



Ipsos MORI
Social Research Institute

March 2019

National Youth Social Action

Survey: Wave 5

Technical report

Sarah Knibbs, Claudia Mollidor, Bláithín Stack

Contents

Methodology	1
Questionnaire design	1
Main fieldwork	1
Data Processing and weighting	1
Sample profile	2
Statistical reliability	3
Guide to social classification	5
Cognitive testing	6
Approach	6
New questions	6
Amended questions	8

List of Tables

Table 1.1: Sample profile	2
Table 1.2: Size of sample by sampling tolerances	4
Table 1.3: Size of sample by differences required for significance at percentage levels	4
Table 1.4: Social class definitions	5
Table 1.5: Profile of participants in the cognitive interviews	6

Methodology

Ipsos MORI was commissioned by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) and Step Up To Serve to conduct the National Youth Social Action survey. The survey was established in 2014 to measure the participation of 10-20 year olds across the UK in social action and inform the #iwill campaign's strategy and communications.

To date five waves of the survey have been conducted, with the most recent taking place between October-November 2018.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire for the fifth wave of the survey was based on the fourth wave, with revisions and some questions added. Of the new questions included in the 2018 survey, some were derived from existing surveys; others were designed specifically for the Youth Social Action survey. New questions, not previously used in other studies, were cognitively tested with young people in July. The aim of the cognitive testing was to understand how respondents interpreted and comprehend the new questions, and to ensure key terminology and concepts were well understood.

Full details of which questions were included in the cognitive testing can be found on page 6 of this report.

Main fieldwork

The main survey was conducted face-to-face in respondents' homes by Welwyn Research Ltd. Trained interviewers introduced the survey, gained parental consent for under-16s to participate, and administered the survey. A random location quota design was used to achieve a nationally representative sample. The survey took a sample of sampling points across the UK, with quotas set in each in order to achieve nationally representative samples. Boost sampling was used to achieve a minimum number of interviews in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The main survey fieldwork was conducted from 19th October-12th November 2018. Overall, fully completed questionnaires were obtained from 2,034 young people.

Data processing and weighting

The data was manually punched and verified, and all findings systematically checked against the raw data outputs.

The data were weighted for two reasons. First, the survey used a disproportionately stratified design in order to boost the number of interviews in the UK nations. Second, although the survey used a quota approach, interviewers in some instances achieved a marginally different profile of interviews than the quota targets. As a result, a small amount of weighting was required so that the profile of the achieved sample matches the population on key characteristics. The research team reviewed the research findings to identify the key variables on which to apply weights.

Data are weighted by age within gender, region, and the family socio-economic status. The weights were derived from 2012 census information from the Office of National Statistics. The effect of weighting is shown in the sample profile in the Appendices.

When interpreting the figures in this report, please note that we only report on statistically significant differences throughout; the effect of the data weighting is taken into account when significance tests are conducted.

Sample profile

Table 1.1 Sample profile

	Number	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Total	2,034	100	100
Gender of Pupils			
Male	970	48	51
Female	1064	52	49
Age of Pupils			
10	198	10	8
11	161	8	8
12	175	9	9
13	152	7	9
14	156	8	9
15	155	8	9
16	210	10	9
17	220	11	9
18	214	11	10
19	177	9	10
20	216	11	10
Ethnic Origin			
White	1784	88	85
BME	250	12	15
Status			
SEN	78	4	4
Disability	71	3	3
Occupation			
School	1119	55	57
College	318	16	15
University	176	9	8
Job	259	13	14
Apprenticeship	37	2	2

Unemployed	122	6	4
Social Grade			
AB	273	13	27
C1	748	37	29
C2	388	19	21
DE	625	31	23
Region			
Greater London	187	9	13
South East	229	11	14
South West	109	5	8
North East	126	6	4
North West	159	8	11
Eastern	193	9	13
East Midlands	108	5	7
West Midlands	137	7	9
Yorkshire & Humberside	136	7	8
Country			
England	1384	68	84
Wales	212	10	5
Scotland	215	11	8
Northern Ireland	223	11	3

Source: Ipsos MORI

Statistical reliability

The respondents to the questionnaire are only samples of the total population, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if all 10–20 year olds in the UK had been interviewed (the true values). We can, however, predict the variation between the sample results and the true values from knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that a particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually chosen to be 95% - that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the true value will fall within a specified range. Table 1.2 illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the 95% confidence interval using t-tests.

