

Discovery CHILDWISE



Children's Online Safety Tracker (COST) Wave 3 – Technical Report

To accompany the COST Wave 3 data tables

Prepared by:

**Discovery Research / CHILDWISE
25 Gloucester Place
London
W1U 8HT**

Contents

Preface	2
Summary of approach to Wave 3 survey	3
<i>Respondents</i>	3
<i>Content of survey</i>	3
<i>Method</i>	3
<i>Interviews</i>	3
<i>Fieldwork dates</i>	3
 Wave 3 survey Technical Report	 5
<i>Trend reporting</i>	5
<i>Methodology – a hybrid approach</i>	5
<i>Interviewing children and obtaining consent</i>	6
<i>Sample design</i>	6
<i>Age groups of children</i>	7
<i>Data integrity checks</i>	7
<i>How to interpret the data</i>	9
<i>Weighting</i>	9
<i>Guide to statistical reliability</i>	12
 Annex A	 17
<i>Least-fill weightings - Full Wave 3 data</i>	17

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 3 of the COST. Detailed information is provided for the data collected via the online panel and via schools – this data is the basis for the published data tables for Wave 3.

Summary of approach to Wave 3 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 half 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 half 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.
- The Childwise **schools panel** was used to reach teachers at schools and recruit children aged 8 to 11 to take part in the research¹.

Interviews

- 2,600 interviews were carried out via the **online panel**, 1,735 completing Module 1 (aged 8-17) and 865 Module 2 (aged 11-17, of secondary school age only)
- 883 interviews were carried out via **schools**² with primary aged children (8 to 11 year olds), all of whom completed Module 2, to ensure a safeguarded environment for primary aged children to answer questions about online harms.

Fieldwork dates

- Two waves of research are carried out each school year, one in the autumn, and one in the spring.

¹ Data was also collected from children in secondary schools aged 11-17 as part of an ongoing pilot. Data met the sampling requirements for this to be considered representative and analysable, therefore we plan to continue collecting data in this way going forward.

² 1363 total interviews with 8-17 year olds in schools, 883 in primary schools (aged 8-11), 480 in secondary schools and sixth forms (aged 11-17).

- **Wave 3 online panel** fieldwork was conducted between 30th March and 29th April 2026.
- **Wave 3 schools** fieldwork was conducted between 3rd March and 24th April 2026.

Wave 3 survey Technical Report

The core focus of this report is a sample of 2,600 UK children aged 8 to 17 interviewed via an online panel by Discovery Research Ltd. These interviews were carried out across the UK between 30th March to 29th April 2026.

883 interviews were also carried out with 8 to 11 year olds in schools via the Childwise schools panel, between 3rd March to 24th April 2026. These were required to ensure a safeguarded environment for primary aged children to answer questions about online harms. Data for this sample is tabulated separately from the core data.

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 has been 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 came into force in July 2025.

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 (n=1266 sample), as well additional partner panel CINT (n=1,334 sample).

At Wave 3, following a change in the legal basis for collecting and processing data for this project to 'public task' (more detail in 'Interviewing children and obtaining consent' below), we were able to increase the number and representation of children taking part by using opt-out parental consent (opposed to opt-in consent at Waves 1 and 2). This means that the in-school element of the research at Wave 3 is no longer a pilot.

However, the main Wave 3 data reported on is based solely on the online panel, although data tabulations for school data are provided (as a separate set of data tabulations) to give data on Module 2 at a primary school level.

Interviewing children and obtaining consent

Online sample

- 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.

Schools sample

- The legal basis for collecting and processing data for this project from Wave 3 onwards is ‘public task’, meaning that it is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest.
- This change was required to increase the number and representation of children taking part, as research feeds into reports that Ofcom is legally required to prepare under the Online Safety Act.
- This means that it has been possible to use parental **opt-out** consent from Wave 3 onwards, and we no longer require explicit parental consent for processing special category data, as this will be processed on the legal basis of substantial public interest.
- Informed opt-in consent was then obtained from children themselves within the survey, along with consent for questions relating to special category data.

