

# Youth Economic Activity and Health (YEAH) Survey

Technical Report

Golo Henseke, Xavier Faux (Ipsos), Steven Watt (Ipsos)  
6-16-2023

This technical report follows the structure suggested by “Ines Schaurer, Kunz, Tanja, & Heycke, Tobias (2020). Documentation of online surveys. Mannheim, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences (GESIS- Survey Guidelines). DOI: 10.15465/gesis-sg\_en\_03”

All omission and errors in this reports are the first authors.

## 1 General Information

### 1.1 Study topic, objectives, and description of research

The Youth Economic Activity and Health (YEAH) Survey, 2021-2022 was a major data collection effort to track the well-being, learning, and expectations of 16-25-year-olds in the second phase of the COVID-19 pandemic after effective vaccines had started to roll out.

The survey’s main objectives were to deliver intelligence on:

1. Successful transitions
2. Future planning, optimism and expectations
3. Learning progression in education and the world of work
4. Career development activities, career support and career progress
5. Health, subjective well-being, and support networks

Key findings include:

1. Increases in social contacts, receding worries about career prospects and job skills learning, and opportunities for job skills learning contributed significantly to increases in life satisfaction. Nonetheless, social inequalities in well-being persist.
2. Young people adjusted their career expectations and concerns about job skills learning in line with macro-level developments. For some, things have turned out for the better. The improvements were particularly pronounced among youth facing transitional decisions.
3. Career preparation activities support the development of career adaptability, career-related cognitions and life satisfaction. Career adaptability is a psychosocial resource to adapt to a changing career landscape and employment opportunities. Many young people participated in career-development activities during education. However, a non-negligible proportion had not engaged in any career development. The findings emphasise the importance of school-based career preparation activities in supporting adaptive career-related attitudes and cognitions and, in so doing, life satisfaction.

### 1.2 Principal investigators, Project team members, Survey organisation

The project and survey data collection were led by Dr Golo Henseke as the Principal investigator. He is the primary contact. Professor Francis Green and Professor Ingrid Schoon guided and co-designed the survey at all stages of development. The project team was affiliated with IOE, UCL's Faculty of Education and Society.

The survey was carried out by Ipsos MORI UK.

### 1.3 Funding

Funding for this research is provided by the Economic and Social Research Council, Grant No. ES/V01577X/1.

#### 1.4 Target population, sampling design, sample source, and provider

Target population: *An online nationally representative sample of 16 to 25 year olds in the UK. The study is a 6 wave longitudinal survey, with replacement. An extension enabled the collection of a seventh wave.*

How were the respondents sampled? *Quota sample with quotas set by age interlocked by gender, region and working status. Quotas were set on the overall sample (including fresh sample where we have needed to replace participants from previous waves). Quotas set were as follows, with flexibility allowed to ensure the full sample could be completed:*

	TOTAL 100.00%	Male	Female
16-20	49.1%	25.5%	23.6%
21-25	50.9%	26.2%	24.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>48.3%</b>
North East	4.0%		
North West	11.4%		
Yorkshire and the Humber	9.0%		
West Midlands	9.3%		
East Midlands	7.6%		
East of England	7.6%		
South West	7.9%		
South East	13.7%		
London	13.9%		
Wales	4.5%		
Scotland	8.2%		
Northern Ireland	2.9%		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		
Working	46.3%		
Not working	53.8%		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		

How was the sampling frame defined? *Quotas were derived from PAMCo 3 2020 (June'19-Jul'20). This frame was maintained throughout the life of the project.*

Who provided the sample? *Participants were recruited from online panels owned by Ipsos MORI and affiliate providers as required. In the UK, the Ipsos MORI panel has in excess of 300,000 members, and there is a total reach of in excess of 8 million people across providers. Ipsos' online panels are continuously refreshed using a variety of sources and methods. The vast majority of panelists are referred through various online suppliers. Based on many years of experience, Ipsos considered multi-source recruitment is the best option for maintaining a representative base of respondents. Ipsos only used high quality recruitment sources to entice people who are eager to take surveys. They strategically focus on developing processes that reflect the newest internet practices as may currently be found through social networks. Email lists, banners, website and text ads, co-registration, and search engine marketing are also used. When evaluating the priority of sources, the recruitment process takes the following into consideration:*

