

## Methodology

### Leeds Financial Inclusion, 2018

This research was conducted as a face-to-face interviewer administered survey completed between 9<sup>th</sup> March and 11<sup>th</sup> May 2018. In total 922 individuals took part in the survey, with 602 of these being within areas classified as ‘deprived’ and 320 as a counter-sample of areas classified as ‘economically average’. Management of the face-to-face data collection, and the fieldwork itself, was carried out by Qa Research, a York-based social research agency.

The deprived sample was designed to replicate the sample areas from the 2004 and 2011 research in order to allow comparison over time. These ‘bespoke’ areas typically covered parts of several Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) that were in the 10% (and in some cases 1%) most deprived in the country. Whilst it was acknowledged that the make-up of these areas and levels of various types of deprivation may have changed in the 14 years since the 2004 survey, analysis of these LSOAs in the 2015 Index of Multiple Deprivation showed that all remained within the 10% most deprived in England. In addition, the need for data comparability meant that the same areas were chosen once again. These bespoke areas were;

- **Holbeck**; area south of the city and north of the M621 motorway; this area was bounded by Nineveh Road in the east and Domestic Road in the north.
- **Little London**; area bounded by Clay Pit Lane in the south, Meanwood Road in the north east, Leicester Place / Blenheim Grove in the south west and Crave Place in the north.
- **Lincoln Green**: area around Lincoln Green Road and area to east of Becketts Street but south of Shakespeare Street.
- **Harehills**: area bounded by Harehills Lane in the east, Harehills Avenue in the north, Spencer Place in the west and Bayswater Road/Ashley Road in the south.
- **Gipton**: area around St Wilfred’s Grove;
- **South Farms Road**: area around South Farms Road bounded in north by Caldecote Drive and in south by Gipton Approach
- **Seacroft**: area to south west of Parklands
- **Halton Moor**: part of the estate south of Neville Road
- **Richmond Hill**: area just to the west of East End Park, south of York Road, north of railway line and bounded in the west by Pontefract Lane
- **Beeston Hill**: bounded in east by Dewsbury Road, in north by Hunslet Hall Road, to west by Tempest Road and to south by Trentham Street
- **Belle Isle**, the area around Belle Isle Circus.

The sample collected within these areas was designed to be representative based on data from the 2011 Census. Whilst data from the Census was nearly seven years old at the time of surveying, this was the only data source that allowed us to look at the key sampling criteria (age, gender, ethnic origin, and employment status) at an individual LSOA level and thus compile a sample frame specific to each bespoke area. Interviewers were given quotas based on gender, age, ethnic origin and employment status.

The economically average sample was not conducted in the 2004 survey and was first carried out in the 2011 survey. As with the deprived sample, the same areas from 2011 were replicated to ensure data comparability. These areas were based on Middle Super Output Areas, and were;

- **Upper Armley**, all the MSOA, the area is bounded by Stanningley Road to the north, a railway line to the south, Wortley Road and Armley Ridge to the east and the area of New Scarborough to the west
- **Yeadon** (Henshaws, Southway and Westfields) the area to the north and to the west of Yeadon Town Centre
- **Oakwood and Gipton Wood**: the area bounded by Easterly Road, Roundhay Road, Oakwood Lane, Oakwood Grange Lane and North Grove Rise
- **Middleton Heritage Village, Robin Hood South, Lofthouse and Thorpe**

As with the deprived sample, a sample frame for the economically average areas was based on the 2011 Census. Quotas were again set on age, gender, ethnic origin, and employment status.

The target sample and completed number of surveys for the both the deprived and economically average sample can be seen in the tables overleaf.

For reference, the LSOAs and MSOAs that each area was sampled from were as follows. Note that the bespoke areas described on the previous page do *not* encompass the entirety of the LSOAs / MSOAs below and interviewing was contained within the boundaries described.

Deprived Sample		Economically Average Sample	
Sample point	LSOA	Sample point	MSOA
Beeston Hill	Leeds 085A	Upper Armley	Leeds 010
Beeston Hill	Leeds 085B	Yeadon (Henshaws, Southway, Westfields)	Leeds 037
Beeston Hill	Leeds 085C	Oakwood and Gipton Wood	Leeds 067
Beeston Hill	Leeds 086A	Rothwell	Leeds 098
Beeston Hill	Leeds 086C	Middleton, Robin Hood S, Lofthouse, Thorpe	Leeds 105
Belle Isle	Leeds 092C		
Belle Isle	Leeds 092D		
Gipton	Leeds 047B		
Gipton	Leeds 047C		
Halton Moor	Leeds 072D		
Harehills	Leeds 048A		
Harehills	Leeds 048B		
Harehills	Leeds 048C		
Harehills	Leeds 048D		
Harehills	Leeds 053D		
Harehills	Leeds 064B		
Holbeck	Leeds 082A		
Holbeck	Leeds 082C		
Lincoln Green	Leeds 064A		
Lincoln Green	Leeds 064E		
Lincoln Green	Leeds 064F		
Lincoln Green	Leeds 065D		
Little London	Leeds 055B		
Richmond Hill	Leeds 070C		
Richmond Hill	Leeds 075B		
Seacroft	Leeds 050A		
Seacroft	Leeds 050D		
South Farm Road	Leeds 060C		
South Farm Road	Leeds 060D		

