



Ipsos MORI
Social Research Institute

September 2017

Taking Part Year 12 (2016/17)

Technical Report

Ipsos MORI

Contents

Introduction	1
Background, including aims and objectives	1
Role of Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research.....	2
Summary of outputs	3
Structure of the Technical Report	4
Acknowledgements	4
Sample design	5
Survey population and sample frame	5
Key features of the sample design	5
The panel sample	5
The cross-sectional sample	7
The 2011/12 sample design	8
Allocation of primary sampling units to sample month	9
Sampling of individuals at cross-sectional addresses.....	9
Sampling procedures at panel addresses	10
Questionnaire development and design.....	12
Overview of questionnaires	12
Questionnaire development	12
Overview of the structure of the questionnaires	14
Adult questionnaire.....	14
Household information.....	14
Well-being	14
Socialisation.....	14
Screening questions	14
Digital activities.....	15
Participation	15
Barriers to participation	15
Volunteering and charitable giving.....	16
Community participation	16
First World War commemorations.....	16
News	16
Demographics	16
Invitation to join the web panel	16
Evaluation of use of white definitions show cards.....	17
Youth questionnaire.....	17

School and school year	17
Life events	17
Screening questions	17
Sport and physical activity	18
Well-being	18
Demographics	18
Invitation to join the web panel	18
National Pupil Database linkage	19
Child questionnaire	19
School and school year	19
Life events	19
Screening questions	19
Sport and physical activity	20
Demographics	20
National Pupil Database linkage	20
Fieldwork	21
Introduction	21
Fieldwork procedures	21
Advance letter and leaflet	21
Selection/Enumeration instrument	21
Selection procedure for youths/children	22
Parental permission rules	23
Documents	23
Movers	24
Minority languages	24
Changes to documents during Year 12	25
Web panel recruitment	25
National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage handouts	26
Pilot 26	
Briefings	27
Fieldwork dates and fieldwork management	28
Supervision and quality control	29
Maximising response	29
Incentives	29
Calling pattern	30
Reissues	31
In year review of fieldwork performance	32
Fieldwork outcomes	33

Adult cross-sectional sample	34
Adult panel sample	38
Youth cross-sectional sample	42
Youth panel sample	43
Child cross-sectional sample	45
Child panel sample	46
Web panel recruitment	47
Adult sample	47
Youth sample	52
National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage consent rates	55
Interview lengths	56
Data processing and outputs	58
Introduction	58
Coding open-ended questions	58
Case identifiers	59
Variable naming	59
SPSS outputs: interim data set	59
SPSS outputs: Annual datasets	60
Adult cross-sectional dataset	60
Adult panel dataset	60
Child dataset	61
Youth panel dataset	61
Child panel dataset	62
Half-yearly adult dataset	62
Data checking process and quality checking	62
Taking Part Statistical Release	63
Weighting	65
Stage 2: Dwelling selection weights	66
Stage 3: Household calibration weighting	66
Stage 4: Adult / youth / child selection weights	67
Appendix 1	73

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Panel members issued for Year 12: assumptions and reality.....	6
Table 2.2: Number of panel households issued by sample month	7
Table 2.3: Number of primary sampling units by interviewer workload	8
Table 2.4: Number of primary sampling units issued by sample month by former Government Office Region9	
Table 2.5: Changes to panel procedures in Year 12	11
Table 3.1: Question topics for inclusion in a rotating module	13
Table 4.1: Documents used for Year 12 Taking Part fieldwork, and their purpose.....	23
Table 4.2: Number of pilot interviews: questionnaire instrument by sample type.....	27
Table 4.3: Fieldwork dates for each sample month	28
Table 4.4: Outcome codes eligible for reissue.....	31
Table 4.5: Reissue analysis, by sample type	32
Table 4.6: Fieldwork outcomes (adult cross-sectional sample)	34
Table 4.7: Fieldwork response rates by former Government Office Region (adult cross-sectional sample)	37
Table 4.8: Fieldwork outcomes (panel household sample)	38
Table 4.9: Fieldwork outcomes (adult 'split-off' and core panel samples)	40
Table 4.10: Fieldwork outcomes (youth cross-sectional sample).....	43
Table 4.11: Fieldwork outcomes (youth panel sample)	44
Table 4.12: Fieldwork outcomes (child cross-sectional sample).....	45
Table 4.13: Fieldwork outcomes (child panel sample)	46
Table 4.14: Adult web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type.....	47
Table 4.15: Adult web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type.....	48
Table 4.16: Adult web panel population profile	50
Table 4.17: Youth web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type	52
Table 4.18: Youth web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type	53
Table 4.19: Youth web panel population profile.....	54
Table 4.20: Consent rates for National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage, by sample type	56
Table 4.21: Adult interview lengths, by sample type	57
Table 4.22: Youth and child proxy interview lengths, by sample type.....	57
Table 5.1: Adult sample size at six-month cut-off and full year	59
Table 5.2: Adult survey interviews by sample type	60
Table 5.3: Number of adult panel interviews	60
Table 5.4: Breakdown of youth and child interviews by sample type	61
Table 5.5: Number of youth panel interviews	61
Table 5.6: Number of child proxy panel interviews.....	62
Table 5.7: Adult sample size at six and twelve month cut-off.....	62
Table 5.8: Statistical spreadsheets produced for the half-year dataset (Q1 and Q2 cases in Year 12)	63
Table 5.9: Address selection weights by former Government Office Region and density stratum	66
Table 5.10: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: counts	68
Table 5.11: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: percentages	68
Table 5.12: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by age group and gender: counts and percentages	69
Table 5.13: Cross-sectional sample estimates for panel sample calibration: adults	70
Table 5.14: Cross-sectional sample estimates for panel sample calibration: youths and children	72

Introduction

Background, including aims and objectives

Taking Part is the flagship survey for 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 11-15 was also interviewed in applicable households. In 2008/09, the child survey was broadened to cover 5-10 year olds, with data collected by proxy interviews with the responding adults.

Since Year 8 (2012/13), longitudinal data¹ 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.

¹ Year 8 was the first year that some respondents were re-interviewed so the Taking Part 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 Official Statistics.

Since Taking Part was first commissioned it has been running on a continuous basis and the 2016/17 survey is the twelfth year of fieldwork. In March 2016, DCMS published *Taking Part: the next five years*² 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.

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*. Our aim over the next three years is to ensure there is a smooth transition from the previous contractor, as well as to make a number of significant improvements to the survey design and procedures.

This report covers the first year of the transition – the twelfth year of fieldwork covering 2016/17. For Year 12 of Taking Part, the survey had two principal aims:

1. To estimate the **number of people** taking part in leisure, cultural and sporting activities in England, by collecting data from a nationally representative cross-sectional sample of adults (16+), youths (aged 11-15) and children (aged 5-10).
2. To identify the **reasons for changes** in participation in leisure, cultural and sporting activities in England over time, by collecting data from a panel of adults, youths and children.

These aims were unchanged from Year 11, and enabled us to complete a smooth transition while working to a very challenging timetable, without prejudicing survey delivery.

The changes to Taking Part following Year 12 will be detailed in two future annual reports. In summary the changes to Taking Part derive from the decision to move from the one data collection method used until Year 12 (face-to-face interviewing) to two distinct data collection methods (face-to-face and web interviewing), each tailored to one of the two principal aims. One of the future annual reports will describe the continued collection of cross-sectional data by face-to-face interviewing, using an improved sampling and weighting approach, and revised questionnaire instruments. It will also describe the recruitment of new panellists during the cross-sectional face-to-face interviews. The other future annual report will describe the collection of panel data by web interviewing only.

² https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/511407/The_Future_of_Taking_Part_-_FINAL_29032016.pdf.

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;
- 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 2016/17 survey were produced. These are outlined below:

- **Five SPSS datasets.** These datasets were delivered to the Taking Part team at DCMS, with slightly edited versions prepared for the UK Data Archive:
 - An adult cross-sectional dataset containing data from interviewed adults (aged 16 or over) from the cross-sectional and panel sample who were interviewed in 2016/17. The dataset includes questionnaire data from 2016/17 only.
 - An adult panel dataset containing data from all adults (aged 16 or over) interviewed in 2016/17 who were members of the panel sample. The dataset includes 2016/17 questionnaire data and panel questionnaire data from previous years.
 - Child dataset: containing data from all youths and children (aged 5-15) from the cross-sectional and panel sample who were interviewed in 2016/17. The dataset includes questionnaire data from 2016/17 only.
 - Youth (aged 11-15) panel dataset containing data from all children aged 11-15 interviewed in 2016/17 who were members of the panel sample. The dataset includes 2016/17 questionnaire data and panel questionnaire data.
 - Child 5-10 panel dataset: containing data from all children aged 5-10 interviewed 2016/17 who were members of the panel sample. The dataset includes 2016/17 questionnaire data and longitudinal panel data.
- **Technical Report:** Published on the Taking Part website, containing details of survey design, fieldwork, questionnaire development, the web panel and data processing.
- **Taking Part 2016/17 quarter 2 statistical release.** Tables published on the Taking Part website for adults only (aged 16 or over), consisting of headline measures with demographic and area level breakdowns for the arts, heritage,

museums and galleries, libraries, archives, digital participation and charitable giving and First World War. Reports and visualisations produced by DCMS were also published.

- **Taking Part 2016/17 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 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 2016/17 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 2016/17 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), Elizabeth Fuller (Project Director, NatCen Social Research) and Sarah Morris (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, Tom Huskinson, Jessica Bultitude, Darren Fisher, Duncan Peskett, Darren Thickpenny, Alan Nicholas, Alun Humphrey, Thomas Leach, Nikki Leftly, Dan Philo, Tahmineh Hendron, Simon Holroyd, Sophie Ainsby, Minesh Patel, Hannah Bridges and Alessio Fiacco.

We would also like to thank those we worked closely with at DCMS: Mary Gregory, Olivia Christophersen, Helen Miller-Bakewell, Alison Reynolds and Wilmah Deda. We are also grateful for the support provided by Sport England, Historic England and the Arts Council England.

Sample design

Survey population and sample frame

The population of interest were those living in private residential dwellings (that is, excluding communal establishments as defined by the 2011 Census³) in England.

In Year 12 (2016/17), Taking Part was designed to yield a representative sample of 10,000 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). The design in Year 12 was the same as that since Year 8 (2012/13), with the improved design being introduced in Year 13 (2017/18).

Following the sampling strategy used since the longitudinal element to Taking Part was introduced in Year 8 (2012/13), the 2016/17 sample was a mixed sample, divided between a cross-sectional sample (known as the 'fresh' sample in previous reports) and panel (or re-interview) sample.

For the cross-sectional sample, we used the 'small user' Postcode Address File (PAF) as the sample frame, following standard practice on Taking Part and other high quality household surveys. This provides a list of almost 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.

Key features of the sample design

Since Year 8 of Taking Part, when some respondents were re-interviewed for the first time, the national estimates have been produced by combining data collected from the cross-sectional and panel parts of the sample.

The Year 12 sample comprised 724 primary sampling units, of which 702 comprised one postcode sector, and the remainder comprised between two and four postcode sectors. The 724 primary sampling units used since Year 7 (2011/12) were retained in Year 12 as this was the most cost-effective way of re-interviewing panel members and conducting cross-sectional interviews. Full details of how these 724 primary sampling units were selected for Year 7 are given at Appendix 1.

The panel sample

Since Year 8 of Taking Part, the sampling strategy had aimed to generate 5,000 interviews from cross-sectional sample addresses plus 5,000 interviews with adult panel members who had been interviewed in the previous survey year. As the number of adults interviewed who agreed to join or continue on the panel in each survey year exceeded the number required for sampling for the following year, the previous contractor devised a method of sub-sampling panel members for each survey year (see for example section 2.2 of the Year 11 (2015/16) Technical Report⁴).

³ 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.

⁴ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/543460/Taking_Part_Technical_Report_2015-16.pdf.

This option was not open to the new contractors because it was likely that many fewer panel members would agree to have their survey and contact data passed to a different survey organisation and agree to be re-contacted by an interviewer working for a different survey organisation, and this turned out to be the case. Further, as Taking Part fieldwork is continuous, with sample released monthly, it was not possible to know how many panel members might be available for sampling in Year 12, at the point when decisions had to be made about the sample design for Year 12.

For this reason all adults in the panel sample that responded in the previous survey year (Year 11) and agreeing to be re-contacted in Year 12 and have their previous answers passed to another survey research organisation were sampled for Year 12 fieldwork. Once the panel data were received from the previous contractor, a number of checks were put in place to ensure that in all issued panel households, the original main adult interviewed had agreed to be re-contacted and have their previous answers passed to another survey research organisation. This was intended to avoid potentially difficult situations where a youth or young adult had agreed to be re-contacted but the main adult had not, but may have perceived their refusal as being on behalf of the household.

In Table 2.1, we set out the assumption made about the number of panel members that would be available for re-interviewing in Year 12, and compare it with the number actually received from the previous contractor that could be issued to the field⁵.

Table 2.1: Panel members issued for Year 12: assumptions and reality

	Households	Adult panel members	Youth panel members	Child panel members
Assumption	5,598	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual				
Q1	1,309	1,340	87	133
Q2	1,349	1,386	99	131
Q3	1,303	1,342	104	118
Q4	1,271	1,304	79	133
Total	5,232	5,372	369	515
Difference from assumption	-366	N/A	N/A	N/A

⁵ Note that under the Taking Part procedures in place from Year 8 (2012/13) to Year 11, (2015/16), panel members were allocated age-appropriate instruments. Thus panel households could have multiple adult and youth respondents, and multiple child proxy interviews were possible. See Table 2.5 for a description of the Year 11 procedures.

