Financial Capability of Children and Young People in the United Kingdom:

Recontact Study 2017-2018

Technical Report

www.moneyadviceservice.org.uk

bmg research

Money & Pensions Service

Contents

Context and Objectives

The Money Advice Service (MAS), which is now part of the Money and Pensions Service, had a statutory duty to improve people's financial capability and help them manage their money better. As part of this remit, MAS led the development of a Financial Capability Strategy for the UK (The Strategy).

The Strategy, published in October 2015, was co-produced by a range of key organisations from across the public sector, third sector and financial services industry responsible for providing or regulating financial services, and commissioning, funding and delivering financial education and money/debt advice. The Money Advice Service continued to develop The Strategy in close co-operation with these stakeholders and put in place a number of steering groups to help implement The Strategy.

Two key elements of The Strategy, relevant to this project are Children and Young People, and Young Adults (*Please see* **Financial Capability Strategy for the UK**).

The Money Advice Service recognised that for many young adults, navigating the transition from education to the jobs market and more independent living can be challenging and impactful. Following the Children and Young People Financial Capability Survey in 2016, which gained insight into the financial capability of children aged 7-17 across the UK, the Money Advice Service sought to follow the development of those who were aged 15, 16 or 17 during the original 2016 survey. BMG was commissioned to conduct two recontact surveys amongst this older age group in 2017 and 2018 as the respondents approached and reached adulthood. The recontact surveys investigated how young people's level of financial capability may change or develop as they start to become aware of, or take on, many of the financial responsibilities that are associated with adulthood.

This report details the technical considerations of the 2017 and 2018 recontact surveys.

Acknowledgements

The Money and Pensions Service would like to acknowledge and thank the organisations and individuals that have contributed to the development of this survey. Thanks go to BMG who managed the 2017 and 2018 recontact survey and particularly to those who worked on this report: Dr Michael Turner and Robert Plant. We would like to thank the children, young adults and their parents that took the time to take part in this research.

Methodology

Overview

The Recontact 15-17 Financial Capability Survey was administered to two groups of respondents – young people who were aged 15-17 in the original 2016 wave of the Children and Young People Financial Capability Survey, and their parent[1], carer or guardian.

Just as with the original 2016 wave of the Children and Young People Financial Capability Survey, the 2017 and 2018 recontact questionnaires were administered using a mixed method approach. Some were conducted through face-to-face computer assisted self-interviewing (CASI) and others through an online survey.

For the 2017 and 2018 recontact surveys, the parent survey and young person survey could be answered separately, in either order (parent or young person first). Furthermore, the parent and the young person surveys didn't need to be completed in the same mode. One could complete via online survey and the other by CASI. The corresponding parent and young person surveys were then matched up at the end. This differed from the 2016 wave of the Children and Young People Financial Capability Survey, where the survey was always completed in the same mode by parents and children, and always parent first, followed by the child straight afterwards.

Using A Browser-Based Platform

In order to limit any effect on the results caused by the interview mode (online versus CASI), there was a need to keep the 2017 and 2018 recontact survey experience alike across the online and CASI modes. Therefore, the survey was built on a browser-based platform which automatically re-sized the questions based on the identified device-type and screen size, whilst also keeping the essential thematic and design features consistent for all users.

1 Throughout the report, when referring simply to 'parents', this term covers the information collected from all the parents, carers and guardians.

Questionnaire Design

The recontact questionnaire for 2017 and 2018 was based largely on the original 2016 wave of the Children and Young People Financial Capability Survey, with many questions run again to track changes year on year. However, some questions were adapted to be more relevant to the narrower age group, a cohort of young people that were now two or three years older. Also, given that many of those who took part in the recontact study had transitioned to adulthood, this provided an ideal opportunity to track some adult outcomes by asking a select number of questions from the Adult Financial Capability Survey.

Questionnaire length and topics

For the recontact surveys in 2017 and 2018, both the parent and young person questionnaires were kept shorter than in the initial survey conducted in 2016. The times taken to complete the survey in the recontact years are given in the table below.

Length of time to complete survey

	Online Length (mins)	CASI Length (mins)
2017	6	5
2018	6	5
Young People		
2017	23	19
2018	24	19

The parent and young person sections covered different topics, which are described separately below.

Parent Survey

Topics covered in the 2017 and 2018 recontact surveys:

- **Change in circumstances/current circumstances:**

  employment; income; parenting responsibilities; education; relationship status; household composition.

- **Young Person Proxy Questions:**

  Young Person finances, spending and saving, and whether these had changed over the last year. Some of these questions were also asked to the young person. Question topics included the following:

  - key demographic and parental responsibility updates;
  - young person spending/saving habits;
  - young person financial responsibility;

- young person financial communication;
- whether the young person had a bank account;
- the young person's preparedness for financial independence.

Young Person Survey

Topics covered in the 2017 and 2018 recontact surveys:

- **Young Person Demographics:**

  education; employment; parenting responsibilities; ethnicity.

- **Financial Education:**
  - recall of receiving any financial education;
  - where any financial education had been received (School, College, Work, University, etc);
  - whether it was found to be informative and useful.
- **Income Savings and Spending:**
  - Financial situation of the young person;
  - Spending and saving habits:
    - what they spend their money on;
    - how they save their money;
    - how much they were saving and whether this had increased or decreased over the past 12 months.
  - Level and sources of income of the young person.
- **Debt and Financial Responsibilities:**
  - how financially dependent they were on their parent;
  - whether they were financially independent;
  - their level of financial confidence;
  - any financial products they had;
  - the level and type of any debt they had at the time.
- **Advice and Goals:**
  - the financial goals of the young person;
  - the individuals or organisations giving them financial advice.
- **Personality and Habits:**
  - General attitudes towards money and their financial situation.
- **Quiz Questions:**

  A series of quiz type questions, aimed at measuring the level of financial competence of the young person.

