

# **THE WORLD CAN'T WAIT**

**Survey of Participants from Rally  
June 2 2007**

## Summary of Key Findings

- CAFOD was by far the most successful organisation in mobilising its supporters for the World Can't Wait event. Almost half of all respondents (48%) first heard about the event through CAFOD.
- Furthermore, CAFOD was by far the most recalled organisation at the event, even amongst supporters of different organisations. A significant proportion of respondents also recalled Christian Aid and Tearfund. Oxfam, WaterAid, Save the Children and Action Aid were slightly less prominent.
- The event appeared to be successful in providing an enjoyable experience for participants. Eight in ten respondents said that they enjoyed the event. However, respondents aged 16-34 were less likely than average to express the highest level of satisfaction with the event.
- Almost half of respondents felt that events like the World Can't Wait have a 'very significant' impact upon decision makers. People who enjoyed the event were more likely than those who didn't enjoy it to feel that their participation would make a difference.
- When asked to judge specific activities on the day, the debate and speeches in the Emmanuel Centre were generally the best received. Activities in the park were the most likely to be perceived by respondents to lack impact, however, the majority still judged these activities favourably.
- When asked what didn't work on the day, many respondents said that the mass moment of noise was poorly coordinated, and many expressed disappointment with the overall turnout citing a lack of publicity for the event.
- However, many praised the organisation of the event and ideas like the mass moment of noise and the use of speech bubbles. Some felt that these ideas could have been better utilised.
- Encouragingly, 94% of respondents said that they would attend a similar event in the future.

04/07/2007

## **Introduction**

On June 2<sup>nd</sup> 2007, a coalition of charities, pressure groups, campaigning organisations and faith-based groups held an event called the World Can't Wait in Central London. The aim of the event was to send a message to the G8 to do more to alleviate poverty around the world. This report details the findings of a survey conducted amongst the supporters of these groups who attended the event.

### **Aims and Objectives**

The aim of the survey was to obtain feedback from event attendees on what they thought worked about the event and what did not work (or could have been improved), the extent to which they enjoyed the event and felt it made a difference, and the likelihood that they would attend a similar event in the future. This information will be used to inform future events to help maximise their impact.

### **Methodology**

In total 295 people took part in the survey. Two methodologies were used to collect results. Hard copies of the questionnaire were distributed and collated at the World Can't Wait event itself. Participants were also emailed a version of the survey immediately after the event that they could complete online. Fieldwork took place between 2<sup>nd</sup>-25<sup>th</sup> June 2007.

Of those that took part, all but 5 fully completed the survey. The answers of those who filled in only some of the questions have been included in this analysis where applicable.

## **Sample Profile**

This section is summary of the sample of respondents who participated in the survey. Note that this profile may not be representative of the 'typical' population who attend events like The World Can't Wait – certain people may be more likely than others to complete a survey and could therefore be over-represented. Nevertheless, this does provide at least a snapshot of the types of audiences interested in taking action against global poverty.

### **Gender**

Of those that stated their gender, two-thirds of respondents (68%) were female whilst a third were male (32%).

## Age of respondents

There was a wide spread of age groups within the sample. The oldest age groups were the most heavily represented with both the 55-64 cohort and the 65+ group each accounting for around a fifth of the sample. The least represented group was the 16-24 group (9%). A full breakdown of the sample by age is detailed in Table 1.1 below.

<b>Table 1.1: Age profile of sample</b>		
<i>Base: all who supplied their age (287)</i>	<b>No. of respondents</b>	<b>%*</b>
Under 16	30	10
16-24	26	9
25-34	41	14
35-44	33	11
45-54	43	15
55-64	56	20
65 or older	58	20

*\*These percentages do not total 100% due to rounding*

Caution should be taken with findings in this report analysed by age as some of these groupings are represented by small sample sizes, particularly those aged under 16, 16-24 and 35-44.

Generally the spread of ages was even between the genders. However, the 65 + age group was even more female dominated than the other age groups (78% in this category were women).

