



**Ipsos MORI**  
Social Research Institute

March 2017

# National Youth Social Action

## Survey: Wave 4

Technical report

Sarah Knibbs, Olivia Michelmore

# Contents

<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Questionnaire Design</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Main Fieldwork</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Data Processing and Weighing</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Sample profile</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Statistical reliability</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Cognitive testing</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Approach</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>New questions</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Amended questions</b> .....	<b>8</b>

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1.1: Size of sample by sampling tolerances</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Table 1.2: Size of sample by differences required for significance at percentage levels</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Table 1.3: Cognitive testing respondent profile</b> .....	<b>5</b>

# Methodology

Ipsos MORI was commissioned by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) and Step Up To Serve to measure the participation of 10-20 year olds across the UK in social action over the past 12 months. The wave 3 questionnaire was revised for the fourth wave and further tested by Ipsos MORI.

## Questionnaire Design

New questions were added to the survey this year and were cognitively tested with young volunteers in August. The aim of the cognitive testing was to test how respondents interpreted and understood the new questions, and to ensure key terminology and concepts were well understood.

Full details on 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 in order 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 1-15 September 2017. Overall, fully completed questionnaires were obtained from 2,030 young people.

## Data Processing and Weighing

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

Sample profile	Number	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Total	2,030	100	100
<b>Gender of Pupils</b>			
Male	994	49	51
Female	1036	51	49
<b>Age of Pupils</b>			
10	213	10	8
11	160	8	8
12	205	10	9
13	155	8	9
14	171	8	9
15	164	8	9
16	218	11	9
17	175	9	9
18	204	10	10
19	172	8	10
20	193	10	10
<b>Ethnic Origin</b>			
White	1850	91	89
BME	180	9	11
<b>Status</b>			
SEN	54	3	2
Disability	53	3	2
<b>Occupation</b>			
School	1171	58	56
College	283	14	14
University	193	10	10
Job	256	13	15
Apprenticeship	31	2	1
Unemployed	96	5	4

## Social Grade

AB	319	16	27
C1	710	35	29
C2	425	21	21
DE	576	28	23

## Region

England	1360	67	84
Greater London	183	9	13
South East	234	12	14
South West	127	6	8
North East	106	5	4
North West	175	9	11
Eastern	170	8	13
East Midlands	108	5	7
West Midlands	140	7	9
Yorkshire & Humberside	117	6	8
Wales	221	11	5
Scotland	225	11	8
Northern Ireland	224	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 8.1 illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the 95% confidence interval using t-tests.

**Table 1.1: 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
2,038 interviews ( <i>All 10-20 year old respondents to this survey</i> )	1	2	2

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

For example, with a sample of 2,030 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 studies.

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 8.2:

**Table 1.2: Size of sample by differences required for significance at percentage levels**

	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*

# Cognitive testing

## Approach

The Youth Social Action 2017 survey cognitively tested several new and amended questions, on topic areas such as rewards for participation, social action programmes and family/friends' participation. The aim of the cognitive testing was to test how respondents interpreted and understood the new questions, and to ensure key terminology and concepts were well understood.

The approach taken to the cognitive testing was the same as the approach taken for previous surveys. A total of five participants were recruited; 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 7-10 August 2017. The majority of these were conducted over the phone; young people were sent a copy of the questionnaire in advance but were asked not to read beforehand in case it affected their judgement or answers. The interviewer read out the questions during the call, and the young people used a copy of the questionnaire / showcards to help them select their answers. One interview was conducted in person in the young person's home.