Fieldwork

Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing (CASI) Technology

For CASI to be successful, a consistent and reliable internet connection is required. Mobile 3G/4G data connection could not be entirely relied upon, due to a weak connection in some locations with potential for signal dropout while conducting the survey. Therefore, where possible, parents were asked whether their home wi-fi could be used for data transmission, with passwords deleted/forgotten before interviewers left the household.

Although the CASI units used were protected by strong encryption algorithms, it would have been inadvisable to store potentially sensitive data on a mobile unit. Given this, responses were transmitted 'live' over wi-fi or mobile signal access to a central server.

Incentive

As this was a recontact study, incentive vouchers of £20, were given to the parent on completing the survey. This incentive could be shared with the young person at the discretion of the parent.

Recruitment

Relatively few contacts were available for the recontact study, just 1,882 for the first wave and 829 for the second wave. Therefore, a main technical consideration was to ensure that as many eligible respondents were re-contacted in each wave as possible, knowing that some respondents from the sample would have changed address, and some young people would have left home for work or university.

For the online panel component of the sample, all those parents who were identified as still registered as panellists were sent an initial email invitation followed by up to five reminders spread evenly throughout the fieldwork period.

An invitation process was designed to maximise the number of responses. For the random probability sample the following stages were followed:

- email invitation (for all those who gave an email address);
- first invitation letter;
- second invitation letter;
- telephone reminder (for those who gave a telephone number);
- face-to-face door knock one (with reminder card left behind);
- face-to-face door knock two (with reminder card left behind);
- face-to-face door knock three (with reminder card left behind);
- face-to-face door knock four (with reminder card left behind);
- face-to-face door knock five (with reminder card left behind);
- final telephone reminder (for those who gave a telephone number);

- final invitation letter.

A maximum of five door knocks were conducted, unless participants completed, refused or field interviewers discovered that participants had moved residence. In all cases where residents had moved, attempts were made to establish contact through previously provided telephone numbers and email addresses.

Completed Interviews by Mode

Using a mixed mode approach of CASI and online created fewer barriers to participation, increasing the likelihood of response, by engaging with respondents through devices and an approach that was most convenient to them.

For the 2017 recontact phase there were 1,882 surveys completed by 15-17-year-olds and their parents in 2016 – all of whom were eligible to take part in the recontact survey. Of the 1,882 respondents who were eligible to take part in the recontact survey, these were split into two main sets:

- 676 respondents originally contacted directly by BMG Research via face-to-face interview;
- 1,206 respondents who were originally contacted via an online panel.

In 2018, in total, there were 829 surveys completed by 15-19-year olds and their parents from 2017– all of whom were eligible to take part in the 2018 recontact survey. Of the 829 respondents who were eligible to take part in the 2018 recontact survey, these were split into two main sets:

- 340 respondents originally contacted directly by BMG Research via face-to-face interview;
- 489 respondents who were originally contacted via an online panel.

BMG Research administered the 2017 and 2018 recontact surveys for all respondents who were originally contacted via a face-to-face interview. Both the young person and the parent of the young person were given the opportunity to complete an online survey. Parents and young people were asked to complete their own individual survey. Those who did not respond to the opportunity to complete an online survey were given the opportunity to complete the recontact survey through a face-to-face interview (CASI).

For each recontact survey to be classified as complete, a survey must have been received from both the young person and the parent of the young person, using either the online method or the face-to-face method.
The responses from the two individual surveys were combined to make one complete survey.
In the 2017 recontact survey, 5% completed using a different method of data collection. Of the 676 eligible respondents, 326 (48%) completed the recontact survey.
In 2018, there were a small proportion of surveys (9%) that were completed using a mixed method of data collection. Of the 340 eligible respondents, 234 (69%) completed the recontact survey.

Although BMG Research designed and scripted the survey, ResearchBods administered recontact invitations for all respondents who were originally contacted via the panel. In 2017, of the 1,206 eligible respondents, 506 (42%) completed the recontact survey. Whereas in 2018, of the 489 eligible respondents, 213 (44%) completed the recontact survey.

Table 1

2017 Survey Responses		Parent Complete			Young Person Complete		
Original Survey	Eligible Contacts	Email/Post/CATI to Online		Panel		In-person	Panel
Online Panel Survey	1206	-	-	509	-	-	506
Face to Face	676	199	124	-	194	129	-

Table 2

2018 Survey Responses							
Original Survey	Eligible Contacts	Email/Post/CATI to Online		Panel			Panel
Online Panel Survey	489	-	-	213	-	-	213
Face to Face	340	91	159	-	105	142	-

Face-to-face Random Probability Sample

Table 3

2017 Response Breakdown	Valid Response (%)
Complete	52%
Partial	4%
Refused	15%
Call back / Appointment fail	9%
No Contact	20%
Ineligible / Moved Away	-
Total	100%

Table 4

2018 Response Breakdown	Valid Response (%)
Complete	69%
Partial	6%
Refused	9%
Call back / Appointment fail	4%
No Contact	5%
Ineligible / Moved Away	7%
Total	100%

Online Panel Response

Table 5

2017 Response Breakdown	Valid Response (%)
Complete	57%
Partial	15%
No Contact	28%
Est. 12-month Panel Attrition	-
Total	100%

Table 6

2018 Response Breakdown	Valid Response (%)
Complete	44%
Partial	18%
No Contact	38%
Est. 12-month Panel Attrition	-
Total	100%

Fieldwork Period

For the 2017 recontact wave, the online fieldwork for those who were originally contacted via a face-to-face interview (in 2016), took place between the 20th of May 2017 and the 30th of July 2017. The face-to-face fieldwork took place between 17th June 2017 and 25th July 2017. The fieldwork for the panel element of the recontact study, which was carried out on the ResearchBods online panel, took place between 25th May and 30th July 2017.

In the 2018 recontact wave, the online fieldwork for those who were originally contacted via a face-to-face interview, took place between 4th June 2018 and 28th August 2018. The face-to-face fieldwork took place between 18th June 2018 and 28th August 2018. The fieldwork for the panel element of the recontact study, which was carried out on the ResearchBods online panel, took place between 11th June 2018 and 28th August 2018.

