



m.e.l  
research

**Kirklees CLiK Survey 2021**

**Technical Report**

**March 2022**



Project details .....	2
Introduction and background .....	3
Methodology.....	4
Sampling and Distribution .....	6
Data processing.....	8

# Project details

<b>Title</b>	Kirklees CLiK Survey 2021
<b>Client</b>	Kirklees Council
<b>Project number</b>	21142
<b>Author</b>	Steve Handley, Research Director

This project has been delivered to ISO 9001:2015, 20252:2019 and 27001:2013 standards.



Certificate No:340192020



Certificate No:340202020



Certificate No:374882021

## M·E·L Research Ltd

Somerset House, 37 Temple Street, Birmingham, B2 5DP

Email: [info@melresearch.co.uk](mailto:info@melresearch.co.uk)

Web: [www.melresearch.co.uk](http://www.melresearch.co.uk)

Tel: 0121 604 4664



# Introduction and background

This report outlines the methodology and design of the CLiK (Current Living in Kirklees) Survey for 2021, which was conducted by M·E·L Research on behalf of Kirklees Council and partner organisations. The study follows on from five previous CLiK surveys, conducted in 2001, 2005, 2008, 2012 and 2016.

The overall aim of the survey was to gather comprehensive data on the health and wellbeing of Kirklees residents aged 16+ across a range of measures, including lifestyle choices, quality of life and quality of place. The survey content was substantially revised for 2021, although some continuity was retained for key metrics.

Further objectives of the research included:

- Providing the Council with Kirklees-level, Locality-level, CCG-level and other geographical-level data;
- Enabling further analysis by specific population groups and communities of identity; and
- Refreshing outcome indicators for key programmes.

The data will also enable updates to be made to key strategic documents as well as helping to improve commissioning and service provision.

# Methodology

As with previous surveys, the 2021 CLiK survey was conducted using a self-completion questionnaire. Given that the survey sought to capture sensitive health information from individuals, a self-completion approach is the most appropriate methodology.

In the last iteration of this survey, run in 2016, participants could complete the survey by either filling in a paper questionnaire, which was sent to a random sample of households in Kirklees, or alternatively could complete it online using the internet link and login details provided on the cover letter. The same core approach was deployed in 2021 but was also supplemented by open access channels to maximise the reach of the survey.

The three core strands of the methodology were as follows:

- A random sample of 43,000 Kirklees residential addresses, stratified by deprivation quintiles. All sampled households received an initial survey invitation by post plus a reminder. In all of the reminder communications a full paper questionnaire was provided to ensure that participation was not reliant on internet access/digital competence.
- An open access online survey for non-sampled households. This link was promoted by Kirklees Council and partner organisations.
- Local promotion of the survey by Community Champions to aid engagement among minority communities. Community Champions had access to the open online survey as well as their own printed copies of the survey to share.

In order to encourage participation, the following steps were taken:

- All survey communications provided a clear information on the value of taking part including how previous CLiK survey data had been used to identify needs and shape service delivery across Kirklees.
- A statement was provided covering the confidentiality of survey responses and how M·E·L Research, as an independent research agency, protects this.
- Signposting to support via a freephone helpline and dedicated email address was included in the survey invite letter.
- Translated text in seven languages (Urdu, Polish, Hungarian, Gujarati, Kurdish, Arabic, Punjabi) was also included in the survey invite letter explaining how language support could be accessed.

- A prize draw to win £150 of shopping vouchers, supplied by M·E·L Research was offered to residents. A choice to opt in or out of this prize draw was provided at the end of the survey, with the winner selected at random in February 2022 following the finalisation of the dataset.

Similar to the 2016 survey, multiple people from the same household could complete the CLiK 2021 survey and this was encouraged on communications. Multiple responses from households in the targeted, postal sample were treated as separate individual responses when reporting the results. The final dataset includes a flag showing where responses were received from the same household, allowing additional analysis to be conducted at household level. This method was only applied to the targeted, postal sample as geographical household information was not obtained through the open link or community champion channels.

Data collection took place between 1<sup>st</sup> November and 17<sup>th</sup> December 2021. Reminder communications were sent in the week commencing 22<sup>nd</sup> November.