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

Table 2.2: Number of panel households 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
2016										
April	59	31	72	28	49	66	49	89	41	484
May	57	62	44	37	77	30	30	78	58	473
June	46	37	26	31	28	34	48	48	54	352
July	88	48	41	27	58	42	47	95	33	479
August	70	60	46	34	42	55	40	55	29	431
September	65	39	47	25	44	41	56	59	63	439
October	25	30	44	36	31	38	34	71	47	356
November	54	64	45	47	32	34	23	79	37	415
December	64	55	71	50	48	54	41	73	76	532
2017										
January	36	42	84	42	30	28	48	70	27	407
February	76	51	49	51	33	38	47	63	39	447
March	44	48	48	34	49	42	38	61	53	417
Total	684	567	617	442	521	502	501	841	557	5,232

The cross-sectional sample

To develop a design for Year 12 of Taking Part which would result in 10,000 achieved interviews, the number of panel households received from the previous contractor was estimated as well as how many would yield an interview. The number of PAF addresses to select for the cross-sectional sample was then calculated.

The number of cross-sectional addresses selected in each primary sampling unit was set prior to knowing how many panel members from the later fieldwork months of Year 11 had agreed to be re-contacted and have their previous answers passed to another survey research organisation.

Sixteen PAF addresses were selected per primary sampling unit. This took into account the uncertainty about the available number of panel households available for Year 12 fieldwork.

In each primary sampling unit, the available addresses were ordered by postcode and 32 were randomly selected using the random start and fixed interval method. Selected addresses were systematically allocated so that every other one was designated a main address, and the remaining were the reserve addresses for that primary sampling unit.

The cross-sectional sample was therefore an equal probability sample, and the number of panel members varied by primary sampling unit. No limit was imposed on interviewer workloads in any primary sampling unit. The number of addresses issued, and interviewer workloads, varied by primary sampling unit, as shown in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Number of primary sampling units by interviewer workload

	Number of PSUs	% of total
16 addresses (0 panel households)	47	6.5%
17-19 addresses (1-3 panel households)	151	20.9%
20-24 addresses (4-8 panel households)	265	36.6%
25-29 addresses (9-13 panel households)	167	23.1%
30+ addresses (14+ panel households)	94	13.0%
Total	724	100.0%

On average 7 panel members were issued per primary sampling unit, implying the average workload for an interviewer was 23 addresses (16 cross-sectional, 7 panel). Just over one-quarter (27.4%) of interviewers had a 'low' workload (fewer than 20 addresses), whereas just over one-third (36.1%) had a relatively 'high' workload (25 addresses or more).

The 2011/12 sample design

Readers who wish to familiarise themselves with the thinking behind the Year 7 sampling design and its detailed implementation may refer to Appendix 1 of this report, where section 2.3 of the Year 11 Technical Report is re-printed in its entirety. This section includes only the important facts about the Year 7 sampling design as they relate to the Year 12 fieldwork operations.

Allocation of primary sampling units to sample month

The allocation of primary sampling units to sample month used by the previous contractor was retained. Table 2.4 shows the number of primary sampling units issued in every sample month by former Government Office Region⁶:

Table 2.4: 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
2016										
April	7	7	7	3	7	7	9	9	5	61
May	5	8	6	6	7	4	9	9	5	59
June	6	9	5	5	6	7	10	7	6	61
July	6	8	7	5	7	6	10	9	4	62
August	6	8	6	5	6	6	9	9	5	60
September	5	7	6	5	7	5	10	9	6	60
October	4	9	5	6	7	6	9	8	6	60
November	6	9	5	6	5	6	9	8	5	59
December	5	8	7	5	5	7	9	8	6	60
2017										
January	4	8	7	5	5	6	9	9	5	58
February	6	9	6	6	6	6	9	9	6	63
March	5	8	6	5	7	6	9	9	6	61
Total	65	98	73	62	75	72	111	103	65	724

Sampling of individuals at cross-sectional addresses

The sampling of individuals at cross-sectional addresses in principle followed the procedures adopted in previous years. The previous contractor used paper Address Contract Sheets and Kish Grids to assist interviewers in carrying out the sampling procedures correctly whereas in Year 12 electronic instruments were used.

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.

⁶ Nine of the 724 primary sampling units contained addresses in two regions (because postcode sector boundaries are not coterminous with Government Office Region boundaries). In Table 2.4 these nine primary sampling units have been classified according to the Government Office Region most of the selected addresses were in.

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 interviewed⁷.

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. 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.

This procedure removed the need for child screening, which in previous years of Taking Part had normally occurred after the adult interview had been completed.

Sampling procedures at panel addresses

At panel addresses, interviewers were required to complete the Enumeration instrument after making contact. The Enumeration instrument enabled them to check which panel members were still living at the address. All resident adult and youth panel members were eligible for interview (data was collected about child panel members only if the main adult was still living with them). There was no selection of other household members to participate in Taking Part; in other words, new panel members were not recruited at panel addresses for the purpose of a face-to-face interview.

⁷ Note that unlike in Year 11 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.

The fieldwork procedures at panel addresses were simplified for Year 12, which affected the eligibility of some panel members and the instruments allocated to them. Table 2.5 summarises the changes made. The reason for these changes was to reduce the complexity of the survey significantly, while minimising the impact of changes to the panel sample size.

Table 2.5: Changes to panel procedures in Year 12

Year 11 procedures	Change for Year 12
Interviewers attempted to trace adult panel members who had moved away and interview them at a new address.	Interviewers attempted to trace any main adult panel members who had moved away and interview them at a new address. Other adults (that is, those who had originally been part of the child proxy or youth sample, but had since become eligible for the adult interview) who had moved away were not traced.
Interviewers attempted to trace youth panel members who had moved away and interview them at a new address.	Interviewers did not attempt to trace any youth panel members who had moved away.
Interviewers attempted to trace child panel members who had moved away and interview a parent or guardian at a new address. The interviewer interviewed the parent or guardian using the child proxy instrument as well as a household instrument to collect basic household information for analysis purposes. The parent or guardian could be a different parent or guardian who completed the child proxy interview during Year 10 (2014/15).	Interviewers did not attempt to trace any child panel members who had moved away.
Any child panel members who were 11 years old at the time of interview were re-allocated to the youth sample in field and interviewed using the youth instrument.	All those who had been in the child sample at Year 11 and whose age at Year 11 was 10 years old, were allocated to the youth instrument for Year 12.
Any youth panel members who were 16 years old at the time of interview were re-allocated to the adult sample in field and interviewed using the adult instrument.	All those who had been in the youth sample at Year 11 and whose age at Year 11 was 15 years old, were allocated to the adult instrument for Year 12.
Interviewers established whether the panel household contained any 5-year-olds who were not already part of the child panel. The interviewer carried out a child proxy interview with a parent/guardian about any such children.	Interviewers did not recruit any 5-year-olds to the panel sample.

Instruments were pre-allocated to panel members in the office rather than in the field. This had the advantage of simplifying the complexity of the survey in the office and in the field. The rules described above meant that it was possible for a 15-year-old to be interviewed with the adult instrument, or for a 10-year-old to be interviewed with the youth instrument. In our view the nature of the questions was such that the instruments were age-appropriate in these situations.

Questionnaire development and design

Overview of questionnaires

The Taking Part Survey questionnaires are designed to enable DCMS to collect information about measures of engagement across the sectors of the economy for which DCMS takes responsibility. The questionnaires are designed to collect two types of data:

- Questions for those in the cross-sectional sample: questions are designed for participants who are new to the Taking Part Survey. The data collected are used to provide estimates on the number of people taking part in leisure, culture and sporting activities in England.
- Questions for those in the panel sample: questions are designed for participants who have taken part in the survey in previous years. The data collected are used to identify reasons for change in participation over time.

Separate questionnaires were used for adults aged over 16, young people aged between 11 and 15, and children aged between 5 and 10 (about whom data was collected from a parent or guardian).

In Year 12 (2016/17), three versions of the adult questionnaire were used:

- Quarter 1 sample: on average, the adult questionnaire took significantly longer to administer than planned (56 minutes 5 seconds⁸ compared with a target mean interview length of 40 minutes).
- Quarter 2 sample: the adult questionnaire was amended in an attempt to reduce the mean interview length.
- Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 samples: the adult questionnaire was amended by including new questions about the First World War commemorations.

Full documentation of all versions of the questionnaires for adults, young people and children will be published separately. This includes documentation of changes made to the questionnaires since the 2015-16 survey.

Questionnaire development

The questionnaires used in Year 12 were based on those used in Year 11 (2015/16). Because of the short period between the confirmation of the Year 12 contract in December 2015 and the start of fieldwork in April 2016, there was insufficient time for a full process of review, testing (including cognitive testing) and revision of the questionnaire content.

Researchers at Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research consulted DCMS to identify any changes required to meet the current policy needs of DCMS. The questionnaires were then reviewed and revised and the questions re-ordered in line with those priorities. Final amendments were based on feedback from interviewers who carried out the survey pilot (see the Fieldwork section of this report).

⁸ This was 57 minutes and 29 seconds for the cross-sectional interviews, and 54 minutes and 7 seconds for the panel interviews.

The most significant change to the adult questionnaire was to replace the Year 11 questions on sports and physical activity with self-completion questions based on 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. The corresponding sections of the young people and child questionnaires were not amended in the same way as the survey population for the Active Lives Survey is adults aged 16 and over living in England.

Less significant changes included minor updates to lists of response options, small wording changes and removal and addition of a small number of questions. There are also a small number of questions that are rotated in and out of the questionnaire annually (details can be found in *Taking Part: the next five years*, pages 14-15), and in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Question topics for inclusion in a rotating module

Block	Subject	Questions
1 st year (2016/17)	Heritage visits	Three questions, covering who the respondent has visited a heritage site with, the geographical location of the heritage site, and how far they travelled to get to the heritage site (WHOHER, HERWHERE and HERWHE2).
	Heritage extras	Two questions, covering membership of heritage organisations, and involvement in historical re-enactments (HERMEM, REENACT).
	Museum visits	Two questions, covering the geographical location of a museum/gallery the respondent has visited, and how far they travelled to get there (MUSWHER and MUSWHE2).
	Charitable giving	Ten questions, covering why the respondent donated money, what would encourage them to give money, and whether they think they will give more or less money in the next 12 months (GIVESECT, GIVEENC).
	Library visits	Three questions, covering who the respondent has visited a library with, how they travel to the library, and how long it takes to get to their library from their home (LIBWHO, LIBTRAV, LIBWHE).
2 nd year (2017/18)	Music venues	One question, covering the kinds of venue the respondent has watched live music in (AARTAVN2).
	Art venues	One question, covering the kinds of venue the respondent has watched live music in (AARTAVN2).
	Heritage	One question, which asks whether the respondent has become involved in a suite of activities as a result of visiting a heritage site (question for review before reinsertion) (HERLOCAL).
	Opinions	Fifteen questions, covering the extent to which respondents agree with a set of opinions others have expressed about the arts (A4OP1A2, B4OP1A2, C4OP1A2).

During the pilot and Quarter 1 of the Year 12 survey year, the mean interview length of the adult questionnaire was significantly longer than expected⁹. As a result, further changes were made to the questionnaire across the survey year, following Quarter 1 and again after Quarter 2 to reduce the length of the questionnaire.

⁹ As the number of youth and child proxy interviews was relatively small, we were unable to assess accurately the mean interview length on a quarterly basis.

Overview of the structure of the questionnaires

The adult questionnaire was administered as one instrument, with different questions asked dependent on whether the respondent was part of the cross-sectional or panel sample.

Adult questionnaire

For both cross-sectional and panel respondents, the adult questionnaire covered substantially similar ground, with some sections specifically asked of respondents who had not participated in Taking Part before or of panel members respectively.

The questionnaire content is summarised briefly here, including indications of differences between the two sample types and the versions used across the survey year. Full questionnaires and documentation of changes since the Year 11 survey (2015-16) will be published separately.

Household information

For cross-sectional respondents, this section collected details about all adults and children living in the household: name, sex, age and relationship to the responding adult. Some additional information about the respondent (for example month of birth) was also collected.

Well-being

All respondents were asked the four ONS standard questions¹⁰ designed to measure different dimensions of well-being.

Socialisation

Cross-sectional respondents (and panel members formerly in the youth sample who were responding to the adult questionnaire for the first time) were asked about cultural and sporting activities that they had engaged in when growing up (defined as when they were aged between 11 and 15).

This section was reduced in length for the Quarter 2 sample and thereafter.

Screening questions

All adult respondents were asked a series of screening questions covering participation during the last 12 months in different types of activities. Respondents could include participation regardless of whether it took place within England. The sports and physical activity section also asked some follow-up questions within the same module, unlike the modules relating to the other sectors DCMS is responsible for. This was to replicate the order of the questions in the Active Lives Survey.

¹⁰ 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/S14-INTERIM-PRINCIPLE-Personal-Well-being-V1.1-June-16-1.pdf>.

The topics covered in the screening section were as follows:

- general free time activities, including watching TV and playing video games;
- participating in arts activities;
- attending arts activities;
- libraries;
- archives;
- heritage (sites of historic interest);
- museums and galleries; and
- sport and physical activity.

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.

After each screening question, where participation in an activity was identified, follow-up questions were asked. These, included whether the activity was undertaken in the respondent's free time, as part of voluntary work, for academic study or as paid work, as well as the frequency of participation.

For the Quarter 2 sample onwards the sport and physical activity section was reduced in length and some other related follow-up questions were removed. These changes will be published separately.

Digital activities

This section covered internet access and use of online resources for reasons connected to culture, leisure and sport, including access to information, uploading and downloading content, and use of social media.

Participation

Respondents in the cross-sectional sample were asked more detailed follow-up questions about the activities they had participated in. The activities were randomly chosen from those identified in the screening sections, so that no more than one activity from each topic was asked about. These questions covered levels of satisfaction, including whether the respondent had recommended this activity to a friend or family member. In addition, there were questions about attitudes to the historical environment.

Barriers to participation

Respondents who were part of the Quarter 1 cross-sectional sample were asked, for any type of activity where they had not participated in the last 12 months, about any participation in their lifetime. For the Quarter 2 sample onwards, these questions were removed.

Panel members were asked more detailed questions about changes in participation, including any significant life events, positive or negative, that they had experienced since they were last interviewed. If a comparison with data collected the

year before suggested that they were participating more or less in any activity, the reasons for these changes were asked about.