Representativeness and Weighting

Sample Profile

The results tabulated below are the profile data as a proportion of all completed surveys, where both the young person and the parent completed the survey.

There are three general profile strands:

- profile of parents;
- profile of children and young people;
- profile of households, including geo-demographics.

The following set of tables include weighted and unweighted counts and proportions. Although the unweighted and weighted results are compared here, the weighting schema is discussed in greater detail in the weighting sub-section.

Adult Profile

Parents who were interviewed tended to be female. Weighting had a slight impact on the proportions recorded across gender.

Table 7

Adult Gender 2017			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Male	247 *29.8*	254 *30.6*	*+0.8*
Female	582 *70.2*	575 *69.4*	*-0.8*
Base sizes	829		

Table 8

Adult Gender 2018			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Male	134 *30.0*	154 *34.5*	*+4.5*
Female	313 *70.0*	293 *65.5*	*-4.5*
Base sizes	447		

Tables nine and 10, show how the ages of parents collected at the time of the 2016 survey were distributed across the 2017 and 2018 survey samples. Age of parent was not collected again during the 2017 and 2018 surveys. The ages will therefore have shifted from that shown by one year and two years respectively in each recontact wave.

As the majority of parents were the birth-parent of the young person in question, few responses were from those aged below 30 or over 60.

Weighting had a minimal impact on the age distribution of parents, though had the most impact within the age band of 35-39 years.

Table 9

Spread of 2016 Adult Ages in 2017 Sample			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
18-29	8 *1*	9 *1*	*0.0*
30-34	46 *5.5*	40 *4.8*	*-0.7*
35-39	135 *16.3*	124 *15.0*	*-1.3*
40-44	222 *26.8*	218 *26.3*	*-0.5*
45-49	222 *26.8*	228 *27.5*	*-0.7*
50-54	131 *15.8*	142 *17.1*	*+1.3*
55-59	49 *5.9*	50 *6.0*	*+0.1*
60-64	8 *1.0*	10 *1.2*	*+0.2*
65+	8 *1.0*	9 *1.1*	*+0.1*
Base sizes	829		

Table 10

Spread of 2016 Adult Ages in 2018 Sample			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
18-29	4 *0.9*	4 *1*	*+0.1*
30-34	30 *6.7*	25 *5.5*	*-1.2*
35-39	87 *19.5*	71 *15.8*	*-3.7*
40-44	115 *25.7*	106 *23.8*	*-1.9*
45-49	114 *25.5*	126 *28.1*	*+2.6*
50-54	59 *13.2*	73 *16.4*	*+3.2*
55-59	30 *6.7*	31 *7.0*	*+0.3*
60-64	3 *0.7*	4 *0.8*	*+0.1*
65-69	4 *0.9*	4 *0.9*	*±0.0*
70+	1 0.2	3 0.7	*+0.5*
Base sizes	447		

The young person's mother was most likely to have answered the parent survey. The unweighted and weighted distributions were very similar, aside from a decrease in mothers after weighting and a corresponding increase in fathers. This is more pronounced in the 2018 phase.

Table 11

Relationship to Young Person 2017			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Mother	567 *68.4*	557 *67.2*	*-1.2*
Father	230 *27.7*	239 *28.8*	*+1.1*
Step-parent	15 *1.8*	14 *1.7*	*-0.1*
Grandparent	4 *0.5*	4 *0.5*	*±0.0*
Aunt or uncle	0 *0.0*	0 *0.0*	*±0.0*
Other relative	5 *0.6*	5 *0.6*	*±0.0*
Carer/guardian	8 *1.0*	10 *1.1*	*-0.1*
Base sizes	829		

Table 12

Relationship to Young Person 2018			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Mother	305 *68.2*	281 *62.9*	*-5.3*
Father	125 *28.0*	146 *32.6*	*+4.6*
Step-mother	2 *0.4*	3 *0.6*	*+0.2*
Step-father	8 1.8	8 1.7	*-0.1*
Grandmother	2 *0.4*	2 *0.5*	*+0.1*
Other relative	2 *0.4*	3 *0.7*	*+0.3*
Carer/guardian	3 *0.7*	4 *0.9*	*+0.2*
Base sizes	447		

Weighting had little effect on the ethnicity proportions in both 2017 and 2018.

Table 13

Ethnicity 2017			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
White British	686 *82.8*	690 *83.2*	+0.4
White Irish	16 *1.9*	10 *1.2*	-0.7
White Other	17 *2.1*	15 *1.8*	-0.3
Mixed	9 *1.1*	11 *1.4*	+0.3
Asian Indian	17 *2.1*	19 *2.3*	+0.2
Asian Pakistani	25 *3.0*	27 *3.3*	+0.3
Asian Bangladeshi	9 *1.1*	8 *1.2*	+0.1
Asian Chinese	3 *0.4*	3 *0.4*	±0.0
Asian Other	2 *0.2*	2 *0.2*	±0.0
Black African	15 *1.8*	15 *1.8*	±0.0
Black Caribbean	6 *0.7*	6 *0.8*	+0.1
Black Other	4 *0.5*	5 *0.6*	+0.1
Other	6 *0.7*	5 *0.6*	+0.1
Not stated	14 *1.7*	12 *1.5*	-0.2
Base sizes	829		

Table 14

Ethnicity 2018			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
White British	355 *79.4*	359 *80.2*	+0.8
White Irish	9 *2.0*	8 *1.7*	0.3
White Other	9 *2.0*	9 *1.9*	0.1
Mixed	8 *1.8*	10 *2.2*	+0.4
Asian Indian	11 *2.5*	11 *2.5*	±0.0
Asian Pakistani	17 *3.8*	19 *4.4*	+0.6
Asian Bangladeshi	6 *1.3*	5 *1.0*	0.1
Asian Chinese	1 *0.2*	1 *0.2*	±0.0
Asian Other	3 *0.7*	2 *0.5*	0.2
Black African	10 *2.2*	10 *2.2*	±0.0
Black Caribbean	4 *0.9*	3 *0.7*	0.2
Black Other	3 *0.7*	3 *0.6*	0.1
Other	4 *0.9*	2 *0.5*	0.4
Not stated	7 *1.6*	6 *1.4*	0.2
Base sizes	447		

The following tables show the weighted and unweighted percentages for key parent demographics. These tables demonstrate that weighting the data has a minor effect on the resulting percentages of the key demographics. The difference between the weighted and unweighted percentages are all below a shift of 5%.