All responses were processed and checked by M.E.L Research, while the majority of the analysis will be conducted by Kirklees Council.

# Sampling and Distribution

## Sampling

A sample of 43,000 addresses was drawn from the Royal Mail's Postal Address File, which is considered the most complete list of residential addresses available. Please note that the sampling frame used for CLiK 2016 was the local Land and Property Gazetteer held by Kirklees Council. The core sampling approach was a stratified random sample. This was designed to produce robust results at subdistrict and socio-demographic group level to inform the commissioning, planning and provision of local services.

Since health inequality is associated with level of deprivation, the sampling frame was designed to ensure robust results from those living across Kirklees. The sampling approach used the 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) to categorise all Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) by levels of deprivation. The LSOAs were then divided into quintiles which were the basis of the sampling outlined below in Table 1. In the absence of recent data on response rate rates from Kirklees, no oversampling of deprived areas was applied. The anticipated response rate to the postal survey as 15-20%, but as shown in Table 1, the range of response rate per deprivation quintile was 9%-15%.

**Table 1: Sample stratification**

Level of deprivation	Count of Kirklees households in the quintile	% distribution	No of households selected per quintile	% distribution	Responses from sampled addresses	Response rate
Quintile 1 - most deprived	56,755	30%	12,943	30%	12,943	9%
Quintile 2	40,915	22%	9,327	22%	9,327	13%
Quintile 3	33,101	18%	7,551	18%	7,551	11%
Quintile 4	38,419	20%	8,757	20%	8,757	14%
Quintile 5 - least deprived	19,399	10%	4,422	10%	4,422	15%
Total	188,589	100%	43,000	100%	5141	12%

## Distribution

The printed materials distributed to the sampled addresses were a mixture of a 'push-to-web' letter invite and a full paper questionnaire.

In the initial mailing, addresses within the least deprived quintiles (3, 4 and 5) were sent a letter encouraging online participation in the CLiK survey. This was on the basis that push-to-web letters of this nature is more prevalent within research, with those living in less deprived quintiles less likely to be digitally excluded (i.e., are able to access the internet) and more likely to have high digital competence and confidence to allow participation online. Online survey access was provided both through a printed link and via a QR code. Those who lived in quintiles 1 and 2 were provided with the same means of participating in the survey, along with a full 16-page printed questionnaire and freepost return envelope.

Midway through the survey period, a reminder was sent to all addresses in the targeted sample where a completed survey had not been registered (either online or via a paper return). All such reminders contained a full printed questionnaire, irrespective of whether that address had received a printed questionnaire in the initial mailing. This was to ensure that all sampled addresses were provided the means by which they could participate in an offline manner.



# Data processing

The total number of completed surveys per channel are summarised in table 2 below. Please note that some of the activity of Community Champions would have driven participation via the online open link and as such, those responses have not been captured separately.

**Table 2: Achieved sample by participation channel**

Response channel	N	%
Pre sampled postal return	4,085	66%
Pre sampled online return	1,075 <sup>1</sup>	17%
Online open survey	949	15%
Community Champion paper return	99	2%
Total	6,208	100%

A response rate of 12% (5,160 completions) was achieved from the targeted, pre-sampled addresses via postal or online completion. In 2016, the overall response rate for the CLiK survey was 20%. Should this downwards trend continue, careful consideration will be needed regarding the methodology to be utilised in the next iteration of this research.

## Booking-in

In the pre-selected sample, each household was allocated a unique survey number to allow responses to be linked back to information on geography and deprivation.

Once completed, questionnaires were returned to M·E·L Research, envelopes were opened and questionnaires collated and prepared for data entry. Barcodes of the unique survey number were scanned to register the questionnaires as received.

Questionnaires were manually data entered with at least 5% of the volume received back checked using a double entry method to ensure the quality of the data inputting. Data was input in batches. Where any data inputting anomalies were identified this resulted in a further back checking of the other surveys within that batch. Overall, 7% of the questionnaires were double data entered and an error rate of 0.17% was recorded, meeting our 0.2% error rate quality standard.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that there is a discrepancy between the sum of the pre-sampled returns in Table 2 and the quintile based returns in Table 1. This is because some respondents removed the identifying ID number and barcode from the paper survey they returned, thus preventing allocation of this return to a quintile.