**Table 1.3: Cognitive testing respondent profile**

	Gender	Age
YP 1	Female	13
YP 2	Female	19
YP 3	Male	11
YP 4	Male	15
YP 5	Male	11

## New questions

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

**Q4b** In the past year, how many of these groups or programmes have you been involved in?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

**Q8** Thinking about the activity you did most often in the past 12 months ... was your participation rewarded in any of the following ways:

Somebody thanked me

I received a certificate/badge or award/prize/accreditation

I was invited to a ceremony or a celebration event

I received public recognition (e.g. in a local paper)

I received a gift

I met a celebrity

Other

I was not rewarded

**Q12** What causes or issues would you be interested in supporting or getting involved with in the future?

a) **Health & social care**

Examples: Cancer charity, local hospital, mental health charity, care homes

b) **Social inequality**

Examples: Bullying, racism, people with disabilities, LGBT issues, poverty/homelessness

c) **Local community**

Examples: Youth groups, sports clubs, drama clubs, neighbourhood watch, helping old/ young in community

d) **The environment**

Examples: Local area or international e.g. rainforest, climate change

e) **Other countries**

Example: countries in poverty

f) **Education, careers, employability**

Examples: Younger, older or peers to improve themselves

g) **Animal protection**

Example: animal protection

h) **Something else**

i) **None of these**

**Q13b** And why is that?

I enjoyed helping other people

I helped a charity/ cause/ group that I believe in

I had fun

I felt better about myself

I met new people



I felt I made a difference  
I learnt new skills  
It added to my CV/ job opportunities  
I felt valued as part of a team  
I gained confidence/ self-esteem  
I learnt about things that affect me/ my community/ the environment  
The activity was related to personal interest e.g. sports  
Other people's lives / the environment were improved  
Money was raised for a good cause/ charity  
Awareness of the issue/ charity has improved  
Something else/other  
Don't know

**Q13c And why is that?**

I didn't think it was a worthwhile cause/ charity  
I didn't have any say in the activity  
I didn't find it fun/ engaging/ interesting  
I didn't think it helped the community  
I didn't learn anything  
It didn't help build my experience/ CV  
It was a one-off activity/ event  
The activity was poorly planned/ organised  
It hasn't made a difference to anyone's lives/ the environment  
It didn't raise awareness about the issue/ cause/ charity  
The area/ issue/ cause did not need help  
It seemed a pointless activity  
It was not well planned/ organised  
Not enough time/ activity was too short  
Something else/other  
Don't know

**Q15 Do any of your friends take part in activities to help other people or the environment?**

All my friends  
Some of my friends  
None of my friends

Don't know

Q16 Does any of your family take part in activities to help other people or the environment?

All my family

Some of my family

None of my family

Don't know

## Amended questions

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

Q4 Thinking overall about the things that you've mentioned. How did you get involved in the activities? Please choose as many answers on the card as apply.

A programme through a charity: National Trust and RSPB were added to the England showcards as examples.

A development programme for young people: John Muir Awards was added as an example.

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.

A programme through a charity: National Trust and RSPB were added to the England showcards as examples.

A development programme for young people: John Muir Awards was added as an example.

New code added: A volunteering programme in a health & social care setting, e.g., volunteering in a hospital or care home

Q7 Thinking about the activity you did most often in the past 12 months ...do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

New code added: Taking part in the activity encouraged me to do more sport and exercise in my day-to-day life

Q9a Please can you say why haven't you been involved in these kinds of activities in the past 12 months?

INTERVIEWER PROBE: What else?

New codes added:

No one thanked me or recognised my contribution

It was too hard/difficult to get to

Q9b Thinking overall about types of activities that benefit other people or the environment, which of these would encourage you to take part in them? INTERVIEWER PROBE: What else...?

- New codes added:
  - If I could do it online
  - If I was thanked or received an award
  - If it was to support a cause I cared about
  - If it meant I could get outdoors

**Q10a** Apart from donating money or goods, please can you say why haven't you been involved in any other kinds of activities in the past 12 months? INTERVIEWER PROBE: What else?

- New codes added:
  - No one thanked me or recognised my contribution
  - It was too hard/difficult to get to

**Q10b** Thinking overall about types of activities that benefit other people or the environment, apart from donating money or goods, which of these would encourage you to take part in them? INTERVIEWER PROBE: What else?

- New codes added:
  - If I could do it online
  - If I was thanked or received an award
  - If it was to support a cause I cared about
  - If it meant I could get outdoors

**Sarah Knibbs**

Research Director  
Sarah.Knibbs@ipsos.com

**Olivia Michelmore**

Senior Research Executive  
Olivia.Michelmore@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,