



Ipsos MORI  
Social Research Institute

August 2018

# Taking Part Year 13 (2017/18)

Technical Report

Ipsos MORI



# Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Background, including aims and objectives .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Role of Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research.....	2
<b>Summary of outputs .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Structure of the technical report.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Sample design .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Survey population .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Change in sample design.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Sampling frame.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Reviewing the stratification variables and selecting the Primary Sampling Units (PSUs).....</b>	<b>6</b>
Review of stratification variables.....	6
Selection of new Primary Sampling Units (PSUs).....	6
Allocation of Primary Sampling Units to sample month .....	7
<b>Selection of addresses.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Selection of individuals.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Changes to the number of addresses issued per Primary Sampling Unit during Year 13 .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaire development and design.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Overview of questionnaires .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaire development .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Overview of the structure of the questionnaires.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Adult questionnaire.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Household information.....	11
Socialisation.....	11
Free time activities, TV and computer games .....	12
Arts participation .....	12
Arts attendance.....	12
Museums and galleries.....	12
Libraries.....	12
Archives.....	12
Heritage.....	13
Walking, cycling and sports participation .....	13
Digital activities.....	13
Volunteering and charitable giving.....	13

Community cohesion and belonging.....	13
Attitudes to the arts and historic buildings.....	13
News 13	
First World War centenary commemorations.....	13
Subjective well-being .....	14
Demographics .....	14
Invitation to join the web panel .....	14
<b>Youth questionnaire .....</b>	<b>14</b>
School and school year .....	14
Screening questions .....	14
Sport and physical activity .....	15
Well-being .....	15
Demographics .....	15
Invitation to join the web panel .....	16
National Pupil Database linkage .....	16
<b>Child questionnaire .....</b>	<b>16</b>
School and school year .....	16
Screening questions .....	16
Sport and physical activity .....	17
Demographics .....	17
National Pupil Database linkage .....	17
<b>Fieldwork .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Fieldwork procedures.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Advance letter and leaflet.....	18
Selection instrument.....	18
Selection procedure for youths/children.....	19
Parental permission rules.....	19
Documents .....	19
Minority languages .....	20
Changes to documents during Year 13 .....	21
Web panel recruitment.....	21
National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage handouts.....	22
<b>Pilot 22</b>	
<b>Briefings .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Fieldwork dates and fieldwork management.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Supervision and quality control .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Maximising response .....</b>	<b>25</b>

Incentives .....	25
Calling pattern .....	25
Reissues .....	25
In year review of fieldwork performance .....	27
<b>Fieldwork outcomes .....</b>	<b>27</b>
Adult sample .....	28
Youth sample .....	31
Child sample .....	32
<b>Web panel recruitment .....</b>	<b>33</b>
Adult sample .....	33
Youth sample .....	37
<b>National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage consent rates .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Interview lengths .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Data processing and outputs .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Coding open-ended questions .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Variable naming.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>SPSS outputs: interim data set .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>SPSS outputs: Annual datasets .....</b>	<b>45</b>
Adult dataset.....	45
Child dataset.....	45
Half-yearly adult dataset .....	46
<b>Data checking process and quality checking .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Taking Part Statistical Release.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Weighting .....</b>	<b>49</b>
Stage 1: Household weights .....	49
Stage 2: Adult / youth / child calibration weights .....	49

## List of Tables

<b>Table 2.1: Number of primary sampling units issued by sample month by former Government Office Region</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Table 2.2: Number of addresses issued by sample month</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Table 4.1: Documents used for Year 13 Taking Part fieldwork, and their purpose</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Table 4.2: Fieldwork dates for each sample month</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Table 4.3: Outcome codes eligible for reissue</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>Table 4.4: Reissue analysis</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Table 4.5: Fieldwork outcomes (adult sample)</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Table 4.6: Fieldwork response rates by former Government Office Region (adult sample)</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Table 4.7: Fieldwork outcomes (youth sample)</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Table 4.8: Fieldwork outcomes (child sample)</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Table 4.9: Adult web panel recruitment analysis</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>Table 4.10: Adult web panel recruitment analysis</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>Table 4.11: Adult web panel population profile</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Table 4.12: Youth web panel recruitment analysis</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Table 4.13: Youth web panel recruitment analysis</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Table 4.14: Youth web panel population profile</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Table 4.15: Consent rates for National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<b>Table 4.16: Adult interview lengths</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>Table 4.17: Youth and child interview lengths</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>Table 5.1: Statistical spreadsheets produced for the full dataset</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>Table 5.2: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: counts</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>Table 5.3: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: percentages</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>Table 5.4: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by age group and gender: counts and percentages</b> .....	<b>51</b>

# Introduction

## Background, including aims and objectives

Taking Part is the flagship survey of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). It collects data on many aspects of leisure, cultural and sporting participation in England, and these data are used to produce four key measures to assist the monitoring of the Department's performance. These are the percentage of adults in England who have:

- engaged in arts;
- visited a heritage site;
- visited a museum or gallery; and
- used a public library service.

In addition, the survey also collects a wide range of other related data, covering:

- satisfaction and enjoyment with culture and sport;
- engagement with culture and sport whilst growing up;
- volunteering;
- internet use;
- charitable donations;
- TV, radio and newspaper consumption; and
- public attitudes towards the First World War Centenary Commemorations.

Taking Part is mainly funded by DCMS, but it is also part funded by a number of the Department's partner organisations, these being Sport England, Historic England and the Arts Council England.

Taking Part was first commissioned in 2005 as an annual face-to-face household survey of 28,000 adults (aged 16+) in England. From 2006, a randomly selected child aged 11 to 15 was also interviewed in applicable households. In 2008/09, the child survey was broadened to cover 5 to 10 year olds, with data collected by proxy interviews with the responding adults.

Since Year 8 (2012/13), longitudinal data<sup>1</sup> have been collected to better understand the ways in which engagement with culture and sport changes at the individual level and how life events can help or hinder participation. The first analysis of these data was published in July 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> Year 8 was the first year that some respondents were re-interviewed so the Taking Part web panel contains some respondents interviewed for the first time in Year 7 (2011/12).

In 2012 Taking Part was assessed against the standards set out in the Code of Practice for Official Statistics by the UK Statistics Authority and retained National Statistics status. The procedures used to gather and process the Taking Part data are compliant with the Code of Practice for Statistics.

Since Taking Part was first commissioned it has been running on a continuous basis. In March 2016, DCMS published *Taking Part: the next five years<sup>2</sup>* which set out the two main aims of the survey:

1. to provide robust time series data to monitor participation and the activity of the general population; and
2. to provide data which allow DCMS to understand the reasons for participation and behaviour change.

The 2017/18 survey is the thirteenth year of fieldwork.

### Role of Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research

In December 2015, Ipsos MORI, in partnership with NatCen Social Research, won the Taking Part contract for the survey years 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/2019, with the potential for an extension for a further two years. Ipsos MORI are the lead contractor in the consortium but Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research are very much equal partners in this endeavour.

There will be considerable changes to the Taking Part survey over this period, including modernisation of the way data are collected, updates to the questionnaire content and design of new products to help users access and analyse Taking Part data. Further detail about these changes can be found in *Taking Part: the next five years*. Having achieved a smooth transition from the previous contractor during Year 12 of Taking Part, our aim for Year 13 was to make a number of significant improvements to the survey design and procedures.

This report covers the second year of our contract – the thirteenth year of face-to-face fieldwork covering 2017/18. Whereas for Year 12 of Taking Part the face-to-face fieldwork aimed to fulfil the two main aims set out above, in Year 13 the face-to-face fieldwork aimed only to achieve the first of these. Thus for Year 13, the face-to-face data collection aimed to estimate the **proportion of people** taking part in leisure, cultural and sporting activities in England, by collecting data face-to-face from a nationally representative cross-sectional sample of adults (16+), youths (aged 11-15) and children (aged 5-10).

During Year 12 we implemented the decision to continue the longitudinal data collection by web interviewing. Thus the face-to-face fieldwork no longer aimed to identify the **reasons for changes** in adults, youth and child participation in leisure, cultural and sporting activities in England over time.

Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research each take responsibility for delivering half of the face-to-face fieldwork in any survey year. The other responsibilities of the Taking Part contract are divided between the organisations. Ipsos MORI are responsible for:

- sampling;
- weighting;

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/511407/The\\_Future\\_of\\_Taking\\_Part\\_-\\_FINAL\\_29032016.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/511407/The_Future_of_Taking_Part_-_FINAL_29032016.pdf).



- questionnaire scripting; and
- web panel development and fieldwork.

NatCen Social Research are responsible for:

- questionnaire development;
- questionnaire testing; and
- data processing and outputs.

## Summary of outputs

A number of key outputs from the 2017/18 survey were produced. These are outlined below:

- **Three SPSS datasets.** These datasets were delivered to the Taking Part team at DCMS, of which two (edited versions) are being prepared for the UK Data Archive:
  - (for DCMS and the UK Data Archive) An adult cross-sectional dataset containing questionnaire data from interviewed adults (aged 16 or over) from the sample who were interviewed in 2017/18.
  - (for DCMS and the UK Data Archive) A child cross-sectional dataset containing questionnaire data from all youths and children (aged 5-15) from the sample who were interviewed in 2017/18.
  - (for DCMS) An interim adult cross-sectional dataset containing questionnaire data from interviewed adults (aged 16 or over) from the sample who were interviewed from 10 April 2017 to 30 September 2017.
- **Technical report:** Published on the Taking Part website, containing details of survey design, fieldwork, questionnaire development, the web panel recruitment and data processing.
- **Taking Part 2017/18 quarter 2 statistical release.** Tables published on the Taking Part website for adults only (aged 16 or over), consisting of headline measures and time series for the arts, heritage, museums and galleries, libraries, archives, digital participation and the First World War Centenary Commemorations. Reports and visualisations produced by DCMS were also published.
- **Taking Part 2017/18 quarter 4 statistical release.** Tables published on the Taking Part website for adults (aged 16 or over) and children (aged 5-15), consisting of headline measures with demographic and area level breakdowns for the arts, heritage, museums and galleries, libraries, archives, digital participation, volunteering and charitable giving, TV viewing and First World War, Reports and visualisations produced by DCMS were also published.

## Structure of the technical report

This report documents the technical aspects of the 2017/18 Taking Part face-to-face survey. The report is structured as follows:

- Chapter two provides a description of key features of the sample design.

- Chapter three focuses on the 2017/18 adult, youth and child questionnaires.
- Chapter four covers fieldwork including all fieldwork and management procedures and a summary of fieldwork performance.
- Chapter five covers data processing and outputs, including weighting.

The report has been written by members of the project team – Nicholas Gilby (Project Director, Ipsos MORI), Kevin Pickering (Head of Statistics, Ipsos MORI), Mari Toomse-Smith (Project Director, NatCen Social Research), Liz Fuller (former Project Director, NatCen Social Research) and Pete Dangerfield (Senior researcher, NatCen Social Research).

## Acknowledgements

We wish to thank, first of all, all those who welcomed interviewers into their homes and gave up their time to be interviewed. We should also like to acknowledge the commitment and professionalism of the interviewers who worked on the survey throughout the year, on whom the survey's success depends.

We should like to thank all those colleagues who contributed to the survey, including Sam Clemens, Stephan Tietz, Jessica Bultitude, Darren Fisher, Vanessa Fiorentini, Jackie Rayner, Duncan Peskett, Darren Thickpenny, Alan Nicholas, Alun Humphrey, Hollie Jones, Caroline Brouwer, Thomas Leach, Nikki Leftly, Dan Philo, Richard Boreham, Tahmineh Hendron, Simon Holroyd, Sophie Ainsby, Minesh Patel, Hannah Bridges, Julie Weaver, Elaine James, Ruxandra Comanaru, Steve Edwards and Alessio Fiacco.