## Data Cleaning

In the online survey any respondents who had reached the end screen of the survey but had failed to press the submit button were treated as a complete. However, partially completed surveys did not form part of the dataset.

A series of logic checks and inputting ranges were inbuilt into the online surveys. These were replicated in the inputting script through which the paper-based responses were captured.

In addition, the following approaches were taken in cleaning the dataset.

- Where respondents should have skipped a question, but an answer was provided, these responses are excluded from the analysis.
- Where multiple options were coded in a single response question, the second answer provided was entered to provide consistency - removing any choice on this from the data entry executive.
- For the questions that required text or numeric entry e.g., height, weight, age, units of alcohol, physical activity etc, the data collected was subject to further visual checks, with obvious outlier cases excluded where required. For example, in the height data a response height of 66cm was excluded. A further 2 cases gave a single digit for height in cm. These were also excluded.

A free-text response of “prefer to self-describe” was available within the gender identity question. This was included to ensure that the survey provided respondents with the opportunity to communicate their gender identify in language they felt was appropriate. As just 21 respondents gave this response no further coding of these responses has been applied.

## Data weighting

Weights were applied to the final data to adjust imbalances in the demographic profile of survey respondents. Weightings were based on following four variables:

- Age within ward for six age bands (16-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75+);
- Gender within ward;
- Ethnicity within ward (White and South Asian and non-South Asian BME); and
- The distribution of the Kirklees population between the 23 ward areas.

The profile of the Kirklees population was drawn from 2020 mid-year population estimates and 2011 Census data. The Census was used for the ethnicity weighing given that more recent data on this aspect of the population is not available at the ward level required.

M·E·L Research first weighted the data by age, gender and ethnicity within each of the 23 wards in Kirklees – these were then balanced by ward size in accordance with population distribution across Kirklees. Weighting was capped at 5.0 to avoid extreme weights being applied. Where a ward was unknown (which was a possible outcome in the open survey channels) an average of the Kirklees weights was applied. The same principle applied to cases where any of the age, gender and ethnicity information was unknown.

The following tables shows the overall impact of the weighting by age, gender and ethnicity on the profile of responses received:

**Table 3 Sample Profile**

Gender	Unweighted	Unweighted	Weighted	Weighted
	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Total</b>	6,087	100%	5,966	100%
Male	2,434	40%	2,864	48%
Female	3,632	60%	3,084	52%
Transgender	11	0%	10	0%
Prefer to self-describe	21	0%	21	0%

Age	Unweighted	Unweighted	Weighted	Weighted
	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Total</b>	5,905	100%	5,787	100%
16 - 17	20	0%	40	1%
18 - 24	152	3%	383	7%
25 - 34	409	7%	1,195	21%
35 - 44	637	11%	938	16%
45 - 54	852	14%	1,013	18%
55 - 64	1,216	21%	897	15%
65 - 74	1,475	25%	723	13%
75+	1,144	19%	597	10%

Ethnicity	Unweighted	Unweighted	Weighted	Weighted
	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Total</b>	6,098	100%	5,976	100%
White: English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	5,220	86%	4,632	77%
White: Irish	40	1%	37	1%
White: Gypsy or Irish traveller	1	0%	1	0%
White: Roma	0	0%	0	0%
White: Eastern European	39	1%	61	1%
White: Any other White background	79	1%	97	2%
Asian / Asian British: Indian	164	3%	304	5%
Asian / Asian British: Pakistani	257	4%	551	9%
Asian / Asian British: Bangladeshi	8	0%	18	0%
Asian / Asian British: Chinese	10	0%	12	0%
Asian / Asian British: Kashmiri	10	0%	13	0%
Asian / Asian British: Any other Asian background	27	0%	31	1%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British: African	32	1%	32	1%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British: Caribbean	82	1%	64	1%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British: Any other Black / African / Caribbean background	16	0%	12	0%
Mixed / multiple ethnic groups: White and Black Caribbean	33	1%	38	1%
Mixed / multiple ethnic groups: White and Black African	6	0%	6	0%
Mixed / multiple ethnic groups: White and Asian	19	0%	17	0%
Mixed / multiple ethnic groups: Any other Mixed / multiple ethnic background	15	0%	15	0%
Other ethnic groups: Arab	17	0%	21	0%
Other ethnic groups: Other ethnic group	23	0%	17	0%