## 1.5 Sample size and response metrics [Ipsos]

This section provides an overview of the key performance metrics that describe the characteristics and the success of the survey. The Table below summaries, where applicable, the number of invited participants, the number of started surveys, and the number of re-invites, which are deemed central to judge the quality of a study:

		Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6	Wave 7
Total invitations sent	Fresh	17,927	22,650	26,482	50,763			
	Re-invite	n/a	1000	1543	1794	1832	1584	n/a
Number of started surveys		1384	1356	1956	2460	1986	2599	3471
Number of drop outs		111	85	154	184	138	272	508
Total completes	Fresh	1000	542	495	491	527	543	2000
	Re-invite	n/a	458	505	518	473	457	n/a
Overall completion rate	Fresh and Re-invite	5.6%	4.2%	3.6%	1.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Longitudinal completion rate	Re-invite	n/a	46%	33%	29%	26%	29%	n/a
Average duration		10 mins	11 mins	12.9 mins	11.9 mins	12.6 mins	12 mins	11 mins

From Wave 5, Ipsos changed its panel system such that panellists are no longer emailed invitations. They are alerted on the platform that there are surveys available, and they are able to select surveys to participate in. Where quotas are full, they are redirected to other surveys.

For quota samples such as the current dataset, the **completion rate** can inform about the study's success. The completion rate is calculated as the share of those who completed the online survey among all the eligible panel members who were invited to the survey. For the whole sample the completion rate varied between 5.6 % to 1.9 %. In the longitudinal sample the completion rate varied between 26 % and 46 %.

## 1.6 Survey mode, design, and sample characteristics

The survey was conducted online only. It was designed as a longitudinal survey, with replacement of participants who did not complete the current wave. Participants from all prior waves were invited

to participate. If the quota was not complete, invitations were sent to fresh sample, with the objective of ensuring the overall sample quotas were met.

The unweighted profile of the sample was as follows:

		Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6	Wave 7
Age	16-20	47%	45%	49%	48%	46%	48%	49%
	21-25	53%	55%	51%	52%	54%	52%	51%
Gender	Male	47%	47%	49%	49%	48%	46%	43%
	Female	51%	51%	48%	48%	50%	52%	53%
	Other	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Region	N East	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
	N West	12%	12%	11%	11%	10%	11%	12%
	Yorks & Humber	9%	9%	10%	9%	8%	9%	9%
	W Midlands	9%	8%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
	E Midlands	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
	East Anglia	8%	7%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
	South West	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
	South East	14%	14%	14%	13%	14%	14%	14%
	Greater London	14%	16%	14%	15%	15%	14%	14%
	Wales	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%
	Scotland	7%	8%	8%	9%	9%	9%	8%
	Northern Ireland	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Work status	Working	45%	47%	48%	45%	46%	43%	49%
	Unemployed	10%	9%	9%	9%	7%	6%	11%
	Student/pupil	45%	44%	46%	45%	47%	52%	41%
Social grade	A	6%	7%	6%	6%	5%	7%	7%
	B	36%	36%	40%	36%	36%	38%	30%
	C1	23%	24%	24%	25%	23%	23%	21%
	C2	8%	7%	8%	8%	9%	9%	11%
	D	9%	8%	10%	10%	11%	10%	11%
	E	18%	18%	11%	15%	16%	14%	20%
Device completed survey on	Laptop/PC	50%	46%	42%	42%	44%	40%	13%
	Smartphone	48%	51%	56%	56%	54%	58%	86%
	Tablet	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%

- Are statements about the representation of the target population in terms of undercoverage and overcoverage possible? If possible, report bias measures. *Participants in the survey are from a self-selecting panel of people who have joined an online community to participate in surveys. These panellists may have characteristics which are different from the broader population. Members of the broader population who are not users of the internet or who are light users tend to be un-represented. Bias measures are not possible.*