We would also like to thank those we worked closely with at DCMS: Olivia Christophersen, Alison Reynolds and Alex Björkegren. We are also grateful for the support provided by Sport England, Historic England and the Arts Council England.

# Sample design

## Introduction

Taking Part uses a random probability sampling methodology. As is common in high-quality face-to-face surveys of the general population, for Taking Part a multi-stage stratified sample is drawn to maximise precision while minimising cost.

## Survey population

The population of interest were those living in private residential dwellings (that is, excluding communal establishments as defined by the 2011 Census<sup>3</sup>) in England.

In Year 13 (2017/18), the face-to-face data collection for Taking Part was designed to yield a representative cross-sectional sample of c8,100 adults aged 16+ who are normally resident in England, along with a representative sample of resident youths (aged 11-15) and children (aged 5- 10). This represented a significant change from the design used for Years 8 (2012/13) to 12 (2016/17), whereby the sample was a mixed sample, divided between a cross-sectional sample (known as the 'fresh' sample in some previous reports) and panel (or re-interview) sample.

## Change in sample design

From Year 8 to Year 12 of Taking Part, national cross-sectional estimates of the activity of the general public in England were obtained by combining data from cross-sectional and panel sample members, all of whom were interviewed face-to-face. This meant that the 'clusters', or Primary Sampling Units (PSUs), from which addresses for interviewers to visit were sampled, were retained each year in order to make the fieldwork more efficient.

Analysis of key estimates from previous years of Taking Part compared the panel component of the sample against the cross-sectional component and demonstrated there were significant differences between the components. This is because the participants that agreed to take part in each follow-up interview were systematically different in their characteristics than those that did not. As there was evidence that including the panel sample in the national cross-sectional estimates was biasing the estimates, it was decided to exclude them for Year 13 onwards and instead to follow them up as a separate web panel. One impact of this was that the PSUs could be re-sampled for Year 13, and each survey year thereafter, as there was no longer the requirement to interview the panel sample face-to-face.

## Sampling frame

The sample of addresses was selected from the small user Postcode Address File (PAF) – this was the sampling frame that was used previously for Taking Part and is the standard for other high quality household surveys. The PAF is a list of nearly all private residential addresses in the UK and is the most comprehensive sample frame available. As the PAF lists addresses, not individuals, interviewers were required to randomly select respondents from among those eligible.

---

<sup>3</sup> A communal establishment is an establishment providing managed residential accommodation. 'Managed' in this context means full-time or part-time supervision of the accommodation. For further information please see <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/the-2011-census/2011-census-questionnaire-content/final-population-definitions-for-the-2011-census.pdf>. It is normal practice to exclude communal establishments from household surveys due to the obstacles in drawing a sample and reaching the population living in communal establishments.

## Reviewing the stratification variables and selecting the Primary Sampling Units (PSUs)

The first stage of sampling in a multi-stage stratified sample is to select the PSUs.

The design of Taking Part from Year 7 to Year 12 was to retain the 724 PSUs sampled at Year 7 each year. As Taking Part panel members would no longer be interviewed face-to-face in Year 13, we were able to select new PSUs.

### Review of stratification variables

The PSUs for Years 7 to 12 were originally sampled at Year 7 using the following for stratification measures: region, address density and what was described as a 'factor' variable. Prior to the sampling, some analyses were carried out to assess the optimal stratification variables ('stratifiers') for Year 13 onwards. This was done by identifying which candidate measures were most strongly correlated with nine key survey estimates and hence would optimise precision.

The first level of stratification, region (based on former Government Office Region), was fixed because the sampling design required disproportionately sampling across regions to achieved fixed sample sizes in each region. For the second level of stratification, each candidate measure was recoded into tertiles (three equal sized percentiles). A series of regression models were then fitted to assess how much variance was explained by each of the candidate stratification measures (in addition to region) for the nine key survey estimates. This showed that the 2011 Census estimate of the proportion of adults with a high educational level explained the most variance for nearly all the outcome measures and had the highest average measure. It also performed better than the stratifier used to sample the PSUs for Year 7. This was therefore adopted as the second level of stratification.

A similar approach was used to test the third level of stratification. Each remaining candidate stratification measure was added to a series of models including region and tertiles of the proportion of adults with a high educational level. The results from this stage of the analysis were less conclusive, although the population density measure gave the highest average measure of variance explained and was fairly consistently one of highest for each of the individual outcome measures. It was also an appealing measure because it was less correlated with the second stratifier (education) than some of the other measures such as the standard National Statistics categorisation of Socio Economic Classification (NS-SEC), and had been used as a stratifier when the PSUs were sampled for year 7. This was therefore adopted as the third level of stratification.

Therefore, the stratifiers used for the sampling of the PSUs in Year 13 were: region, tertiles of higher qualification level, and population density.

### Selection of new Primary Sampling Units (PSUs)

Postcode sectors were used as the PSUs for Year 13. A list of all postcode sectors in England was drawn from the most up-to-date small user Postcode Address File (PAF) and all sectors containing fewer than 1,000 delivery points were combined with adjacent sectors, so that each combined sector contained at least 1,000 delivery points.

The Year 13 sample comprised 720 PSUs, of which 702 comprised one postcode sector, and the remainder comprised two postcode sectors. Prior to selection the list of (combined) postcode sectors was stratified by region, tertiles of higher qualification level and population density, both based on 2011 Census data. The PSUs were then sampled within region as a systematic sample with probability proportional to PAF delivery point count (see Table 2.1 for counts of PSUs sampled in each region).

## Allocation of Primary Sampling Units to sample month

Once selected, the 720 PSUs were randomly allocated to a quarter so that each quarter's allocation was nationally representative. This was done by systematically allocating the PSUs to groups of four using the same stratifiers and then randomly allocating to quarter within each group. A similar approach was used to allocate to month with quarter. Finally, the points were randomly allocated between NatCen and Ipsos MORI.

Table 2.1 shows the number of primary sampling units issued in every sample month by former Government Office Region<sup>4</sup>:

**Table 2.1: Number of primary sampling units issued by sample month by former Government Office Region**

	North East	North West	Yorkshire and the Humber	East Midlands	West Midlands	East of England	London	South East	South West	Total
<b>2017</b>										
<i>Quarter 1</i>										
April	6	7	6	5	6	7	8	9	6	60
May	5	8	6	5	6	7	8	9	6	60
June	5	8	6	5	6	6	8	10	6	60
<i>Quarter 2</i>										
July	5	8	6	5	6	7	8	9	6	60
August	5	8	6	5	7	5	9	9	6	60
September	5	8	6	6	5	7	8	8	7	60
<i>Quarter 3</i>										
October	6	7	6	6	5	7	8	9	6	60
November	5	9	5	5	7	6	7	10	6	60
December	5	8	6	5	6	6	9	9	6	60
<b>2018</b>										
<i>Quarter 4</i>										
January	5	8	5	6	7	5	9	9	6	60
February	6	7	6	6	5	7	8	9	6	60
March	5	8	6	5	6	7	7	10	6	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>720</b>

<sup>4</sup> Ten of the 720 PSUs contained addresses in two regions (because postcode sector boundaries are not coterminous with former Government Office Region boundaries). In Table 2.1 these ten PSUs have been classified according to the former Government Office Region most of the selected addresses were in.

## Selection of addresses

Within each PSU, 23 addresses were initially randomly selected from the list of addresses in that PSU stratified by postcode to give a total issued sample size of 16,560. The number of addresses in each PSU varied slightly each quarter – see below for details.

## Selection of individuals

The sampling of individuals at cross-sectional addresses followed the same procedures as Year 12. As in Year 12, electronic instruments were used for respondent selection in Year 13.

At each sampled address, interviewers established whether there was more than one dwelling unit. If there was, they entered a description of each dwelling unit into the Selection instrument and the computer then randomly selected one. Interviewers then made contact at the address and entered the names or initials of adults resident at the address into the Selection instrument and the computer then randomly selected one to be interviewed<sup>5</sup>.

During the adult interview, information about the age and gender of other household members was collected, including the relationship of each household member to the adult respondent. Using this information, the computer randomly selected (if applicable):

- One resident child aged 5 to 10. Only children of the responding adult were eligible for selection. This was the same eligibility criteria used in previous years of Taking Part.
- One resident child aged 11 to 15. All resident children were eligible for selection, regardless of their relationship to the responding adult. This was the same eligibility criteria used in previous years of Taking Part.

## Changes to the number of addresses issued per Primary Sampling Unit during Year 13

The number of addresses issued per PSU varied over the course of Year 13, from 21 in Q1, to 23 in both Q2 and Q3, and to 25 in Q4. The reason we did this was to attempt to contain the cost of the face-to-face fieldwork within the available budget.

In Year 12 the adult and youth questionnaires were significantly longer than costed for, threatening the long-term sustainability of the survey within the current budget.

At the Year 13 pilot, we found the proposed Year 13 adult questionnaire was significantly above the costed mean adult questionnaire length for Year 13 (40 minutes). At this late stage in the process, it was not possible to make the significant cuts to the questionnaire required, and we agreed with DCMS that we would cut the number of addresses issued per PSU from the planned 23 to 21. We agreed we would monitor interview lengths closely during Year 13, and be prepared to increase or decrease the number of addresses issued per point for future quarters if required, based on the Year 13 mean

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that unlike in Year 11 and previous years of Taking Part, there was no random selection of households if there was more than one within the sampled dwelling unit. This situation occurs only very rarely, and including a stage for household selection in the Selection instrument would be very cumbersome. We instructed interviewers that if there was more than one household at the dwelling, for the purposes of selection they should treat all adults living in the dwelling as one household.

adult questionnaire length. Accordingly, prior to each quarter we analysed the interview lengths and agreed the number of addresses to issue per PSU with DCMS. When addresses were removed (Q1) or added (Q4), this was done using random probability methods.

Table 2.2 sets out the number of addresses issued by sample month by former Government Office Region.

**Table 2.2: Number of addresses issued by sample month**

	North East	North West	Yorkshire and the Humber	East Midlands	West Midlands	East of England	London	South East	South West	Total
<b>2017</b>										
<i>Quarter 1</i>										
April	126	147	126	105	126	147	167	190	126	1,260
May	104	169	127	105	125	147	168	189	126	1,260
June	105	167	126	105	127	127	167	210	126	1,260
<i>Quarter 2</i>										
July	115	184	138	115	138	161	184	207	138	1,380
August	115	184	138	115	161	115	207	207	138	1,380
September	115	184	138	138	115	161	184	184	161	1,380
<i>Quarter 3</i>										
October	138	161	138	137	115	162	184	207	138	1,380
November	115	207	115	115	161	138	161	230	138	1,380
December	115	184	138	115	138	138	208	206	138	1,380
<b>2018</b>										
<i>Quarter 4</i>										
January	125	200	125	150	175	125	225	225	150	1,500
February	150	175	150	150	125	175	200	225	150	1,500
March	125	200	150	125	150	174	175	253	148	1,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,448</b>	<b>2,162</b>	<b>1,609</b>	<b>1,475</b>	<b>1,656</b>	<b>1,770</b>	<b>2,230</b>	<b>2,533</b>	<b>1,677</b>	<b>16,560</b>

# Questionnaire development and design

## Overview of questionnaires

DCMS' goal is to encourage participation in the arts, heritage and sport. Accordingly, the Taking Part survey questionnaires were designed to collect information on participation in leisure, cultural and sporting activities. In Year 13 (2017/18), there were separate questionnaires designed for adults aged 16 and over, youths (aged 11-15) and children (aged 5-10).

This was the first survey year since Year 8 (2012/13) where face-to-face fieldwork comprised data collection from cross-sectional sample only (see the Sample design section of this report) and consequently only one version of the questionnaire was needed for each sample group.

The same questionnaires were used throughout the year, with some very minor changes. The exception to this was a change in Quarter 4 in the positioning of the museums and galleries questions in the adult questionnaire; these were moved from after the arts attendance questions to after the heritage section.