## Participation in Make Poverty History

Only 10% of respondents didn't participate in any way in Make Poverty History (MPH), indicating the strength of that campaign and perhaps the ability of mass-publicity events in ensuring long-term commitment for the anti-poverty cause. Seventy-four percent of respondents said that they bought a white wristband during the MPH campaign (see Table 1.2 below). The next most common actions were to send an email (51%), and to attend the MPH rally in Edinburgh (44%).

<b>Table 1.2: Participation in Make Poverty History</b>	
<i>Base: all providing an answer (290)</i>	<b>%</b>
Bought a white wristband	74
Sent an email	51
Attend the MPH rally in Edinburgh	44
Took part in a local MPH event	33
Entered the text lottery for a Live8 concert	7
Attended a Live8 concert	2
Didn't participate in any way in MPH	10

Findings in this report accorded to non-participants in MPH should be treated with caution given the small sample size (29).

Perhaps surprisingly, 25-34 year-olds were the most likely to say that they didn't participate in MPH (17%), in particular they were the least likely to have bought a wristband (56% did so) and the least likely to have attended the Edinburgh rally (27%). This may have been because of the types of organisations that mobilised the greatest number of supporters on the day differed from those with the most support during MPH. to be

Men were more likely than women to have sent an email as part of MPH (61% cf. 45%).

## Analysis of Results

### How became aware of the World Can't Wait event

*Almost than half of all respondents first became aware of the event through CAFOD*

Respondents were asked how they first heard about the World Can't Wait event. It appears that CAFOD was by far the most successful organisation in mobilising its supporters. Approaching half (48%) of all respondents said that they had first become aware of the event through CAFOD (see Table 2.1 below).

The next most common channel was through friends, colleagues or fellow supporters, cited by 10%. Only 1 person (0.3%) said that they had found out about the event through the press or media, suggesting that there is significant room for improvement in publicising future events through media channels. Moreover, only a small proportion (4%) learnt about the event through the Your Voice Against Poverty website, which is likely to be the key source of information for people not connected with one of the participating organisations.

<b>Table 2.1: Channel through which first became aware of World Can't Wait event</b>	
<i>Base: all providing an answer (294)</i>	<i>%*</i>
CAFOD	48
Through a friend, colleague or fellow supporter	10
Christian Aid	5
Micah Challenge	4
Tearfund	4
Your Voice Against Poverty website	4
Through school or a teacher	3
Oxfam	2
Save the Children	2
Jubilee Debt Campaign	2
Via another source	15
Cannot remember	2

*\*These percentages do not total 100% due to rounding*

## Extent to which respondents enjoyed the event

*The vast majority of respondents enjoyed the event*

Respondents were asked if they had had a good time at the World Can't Wait Event. They were asked to provide a rating between 1 and 5 with 5 meaning that they found the event 'very enjoyable' and 1 meaning that they didn't enjoy the event at all. As can be seen in the Table 2.2 below, the vast majority (81%) scored the event either 4 or 5, indicating that the event was successful in providing an enjoyable experience for participants. Indeed, almost half (46%) rated the event as 'very enjoyable'. The average score given was 4.2.

<b>Table 2.2: Extent to which respondents enjoyed the event</b>	
<i>Base: all (295)</i>	<b>%*</b>
1 (Did not enjoy the event at all)	3
2	2
3	15
4	35
5 (Very enjoyable)	46
NET DID ENJOY EVENT (4 or 5)	81
NET DIDN'T ENJOY EVENT (1 or 2)	4

*\*These percentages do not total 100% due to rounding*

Only 4% indicated that they didn't enjoy the event (by giving a score of 1 or 2).

It is interesting to note that whilst the 16-24 and 25-34 age groups were just as likely as the other age groups to say that they enjoyed the event (scoring the event a 4 or a 5), their level of satisfaction tended to be lower. Only 27% of 16-24 year olds, and 20% of 25-34 year olds said that they found the event to be 'very enjoyable' (compared to 46% overall) which suggests that some work may be required in order to make future events more appealing to these age groups.