Table 15

Table 16

Table 17

Employment status 2017			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Working full-time	363 *43.8*	369 *44.5*	+0.7
Working part-time	174 *21.0*	178 *21.4*	+0.4
Self employed	43 *5.2*	44 *5.3*	+0.1
Retired	18 *2.2*	19 *2.3*	-0.1
In full-time education	9 *1.1*	7 *0.9*	-0.2
Unemployed seeking work	40 *4.8*	38 4.6	-0.2
Unemployed not seeking work	155 *18.7*	147 *17.7*	-1.0
Part time education and work	5 *0.6*	6 *0.7*	+0.1
Not stated	22 *2.7*	21 *2.5*	-0.2
Base sizes	829		

Table 18

Employment status 2018			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Working full-time	189 *42.3*	210 *46.9*	+4.6
Working part-time	85 *19.0*	74 *16.5*	3.5
Self employed	25 *5.6*	26 *5.8*	+0.2
Retired	10 *2.2*	13 *3.0*	+0.8
In full-time education	7 *1.6*	5 *1.0*	0.6
Unemployed seeking work	25 *5.6*	18 4.1	1.5
Unemployed not seeking work	89 *19.9*	84 *18.7*	1.2
Part time education and work	2 *0.4*	1 *0.2*	0.2
Not stated	15 *3.4*	16 *3.6*	+0.2
Base sizes	447		

Table 19

Marital status 2017			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Married/living with partner	637 *76.8*	645 *77.8*	*+1.0*
Single (never married)	77 *9.3*	74 *8.9*	*-0.4*
Widowed	9 *1.1*	6 *0.8*	*-0.3*
Separated	41 *4.9*	38 *4.6*	*-0.3*
Divorced	61 *7.4*	62 *7.4*	±0.0
Not stated	4 *0.5*	4 *0.4*	*-<0.1*
Base sizes	829		

Table 20

Marital status 2018			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Married/living with partner	339 *75.8*	359 *80.4*	*+4.6*
Single (never married)	47 *10.5*	37 *8.3*	*-2.2*
Widowed	4 *0.9*	3 *0.6*	*-0.3*
Separated	20 *4.5*	17 *3.7*	*-0.8*
Divorced	34 *7.6*	29 *6.5*	±1.1
Not stated	3 *0.7*	2 *0.4*	*+0.3*
Base sizes	447		

Table 21

Highest level of qualification 2017			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
No qualifications	101 *12.2*	93 *11.2*	*-1.0*
Vocational	81 *9.8*	82 *9.9*	*+0.1*
A-level, Higher, Baccalaureate or equivalent	97 *11.7*	101 *12.2*	*+0.5*
DipHE/HNC/HND equivalent	78 *9.4*	79 *9.5*	*+0.1*
GCSE equivalent	211 *25.5*	209 *25.2*	*-0.3*
Undergraduate degree	139 *16.8*	144 *17.4*	*+0.6*
Postgraduate degree	85 *10.3*	87 *10.5*	*+0.2*
Other	19 *2.3*	18 *2.1*	*-0.2*
Still in education	5 *0.6*	3 *0.4*	*-0.2*
Not stated	13 *1.6*	13 *1.6*	±0.0
Base sizes	829		

Table 22

Highest level of qualification 2018			
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
No qualifications	64 *14.3*	44 *9.9*	*-4.4*
Vocational	41 *9.2*	49 *11.1*	*+1.9*
A-level, Higher, Baccalaureate or equivalent	42 *9.4*	51 *11.5*	*+2.1*
DipHE/HNC/HND equivalent	49 *11.0*	48 *10.7*	*-0.3*
GCSE equivalent	108 *24.2*	100 *22.5*	*-1.7*
Undergraduate degree	63 *14.1*	72 *16.0*	*+1.9*
Postgraduate degree	50 *11.2*	56 *12.5*	*+1.3*
Other	14 *3.1*	9 *2.1*	*-1.0*
Still in education	4 *0.6*	2 *0.4*	*-0.2*
Not stated	12 *2.7*	15 *3.3*	+0.6
Base sizes	447		

Table 23

Time spent on internet in week prior to survey 2017			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
None	14 *1.7*	12 *1.5*	*-0.2*
< 1 hour	12 *1.4*	11 *1.3*	*-0.1*
1-2 hours	43 *5.2*	38 *4.6*	*-0.6*
3-5 hours	99 *11.9*	104 *12.5*	*+0.6*
6-10 hours	231 *27.9*	226 *27.2*	*-0.7*
11-19 hours	156 *18.8*	155 *18.7*	*-0.1*
20 hours or more	250 *30.2*	261 *31.5*	*+1.3*
Not stated	24 *2.9*	22 *2.6*	*-0.3*
Base sizes	829		

Table 24

Time spent on internet in week prior to survey 2018			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
None	7 *1.6*	5 *1.2*	*-0.4*
< 1 hour	9 *2.0*	6 *1.4*	*-0.6*
1-2 hours	24 *5.4*	22 *4.8*	*-0.6*
3-5 hours	54 *12.1*	52 *11.7*	*-0.4*
6-10 hours	114 *25.5*	110 *24.6*	*-0.9*
11-19 hours	80 *17.9*	79 *17.8*	*-0.1*
20 hours or more	137 *30.6*	157 *35.1*	*+4.5*
Not stated	22 *4.9*	16 *3.5*	*-1.4*
Base sizes	447		

