Discovery

CHILDWISE

Ofcom

Children's Online Safety Tracker (COST) Wave 2 – Technical Report

To accompany the COST Wave 2 data tables

Prepared by:

Discovery Research / CHILDWISE
25 Gloucester Place
London
W1U 8HT

Contents

Preface

The Children's Online Safety Tracker (COST) survey is run by Discovery Research Ltd. / Childwise Research Ltd. on behalf of Ofcom. The objectives of this quantitative tracking study were to gain a deeper understanding of UK children aged 8-17's recalled experiences of content that is harmful to them and their use of safety measures over time.

The research will be used to inform Ofcom's continued policy work under the Online Safety Act, and for use by external stakeholders as a published source of information.

This report gives technical information about the data collection at Wave 2 of the COST. Detailed information is provided for the data collected via the online panel – this data is the basis for the published data tables for Wave 2.

Summary of approach to Wave 2 survey

Respondents

- UK children aged 8 to 17.

Content of survey

- *Core and wellbeing (asked to ALL)* – demographics, overall happiness/satisfaction in life, happiness in online situations, safety online, apps used in the last four weeks, and time online.
- *Module 1: Safety measures (asked to approximately three quarters of the sample)* – On apps used in the last four weeks: setting up accounts / profiles, use of terms and conditions, participation in group chats, posting content, disabling comments, blocking and muting, reporting and complaining.
- *Module 2 – Online harms encountered (asked to approximately a quarter of the sample)* – Online harms seen in the last four weeks or six months, how seeing these made them feel, where they saw these harms, what they were doing when they saw them, what action they took, and what action the service took.

Method

An online panel of adults was used to reach parents and recruit their children if aged 8 to 17.

Interviews

- 3,387 interviews were carried out via the online panel, 1,735 completing Module 1 (aged 8-17) and 1,652 Module 2 (aged 11-17, of secondary school age only)

Fieldwork dates

- Online panel fieldwork was conducted between 18th November and 21st December 2025.

Wave 2 survey Technical Report

Discovery Research Ltd. interviewed a sample of 3,387 UK children aged 8 to 17. Interviews were carried out across the UK and all interviews were carried out between 18th November to 21st December 2025.

Details of the research methodology, consent process, sample design, data integrity checks and weighting procedures for this study are outlined in the following pages.

A note on statistical reliability is also included.

Trend reporting

From Wave 2 onwards, it is possible to make comparisons between data collected at different waves, to draw conclusions about changes over time, particularly in terms of any changes in results since the Online Safety Act coming into force in July 2025.

To enable Wave 1 vs. Wave 2 comparisons to be made, we have filtered out 27 cases at Wave 2 where participants only saw a Non Designated Content (NDC) harm, and therefore had not seen any other harms (questions on NDC harms were added at Wave 2). For Wave 1 vs. Wave 2 comparisons, we have also removed responses from 1284 participants who were asked about any NDC harms, from the harms explored in the deep dive section of the survey, however these responses were retained for stand-alone Wave 2 reporting,

Methodology – a hybrid approach

This study was designed from the outset to follow a hybrid methodology - combining children's participation via an online panel provider (recruited through parents) and in-school settings (with parental consent).

The online sample was achieved as expected, using a range of online panels to reach parents and recruit their children aged 8-17. These included STRAT7's proprietary panel, SurveyBods, as well additional partner panels, CINT, Mainframe, Pure Profile and Toluna, in order to achieve the most challenging quotas (namely Northern Ireland and Wales).
However, at Waves 1 and 2, the in-school element was instead conducted as a large-scale pilot to test the feasibility of recruiting and interviewing children within a school environment, specifically testing the parental opt-in consent process, and address any potential issues ahead of the full rollout.