### Deprived Sample - target

Sample point	Total	Age 18-34	Age 35-54	Age 55+	Males	Females	White	BME	Employed	Unemployed	Economically inactive
Beeston Hill	85	35	28	22	45	40	55	30	39	10	36
Belle Isle	15	6	6	4	7	8	13	2	7	2	6
Gipton	35	14	13	8	16	19	18	17	17	4	14
Halton Moor	50	18	17	14	23	27	42	8	23	5	22
Harehills	95	46	33	16	49	46	25	70	45	12	39
Holbeck	75	31	28	16	40	35	54	21	38	9	28
Lincoln Green	60	26	19	14	33	27	34	26	31	6	23
Little London	50	22	17	10	22	28	28	22	24	5	21
Richmond Hill	45	18	16	11	21	24	38	7	26	5	15
Seacroft	45	20	17	8	18	27	41	4	21	6	19
South Farm Road	45	13	15	16	21	24	38	7	21	4	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>243</b>

*\*due to rounding error, some totals may not sum correctly*

### Deprived Sample – achieved

Sample point	Total	Age 18-34	Age 35-54	Age 55+	Males	Females	White	BME	Employed	Unemployed	Economically inactive
Beeston Hill	84	26	35	23	41	43	64	20	37	11	36
Belle Isle	15	6	5	4	8	7	13	2	6	1	8
Gipton	35	10	19	6	11	24	19	16	18	0	17
Halton Moor	49	20	16	13	21	28	44	5	22	5	22
Harehills	96	31	28	37	42	54	41	55	30	8	58
Holbeck	75	27	36	12	35	40	55	20	29	8	38
Lincoln Green	57	21	18	18	33	24	30	27	24	8	25
Little London	50	22	18	10	22	28	30	20	24	5	21
Richmond Hill	49	21	16	12	20	29	40	9	17	4	28
Seacroft	45	18	17	10	16	29	41	4	18	7	20
South Farm Road	47	16	16	15	22	25	35	12	21	6	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>293</b>

### Economically Average Sample – target

Sample point	Total	Age 18-34	Age 35-54	Age 55+	Males	Females	White	BME	Employed	Unemployed	Economically inactive
Oakwood /Gipton Wood	75	22	26	27	36	39	48	27	42	3	29
Upper Armley	75	27	26	22	38	37	68	7	48	4	22
Rothwell	75	17	27	31	35	40	73	2	43	3	29
Yeadon	75	20	27	28	35	40	73	2	44	3	28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>108</b>

*\*due to rounding error, some totals may not sum correctly*

### Economically Average Sample – achieved

Sample point	Total	Age 18-34	Age 35-54	Age 55+	Males	Females	White	BME	Employed	Unemployed	Economically inactive
Oakwood /Gipton Wood	90	23	33	34	42	48	63	27	55	4	31
Upper Armley	75	23	24	28	35	40	72	3	40	3	32
Rothwell	75	15	24	36	30	45	74	1	37	1	37
Yeadon	80	17	24	39	36	44	79	1	30	4	46
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>146</b>

**NB:** The target sample for the economically average research was originally 300, however due to difficulty in sampling the BME and Employed categories 20 additional 'boosted' surveys were completed in order to lessen variation from the population.

### **Weighting the data**

In order to correct for slight variation from the target sample and ensure that data was comparable over time, the 2018 deprived sample data was weighted to the profile of the 2011 Census by age and employment, and also to the tenure profile of the 2004 survey (the 2011 data was also weighted by the latter metric). Of the three economically deprived datasets presented in this report, each was weighted (or not) as follows;

- 2004 – not weighted
- 2011 – weighted by housing tenure only to profile of the 2004 data
- 2018 – weighted to 2011 Census profile based on age and employment, and to the tenure profile of the 2004 survey

The 2018 economically average sample was also weighted to correct for minor variation and bring it in line with the profile of the 2011 Census. Weighting was as follows:

- 2011 – not weighted
- 2018 – weighted to the profile of the 2011 Census based on gender, age, ethnicity, and employment

### **Data confidence**

Based on the 18+ population of the LSOAs that the deprived sample is derived from (31,786 at the 2011 Census), the sample of 602 had a standard error of no more than +/-3.96% at the 95% confidence level. Note that as not all the LSOAs were included in the bespoke areas the actual population will be lower and therefore the standard error smaller.

With an 18+ population of 29,122 (at the 2011 Census) the economically average sample of 320 surveys had a standard error of no more than +/-5.45% at the 95% confidence level. This falls slightly outside the benchmark for *statistically robust* data (+/-5.0%) and therefore the results of this sample should be considered indicative rather than representative.