For panel members, broader attitudes to the arts and arts participation were also explored.

Volunteering and charitable giving

All respondents were asked about volunteering and charitable giving over the last 12 months, including what forms these took, how often they were done and whether volunteering or giving was focused on arts, cultural or sporting causes. Respondents in the cross-sectional sample were also asked about attitudes to charitable giving related to these areas of activity.

Some questions were removed for the Quarter 2 sample and thereafter.

Community participation

Respondents in the cross-sectional sample were asked about attitudes to their local area and whether they had taken any actions to influence what happens within their community, particularly in relation to cultural and sporting provision. They were also asked about what made them proud of Britain.

First World War commemorations

All respondents were asked about their recall of, participation in and attitudes to events surrounding the commemoration of the First World War. For the Quarter 2 sample onwards, questions asking about the events commemorating the centenary of World War 1 were asked of a random half of adults aged 25 or over (they were asked of all adults aged 16 to 24).

The questions in this section were amended for the Quarter 3 sample and thereafter.

News

This section covered access to news via different media: print, broadcast and online. Some questions were removed for the Quarter 2 sample and thereafter.

Demographics

A full range of demographic information was collected, including educational qualifications, employment, household income, household tenure, sexual identity, national identity, ethnicity and religious affiliation. Other background information included car ownership (asked of the Quarter 1 sample only) and phone ownership, health and its impact on activities, smoking and drinking.

Invitation to join the web panel

All adult respondents, whether part of the panel or the cross-sectional sample, were asked to join the web-based panel. This panel will replace the face-to-face interviews with panel members and details of the operation of the web panel will be published separately. Consent was obtained verbally. Contact details for the adult, including their email address and telephone number, were also collected to facilitate web panel data collection.

Evaluation of use of white definitions show cards

As part of our review of the documents used by interviewers which we undertook in advance of Year 13 (2017/18) fieldwork, we included a question during Q3 fieldwork, asking interviewers if they had used the white definitions show cards during the adult interview. This question was retained for the Q4 sample and was asked at the end of 3,739 adult interviews during Year 12. Interviewers reported using the white definitions show cards during 8.6 per cent of these interviews.

Youth questionnaire

Youth respondents aged between 11-15 were asked about their participation in cultural and sporting activity. As with the adult interview, the questions asked differed depending on whether the respondent was in the cross-sectional or panel part of the sample, but the content was similar for respondents of both sample types. The questionnaire asked about activities that the respondent participated both in school lessons and their spare time.

The youth questionnaire did not change between quarters. Full questionnaires and documentation of changes since the 2015-16 survey will be published separately.

School and school year

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

Life events

Youth panel respondents were asked to identify any life changes that may have occurred since the previous interview. The first question covered changes to schools and education, while the second focused more on changes to their personal circumstances. The respondents were given a life events calendar to use as an aide memoire to record key activities or changes over the past 12 months, although completing this was not a requirement. As part of the review of the documents used by interviewers in advance of Year 13 fieldwork, during the Q3 fieldwork a question was included asking interviewers if they had used the life events calendar during the adult interview. This question was retained for the Q4 sample and was asked at the end of 276 youth interviews during Year 12. Interviewers reported using the life events calendar during 21.7 per cent of these interviews.

Screening questions

All youth respondents were asked a series of screening questions covering participation during the last 12 months in different types of activities. Respondents could include participation regardless of whether it took place within England.

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:

- Dance activities;
- Music activities;
- Theatre and drama activities;
- Reading and writing activities;

- Arts, crafts and design activities;
- Outdoor arts participation and attendance, e.g. street arts, circus;
- Film and video activities;
- Radio activities;
- Computer-based activities;
- Libraries;
- Archives;
- Museums and galleries; and
- 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

Youth 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 youths, asking them to rate their level of happiness on a scale of 1 to 10¹¹.

Demographics

Background information about health and ethnicity was collected from respondents, as well as confirmation of their date of birth and full name.

Invitation to join the web panel

All youth respondents, whether part of the panel or the cross-sectional sample, were asked, subject to parental consent, to join the web-based panel in future. This panel will replace the face-to-face interviews with panel members and details of the operation of the web panel will be published separately. Verbal consent was sought firstly from the legal parent or guardian and then from the youth respondent. Contact details for the youth, including their email address and telephone number, were also collected, to facilitate web panel data collection.

¹¹ This is one of the Personal Well-being (PWB) questions.

National Pupil Database linkage

Verbal consent was sought, firstly from the parent or legal guardian and then the youth respondent, to use the youth 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.

Evaluation of use of white definitions show cards

As part of our review of the documents used by interviewers which we undertook in advance of Year 13 (2017/18) fieldwork, we included a question during Q3 fieldwork, asking interviewers if they had used the white definitions show cards during the youth interview. This question was retained for the Q4 sample and was asked at the end of 276 youth interviews during Year 12. Interviewers reported using the white definitions show cards during 10.1 per cent of these interviews.

Child questionnaire

The child proxy questionnaire was administered after the adult interview, where applicable. The parent or guardian of the child was asked about the activities the child participated in outside of school only. Collecting detailed information about activities the child took part in at school would be onerous for the parent to complete, and the information would be likely to be unreliable. Other than this, the child proxy questionnaire was very similar to the youth questionnaire and did not change between quarters.

School and school year

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

Life events

The parent or guardian of the child was asked to identify any life changes that may have occurred since the previous interview.

Screening questions

Parents or guardians were asked a series of screening questions covering their child's participation during the last 12 months in different types of activities. Participation could be included regardless of whether it took place within England.

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 during school lessons or during their spare time:

- Dance activities;
- Music activities;
- Theatre and drama activities;
- Reading and writing activities;

- Arts, crafts and design activities;
- Outdoor arts participation and attendance, e.g. street arts, circus;
- Film and video activities;
- Computer-based and radio activities;
- Libraries;
- Museums and galleries; and
- 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

Parents and guardians 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 check question asking 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 health and ethnicity was collected from parents or guardians about the child, as well as confirmation of their child's date of birth and full name.

National Pupil Database linkage

Verbal consent was collected from the parent or legal guardian to use their child's personal information to link National Pupil Database (NPD) records to survey data about the child. Parents or guardians 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 12 (2016/17) 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 advance letters and leaflets were reviewed and re-designed for Year 12, to ensure they were eye-catching and conveyed key information in as succinct a manner as possible. On each letter the logos of DCMS and the survey organisation were printed, along with the signature of the Head of Statistics at DCMS.

The letters and leaflets 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 letters and leaflets 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 voucher that could be redeemed for cash at any Post Office. The leaflets contained more detail than the advance letters, including interesting findings from Taking Part, which were judged would not affect respondents' answers to survey questions.

Different versions of the advance letter and leaflet were produced for cross-sectional and panel addresses, although care was taken to keep the content the same as far as possible. To make it easier for interviewers to distinguish between the cross-sectional and panel letters and leaflets, different logos and colour schemes were used. A turquoise typeface was used for the panel advance letters and leaflets and a pink typeface for the cross-sectional advance letters and leaflets.

The main difference between the cross-sectional and panel advance letters and leaflets was that panel members were reminded about their previous participation, that they had agreed to be re-contacted and why they should take part again. The panel advance letters were addressed directly to the adult who previously participated. Cross-sectional advance letters were addressed 'Dear Sir/Madam'.

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.

During Year 12 fieldwork, 169 adults in the cross-sectional sample and 69 adults in the panel sample opted out of the survey by contacting Ipsos MORI, NatCen Social Research or DCMS. The opt-out rate was 1.5 per cent in the cross-sectional sample and 1.3 per cent in the panel sample.

Selection/Enumeration instrument

The Selection/Enumeration instrument was developed for Year 12, and replaced the Address Contact Sheets previously used on Taking Part.

At cross-sectional addresses, after making contact, the interviewer's first task was to complete the Selection instrument, as no adult, youth or child interviewing scripts could become available until this was done.

The Selection instrument was a 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 a respondent was selected for interview, the interviewer was required to enter the name of the respondent before continuing.

If the randomly selected adult was aged 16 or 17 and still lived with a parent or legal guardian, as a courtesy interviewers were required to obtain parental permission for the adult interview and to record the name of the parent consenting in the Selection instrument.

At panel addresses, after making contact the interviewer's first task was to complete the Enumeration instrument, as no adult, youth or child interviewing scripts could become available until this was done. The Enumeration instrument enabled interviewers to check which panel members were still living at the address.

As with the Selection instrument, the Enumeration instrument was a Dimensions script, designed so it could be used on the doorstep if required. Interviewers were permitted to complete the Enumeration instrument with any adult who lived at the sampled address, with the exception of 'split-off' addresses¹². Interviewers were told that when visiting 'split-off' addresses they should complete the Enumeration instrument only with the main adult panel member, and not to disclose any information about the other panel members the adult panel member was linked to.

The Enumeration instrument required interviewers to record whether each adult, youth or child panel member was still living at the address, had moved out, or something else had happened (for example, whether they had died, or gone to prison). If the interviewer discovered that the main adult panel member had moved out, the Enumeration instrument prompted them to ask for the main adult panel member's new address and, if this was volunteered, to record it. Interviewers were required to indicate if they considered the new address to be within their interviewing area. If they said it was, a new Enumeration instrument for the 'split-off' address became available.

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, of all household members and the relationship of each household member to the respondent. During adult interviews in households in the cross-sectional sample, the computer used this information to select randomly one youth and child (if applicable) for inclusion in the achieved sample.

At panel addresses there was no selection of youths and children. Interviewers were asked to complete all available youth and child instruments if possible.

¹² A 'split-off' address was defined as an address where the original adult panel member had moved to, where they had moved away from some or all of the other panel members (who remained at the core address).

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 or Enumeration instrument.

At the start of each youth interview interviewers were required to record in the Dimensions script 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.

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

Table 4.1: Documents used for Year 12 Taking Part fieldwork, and their purpose

Document	Purpose
All respondents	
White definitions show cards	For interviewers to help respondents decide what was covered by terms such as paid work and volunteering.
Cross-sectional addresses	
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.
Panel addresses	
Incentive receipt forms	For interviewers to collect the respondent's signature when the incentive was handed to them at the end of a youth interview.
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.

Document	Purpose
Documents for the adult interview (both cross-sectional and panel addresses)	
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.
Documents for the youth interview (both cross-sectional and panel addresses)	
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 if 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 survey answers.
Documents for the child proxy interview (both cross-sectional and panel addresses)	
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.

Movers

Procedures for those who had moved address since their previous interview (hereafter 'movers') were simplified in Year 12, to assist with the successful set up of the sample management systems within the challenging timetable. Interviewers were only required to obtain details of a new address if the main adult had moved, either with their household or if they had separated from the household they were part of at the time of the Year 11 (2015/16) interview.

Where the previous contractor provided us with alternative addresses or 'stable contacts' for panel members, these were provided to the interviewer. Where the respondent had moved, yet no alternative contact details had been provided, interviewers were instructed to ask the current householder or neighbours for a forwarding address. Interviewers were required to make calls on up to two neighbours (maximum of two face-to-face calls per neighbour) to establish whether the address was occupied, or whether they could help trace panel members.

Interviewers were asked to record any new address they found for movers and, if the interviewer considered the address to be in their area, to attempt to interview the panel members at their new address.

Any respondents who no longer lived in England or who had moved to a communal establishment were no longer eligible for the survey.

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.

Changes to documents during Year 12

Some changes were made during Year 12 to the fieldwork documents. These changes were made following the gathering of feedback from interviewers at briefings and in four telephone conferences, and separately from field managers. This feedback was collated and discussed at a fieldwork performance review conference held by Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research in September 2016.

For the first two quarters of Year 12 fieldwork, advance letters and leaflets were despatched centrally, on a designated day at the start of each sample month. Following feedback from interviewers, this procedure was changed so that for the Quarter 3 sample onwards 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 method¹³. For the Quarter 3 sample onwards, interviewers were sent advance letters and leaflets in pre-sealed postage paid envelopes for all the addresses in their work pack.

For the Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 samples a non-contact letter was introduced to help interviewers with non-contact cases and those working on reissues. The aim of the letter was to help interviewers make contact with respondents. On each letter the logos of DCMS and the survey organisation were printed, but the letter was designed so that it could be signed by interviewers and sent by them in the post or put through the respondent's letter box.

A laminate impact card was introduced for the Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 samples to help interviewers convince respondents of the value of the survey when they were attempting to secure participation. The laminate contained five specific examples of actions taken by DCMS or the survey co-sponsors as a result of analysis of Taking Part data. This also gave interviewers information to use on the doorstep which was not contained in the advance letter or leaflet.

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 13 (2017/18) onwards. During Year 12, in both cross-sectional and panel sample cases, at the end of the adult interview, interviewers asked respondents with internet access 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.

¹³ 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>.

Interviewers were instructed to give the 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 in both cross-sectional and panel sample cases, 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.

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 survey answers. Interviewers were instructed to leave the parent or legal guardian with a handout which explained what the National Pupil Database 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 National Pupil Database 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 National Pupil Database handout, containing the same information as that given to the parent or legal guardian.

Pilot

Although the commissioning timetable was very challenging, as a key objective for Year 12 was ensuring a smooth transition of contractor without prejudicing survey delivery, pilot was carried out to ensure the sample management systems and questionnaire instruments were working properly. As far as possible the procedures followed replicated those intended to be used during Year 12 fieldwork. To ensure robust testing of all procedures, ten interviewers (five from Ipsos MORI and five from NatCen Social Research) worked on the pilot.

There were a number of other objectives for the pilot. These were estimating the average adult interview length, and gaining feedback on all aspects of the survey process, including the survey materials, interviewers' experiences of securing participation, the sample management systems, the Selection and Enumeration instruments, the adult, youth and child instruments, the web panel recruitment process, and securing consent for National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage.

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 at cross-sectional and panel addresses. A further consideration was that DCMS wished to minimise attrition among panel members. Accordingly, we needed to minimise the number of panel members interviewed during the pilot (who would then not be interviewed during Year 12) while ensuring sufficient panel members were interviewed so that the instruments were fully tested.