Table 25

Table 26

Responsibility for financial decisions in household 2018			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Interviewed adult is solely responsible	160 *35.8*	155 *34.7*	*-1.1*
Interviewed adult is mainly responsible	90 *20.1*	111 *24.7*	*+4.6*
Interviewed adult is jointly responsible	196 *43.8*	180 *40.2*	*-3.6*
Interviewed adult has no responsibility	1 *0.2*	1 *0.3*	*+0.1*
Base sizes	447		

Table 27

Care responsibility for young person 2017	derived		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Interviewed adult solely responsible	216 *26.1*	214 *25.9*	*-0.3*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult within household	557 *67.2*	562 *67.8*	*+0.6*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult from outside household	50 *6.0*	45 *5.5*	*-0.5*
Not responsible for these	11 *1.3*	11 *1.4*	*-<0.1*
Base sizes	829		

Table 28

Care responsibility for young person 2018	derived		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Interviewed adult solely responsible	132 *29.5*	121 *27.0*	*-2.5*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult within household	293 *65.5*	308 *69.0*	*+4.5*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult from outside household	22 *4.9*	18 *4.0*	*-0.9*
Base sizes	447		

Table 29

Rule setting for young person 2017			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Interviewed adult solely responsible	232 *28.0*	225 *27.2*	*-0.8*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult within household	569 *68.6*	576 *69.5*	*+0.9*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult from outside household	30 *3.6*	29 *3.5*	*-0.1*
Someone else responsible	1 *0.1*	1 *0.1*	*±0.0*
No-one responsible	0 *0.0*	0 *0.0*	*±0.0*
Base sizes	829		

Table 30

Rule setting for young person 2018			
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Interviewed adult solely responsible	143 *32.0*	133 *29.7*	*-2.3*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult within household	291 *65.1*	303 *67.9*	*+2.8*
Interviewed adult jointly responsible with another adult from outside household	13 *2.9*	11 *2.5*	*-0.4*
Base sizes	447		

Young Person Profile

Young person gender by age at the original wave is a variable used in the overall weighting schema. Where a shift is seen between the unweighted and weighted distribution of young people, it is no greater than 2%.

Table 31

2017 Young Person gender	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*

Table 32

2018 Young Person gender	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
	103 *53.9*	*55.9*	*+2.0*	*52.5*	81 *54.4*	*+1.9*	62 *53.0*	81 *52.9*	*0.1*	238 *53.2*	243 *54.4*	*+1.2*
Female	88 *46.1*	64 *44.1*	*2.0*	66 *47.5*	68 *45.6*	*1.9*	55 *47.0*	72 *47.1*	*+0.1*	209 *46.8*	204 *45.6*	*1.2*
Base sizes	191	145		139	149		117	153		447	447	

Weighting for young person age was based on the young people's ages during the 2016 survey. Because of the staged fieldwork dates, it was possible for a young person to be aged 19 years or greater at recontact.

Table 33

2017 Current Young Person age	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Aged 15	49 14.6	39 14.6	*±0.0*	0 0.0	0 0.0	*-±0.0*	0 0.0	0 0.0	*-±0.0*	49 5.9	39 4.7	-1.2
Aged 16	238 70.8	191 71.3	+0.5	20 7.9	26 9.6	+1.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	*-±0.0*	258 31.1	218 26.3	-4.8
Aged 17	49 14.6	38 14.1	-0.5	203 80.2	219 79.3	-0.9	38 15.8	45 15.8	*-±0.0*	290 35.0	302 36.4	+1.4
Aged 18	0 0.0	0 0.0	*±0.0*	30 11.9	31 11.1	-0.8	172 71.7	203 71.1	-0.6	202 24.4	233 28.1	+3.7
Aged 19	0 0.0	0 0.0	*-±0.0*	0 0.0	0 0.0	*-±0.0*	30 12.5	37 13.0	+0.5	30 3.6	37 4.5	+0.9
Base sizes	336	268		253	276		240	285		829	829	

Table 34

2018 Current Young Person age	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Aged 16	31 16.2	24 16.6	+0.4	3 2.2	5 3.4	+1.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	±0.0	34 7.6	29 6.5	*-1.1*
Aged 17	116 60.7	89 61.4	+0.7	20 14.4	21 14.1	+0.3	3 2.6	5 3.2	+0.6	139 31.1	115 25.7	-5.4
Aged 18	43 22.5	31 21.4	-1.1	93 66.9	98 65.8	-1.1	22 18.8	28 18.2	-0.6	158 35.3	157 35.0	*-0.3*
Aged 19	1 0.5	1 0.7	+0.2	23 16.5	25 16.8	+0.3	73 62.4	91 59.1	-3.3	97 21.7	117 26.1	+4.4
Aged 20	0 0.0	0 0.0	±0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	±0.0	19 16.2	30 19.5	+3.3	19 4.3	30 6.7	+2.4
Base sizes	191	145		139	149		117	154		447	447	

Weighting the data in 2017 and 2018 had a minor effect on the distribution of young people who had a long-standing physical or mental impairment, illness or disability. Weighting the data also had a minor effect on the distribution of time spent on the internet, with the differences between the weighted percentages and unweighted percentages all being less than 5%.