Table 1.2 Size of sample by sampling tolerances

Size of sample on which survey results is based	Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	+	+	+
100 interviews	6	9	10
500 interviews	3	4	4
1,000 interviews	2	3	3
2,034 interviews (<i>All 10-20 year old respondents to this survey</i>)	1	2	2

Source: Ipsos MORI

For example, with a sample of 2,034 where 30% give a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the “true” value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 2 percentage points from the sample result.

Strictly speaking the tolerances shown here apply only to random samples, although they offer an approximation for the quota design used by the current study. Good quality quota surveys have been shown to behave in the same ways as findings derived from random probability studies¹.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be “real”, or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been interviewed). To test if the difference is a real one - i.e. if it is “statistically significant”, we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume “95% confidence interval”, the differences between the two sample results must be greater than the values given in Table 1.3:

Table 1.3 Size of sample by differences required for significance at percentage levels

Size of sample compared	Differences required for significance at or near these percentage levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
100 and 100	8	13	14
250 and 100	7	11	12
500 and 250	5	7	8
500 and 500	4	6	6
1,000 and 500	3	5	5
1,000 and 1,000 (e.g. boys vs. girls)	3	4	4
1,500 and 1,000	2	4	4

Source: Ipsos MORI

¹ Orton, S. (1994), Evidence of the Efficiency of Quota Samples. Survey Methods Newsletter, vol. 15, no. 1; Stephenson, C. B. (1979), Probability Sampling with Quotas: Wan Experiment. POQ, vol. 43, no. 4.

For example, with a sample of 2,034 where 71% of boys agree with the statement 'I believe I can make a difference in the world' and 77% of girls give the same answer, the difference is large enough (more than four per cent) to demonstrate statistically significant variations in the attitudes of young people by gender on this issue.

Guide to social classification

In this report, references are made to social grade. The following table contains a brief list of social grade definitions as used by the Institute of Practitioners in Advertising. These groups are standard on all surveys carried out by Ipsos MORI.

Table 1.4 Social class definitions

Social Grade	Social Class	Occupation of Chief Income Earner
A	Upper Middle Class	Higher managerial, administrative or professional
B	Middle Class	Intermediate managerial, administrative or professional
C1	Lower Middle Class	Supervisor or clerical and junior managerial, administrative or professional
C2	Skilled Working Class	Skilled manual workers
D	Working Class	Semi and unskilled manual workers
E	Those at the lowest levels of subsistence	State pensioners, etc, with no other earnings

Source: Ipsos MORI

Interviewers asked the head of household the following questions to help assign a social grade classification for each participant. In almost all cases the head of household was the parent/ guardian/carer of the individual interviewed, unless the young person had left home and were the head of household themselves:

- Who is the chief income earner in the household? (This is the person in the household with the largest income, whether from employment, pensions, state benefits, investments or any other source.)
- What is the occupation of the chief income earner?
- What is chief income earner's job title and what do they actually do?
- What type of company does the chief income earner work for?
- How many people work for the company?
- How many people is the chief income earner responsible for?
- Does the chief income earner have any job-related qualifications?

In some cases, interviewers also ask these additional questions:

- Is the chief income earner self-employed?
- How many hours a week does the chief income earner work?
- Is the chief income earner's job manual or non-manual?

Cognitive testing

Approach

The Youth Social Action 2018 survey cognitively tested several new and amended questions, on topic areas such as social action participation within school, college or workplace, timing of social action programmes and making a difference in terms of community and the environment. The aim of the cognitive testing exercise was to test how respondents interpreted and understood the new questions, and to ensure key terminology and concepts were readily understood.