We obtained from the previous contractor a database of panel members who had been interviewed in Quarter 1 primary sampling units in Year 11 and who had agreed to be re-contacted in Year 12 and have their previous answers passed to another survey research organisation. Analysis of the database showed a large variation in the number of panel members available in each primary sampling unit. As primary sampling units with large numbers of panel members would create a heavy workload for interviewers during Year 12 fieldwork, risking higher levels of non-contact, we decided to carry out the pilot in sampling points with very large numbers of panel members.

For the pilot four pilot sampling points were selected from the Quarter 1 primary sampling units where there were over 25 panel members available. We decided to select panel members from these four primary sampling units but leave a minimum of 19 in each primary sampling unit for Year 12 fieldwork. We decided not to issue any panel members in the other six pilot sampling points, to avoid reducing the number of panel members available for Year 12 fieldwork further. We could therefore choose areas near the four pilot sampling points for the other six pilot sampling points, making it possible to carry out one pilot briefing only.

In each pilot sampling point 33 addresses were selected. In the six pilot sampling points where there were no panel members, there were 33 cross-sectional addresses; in the other four pilot sampling points there were between 20 and 33 cross-sectional addresses, with panel addresses taking each pilot sampling point to a total of 33 addresses.

In order to improve interviewer productivity, in the four pilot sampling points where there were panel members cross-sectional addresses were selected so that they were clustered around the panel members selected for the pilot. Further, for cross-sectional addresses the interval between addresses was set to 20, rather than the more usual 100 or more, ensuring addresses were reasonably close together. For the other six pilot sampling points the interval between addresses was also set to 20.

All ten pilot interviewers attended a full-day briefing held on 9 March 2016 in Solihull. All members of the DCMS, Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research teams attended. As only four pilot sampling points contained panel members, we instructed interviewers working in those areas to attempt interviews with panel members first. Interviewers were given 10 days to complete the pilot assignment, and for this reason no required calling pattern was set.

Pilot fieldwork took place from 10 to 20 March 2016. A total of 98 interviews were completed. The number of interviews completed with each questionnaire instrument, broken down by sample type, is given in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Number of pilot interviews: questionnaire instrument by sample type

Questionnaire instrument	Cross-sectional	Panel	Total
Adult	59	21	80
Youth	4	1	5
Child	8	5	13
Total	71	27	98

A feedback form was included in each interviewer's work pack which they were asked to complete it before the de-briefing. A de-briefing was held in Solihull on 21 March 2016, to discuss interviewers' experiences with them and to collect the completed feedback forms.

Briefings

As most of the interviewers had not worked on Taking Part previously, an extensive programme of briefings was held which took place throughout the year. Each briefing was a day-long briefing lasting five and a half hours.

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 interviewers were briefed about Taking Part, the different procedures to follow for cross-sectional and panel sample, the importance of achieving high response rates,

the sample management systems to be used by their organisation, the instruments, web panel recruitment, data protection and information linkage, and the advance mailing and incentives. During each briefing, interviewers were able to practice using the sample management systems and the instruments.

Across the year we briefed 282 interviewers in 23 separate briefings. Briefings were held in Altrincham, Birmingham, Bristol, Derby, Haydock, London, Manchester, North Petherton and York. Of the 282 interviewers briefed, 128 were briefed at the start of Quarter 1 fieldwork.

Fieldwork dates and fieldwork management

As had been the practice previously on Taking Part, during Year 12 the fieldwork was managed on a monthly basis. In general assignments were issued at the beginning of each month, although the third month in every quarter was started two weeks early to allow sufficient time for fieldwork to finish to meet the data cut-offs required.

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 12 are set out in Table 4.3. Fieldwork for Year 12 began on 5 April 2016 and ended on 7 June 2017. These duration of fieldwork for each sample month differed in Year 12 from Year 11. In Year 11 the deadline for all the Quarter 1 sample was 20 December of the survey fieldwork year, the deadline for all the Quarter 2 sample was 31 January of the survey fieldwork year, and the deadline for all the Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 sample was 31 March of the survey fieldwork year.

Table 4.3: Fieldwork dates for each sample month

Sample quarter	Sample month	Fieldwork start	Fieldwork end
2016			
1	April	5 April 2016	22 August 2016
1	May	1 May 2016	27 September 2016
1	June	20 May 2016	1 September 2016
2	July	1 July 2016	28 December 2016
2	August	1 August 2016	8 March 2017
2	September	19 August 2016	6 April 2017
3	October	1 October 2016	15 May 2017
3	November	28 October 2016	16 May 2017
3	December	23 November 2016	8 May 2017
2017			
4	January	1 January 2017	1 June 2017
4	February	1 February 2017	4 June 2017
4	March	17 February 2017	7 June 2017

Our intention was to use the Year 12 instruments for the Year 12 sample only. In previous years, strict cut-offs had been applied for both data delivery and questionnaire changes. For example, cases from the Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 sample which were still being worked by interviewers at the time the half-year data cut-off was applied would then appear in the full year dataset only (in other words the half-year dataset would not contain all Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 sample cases for that year). Similarly, in previous years if a questionnaire change was made at any point, interviewers then used the amended instruments for all cases remaining in the field. So, for example, a respondent at a Quarter 1 sample address could potentially be interviewed using a Quarter 1 or Quarter 2 instrument.

To make Taking Part easier to analyse, it was decided to allocate instruments to each sample quarter, so that if any changes were made to an instrument for any sample quarter, these changes only applied to the sample from that quarter. Allocation of instruments to sample members was controlled automatically; interviewers were advised of any changes to instruments 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 questionnaire instruments were being implemented properly in the field. In total 982 respondents were re-contacted, 963 (98%) by telephone, 16 (2%) by post, and 3 by personal visit (less than 0.5%).

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 Primary Sampling Unit).

Maximising response

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

Incentives

The incentive strategy was changed for Year 12. For Year 11, an unconditional incentive of a book of six first-class stamps was included with the advance letter sent to every address in the sample, whether cross-sectional or panel. Each household where at least one interview was completed received a £5 high-street voucher.

For the cross-sectional part of the sample in Year 12 the incentive was changed to 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.

For the panel part of the sample in Year 12 there were up to two incentives per household. For the main adult respondent, the incentive was changed to an unconditional £10 Post Office voucher, printed at the bottom of the advance letter sent to them. Any responding youths were given a £5 gift card at the end of their interview, as they had received at the end of previous Taking Part interviews.

For the Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 samples, the value of the unconditional Post Office voucher sent to the main adult respondent was reduced from £10 to £5. This was done because the length of the adult questionnaire proved longer than expected in the field, and this measure contributed to efforts to keep the costs of Year 12 fieldwork within the agreed budget. As the household response rate for the panel sample was at the expected level, this was judged to be a low-risk change to the incentive strategy. Moreover, in Year 11 respondents had received a conditional incentive of a £5 high-street voucher, and so many would not perceive this change as a reduction in the incentive amount¹⁴. The re-interview rate among panel members was 74 per cent for the Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 samples and decreased slightly to 71.3 per cent for the Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 samples.

Calling pattern

For Year 12, the calling pattern interviewers were required to follow was also changed. 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 11, for all addresses interviewers were required to make a minimum of eight calls before a non-contact outcome could be recorded for an address. Calls had to be made on different days of the week and at different times of day: at least two of the calls had to be made on a weekday evening (after 7.00 p.m.) and least one call at a weekend (10.00 a.m. to 9.00 p.m.).

In Year 12, 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.

At panel addresses interviewers were permitted to make initial contact by telephone, but only after at least four face-to-face visits had been made to the core or 'split-off' address.

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

¹⁴ Note that in Year 11 a book of six first-class stamps was included with the advance letter.

Reissues

In order to maximise the response rate in the cross-sectional part of the sample, and to minimise attrition in the panel part of the sample, 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 4.4 shows which outcome codes made an address eligible for reissue:

Table 4.4: Outcome codes eligible for reissue

Outcome code	Outcome description
320	No further contact at issued address
411	PANEL ONLY - Refusal by telephone
420	CROSS-SECTIONAL ONLY - 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)
671	PANEL ONLY – Target adult (16+) has moved and unable to find follow up address
672	PANEL ONLY – Target adult (16+) has moved to address outside my area
690	Other unknown eligibility (give details)
790	Other ineligible (give details)
890	Other unknown eligibility despite making contact (give details)

Table 4.5 gives details of the reissuing carried out during Year 12 fieldwork, by sample type. During Year 12, 3,056 of 11,584 cross-sectional addresses (26.4%) were reissued, and 236 of 5,297 panel addresses (4.5%). No addresses were reissued more than once. A productive outcome was achieved at 14.7 per cent of reissued cross-sectional addresses and 19.9 per cent of reissued panel addresses. Table 4.5 also shows the conversion rate by Standard Outcome Code used at first issue, for both cross-sectional and panel cases, including only those first issue Standard Outcome Codes which generated at least 50 re-issues. Interviewers working re-issue cases were most successful at households where the respondent had broken an appointment (23%), or had been away for the whole fieldwork period (22%). Among panel cases which were re-issued interviewers were most successful at households where the respondent had broken an

appointment (37%), or where the first issue interviewer had been unable to make contact (33%). Among cross-sectional cases which were re-issued interviewers were most successful at households where the respondent had been away for the whole fieldwork period (22%) or where the respondent had broken an appointment (20%),

Table 4.5: Reissue analysis, by sample type

	Standard outcome code	All	Cross-sectional	Panel¹⁵
Total addresses issued		16,881	11,584	5,297
Total addresses reissued		3,292	3,056	236
% of sample reissued		19.5%	26.4%	4.5%
Fully productive reissue addresses		444	400	44
Partially productive reissue addresses		53	50	3
Total productive reissue addresses		497	450	47
Conversion rate		15.1%	14.7%	19.9%
First issue outcome conversion rates				
Broken appointment – no re-contact	450	23%	20%	37%
Refusal because away / in hospital during entire fieldwork period	520	22%	22%	23%
No contact with anyone at address (after required visits made)	650	18%	18%	15%
Refusal by proxy (other person)	432	17%	17%	13%
No further contact at issued address	320	15%	14%	33%
Refusal because ill at home during entire fieldwork period	510	15%	16%	11%
Refusal by target adult (16+)	431	14%	14%	13%
CROSS-SECTIONAL ONLY - Contact made, but refused to give information about household / names	420	10%	10%	

In year review of fieldwork performance

During Year 12 we gathered feedback from interviewers at briefings and in four telephone conferences, and separately from field managers. This feedback was collated and discussed at a fieldwork performance review conference held by Ipsos MORI and NatCen Social Research researchers in September 2016.

¹⁵ This includes split-off addresses

As a result, some changes were made to the documents made available to interviewers, and the incentive strategy was changed.

Fieldwork outcomes

The fieldwork outcomes, including response rates, are set out in this section. As in the Year 11 Technical Report, the figures reflect the sample year. We report fieldwork outcomes separately for the adult, youth and child samples, by cross-sectional and panel sample.

For Year 12 '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 instructions manual.

Adult cross-sectional sample

Table 4.6 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the adult cross-sectional sample for Year 12 of Taking Part. The final contact rate¹⁶ was 86.6 per cent and the final co-operation rate¹⁷ was 57.5 per cent. The 'unadjusted' response rate¹⁸ was 53.7 per cent, and the yield rate¹⁹ was 46.9 per cent.

For Year 12 a slightly different method of producing an 'adjusted' response rate²⁰ was used. In Year 11 the 'adjusted' response rate assumed that the proportion of outcomes classified as 'Residential address but no contact with anyone at address' that were ineligible was the same as the proportion of ineligible outcomes observed at all other addresses. In our view this approach will over-estimate the proportion of 'Residential address but no contact with anyone at address' that are ineligible because some of the ineligible outcomes ('Not yet built/under construction', 'Derelict/demolished', 'Non-residential address', and 'Communal establishment') will not be appropriate for non-contact addresses.

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 number of outcomes recorded for these five 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 4.6 per cent. This lower than the total ineligible rate of 5.9 per cent because the cases where the eligibility of the household could not be not yet built/under construction, demolished/derelict, non-residential or communal establishments/institutions. Following this procedure, the adjusted response rate was calculated as 50.1 per cent.

Table 4.6: Fieldwork outcomes (adult cross-sectional sample)

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases	% of all cases which might be eligible
Complete interview (I+P)		5,431	46.9	49.8
Complete interviews with all target respondents	110	5,188	44.8	47.6
Complete interview with at least target adult (16+) but not all target respondents	210	243	2.1	2.2
Eligible, but no interview (NC)		673	5.8	6.2
No further contact at issued address	320	639	5.5	5.9
Contact made, but not with member of the sampled dwelling	321	0	0.0	0.0

¹⁶ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

¹⁷ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

¹⁸ 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).

¹⁹ This is the proportion of issued addresses which are productive.

²⁰ This is the same as the Response Rate 3 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

Contact made at sampled dwelling/HH, but not with responsible resident	322	0	0.0	0.0
Contact made with responsible resident at sampled dwelling/HH, but not with target adult (16+)	323	3	0.0	0.0
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	25	0.2	0.2
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	6	0.1	0.1
Refusals (R)		3,508	30.3	32.2
Office refusal	410	169	1.5	1.5
Contact made, but refused to give information about household / names	420	631	5.4	5.8
Refusal by target adult (16+)	431	2,034	17.6	18.7
Refusal by proxy (other person)	432	399	3.4	3.7
Refusal (parental permission)	433	2	0.0	0.0
Refusal during interview	440	6	0.1	0.1
Broken appointment – no re-contact	450	267	2.3	2.4
Other non-response (O)		503	4.3	4.6
Refusal because ill at home during entire fieldwork period	510	67	0.6	0.6
Refusal because away / in hospital during entire fieldwork period	520	115	1.0	1.1
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	152	1.3	1.4
Language barrier / difficulties	540	62	0.5	0.6
Language barrier with target respondent	542	8	0.1	0.1
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	99	0.9	0.9
Unknown eligibility (UE)		791	6.8	7.3
Not issued to an interviewer	611	0	0.0	0.0
Issued but not attempted	612	0	0.0	0.0
Address inaccessible	620	64	0.6	0.6
Unable to locate address / insufficient address	630	64	0.6	0.6
No contact with anyone at address (after required visits made)	650	628	5.4	5.8
Other unknown eligibility	690	35	0.3	0.3

Ineligible (NE)		678	5.9	
Not yet built/under construction	710	6	0.1%	
Demolished/derelict	720	15	0.1%	
Vacant/empty	730	375	3.2%	
Non-residential	740	116	1.0%	
Address occupied, but no resident(s)	750	21	0.2%	
Communal establishment/institution	760	12	0.1%	
Resident household(s), but no person eligible for the survey	770	19	0.2%	
Other ineligible	790	114	1.0%	
Total issued		11,584		

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 (36.8%)
- Too busy (21.4%)
- Another reason (11.2%)
- Waste of time (6.1%)
- Do not see the personal benefit (4.1%)

No reason was offered by those refusing in 25.4 per cent of households that refused to participate in the survey.