Sample design

The survey was conducted online and was scripted and hosted by panel provider STRAT7.

Online sample

Members of STRAT7’s proprietary online panel (SurveyBods) and panel partner CINT 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.

Schools sample

Schools from the Childwise schools panel were invited via email to take part. The sample of schools was stratified by UK nation / region, and school year. Loose quotas were applied to achieve approximately 80% of schools from urban / suburban areas, and 50% of schools from areas of high deprivation (deciles 1 to 5 of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation). Each school was asked to provide 25-30 pupils (approximately one class) with an even split of boys and girls, to take part in the survey.

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

Online sample

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

Schools sample

- As schools data was collected from a verifiable source, and was carried out in a supervised, regulated and safeguarded environment, these tests were not included for schools data.
- Tests such as RECAPTCHA questions and IP checking were specifically not included as pilot studies identified that these had the potential to cause issues with access to the survey in schools.
- There are also no areas in the schools survey where flatlining tests can be carried out.
- Schools data was checked to ensure it was conducted within reasonable school hours including before and after school clubs (8am to 5.30pm weekdays), single responses submitted ahead of time were removed (teacher survey tests), and general data quality checks were carried out during safeguarding checks on open response questions.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 '<i>They took it down</i>' and '<i>They left it online</i>' (codes 1 and 2) or '<i>They took it down</i>' and '<i>They told me there was nothing wrong with it</i>' (codes 1 and 7)
Honey pot	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Online sample

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 2024³ data and the NRS survey⁴.⁵ The following table shows the initial unweighted and weighted sample profile for the final sample, with a weighting efficiency of 97.71% (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	7%	10%	0%	0%
Boys aged 10-12	16%	15%	11%	15%
Girls aged 10-12	15%	15%	9%	14%
Boys aged 13-15	15%	16%	24%	22%
Girls aged 13-15	14%	15%	21%	21%
Boys aged 16-17	11%	10%	19%	15%
Girls aged 16-17	12%	10%	17%	14%
Identify in another way	0%	-	0%	-
SEG - AB	33%	28%	41%	28%
SEG - C1	24%	26%	21%	26%
SEG - C2	18%	22%	15%	22%
SEG - DE	25%	24%	23%	24%
SEG - Other	0%	-	0%	-

³ ONS Mid-Year Estimates 2024,

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland>

⁴ 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>

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

Schools sample

Schools data is by nature of the collection process less granular than data collected via the online panel (e.g multiple responses per school from within one school year), which makes it difficult to get the same level of regional representation that we do for the online sample. For this reason, schools data was not weighted.

Sub-group	Module 2
	Interviews unweighted
Boys aged 8-9	21%
Girls aged 8-9	19%
Boys aged 10-11	28%
Girls aged 10-11	28%
Identify in another way	4%
East of England	17%
East Midlands	9%
Greater London	13%
North East	3%
North West	0%
Northern Ireland	8%
Scotland	4%
South East	27%
South West	6%
Wales	3%
West Midlands	4%
Yorkshire and the Humber	6%

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 experienced⁶ 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 a robust 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 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 is 95.74%, which are within our thresholds for statistical reliability.

⁶ 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

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).

Online sample

As the online 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 3 sample:

Analysis group	Full sample	
	Sample size	ESS
Total sample	2600	2357
Module 1	1735	1665
Module 2	865	705
Gender - Male	1363	1246
Gender - Female	1233	1109
School stage - Primary	613	585
School stage - Secondary	1987	1772
Pre teen age 8-12	994	903
Teen age 13-17	1606	1476
Age 8-9s	288	276
Age 10-12s	706	626
Age 13-15s	901	835
Age 16-17s	705	652
Male 8-9s	162	157
Female 8-9s	126	122
Male 10-12s	372	333
Female 10-12s	334	295
Male 13-15s	476	440
Female 13-15s	423	393
Male 16-17s	353	326
Female 16-17s	350	325
Nation – England	2162	1967
Nation – Scotland	186	174
Nation – Wales	131	120
Nation – Northern Ireland	121	112

Full Wave 3 data

The tables below show statistical reliability for the full Wave 2 data (ESS=2357).