Full documentation of the survey questionnaires will be published separately, accompanied by a guide to changes made to the questionnaire since the Year 12 (2016/17) survey.

## Questionnaire development

For the Year 13 survey, questionnaire development balanced two objectives: reviewing and revising content to ensure that it met current and anticipated information needs, while ensuring as far as possible that data were collected in a comparable fashion with previous years of the survey so as to enable the tracking of trends over time. The process focused on the adult interview and content of the youth and child questionnaires remained substantially unchanged.

In the first phase of the review the research team from Ipsos MORI and NatCen examined the structure and wording of the adult questionnaire to identify possible improvements. Structural changes designed to improve accessibility and flow included:

- re-ordering some modules, for example moving the museums and galleries questions closer to the arts participation and attendance sections, and moving well-being questions from the start to the end of the questionnaire;
- grouping screening and follow-up questions for each topic, rather than the former structure where screening and frequency questions were asked in a sequence and additional questions about different areas of activity were asked much later in the questionnaire;
- breaking single screening questions with long lists of options into shorter, more manageable lists;
- requiring interviewers to present response options to the respondent on the computer screen rather than on separate show cards<sup>6</sup>;

<sup>6</sup> Show cards were retained for the demographics section of the interview, to assure respondents a high level of confidentiality.



- changing the sport and activity questions from a self-completion to an interviewer-administered mode. For Year 12 the sport and activity questions had been asked in a self-completion mode to facilitate comparison with the Active Lives Survey carried out by Ipsos MORI on behalf of Sport England. The Active Lives Survey uses a 'push-to-web' self-completion data collection methodology. For Year 13 it was decided to use an interviewer-administered mode as we hoped this would reduce the average interview length, and there was no longer a need to collect data comparable with the Active Lives Survey.

In addition, the research team looked at the content of each questionnaire section and the wording of individual questions. They made recommendations to the DCMS research team who consulted with their partner organisations: Arts Council England, Historic England and Sport England. The review was informed by cognitive testing of questions, including screening questions, reasons for not doing activities, and understanding of what was covered by questions about library services, heritage, live sporting events, charitable giving and some online activities.

The DCMS strategy for Taking Part is set out in *Taking Part: the next five years* (March 2016). This strategy proposed some degree of question rotation, so that some groups of questions would be included in alternate years. In Year 13, some questions included in the previous year were omitted for this reason, covering the detail of visits to libraries, museums, galleries and heritage sites, membership of heritage organisations, and reasons for charitable giving. Questions included in Year 13 as part of this rotation included questions on arts and music venues; involvement in heritage-related activities; and attitudes to the arts.

An important consideration was the duration of the interview for different sample groups; the objective was an average of 40 minutes for adult respondents, which imposed limitations on the number of questions that could be asked.

The final version of the questionnaire was tested in the pilot (see the Fieldwork section of this report), and interviewers gave feedback about the revisions.

In addition to changes in the wording and structure of the questionnaire, the computer programme used for all three interviews was comprehensively revised to remove any elements designed for the panel sample.

## Overview of the structure of the questionnaires

The following sections summarise the coverage of each questionnaire. Full questionnaires and documentation of changes since the Year 12 survey will be published separately.

### Adult questionnaire

#### Household information

This section included information about the household and its inhabitants, including, for each person, their name, gender, age, relationship to the responding adult and marital status. The programme selected the adult and youth to be interviewed, and the identity of the child about whose activities the adult would be asked about.

#### Socialisation

This section included questions about cultural and sporting activities which the respondent participated in during their childhood, defined as the ages of 11 to 15.

## Free time activities, TV and computer games

This section comprised three questions covering a range of leisure activities not covered elsewhere in the questionnaire, questions about the types of TV programmes watched in the last 12 months and a question about how often the respondent played video games.

## Arts participation

This section included three questions asking about participation in various arts activities in the last 12 months (regardless of whether participation took place within England). The questions included no more than 11 options each, grouped into similar kinds of activity, and the order in which these lists were presented was randomised. This development work was undertaken to remove the very long list of answer options previously used, and in line with the commitment in *Taking Part: the next five years* that all new questions would be designed as unimode questions (capable of being used work across a range of data collection modes, including online). For each activity the respondent had done, follow-up questions asked whether this was done in their own time, as part of paid or voluntary work or study, and how often. For one of these activities, randomly selected, the respondent was asked to rate how much they enjoyed it.

The section included a follow-up question for respondents who had not taken part in any of the activities asked about, asking about their reasons for not participating in arts activities.

## Arts attendance

This section followed a similar format to the arts participation section, asking about attendance at different types of arts events (regardless of whether attendance took place within England), with similar follow-up questions. It also included some questions about venues where the respondent had attended arts or music events, and the sort of musical performances respondents had been to see.

## Museums and galleries

This section included similar questions about attendance at museums and galleries (regardless of whether the museums and galleries were in England) and also asked whether respondents had recommended them to a friend or family member. At the start of Year 13, this section was moved from after the heritage section to directly after the arts attendance section. Early data suggested that this change may have resulted in a fall in the reported rates of museum attendance and to avoid this order effect, the section was moved back to its original position in Quarter 4.

## Libraries

Questions on libraries covered all use of library services (regardless of whether the libraries were in England), with visits, online use and other use asked about separately. The prevalence question was updated to ensure all types of library use were captured. The type of service used was asked about, as well as frequency of use, satisfaction, reasons for dissatisfaction, and reasons for not using libraries.

## Archives

Questions about archive use included a definition of an archive and covered archive visits only (not online archive use) (regardless of whether the archives were in England). Follow-up questions were similar to those asked about libraries.

## Heritage

These questions were about visits to locations of historic interest, whether in England or not. As well as follow-up questions about whether this was done in the respondent's own time, for paid or voluntary work or study, and the frequency of visits, respondents were asked about voluntary activities connected with historic sites, payment of entry fees, enjoyment and reasons for not visiting historic sites.

Respondents were also asked whether they lived or worked in a building or area of historic interest, and whether they participated in metal detecting.

## Walking, cycling and sports participation

This section asked about different forms of physical activity, including walking and cycling, whether or not it took place in England. For activities carried out within the last four weeks, follow-up questions included frequency of participation, duration, and degree of effort involved.

Additional questions were asked about attendance at live sporting events.

## Digital activities

Questions covered internet access via different types of devices. Questions focused on the use of websites related to arts and cultural activities (including archives); creating and uploading content; and the use of social media for culturally-related purposes and sport.

## Volunteering and charitable giving

These sections asked about types of volunteering, specifically in the areas relevant to DCMS. Similar questions were asked about donating money to charities.

## Community cohesion and belonging

This section investigated the attitudes of respondents to their local area and to Britain.

## Attitudes to the arts and historic buildings

This section covered the attitudes of respondents to the arts, including government funding, and to the heritage of their local area.

## News

This section asked about accessing news using different media: printed newspapers, apps and websites, television and radio.

## First World War centenary commemorations

This section asked about awareness of and participation in activities to commemorate the Centenary of the First World War. Recall questions about specific events were focused on those within the 12 months before survey fieldwork began (from 11 November 2017 respondents were asked about the centenary commemoration of the Armistice). Respondents

were asked about their attitude to commemorating the First World War Centenary, and their engagement with commemorative events and activities, and its impact on them.

### Subjective well-being

This section comprised the four standardised well-being questions<sup>7</sup> developed by the Office for National Statistics. It was decided to place these questions near the end of the questionnaire rather than near the beginning (as they were during Year 12). Interviewers had reported that the questions could provoke respondents to reflect on their life situation, which was inadvisable before a good rapport had been established with the respondent.

### Demographics

This covered personal information: educational qualifications, employment status, income, housing, health and disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, national identity and religion.

### Invitation to join the web panel

All respondents with internet access were asked to join the web-based panel. Consent was obtained verbally. Contact details for the respondent, including their email address and telephone number, were also collected to facilitate web panel data collection.

## Youth questionnaire

The youth questionnaire remained substantially unchanged from Year 12. Youth respondents (aged 11-15) were asked about their participation in cultural and sporting activity, both in school lessons and their spare time. The youth questionnaire did not change between quarters.

To aid recall, interviewers were provided with a 'life events' calendar, on which respondents could record significant events over the preceding 12 months. In Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 of Year 12 fieldwork we included a question asking interviewers at the end of each youth interview if they had used the life events calendar during that interview. Our analysis, published in the Year 12 technical report, showed that interviewers reported using them during 21.7 per cent of youth interviews. In Year 13, interviewers reported using the life events calendar in 11.8 per cent of youth interviews.

### School and school year

This section asked about the respondent's school attendance and school year.

### Screening questions

All respondents were asked a series of screening questions covering participation during the last 12 months in different types of activities. If the respondent had participated in any of the activities listed below, they were asked a series of follow-up questions, including frequency and whether the participation was during school lessons or during their spare time.

---

<sup>7</sup> These are the Personal Well-being (PWB) questions as they currently appear on the ONS Annual Population Survey. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) introduced these questions on the Annual Population Survey (APS) in April 2011. For further information, see <https://gss.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Personal-Well-being-June-17-Pending-informing-SPSC.pdf>.

- Dance activities;
- Music activities;
- Theatre and drama activities;
- Reading and writing activities;
- Arts, crafts and design activities;
- Outdoor arts participation and attendance, for example, street arts, circus;
- Film and video activities;
- Radio activities;
- Computer-based activities;
- Libraries;
- Archives;
- Museums and galleries;
- Heritage (sites of historic interest).

The lists of activities used in the questions relating to participating in and attending arts activities were randomised for each respondent so that the same categories did not always appear at the top and bottom of the list.

### **Sport and physical activity**

Respondents were given a show card and asked to identify which sports activities they had participated in during the last four weeks. Follow-up questions covered which activities took place during school lessons and which were carried out during their spare time, frequency of participation and which activities they enjoyed the most. Questions were also asked about swimming and cycling competency.

### **Well-being**

A single question was asked of respondents, asking them to rate their level of happiness on a scale of 1 to 10.

### **Demographics**

Background information about health and ethnicity was collected from respondents, and interviewers confirmed their date of birth and full name.

### Invitation to join the web panel

All respondents were asked, subject to parental consent, to join the web-based panel. Verbal consent was sought firstly from a legal parent or guardian and then from the respondent. Contact details for the respondent, including their email address and telephone number, were also collected to facilitate web panel data collection.

### National Pupil Database linkage

Verbal consent was sought, firstly from the parent or legal guardian and then the respondent, to use the respondent's personal information to link National Pupil Database (NPD) records to their survey data. Respondents and the consenting parent or guardian were given a handout containing their reference number, with information about NPD linkage and details of who to contact to opt out of the linkage.

## Child questionnaire

The child questionnaire was similar to the youth questionnaire and remained substantially unchanged from Year 12.

Adult respondents who were parents or guardians of resident children aged 5 to 10 were asked about a randomly selected resident child's participation in cultural and sporting activity. These questions covered participation outside school lessons only, to avoid extra burden for an adult respondent who had been asked about their own activities and attitudes during their own interview; it was also felt that parents and guardians would not necessarily know of all the activities their child had participated in at school.

The child questionnaire did not change between quarters.

### School and school year

This section asked about the child's school attendance and school year.

### Screening questions

Adult respondents were asked a series of screening questions covering their child's participation during the last 12 months in different types of activities outside school. If the respondent's child had participated in any of the activities listed below, they were asked a series of follow-up questions, including frequency and whether the participation was within the last seven days.

- Dance activities;
- Music activities;
- Theatre and drama activities;
- Reading and writing activities;
- Arts, crafts and design activities;
- Outdoor arts participation and attendance, for example, street arts, circus;

- Film and video activities;
- Computer-based and radio activities;
- Libraries;
- Museums and galleries;
- Heritage (sites of historic interest).

The lists of activities used in the questions relating to participating in and attending arts activities were randomised for each respondent so that the same categories did not always appear at the top and bottom of the list.