Table 4.7 shows the fieldwork unadjusted response rates and yield rates for the adult cross-sectional sample for Year 12 of Taking Part, broken down by former Government Office Region. The yield rate was highest in the North West, which also had the highest unadjusted response rate (62.7%). The lowest yield rate and unadjusted response rate were seen in London.

Table 4.7: Fieldwork response rates by former Government Office Region (adult cross-sectional sample)

Region	Issued	In scope	Interviews	Unadjusted response rate	Yield rate
North East	1,040	90.1%	494	55.1%	47.5%
North West	1,568	92.5%	840	62.7%	53.6%
Yorkshire and the Humber	1,168	81.0%	627	51.7%	53.7%
East Midlands	992	83.3%	496	57.5%	50.0%
West Midlands	1,200	85.1%	547	50.6%	45.6%
East of England	1,152	85.1%	573	50.3%	49.7%
London	1,776	91.7%	635	47.3%	35.8%
South East	1,648	90.6%	756	55.1%	45.9%
South West	1,040	85.1%	463	53.2%	44.5%
Total	11,584	87.3%	5,431	53.7%	46.9%

Adult panel sample

Table 4.8 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the panel household sample for Year 12 of Taking Part. This includes both 'core' and 'split-off' panel addresses. The final contact rate²¹ was 88.2 per cent and the final co-operation rate²² 83.6 per cent. The re-interview rate (that is, the proportion of cases issued where an interview was achieved) was 72.7 per cent. All panel members are assumed to be eligible, unless they were found to no longer live in England or in private residential accommodation. Untraced movers were not defined as 'out of scope', as was done in the Year 11 Technical Report as almost all of the panel members will still be eligible for the survey.

A response rate has not been computed, as this would require taking into account the re-interview rate at each wave of Taking Part. This calculation would be far from straightforward as panel members were recruited over six fieldwork years.

Table 4.8: Fieldwork outcomes (panel household sample)

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases	% of all cases which might be eligible
Complete interview (I+P)		3,849	72.7	73.7
Complete interviews with all target respondents	110	3,763	71.0	72.0
Complete interview with at least target adult (16+) but not all target respondents	210	86	1.6	1.6
Eligible, but no interview (NC)		286	5.4	5.5
No further contact at issued address	320	131	2.5	2.5
Contact made at sampled dwelling/HH, but not with responsible resident	322	0	0.0	0.0
Contact made with responsible resident at sampled dwelling/HH, but not with target adult (16+)	323	1	0.0	0.0
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	11	0.2	0.2
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	0	0.0	0.0
Moved	326	143	2.7	2.7
Target adult (16+) has moved and unable to find follow up address	331	0	0.0	0.0
Refusals (R)		616	11.6	11.8
Office refusal	410	69	1.3	1.3
Refusal by telephone	411	0	0.0	0.0

²¹ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

²² We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

Refusal by target adult (16+)	431	377	7.1	7.2
Refusal by proxy (other person)	432	56	1.1	1.1
Refusal (parental permission)	433	1	0.0	0.0
Refusal during interview	440	0	0.0	0.0
Broken appointment – no re-contact	450	113	2.1	2.2
Other non-response (O)		141	2.7	2.7
Refusal because ill at home during entire fieldwork period	510	28	0.5	0.5
Refusal because away / in hospital during entire fieldwork period	520	43	0.8	0.8
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	18	0.3	0.3
Language barrier / difficulties	540	0	0.0	0.0
Language barrier with target respondent	542	0	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	52	1.0	1.0
Unknown eligibility (UE)		333	6.3	6.4
Not issued to an interviewer	611	0	0.0	0.0
Issued but not attempted	612	1	0.0	0.0
Address inaccessible	620	3	0.1	0.1
Unable to locate address / insufficient address	630	14	0.3	0.3
No contact with anyone at address (after required visits made)	650	108	2.0	2.1
Target adult (16+) has moved and unable to find follow up address	671	166	3.1	3.2
Target adult (16+) has moved to address outside my area	672	34	0.6	0.7
Other unknown eligibility	690	7	0.1	0.1
Ineligible (NE)		72	1.4	
Resident household(s), but no person eligible for the survey	770	30	0.6	
Target adult (16+) has died	781	27	0.5	
Target adult (16+) no longer lives in England	789	10	0.2	
Other ineligible	790	5	0.1	
Total issued		5,297		

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

- Too busy (39.0%)
- Another reason (20.3%)
- Does not want to take part any more (15.9%)
- Not interested (15.9%)
- Stressful family situation (13.9%)

No reason was offered by those refusing in 16.9 per cent of households that refused to participate in the survey.

As the design of the Taking Part panel allows child panel members to be re-allocated to the youth sample, and youth panel members to be re-allocated to the adult sample, when they reach the appropriate age, in some households more than one adult, youth or child was available for interview. At the 3,849 panel households where an interview was achieved, there were 3,950 potential adult respondents. Of these, 3,921 were interviewed (99.3%).

Table 4.9 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the adult panel sample for Year 12 of Taking Part, for 'split-off' cases only. A comparison to all 'core' panel cases is also included. For the core panel sample the final contact rate²³ was 88.6 per cent and the final co-operation rate²⁴ 83.6 per cent. The re-interview rate (that is, the proportion of cases issued where an interview was achieved) was 73.1 per cent. For the 'split-off' panel sample the final contact rate was 49.2 per cent and the final co-operation rate 71.9 per cent. The re-interview rate (that is, the proportion of cases issued where an interview was achieved) was 35.4 per cent.

Table 4.9: Fieldwork outcomes (adult 'split-off' and core panel samples)

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases	% of all cases which might be eligible	% of all cases	% of all cases which might be eligible
		'Split-off' panel cases			'Core' panel cases	
Complete interview (I+P)		23	35.4	35.4	73.1	74.1
Complete interviews with all target respondents	110	22	33.8	33.8	71.5	72.5
Complete interview with at least target adult (16+) but not all target respondents	210	1	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6
Eligible, but no interview (NC)		10	15.4	15.4	5.3	5.3
No further contact at issued address	320	3	4.6	4.6	2.4	2.5

²³ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 Technical Report: (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive) / Total non-deadwood. This appears to be the same as the Contact Rate 3 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

²⁴ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 Technical Report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive). This appears to be the same as the Co-operation Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

Contact made at sampled dwelling/HH, but not with responsible resident	322	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contact made with responsible resident at sampled dwelling/HH, but not with target adult (16+)	323	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	1	1.5	1.5	0.2	0.2
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Moved	326	6	9.2	9.2	2.6	2.7
Target adult (16+) has moved and unable to find follow up address	331	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Refusals (R)		6	9.2	9.2	11.7	11.8
Office refusal	410	0	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3
Refusal by telephone	411	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Refusal by target adult (16+)	431	3	4.6	4.6	7.1	7.2
Refusal by proxy (other person)	432	0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1
Refusal (parental permission)	433	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Refusal during interview	440	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Broken appointment – no re-contact	450	3	4.6	4.6	2.1	2.1
Other non-response (O)		3	4.6	4.6	2.6	2.7
Refusal because ill at home during entire fieldwork period	510	0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5
Refusal because away / in hospital during entire fieldwork period	520	1	1.5	1.5	0.8	0.8
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Language barrier / difficulties	540	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Language barrier with target respondent	542	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lost interview	550	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full interview achieved but target adult 16+ requested data be deleted	591	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Partial interview achieved but target adult 16+ requested data be deleted	592	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	2	3.1	3.1	1.0	1.0
Unknown eligibility (UE)		23	35.4	35.4	5.9	6.0
Not issued to an interviewer	611	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Issued but not attempted	612	1	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0

Address inaccessible	620	0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Unable to locate address / insufficient address	630	0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
No contact with anyone at address (after required visits made)	650	0	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1
Target adult (16+) has moved and unable to find follow up address	671	16	24.6	24.6	2.9	2.9
Target adult (16+) has moved to address outside my area	672	6	9.2	9.2	0.5	0.5
Other unknown eligibility	690	0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Ineligible (NE)		0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
Resident household(s), but no person eligible for the survey	770	0	0.0		0.6	
Target adult (16+) has died	781	0	0.0		0.5	
Target adult (16+) no longer lives in England	789	0	0.0		0.2	
Other ineligible	790	0	0.0		0.1	
Total issued		65			5,232	

Youth cross-sectional sample

Table 4.10 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the youth cross-sectional sample for Year 12 of Taking Part. The final contact rate²⁵ was 97.0 per cent and the final co-operation rate²⁶ was 70.3 per cent.

The in-household youth response rate²⁷ was 68.2 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 34.2 per cent (50.1% * 68.2%).

²⁵ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

²⁶ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

²⁷ 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 4.10: Fieldwork outcomes (youth cross-sectional sample)

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases
Complete interview (I+P)		410	68.2
Complete interview with target respondent	111	410	68.2
Partial interview with target respondent	211	0	0.0
Eligible, but no interview (NC)		18	3.0
Contact made with responsible resident at given address, but not with target respondent	323	8	1.3
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	9	1.5
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	1	0.2
Refusals (R)		156	26.0
Household refusal before interview		59	9.8
Refusal by target respondent	431	27	4.5
Refusal by proxy	432	22	3.7
Refusal (parental permission)	433	46	7.7
Refusal during interview	440	0	0.0
Broken appointment – no recontact	450	2	0.3
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
Other non-response (O)		17	2.8
Ill at home during field period	510	1	0.2
Away/in hospital throughout field period	520	2	0.3
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	4	0.7
Language barrier with target respondent	542	0	0.0
Lost interview	550	0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	10	1.7
Total issued		601	

Youth panel sample

Table 4.11 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the youth panel sample for Year 12 of Taking Part. This includes both 'core' and 'split-off' panel addresses. The final contact rate²⁸ was 96.3 per cent and the final co-operation rate²⁹ was 88.7 per

²⁸ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

cent. The youth re-interview rate (that is, the proportion of cases issued where an interview was achieved) was 85.4 per cent. Two of the youths were enumerated at 'split-off' households, and one was interviewed.

Table 4.11: Fieldwork outcomes (youth panel sample)

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases
Complete interview (I+P)		228	85.4
Complete interview with target respondent	111	228	85.4
Partial interview with target respondent	211	0	0.0
Eligible, but no interview (NC)		10	3.7
Contact made with responsible resident at given address, but not with target respondent	323	2	0.7
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	2	0.7
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	3	1.1
Moved	326	3	1.1
Refusals (R)		26	9.7
Household refusal before interview		9	3.4
Refusal by target respondent	431	3	1.1
Refusal by proxy	432	9	3.4
Refusal (parental permission)	433	5	1.9
Refusal during interview	440	0	0.0
Broken appointment – no recontact	450	0	0.0
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
Other non-response (O)		3	1.1
Ill at home during field period	510	0	0.0
Away/in hospital throughout field period	520	1	0.4
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	0	0.0
Language barrier with target respondent	542	0	0.0
Lost interview	550	0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	2	0.7
Total issued		267	

²⁹ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

Child cross-sectional sample

Table 4.12 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the child cross-sectional sample for Year 12 of Taking Part. The final co-operation rate³⁰ was 90.7 per cent.

The in-household child proxy response rate³¹ was 89.0 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 cross-sectional response rate multiplied by the in-household child proxy response rate. The child proxy response rate is thus 44.6 per cent (50.1% * 89.0%).

Table 4.12: Fieldwork outcomes (child cross-sectional sample)

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases
Complete interview (I+P)		624	89.0
Complete interview with target respondent	111	624	89.0
Partial interview with target respondent	211	0	0.0
Eligible, but no interview (NC)		13	1.9
Contact made with responsible resident at given address, but not with target respondent	323	6	0.9
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	5	0.7
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	2	0.3
Refusals (R)		55	7.8
Household refusal before interview		19	2.7
Refusal by target respondent	431	7	1.0
Refusal by proxy	432	19	2.7
Refusal (parental permission)	433	7	1.0
Refusal during interview	440	3	0.4
Broken appointment – no recontact	450	0	0.0
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
Other non-response (O)		9	1.3
Ill at home during field period	510	1	0.1
Away/in hospital throughout field period	520	1	0.1

³⁰ We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 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).

³¹ 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).

Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	1	0.1
Language barrier with target respondent	542	2	0.3
Lost interview	550	0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	4	0.6
Total issued		701	

Child panel sample

Table 4.13 shows the fieldwork outcomes for the child panel sample for Year 12 of Taking Part. This includes both 'core' and 'split-off' panel addresses. The final co-operation rate³² was 96.1 per cent. The child proxy re-interview rate (that is, the proportion of cases issued where an interview was achieved) was 95.8 per cent. Three of the children were enumerated at 'split-off' households, and two child proxy interviews were conducted.