Satisfaction levels were slightly lower amongst men than they were amongst women, however, the difference was not statistically significant.

## Extent to which respondents feel such events make a difference

*Nine in ten feel that events like World Can't Wait have at least a modest impact*

Generally participants at World Can't Wait were positive in their assessment of the likely impact of mass-participation campaigning events in influencing decision-makers. Respondents were asked whether they felt such events were 'very significant and make a big difference', whether they have a 'modest impact', or whether their impact is 'small, almost negligible'.

Overall, respondents feel that their participation in such events is influential and can make a genuine difference about the issues they care about. Approaching half (48%) felt that such events are 'very significant and make a big difference', whilst a similar proportion (44%) felt that they have at least a 'modest impact'. Only 6% believed that such events have a 'very small' impact whilst 3% were unsure (see Table 2.3 below).

<b>Table 2.3: Extent to which respondents felt that events like the World Can't Wait have an impact upon decision-makers</b>	
<i>Base: all (295)</i>	<b>%*</b>
Such events are very significant and make a big difference	48
Such events have a modest impact	44
Such events have a very small, almost negligible influence	6
Don't know / Unsure	3

Women had a slightly greater tendency to view the impact as such events as very significant compared to men, although again the difference was not statistically significant.

There was a greater feeling of powerless amongst those aged under 16 compared to the average; 17% felt that such events have a 'very small' influence on decision-makers compared to 6% overall. However, the groups least likely to believe that these events have a 'very big' impact were the 25-34 and 35-44 age groups. Only 35% of respondents within these groups collectively felt agreed with the most positive statement, lower than both younger and older age groups.

Confidence in the ability to influence decision-makers was highest amongst the 65 and older age group; two-thirds (66%) of respondents in this age group felt such events have a 'very significant' impact compared to 48% overall.

Ensuring that supporters enjoy events appears to significantly increase the confidence of participants that their involvement will make a genuine difference. More than two-fifths (63%) of those who found the event 'very

enjoyable' said that they expect such events to have a 'very significant' impact.

Those who did not participate in any way in MPH were significantly more likely than those who did take part in that campaign to believe that events like World Can't Wait have a 'very small' impact (24% cf. 4%) and were correspondingly less likely to perceive them to have a 'very significant' or 'modest' impact (72% cf. 93%).

### **Impact of participating groups on event attendees**

*CAFOD was by far the most recalled charity at the event, even amongst supporters of different organisations*

Respondents were asked to record which charities, campaigning organisations, and pressure groups they recalled seeing at the event. Most respondents were able to recall between one and five organisations. Note that respondents who did not provide an answer to this question (18) have been excluded from this analysis as it is impossible to distinguish whether they left no answer because they could not recall an organisation or because they were loathe to provide an answer.

By far the most prominent organisation at the event was CAFOD. More than eight in ten (84%) recalled seeing the charity's presence at the World Can't Wait. A majority also recalled seeing Christian Aid (54%), with Tearfund also performing well with more than two-fifths (44%) remembering them.

Around one in three remembered seeing Oxfam (35%), whilst approximately a quarter recalled WaterAid (28%), Save the Children (24%) and Action Aid (24%).

Given that almost half the sample (138 respondents) had originally found out about the event through CAFOD, and were therefore likely to be in attendance in support of that particular charity, a second analysis of this question was conducted that excluded all respondents who had learnt of the event through CAFOD. Interesting, results remain very similar to the original analysis. CAFOD was still by far the most recalled organisation with three-quarters (75%) of respondents remembering the charity. This indicates that CAFOD made a significant impression at the event on non-supporters. It could be that because CAFOD mobilised so many of its supporters, thereby boosting its presence at the event, was one of the significant reasons why so many non-supporters remembered seeing the charity. Results for most of the other organisations also remain consistent with the previous analysis that included CAFOD supporters.