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 (2357)	1.2%	1.6%	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Module 1 (1665)	1.4%	1.9%	2.2%	2.4%	2.4%
Module 2 (705)	2.2%	3.0%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%
Males (1246)	1.7%	2.2%	2.5%	2.7%	2.8%
Females (1109)	1.8%	2.4%	2.7%	2.9%	2.9%
Age 8-9s (276)	3.5%	4.7%	5.4%	5.8%	5.9%
Age 10-12s (626)	2.4%	3.1%	3.6%	3.8%	3.9%
Age 13-15s (835)	2.0%	2.7%	3.1%	3.3%	3.4%
Age 16-17s (652)	2.3%	3.1%	3.5%	3.8%	3.8%

For example, if 30% or 70% of a sample of 2357 gives a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the 'true' value will fall within the range of +/-1.9 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% +/-
1246 vs. 1109 (Boys vs. girls)	2.4%	3.2%	3.7%	4.0%	4.1%
613 vs. 1987 (Primary vs. secondary)	2.7%	3.6%	4.2%	4.4%	4.5%
626 vs. 835 (10-12s vs. 13-15s)	3.1%	4.1%	4.8%	5.1%	5.2%

476 vs. 423 (Boys 13-15 vs. girls 13-15)	3.9%	5.2%	6.0%	6.4%	6.6%
--	------	------	------	------	------

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.

At Wave 3 we can compare data across waves. Some example differences required for significance at or near these percentages are shown in the table below for Wave 2 vs. Wave 3 samples.

Effective sample size (Wave 2 vs. Wave 3)	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
3234 vs. 2357 (Total)	1.6%	2.1%	2.4%	2.6%	2.7%
1670 vs. 1665 (Module 1)	2.0%	2.7%	3.1%	3.3%	3.4%
1539 vs. 705 (Module 2)	2.7%	3.6%	4.1%	4.4%	4.5%
1647 vs. 1246 (Males)	2.2%	2.9%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%
1559 vs. 1109 (Females)	2.3%	3.1%	3.5%	3.8%	3.9%
292 vs. 276 (Age 8-9s)	4.9%	6.6%	7.5%	8.1%	8.2%
883 vs. 626 (Age 10-12s)	3.1%	4.1%	4.7%	5.0%	5.1%
1187 vs. 835 (Age 13-15s)	2.7%	3.5%	4.1%	4.3%	4.4%
882 vs. 652 (Age 16-17s)	3.0%	4.1%	4.6%	5.0%	5.1%

Schools sample

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 schools sample:

Sample size	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
Total (883)	2.0%	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%	3.3%
Males (428)	2.8%	3.8%	4.3%	4.6%	4.7%
Females (421)	2.9%	3.8%	4.4%	4.7%	4.8%
Age 8-9s (370)	3.1%	4.1%	4.7%	5.0%	5.1%
Age 10-11s (513)	2.6%	3.5%	4.0%	4.2%	4.3%

For example, if 30% or 70% of a sample of 883 gives a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the 'true' value will fall within the range of +/-3.0 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:

Sample size	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
428 vs. 421 (Boys vs. girls)	4.0%	5.4%	6.2%	6.6%	6.7%
370 vs. 513 (8-9s vs. 10-11s)	4.0%	5.4%	6.1%	6.6%	6.7%

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.

At Wave 3 we can begin to compare schools data across waves. Some example differences required for significance at or near these percentages are shown in the table below for Wave 2 vs. Wave 3 samples.