Table 4.13: Fieldwork outcomes (child panel sample)

Outcome	Standard outcome code	No. of cases	% of all cases
Complete interview (I+P)		343	95.8
Complete interview with target respondent	111	343	95.8
Partial interview with target respondent	211	0	0.0
Eligible, but no interview (NC)		1	0.3
Contact made with responsible resident at given address, but not with target respondent	323	0	0.0
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but no appointment/interview	324	0	0.0
Contact made with target respondent at given address, but not with parent for permission	325	0	0.0
Moved	326	1	0.3
Refusals (R)		12	3.4
Household refusal before interview		2	0.6
Refusal by target respondent	431	1	0.3
Refusal by proxy	432	7	2.0
Refusal (parental permission)	433	2	0.6
Refusal during interview	440	0	0.0
Broken appointment – no recontact	450	0	0.0
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

³² We have used the same method of calculation as in the Year 11 Technical Report: Interviews / (Interviews + Refusals + Other unproductive). This appears to be the same as the Co-operation Rate 1 set out in the AAPOR Standard Definitions (Ninth edition, 2016).

Other non-response (O)		2	0.6
Ill at home during field period	510	0	0.0
Away/in hospital throughout field period	520	0	0.0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	530	0	0.0
Language barrier with target respondent	542	0	0.0
Lost interview	550	0	0.0
Other non-response (give details)	599	2	0.6
Total issued		358	

Web panel recruitment

Adult sample

Table 4.14 sets out an analysis of adult web panel recruitment, by sample type.

Table 4.14: Adult web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type

	Cross-sectional	Panel
Adults interviewed	5,431	3,921
With internet access	4,859	3,558
Willing to join web panel	3,053	2,765
Willing to consider joining web panel	251	121
% of adults with internet access	89.5%	90.7%
% of adults with internet access willing to join web panel	62.8%	77.7%
% of adults with internet access willing to consider joining web panel	5.2%	3.4%
% of all adults willing to join web panel	56.2%	70.5%
% of all adults willing to consider joining web panel	4.6%	3.1%

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:

- Being too busy (28.0%)
- Lacking the internet skills to complete the web questionnaire (23.5%)
- Feeling they had done enough already (16.4%)
- Not wanting to complete questionnaires on the web (13.6%)

- A reason not given on the list of answer options (12.1%)

Table 4.15 sets out an analysis of adult web panel recruitment rates, by key demographics.

There were significant differences in the proportion of legacy panel members who were willing to join the web panel by age, 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 same significant differences were observed among cross-sectional respondents, but significant differences in the proportion willing to join the web panel were also observed by gender and ethnicity. The key points to note are:

1. Generally, among all sub-groups legacy panel members were more likely to be willing to join the web panel than cross-sectional respondents.
2. 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. Among the cross-sectional respondents, around two-thirds of those aged 16 to 54 were willing to join the web panel, but the proportion willing to do so fell to 27.0 per cent among those age 75 to 79 and to 13.8 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. We observed a similar pattern among legacy panel members.
3. Those in the upper socio-economic classes were significantly more likely to join the web panel than those in the lower socio-economic classes. Among both legacy panel members and cross-sectional respondents, the proportion of those in the upper socio-economic classes willing to join the web panel was around eighteen percentage points higher than among those in the lower socio-economic classes.
4. 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.
5. 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 are also likely to engage with the arts, or visit a library.

Table 4.15: Adult web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type

	Legacy panel members			Cross-sectional respondents		
	With internet access (%)	Willing to join web panel (%) (with internet access)	Willing to join web panel (%) (of all respondents)	With internet access (%)	Willing to join web panel (%) (with internet access)	Willing to join web panel (%) (of all respondents)
<i>Base size</i>	3,921	3,558	3,921	5,431	4,859	5,431
All	90.7	77.7	70.5	89.5	62.8	56.2
Gender						
Male	91.1	76.3	69.5	89.6	60.8	54.5
Female	90.4	79.0	71.4	89.4	64.4	57.6

Age						
16-24	100.0	83.7	83.7	99.5	67.8	67.5
25-34	99.5	91.6	91.2	99.5	69.5	69.2
35-44	99.8	86.4	86.3	99.2	71.9	71.3
45-54	98.8	84.2	83.2	96.5	66.6	64.3
55-64	94.9	79.2	75.1	93.5	61.4	57.4
65-74	87.2	67.2	58.6	83.5	54.1	45.1
75-79	71.9	52.7	37.9	66.8	40.4	27.0
80+	55.0	51.8	28.5	43.6	31.8	13.8
Ethnicity						
White	90.3	77.9	70.3	88.6	63.4	56.2
Black	91.7	71.4	65.5	92.0	58.0	53.3
Asian	97.4	75.2	73.3	93.9	57.0	53.6
Other	97.6	80.8	78.9	97.1	65.2	63.3
Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)						
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	95.0	81.9	77.8	94.4	67.8	64.0
Lower (classes 5 to 8)	83.9	70.4	59.0	83.1	57.2	47.5
Disability						
Disability	83.1	72.9	60.5	77.5	58.3	45.2
No disability	94.0	79.6	74.9	93.6	64.4	60.2
Level of activity						
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	94.2	80.2	75.6	94.1	67.1	63.2
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	77.8	66.6	51.9	76.1	47.5	36.1
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	94.0	80.1	75.3	93.8	66.8	62.7
Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	80.2	68.9	55.2	78.4	50.6	39.7
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	95.9	80.6	77.3	96.1	69.7	67.0
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	84.6	73.8	62.5	82.2	54.2	44.6

months						
Using a public library in the previous 12 months	94.0	78.4	73.8	93.0	68.7	63.9
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months	89.0	77.3	68.8	87.5	59.4	52.0

Table 4.16 compares the profile of the population to that of the respondents and those agreeing to join the web panel. 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 4.16: Adult web panel population profile

	Population	All respondents	Respondents willing to join web panel (%)			Respondents willing to join web panel (n)		
	Population (%)	(%)	All	Legacy panel members	Cross-sectional respondents	All	Legacy panel members	Cross-sectional respondents
All			62.2	70.5	56.2	5,818	2,765	3,053
Gender								
Male	49.0	46.0	45.1	47.5	43.0	2,626	1,312	1,314
Female	51.0	54.0	54.9	52.5	57.0	3,192	1,453	1,739
Age								
16-24	13.7	6.8	8.0	6.9	9.1	468	190	278
25-34	16.9	13.1	16.0	13.1	18.7	932	361	571
35-44	15.9	15.0	18.6	17.1	19.9	1,081	472	609
45-54	17.3	16.3	18.9	19.3	18.5	1,099	534	565
55-64	14.1	16.9	17.8	19.2	16.5	1,035	532	503
65-74	12.1	18.1	15.1	17.9	12.6	879	494	385
75-79	4.0	6.0	3.1	3.5	2.7	178	96	82
80+	6.0	7.4	2.4	3.1	1.8	140	86	54
Ethnicity								
White	85.4	88.7	88.8	91.3	86.5	5,164	2,524	2,640
Black	3.5	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.6	135	55	80
Asian	7.8	4.4	4.2	3.1	5.2	243	85	158
Other	2.3	4.3	4.7	3.5	5.7	271	97	174
Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)								
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	48.4	56.6	63.7	65.5	62.1	3,706	1,811	1,895

Lower (classes 5 to 8)	33.9	36.1	30.3	29.2	31.3	1,763	806	957
Not classified	17.7	7.3	6.0	5.4	6.6	349	148	201
Disability								
Disability	17.2	27.2	22.9	25.6	20.4	1,331	709	622
No disability	82.8	72.1	76.7	74.0	79.2	4,464	2,047	2,417
Level of activity								
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	76.6	76.1	83.9	84.3	83.5	4,880	2,332	2,548
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	23.4	23.9	16.1	15.7	16.5	938	433	505
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	73.9	73.7	80.7	81.4	80.1	4,696	2,252	2,444
Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	26.0	26.3	19.3	18.5	19.9	1,120	512	608
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	53.6	52.9	60.7	59.4	61.9	3,533	1,642	1,891
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	46.4	47.1	39.3	40.6	38.1	2,285	1,123	1,162
Using a public library in the previous 12 months	34.1	35.4	38.7	36.7	40.6	2,253	1,015	1,238
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months	65.8	64.5	61.2	63.3	59.4	3,563	1,749	1,814

Youth sample

Table 4.17 sets out an analysis of youth web panel recruitment, by sample type.

Table 4.17: Youth web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type

	Cross-sectional	Panel
Youths interviewed	410	228
Parents consenting for youth to join web panel	311	204
Parents consenting for youth to provide email address or mobile telephone number	299	201
Youths willing to join web panel	285	196
Youths willing to consider joining web panel	6	1
% of parents consenting for youth to join web panel	75.9%	89.5%
% of parents consenting for youth to provide email address or mobile telephone number	72.9%	88.2%
% of youths willing to join web panel after parental consent given	95.3%	97.5%
% of youths willing to consider joining web panel after parental consent given	97.3%	98.0%
% of all youths willing to join web panel	69.5%	86.0%
% of all youths willing to consider joining web panel	1.5%	0.4%

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:

- Considering the youth too young (28.5%)
- Being too busy and feeling they had done enough already (both mentioned by 27.6%)
- The youth does not complete questionnaires on the internet (7.3%)

Interviewers also asked those youths refusing to join the web panel for the reason(s) for their refusal. The reasons given were being too busy, a reason not given on the list of answer options, not wanting to complete questionnaires on the web and feeling they had done enough already.

Table 4.18 sets out an analysis of youth web panel recruitment rates, by key demographics.

Table 4.18: Youth web panel recruitment analysis, by sample type

	Legacy panel members			Cross-sectional 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)	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>	228	201	228	410	299	410
All	88.2	97.5	86.4	72.9	95.3	69.5
Gender						
Male	87.6	97.0	85.8	75.5	96.0	72.5
Female	88.7	98.0	87.0	69.6	94.4	65.7
Age						
11	90.0	100.0	90.0	62.0	96.8	60.0
12	89.4	97.6	87.2	74.0	98.6	72.9
13	82.5	97.0	80.0	72.4	93.7	67.8
14	87.8	97.2	87.8	83.9	97.9	82.1
15	90.0	94.4	85.0	78.9	89.3	70.4
Ethnicity						
White	90.0	97.7	87.9	74.0	95.5	70.7
Other	78.4	96.6	78.4	70.0	94.8	66.4
Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)						
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	90.8	99.2	90.8	74.7	95.9	71.6
Lower (classes 5 to 8)	85.1	93.0	79.1	72.2	93.8	67.7
Disability						
Disability	95.7	95.5	91.3	82.4	92.9	76.5
No disability	87.6	97.7	86.1	72.2	95.6	69.0
Level of activity						
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	88.1	97.5	86.3	73.8	95.3	70.3
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	100.0	100.0	100.0	40.0	100.0	40.0
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	92.3	97.4	90.5	75.4	96.2	72.6

Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	76.7	97.8	75.0	67.4	93.1	62.8
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	91.9	97.1	89.9	74.2	96.9	71.9
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	81.0	98.4	79.7	70.8	93.1	66.0
Using a public library in the previous 12 months	88.8	98.0	87.6	76.1	95.8	72.9
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months	86.4	96.1	83.1	66.7	93.9	62.6

Table 4.19 compares the profile of the youth population to that of the respondents and those agreeing to join the web panel.

Table 4.19: Youth web panel population profile³³

	Population	All respondents	Respondents willing to join web panel (%)			Respondents willing to join web panel (n)		
	Population (%)	(%)	All	Legacy panel members	Cross-sectional respondents	All	Legacy panel members	Cross-sectional respondents
All						482	197	285
Gender								
Male	51.2	53.6	54.6	49.2	58.2	263	97	166
Female	48.8	46.4	45.4	50.8	41.8	219	100	119
Age								
11	20.7	25.1	23.7	27.4	21.1	114	54	60
12	20.3	22.4	23.0	20.8	24.6	111	41	70
13	19.7	19.9	18.9	16.2	20.7	91	32	59
14	19.4	15.2	17.0	18.3	16.1	82	36	46
15	19.9	17.4	17.4	17.3	17.5	84	34	50
Ethnicity								
White	:	76.8	78.6	84.8	74.4	379	167	212

³³ : is used to indicate where data are not available.

Other	:	23.0	21.2	14.7	25.6	102	29	73
Socio-economic group (NS-SEC)								
Upper (classes 1 to 4)	:	58.2	60.8	65.5	57.5	293	129	164
Lower (classes 5 to 8)	:	31.3	29.7	26.9	31.6	143	53	90
Disability								
Disability	:	8.9	9.8	10.7	9.1	47	21	26
No disability	:	90.3	89.6	88.3	90.5	432	174	258
Level of activity								
Engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	97.3	98.3	99.0	99.5	98.6	477	196	281
Not engaging with the arts in the previous 12 months	2.7	1.7	1.0	0.5	1.4	5	1	4
Visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	70.5	70.4	73.9	77.2	71.6	356	152	204
Not visiting a heritage site in the previous 12 months	29.5	29.6	26.1	22.8	28.4	126	45	81
Visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	65.0	63.9	66.4	67.5	65.6	320	133	187
Not visiting a museum or gallery in the previous 12 months	33.8	35.0	32.8	32.0	33.3	158	63	95
Using a public library in the previous 12 months	67.7	71.0	73.7	75.1	72.6	355	148	207
Not using a public library in the previous 12 months	31.8	28.5	26.1	24.9	27.0	126	49	77

National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage consent rates

Table 4.20 sets out an analysis of consent rates for National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage, by sample type.

Table 4.20: Consent rates for National Pupil Database (NPD) linkage, by sample type

	Cross-sectional	Panel
Youths	410	228
Parents consenting for youth's NPD records to be linked to survey data	303	208
Youths consenting for their NPD records to be linked to survey data	292	207
% of parents consenting for youth's NPD records to be linked to survey data	73.9%	91.2%
% of youths consenting for their NPD records to be linked to survey data, after parental consent given	96.4%	99.5%
% of all youths where consent for NPD records to be linked to survey data given	71.2%	90.8%
Children	624	343
Parents consenting for child's NPD records to be linked to survey data	441	293
% of parents consenting for child's NPD records to be linked to survey data	70.7%	85.4%

Interview lengths

The questionnaire instrument for the adult interview was revised twice after the start of Year 12 fieldwork, so that different questionnaire instruments were used for the Quarter 1 sample, Quarter 2 sample, and for the 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 4.21 shows the overall interview lengths for each of these questionnaire versions.

