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Background and Study Overview

• Strong policy direction for both personalisation and safeguarding

• Predictions of better safeguarding practice with personalisation – through increased empowerment
  – With opposing views as well, especially concerning physical and financial abuse

• Part of a larger mixed-method research project
  – Analysis of Safeguarding Adults Annual Reports
  – Analysis of national and local existing data
    • Research direction of maximising benefits of existing data
  – Interviews with different stakeholders
### Analysis of Secondary Data Sources

#### POTENTIAL AND CHALLENGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ItemBaseID</th>
<th>LocationID</th>
<th>Council Code</th>
<th>Northumber</th>
<th>Gateshead</th>
<th>Newcastle</th>
<th>North Tynesi</th>
<th>South Tynesi</th>
<th>Sunderland</th>
<th>Hartlepool</th>
<th>Middlesbrou</th>
<th>Redcar</th>
<th>Stockton-on-Durham</th>
<th>Darlington U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000101</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000102</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000103</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000104</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000105</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000106</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000107</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000108</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000109</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000110</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000111</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000112</td>
<td>AVA_tbl1_pgl_row1_col12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table continues with similar data entries.
Aims of Quantitative Analysis

• To utilise existing local and national data on allegation of abuse to investigate possible links between levels and patterns of alleged abuse and receiving personal budgets (particularly direct payments)
  – Abuse of Vulnerable Adults (AVA) returns
  – Referrals, Assessments and Packages of Care (RAP) and the Adult Social Care Combined Activity Returns
  – Local data from three case study sites
• Based on a conceptual framework exploring potential impact of using unregulated care work through personal budgets/direct payments on safeguarding issues.
• The framework also acknowledges, and attempts to measure, the effect of local area characteristics, the level of personal budgets uptake at the local authority level and personal individual characteristics of service users on different elements of abuse.
Figure 3.1: Different data sets within the scope of the analyses.
National Datasets

Abuse of Vulnerable Adults (AVA) returns Referrals, Assessments and Packages of Care (RAP) and the Adult Social Care Combined Activity Returns

• Pros:
  – Pre-collected, relevant and cost-effective
  – Information on the whole of England
  – Census of all referrals of alleged abuse
  – Covers information on wide range of alleged abuse characteristics
  – Provides information on uptake of personal budgets across England
National Datasets

• Cons:
  – Collected at the level of local authority
  – No individual referral records
  – Cannot link an individual’s uptake of personal budget and safeguarding issues
  – Aggregate information on different elements
  – Information on uptake of personal budget are in separate dataset from that on safeguarding
  – ‘Huge’ number of ‘variables’
    • Total numbers provided in tables’ cells
  – Challenging storage format \(\rightarrow\) requires considerable level of data preparation
Solution Strategies

• Can only infer relationships at the local authority level
• Link various information at LA level
• Use ‘proxy’ variables to investigate level of uptake of different elements of personal budgets (direct payments and self-directed support)
• Link to other local area characteristics such as deprivation level and rurality
• Use techniques to select relevant variables
• Complement analysis of national datasets with that of anonymous individual referral records obtained from three case study sites (local data)
An example of a correlation Matrix as a means for variables’ reduction, selecting ‘unique’ variables for inclusion.
Use Proxy Variables to Indicate Levels of uptake of personal budgets

• Using Referrals, Assessments and Packages of Care (RAP) and the Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) datasets

• Calculated six new variables as indicators
  1. Percentage* of all service users aged 18-64 who receive direct payments (DP) (P_DP18_64)
  2. Percentage* of service users aged 18-64 who either receive self directed support (SDS) or DP (P_SDSDP18_64)
  3. Percentage* of service users aged 18-64 receiving SDS (P_SDS18_64)
  4. Percentage* of service users aged 65 years or more receiving DP (P_DP65).
  5. Percentage* of users aged 65 years or more receiving SDS or direct payments (P_SDSDP65)
  6. Percentage* of users aged 65 years or more receiving SDS (P_SDS65)

*Percentage based on users of Community Based Services (CBS)
Employ data visualisation techniques to examine a huge volume of outputs.