## 2 Preparation

### 2.1 Questionnaire characteristics

Across the seven waves, the survey questionnaires covered a range of topics. Core topics included: individual socio-demographics including family background, educational attainment, and current economic activity, health and subjective well-being (life satisfaction, sense of direction, HMCL-5, SWEMBS)

- Routing information and information on major branches: The survey routed participants through different modules depending on their main economic activity: *paid work, in education, or neither in education or work.*
- The anticipated completion time and the actual average completion time Anticipated duration: 10 minutes. *Actual duration: 10-13 minutes*
- Number of questionnaire versions and the differences between the versions. *One version which is used for all respondents, with routing based on responses to specific questions. Some changes were made to the questionnaire each wave, with the addition of new questions and deletion of others.*
- Multimedia elements that were included *None*

### 2.2 Questionnaire implementation

- Was the survey implemented browser-based or app-based? *Browser based*
- Which survey software solution was used? In case of commercial survey software: Which software provider was used? In case of an in-house developed survey software: Which programming language was used? *We use Dimensions software for data collection*
- Who was responsible for the survey programming and where was the questionnaire hosted? *Ipsos MORI. The survey was hosted on our servers*
- Were any measures implemented to account for multiple devices and various display sizes? *We script our surveys to be device agnostic, so regardless of whether respondents are participating using a PC, tablet, or smartphone, the survey is sized so as to be readable*
- Was a responsive layout implemented that adapts to the screen size? If so, what was the rationale for different layouts (e.g., type of device, screen size)? *Yes, we use device agnostic scripting*
- Were there any technical requirements for respondents' devices (e.g., specific mobile phone type) in order to participate? *No, other than needs to be a smartphone for those completing on a phone*
- Were any paradata about the survey data collection process gathered? If yes, by server-side or client-side scripting? *Data captured includes day of interview, start and end times of the interview (used to calculate duration of interview), device used to complete the interview, whether there was a change in device. This data is captured by the survey software. This data is not analysed at a survey level, apart from duration, which is a key quality metric (to*

*exclude speedsters) and which is used to ensure incentive payments have been set at the correct level.*

- Were any additional scripts for special purposes included (e.g., JavaScript)? *No*
- Was it allowed to skip answers or were forced answers implemented? *Respondents must answer all questions. Where appropriate, don't know or prefer not to say response options were provided*
- Were any soft-prompts implemented that inform about incomplete answering and that are ignorable? *Respondents are prompted if they do not answer a question. All questions must be completed, with prefer not to answer options available where appropriate.*
- Was a back-button included? *No*
- Was a progress indicator included? *Yes*
- Were any plausibility and consistency checks implemented? *No – though there is routing through the questionnaire based on prior responses*
- Was there an option to suspend the survey and resume later? *Yes*
- Were any additional configurations applied that are worth mentioning (e.g., time out, automated forwarding)? *No*
- Was any randomization implemented? This applies to the randomized order of answer categories, items, or question blocks. *Many questions would have had lists randomised, or scales shown forwarded/reversed in order to minimize any order biases. Question blocks were not randomised.*

## 3 Data collection

### 3.1 Contact strategy

Up to wave 4

- Panelists received an invitation email with the following information:
  - Survey information (survey number and depending on the study it could include end date, survey duration, and/or number of incentive points)
  - A unique URL that provides access to the questionnaire
  - Physical address for Ipsos
  - Member support email address/link
  - Link to privacy policy
  - Opt-out information

Wave 5-7

- Panelists received one invite per day which is the Survey Digest where they have a button to access surveys. Once they click the button, the system redirects them specific surveys based on quota requirements at the time. Respondents have access to the below information for surveys:
  - Survey information (survey number and depending on the study it could include end date, survey duration, and/or number of incentive points)
  - Physical address for Ipsos
  - Member support email address/link
  - Link to privacy policy
  - Opt-out information

### 3.2 Reminder strategy

Up to Wave 4: An initial invitation, plus up to 2 reminders were sent. From Wave 5, the survey would be available as part of their daily survey digest, depending on quota requirements for this and other surveys.