Table 4.21: Adult interview lengths, by sample type

	Cross-sectional	Panel
Q1		
Mean	57 minutes 29 seconds	54 minutes 7 seconds
Median	54 minutes 58 seconds	51 minutes 28 seconds
Q2		
Mean	45 minutes 14 seconds	46 minutes 19 seconds
Median	42 minutes 24 seconds	44 minutes 19 seconds
Q3 and Q4		
Mean	46 minutes 4 seconds	45 minutes 49 seconds
Median	43 minutes 47 seconds	43 minutes 1 seconds

The same youth and child proxy questionnaire instruments were used throughout Year 12. Table 4.22 shows the overall interview lengths for each of these questionnaires.

Table 4.22: Youth and child proxy interview lengths, by sample type

	Cross-sectional	Panel
Youth interviews		
Mean	23 minutes 12 seconds	26 minutes 4 seconds
Median	21 minutes 52 seconds	24 minutes 58 seconds
Child proxy interviews		
Mean	11 minutes 28 seconds	11 minutes 2 seconds
Median	11 minutes 0 seconds	10 minutes 41 seconds

Data processing and outputs

Introduction

Full data and other outputs were delivered to DCMS after all Year 12 fieldwork was complete, with an interim delivery at the end of the first six months of fieldwork. This interim delivery took place on 21 November 2016, following a cut-off for inclusion of cases of 30th September 2016. Full Year 12 data and other outputs were delivered in July 2017. 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 the 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 11 (2015/16) and Year 12 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.

Case identifiers

As part of the data preparation process, each case was allocated a unique identifier to allow cases to be linked within households and across survey years. This resulted in each case having a single identifier for both the cross-sectional and longitudinal datasets.

Variable naming

Variable names remain consistent with previous years, with the exception of questions that have changed since the Year 11 survey. Where variables have changed since Year 11, a suffix of 'Y12' was added to the variable name. Where a change to a variable has taken place during the sample quarter, a suffix of 'Y12QX', with 'X' representing the sample quarter, has been 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 2016, covering the majority of 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 (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Adult sample size at six-month cut-off and full year

Sample month	Six-month cut-off	Percentage of Q1 and Q2 cases	Full year data
Cross-sectional sample	2,470	89.3%	5,431
Panel sample	1,853	92.3%	3,921
Total sample	4,323	90.6%	9,352

SPSS outputs: Annual datasets

Annual datasets were produced following the close of Year 12 fieldwork. Six SPSS datasets were delivered to DCMS, of which five were prepared for the UK Data Archive. An overview of each dataset produced and numbers included in each dataset is outlined below.

Adult cross-sectional³⁴ dataset

The adult cross-sectional dataset contains data from interviewed adults (aged 16 and over) from the cross-sectional and panel sample who were interviewed in the Year 12 fieldwork year (see Table 5.2 for further detail). The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 12 fieldwork year only.

Table 5.2: Adult survey interviews by sample type

Sample month	Screen number (CScreen)	Adult interviews
Cross-sectional sample	0	5,431
Panel sample		3,921
<i>Of which:</i>		
<i>Respondent in Year 11 adult sample</i>	1	3,843
<i>Respondent in Year 11 youth sample</i>	2	78
Total sample		9,352

Adult panel dataset

The adult panel dataset contains data from all adults (aged 16 or over) interviewed in the Year 12 fieldwork year who were members of the panel sample (see Table 5.3 for further detail). The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 12 fieldwork year and questionnaire data from all previous years of the panel (that is, from Year 7 onwards).

Table 5.3: Number of adult panel interviews

Number of adult interviews	Number of cases	First year of respondent participation
Two interviews	10,125	2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15 or 2015/16
Three interviews	5,954	2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14 or 2014/15
Four interviews	3,983	2011/12, 2012/13 or 2013/14
Five interviews	2,693	2011/12 or 2012/13
Six interviews	1,184	2011/12

³⁴ Note that this is described as a cross-sectional dataset, even though it included panel sample, because in Year 12 national cross-sectional estimates were produced by combining cross-sectional and panel sample.

Child dataset

The child dataset contains data containing data from all children (aged 5-15) from the cross-sectional and panel sample who were interviewed in the Year 12 fieldwork year (see Table 5.4 for further detail). The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 12 fieldwork year only.

Table 5.4: Breakdown of youth and child interviews by sample type

Type of interview ³⁵	Screen number (Cscreen)	Number of interviews
Youth sample		638
Cross-sectional sample	9	410
Panel sample		228
<i>Of which:</i>		
Respondent in Year 11 youth sample	7	93
Respondent in Year 11 child sample	4	135
Child sample		967
Cross-sectional sample	8	624
Panel sample		343
<i>Of which:</i>		
First child proxy interview in household	6	215
Other child proxy interview in household	15/25	128

Youth panel dataset

The youth 11-15 panel dataset: contains data from all youths aged 11-15 interviewed in the Year 12 fieldwork year who were members of the panel sample (see Table 5.5 for further detail). The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 12 fieldwork year and questionnaire data from all previous years of the panel (that is, from Year 7 onwards).

Table 5.5: Number of youth panel interviews

Number of adult interviews	Number of cases	First year of respondent participation
Two interviews	778	2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15 or 2015/16
Three interviews	347	2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14 or 2014/15
Four interviews	149	2011/12, 2012/13 or 2013/14
Five interviews	43	2011/12 or 2012/13
Six interviews	0	2011/12

³⁵ Screen number 5 (new 5-year-old proxy interviews from panel sample) was not applicable in Year 12 as we did not include new 5-year-olds in the sample.

Child panel dataset

The child 5-10 panel dataset: contains data about all children aged 5-10 interviewed in the Year 12 fieldwork year who were members of the panel sample (see Table 5.6 for further detail). The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 12 fieldwork year and questionnaire data from all previous years of the panel (that is, from Year 7 onwards).

Table 5.6: Number of child proxy panel interviews

Number of adult interviews	Number of cases	First year of respondent participation
Two interviews	1,208	2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15 or 2015/16
Three interviews	574	2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14 or 2014/15
Four interviews	249	2011/12, 2012/13 or 2013/14
Five interviews	112	2011/12 or 2012/13
Six interviews	12	2011/12

Half-yearly adult dataset

The half-yearly adult dataset contains data from interviewed adults (aged 16 and over) from the cross-sectional and panel sample who were interviewed in the second half of the Year 11 fieldwork year and the first half of the Year 12 fieldwork year. The dataset includes questionnaire data from the Year 11 and Year 12 fieldwork year only. Table 5.7 shows the number of Year 12 cases included in the half-yearly adult dataset, by sample type.

Table 5.7: Adult sample size at six and twelve month cut-off

Sample month	Six-month cut-off	Twelve-month cut-off
Cross-sectional sample	2,470	5,431
Panel sample	1,853	3,921
Total sample	4,323	9,352

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 tables were delivered in January 2017, and were based on adult data from April to September 2016 (most of the first half of the Year 12 fieldwork year) combined with data from October 2015 to March 2016 (the second half of the Year 11 fieldwork year). The full Year 12 tables were delivered in August 2017, and were based on adult and child data for the full Year 12 fieldwork year (April 2016 – May 2017). The tables were delivered in an Excel workbook, and the content of each spreadsheet is summarised in Table 5.8.

The tables for both sets of deliveries included complete data from all available survey years. The first set of tables for the half-year dataset showed estimates for the second half of Year 11 fieldwork and the first six months of Year 12 fieldwork with the upper and lower limits of the 95 per cent confidence interval and an indication of whether the estimate had changed significantly from the earliest available estimate (usually, but not always, Year 1 of Taking Part - 2005/06). The full Year 12 tables also showed the estimates and confidence intervals with data for the Year 12 fieldwork year.

Due to questionnaire changes between Year 11 and Year 12, as well as changes made to the questionnaire during Year 12, we were not able to test a small number of estimates for significant changes against the base year. In addition, due to a change in the ACORN classification system, there was a break in the time-series for the ACORN analysis in Year 12. Footnotes in the tables were used to denote estimates that could not be compared with previous years.

Table 5.8: Statistical spreadsheets produced for the half-year dataset (Q1 and Q2 cases in Year 12)

Spreadsheet	Overview of spreadsheet
Arts	Engaged with the arts in the last year Frequency of engagement with the arts in the last year Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables
Heritage	Visited a heritage site in the last year Frequency of visiting a heritage site in the last year Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables
Museums and galleries	Visited a museum or gallery in the last year Frequency of visiting a museum or gallery in the last year Whether visited a museum or gallery in own time, for paid work, for academic study or for voluntary work Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables

Libraries	Visited a public library in the last year Frequency of visiting a public library in the last year Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables
Archives	Visited an archive centre or records office in the last year Visited an archive centre or record office in the last year in own time or as voluntary work Frequency of visiting an archive centre or records office in the last year Whether visited an archive centre or records office in own time, for paid work, for academic study or for voluntary work Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables
Digital participation	Visited websites in the last year • Museum or gallery website • Library website • Heritage website • Arts website • Archive or record office website • Sport website Reasons for visiting websites • Museum or gallery website • Library website • Heritage website • Theatre or concert website • Arts website • Archive or record office website
Charitable giving	Has donated money in last year Frequency of charitable giving in the last year Means through which money was donated in last year Whether goods and prizes have been donated in last year Whether has donated money in last year to • Heritage • The arts • Museums or galleries • Libraries • Sport • Any DCMS sector Amounts donated in last year to • Heritage • The arts • Museums or galleries • Libraries • Sport Number of DCMS sectors donated to in last year Intentions to give to DCMS sectors in next year Reasons for giving more to DCMS sectors Reasons for giving less to DCMS sectors Attitudes to charitable giving and encouraging donations to DCMS sectors Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables

First World War	Awareness of national or local events or activities to commemorate the Centenary of First World War Awareness of individual events to commemorate the Centenary of First World War Attitudes to commemorating the Centenary of First World War Ways of following the Centenary of First World War events Plans for involvement in events to commemorate the Centenary of First World War Analysis by area-level variables Analysis by demographic variables
------------------------	---

Weighting

The sample for Taking Part Year 12 that was interviewed face-to-face consisted of a panel sample, which first took part in a previous year of the study and a cross-sectional sample selected using addresses selected from the Postcode Address File. The approach to weighting was to generate weights for the cross-sectional sample first, using two stages of calibration weighting to mid-year population counts with the appropriate selection weights applied. The weighted cross-sectional sample was then used to produce estimates for a range of characteristics which were used to weight the panel sample. This was done by calibrating the adult, youth and child panel samples separately to both the mid-year population counts and the estimated population counts from the weighted cross-sectional sample.

Cross-sectional sample weights

The weights for the cross-sectional sample were generated in five stages. The first three stages generated household-level weights which formed the foundation of the individual-level weights for the samples of adults (aged 16 or older), youths (aged 11 to 15) and children (aged 5 to 10). These were generated separately from the household-level weights in parallel in the final two stages.

Stage 1: Address selection weights

The design the previous contractor used for Taking Part sampled the primary sampling units (PSUs) within strata defined by former Government Office Region and population density (see Appendix 1); this sampling was designed so that the selection probabilities for addresses varied across the strata. The approach for the Taking Part Year 12 cross-sectional sample was to select a fixed number (16) of addresses within each of the previously-selected PSUs; because of how the PSUs were originally sampled in Year 7, this meant that the addresses for Taking Part Year 12 were sampled with varying selection probabilities. Because the weights were calibrated by region at a later stage, the selection weights only needed to take account of the selection probabilities within region; selection weights were therefore calculated so that the weighted sample of issued addresses were in the correct proportion across the density strata within each region (see Table 5.9). Using this set of address selection weights generated exactly the same set of final weights that would have been obtained if the selection weights had taken account of the disproportionate sampling across region.

Table 5.9: Address selection weights by former Government Office Region and density stratum

	Density: low	Density: medium	Density: high
North East	2.000	1.375	1.125
North West	2.000	1.375	1.125
Yorkshire and the Humber	2.000	1.375	1.125
East Midlands	2.000	1.375	1.125
West Midlands	2.250	1.500	1.250
East of England	2.000	1.375	1.125
London	2.750	2.000	1.625
South East	2.000	1.375	1.125
South West	2.000	1.375	1.125

Stage 2: Dwelling selection weights

A very small number of addresses (1%) contained more than one dwelling. At these addresses, one of the dwellings was sampled at random from those identified and so a selection weight was required. This weight was initially calculated to be equal to the number of dwellings identified, although was trimmed at 2 to avoid large values.

Stage 3: Household calibration weighting

The next stage generated a household-level weight so that the weighted distribution of all household members matched the 2016 mid-year population distribution for categories of age group and gender, and by former Government Office Region (see Tables 5.11 and 5.12). The address selection weights and dwelling selection weights were combined (i.e. multiplied together) to be used as the starting weights in this household calibration weighting stage.

The final household calibration weights were divided by the starting weighting (i.e. the combined selection weights) to generate the adjustment factor. For each region, this adjustment factor was trimmed at the values of the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles and the trimmed adjustment factors then multiplied by the starting weights to generate trimmed calibration weights. This was done to reduce the variance of the weights.

Stage 4: Adult / youth / child selection weights

Selection weights were calculated for the selection of one adult (16 or older), one youth (aged 11 to 15) and one child (aged 5 to 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.

Stage 5: Individual calibration weighting

The household calibration weights from Stage 3 were multiplied by the adult, youth and child selection weights to be used as the starting weights in the individual calibration weighting 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 former Government Office Region (see Tables 5.11 and 5.12). 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.