Figure 4.8: Distributions of aggregate referrals with nature of financial abuse, for users 65+, local authority level.
Collecting local data

• Had to be limited to a small number of local authority due to time required to secure negotiation and securing data
• Covered the period from April 2011 to April 2013 to match AVA reporting periods
• Requested information on personal characteristics, uptake of personal budgets in addition to referral details
• Obtained anonymous individual records on 2209 cases
• Variable levels of data completion and variable definitions of IB and SDS
Using individual records to model statistical relationships: Example - relationship of alleged abuser to user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Estimated odds ratio</th>
<th>UI</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPYes</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSYes</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age65+</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageUnknown</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user.groupmental.h</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user.groupOther</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user.groupphysical.d</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicityBME</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicityUnknown</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genderMale</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19: Results of logistic regression model of alleged abuser to be domiciliary care staff (N=1425), individual user level
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Quantitative data analysis

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
Levels of Referrals

- Analysis of aggregate national data indicates no evidence of strong relationship between the uptake of personal budgets on the local authority level and the volume of referrals or repeated referrals.
- There are tentative suggestions of a variable distribution of referrals and repeated referrals in significantly rural areas.
- On the individual level, the analysis suggests some relationship between receipt of personal budgets, particularly in receipt of direct payment, on the likelihood of an alert to be reported on AVA returns.
Source of Referrals: Focus on domiciliary care workers, self-referrals and family members

• National data analysis indicates no significant associations between level of uptake of personal budgets and distributions of referrals from domiciliary care staff, referrals made by users’ family members or self-referrals.

• Tentative indications among significantly rural areas where the median of reported referrals by domiciliary care staff is higher than other areas.

• Local authorities located in areas with low income-deprivation scale (more wealthy) and low unemployment scale, have slightly wider distributions of self-referrals.

• None of the local data included information on source of referrals.
Nature of Alleged Abuse

• The most common form of alleged abuse in England is physical abuse followed by financial abuse.

• On the aggregate level we found no significant relationships between the percentage of users’ on personal budgets and
  – the prevalence of allegations of physical, emotional, sexual or financial abuse.

• National data analysis points to higher prevalence of referrals with allegations of sexual abuse within wealthier areas.

• Individual referral records’ analysis shows
  – No conclusive relationship between allegations of physical or emotional abuse and personal budgets
  – Lower (but not significant) prevalence of allegations of sexual abuse among users in receipt of direct payments or who are on self-directed support
  – Significantly higher likelihood of allegations of financial abuse among users on self-directed support but not users receiving direct payments.

  • The model also indicates an increased likelihood of financial abuse among users with physical disabilities regardless of whether they receive personal budgets or not.
Location of Alleged Abuse: Focus on Users’ own homes

• Analysis of the national datasets indicates no clear relationship with the uptake of direct payment or self-directed support

• A logistic regression model utilising local data indicates no significant relationship between receiving direct payment or being on self-directed support and the likelihood of having allegation of abuse occurring at users’ own homes.

• Other personal characteristics and types of care needs have significant relationships, namely gender and having learning disability needs.
Relationships of Alleged Abuser to User: Focus on domiciliary care staff, main carer and family members

• National data analysis indicates no significant association with personal budgets’ uptake

• Local data analysis indicate a positive significant association between receiving self-directed support and the likelihood of alleged abuser to be domiciliary care staff
Outcome of Referrals

• Analysis of both national and local data indicates no significant relationships between the uptake of personal budgets and cases being substantiated

  – With the exception of users receiving direct payments in site B (significantly higher prevalence of substantiated cases)
Conclusion

• Potential of existing, pre-collected data in contrast to challenges
  – Aggregate nature of national data potentially masking some existing relationships
• Difficulties in establishing exact definitions of what ‘direct payment’ and ‘self-directed support’ means across different local authorities
• Some relationships between uptake of different elements of PB and financial abuse and the alleged abuser to be domiciliary care staff
• Important indicators of other relationships especially rurality, local area income level and personal characteristics e.g. gender and type of care needs
Questions and Discussions
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