**Table 2.3: Organisations recalled by respondents at the event\***

Organisation	Including CAFOD supporters	Not including CAFOD supporters
	<i>Base: all who supplied an answer (277)</i>	<i>Base: all who supplied an answer and did not hear about event through CAFOD (145)</i>
	%	%
CAFOD	84	75
Christian Aid	54	56
Tearfund	44	42
Oxfam	35	30
WaterAid	28	32
Save the Children	24	21
Action Aid	24	23
Micah Challenge	11	18
VSO	12	16
World Vision UK	9	11
Jubilee Debt Campaign	7	8
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament	7	10
Stop AIDS Coalition	6	8
World Development Movement	5	7
War on Want	5	3
Traidcraft	4	7
Fair Trade	4	2
Team Fund	4	1
Trade Justice Movement	3	2

Trade Union Congress	3	2
CARE International	2	3
Plan International UK	2	3
Make Poverty History	2	1
Islamic Relief	2	2
Campaign Against Arms Trade	2	1

*\*Note: Only those organisations cited by at least 2% of all respondents (including those informed about the event by CAFOD) have been included in this table.*

**Effectiveness of activities at the World Can’t Wait event**

*Activities in the Emmanuel Centre and the three minute mass moment of noise were the best received activities*

Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of specific activities that made up the World Can’t Wait event on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means they were ‘not at all effective’ and 5 means they were ‘very effective’.

As can be seen in Table 2.4 below, not as many people were able to rate the charity activities in the park or the activities in the Emmanuel Centre because they did not see or attend those events. However, there is still a sizable base for each event from which to conduct an evaluation based on those able to provide a score.

Activities in the Emmanuel Centre were generally perceived to be the most effective; almost half (49%) rated this as ‘very effective’ with 75% giving these activities a score of 4 or 5. Three-quarters (76%) of respondents also gave the river activities a score of 4 or 5, although slightly fewer gave these activities the highest score (38%). The three-minute mass moment of noise was similarly well received with two-thirds (67%) giving it a score of 4 or 5.

Perceptions of the effectiveness of the charity activities in the park were slightly more mixed. Only around two-thirds (43%) gave these activities a score of 4 or 5, with this event receiving the highest proportion of negative scores between 1 and 2 (20%).

**Table 2.4: Ratings of events at the World Can't Wait\***

<b>Event</b>	<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>
		(Not at all effective)				(Very effective)	
Charity activities in the Park	165	4	16	37	24	19	3.4
Activities in the Emmanuel Centre	162	2	4	19	26	49	4.2
River activities	255	2	5	16	38	38	4.0
The 3 minute mass moment of noise	265	4	9	20	23	43	3.9

\*These percentages do not total 100% due to rounding

Women were more likely to perceive some of the events as being effective than men. The average effectiveness score for the 3 minute mass moment given by women was 4.0 compared to an average score of 3.8 given by men. Female participants also gave a higher average score for the river activities compared to men (4.2 cf. 3.7). Although these differences may not appear to be huge, they are statistically significant findings, indicating that men are slightly more cynical as to lasting change such events can stimulate in their current format. For the other two activities rated by respondents there was no significant difference between male and female scores.

Unfortunately it is not possible to analyse these results by other respondent demographics due to small base sizes.

### **Participants views on what did and what didn't work on the day**

*Many respondents criticised the organisation, particularly the river activities and the confusion over the mass moment of noise*

Respondents were asked what particular aspects of the event they felt worked well on the day, and what did not work well and how they could be improved. Respondents were free to enter whatever answer they liked and the overwhelming majority of respondents chose to provide an answer to this question, many taking their time to provide detailed answers. This demonstrated that many of the participants clearly care passionately about the issue of poverty and that there is significant enthusiasm to help maximise the effectiveness of events like the World Can't Wait amongst grass-roots supporters. Below is a summary of the most common responses.