Table 35

2017 Long-standing physical or mental impairment, illness or disability	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Not stated	2 *0.6*	2 *0.6*	*±0.0*	1 *0.4*	1 *0.4*	*±0.0*	3 *1.3*	3 *1.1*	*-0.2*	6 *0.7*	6 *0.7*	*±0.0*
Base sizes	336	268		253	276		240	285		829	829	

Table 36

2018 Long-standing physical or mental impairment, illness or disability	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
		9.0	*0.1*	13							42 *9.4*	*0.9*
Has no impairment	171 *89.5*	130 *89.7*	*+0.2*	123 *88.5*	134 *89.9*	*+1.4*	100 *85.5*	135 *88.2*	*+2.7*	394 *88.1*	399 *89.3*	*+1.3*
Not stated	3 *1.6*	2 *1.4*	*-0.2*	3 *2.2*	3 *2.0*	*-0.2*	1 *0.9*	1 *0.7*	*-0.2*	7 *1.6*	6 *1.3*	*-0.3*
Base sizes	191	145		139	149		117	153		447	447	

Table 37

20 hours or more	102 *30.4*	79 *29.6*	*-0.8*	91 *36.0*	100 *36.3*	*+0.3*	77 *32.1*	86 *30.2*	*-1.9*	270 *32.6*	265 *32.0*	*-0.6*
Not stated	43 *12.8*	33 *12.1*	*-0.7*	27 *10.7*	29 *10.4*	-0.3	36 *15.0*	44 *15.3*	*+0.3*	106 *12.8*	105 *12.7*	*-0.1*
Base sizes	336	268		253	276		240	285		829	829	

Table 38

						_						_
						_			_			
20 hours or more	60 *31.4*	40 *27.6*	*-2.8*	52 *37.4*	50 *33.6*	*-3.8*	47 *40.2*	55 *35.9*	*-4.3*	159 *35.6*	145 *32.4*	*-3.2*
Not stated	24 *12.6*	18 *12.4*	*-0.2*	14 *10.1*	14 *9.4*	-0.7	14 *12.0*	18 *11.8*	*-0.2*	52 *11.6*	50 *11.2*	*-0.4*
Base sizes	191	145		139	149		117	153		447	447	

Household Profile

Weighting the data had a minor effect on composition of households or the tenure of the household, with the difference between the weighted and unweighted percentages of any category less than 8.5% in 2017 and 2018.

Table 39

2017 Household composition	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N **%**	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Adults (parents, step-parents, guardians)	306 *91.1*	243 *90.4*	*-0.7*	231 *91.3*	250 *90.9*	*-0.4*	213 *88.9*	253 *88.8*	*-.01*	750 *90.5*	746 *90.0*	*-0.5*
Adults (grandparents)	3 *0.9*	2 *0.8*	*-0.1*	2 *0.8*	1 *0.5*	*-0.3*	1 *0.4*	1 *0.4*	*±0.0*	6 *0.7*	5 *0.6*	*-0.1*
								76 *26.8*	*+1.4*	209 *25.2*	225 *27.2*	*+2.0*
Other adults (18+)	39 *11.6*	33 *12.3*	*0.7*	34 *13.4*	39 *14.2*	*+0.8*	38 *15.8*	44 *15.4*	*0.4*	111 *13.4*	116 *14.0*	*+0.6*
Young people (15-17)	336 *100*	268 *100*	*±0.0*	253 *100*	276 *100*	*±0.0*	240 *100*	285 *100*	*±0.0*	829 *100*	829 *100*	*±0.0*
Teenagers (12-14)	112 *33.3*	91 *33.8*	*+0.5*	80 *31.6*	83 *30.2*	*-1.4*	67 *27.9*	78 *27.3*	*-0.6*	259 *31.2*	252 *30.3*	*-1.0*
Older children (8-11)	99 *29.5*	76 *28.5*	*-1.0*	63 *24.9*	69 *25.1*	*+0.5*	64 *26.7*	71 *24.8*	*-2.1*	226 *27.3*	216 *26.1*	*-1.2*
Young children (3-7)	67 *19.9*	52 *19.5*	*±0.0*	39 *15.4*	43 *15.7*	*+0.3*	31 *12.9*	35 *12.1*	*-0.8*	137 *16.5*	130 *15.7*	*-0.8*
Babies and toddlers (0-2)	12 *3.6*	10 *3.6*	*±0.0*	8 *3.2*	8 *2.8*	*-0.4*	11 *4.6*	13 *4.5*	*-0.1*	31 *3.7*	30 *3.6*	*-0.1*
Base sizes	336	268		253	276		240	285		829	829	

Table 40

2018 Household composition	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
Adults (parents, step-parents, guardians)	180 *94.2*	133 *92.0*	*-2.2*	129 *92.8*	136 *91.4*	*-1.4*	105 *89.7*	136 *88.5*	*-1.2*	414 *92.6*	405 *90.6*	*-2.0*
Adults (grandparents)	2 *1.0*	1 *0.9*	*-0.1*	1 *0.7*	1 *0.7*	*±0.0*	1 *0.9*	1 *0.4*	*-0.5*	4 *0.9*	3 *0.7*	*-0.2*
	15.2		*+1.7*		*32.4*	*+4.3*			*+2.9*	*21.5*	114 *25.5*	*+4.0*
Other adults (18+)	18 *9.4*	16 *10.8*	*0.6*	19 *13.7*	21 *14.0*	*+0.3*	15 *12.8*	20 *13.1*	*+0.3*	52 *11.6*	57 *12.7*	*+1.1*
Young people (15-17)	191 *100*	145 *100*	*±0.0*	139 *100*	149 *100*	*±0.0*	117 *100*	153 *100*	*±0.0*	447 *100*	447 *100*	*±0.0*
Teenagers (12-14)	71 *37.2*	51 *35.4*	*-1.8*	46 *33.1*	44 *29.5*	*-3.6*	33 *28.2*	40 *26.1*	*-2.1*	150 *33.6*	135 *30.3*	*-3.3*
Older children (8-11)	61 *31.9*	44 *30.7*	*-1.2*	42 *30.2*	48 *32.5*	*+2.3*	36 *30.8*	40 *26.0*	*-4.8*	139 *31.1*	133 *29.7*	*-1.4*
Young children (3-7)	41 *21.5*	27 *18.9*	*-2.6*	19 *13.7*	18 *12.1*	*-1.6*	17 *14.5*	20 *13.1*	*-1.4*	77 *17.2*	66 *14.7*	*-2.5*
Babies and toddlers (0-2)	4 *2.1*	3 *1.9*	*-0.2*	7 *5.0*	6 *3.9*	*-1.1*	6 *5.1*	7 *4.8*	*-0.3*	17 *3.8*	16 *3.6*	*-0.2*
Base sizes	191	145		139	149		117	153		447	447	