### **Sport and physical activity**

Adult respondents were given a show card and asked to identify which sport and physical activities their child had participated in during the last four weeks. Follow-up questions covered a question checking whether activities took place outside of school, and length and frequency of activities. Questions were also asked about swimming and cycling competency.

### **Demographics**

Background information about the health and ethnicity of their child was collected from respondents, and interviewers confirmed their child's date of birth and full name.

### **National Pupil Database linkage**

Verbal consent was collected from the respondent to use their child's personal information to link National Pupil Database (NPD) records to survey data about the child. Respondents were given a handout containing their reference number, with information about NPD linkage and details of who to contact to opt out of the linkage.

# Fieldwork

## Introduction

This chapter describes all aspects of the Year 13 (2017/18) data collection process, including fieldwork procedures, the pilot, briefings, fieldwork management, quality control procedures, outcomes and response rates achieved.

## Fieldwork procedures

### Advance letter and leaflet

The design of the advance letters and leaflets was retained from Year 12. On each letter the logos of DCMS and the survey organisation were printed, along with the signature of the Head of Statistics at DCMS. Advance letters were addressed 'Dear Sir/Madam'.

The letter and leaflet explained the nature of the study, why the address had been selected and that an interviewer carrying photo identification would be calling in the next week or so. The letter and leaflet also stressed the importance of the study, that the experience of everyone was relevant, and that survey answers would be treated as confidential. They explained how to contact the survey organisation or find further information. The letter included the unconditional incentive of a £10 voucher that could be redeemed for £10 in cash at any Post Office. The leaflet contained more detail than the advance letters, including interesting findings from Taking Part, which were judged would not affect respondents' answers to survey questions.

Each organisation used its own branding on the documents so it was clear to all respondents which organisation the interviewer worked for. For this reason, each organisation maintained a Taking Part telephone helpline and email contact address, both of which were printed on the advance letters and leaflets.

To make it easier for interviewers to distinguish between the cross-sectional and web panel leaflets, different logos and colour schemes were used. An orange typeface was used for the cross-sectional advance letters and leaflets, and a pink typeface was used for the web panel leaflets.

During Year 13 fieldwork, 258 adults opted out of the survey by contacting Ipsos MORI, NatCen Social Research or DCMS. The opt-out rate was 1.6 per cent.

### Selection instrument

The electronic Selection instrument developed for Year 12 of Taking Part was retained for Year 13.

After making contact, the interviewer's first task was to complete the Selection instrument, as no adult, youth or child questionnaires could become available until this was done.

The Selection instrument was a Unicom Intelligence (formerly 'Dimensions') script. It was designed so it could be used on the doorstep if required, using the touch screen function on the interviewers' tablets or laptops. Interviewers were permitted to complete the Selection instrument with any adult who lived at the sampled address.



The Selection instrument enabled interviewers to complete the process of selecting a dwelling unit and adult aged 16 or over, where there was more than one of either. When entering the identity of adults into the Selection instrument for the purposes of selection, interviewers were permitted to use initials instead of names, where respondents did not wish to give out names early in the selection process. When an adult was selected for interview, the interviewer was required to enter the name of the respondent before continuing.

### Selection procedure for youths/children

At the start of all adult interviews, interviewers collected information about the members of the adult's household, including the name, gender, age, and marital status of all household members and the relationship of each household member to the respondent. During adult interviews the computer used this information to select randomly one youth and child (if applicable) for inclusion in the achieved sample.

### Parental permission rules

If the randomly selected adult was aged 16 or 17 and still living with a parent or legal guardian, as a courtesy interviewers were required to obtain parental permission before the adult interview. Interviewers were instructed to show a parent or legal guardian the parental permission card which explained what topics were covered in the interview. Interviewers recorded the name of the parent or legal guardian consenting in the Selection instrument.

At the start of each youth interview the questionnaire asked interviewers for the name of the parent or legal guardian giving them permission to interview the youth.

### Documents

A large number of documents were required for Taking Part. Each organisation produced its own versions of documents, using the agreed wording. This ensured each organisation retained its own corporate identity in the eyes of the respondents, meaning there was no confusion about which organisation the interviewer worked for.

For Year 13, the white definitions show card<sup>8</sup>, used in Year 12 and previous years of Taking Part was not required. In Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 of Year 12 fieldwork we had included a question asking interviewers at the end of each adult and youth interview if they had used the white definitions show cards. Our analysis, published in the Year 12 technical report, showed that interviewers reported using the white definitions show cards during 8.6 per cent of the adult interviews and 10.1 per cent of the youth interviews. Given the low rate of usage of the white definitions show cards we decided to replace them with information screens in the questionnaires, containing the text previously printed on the card. This was more convenient for interviewers and reduced the amount of documents required.

---

<sup>8</sup> The white definitions show card was intended for interviewers to use to help respondents decide what was covered by terms such as paid work and volunteering.

Table 4.1 sets out the purpose of each Taking Part-specific document issued to interviewers.

**Table 4.1: Documents used for Year 13 Taking Part fieldwork, and their purpose**

Document	Purpose
<b>Documents for the adult interview</b>	
Advance letters (spares)	For interviewers to leave with respondents who requested another copy of the advance letter.
Advance letter (Laminated)	For interviewers to use on the doorstep.
Leaflets (spares)	For interviewers to leave with respondents who requested another copy of the leaflet.
Web panel leaflet	For interviewers to use at the end of the interview to show respondents when inviting them to join the web panel. Interviewers were required to leave a leaflet with each respondent who agreed to join the web panel.
Show cards	For interviewers to use these when interviewing an adult aged 16 or over.
Parental permission card	For interviewers to use if seeking parental permission for an interview with an adult aged 16 or 17.
Non-contact letter	For interviewers working with difficult-to-contact cases and those working on reissues. The aim of the letter was to help interviewers make contact with respondents.
Laminate impact card	For interviewers to use to convince respondents of the value of the survey when attempting to secure participation.
<b>Documents for the youth interview</b>	
Life events calendar	For interviewers to use in the youth interview to help respondents recall what they had done.
Parental permission card	For interviewers to use when seeking parental permission for an interview with a youth.
Show cards	For interviewers to use when interviewing a youth aged 11 to 15 years old.
Youth National Pupil Database handout	For interviewers to leave with any youth agreeing to linkage of their National Pupil Database records with their survey answers.
Parent National Pupil Database handout	For interviewers to leave with any adult agreeing to linkage of the youth's National Pupil Database records with the youth's survey answers.
<b>Documents for the child proxy interview</b>	
Show cards	For interviewers to use when interviewing an adult about a child aged 5 to 10 years old.
Parent National Pupil Database handout	For interviewers to leave with any adult who agreed to linkage of their child's National Pupil Database records with the adult's survey answers about their child.

### Minority languages

Household interpreters were permitted for Taking Part, as the questions were not sensitive. Interviewers were instructed that any household interpreters should be aged 12 or over, in line with previous practice on Taking Part.

Interviewers were told that for the question SXCLASS, where the adult was asked about their sexual identity, they should decide on a case-by-case basis whether to ask this question if there was a household interpreter. If interviewers did not consider the question was appropriate because of the presence of a household interpreter, they were instructed to code 'refused' and make a note that this was their decision and not the respondent refusing to answer.

In situations where the respondent's English was adequate for the Taking Part interview, but they preferred to be interviewed in another language, interviewers were instructed to let their Field Department know. In these cases, if interviewers spoke the respondent's preferred language then we permitted interviewers to carry out the interview in that language.

During Year 13, 45 of the 7,715 adult interviews (0.6%) were conducted in a language other than English. Taking Part interviews were carried out in English and 15 other languages.

### Changes to documents during Year 13

At the start of Year 13, interviewers were permitted to despatch their own advance letters and leaflets. Evidence from an experiment carried out on the Crime Survey for England and Wales found that allowing interviewers to send out their own letters was on balance more likely to have a positive effect on the first issue response rate than a negative effect, when compared to the central despatch method<sup>9</sup>. Interviewers were sent advance letters and leaflets in pre-sealed postage paid envelopes for all the addresses in their work pack.

Following a review of fieldwork procedures at NatCen Social Research, from 2018 a decision was made that for all NatCen surveys advance mailings would be despatched centrally. Accordingly, for the Quarter 4 sample fieldwork, NatCen interviewers did not despatch their own advance letters, but Ipsos MORI interviewers continued to do so.

### Web panel recruitment

One of the major changes to Taking Part is the use of a web data collection method for the Taking Part panel for Year 12 (2016/17) onwards. During Year 13, at the end of the adult interview, interviewers asked adult respondents with internet access, and all youth respondents, to join the web panel. Full details of the operations of the web panel will be published in a separate report at a later date.

Interviewers were instructed to give the adult respondents a web panel leaflet and explain the purpose of the web panel and encourage them to join it. If the respondent agreed or said they wanted to consider it further in their own time, interviewers collected the respondent's contact details. Interviewers were required to leave a copy of the web panel leaflet with all those who agreed to join the web panel.

The same procedures were used in the youth interview, except that interviewers were required to obtain the consent of a parent or legal guardian before asking the youth to join the web panel. Interviewers were also required to ask the parent or legal guardian for consent to ask the youth for their e-mail address and mobile telephone number.

---

<sup>9</sup> Catherine Grant, (2016). *Mailing strategies for optimising response for face to face fieldwork requests Interviewer led mailings compared with central despatch*. Office for National Statistics Survey Methodology Bulletin 75 at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/methodologicalpublications/generalmethodology/surveymethodologybulletin>.

## National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage handouts

At the end of youth or child proxy interviews, interviewers were required to ask a parent or legal guardian for consent for DCMS to link the National Pupil Database (NPD) records of their child to the youth or child proxy data, as applicable. Interviewers were instructed to leave the parent or legal guardian with a handout which explained what the NPD is and how their child's data will be used, and how to withdraw their consent to the linkage.

At the end of the youth interview, after consent for NPD linkage had been obtained from a parent or legal guardian, interviewers were asked to secure the consent of the youth for the linkage too, and to leave the youth with their own NPD handout, containing the same information as that given to the parent or legal guardian.

### Pilot

For Year 13, a considerable amount of programming work had been undertaken to eliminate questions and routing relating to the panel sample from the face-to-face survey and, further, the adult questionnaire was significantly changed. We felt a pilot was essential to ensure the sample management systems and questionnaires were working properly. As the average length of the adult interview remained a concern, we also wanted to use the pilot to produce an estimate of the average adult interview length for the proposed Year 13 adult questionnaire.

As far as possible the procedures followed replicated those intended to be used during Year 13 fieldwork. To ensure robust testing of all procedures, six interviewers (three from Ipsos MORI and three from NatCen Social Research) worked on the pilot.

As the pilot had to be carried out over a short period, special sampling procedures were used to help the interviewers be as productive as possible, and to carry out sufficient numbers of interviews. As we no longer needed to pilot the questionnaires with panel members, this simplified the sampling task greatly. We decided to use a quota sampling method to maximise the number of interviews interviewers could achieve, while ensuring they obtained a sample with a broad range of key characteristics such as age, gender and working status.

Interviewers were asked which postcode area they would prefer to work in. Ipsos MORI's Sampling Department randomly selected a paired Output Area (around 250 addresses) in the chosen postcode area. We provided interviewers with a street listing of the paired Output Areas along with a quota (gender, age, working status) to work to, and a map. The aim was for each interviewer to achieve nine interviews to quota, aiming to ensure we interviewed respondents from a range of backgrounds and enabling interviewers to test different routes through the questionnaires.

All six pilot interviewers attended a half-day briefing held on 10 February 2017 at Ipsos MORI's head office in London. Members of the DCMS, Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research teams attended.

Pilot fieldwork took place from 11 to 21 February 2017. A total of 51 interviews were completed, of which 45 were adult interviews, 4 were child proxy interviews, and 2 were youth interviews.