As a pilot study, the in-school sample is not representative of children across the UK. For example, despite having schools recruited in all regions, at Wave 2 we had 10 participating primary schools in England, and 1 in Wales, with no participating schools from Scotland or Northern Ireland. The small sample size not only reflects challenges schools encountered when trying to obtain sufficient levels of parental opt-in consent,

but also the nature of research in schools - each school represents 25-30 potential students, and participation/non-participation can have a significant effect on the balance of the sample achieved. We had marginally more Year 4 schools recruited to take part (in our experience it is more challenging to recruit schools for this year group, so extra effort went into recruitment), and proportionally more of these took part compared to Year 5 and 6 schools. As a result, the in-school sample is skewed towards Year 4 children, who account for more than half of all interviews. The participating school in Wales submitted responses from three different year groups, despite only being asked for one. By region, we achieved a reasonable spread across England, although the sample is slightly weighted towards the South East (excluding London).

As a consequence, the main Wave2 data reported here are based solely on the online panel.

Please note, data from the in-school pilot is not included in the published Wave 1 tables, and is only published for Wave 2 for primary schools, in order to provide limited data on Module 2 at a primary school level. The published primary school results should be treated as indicative.

Going forwards, two waves of research will be carried out each school year from Wave 2 onwards (Autumn / Spring).

Interviewing children and obtaining consent

- Prior to data collection, informed opt-in consent was obtained from parents or legal guardians via the online survey, and from children themselves within the survey.
- Additional consent was obtained from parents or legal guardians for the provision of sensitive data – ethnicity and health conditions for all ages, and sexual orientation, specifically for those aged 13+. Children were then asked for their own informed consent for these questions (if appropriate) during the survey.

Sample design

The survey was conducted online and was scripted and hosted by panel provider STRAT7. Members of STRAT7's proprietary online panel (SurveyBods) and panel partners (CINT, Mainframe, Pure Profile and Toluna) were invited via email to take part. All panellists are aged 18+ and were approached to identify those with children aged between 8-17, who were then invited to take part in the interview. The sample of children was stratified by UK nation / region, gender, age and socio-economic group.

Age groups of children

Age groups used in the data tables are split into four bands – 8-9s, 10-12s, 13-15s, and 16-17s; plus two broader age bands – 8-12 and 13+ to represent pre-teen and teenage groups. This is to align with Ofcom's ages and developmental stages for online safety work.

Data integrity checks

A number of important data quality/integrity checks were conducted by the STRAT7 Quality team, to ensure the data collected was of bona fide panel respondents, and of the highest possible quality.

.

Detailed quality checks

Quality check	Supporting information
RECAPTCHA	Google API RECAPTCHA to help screen out bots.
Digital Fingerprinting	A 3rd party piece of software that happens via a 5 second API call, unbeknown to respondents that checks 100+ unique parameters at a device level; this will create an average fraud and duplicate score per respondent.
Fraudulent	Identifying and flagging bots and AI on more than 10 different parameters.
Flatlining	Respondents completing grids with no variation in responses (standard deviation = 0) or little variation in responses (standard deviation <0.5) were recorded and shared with the Discovery Research team for review.
Speeder	Respondents completing the survey in under half the median completion time minus one minute were flagged for review.
Poor verbatim	• All open-ended questions to be checked • Disable copy/paste function on open-ended questions • Any gibberish, N/A, none, don't know, DK, etc. as well as irrelevant answers to the questions • Flag as `Poor verbatim DK` if a respondent answers only with none, don't know, dk, etc
Multicodes	Question C21_1 / C21_2 – flag if 6 or more items selected, and check data.
Plausibility	• Cross reference question responses that could lead to contradictory or implausible scenarios within the data set. This is contextual, and taken into account against the other checks. • D2 vs D4 - check if possible to have children at that age • M1Q23 - if selects both *'They took it down' and 'They left it online'* (codes 1 and 2) or *'They took it down'* and *'They told me there was nothing wrong with it'* (codes 1 and 7)
Honey pot	A question overlaid onto the screen, invisible to the human eye. Should any participants provide an answer here it means we can satisfactorily assume they're a bot, as only automated software would be able to detect the question/answer field. Will be flagged automatically in the survey and removed. • qName – if there is any data in this variable it's a bot • Qstars - If it is the wrong answer, then it's a bot • PressAndHold - Used to confirm a respondent is human by requiring a longer press to interact
Duplicate	Identifies and flags duplicate responses which are bots and AI by applying 80+ different parameters for the check.

How to interpret the data

For full details on how to interpret the data, please refer to the tab labelled 'info on specific data tables' in the data tables file.