Table 41

Other	1 *0.3*	1 *0.3*	*±0.0*	0 0.0	0 *0.0*	*±0.0*	0 *0.0*	0 *0.0*	*±0.0*	1 *0.1*	1 *0.1*	*±0.0*
Not stated	4 *2.1*	3 *1.2*	*-0.9*	9 *3.6*	9 *3.2*	*+0.4*	7 *2.9*	8 *2.6*	*-0.3*	20 *2.4*	20 *2.4*	*±0.0*
Base sizes	336	268		253	276		240	285		829	829	

Table 42

Don't know	2 *1.0*	2 *1.4*	*+0.4*	2 1.4	2 *1.3*	*-0.1*	2 *1.7*	2 *1.3*	*-0.4*	6 *1.3*	6 *1.3*	*±0.0*
Prefer not to say	1 *0.5*	1 *0.7*	*+0.2*	3 *2.2*	7 *4.7*	*+2.5*	4 *3.4*	4 *2.6*	*-0.8*	8 *1.8*	12 *2.7*	*+0.9*
Base sizes	191	145		139	149		117	154		447	448	

Weighting

The data for the 2017 and 2018 recontact waves went through two stages of weighting.

Attrition Weighting

To be able to compare the initial survey and two recontact waves of the survey, the data needed to be weighted in a way that considered participant attrition. If respondents who chose to respond to the recontact survey differed from those who chose not to participate in the recontact survey, then attrition will have changed the sample composition and results of the survey.

A binary logistic regression model was built, using the original 2016 survey data, to predict the probability of respondents completing the recontact survey. This was done both to allow the comparison of the 2017 recontact against the initial 2016 survey, and the 2018 recontact against the initial 2016 survey. Another weight was created to compare the 2018 recontact against the 2017 recontact wave.

All of the respondents aged 15 to 17 and their parents, who completed the original 2016 survey (N = 1,882) were given the opportunity to take part in the 2017 survey. In 2018, all of the respondents aged 15-19 and their parents who completed the 2017 recontact survey (N=829) were given the opportunity to take part in the 2018 survey. A binary variable was created for each recontact wave, which flagged those who took part in the corresponding year's recontact survey. This variable was set as the dependent variable in the logistic regression models.

Given that there was a limited set of demographic and geographical information available on respondents that remained consistent across 2016, 2017 and 2018 waves, and that attrition weighting variables should not include those that are used as part of the calibration weighting process; variables available which had a logically coherent connection with a respondent's propensity to stay in the study were as follows:

- method of survey (online/face-to-face);
- IMD (Index of multiple deprivation);
- urban/rural flag.

These were all set to be the independent variables in the logistic regression model.

Weights 2018 vs. 2016

In 2018, the results of the logistic regression model (table 43) showed that those who completed the original 2016 survey via a face-to-face interview were 2.3 times more likely to complete the 2018 recontact survey ($P<0.05$) than those who completed the 2016 survey online. The 'IMD' score didn't reach the statistical significance mark of $P<0.05$. However, the model shows that its impact (although not statistically significant) on the probability of completing the recontact survey was in the expected direction – meaning that those living in more deprived areas (higher IMD score) were less likely to respond. Therefore, IMD was kept in the model.

Table 43: 2018 vs. 2016 Response Regression

Response Regression	B	Change in Odds	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.
Constant	-1.46		0.14	106.02	1	0.000
Method of Survey						
Face-to-face vs. Online	0.85	2.34	0.12	53.38	1	0.000
IMD	-0.02	0.98	0.04	0.26	1	0.612

Weights 2017 vs. 2016

The results of the logistic regression model in 2017, showed that those who completed the original survey via a face-to-face interview were 1.3 times more likely to complete the re-contact survey (P<0.05). The urban/rural classification also had a significant impact on the probability of completing the re-contact survey (P<0.05), with those who lived in an urban area being 1.5 times more likely to complete the re-contact survey than those who lived an intermediate area. The IDM score had no significant impact on the probability of completing the re-contact survey.

The regression models predict the probability of completing the 2017 and 2018 recontact surveys respectively. The attrition weight coefficients were calculated using the inverse of the estimated probability. The attrition weights were then re-based/normalised to sum to the number of respondents in the recontact survey.

Weights 2018 vs 2017

The 2018 vs. 2017 weights are useful when comparing the 2018 sample with the sample achieved in 2017. They were constructed in the same way to that used for the 2017 vs. 2016 and 2018 vs. 2016 weighting. First, a binary logistic model was used to estimate propensity to respond to the 2018 recontact based on those who responded in 2017. Secondly, attrition weights were calculated as an inverse probability to respond to the recontact survey. Thirdly, attrition weights were calibrated using a wider range of demographics. In the response model, the dependent variable flags the 2017 respondents who also responded in 2018 (total number of 2017 respondents N = 829; 420 of them respond to the 2018 recontact phase).

The results of the response regression modelling can be seen in table 44.

Table 44: 2018 vs. 2017 Response Regression

Response Regression	B	Change in Odds	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.
Constant	-0.29		0.18	2.52	1	0.112
Method of Survey						
Face-to-face vs. Online	0.89	2.43	0.16	32.87	1	0.000
IMD	-0.01	0.99	0.05	0.04	1	0.841

Those who were contacted via a face-to-face interview (and did respond during the 2017 recontact survey) were 2.4 times more likely to complete the 2018 recontact survey (P < 0.05). The IMD's impact on the probability of completing the recontact survey is in the expected direction (although it doesn't reach statistical significance at the conventional 5% level) – those living in more deprived areas (higher IMD score) were less likely to respond to the recontact.