Panel sample weights

The panel sample weights were generated using calibration weighting so that the weighted samples for adults, youths and children matched the corresponding 2016 mid-year population counts for age group / gender and former Government Office Region as well as a range of estimates from the cross-sectional sample. The estimates from the cross-sectional sample used to calibrate the panel sample are shown in Tables 5.13 and 5.14 and consisted of the following measures:

- Adult sample: number of adults in the household; number of children (aged 0 to 15) in the household; highest level of education; whether in work or not; tenure; self-reported health; limiting long-term illness; ethnicity (White British compared to ethnic minority categories).
- Youth sample: number of adults in the household; number of children (aged 0 to 15) in the household; tenure; physical or mental illness or disability; ethnicity (White British compared to ethnic minority categories).
- Child sample: number of adults in the household; number of children (aged 0 to 15) in the household; tenure; physical or mental illness or disability; ethnicity (White British compared to ethnic minority categories).

The starting weights were calculated for the three samples to be:

- Adult sample: starting weight = number of adults in the household / the number of adults in the household that participated.
- Youth sample: starting weight = the number of youths in the household / the number of youths in the household that participated.
- Child sample: starting weight = the number of children in the household / the number of children in the household that participated.

As for the fresh sample household weights above (stage 3), trimming was carried out on the calibration adjustment factors at the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles for the adult and youth samples to reduce the variance of the weights. No trimming was required for the child sample.

The final weights (wt_adult, wt_youth and wt_child) were scaled to have mean 1. Because they were scaled to have mean 1, when the fresh and panel samples were combined, they were in their sample proportion when the weights were applied.

Table 5.10: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: counts

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

Table 5.11: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by former Government Office Region: percentages

	All	Adults (16+)	Youths (11 to 15)	Children (5 to 10)
North East	4.8%	4.8%	4.5%	4.5%
North West	13.1%	13.1%	13.1%	13.0%
Yorkshire and the Humber	9.8%	9.8%	9.9%	9.8%
East Midlands	8.5%	8.6%	8.4%	8.3%
West Midlands	10.5%	10.4%	11.0%	10.7%
East of England	11.1%	11.1%	11.2%	11.2%
London	15.9%	15.6%	15.7%	16.8%
South East	16.3%	16.3%	16.7%	16.6%
South West	10.0%	10.2%	9.5%	9.2%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5.12: Mid-year population estimates (2016) by age group and gender: counts and percentages

	Males: counts	Females: counts	Males: %	Females: %
0-4	1,757,639	1,671,407	3.2%	3.0%
5-10	2,089,068	1,990,342	3.8%	3.6%
11-15	1,546,680	1,473,964	2.8%	2.7%
16-24	3,148,246	2,989,586	5.7%	5.4%
25-34	3,799,113	3,762,097	6.9%	6.8%
35-44	3,530,273	3,562,004	6.4%	6.4%
45-54	3,831,407	3,924,767	6.9%	7.1%
55-64	3,107,024	3,201,609	5.6%	5.8%
65-74	2,608,023	2,805,321	4.7%	5.1%
75+	1,883,447	2,586,050	3.4%	4.7%
TOTAL	27,300,920	27,967,147	49.4%	50.6%
16-24	3,148,246	2,989,586	7.0%	6.7%
25-34	3,799,113	3,762,097	8.5%	8.4%
35-44	3,530,273	3,562,004	7.9%	8.0%
45-54	3,831,407	3,924,767	8.6%	8.8%
55-64	3,107,024	3,201,609	6.9%	7.2%
65-74	2,608,023	2,805,321	5.8%	6.3%
75+	1,883,447	2,586,050	4.2%	5.8%
ADULTS (16+)	21,907,533	22,831,434	49.0%	51.0%
11-13	938,886	894,698	31.1%	29.6%
14-15	607,794	579,266	20.1%	19.2%
YOUTHS (11 to 15)	1,546,680	1,473,964	51.2%	48.8%
5-7	1,062,779	1,013,960	26.1%	24.9%
8-10	1,026,289	976,382	25.2%	23.9%
CHILDREN (5 to 10)	2,089,068	1,990,342	51.2%	48.8%

Table 5.13: Cross-sectional sample estimates for panel sample calibration: adults

	ADULTS (16 plus)	
	Weighted count	%
Number of adults in household:		
1	1030	19.0%
2	2919	53.7%
3	947	17.4%
4+	536	9.9%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%
Number of children aged 0-15 in HH:		
None	3927	72.3%
1	704	13.0%
2	576	10.6%
3+	224	4.1%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%
Highest qualification:		
Higher Education and professional	1545	28.4%
Other Higher Education below degree level	522	9.6%
A levels etc.	936	17.2%
Trade Apprenticeships	922	17.0%
GCSE/O Level grades	565	10.4%
None	941	17.3%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%
Any paid work in the seven days:		
No	2271	41.8%
Yes	3160	58.2%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%
Tenure:		
Owned outright	1776	32.7%
Buying with mortgage	1639	30.2%

Other	2015	37.1%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%
General health:		
Very good	1916	35.3%
Good	2140	39.4%
Fair	990	18.2%
Bad/Don't know	385	7.1%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%
Any physical or mental health conditions:		
Yes/ Don't know	1620	29.8%
No	3811	70.2%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%
Ethnic group:		
White British	4302	79.2%
Other	1129	20.8%
TOTAL	5431	100.0%

Table 5.14: Cross-sectional sample estimates for panel sample calibration: youths and children

	YOUTHS (AGED 11 TO 15)		CHILDREN (AGED 5 TO 10)	
	Weighted count	%	Weighted count	%
Number of adults in household:				
1	77	18.8%	143	22.9%
2+	333	81.2%	481	77.1%
TOTAL	410	100.0%	624	100.0%
Number of children aged 0-15 in HH:				
1	127	31.0%	117	18.8%
2	181	44.2%	300	48.1%
3+	102	24.8%	207	33.1%
TOTAL	410	100.0%	624	100.0%
Tenure:				
Owned outright	52	12.8%	40	6.4%
Buying with mortgage	198	48.3%	284	45.5%
Other	159	38.9%	300	48.1%
TOTAL	410	100.0%	624	100.0%
Any physical or mental health conditions:				
Yes/Don't know	46	11.3%	65	10.5%
No	364	88.7%	559	89.5%
TOTAL	410	100.0%	624	100.0%
Ethnic group:				
White British	104	25.2%	160	25.6%
Other	306	74.8%	464	74.4%
TOTAL	410	100.0%	624	100.0%

Appendix 1

The foregoing is a copy of Chapter 2 of the Year 7 (2011/12) Technical Report³⁶. It is copied for the convenience of the reader who wishes to know about the basis of the sampling design for Year 12 (2016/17) of Taking Part. This chapter was authored by the research team at TNS-BMRB and its reprinting in this report should not be taken as an endorsement of its contents by Ipsos MORI.

Sample Design

Survey Population and Sample Frame

The survey was designed to yield a representative sample of 9,000 adults aged 16+ who are normally resident in England. Relevant adults were also asked to provide information about co-resident children aged 5-10 and to facilitate direct interviews with a sample of co-resident children aged 11-15.

For practical purposes, residents of institutional accommodation (armed forces barracks, student halls of residence, hospitals, care homes, prisons etc.) were excluded as is normal practice for household surveys due to practicalities of drawing a sample and reaching these populations.

TNS BMRB utilised the 'small user' Postal Address File (PAF) as the sample frame. This provides a list of almost all private residential addresses in the UK and is the most comprehensive frame available. Because it lists addresses, not individuals, interviewers were required to randomly select respondents from among those eligible.

Key Features of the Sample Design

Taking Part employs a two-stage address sample design in which a sample of addresses is drawn from within a sample of postal sectors. Postal sector areas are defined using the first half of a postcode plus the first digit of the second half (e.g. L19 3 is the postal sector containing the postcode L19 3QU). For survey purposes, postal sectors with a very small number of addresses in 2003 were combined to form the primary sampling units (PSUs) used by TNS BMRB. Table 2.1 shows descriptive statistics for these primary sampling units in 2011.

Table 2.1: Descriptive statistics for primary sampling units

PSU information	Counts
Total number of PSUs	7,152
Mean number of addresses per PSU	3,157
Minimum number of addresses per PSU	259
Maximum number of addresses per PSU	10,434
Standard deviation in number of addresses per PSU	1,434

³⁶ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/137751/TakingPart-Y7-TechnicalRepor.pdf.

The statistical efficiency of two-stage samples is primarily a function of the variance in primary sampling unit-level survey estimates. Analysis of previous editions of Taking Part showed that this variance was greatest in areas of high population density and smallest in areas of low population density. This variance can be mitigated through smaller interview totals per primary sampling unit. Consequently, after allocating each primary sampling unit to one of three 'address density' strata, TNS BMRB set approximate interview targets of 10 per primary sampling unit (high density stratum), 12 per primary sampling unit (mid density stratum) and 17 per primary sampling unit (low density stratum).

Furthermore, historical data suggested that some variation in address conversion rates (interviews as a proportion of addresses sampled) could be expected. In order to maximise the likelihood of meeting interview targets in each primary sampling unit, the ratio of sampled addresses to target interviews varied between regions³⁷. Although this means that the address sample is not an equal probability sample, it is anticipated that the net weight applied to each case (a combination of sampling weight and response propensity weight) will have lower variance than would be the case with an equal probability design. Table 2.2 shows the address sample totals for each primary sampling unit classification.

Table 2.2 Address sample totals for each primary sampling unit classification

Region(s)	Address density Stratum	Sampled addresses per PSU	Expected number of interviews per PSU
All except West Midlands and London	High	18	10
All except West Midlands and London	Medium	22	12
All except West Midlands and London	Low	32	17
West Midlands	High	20	10
West Midlands	Medium	24	12
West Midlands	Low	36	17
London	High	26	10
London	Medium	32	12
London	Low	44	17

Twenty-seven sample strata were formed from the interaction of region (nine categories) and address density (three categories). TNS BMRB calculated an initial target number of primary sampling units for each stratum a using the following formula:

$$(((Na/N)*10,000) / E(ints per PSU)a)*1.2$$

³⁷ Historically, response rates have been lower in West Midlands and, especially, in London. Consequently, we issue more addresses per PSU to achieve the same average interviewer total per PSU.

The formula included an inflation of 20% to provide a reserve sample of primary sampling units. This initial figure was rounded to an integer and then further adjustments were made to maximise the likelihood of achieving the overall target of 10,000 adult interviews. Table 2.3 shows the final number of PSUs sampled from each stratum.

Table 2.3 Final number of PSUs sampled for each stratum

Region	Address density			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
NE England	27	31	20	78
NW England	50	46	22	118
Yorkshire & the Humber	30	34	24	88
East Midlands	18	29	27	74
West Midlands	35	37	19	91
East of England	22	32	32	86
London	114	17	2	133
SE England	27	51	36	124
SW England	33	26	28	77
Total	356	303	210	869

Additional Sample Stratification

Within each explicit stratum, primary sampling units were further sorted by a set of three ‘factor’ variables designed to be correlated with the key frequency data collected in the survey.

To achieve this, a set of regression models was produced using historic Taking Part data, one for each of the five sectors covered in the survey. The predictors in the model were limited to region and ACORN distribution (a neighbourhood classification produced by CACI) available for each primary sampling unit. The resulting regression equations were then applied to every primary sampling unit to produce a simple ‘predicted frequency’ for each of the five sectors.

These variables were further reduced into three ‘factors’ using a principal components extraction method combined with the ‘varimax’ rotation method to ensure that the three factors are not correlated with each other. This transformation should maximise the value of this data when stratifying the population of primary sampling units. The factors were ranked based on the proportion of variance (across the original sector ‘predicted frequencies’) each accounted for.

Within each explicit stratum, five strata were produced based on factor 1, three sub-strata based on factor 2, and finally primary sampling units were sorted by factor 3. In all, this led to 405 strata although only the primary strata were used as explicit strata (i.e. a target number of PSUs was not computed for all 405 strata, just for the primary 27). Nevertheless, the final sort order will be used to form ‘variance strata’ to ensure that standard error estimates reflect the sample design as accurately as possible.

Primary sampling units were sampled with a probability proportionate to address count. Sampling a fixed number of addresses in each sampled primary sampling unit ensures an equal probability address sample within each of the classes described in table 2.2. The address sampling probability varies between classes but not within each class.

Allocation of Primary Sampling Units to sample Month

Once the 869 primary sampling units had been sampled, one in six was systematically allocated to the reserve pool, leaving 724 to be allocated to a time period.

Taking Part samples are issued on a monthly basis. First, the 724 'main sample' primary sampling units were systematically allocated to a quarter using the following string pattern:

1-2-3-4-2-3-4-1-3-4-1-2-4-1-2-3

Repetition of this pattern produces a balanced sample in each quarter. The starting position within the string pattern was randomly generated.

Within each quarter, primary sampling units were systematically allocated to months in the same way but using the following string pattern:

1-2-3-2-3-1-3-1-2

Sampling of Individuals at Sampled Address

At each sampled address, the interviewer would randomly sample one dwelling unit (if more than one), then randomly sample one household (if more than one) within the sampled dwelling unit. Interviewers used unique Kish Grids assigned to each address to assist them in this process.

The same Kish Grid was also used to randomly sample individuals within the household.

Interviews were sought with:

- 1 adult aged 16+
- 1 child aged 11-15 (if resident)

Any parents or guardians of 5-10 year olds who were interviewed for the adult survey were asked to provide information about one randomly sampled child in this age range.

Mid-fieldwork Adjustments to the Number of Sampled Addresses

As fieldwork progressed, it became clear that the response rate was higher than anticipated. Consequently, a systematic random sample of addresses was removed from each of months 3-12 (addresses issued between June 2011 and Mar 2012) with decisions about the total made on a monthly basis. Table 2.4 shows how many were removed from each sample issue month.

Table 2.4 Number of removed addresses per month

Month	Original total addresses to issue	Removed before fieldwork	Issued total
April 2011	1,476	0	1,476
May 2011	1,434	0	1,434
June 2011	1,470	164	1,306
July 2011	1,490	188	1,302
August 2011	1,462	172	1,290
September 2011	1,490	188	1,302
October 2011	1,426	158	1,268
November 2011	1,452	144	1,308
December 2011	1,490	166	1,324
January 2012	1,378	70	1,308
February 2012	1,536	162	1,374
March 2012	1,518	170	1,348
Total	17,622	1,582	16,040

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://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.