Weighting

The data are weighted to the profile of age and gender, SEG profile, and region / nation for all children aged 8-17 based on the available ONS Mid-Year Estimates 2023[1] data and the NRS survey[2].[3] The following table shows the initial unweighted and weighted sample profile for the final sample, with a weighting efficiency of 89.5% (which is within our threshold for statistical reliability of 70%+). NB: for weighting purposes the data, demographic weights were applied separately to each module, but weighting efficiency calculated on the weighted sample as a whole.

Sub-group	Module 1		Module 2	
	Interviews unweighted	Interviews weighted	Interviews unweighted	Interviews weighted
Boys aged 8-9	9%	10%	0%	0%
Girls aged 8-9	9%	10%	0%	0%
Boys aged 10-12	16%	16%	13%	15%
Girls aged 10-12	16%	15%	10%	14%
Boys aged 13-15	15%	16%	23%	22%
Girls aged 13-15	14%	15%	22%	21%
Boys aged 16-17	11%	10%	16%	14%
Girls aged 16-17	11%	9%	16%	13%
Identify in another way	0%	-	0%	-
SEG - AB	32%	28%	32%	28%
SEG - C1	23%	26%	22%	26%
SEG - C2	20%	22%	22%	22%
SEG - DE	26%	24%	24%	24%
SEG - Other	0%	-	0%	-

[1] ONS Mid-Year Estimates 2023, https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland

[2] National Readership Survey (figures sourced from Children's Online Knowledge and Understanding Study (COKU), 2024 https://www.ofcom.org.uk/siteassets/resources/documents/research-and-data/data/statistics/2025/childrens-media-literacy-tracker-2024/technical-report.pdf?v=390153

[3] Fieldwork was conducted using an online sample and focuses on children's online experiences. Data are weighted to match population proportions for all UK children, including those who are not online. As a result, the weighted sample may not exactly mirror the demographic profile of online children alone; however, this approach ensures representation across the full range of children in the UK population, including groups who may be less likely to be online.

East of England	8%	9%	9%	9%
East Midlands	7%	7%	7%	7%
Greater London	13%	13%	13%	13%
North East	5%	4%	6%	4%
North West	12%	11%	12%	11%
Northern Ireland	3%	3%	3%	3%
Scotland	7%	8%	6%	8%
South East	14%	14%	13%	14%
South West	7%	9%	8%	9%
Wales	5%	5%	6%	5%
West Midlands	10%	9%	9%	9%
Yorkshire and the Humber	8%	8%	8%	8%

Ensuring a robust sample across online harmful content experienced

Module 2 of the survey questionnaire included a 'least-fill quota' based on the online harmful content experienced at question M2Q2 ('Have you seen or heard any of the below online in the last 4 weeks? This could have been a video, picture, written post, a comment or something you have heard']. Respondents were then routed to the follow up questions M2Q6 to M2Q14 for the online harm they had experienced[4] with the lowest number of completed interviews at that point. This was to ensure that we maximised the achieved sample size for each harmful content experienced for these subsequent questions. However, this led to an unrepresentative distribution of respondents asked about each online harm in detail which needs to be addressed, to ensure the data is as representative as possible of the population.

Although question M2Q2 provides a representative measurement of the prevalence of each online harm experienced, the least-fill allocation (applied to ensure as robust a sample size across the different individual harms) creates a distorted distribution of online harms asked about in the later questions: M2Q6 to M2Q14.

This distortion is further compounded by an uneven number of specific harms within each harm group. For example, the code *'pornography'* (from M2Q2 Block 6) gets equal weighting in the least-fill allocation as *'people being hateful to others'* (from M2Q2 Block 5b), which is based on nine individual harms. Whilst results at questions M2Q6 to M2Q14 are accurate for analysis in isolation, any analysis undertaken on these questions for individual online harms combined will therefore be skewed, based on the least-fill allocation.