Ward (where known)	<i>Unweighted Count</i>	Unweighted %	<i>Weighted Count</i>	Weighted %
<b>Total</b>	6,013	100%	5,893	100%
Ashbrow	261	4%	274	5%
Batley East	186	3%	227	4%
Batley West	194	3%	277	5%
Birstall and Birkenshaw	253	4%	226	4%
Cleckheaton	228	4%	226	4%
Dalton	238	4%	227	4%
Denby Dale	302	5%	232	4%
Dewsbury East	193	3%	264	4%
Dewsbury South	180	3%	250	4%
Dewsbury West	163	3%	287	5%
Golcar	275	5%	247	4%
Greenhead	302	5%	285	5%
Heckmondwike	209	3%	232	4%
Holme Valley South	346	6%	268	5%
Lindley	353	6%	288	5%
Liversedge and Gomersal	223	4%	265	4%
Mirfield	353	6%	277	5%
Newsome	322	5%	329	6%
Almondbury	303	5%	249	4%
Colne Valley	348	6%	245	4%
Crosland Moor and Netherton	229	4%	260	4%
Holme Valley North	288	5%	236	4%
Kirkburton	264	4%	224	4%

## Data overcodes

For reference, table 4 below outlines the definitions for some of the more complex derived variables that are included in the individual-level SPSS dataset.

**Table 4: data overcodes summary**

Overall heading	Column heading in dataset	Definitions
Life satisfaction (ONS wellbeing metric)	Low	Q4a (0-4)
	Medium	Q4a (5-6)
	High	Q4a (7-8)
	Very High	Q4a (9-10)
Things in life are worthwhile (ONS wellbeing metric)	Low	Q4b (0-4)
	Medium	Q4b (5-6)
	High	Q4b (7-8)
Happy yesterday (ONS wellbeing metric)	Low	Q4c (0-4)
	Medium	Q4c (5-6)
	High	Q4c (7-8)
	Very High	Q4c (9-10)
Anxious yesterday (ONS wellbeing metric)	Very Low	Q4d (0-1)
	Low	Q4d (2-3)
	Medium	Q4d (4-5)
	High	Q4d (6-10)
SWEMWBS raw score	SWEMWBS raw score	Calculated from Q5a-g (must have answered all 7 questions)
SWEMWBS metric score	SWEMWBS metric score	Derived from raw score using lookup table
SWEMWBS grouping	Low	Raw score 7-21 (rounded metric score 7-19.3)
	Medium	Raw score 22-30 (rounded metric score 19.4-27)
	High	Raw score 31-35 (rounded metric score 28.1-35)

Health condition: Reduced ability to perform daily activities	Yes, a lot/a little	Q6b/1&2
	No	Q6b/3
Confidence managing own health	Confident	Q7/3&4
	Not confident	Q7/1&2
Any long-term condition	Yes	Q8a/Any response (1-23)
	No	Q8a/None of the above (code 24)
Any long-term condition affecting daily life	Yes	Q8b/Affects daily life a lot or affects daily life a little (1-23)
	No	Q8a/None of the above (code 24) OR Q8b/Does not affect daily life (1-23)
Grouped long-term conditions	Any mental health condition	Q8a (2-6)
	Respiratory	Q8a (7,11)
	Cardiovascular	Q8a (13-15)
	Pain	Q8a (16-17)
Number of long-term conditions	0	Q8a/None of the above (code 24)
	1	Q8a/Any one response (1-23)
	2	Q8a/Any two responses (1-23)
	3+	Q8a/Any three or more responses (1-23)
Number of long-term conditions affecting daily life	0	Q8a/None of the above (code 24) OR Q8b/Does not affect daily life (1-23)
	1	Q8b/Any one response in affects a lot or affects a little columns (1-23)
	2	Q8b/Any two responses in affects a lot or affects a little columns (1-23)
	3+	Q8b/Any three or more responses in affects a lot or affects a little columns (1-23)
Daily life affected by long term condition	It affects my daily life a lot/a little	Q8b/1&2
	Does not affect daily life	Q8b/3
Meeting physical activity guidelines (Under 19s)	Yes	Age under 19 (Q57) and (Q29/1 + 29/2) >=420
	No	Age under 19 (Q57) and (Q29/1 + 29/2) <420
Meeting physical activity guidelines (Adults 19+)	Yes	Age 19+ (Q57) and combination of Q29/1 and Q29/2 that yields total >=150 (where Q29/2 counts double Q29/1)