## **What didn't work well or could be improved**

### *Mass noise poorly co-ordinated*

Many criticised the organisation of the river activities, particularly the 3 minute mass moment of noise. Many participants believed that the noise began at 2pm rather than 2:30pm. Some were not aware of the moment of silence that was meant to precede the noise. Some suggested that more marshals, signs and general information could have helped co-ordinate this better.

I thought the event was poorly organised. Was not apparent what was happening and was not advertised. I didn't even realise that there was a 3 minute mass moment of noise at 2:30!

*Female, 25-34, London*

We thought the alarm/whistle mass at 2:30pm would be louder and have more impact.

*Female, Under 16, Lancashire*

The river demo was a bit disorganised - had we not asked a couple of stewards what was happening we would not have known. The silence was not as effective as it might have been in that there was no concerted noise beforehand. I am comparing this to the Christian Aid 'Drum the Message Home' rally last autumn when the drumming practice beforehand and the Downing Street silence were most moving.

*Male, 65+, Lancashire*

Although some respondents liked the idea of a boat acting as a point of focus to the river activities, they were outnumbered by people who complained that they couldn't hear what speakers on the boat were saying.

*The turnout and subsequent impact of the event was disappointing for many*

A large proportion of respondents were disappointed by the turnout and felt that there was a particularly poor turnout from young people and those from secular organisations (which is supported from the sample demographics of this survey). Some felt that many organisations had failed to fully support the event in the manner that had been so effective in Edinburgh in 2005. It was noted that there were fewer emails publicising the event prior to it taking place, and that these tended to be sent out too late.

Given the lack of numbers, many respondents felt that the gathering of people around the river spread people out too thinly, and failed to provide a memorable image for the media (several respondents complained of being hidden by trees), thereby reducing the political impact of the event. Several felt there was insufficient publicity in the media prior to the event. Some also felt that it was less clear who was meant to be receiving the message of the day compared to other smaller events such as Stop AIDS and the recent Darfur protest, and that MPs were unlikely to be resident in the House of Commons on a Saturday.

More publicity needed. I did not see any full pages ads in papers. I found it difficult to find out specifically what was happening until quite near the day. Many people who did not receive direct mailing from a charity were never reached.

*Female, 55-64, Sussex*

I was generally disappointed with advertising and numbers at the day. Over the past 10+ years I have been to many such events, and can normally wander through the crowd meeting many people I know. However this wasn't the case - so where were all the other campaigners who normally show up for these events? Especially students/early 20's seemed missing.

*Female, 25-34, London*

More people needed! It didn't seem like all the aid agencies were fully behind this event. Would more people have come if it had been more widely advertised among a broader range of organisations which supported Edinburgh?

*Male, 45-54, South Yorkshire*

I think it is good to have an agreed meeting spot and then an actual march/rally to an end venue. It felt that people were milling around with no sense of purpose.

*Female, 25-34, London*

Please find ways to get your message/news of events to a wider audience. Also, people often leave these events saying 'what do we do now?' Could you provide concrete action for people to do once home (not just emails and letters to politicians) What could we boycott to affect the world bank? What tax could we refuse to pay?

*Female, 35-44, Poole*

#### *Some felt the atmosphere was flat*

Some also said that they felt the atmosphere was flat, particularly the events in the park and suggested that it would have benefited from more speakers and more music. Several also highlighted the need for more whistles to be available on the day to contribute to the moment of noise.

The park was too quiet. It seemed to be the central meeting place but needed a stage, inspiring speakers and directions about when to leave for the rally etc. The lack of this lessened the sense of importance of the event, after all most people could only just about hear/see the speakers on the boat (Why couldn't Annie Lennox etc. have spoken first in the park where more could have heard them?).

*Female, 35-44, Poole*

I think music helps to create a good atmosphere and I also think it would have been good to have co-ordinating chanting.

*Female, 25-34, London*

I was disappointed. Except for the 2pm action, the day lacked focus and seemed disjointed. The Trade Justice Stop-EPA day was far better.