Our solution to this imbalance is an additional layer of data weighting, which is only applied to data for questions M2Q6 to M2Q14. These weights reflect the true distribution of each of the online harms recorded at M2Q2, and thus correct the skew created by the least-fill allocation. (NB: at each subsequent wave of research these

[4] Questions included: where the specific harm was seen, what the child was doing on app/service when experienced this harm, any actions then taken by the child, response from the app/service (if reported), and whether happy with response

additional weights will be updated, to reflect the proportion of online harms recorded at M2Q2 at that point in time).

The table in Annex A shows the initial unweighted and weighted sample distribution for online harms questions M2Q6 to M2Q14.

As a consequence of this additional stage of data weighting applied to the data at questions M2Q6 to M2Q14, the weighting efficiency for these data for the full sample is 97.79%, and for the adjusted sample (to enable wave on wave comparisons) is 92.59%, which are within our thresholds for statistical reliability.

Guide to statistical reliability

The variation between the sample results and the 'true' values (the findings that would have been obtained if everyone had been interviewed) can be predicted from the sample sizes on which the results are based, and on the number of times that a particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is calculated at the standard 95% confidence level - this means that the chances are 95 in 100 that the 'true' values will fall within a specified range (the confidence interval). However, as the sample is weighted, we need to use the effective sample size (ESS) rather than actual sample size to judge the accuracy of results.

The following table compares actual samples and ESS for selected analysis groups within the full Wave 2 sample, and within the Wave 2 sample adjusted to be comparable with Wave 1 data (removing those who only saw NDC harms):

Analysis group	**Full sample**		**Adjusted sample**	
	Sample size	**ESS**	**Sample size**	**ESS**
Total sample	3387	3234	3360	3209
Module 1	1735	1670	1735	1670
Module 2	1652	1565	1625	1539
Gender - Male	1720	1655	1712	1647
Gender - Female	1664	1576	1645	1559
School stage - Primary	620	597	620	597
School stage - Secondary	2767	2638	2740	2612
Pre teen age 8-12	1235	1180	1230	1176
Teen age 13-17	2152	2075	2130	2054
Age 8-9s	300	292	300	292
Age 10-12s	935	888	930	883
Age 13-15s	1236	1200	1223	1187
Age 16-17s	916	891	907	882
Male 8-9s	148	144	148	144
Female 8-9s	152	148	152	148
Male 10-12s	485	467	483	465
Female 10-12s	450	421	447	419
Male 13-15s	629	610	626	607
Female 13-15s	605	588	595	578
Male 16-17s	458	447	455	444
Female 16-17s	457	444	451	438
Nation – England	2854	2731	2831	2709
Nation – Scotland	232	222	231	221
Nation – Wales	187	182	184	179
Nation – Northern Ireland	114	109	114	109

Full Wave 2 data

The tables below show statistical reliability for the full Wave 2 data (ESS=3234).

The table below illustrates the confidence limits for different sample sizes and percentage results at the 95% confidence level, for selected analysis groups within the main sample:

Effective sample size	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/1	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
Total (3234)	1.0%	1.4%	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Module 1 (1670)	1.4%	1.9%	2.2%	2.3%	2.4%
Module 2 (1565)	1.5%	2.0%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%
Males (1655)	1.4%	1.9%	2.2%	2.4%	2.4%
Females (1576)	1.5%	2.0%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%
Age 8-9s (292)	3.4%	4.6%	5.3%	5.6%	5.7%
Age 10-12s (888)	2.0%	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%	3.3%
Age 13-15s (1200)	1.7%	2.3%	2.6%	2.8%	2.8%
Age 16-17s (891)	2.0%	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%	3.3%

For example, if 30% or 70% of a sample of 3234 gives a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the 'true' value will fall within the range of +/-1.6 percentage points from the sample results.
When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be 'real', or it may occur by chance (because not everyone has been interviewed). We use a two-tailed z-test of proportions, in order to test if the difference is a real one – i.e. if it is 'statistically significant'. We again have to know the size of the samples, the percentages giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume a 95% confidence level, the difference between two sample results must be greater than the values given in the table below to be significant:
Some example differences required for significance at or near these percentages are shown in the table below:

Effective sample size	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
1655 vs. 1576 (Boys vs. girls)	2.1%	2.8%	3.2%	3.4%	3.5%
597 vs. 2638 (Primary vs. secondary)	2.7%	3.6%	4.1%	4.4%	4.4%
888 vs. 1200 (10-12s vs. 13-15s)	2.6%	3.5%	4.0%	4.3%	4.3%
610 vs. 588	3.4%	4.5%	5.2%	5.6%	5.7%

(Boys 13-15 vs. girls 13-15)					

In the tables, Z-tests of proportions are conducted both between relevant, distinct subgroups (e.g. males vs females), and between subgroups and the overall total. Comparisons between distinct, non-overlapping subgroups can be interpreted in the way described above. Comparisons between subgroups and the overall total should be treated as indicative, as subgroups contribute to the overall percentage. Larger subgroups contribute more to the overall percentage and are therefore less likely to appear statistically different from the total.

Adjusted Wave 2 data

The tables below show statistical reliability for the Wave 2 data adjusted to enable comparisons with Wave 1 data (ESS=3209).

The table below illustrates the confidence limits for different sample sizes and percentage results at the 95% confidence level, for selected analysis groups within the main sample:

Effective sample size	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
Total (3209)	1.0%	1.4%	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Module 1 (1670)	1.4%	1.9%	2.2%	2.4%	2.4%
Module 2 (1539)	1.5%	2.0%	2.3%	2.5%	2.5%
Males (1647)	1.5%	1.9%	2.2%	2.4%	2.4%
Females (1559)	1.5%	2.0%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%
Age 8-9s (292)	3.4%	4.6%	5.3%	5.6%	5.7%
Age 10-12s (883)	2.0%	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%	3.3%
Age 13-15s (1187)	1.7%	2.3%	2.6%	2.8%	2.8%
Age 16-17s (882)	2.0%	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%	3.3%

For example, if 30% or 70% of a sample of 3209 gives a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the 'true' value will fall within the range of +/-1.6 percentage points from the sample results.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. As described above, the difference may be 'real', or it may occur by chance (because not everyone has been interviewed), with significance testing thus applied to identify of the differences between two sample results are 'real' or not

Some example differences required for significance at or near these percentages are shown in the table below:

Effective sample size	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
1647 vs. 1559 (Boys vs. girls)	2.1%	2.8%	3.2%	3.4%	3.5%
597 vs. 2612 (Primary vs. secondary)	2.7%	3.6%	4.1%	4.4%	4.5%
883 vs. 1187 (10-12s vs. 13-15s)	2.6%	3.5%	4.0%	4.3%	4.4%
607 vs. 578 (Boys 13-15 vs. girls 13-15)	3.4%	4.6%	5.2%	5.6%	5.7%

At Wave 2 we can begin to compare data across waves. Some example differences required for significance at or near these percentages are shown in the table below for Wave 1 vs. Wave 2 samples.

Effective sample size (Wave 1 vs. Wave 2)	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
2590 vs. 3209 (Total)	1.6%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%	2.6%
1407 vs. 1670 (Module 1)	2.1%	2.8%	3.3%	3.5%	3.6%
1186 vs. 1539 (Module 2)	2.3%	3.0%	3.5%	3.7%	3.8%
1331 vs. 1647 (Males)	2.2%	2.9%	3.3%	3.5%	3.6%
1252 vs. 1559 (Females)	2.2%	3.0%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%
382 vs. 292 (Age 8-9s)	4.6%	6.1%	7.0%	7.5%	7.6%
751 vs. 883 (Age 10-12s)	2.9%	3.9%	4.5%	4.8%	4.9%
808 vs. 1187 (Age 13-15s)	2.7%	3.6%	4.1%	4.4%	4.5%
723 vs. 882 (Age 16-17s)	3.0%	3.9%	4.5%	4.8%	4.9%

Annex A

Least-fill weightings - Full Wave 2 data

The table below shows the initial unweighted and weighted sample distribution for online harms questions M2Q6 to M2Q14, for the full sample.

