26
EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE COUNCIL	England	yes	LA	26
HACKNEY	England	yes	LA	26
MONMOUTHSHIRE	Wales	yes	Vol	26
STOCKPORT	England	yes	LA	26
DUMFRIES AND GALLOWAY	Scotland	no		27
HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM	England	yes	user led	27
TORBAY	England	yes	LA	27
HARINGEY	England	yes	LA	28
KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA	England	yes	user led	28
CALDERDALE	England	yes	user led	29
EALING	England	yes	charity	29
TRAFFORD	England	yes	LA	29
ANGUS	Scotland	no info		30
DONCASTER	England	yes	charity	30
BLACKPOOL	England	yes	LA	31
HOUNSLOW	England	yes	no info	31

NORTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE	England	yes	user led	31
SALFORD	England	no		31
SOUTH AYRSHIRE	Scotland	yes	LA	31
SOUTHWARK	England	yes	LA	31
TELFORD AND WREKIN	England	no		31
SEFTON	England	yes	SSD	32
GATESHEAD	England	yes	charity	33
MERTON	England	yes	no info	33
LEWISHAM	England	yes	user led	34
SWINDON	England	yes	charity	34
COVENTRY	England	yes	charity	35
WARRINGTON	England	yes	CIL	35
WIRRAL	England	yes	no info	35
REDBRIDGE	England	yes	user led	36
RICHMOND UPON THAMES	England	yes	Disability org	37
BOLTON	England	yes		40
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE	England	no	LA	40
MEDWAY	England	yes	SSD	41
NORTH SOMERSET	England	yes	CIL	41
WIGAN	England	yes	SSD	42
HIGHLAND COUNCIL	Scotland	yes	no info	43
INVERCLYDE	Scotland	yes	LA	44
SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE	England	yes	CIL	44

Authorities reporting higher than average numbers of direct payments users

Of the 59 authorities reporting more direct payments users than the mean average for the UK (44.4) only five were outside England (three were in Scotland, one in Wales and one in Northern Ireland). There are direct payments support schemes operating in all 59 of these localities. Hampshire and Essex may be considered as extreme cases (see later)

Although more than ten per cent of localities have some reported direct payments users but no local support scheme, all of the authorities reporting a higher than mean average numbers of direct payments users do have some sort of support scheme in their locality. There appears to be a relationship between the existence of a support scheme in the locality and the number of direct payments users reported by the relevant authority (but this could be cause or effect)

Research questions: Why are the vast majority of authorities reporting higher than average numbers of direct payments users in England? Is the existence of a support scheme in the locality a cause or an effect of higher than average numbers of reported direct payments users?

Suggestions for sampling: cases of non English authorities reporting higher than average numbers of direct payments users; some above average English authorities with and without support schemes (plus Cheshire and Norfolk, which have substantially higher numbers). Cardiff and Armagh and Dungannon (which have the highest numbers for Wales and Northern Ireland).

Table 5: relevant authorities reporting higher than mean average numbers of direct payments users

Locality	Country	DP support	Scheme type	#DP users
BEDFORDSHIRE	England	yes	LA	46
ARMAGH AND DUNGANNON	N Ireland	yes	SSD	47
CARDIFF	Wales	yes	user led	47
MILTON KEYNES	England	yes	Disability org	47
LAMBETH	England	yes	Vol	48
SCOTTISH BORDERS	Scotland	yes	no info	50
WALTHAM FOREST	England	yes	user led	50
HEREFORDSHIRE	England	yes	CIL	51
WESTMINSTER CITY COUNCIL	England	yes	charity	53
NOTTINGHAM	England	yes	CIL	56
DORSET	England	yes	LA	58
WORCESTERSHIRE	England	yes	no info	60
LEEDS	England	yes	CIL	61
LEICESTER	England	yes	user led	63
CAMDEN	England	yes	LA	66
SUFFOLK	England	yes	LA	70
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE	England	yes	user led	71
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE	England	yes	user led	73
SHROPSHIRE	England	yes	user led	73
LIVERPOOL	England	yes	LA	76
WILTSHIRE	England	yes	Disability org	77
KINGSTON UPON THAMES	England	yes	CIL	79
HILLINGDON	England	yes	user led	80
KENT	England	yes	LA	80
CORNWALL	England	yes	user led	81
GLOUCESTERSHIRE	England	yes	SSD	82
LEICESTERSHIRE	England	yes	user led	84
HERTFORDSHIRE	England	yes	user led	85
DEVON	England	yes	SSD	86
STAFFORDSHIRE	England	yes	Disability org	86
KIRKLEES	England	yes	LA	87
WARWICKSHIRE	England	yes	user led	88
CITY OF EDINBURGH	Scotland	yes	CIL	89
EAST SUSSEX	England	yes	charity	92
GREENWICH	England	yes	no info	94
BRISTOL	England	yes	CIL	98
DERBYSHIRE	England	yes	CIL	103
PORTSMOUTH	England	yes	SSD	104
BARNET	England	yes	user led	107
DERBY	England	yes	CIL	109
SHEFFIELD	England	yes	user led	111
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE	England	yes	CIL	116
FIFE	Scotland	yes	user led	120
LINCOLNSHIRE	England	yes	charity	124
CUMBRIA	England	yes	no info	131
CAMBRIDGESHIRE	England	yes	Disability org	134
LANCASHIRE	England	yes	Disability org	137

DURHAM	England	yes	SSD	138
BIRMINGHAM	England	yes	charity	140
MANCHESTER	England	yes	user led	140
OXFORDSHIRE	England	yes	user led	143
CROYDON	England	yes	Vol	150
WEST SUSSEX	England	yes	user led	166
SOMERSET	England	yes	charity	179
SURREY	England	yes	CIL	186
SOUTHAMPTON	England	yes	CIL	187
CESHIRE	England	yes	Disability org	254
NORFOLK	England	yes	user led	258

Authorities reporting very large numbers of direct payments users

Two authorities reported more than 600 direct payments users (both were in England). These figures are more than two and half times the next nearest reported.

Cheshire and Norfolk could just as easily go in this band as the previous one.

Research questions: Why do Hampshire and Essex report such high numbers? Are there any direct connecting factors between the two cases? What was the role of user-led support schemes in these localities? (NB: we already know much of this history but need to explain how it translates into registered LA direct payments user numbers while other areas don't)

Suggestions for sampling: Cheshire, Norfolk, Essex and Hampshire?

Table 6: authorities reporting very large numbers of direct payments users

Locality	Country	DP support	Scheme type	#DP users
HAMPSHIRE	England	yes	CIL	625
ESSEX	England	yes	User led	642

MP/March 04