	No	Age 19+ (Q57) and combination of Q29/1 and Q29/2 that yields total <150 (where Q29/2 counts double Q29/1)
Unhealthy behaviours	Count (0-5)	Count how many of the following: Current smoker (Q38a/4&5) Drink above recommended level (Q37b >=15) Don't meet recommended exercise levels (Age 19+ (Q57) and combination of Q29/1 and Q29/2 that yields total <150 (where Q29/2 counts double Q29/1) OR Age under 19 (Q57) and (Q29/1 + 29/2) <420 ) Unlikely to eat 5+ fruit and veg (Q33/1&2) Drug use (Q40a (2-5))
Experienced discrimination (last 12 months)	Yes	Q47/ Any 'Yes' response
	No/Not sure	Q47/ All 'No'/'Not sure' responses
Loneliness	Never/hardly ever	Q48/1&2
	Occasionally/some of the time	Q48/3&4
	Often/always	Q48/5
Overcrowded	Yes	Q54/1-5 total divided by Q52 where answer is >1
	No	Q54/1-5 total divided by Q52 where answer is =<1
Locality	Batley and Spen	Derived from Wards: Cleckheaton, Heckmondwike, Liversedge and Gomersal, Birstall & Birkenshaw, Batley East, Batley West
	Dewsbury and Mirfield	Derived from Wards: Dewsbury East, Dewsbury South, Dewsbury West, Mirfield
	Huddersfield	Derived from Wards: Almondbury, Ashbrow, Crosland Moor and Netherton, Dalton, Greenhead, Newsome, Lindley
	Kirklees Rural	Derived from Wards: Colne valley, Denby Dale, Golcar, Holme Valley North, Holme Valley South, Kirkburton



Kirklees Places (7)	Batley, Birstall and Birkenshaw	Derived from Wards: Birstall & Birkenshaw, Batley East, Batley West
	Colne Valley	Derived from Wards: Colne Valley, Golcar, Lindley
	Dewsbury	Derived from Wards: Dewsbury East, Dewsbury South, Dewsbury West
	Huddersfield Central	Derived from Wards: Almondbury, Dalton, Newsome
	Huddersfield North	Derived from Wards: Ashbrow, Crosland Moor and Netherton, Greenhead
	Huddersfield Rural	Derived from Wards: Denby Dale, Holme Valley North, Holme Valley South, Kirkburton
	Spen Valley	Derived from Wards: Cleckheaton, Heckmondwike, Liversedge and Gomersal, Mirfield
Economically active	Economically Active	Q22a/1,2,4,5,6,9
	Economically Inactive	Q22a/3,7,8,10,11,12,13
BMI (excluding pregnant)	Underweight	Q58 & Q59 calculation = <18.5; do not calculate if Q60/1
	Healthy weight	Q58 & Q59 calculation = 18.5-24.9; do not calculate if Q60/1
	Overweight	Q58 & Q59 calculation = 25-29.9; do not calculate if Q60/1
	Obese	Q58 & Q59 calculation = 30-39.9; do not calculate if Q60/1
	Very obese	Q58 & Q59 calculation = 40+; do not calculate if Q60/1
	Any overweight	Q58 & Q59 calculation = 25+; do not calculate if Q60/1
	Any obese	Q58 & Q59 calculation = 30+; do not calculate if Q60/1
Child in household below £30k income (relative poverty)	Yes	Q54/1-3 = 1+ AND Q25/(1-3)
	No	Q54/1-3 = 1+ AND Q25/(4-8)