		N. responses (at specific harm level) - take from Table 103: M2Q2. Seen/heard any inappropriate content that was upsetting/scary/uncomfortable in last 4 weeks: APP/SITE SUMMARY (MULTI-CODE)	N responses (by harm block net) - take from M2Q2 tables for individual blocks (Net - any selected)	Block relative influence	Within block influence	Total required distribution (what we want)	Least fill allocation (what we achieved) - Table 100: Summary table of least fill numbers for each content type shown at M2Q2		Additional weights
Block 1	Bullying online	508	807	14.4%	44.9%	6.4%	5.3%		1.21
	Online trolling	624			55.1%	7.9%	5.5%		1.43
Block 2a	Someone being seriously violent	300	411	7.3%	59.4%	4.3%	5.0%		0.88
	A person's serious injuries	205			40.6%	3.0%	4.8%		0.62
Block 2b	Real animals being seriously hurt	194	349	6.2%	48.1%	3.0%	5.0%		0.60
	Animals who aren't real being seriously hurt	209			51.9%	3.2%	4.8%		0.67
Block 3	Dangerous stunts or challenges	486	486	8.6%	100.0%	8.6%	5.4%		1.59
Block 4	People encouraging others to eat, drink or inhale harmful things	282	432	7.7%	55.4%	4.3%	5.1%		0.84
	People encouraging others to eat, drink or inhale things in large amounts	227			44.6%	3.4%	4.9%		0.70
Block 5b	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Girls / Women	255	801	14.3%	12.5%	1.8%	0.8%		2.11
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Boys / Men	199			9.7%	1.4%	0.4%		3.70
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Non-binary people	112			5.5%	0.8%	0.1%		8.34
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Queer, gay, lesbian, bisex	259			12.7%	1.8%	1.0%		1.75
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Transgender people	261			12.8%	1.8%	0.5%		3.89
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards People who are part of a	253			12.4%	1.8%	0.4%		4.71
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards People of a certain ethnic	307			15.0%	2.1%	1.0%		2.08
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Disabled people	217			10.6%	1.5%	0.5%		3.23
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Neurodiverse people	182			8.9%	1.3%	0.5%		2.71
Block 5c	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Girls / Women	131	507	9.0%	12.7%	1.1%	0.3%		4.09
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Boys / Men	126			12.2%	1.1%	0.6%		1.97
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Non-binary people	60			5.8%	0.5%	0.3%		1.87
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Queer, gay, lesbian, bisexual or panse	130			12.6%	1.1%	1.0%		1.11
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Transgender people	129			12.5%	1.1%	0.4%		3.02
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to People who are part of a particular reli	136			13.2%	1.2%	0.3%		4.25
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to People of a certain ethnicity	149			14.5%	1.3%	0.8%		1.55
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Disabled people	94			9.1%	0.8%	0.4%		2.20
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Neurodiverse people	74			7.2%	0.6%	0.4%		1.73
Block 6	Pornography	196	196	3.5%	100.0%	3.5%	4.8%		0.73
Block 7	Showing someone with an eating disorder	189	312	5.6%	43.0%	2.4%	4.9%		0.49
	Extreme eating or extreme exercise behaviours	251			57.0%	3.2%	5.1%		0.62
Block 8	Suicide (taking one's own life): people showing this, giving instructions for this, or e	101	238	4.2%	34.5%	1.5%	4.8%		0.31
	Self-harm	192			65.5%	2.8%	5.0%		0.56
Block 9	Things that make it seem cool to feel really low or depressed	269	397	7.1%	59.8%	4.2%	5.1%		0.84
	Things that say you shouldn't ask for help if you feel really low or depressed	181			40.2%	2.8%	5.0%		0.57
Block 10	Things that make others feel bad or ashamed about their bodies and how they look	418	683	12.2%	50.1%	6.1%	5.1%		1.20
	Things that encourage others to have a certain body type or to keep checking their body shape in the mirror	416			49.9%	6.1%	5.1%		1.18

Least-fill weightings - Adjusted Wave 2 data

The table below shows the initial unweighted and weighted sample distribution for online harms questions M2Q6 to M2Q14, for the sample adjusted to enable wave on wave comparisons.