*Male, 45-54, Manchester*

I don't know who the man selling whistles was, but he did a roaring trade: he could have been making money for a charity, but I don't think so!

*Female, 55-64, West Midlands*

#### *Nowhere to dispose of placards*

Finally, several respondents criticised the lack of facilities to dispose or recycle placards after the event, particularly given that many campaigners want to promote environmental responsibility.

Most disappointedly, I thought it was quite poor that a number of protestors simply discarded their placards by the Thames. Surely as a movement that includes in its aims, putting pressure on world leaders concerning climate change, protestors should not have been dumping placards, but recycling them! There should have been provision to avoid this.

*Female, 25-34, London*

Many respondents also complained that there were insufficient opportunities to buy refreshments.

### **What worked well**

*Debate in the Emmanuel Centre added context to the day's events*

Supporting the quantitative findings, many respondents who attended the speeches and debate inside the Emmanuel Centre praised this part of the day. Supporters of church organisations also praised the additional activities run by these organisations of the day, such as praying and sermons.

Inspirational and thoughtful speeches at Emmanuel Centre were very motivating for today and future campaigning. This energy raising and educational part of the day was great.

*Male, 55-64, London*

We went to the Service at the Methodist Central Hall and found this gave us a clear focus to why we were there as we were able to hear and [to] see people telling us first hand what their experiences were. We found this inspiring.

*Male, 45-54, Somerset*

The best bit for me was the stuff in the Emmanuel Centre - the lady from Zambia and Midge Ure, and the African band that was rudely ignored by most people, were really inspiring.

*Female, 35-44, Hampshire*

Aside from the river activities, many respondents commented favourably on the organisation of the event, particularly transport in and out of London which appeared to work well. Many also highlighted a family-friendly atmosphere with activities in the park that appealed to all ages, as well as the helpfulness of stewards on the day.

The noise-making and general atmosphere was enjoyable and friendly.

*Female, 45-54, London*

Volunteers/stewards were all very helpful and friendly. They created a very positive atmosphere.

*Male, 55-64, London*

### *Good ideas – but could have been better utilised*

There was some praise also for the speech bubbles, white T-shirts, the mass moment of noise and the 'G8 – World Can't Wait' chant, although it is interesting to note that these aspects were also highlighted as things that could have been better utilised or promoted. A handful of respondents enjoyed the Oxfam photographic exhibition at the National Theatre (although some felt it was not close enough to the event) which suggests that such exhibits could be used more prominently in future events.

The speech bubbles were great: I could bring one from a non-attendee and stick it on a sign. She then felt part of it.

*Female, 55-64, Watford*

The Oxfam exhibition at the National Theatre was effective, but I had to make something of a special trip to see it.

*Male, 55-64, Colchester*

I think it was all very effective especially the 3 minute mass of noise. in the future I would recommend noise.

*Female, Under 16, Essex*

### **Likelihood of attending similar events in the future**

*Almost all respondents would attend similar events again*

Encouragingly, when asked whether they would attend another event similar to the World Can't Wait in the future, more than nine in ten (94%) said that they would. Only three respondents (1%) said that they wouldn't, with 5% unsure.

There was no significant variations in response by gender, however participants aged under 16 were more likely to be uncertain as to whether they would attend another event (13%) although the majority (80%) said that they would (7% said they would not).

Respondents who did not participate in MPH were slightly more likely to be unsure as to whether they would attend another event (17% compared to 4% of those who did take part in MPH), although the majority said they would (83%) with no-one ruling out another event entirely.

It is interesting to note that even amongst the handful of respondents who said they did not have an enjoyable time at the event (11 people), only two said that they would not come to another event in the future. Furthermore, none of those who felt that events like the World Can't Wait only have a 'modest impact' on decision-makers said that they would not attend another event (although 6% were unsure). It appears that for these respondents, even a limited impact is therefore sufficient justification for their continued support. Three of the ten respondents who felt events have a 'very small' impact said they would not attend another event with 5 unsure.