A feedback form was included in each interviewer's work pack. Interviewers were asked to complete it before the de-briefing. A de-briefing was held at Ipsos MORI's head office in London on 22 February 2017, to discuss interviewers' experiences with them and to collect the completed feedback forms.

## Briefings

An extensive programme of briefings was held which took place throughout Year 13. Briefings followed a standard agenda and we took care to standardise their content across both organisations, by agreeing a common set of presentation slides for most of the briefing (the exception was material relating to each organisation's sample and field management procedures).

We changed the briefing strategy for Year 13, to account for the fact that most interviewers had worked on Taking Part during Year 12. Interviewers who had worked on Taking Part previously attended refresher briefings, while those who had not attended full briefings.

Each refresher briefing was a half-day briefing lasting three hours, whereas a full briefing was day-long and lasted five hours.

At the refresher briefings, the interviewers were briefed about field performance on Year 12 of Taking Part, the changes to the survey design (removal of face-to-face interviewing of panel members) and related procedures, the significant changes to the questionnaire and the new documents available for Year 13. We also covered procedures and documents that had not changed since Year 12, to ensure those who had not worked on Taking Part for some time were familiar again with all procedures and documents. We also asked interviewers to share their feedback on the messages they had used to secure co-operation from respondents during Year 12.

The full briefing followed the pattern established for Year 12. We covered the survey procedures, the importance of achieving high response rates, the sample management systems to be used by the interviewers' organisation, the Selection instrument and questionnaires, web panel recruitment, data protection and information linkage, and the advance mailing and incentives. During each full briefing interviewers were able to practice using the sample management systems and the Selection instrument and questionnaires.

Across the year we briefed 313 interviewers in 24 separate briefings, of which 10 were refresher briefings. Briefings were held in Bristol, Haydock, Leeds, London, Manchester, North Petherton, Solihill and York. Of the 313 interviewers briefed, 190 were briefed at the start of Quarter 1 fieldwork. Two hundred and twenty-eight attended refresher briefings and 85 attended full briefings.

## Fieldwork dates and fieldwork management

As had been the practice previously on Taking Part, during Year 13 the fieldwork was managed on a monthly basis. In general assignments were issued at the beginning of each month, and extra time was allowed for interviewers to complete their assignments if the sample month fieldwork period included the Christmas holidays. DCMS wished to ensure that publication of the annual report took place at the same time of year as previously. For this reason, it was necessary to start fieldwork for all three sample months in Quarter 4 in January 2018, to ensure there was sufficient time for re-issuing so the target number of interviews could be met, without significantly damaging the response rate.

As many of the activities covered by Taking Part are seasonal in nature, it was important that cases should not be allowed to languish in the field. We aimed to complete fieldwork for all issued cases within 12 weeks of issue, and this was achieved in the great majority of cases. Interviewers were instructed to complete all first issue addresses in eight weeks from the date of issue.

The fieldwork dates for each monthly sample for Year 13 are set out in Table 4.2. Fieldwork for Year 13 began on 10 April 2017 and ended on 29 April 2018.

**Table 4.2: Fieldwork dates for each sample month**

Sample quarter	Sample month	Fieldwork start	Fieldwork end
<b>2017</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>April</b>	10 April 2017	6 September 2017
<b>1</b>	<b>May</b>	2 May 2017	19 September 2017
<b>1</b>	<b>June</b>	30 May 2017	14 September 2017
<b>2</b>	<b>July</b>	30 June 2017	15 December 2017
<b>2</b>	<b>August</b>	31 July 2017	6 December 2017
<b>2</b>	<b>September</b>	3 September 2017	14 December 2017
<b>3</b>	<b>October</b>	1 October 2017	29 April 2018
<b>3</b>	<b>November</b>	27 October 2017	28 April 2018
<b>3</b>	<b>December</b>	10 October 2017	27 April 2018
<b>2018</b>			
<b>4</b>	<b>January</b>	4 January 2018	29 April 2018
<b>4</b>	<b>February</b>	25 January 2018	29 April 2018
<b>4</b>	<b>March</b>	9 January 2018	29 April 2018

As with Year 13, to make Taking Part data easier to analyse, it was decided to allocate questionnaires to each sample quarter, so that if any changes were made to a questionnaire for any sample quarter, these changes only applied to the sample from that quarter. Allocation of questionnaires to sample members was controlled automatically; interviewers were advised of any changes to questionnaires from the previous quarters.

Once the first issue addresses had been fully worked, following the prescribed calling pattern, the Field Departments in each organisation decided which cases should be reissued to interviewers. A specific list of outcome codes making addresses eligible for reissue is set out in the section 'Maximising response'.

## Supervision and quality control

A number of procedures were put in place to supervise fieldwork and ensure that the data collected were of high quality.

Field supervisors from both organisations accompanied a proportion of interviewers in the field, to monitor their work. Any interviewers working on Taking Part for the first time were accompanied by a supervisor on their first day working on their assignment.

Some respondents were also re-contacted to verify that an interview had taken place, and to ask about their recollection of what was asked, to give us confidence that the questionnaires were being implemented properly in the field. In total 927 respondents were re-contacted, 904 (97.5%) by telephone, and 23 (2.5%) by post.

We follow the Market Research Society guidelines for validation of interviewers' work. We validate the work of all new interviewers when they start work (their first PSU).

## Maximising response

A number of steps were put in place to maximise the response rate achieved at all addresses. These were the use of incentives, a set calling pattern, and the reissuing of some unproductive cases.

### Incentives

The incentive strategy was unchanged from that used for the cross-sectional sample for Year 12. The incentive was an unconditional £10 Post Office voucher which could be exchanged for £10 cash at any Post Office. This was printed at the bottom of the advance letter sent to each household, along with its expiry date. Generally, Post Office vouchers expire after about six months from date of issue. Where respondents reported they had not received the advance letter or had thrown it away, interviewers reported this to their Field Department and were issued with a compliments slip, containing just the additional barcode, to give to respondents. This compliments slip could be exchanged at a Post Office for £10 cash.

### Calling pattern

The calling pattern interviewers were required to follow was also unchanged from Year 12. The purpose of a calling pattern is to ensure interviewers make calls at different times and on different days so that the number of addresses where no contact is made is minimised and that people of all circumstances have the opportunity to participate, maximising sample representativeness.

In Year 13, for all addresses interviewers were required to make a minimum of six calls before a non-contact outcome could be recorded for an address. Interviewers were required to make at least one evening call (weekday after 6.00 p.m), one weekend call, and a further call either during a weekday evening or at a weekend. Interviewers were told that, in cases where they could not make contact, there must be at least three weeks between the first and last calls.

We permitted interviewers to arrange appointments for interviews by telephone, but only once an adult interview was completed at an address.

### Reissues

In order to maximise the response rate, some addresses with an unproductive outcome were reissued. Prior to fieldwork a list of outcome codes was developed which, if used by an interviewer for any address, would make an address eligible for reissuing. Each Field Department regularly produced lists of addresses eligible for reissue and decisions about whether to reissue an address were made on a case-by-case basis, after examination of the information available about that address and the interviewer's experience.

Table 4.3 shows which outcome codes made an address eligible for reissue:

**Table 4.3: Outcome codes eligible for reissue**

<b>Outcome code</b>	<b>Outcome description</b>
320	No further contact at issued address
420	Contact made, but refused to give information about household / names
431	Refusal by target adult (16+)
432	Refusal by proxy (other person)
450	Broken appointment – no re-contact
510	Refusal because ill at home during entire fieldwork period
520	Refusal because away / in hospital during entire fieldwork period
540	Language barrier / difficulties
599	Other non-response (give details)
611	Not issued to an interviewer
650	No contact with anyone at address (after required visits made)
690	Other unknown eligibility (give details)
790	Other ineligible (give details)
890	Other unknown eligibility despite making contact (give details)



Table 4.4 gives details of the reissuing carried out during Year 13 fieldwork. During Year 13, 2,718 of 16,560 addresses (16.4%) were reissued. No addresses were reissued more than once. A productive outcome was achieved at 17.3 per cent of reissued addresses. Table 4.4 also shows the conversion rate by Standard Outcome Code used at first issue, including only those first issue Standard Outcome Codes which generated at least 50 reissues. Interviewers working reissue cases were most successful at households where at first issue there had been no further contact at an address (21.9%) or no contact at all (21.1%).

**Table 4.4: Reissue analysis**

	<b>Standard outcome code</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Total addresses issued</b>		16,560
<b>Total addresses reissued</b>		2,718
<b>% of sample reissued</b>		16.4%
<b>Fully productive reissue addresses</b>		439
<b>Partially productive reissue addresses</b>		31
<b>Total productive reissue addresses</b>		470
<b>Conversion rate</b>		17.3%
<b>First issue outcome conversion rates</b>		
<b>No further contact at issued address</b>	320	21.9%
<b>No contact with anyone at address (after required visits made)</b>	650	21.1%
<b>Broken appointment – no re-contact</b>	450	18.6%
<b>Refusal by proxy (other person)</b>	432	18.5%
<b>Contact made, but refused to give information about household / names</b>	420	12.9%
<b>Refusal by target adult (16+)</b>	431	9.8%

#### In year review of fieldwork performance

A fieldwork performance review conference was held by Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research researchers in March 2018. Discussions focused on incentives and interviewer motivation and suggestions for potential changes to procedures for Year 14 were put to DCMS.

### Fieldwork outcomes

The fieldwork outcomes, including response rates, are set out in this section. As in the Year 12 technical report, the figures reflect the sample year. We report fieldwork outcomes separately for the adult, youth and child samples.

For Year 13 'Standard Outcome codes', which have been adopted by the Office for National Statistics and NatCen Social Research, were used. These enable valid comparisons to be made between response rates on different surveys, and by

different organisations, by defining and calculating response rates in a standard way. These Standard Outcome codes are commonly used for major government, academic and public sector surveys.

Every Standard Outcome Code has three digits, with the first digit representing the type of outcome, as follows:

#### Complete interview

1. Complete interview
2. Partially complete interview

#### Eligible, but no interview

3. No-contact
4. Refusal
5. Other eligible but no interview

#### Unknown eligibility

6. Unknown eligibility, non-contact
8. Unknown eligibility, contacted

#### Ineligible

7. Ineligible

A full description of each Standard Outcome Code and the appropriate circumstances to use it was provided to all interviewers as an Appendix to the interviewer instruction manual.

### Adult sample

Table 4.5 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the adult sample for Year 13 of Taking Part. The final contact rate<sup>10</sup> was 87.0 per cent and the final co-operation rate<sup>11</sup> was 57.3 per cent. The 'unadjusted' response rate<sup>12</sup> was 52.6 per cent, and the yield rate<sup>13</sup> was 46.6 per cent.

The method of producing an 'adjusted' response rate<sup>14</sup> was unchanged from Year 12. For the following five outcomes, interviewers were asked to record whether they thought the household was eligible for Taking Part, or if they were unable to establish eligibility: 320, 420, 540, 650, 690. We applied an eligibility rate to the total number of times interviewers used

<sup>10</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 12 technical report: (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive) / Total non-deadwood. This is the same as the Contact Rate 3 set out in the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016) – see <http://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/For-Researchers/Poll-Survey-FAQ/Response-Rates-An-Overview.aspx> for AAPOR's Standard Definitions (2016).

<sup>11</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 12 technical report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive). This is the same as the Co-operation Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

<sup>12</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 12 technical report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Non-contact + Other unproductive). This is the same as the Response Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

<sup>13</sup> This is the proportion of issued addresses which are productive.

<sup>14</sup> This is the same as the Response Rate 3 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

these outcomes. This eligibility rate was calculated by taking the total number of outcomes where the eligibility of the household was unknown and applying an adjusted ineligible rate of 5.0 per cent to these outcomes. This applied ineligible rate is lower than the total ineligible rate of 6.5 per cent. This is because the overall ineligible rate of 6.5 per cent includes outcomes where we are certain the address is ineligible: 'not yet built/under construction', 'demolished/derelict', 'non-residential' and 'communal establishments/institutions'. As we only need to apply an ineligible rate to those outcomes where eligibility is uncertain we only include ineligible outcomes where there is uncertainty in our calculation of the appropriate ineligible rate. Following this procedure, the adjusted response rate was calculated as 50.1 per cent.