		N. responses (at specific harm level) - take from Table 103: M2Q2. Seen/heard any inappropriate content that was upsetting/scary/uncomfortable in last 4 weeks: APP/SITE SUMMARY (MULTI-CODE)	N responses (by harm block net) - take from M2Q2 tables for individual blocks (Net - any selected)	Block relative influence	Within block influence	Total required distribution (what we want)	Least fill allocation (what we achieved) - Table 100: Summary table of least fill numbers for each content type shown at M2Q2		Additional weights
Block 1	Bullying online	508	807	17.8%	44.9%	**8.0%**	6.7%		1.19
	Online trolling	624			55.1%	**9.8%**	6.9%		1.42
Block 2a	Someone being seriously violent	300	411	9.1%	59.4%	**5.4%**	6.2%		0.86
	A person's serious injuries	205			40.6%	**3.7%**	6.0%		0.61
Block 2b	Real animals being seriously hurt	194	349	7.7%	48.1%	**3.7%**	6.2%		0.60
	Animals who aren't real being seriously hurt	209			51.9%	**4.0%**	6.0%		0.67
Block 3	Dangerous stunts or challenges	486	486	10.7%	100.0%	**10.7%**	6.8%		1.57
Block 4	People encouraging others to eat, drink or inhale harmful things	282	432	9.5%	55.4%	**5.3%**	6.3%		0.83
	People encouraging others to eat, drink or inhale things in large amounts	227			44.6%	**4.2%**	6.1%		0.70
Block 5b	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Girls / Women	255	801	17.6%	12.5%	**2.2%**	1.1%		2.08
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Boys / Men	199			9.7%	**1.7%**	0.5%		3.66
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Non-binary people	112			5.5%	**1.0%**	0.1%		8.23
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Queer, gay, lesbian, bisex	259			12.7%	**2.2%**	1.3%		1.73
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Transgender people	261			12.8%	**2.3%**	0.6%		3.84
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards People who are part of a	253			12.4%	**2.2%**	0.5%		4.65
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards People of a certain ethnic	307			15.0%	**2.6%**	1.3%		2.05
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Disabled people	217			10.6%	**1.9%**	0.6%		3.19
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Neurodiverse people	182			8.9%	**1.6%**	0.6%		2.68
Block 5c	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Girls / Women	131	507	11.2%	12.7%	**1.4%**	0.4%		4.04
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Boys / Men	126			12.2%	**1.4%**	0.7%		1.94
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Non-binary people	60			5.8%	**0.7%**	0.4%		1.85
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Queer, gay, lesbian, bisexual or panse	130			12.6%	**1.4%**	1.3%		1.09
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Transgender people	129			12.5%	**1.4%**	0.5%		2.98
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to People who are part of a particular reli	136			13.2%	**1.5%**	0.4%		4.19
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to People of a certain ethnicity	149			14.5%	**1.6%**	1.1%		1.53
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Disabled people	94			9.1%	**1.0%**	0.5%		2.17
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Neurodiverse people	74			7.2%	**0.8%**	0.5%		1.71
Block 6	Pornography	196	196	4.3%	100.0%	**4.3%**	6.0%		0.72
Block 7	Showing someone with an eating disorder	189	312	6.9%	43.0%	**3.0%**	6.1%		0.48
	Extreme eating or extreme exercise behaviours	251			57.0%	**3.9%**	6.5%		0.61
Block 8	Suicide (taking one's own life): people showing this, giving instructions for this, or e	101	238	5.2%	34.5%	**1.8%**	6.0%		0.30
	Self-harm	192			65.5%	**3.4%**	6.2%		0.55
~~Block 9~~	~~Things that make it seem cool to feel really low or depressed~~			~~0.0%~~	~~#DIV/0!~~	~~#DIV/0!~~	~~0.0%~~		~~#DIV/0!~~
	~~Things that say you shouldn't ask for help if you feel really low or depressed~~				~~#DIV/0!~~	~~#DIV/0!~~	~~0.0%~~		~~#DIV/0!~~
~~Block 10~~	~~Things that make others feel bad or ashamed about their bodies and how they look~~			~~0.0%~~	~~#DIV/0!~~	~~#DIV/0!~~	~~0.0%~~		~~#DIV/0!~~
	~~Things that encourage others to have a certain body type or to keep checking their body shape in the mirror~~				~~#DIV/0!~~	~~#DIV/0!~~	~~0.0%~~		~~#DIV/0!~~