Sample size (Wave 2 vs. Wave 3)	10% / 90% +/-	20% / 80% +/-	30% / 70% +/-	40% / 60% +/-	50% +/-
190 vs. 883 (Total)	4.7%	6.3%	7.2%	7.7%	7.8%
95 vs. 428 (Males)	6.7%	8.9%	10.2%	10.9%	11.1%
91 vs. 421 (Females)	6.8%	9.1%	10.4%	11.1%	11.3%
116 vs. 370 (Age 8-9s)	6.3%	8.3%	9.6%	10.2%	10.4%
74 vs. 513 (Age 10-11s)	7.3%	9.8%	11.2%	11.9%	12.2%

Annex A

Least-fill weightings - Full Wave 3 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	267	427	13.7%	44.2%	6.0%	5.3%	1.14
	Online trolling	337			55.8%	7.6%	5.5%	1.40
Block 2a	Someone being seriously violent	155	224	7.2%	57.6%	4.1%	4.9%	0.84
	A person's serious injuries	114			42.4%	3.0%	4.9%	0.62
Block 2b	Real animals being seriously hurt	95	189	6.0%	45.7%	2.8%	4.6%	0.60
	Animals who aren't real being seriously hurt	113			54.3%	3.3%	5.1%	0.64
Block 3	Dangerous stunts or challenges	263	263	8.4%	100.0%	8.4%	5.1%	1.65
Block 4	People encouraging others to eat, drink or inhale harmful things	146	235	7.5%	54.9%	4.1%	5.1%	0.81
	People encouraging others to eat, drink or inhale things in large amounts	120			45.1%	3.4%	4.9%	0.69
Block 5b	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Girls / Women	142	424	13.6%	13.3%	1.8%	0.5%	3.41
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Boys / Men	96			9.0%	1.2%	0.5%	2.30
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Non-binary people	63			5.9%	0.8%	0.4%	2.27
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Queer, gay, lesbian, bisexual or pansexual people	160			15.0%	2.0%	1.1%	1.92
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Transgender people	125			11.7%	1.6%	0.5%	3.00
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards People who are part of a particular religion	135			12.6%	1.7%	0.5%	3.24
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards People of a certain ethnicity	141			13.2%	1.8%	0.5%	3.38
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Disabled people	103			9.6%	1.3%	0.4%	3.71
	Someone being hateful or using hateful language towards Neurodiverse people	105			9.8%	1.3%	0.9%	1.51
Block 5c	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Girls / Women	75	286	9.1%	13.7%	1.3%	0.7%	1.78
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Boys / Men	54			9.9%	0.9%	0.7%	1.28
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Non-binary people	24			4.4%	0.4%	0.2%	2.28
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Queer, gay, lesbian, bisexual or pansexual people	72			13.2%	1.2%	0.7%	1.71
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Transgender people	57			10.4%	1.0%	0.4%	2.71
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to People who are part of a particular religion	84			15.4%	1.4%	0.7%	1.99
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to People of a certain ethnicity	82			15.0%	1.4%	0.7%	1.95
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Disabled people	47			8.6%	0.8%	0.7%	1.12
	Someone telling others to do hateful things to Neurodiverse people	52			9.5%	0.9%	0.5%	1.65
Block 6	Pornography	130	130	4.2%	100.0%	4.2%	5.1%	0.81
Block 7	Showing someone with an eating disorder	106	216	6.9%	42.7%	3.0%	4.8%	0.62
	Extreme eating or extreme exercise behaviours	142			57.3%	4.0%	4.9%	0.80
Block 8	Suicide (taking one's own life): people showing this, giving instructions for this, or encouraging others to do this	55	140	4.5%	34.4%	1.5%	4.4%	0.35
	Self-harm	105			65.6%	2.9%	4.6%	0.64
Block 9	Things that make it seem cool to feel really low or depressed	138	210	6.7%	60.0%	4.0%	5.1%	0.79
	Things that say you shouldn't ask for help if you feel really low or depressed	92			40.0%	2.7%	4.4%	0.61
Block 10	Things that make others feel bad or ashamed about their bodies and how they look	223	384	12.3%	46.4%	5.7%	5.1%	1.11
	Things that encourage others to have a certain body type or to keep checking their body shape in the mirror	258			53.6%	6.6%	5.6%	1.17