**Table 4.5: Fieldwork outcomes (adult sample)**

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases	% of all cases which might be eligible
<b>Complete interview (I+P)</b>		<b>7,715</b>	<b>46.6</b>	<b>49.8</b>
Complete interviews with all target respondents	110	7,416	44.8	47.9
Complete interview with at least target adult (16+) but not all target respondents	210	299	1.8	1.9
<b>Eligible, but no interview (NC)</b>		<b>1,186</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.7</b>
No further contact at issued address	320	1,178	7.1	7.6
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	8	0.0	0.1
<b>Refusals (R)</b>		<b>5,019</b>	<b>30.3</b>	<b>32.4</b>
Office refusal	410	258	1.6	1.7
Contact made, but refused to give information about household / names	420	1,323	8.0	8.5
Refusal by target adult (16+)	431	2,621	15.8	16.9
Refusal by proxy (other person)	432	416	2.5	2.7
Refusal (parental permission)	433	10	0.1	0.1
Broken appointment – no re-contact	450	391	2.4	2.5
<b>Other non-response (O)</b>		<b>736</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Refusal because ill at home during entire fieldwork period	510	97	0.6	0.6
Refusal because away / in hospital during entire fieldwork period	520	119	0.7	0.8
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	184	1.1	1.2
Language barrier / difficulties	540	131	0.8	0.8
Language barrier with target respondent	542	4	0.0	0.0
Lost interview	550	0	0.0	0.0
Full interview achieved but target adult 16+ requested data be deleted	591	0	0.0	0.0

Partial interview achieved but target adult 16+ requested data be deleted	592	0	0.0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	201	1.2	1.3
<b>Unknown eligibility (UE)</b>		<b>828</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.3</b>
Not issued to an interviewer	611	0	0.0	0.0
Issued but not attempted	612	25	0.2	0.2
Address inaccessible	620	62	0.4	0.4
Unable to locate address / insufficient address	630	78	0.5	0.5
No contact with anyone at address (after required visits made)	650	654	3.9	4.2
Other unknown eligibility	690	9	0.1	0.1
<b>Ineligible (NE)</b>		<b>1,076</b>	<b>6.5</b>	
Not yet built/under construction	710	19	0.1	
Demolished/derelict	720	34	0.2	
Vacant/empty	730	702	4.2	
Non-residential	740	162	1.0	
Address occupied, but no resident(s)	750	76	0.5	
Communal establishment/institution	760	27	0.2	
Resident household(s), but no person eligible for the survey	770	16	0.1	
Other ineligible	790	40	0.2	
<b>Total issued</b>		<b>16,560</b>		

When interviewers used certain refusal outcome codes (431 and 432) they were required to record why respondents refused. The most common five reasons given for refusal were as follows:

- Not interested (53.3%)
- Too busy (31.7%)
- Another reason (12.4%)
- Waste of time (6.8%)
- Stressful family situation (6.3%)

No reason was offered by those refusing in 6.4 per cent of households that refused to participate in the survey.

Table 4.6 shows the fieldwork unadjusted response rates and yield rates for the Year 13 Taking Part sample, broken down by former Government Office Region. The yield rate was highest in the North East, which also had the highest unadjusted response rate (64.6%). The lowest yield rate and unadjusted response rate were seen in London.

**Table 4.6: Fieldwork response rates by former Government Office Region (adult sample)**

Region	Issued	In scope	Interviews	Unadjusted response rate	Yield rate
North East	1,448	87.1%	814	64.6%	56.2%
North West	2,162	89.4%	1,071	55.4%	49.5%
Yorkshire and the Humber	1,609	89.4%	867	60.3%	53.9%
East Midlands	1,475	91.3%	673	50.0%	45.6%
West Midlands	1,656	88.6%	694	47.3%	41.9%
East of England	1,770	89.9%	884	55.5%	49.9%
London	2,230	85.8%	784	41.0%	35.2%
South East	2,533	88.8%	1,195	53.1%	47.2%
South West	1,677	86.7%	733	50.4%	43.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,560</b>	<b>88.5%</b>	<b>7,715</b>	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>46.6%</b>

### Youth sample

Table 4.7 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the youth sample for Year 13 of Taking Part. Youths were eligible for interview in 855 households, that is in 11.4 per cent of households where we achieved an adult interview. The final youth contact rate<sup>15</sup> was 98.2 per cent and the final co-operation rate<sup>16</sup> was 79.9 per cent.

The in-household youth response rate<sup>17</sup> was 78.5 per cent. As a youth interview could only be conducted in households where the adult interview had been completed, the response rate for the youth survey is the adult cross-sectional response rate multiplied by the in-household youth response rate. The youth response rate is thus 39.3 per cent (50.1% \* 78.5%).

<sup>15</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 12 technical report: (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive) / Total non-deadwood. This is the same as the Contact Rate 3 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

<sup>16</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 12 technical report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive). This is the same as the Co-operation Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

<sup>17</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 12 technical report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Non-contact + Other unproductive). This is the same as the Response Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

**Table 4.7: Fieldwork outcomes (youth sample)**

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases
<b>Complete interview (I+P)</b>		671	78.5
Complete interview with target respondent	111	671	78.5
Partial interview with target respondent	211	0	0.0
<b>Eligible, but no interview (NC)</b>		15	1.8
Contact made with responsible resident at given address, but not with target respondent	323	7	0.8
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	6	0.7
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	2	0.2
<b>Refusals (R)</b>		141	16.5
Refusal by target respondent	431	32	3.7
Refusal by proxy	432	47	5.5
Refusal (parental permission)	433	47	5.5
Refusal during interview	440	2	0.2
Broken appointment – no recontact	450	13	1.5
Full interview achieved but respondent requested data be deleted	591	0	0.0
Partial interview achieved but respondent requested data be deleted	592	0	0.0
<b>Other non-response (O)</b>		28	3.3
Ill at home during field period	510	0	0.0
Away/in hospital throughout field period	520	6	0.7
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	6	0.7
Language barrier with target respondent	542	0	0.0
Lost interview	550	0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	16	1.9
<b>Total issued</b>		855	

### Child sample

Table 4.8 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the child sample for Year 13 of Taking Part. An adult respondent was eligible to complete the child proxy interview in 978 households, that is in 12.7 per cent of households where we achieved an adult interview. The final co-operation rate<sup>18</sup> was 93.6 per cent.

<sup>18</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 12 technical report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive). This is the same as the Co-operation Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

The in-household child proxy response rate<sup>19</sup> was 92.9 per cent. As a child proxy interview could only be conducted in households where the adult interview had been completed, the response rate for the child proxy survey is the adult response rate multiplied by the in-household child proxy response rate. The child proxy response rate is thus 46.5 per cent (50.1% \* 92.9%).

**Table 4.8: Fieldwork outcomes (child sample)**

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases
<b>Complete interview (I+P)</b>		909	92.9
Complete interview with target respondent	111	909	92.9
Partial interview with target respondent	211	0	0.0
<b>Eligible, but no interview (NC)</b>		7	0.7
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	7	0.7
<b>Refusals (R)</b>		49	5.0
Refusal by target respondent	431	18	1.8
Refusal by proxy	432	22	2.2
Refusal during interview	440	5	0.5
Broken appointment – no recontact	450	4	0.4
Full interview achieved but respondent requested data be deleted	591	0	0.0
Partial interview achieved but respondent requested data be deleted	592	0	0.0
<b>Other non-response (O)</b>		13	1.3
Ill at home during field period	510	0	0.0
Away/in hospital throughout field period	520	1	0.1
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	0	0.0
Language barrier with target respondent	542	1	0.1
Lost interview	550	0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	11	1.1
<b>Total issued</b>		978	

## Web panel recruitment

### Adult sample

Table 4.9 sets out an analysis of adult web panel recruitment. The proportion of adults willing to join the web panel was unchanged since Year 12, at 56.2 per cent.

<sup>19</sup> We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 technical report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Non-contact + Other unproductive). This is the same as the Response Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

**Table 4.9: Adult web panel recruitment analysis**

	<b>All</b>
<b>Adults interviewed</b>	<b>7,715</b>
With internet access	6,671
Willing to join web panel	4,333
Willing to consider joining web panel	252
% of adults with internet access	86.5%
% of adults with internet access willing to join web panel	64.9%
% of adults with internet access willing to consider joining web panel	3.8%
% of all adults willing to join web panel	56.2%
% of all adults willing to consider joining web panel	3.3%

Interviewers asked those refusing to join the web panel for their reasons. The most common five reasons given by those refusing to join the web panel were the same as those given in Year 12:

- Being too busy (38.2%);
- Feeling they had done enough already (20.9%);
- Lacking the internet skills to complete the web questionnaire (13.6%);
- Not wanting to complete questionnaires on the web (8.7%); and
- A reason not given on the list of answer options (9.6%).

Table 4.10 sets out an analysis of adult web panel recruitment rates, by key demographics.

There were significant differences in the proportion of respondents who were willing to join the web panel by gender, age, ethnicity, socio-economic group (NS-SEC), disability, engagement with the arts in the previous 12 months, visiting a heritage site or museum in the previous 12 months, and using a public library in the previous 12 months. The key points to note are:

- 1.** Willingness to join the web panel was higher among those aged 16 to 54, but lower among those aged 55 or over, with the oldest age groups being least willing. Around 70 per cent of those aged 16 to 54 were willing to join the web panel, but the proportion willing to do so fell to 43.8 per cent among those age 75 to 79 and to 32.3 per cent among those aged 80 or over. While lower rates of internet access partly explain why older age groups were less willing to join the web panel, willingness to join web the panel starts to decline by age at the 45 to 54 age group.



2. Those in the upper socio-economic classes were significantly more likely to join the web panel than those in the lower socio-economic classes. The proportion of those in the upper socio-economic classes willing to join the web panel was around twenty percentage points higher than among those in the lower socio-economic classes.
3. The data for the web panel recruitment suggests that the web panel may be biased towards respondents who had engaged with the arts in the previous 12 months, visited a heritage site or museum in the previous 12 months, and visited a public library in the previous 12 months. These respondents were significantly more willing to join the web panel than those who had not.
4. Many of the variables are correlated with each other. For example, disability rates are higher among older age groups. Further, it is likely that those who visit museums also engage with the arts, or visit a library.

**Table 4.10: Adult web panel recruitment analysis**

	All adult respondents		
	With internet access (%)	Willing to join web panel (%) (with internet access)	Willing to join web panel (%) (of all respondents)
<i>Base size</i>	7,715	6,671	7,715
<b>All</b>	86.5	65.0	56.2
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	87.7	62.3	54.6
Female	85.5	67.2	57.4
<b>Age</b>			
16-24	99.1	71.6	71.0
25-34	98.9	69.4	68.6
35-44	98.0	70.4	69.0
45-54	95.9	68.5	65.7
55-64	90.3	62.9	56.8
65-74	77.9	59.8	46.5
75-79	56.8	43.8	24.9
80+	37.2	32.3	12.0
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
White	85.9	66.1	56.8
Black	90.6	54.9	49.8
Asian	89.7	55.1	49.4
Other	91.9	63.4	58.3
<b>Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)</b>			
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	92.0	69.9	64.3
Lower (classes 5 to 8)	75.9	58.3	44.2
<b>Disability</b>			
Disability	72.5	60.8	44.1
No disability	91.4	66.3	60.6

<b>Level of activity</b>			
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	90.3	68.7	62.1
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	72.7	48.2	35.1
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	90.8	69.0	62.7
Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	74.7	51.6	38.5
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	93.6	72.1	67.5
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	79.9	57.2	45.7
Using a public library in the previous 12 months	90.4	71.0	64.2
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months	84.4	61.7	52.1

Table 4.11 compares the profile of the population<sup>20</sup> to that of the respondents and those agreeing to join the web panel<sup>21</sup>. Compared with the population of England, the following groups are under-represented on the web panel: men, the youngest (16 to 24) and oldest (75+) age groups, those from ethnic minority backgrounds, those from the lower socio-economic groups, those without disabilities, those who do not engage with the arts, those who do not visit heritage sites or museums, and those who do not use public libraries.