A longitudinal weight for three waves of the survey, 2016, 2017, 2018

A longitudinal weight was calculated for the set of respondents who responded to all three waves. Weights account for attrition from the initial wave (just 420 of 1,882 wave 1 respondents participated in all three waves) and were benchmarked back to the key characteristics of the initial wave (2016 distribution of 15-17-year-olds across UK regions).

To take account for the loss of participants between 2016, 2017 and 2018 waves, the inverse probability weighting approach was applied. A binary logistic regression model (similar to that described previously) estimated a propensity to respond in all three waves.

The Method of Survey was found to be the only statistically significant predictor of the propensity to take part in three waves. Although both Rural/Urban classification (a categorical predictor) and the IMD (used as a scale predictor) were not statistically significant at the 5% level of significance, one of them, the IMD, was kept in the model. The results of the logistic regression modelling can be seen in table 45.

Table 45: propensity to respond to all three survey waves

Predictors of the Response	B	Change in Odds (Odds Ratio)	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.
Constant	-1.51					
Method of Survey						
Face-to-face vs. Online	0.71	2.04	0.12	36.35	1	0.000
IMD	-0.01	0.99	0.04	0.05	1	0.823

The attrition weight coefficients were calculated using the inverse of the estimated probability.

The attrition weights were then re-based/normalised to sum to the number of respondents in the longitudinal sample (N=420).

Basic statistical characteristics of the longitudinal weights (wave 1 through wave 3) are shown in Table 46.

Table 46: longitudinal weights

N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation
420	0.30	5.64	1.00	0.54

The last step of the weighting procedure included weight calibration to the population demographics (distribution of 15-17-year-olds across UK regions).

Calibration Weighting

The devolved nations (Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales) were deliberately oversampled in the original 2016 survey to allow more detailed analysis. Young people who were 15 at the time of the 2016 survey were over-represented and those who were 17 at the time of the previous survey were under-represented. Therefore, the weighting procedure included weight calibration to the population demographics (distribution of 15-17-year-olds across UK regions) at the time of the initial wave 1, i.e. 2016 population. Small adjustments were made to the attrition weight so that population targets were met. The below displays the population targets used.

Table 47: Calibration Weighting 2017

Region	15 Years of Age (2016)			16 Years of Age (2016)			17 Years of Age (2016)			Total		
N %	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*	*Unwtd*	*Wtd*	*Diff*
North East	18 *5.4*	10 *3.8*	*-1.6*	9 *3.6*	11 *3.9*	*+0.3*	18 *7.5*	11 *3.9*	*-3.6*	45 *5.4*	32 *3.9*	*-1.5*
North West	34 *10.1*	30 *11.1*	*+1.0*	36 *14.2*	31 *11.1*	*-3.1*	27 *11.3*	32 *11.1*	*-0.2*	97 *11.7*	92 *11.1*	*-0.6*
Yorkshire & Humberside	17 *5.1*	22 *8.2*	*+3.1*	21 *8.3*	23 *8.3*	*±0.0*	18 *7.5*	24 *8.4*	*+0.9*	56 *6.8*	69 *8.3*	*+1.5*
East Midlands	26 *7.7*	19 *7.2*	*-0.5*	21 *8.3*	20 *7.2*	*-1.1*	20 *8.3*	21 *7.3*	*-1.0*	67 *8.1*	60 *7.2*	*-0.9*
West Midlands	31 *9.2*	25 *9.2*	*±0.0*	14 *5.5*	26 *9.3*	*+3.8*	20 *8.3*	26 *9.1*	*+0.8*	65 *7.8*	76 *9.2*	*+1.4*
East of England	25 *7.4*	25 *9.5*	*+2.1*	20 *7.9*	26 *9.4*	*+1.5*	24 *10.0*	27 *9.4*	*-0.6*	69 *8.3*	78 *9.4*	*+1.1*
London	36 *10.7*	35 *13.0*	*+2.3*	22 *8.7*	35 *12.8*	*+4.1*	23 *9.6*	36 *12.6*	*+3.0*	81 *9.8*	106 *12.8*	*+3.0*
South East	51 *15.2*	38 *14.2*	*-1.0*	31 *12.3*	39 *14.1*	*+1.8*	22 *9.2*	40 *14.2*	*+5.0*	104 *12.5*	117 *14.2*	*+1.7*
South West	25 *7.4*	22 *8.1*	*+0.7*	17 *6.7*	23 *8.2*	*+1.5*	18 *7.5*	24 *8.3*	*+0.8*	60 *7.2*	68 *8.2*	*+1.0*
Scotland	37 *11.0*	21 *7.8*	*-3.2*	29 *11.5*	21 *7.8*	*-3.7*	13 *5.4*	22 *7.8*	*+2.4*	79 *9.5*	64 *7.8*	*-1.7*
Wales	20 *6.0*	13 *4.8*	*-1.2*	18 *7.1*	13 *4.8*	*-2.3*	19 *7.9*	14 *4.7*	*-3.2*	57 *6.9*	39 *4.7*	*+2.2*
Northern Ireland	16 *4.8*	8 *3.2*	*-1.6*	15 *5.9*	9 *3.2*	*-2.7*	18 *7.5*	9 *3.2*	*-4.3*	49 *5.9*	26 *3.2*	*-2.7*
England	245 *72.9*	216 *80.4*	*+7.5*	182 *71.9*	222 *80.4*	*+8.5*	172 *71.7*	229 *80.4*	*-8.7*	599 *72.3*	667 *80.4*	*+8.1*
Total	336	*268*		253	*276*		240	*285*		829	*829*	

Table 48: Calibration Weighting 2018

Wales	*12* *6.3*	*7* *4.8*	*-1.5*	11 7.9	7 4.7	*-3.2*	12 10.3	7 4.5	*-5.8*	35 7.8	21 4.7	*-3.1*
Northern Ireland	*8* *4.2*	*5* *3.4*	*-0.8*	5 3.6	5 3.4	*-0.2*	7 6.0	5 3.2	*-2.8*	20 4.5	15 3.3	*-1.2*
Total	191	*145*		139	*149*		117	*154*		447	*448*	