For Wave 1-4, reminders were to anyone who had not completed the survey at the time of the reminder to encourage participation. First reminders were sent 3-4 days after initial invitation, when fieldwork progress slowed.

### 3.3 Documentation of invitation and reminder letters.

For Wave 1-4, Panelists received an invitation email with the following information:

- Survey information (survey number and depending on the study it could include end date, survey duration, and/or number of incentive points)
- A unique URL that provides access to the questionnaire
- Physical address for Ipsos
- Member support email address/link
- Link to privacy policy
- Opt-out information

### 3.4 Incentives

All Ipsos panelists receive appropriate incentives to participate in their surveys. The incentives vary depending on the country, survey length, and complexity. Ipsos uses a point system to incentivize panelists, along with sweepstakes draws. Points systems are recognized as being the best in class in online market research, as they are seen as a neutral system which does not skew the participation of specific groups of people. From time to time we strengthen the incentive policy by adding prize draws or other incentives.

Incentive points are allocated depending on the questionnaire length. Panelists who don't qualify for a survey (ex. are screened out after the screening questions) receive a small number of points for their willingness to participate. Accumulated points can be redeemed on the dedicated panelists' website for a variety of rewards.

Besides rewards for surveys, panelists also benefit from:

- Real time point allocation for surveys (after a survey is completed by a panelist, the points allocated can immediately be seen in the points balance).
- Monthly newsletters containing articles on different topics, survey results, panel news, prize draw winners, panelists' tips, FAQs.
- A custom-built website allowing panelists to check in real time their points balance, to browse and redeem rewards, to take their available surveys, to update their contact information, to learn more about the panel, and to read our newsletters.
- Access to support (via email and phone).
- Confidentiality.
- Social Networking via Facebook & Twitter allows our panelists to interact amongst themselves and with us. We communicate at least bi-weekly with our followers with status updates, articles, quick polls, contests, and more.
- Loyalty program: panelists are awarded with bonus points every time they have completed a certain number of surveys. The survey count takes place once a month and



different points are allocated according to the number of surveys completed – more points for a higher number of completed surveys.

- Quarterly prize draws: Panelists will earn an entry in this quarterly draw when they complete a sweepstake-based survey. Currently, specific types of projects are included in this category.

Ipsos also utilizes different sample partners and incentives differ from partner to partner. Cash rewards, gifts, points, sweepstakes and in some cases, no incentives are used. Each partner varies in how they increase their offering based on the survey's length or complexity. By using so many different incentives, we minimized the possibility of incentives biasing responsiveness or creating satisficing behaviour.

### 3.5 Informed consent, privacy information

Ipsos used a “double opt-in” process for all panelists. Individuals wishing to join the Ipsos panel first completed the online recruitment survey and accepted the terms and conditions of membership. We informed our panelists that Ipsos agreed to keep all personal information regarding its panelists confidential (their habits, preferences, personal addresses, etc.), and that this information was used only for Ipsos research. Likewise, panelists were requested to adhere to rules regarding the confidentiality of our surveys. Agreement to these terms and conditions provided the first “opt-in” to panel membership.

Once the recruitment questionnaire was completed, panelists received an email and were required to click on a link to confirm they would like to participate in panel membership. This constituted the second “opt-in”.

Upon completion of the recruitment questionnaire, a subsequent series of short profiling questionnaires were made available to panelists so that we may gather additional information like: pet ownership, car ownership, internet usage, household equipment, etc.

Finally, panelists received a welcome note or are redirected on the Panelists' website from where they can start taking surveys. Also they are informed about the dedicated hotline where they can send any queries.

We ensured that it was simple for panelists to opt-out, or unsubscribe, from the panel at any time. Opt-out information was provided at the time of recruitment, on the panel website, and in each email a panelist received from us.