**Table 4.11: Adult web panel population profile**

	Population	All respondents	Respondents willing to join web panel (%)	Respondents willing to join web panel (n)
	Population (%)	(%)	All	All
<b>All</b>			56.2	4,333
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	49.0	45.3	44.0	1,907
Female	51.0	54.7	56.0	2,426
<b>Age</b>				
16-24	13.7	7.0	8.9	384
25-34	16.9	14.6	17.8	772
35-44	15.9	16.6	20.4	883
45-54	17.3	16.0	18.8	813
55-64	14.1	16.2	16.4	711
65-74	12.1	16.6	13.8	597
75-79	4.0	5.4	2.4	103
80+	6.0	7.6	1.6	70
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
White	85.4	88.8	89.8	3,892

<sup>20</sup> These figures are derived from mid-year population estimates and similar data. Estimates for levels of activity are derived from the weighted estimates from the Year 13 Taking Part face-to-face survey.

<sup>21</sup> These figures are unweighted.

Black	3.5	2.6	2.3	101
Asian	7.8	5.1	4.5	196
Other	2.3	2.9	3.0	130
<b>Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)</b>				
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	48.4	48.7	55.7	2,413
Lower (classes 5 to 8)	33.9	33.3	26.2	1,135
Not classified	17.7	18.1	18.1	785
<b>Disability</b>				
Disability	17.2	25.8	20.3	878
No disability	82.8	73.5	79.3	3,436
<b>Level of activity</b>				
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	78.9	78.2	86.4	3,743
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	21.1	21.8	13.6	590
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	72.8	73.1	81.5	3,533
Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	27.2	26.9	18.5	800
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	48.1	47.9	57.6	2,495
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	51.9	52.1	42.4	1,838
Using a public library in the previous 12 months	32.7	34.1	39.0	1,689
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months	67.2	65.7	61.0	2,642

### Youth sample

Table 4.12 sets out an analysis of youth web panel recruitment.

**Table 4.12: Youth web panel recruitment analysis**

	<b>All</b>
<b>Youths interviewed</b>	<b>671</b>
Parents consenting for youth to join web panel	480
Parents consenting for youth to provide email address or mobile telephone number	456
Youths willing to join web panel	434
Youths willing to consider joining web panel	9
% of parents consenting for youth to join web panel	71.5%
% of parents consenting for youth to provide email address or mobile telephone number	68.0%
% of youths willing to join web panel after parental consent given	95.2%

% of youths willing to consider joining web panel after parental consent given	2.0%
% of all youths willing to join web panel	64.7%
% of all youths willing to consider joining web panel	1.3%

Interviewers asked those parents refusing to let the youth respondent join the web panel the reason(s) for their refusal. The most common reasons given by parents were:

- Feeling they had done enough already (31.9%);
- Being too busy (28.8%);
- Considering the youth too young (19.9%); and
- Unable due to sickness or disability or a reason not given on the list of answer options (both mentioned by 6.3%)

Interviewers also asked those youths refusing to join the web panel for the reason(s) for their refusal. Most refusals to the youth web panel recruitment questions were given by the parent and only 13 by the youth (see Table 4.13). The reasons given by youths were being too young (4), feeling they had done enough already (3), not wanting to complete questionnaires on the web (2), a reason not given on the list of answer options (2), being too busy (1), a questionnaire every three months is too much (1), does not trust giving information on the internet (1), and being unable due to sickness or disability (1).

Table 4.13 sets out an analysis of youth web panel recruitment rates, by key demographics.

**Table 4.13: Youth web panel recruitment analysis**

	All youth respondents		
	Parent willing for youth to join web panel (%)	Youth willing to join web panel (%) (of asked)	Youth willing to join web panel (%) (of all respondents)
<i>Base size</i>	671	456	671
<b>All</b>	68.0	95.2	64.7
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	66.3	96.3	63.8
Female	69.6	94.1	65.5
<b>Age</b>			
11	69.7	94.1	65.5
12	64.6	96.1	62.0
13	70.0	95.9	67.1
14	65.9	96.5	63.6
15	70.7	92.9	65.7
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
White	70.5	95.6	67.5

Other	55.9	92.4	51.7
<b>Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)</b>			
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	74.1	96.2	71.3
Lower (classes 5 to 8)	63.7	94.8	60.4
<b>Disability</b>			
Disability	70.8	94.1	66.7
No disability	67.9	95.3	64.7
<b>Level of activity</b>			
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	69.3	95.1	66.0
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	21.1	100.0	21.1
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	72.6	95.0	69.0
Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	57.4	95.7	54.9
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	70.8	95.0	67.3
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	63.6	95.4	60.7
Using a public library in the previous 12 months	69.1	95.2	65.8
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months	65.2	94.9	61.9

Table 4.14 compares the profile of the youth population to that of the respondents and those agreeing to join the web panel.

**Table 4.14: Youth web panel population profile<sup>22</sup>**

	Population	All respondents	Respondents willing to join web panel (%)	Respondents willing to join web panel (n)
	Population (%)	(%)	All	All
<b>All</b>				671
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	51.2	49.0	48.4	210
Female	48.8	51.0	51.6	224
<b>Age</b>				
11	20.7	21.6	21.9	95
12	20.3	23.5	22.6	98
13	19.7	20.9	21.7	94
14	19.4	19.2	18.9	82
15	19.9	14.8	15.0	65
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
White	:	82.4	85.9	373

<sup>22</sup> : is used to indicate where data are not available.

Other	:	17.6	14.1	61
<b>Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)</b>				
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	:	42.6	47.0	204
Lower (classes 5 to 8)	:	31.6	29.5	128
<b>Disability</b>				
Disability	:	10.7	11.1	48
No disability	:	88.2	88.2	383
<b>Level of activity</b>				
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months		96.4	97.2	430
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months		3.6	2.8	4
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months		68.2	69.6	322
Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months		31.8	30.4	112
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months		57.4	59.2	265
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months		41.9	40.8	165
Using a public library in the previous 12 months		71.8	72.9	320
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months		27.7	27.1	112

## National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage consent rates

Table 4.15 sets out an analysis of consent rates for National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage.

**Table 4.15: Consent rates for National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage**

	<b>All</b>
<b>Youths</b>	<b>671</b>
Parents consenting for youth's NPD records to be linked to survey data	474
Youths consenting for their NPD records to be linked to survey data	461
% of parents consenting for youth's NPD records to be linked to survey data	70.6%
% of youths consenting for their NPD records to be linked to survey data, after parental consent given	97.3%
% of all youths where consent for NPD records to be linked to survey data given	68.7%
<b>Children</b>	<b>909</b>
Parents consenting for child's NPD records to be linked to survey data	644
% of parents consenting for child's NPD records to be linked to survey data	70.8%

## Interview lengths

The questionnaire for the adult interview was revised twice after the start of Year 13 fieldwork, so that slightly different questionnaires were used for the Quarter 1, Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 samples.

The overall timings produced for each quarter's sample were reviewed to identify a significant break point above which to exclude outliers. In addition, only those interviews recorded as having taken place in a single session were included in the analysis to avoid the reliability of the figures being affected by interruptions.

Table 4.16 shows the overall interview lengths for each of these questionnaire versions.

**Table 4.16: Adult interview lengths**

	<b>All</b>
<b>Q1</b>	
Mean	39 minutes 24 seconds
Median	37 minutes 23 seconds
<b>Q2</b>	
Mean	39 minutes 28 seconds
Median	37 minutes 29 seconds
<b>Q3</b>	
Mean	38 minutes 01 seconds
Median	36 minutes 21 seconds
<b>Q4</b>	
Mean	38 minutes 54 seconds
Median	36 minutes 59 seconds
<b>Year 13</b>	
Mean	38 minutes 56 seconds
Median	37 minutes 02 seconds



The same youth and child questionnaires were used throughout Year 13. Table 4.17 shows the overall interview lengths for each of these questionnaires.

**Table 4.17: Youth and child interview lengths**

	<b>All</b>
<b>Youth interviews</b>	
Mean	23 minutes 21 seconds
Median	21 minutes 30 seconds
<b>Child interviews</b>	
Mean	12 minutes 33 seconds
Median	11 minutes 50 seconds

# Data processing and outputs

## Introduction

Full data and other outputs were delivered to DCMS after all Year 13 fieldwork was complete, with an interim delivery at the end of the first six months of fieldwork. This interim delivery took place on 16 November 2017, following a cut-off for inclusion of cases of 30 September 2017. Full Year 13 data and other outputs were delivered in June 2018. Each delivery comprised SPSS datasets, and tables summarising key indicators. This section describes the content of these and the quality checks applied in their production.

## Coding open-ended questions

The questionnaires contained a number of open-ended questions, including those where a specified list of options included an 'other' category. In these cases, responses were recorded by interviewers as text.

Initial coding was undertaken by NatCen Social Research's specially trained coding and editing team, using an Excel-based 'coding hub'. This phase involved coding of any open-ended questions, and addressing any notes made by interviewers during the interview. The coding and editing team was briefed in person before starting work, and each coder's first assignment was double-checked. Thereafter the data hub spreadsheets were reviewed to ensure consistency of approach and quality of work.

Where possible, responses were back-coded into existing categories. Code frames for new open questions were developed by the coding and editing team and researchers, based on listings of verbatim responses. For open-ended questions used in previous survey years, existing code frames were used as a starting point and additional codes agreed with DCMS where these would not disrupt the time-series. All code frames were signed off by the research team and DCMS.

Standard coding of harmonised occupational and employment data was carried out to enable classification according to the standard National Statistics categorisations of Standard Occupational Classification (SOC2010) and Socio Economic Classification (NS-SEC).

Coding took place throughout the fieldwork period to ensure timely delivery of data. The 'coding hub' spreadsheets enabled the research team and DCMS to monitor progress and ensure a consistent approach.

## Data management

Data sets were structured to be consistent with the survey data from previous years. This was managed by using NatCen Social Research's 'data hub' process to control the organisation of data and its manipulation into the required structure. The data hub is MS Excel-based. All key aspects of the data, such as variable and value names and labels, were entered into a spreadsheet which then automatically created SPSS syntax to transform the data into the required format (for example, SPSS re-labelling syntax was automatically generated from the label text specified in the spreadsheet).

This method ensured the following:

- The automatic generation of syntax significantly reduced the likelihood of human error in manually creating syntax from a separate specification.
- The spreadsheet provided clear and easily accessible documentation of the final dataset for checking and editing.

Variables from the Year 12 (2016/17) and Year 13 survey years were mapped in the data hub to check that variables were formatted consistently between survey years.

For multi-coded questions, separate dichotomous variables were produced for each answer option, indicating whether a respondent selected that response or not.

## Variable naming

Variable names remain consistent with previous years, with the exception of questions that have changed since the Year 12 survey. Where variables have changed since Year 12, a suffix of 'Y13' was added to the variable name.

Changes to variables can be identified in the change documentation which will be published separately.

## SPSS outputs: interim data set

An interim data set was produced, based on data collected from adults up to 30 September 2017, covering the majority of the cases from the first six fieldwork months. This data set included adult cases only, and comprised a set of key variables used to produce statistical release tables. The interim dataset contained 3,202 adult respondents, comprising 87.3 per cent of adult respondents interviewed in the Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 samples. The final annual dataset contained data from 7,715 adult respondents.