The approach taken to the cognitive testing was the same as previous waves of the survey. A total of five participants were interviewed; they were aged between 10 and 20 years old and were known to have participated in social action either in the past 12 months or over 12 months ago.

The cognitive testing interviews were conducted on 25th and 26th July 2018 either face-to-face or by telephone. Young people were sent a copy of the questionnaire a day or two in advance of being interviewed but were asked not to read it beforehand in case it affected their judgement or answers. The interviewer read out the questions during the call or interview, and the young people used a copy of the questionnaire / showcards to help them select their answers.

Table 1.5 Participants in the cognitive interviews

	Gender	Age
YP 1	Female	17
YP 2	Female	20
YP 3	Male	11
YP 4	Male	13
YP 5	Male	16

Source: Ipsos MORI

Younger respondents found it more difficult to understand and respond to new questions tested in the cognitive interviewing phase as wording was convoluted and at times unclear. As a result, some questions were simplified and the ordering was changed to ensure that new questions logically followed-on from previous questions on the same topic.

New questions

The following new questions were cognitively tested and included in the survey:

Q3b Thinking about the activity you've done most often in the past 12 months through school or college, please tell me whether the any of the following apply?

A teacher or another member of school staff asked me specifically to get involved

Another student asked me specifically to get involved

I put myself forward/ Nominated myself

The whole class participated

The whole school participated

None of these / Don't know

Q3c Thinking about the activities you've done most often in the past 12 months to help others or the environment through school/college/ university/your apprenticeship/place of work why did you take part?

I had to

I wanted to

I had to and wanted to

Don't know

Q3d And thinking about the activity you've done most often in the past 12 months to help other people or the environment. When do you usually get involved in this activity?

In the morning (before school/college/lectures/work)

During school/college/lectures/work

In the afternoon (after school/college/university/work)

In the evenings

At the weekends

During the holidays

On my days off (for unemployed and employed young people and University students)

Don't know

Q11b If you were to do any activities that benefit other people or the environment in the next 12 months, when would be the best time for you to get involved?

In the morning (before school/college/lectures/work)

During School/college/lectures/work

In the afternoon (after school/college/lectures/work)

In the evenings

At the weekends

During the holidays

On my days off (for unemployed and employed young people and university students)

I'm unlikely to get involved any time

Don't know

Q11c How often, if at all, does your school/college/university/apprenticeship/place of work do the following?

- 1) Arrange activities to help other people or the environment during lessons/lectures/training/Working hours
- 2) Arrange activities to help other people or the environment outside your usual lessons / lectures/ training/ work hours, such as break times or after school /College /university /apprenticeship or place of work (e.g. In optional clubs)

- 3) Arrange activities to help other people or the environment on special days during term time/the school/ college year/work year
- 4) Provide you with information on opportunities to help other people or the environment that are not arranged by your school/college / university/apprenticeship/place of work
- 5) Provide you with the time to independently help other people or the environment

At least once a week
 At least once a month
 At least 3-4 times a year
 1-2 times a year
 Never
 Don't know

Q11d Overall how much, if at all, do you feel that you can have a positive impact on....

Your local community
 Your school community
 The environment

A lot
 A fair amount
 A little
 Not at all
 Don't know

Amended questions

The following questions had new codes added for this year's survey.

Q1 So firstly in the past 12 months have you . . . ?

New code added: Been involved in Young Advisors Groups

Q4a Thinking about the past year, have you taken part in any activities to help other people or the environment with any of the following.

New code added: A club or group e.g. sports, hobbies, general youth group, youth work through your local council, the Urdd, or Young Farmers association

New code added: A programme of activity that conserves or improves the environment or takes place in the natural environment

In addition, some questions were included for the first time, but as they were derived from existing survey questions they were not included in the cognitive testing exercise.

Sarah Knibbs

Research Director

Sarah.Knibbs@ipsos.com

Claudia Mollidor

Associate Director

Claudia.Mollidor@ipsos.com

Bláithín Stack

Research Executive

Bláithín.Stack@ipsos.com

For more information

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

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,