Ipsos flow of router traffic was composed of four main sources: Ad Network, social/gaming, reward, and sample exchanges. Given this blend, we saw both single opt in respondents who were not required to provide or confirm an email address prior to survey taking as well as double opt in respondents who have opted into panels, rewards sites etc. and were managed via those providers

Explicit consent was obtained and recorded at the start of the survey, through selecting an Accept and Continue button, and also checking a Accept radio button. Those not giving consent were not able to complete the survey.

Participants were members of a panel and had opted in to participate in research. Individuals were able to view Ipsos' extensive Privacy Policy at the time of panel registration. As well, the introduction to the survey invitation included a link to the policy and reminds panelists that Ipsos holds all information provided to them in the strictest of confidence. Privacy Policy: <https://social.ipsos.com/static/PrivacyPolicy>

### 3.6 Fieldwork monitoring, fieldwork interventions

- *Fieldwork progress was monitored throughout the life of the project, with the main metrics being:*
  - *Completes per day.*
  - *Interview length*
  - *Incidence (screenouts due to non-qualification)*
  - *Dropouts*
  - *Speedsters/straight liners (removed from data)*
  - *Quota completion*
- *For recontact respondents, an initial invitation and up to 2 reminders are sent.*

## 4 Data processing

### 4.1 Post-collection edits/ quality checks

*The survey was fully tested prior to launch. This test included:*

- *checking the text of questions and that all codes are correctly shown.*
- *ensuring multi-coded questions and single coded questions accepted the correct number of responses.*
- *Routing through the questionnaire based on previous responses.*
- *Only relevant codes are shown dependent on answers to previous questions if this is specified in the questionnaire.*

*Speedsters and straightliners are excluded from the data. Other respondents are accepted as having answered accurately and honestly.*

*Key checks on the data include ensuring the data provided in the SPSS matches the raw data.*

### 4.2 Generated/ derived variables

*The following variables are derived in the data:*

- *social grade, which is derived from main income earner occupation.*
- *IMD score – derived from postcode*
- *Q43\_dp job – derived from UK01OCCR (respondent occupation)*
- *NS SEC – individual social class derived from UK01OCCR (respondent occupation), self-employment status (q40, q41a, q45, q46a), number of employees at the workplace (q41b, q46b) and supervisory responsibilities if employed (q42, q47).*
- *Career adaptability score as a row mean over career concerns (qc10\_1- qc10\_3), career control (qc10\_4- qc10\_6), career curiosity (qc10\_7- qc10\_9), and career confidence (qc10\_10- qc10\_12)*
- *Big 5 extraversion, agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness from qc11\_\**
- *qc1b\_\* items include information from the corresponding qc1c\_\* items*
- *Hopkins Symptom Checklist score (HSCL-5) derived as row mean and row total over q33\_\**
- *Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (SWEMWBS) from q31b\_\* instrument using coding instructions at [The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale \(WEMWBS\)](#). Indicator for probable depression*
- *Short general self-efficacy scale (GSE-6) from q33\_\**

- Where appropriate baseline information were forwarded across waves in the longitudinal file

#### 4.3 Post-hoc output harmonization, if applicable

#### 4.4 Weighting

The data are weighted using a RIM weighting procedure. The weighting profile set matches the quotas set, and is used to correct for any under- or overachievement of quotas.

The source for weighting data was PAMCo 3 2020 (Jun '19 - Jul '20). Weighting targets set were as follows:

	TOTAL 100.00%	Male	Female
16-20	49.1%	25.5%	23.6%
21-25	50.9%	26.2%	24.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>48.3%</b>
North East	4.0%		
North West	11.4%		
Yorkshire and the Humber	9.0%		
West Midlands	9.3%		
East Midlands	7.6%		
East of England	7.6%		
South West	7.9%		
South East	13.7%		
London	13.9%		
Wales	4.5%		
Scotland	8.2%		
Northern Ireland	2.9%		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		
Working	46.3%		
Not working	53.8%		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		

Weighting efficiencies achieved are:

Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave6	Extension
98%	95.8%	98.1%	99%	95.7%	96.9%	

#### 4.5 Anonymization

The data are fully anonymised. The dataset includes a linking serial number so respondent data can be linked from wave to wave, however there is no personally identifiable information included in the data.