## SPSS outputs: Annual datasets

Annual datasets were produced following the close of Year 13 fieldwork. Three SPSS datasets were delivered to DCMS, of which two are being prepared for the UK Data Archive. An overview of each dataset produced and numbers included in each dataset is outlined below.

### Adult dataset

The adult dataset contains data from interviewed adults (aged 16 and over) from the sample who were interviewed in the Year 13 fieldwork year. The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 13 fieldwork year only for 7,715 adults.

### Child dataset

The child dataset contains data containing data from all children (aged 5-15) from the sample who were interviewed in the Year 13 fieldwork year. The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 13 fieldwork year only for 671 youths aged 11 to 15 and 909 children aged 5 to 10.

## Half-yearly adult dataset

The half-yearly adult dataset contains data from interviewed adults (aged 16 and over) from the sample who were interviewed in the first half of the Year 13 fieldwork year up to 30 September 2017. The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 13 fieldwork year only. The half-yearly dataset contained 3,202 adult respondents.

### Data checking process and quality checking

The data underwent a series of checking, cleaning and quality assurance procedures, including:

- Reconciliation of booked-in data against received interview data across Ipsos MORI and NatCen datasets, that is, checking that cases recorded as productive contain interview data.
- Logic and consistency checks to ensure that the data outputs reflect the agreed questionnaire specification.
- Logic checks for minimum and maximum values entered by the interviewer, for example, amount of time spent doing an activity.
- Assigning missing values to the data as per specification agreed with DCMS.
- Checking overall counts and estimates against previous survey years, where applicable.
- Production of derived variables as per specification agreed with DCMS.
- All derived variable syntax and table outputs were checked by another member of the Research team prior to delivery.

### Taking Part Statistical Release

NatCen Social Research delivered tables for publication showing key findings for the Taking Part Statistical Releases, designed to be as consistent as possible with previous years. The half-year dashboard table were delivered in November 2017, and was based on adult data from April to September 2017 (most of the first half of the Year 13 fieldwork year). The full Year 13 tables were delivered in June 2018, and were based on adult and child data for the full Year 13 fieldwork year (April 2017 – April 2018). The tables were delivered in an Excel workbook, and the content of each spreadsheet is summarised in Table 5.1.

**Table 5.1: Statistical spreadsheets produced for the full dataset**

Spreadsheet	Overview of spreadsheet
<b>Arts</b>	Engaged with the arts in the last year Frequency of engagement with the arts in the last year Barriers to attending arts events Barriers to participating in the arts Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables
<b>Heritage</b>	Visited a heritage site in the last year Frequency of visiting a heritage site in the last year

	<p>Whether visited a heritage site in own time, for paid work, for academic study or for voluntary work</p> <p>Types of heritage visited</p> <p>Reasons for not visiting heritage sites</p> <p>Analysis by area-level variables</p> <p>Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>Museums and galleries</b>	<p>Visited a museum or gallery in the last year</p> <p>Frequency of visiting a museum or gallery in the last year</p> <p>Whether visited a museum or gallery in own time, for paid work, for academic study or for voluntary work</p> <p>Reasons for not visiting museums or galleries</p> <p>Analysis by area-level variables</p> <p>Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>Libraries</b>	<p>Visited a public library in the last year</p> <p>Frequency of visiting a public library in the last year</p> <p>Whether visited a public library in own time, for paid work, for academic study or for voluntary work</p> <p>Ways in which public library services were used in the last year</p> <p>Reasons for not using public library services</p> <p>Analysis by area-level variables</p> <p>Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>Archives</b>	<p>Visited an archive centre or records office in the last year</p> <p>Visited an archive centre or record office in the last year in own time, for paid work, for academic study or for voluntary work</p> <p>Frequency of visiting an archive centre or records office in the last year</p> <p>Reasons for attending an archive centre or records office in own time or voluntary work</p> <p>Analysis by area-level variables</p> <p>Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>Digital participation</b>	<p>Visited websites in the last year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Museum or gallery website</li> <li>• Library website</li> <li>• Heritage website</li> <li>• Arts website</li> <li>• Archive or record office website</li> <li>• Sport website</li> </ul> <p>Reasons for visiting websites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Museum or gallery website</li> <li>• Library website</li> <li>• Heritage website</li> <li>• Theatre or concert website</li> <li>• Arts website</li> <li>• Archive or record office website</li> </ul> <p>Analysis by area-level variables</p> <p>Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>Charitable giving</b>	<p>Has donated money in the last year</p> <p>Frequency of charitable giving in the last year</p> <p>Means through which money was donated in the last year</p> <p>Whether has donated money in the last year to</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• The arts</li> <li>• Museums or galleries</li> <li>• Libraries</li> <li>• Sport</li> <li>• Any DCMS sector</li> </ul> <p>Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>Volunteering</b>	<p>Has volunteered in the last year Has volunteered in DCMS sectors last year Frequency of volunteering in the last year Types of volunteering activity Whether volunteering activity was connected to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The arts</li> <li>• Museums or galleries</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Libraries</li> <li>• Archives</li> <li>• Sport</li> <li>• Any DCMS sector</li> </ul> <p>Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>First World War</b>	<p>Awareness of national or local events or activities to commemorate the Centenary of the First World War Awareness of individual events to commemorate the Centenary of the First World War Attitudes to commemorating the Centenary of the First World War Ways of following the First World War Centenary events Plans for involvement in events to commemorate the Centenary of the First World War Whether these events have helped understanding of what was experienced by those who fought in the war and those who lived at the time of the war Whether these events encouraged involvement in volunteering for community or other activities</p> <p>Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables</p>
<b>TV</b>	<p>Things that you do nowadays: watch TV Type(s) of programme watched in the last 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sports</li> <li>• Documentary about the history, architecture and/or monuments of Britain</li> <li>• Other historical documentary</li> <li>• Documentary about museums/galleries</li> <li>• Documentary about the arts</li> <li>• Historical drama (a fictional TV show, featuring actors, set in the past)</li> <li>• Other drama</li> <li>• Music (a TV show featuring live or recorded music)</li> <li>• News</li> <li>• Film</li> </ul>

## Weighting

The approach to weighting required two stages of calibration weighting to mid-year population counts. At the first stage household level weights were generated; these were used at the second stage to generate the individual level weights.

### Stage 1: Household weights

The first stage of weighting generated household-level weights so that the weighted counts of household members matched the 2016 mid-year population estimates<sup>23</sup> for categories of age group and gender, and by region (see Tables 5.2 to 5.4). The starting weights for the calibration were calculated by first generating a dwelling weight equal to the number of dwellings identified at the address and trimmed at 2. This dwelling weight was then adjusted within each region by a constant so that the weighted number of household members equalled the population counts – this was used as the starting weight.

The calibration adjustment was trimmed at the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles to reduce the variance of the weights.

### Stage 2: Adult / youth / child calibration weights

Selection weights were calculated for the selection of one adult (16 or older), one youth (aged 11-15) and one child (aged 5-10). These were equal to the number of adults, youths and children identified in the household, but were trimmed at 3, 2 and 2 (respectively) to avoid large weights. These weights were combined with the household weights produced in Stage 1 to generate the starting weights for the individual-level calibration stage.

The calibration stage adjusts these weights separately so that the profile of the achieved sample of adults, youths and children matched the corresponding mid-year 2016 populations counts for age/gender group and region (see Tables 5.2 to 5.4). No trimming was required for the individual calibration weights as the adjustment factors were not particular variable.

Note that some cases were missing age (due to respondent refusal), but not gender. Those cases were excluded from the individual calibration stage and were assigned the mean calibration weights based on gender and region.

The final weights (wt\_adult, wt\_youth and wt\_child) were scaled to have a mean of 1.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ideally we would have used 2017 mid-year population estimates, but these were not available at the time the weighting was undertaken.

**Table 5.2: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: counts**

	<b>All</b>	<b>Adults (16+)</b>	<b>Youths (11-15)</b>	<b>Children (5-10)</b>
<b>North East</b>	2,636,848	2,169,053	136,410	182,953
<b>North West</b>	7,219,623	5,852,406	395,816	528,525
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	5,425,741	4,397,260	297,710	399,428
<b>East Midlands</b>	4,724,437	3,852,451	254,656	338,934
<b>West Midlands</b>	5,800,734	4,666,775	331,716	436,977
<b>East of England</b>	6,130,542	4,956,562	338,898	456,040
<b>London</b>	8,787,892	6,992,251	474,571	685,509
<b>South East</b>	9,026,297	7,304,015	504,927	675,337
<b>South West</b>	5,515,953	4,548,194	285,940	375,707
<b>TOTAL</b>	55,268,067	44,738,967	3,020,644	4,079,410

**Table 5.3: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: percentages**

	<b>All</b>	<b>Adults (16+)</b>	<b>Youths (11-15)</b>	<b>Children (5-10)</b>
<b>North East</b>	4.77%	4.85%	4.52%	4.48%
<b>North West</b>	13.06%	13.08%	13.10%	12.96%
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	9.82%	9.83%	9.86%	9.79%
<b>East Midlands</b>	8.55%	8.61%	8.43%	8.31%
<b>West Midlands</b>	10.50%	10.43%	10.98%	10.71%
<b>East of England</b>	11.09%	11.08%	11.22%	11.18%
<b>London</b>	15.90%	15.63%	15.71%	16.80%
<b>South East</b>	16.33%	16.33%	16.72%	16.55%
<b>South West</b>	9.98%	10.17%	9.47%	9.21%
<b>TOTAL</b>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%



**Table 5.4: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by age group and gender: counts and percentages**

	<b>Males: counts</b>	<b>Females: counts</b>	<b>Males: %</b>	<b>Females: %</b>
<b>0-4</b>	1,757,639	1,671,407	3.18%	3.02%
<b>5-10</b>	2,089,068	1,990,342	3.78%	3.60%
<b>11-15</b>	1,546,680	1,473,964	2.80%	2.67%
<b>16-24</b>	3,148,246	2,989,586	5.70%	5.41%
<b>25-34</b>	3,799,113	3,762,097	6.87%	6.81%
<b>35-44</b>	3,530,273	3,562,004	6.39%	6.44%
<b>45-54</b>	3,831,407	3,924,767	6.93%	7.10%
<b>55-64</b>	3,107,024	3,201,609	5.62%	5.79%
<b>65-74</b>	2,608,023	2,805,321	4.72%	5.08%
<b>75+</b>	1,883,447	2,586,050	3.41%	4.68%
<b>TOTAL</b>	27,300,920	27,967,147	49.40%	50.60%
<b>16-24</b>	3,148,246	2,989,586	7.04%	6.68%
<b>25-34</b>	3,799,113	3,762,097	8.49%	8.41%
<b>35-44</b>	3,530,273	3,562,004	7.89%	7.96%
<b>45-54</b>	3,831,407	3,924,767	8.56%	8.77%
<b>55-64</b>	3,107,024	3,201,609	6.94%	7.16%
<b>65-74</b>	2,608,023	2,805,321	5.83%	6.27%
<b>75+</b>	1,883,447	2,586,050	4.21%	5.78%
<b>ADULTS (16+)</b>	21,907,533	22,831,434	48.97%	51.03%
<b>11-13</b>	938,886	894,698	31.08%	29.62%
<b>14-15</b>	607,794	579,266	20.12%	19.18%
<b>YOUTHS (11 to 15)</b>	1,546,680	1,473,964	51.20%	48.80%
<b>5-7</b>	1,062,779	1,013,960	26.05%	24.86%
<b>8-10</b>	1,026,289	976,382	25.16%	23.93%
<b>CHILDREN (5 to 10)</b>	2,089,068	1,990,342	51.21%	48.79%

**Nicholas Gilby**

Research Director

nicholas.gilby@ipsos.com

## For more information

3 Thomas More Square  
London  
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

**[www.ipsos-mori.com](http://www.ipsos-mori.com)**

**<http://twitter.com/IpsosMORI>**

### **About Ipsos MORI's Social Research Institute**

The Social Research Institute works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methods and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.