

# **OPSS Population Baseline Survey Pilot report**

January 2025



### This report was commissioned by the Office for Product Safety and Standards.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) or the Department for Business and Trade (DBT), nor do they necessarily reflect government policy.

# Contents

1	Executive summary	3
	1.1 Introduction	3
	1.2 Methodologies	4
	1.3 Methodological learnings	5
	1.4 Data quality	6
	1.5 Recommendations for mainstage	8
2	Introduction	.10
	2.1 Background	. 10
	2.2 Survey design	. 10
3	Methodologies	12
-	3.1 Telephone survey	. 12
	3.2 Post-to-web survey	. 13
	3.3 Panel survey	. 13
	3.4 Face-to-face survey	. 13
4	Methodological learnings	15
•	4.1 Fieldwork period	. 15
	4.2 Response rates	. 16
	4.3 Average length of survey	. 19
	4.4 Demographics	. 20
5	Data quality	25
5	Data quality	<b>25</b>
5	Data quality 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Mean response rate	<b>25</b> . 25 . 25
5	Data quality	<b>25</b> . 25 . 25 . 27
5	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products	25 .25 .25 .27
5 6	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey	25 .25 .25 .27 35
5 6	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey	25 .25 .25 .27 35 .35
5 6	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         S.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Papel survey	25 .25 .25 .27 35 .35 .36
5 6	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         S.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey	25 .25 .27 35 .35 .36 .37
5	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey	25 .25 .27 35 .35 .36 .37 .37 .37
5	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         S.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study	25 .25 .25 .27 35 .36 .37 .37 .38 .38
5	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         S.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study	<b>25</b> .25 .27 <b>35</b> .35 .36 .37 .37 .37 .38 .39
5 6 7	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study         Appendix 1 – Survey results	<b>25</b> .25 .27 <b>35</b> .35 .36 .37 .37 .38 .39 <b>40</b>
5 6 7	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         S.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study         Appendix 1 – Survey results         6.1 Electronics.	25 .25 .27 35 .36 .37 .37 .37 .37 .38 .39 40 .40
5 6 7	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         S.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study         Appendix 1 – Survey results         6.1 Electronics         6.2 Toys	<b>25</b> .25 .27 <b>35</b> .35 .36 .37 .37 .38 .39 <b>40</b> .40 .43
5 6 7	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study         Appendix 1 – Survey results         6.1 Electronics         6.2 Toys         6.3 Cosmetics	<b>25</b> .25 .27 <b>35</b> .35 .36 .37 .37 .37 .38 .39 <b>40</b> .40 .43 .45
5 6 7	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study         Appendix 1 – Survey results         6.1 Electronics         6.2 Toys         6.4 Domestic appliances	25 .25 .27 35 .35 .36 .37 .38 .39 40 .40 .43 .45 .46
5 6 7	Data quality         5.1 Introduction         5.2 Mean response rate         5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products         Recommendations for mainstage         6.1 Telephone survey         6.2 Post-to-web survey         6.3 Panel survey         6.4 Face-to-face survey         6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey         6.6 Other considerations for the main study         Appendix 1 – Survey results         6.1 Electronics         6.2 Toys         6.3 Cosmetics         6.4 Domestic appliances         6.5 Furniture	<b>25</b> .25 .27 <b>35</b> .35 .36 .37 .37 .37 .37 .38 .39 <b>40</b> .40 .43 .45 .46 .49

# **1. Executive summary**

## **1.1 Introduction**

#### Background

- 1. The Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) has a primary purpose of protecting people and places from product-related harm. It is therefore important for OPSS to understand the markets that it intervenes in.
- 2. The OPSS has identified sales data as one of its top priority data gaps. One of the ways that sales data can be defined, is the population of products that exist in UK society (including in domestic properties).
- 3. This project was commissioned to address the data gap regarding the total number of items owned by UK households that fall under the remit of the OPSS and the specific details of the products that are used in UK households as well as the purchase route of those products.
- 4. The OPSS intends to conduct a nationwide representative study to answer the question 'how many OPSS related products are in people's homes' directly. Before commissioning a full-scale survey, OPSS commissioned IFF to conduct a pilot to establish the most effective, replicable methodology.
- 5. The four methodologies to be tested ahead of potential roll out for a population household survey were:
- Telephone interviewing;
- Online interviewing using a proprietary panel;
- Online interviewing using a post-to-web approach; and
- Face-to-face interviewing.
- 6. The aim of the survey was to identify the volume of OPSS-related products in each household, as well as the purchase method of each product and whether products were purchased new or second hand.
- 7. For selected products, OPSS were interested in where they purchased their product, how often the products were used and what brand or model of the product was owned.

#### Survey design

- 8. The survey was designed so respondents were asked the same questions irrespective of the methodology by which they were surveyed. This ensured that responses were comparable across methodologies.
- 9. Due to concerns about length and survey fatigue, it was decided that the survey would be stratified into two modules, with Module 1 being asked questions about half the products (electronics, toys and cosmetics) and Module 2 being asked questions about the other half of the products (cosmetics, large domestic appliances and furniture items).

# **1.2 Methodologies**

#### **Telephone survey**

10. For the telephone survey, there was a target of 200 responses. The sample frame consisted of a blend of Random Digit Dialling (RDD), and 'Lifestyle' sample which is a large database of individuals compiled from a range of different sources. Details were obtained through the lifestyle sample and then numbers were dialled by using random digit dialling. RDD is a method of randomly generating phone numbers. The reason for blending approaches was to help reach a comprehensive coverage of the population.

#### Post-to-web survey

- 11.For the post-to-web survey, a target of 250 interviews was set. The sample frame was taken from the Postcode Address File (PAF). The PAF includes all households within the United Kingdom.
- 12.A selection of the PAF was downloaded and stratified into quintiles using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). IFF then drew 3,000 records from this selection with 600 records from each quintile included in the draw.
- 13. Invitation letters were then sent to each of these addresses which included a link to the survey and a unique identifier. Up to two reminder emails were sent to addresses that had not yet completed.
- 14. Additionally, as an incentive, participants who completed the survey through the post-to-web survey method were offered a £10 Amazon e-voucher or payment via BACS (Bankers' Automated Clearing Services) transfer.

#### Panel survey

- 15. The sample was sourced from Cint, a panel company offering a panel of prerecruited respondents who generally have demographic information already available. The target number of completions for this methodology was 300.
- 16. The panel survey was hosted by IFF on our servers and links were sent to the panel company who tested them before sending them out to their panel.
- 17. From the initial point of contact to the return of survey data took 2-3 weeks inclusive of agreeing the sample, setting up the survey, running fieldwork and having data processed.

#### Face-to-face survey

- 18.10 face-to-face interviews were completed by IFF's internal qualitative interviewing team.
- 19. The participants were recruited using an external recruitment company, Mojo Fieldwork, who passed details to IFF. IFF's internal team then contacted the individual to confirm a time and a date that worked for both the respondent and the interviewer and then interviews were conducted by the IFF qualitative interviewing team.
- 20. Interviews were conducted using paper surveys with digital video recorders used by interviewers. Most of the face-to-face interviews were conducted at the respondent's home, though IFF did not make that a requirement to taking part. Respondents were offered a £50 incentive for taking part.

21. Due to availability of interviewers and to remain efficient and cost effective, all faceto-face interviewers were conducted in London.

# 1.3 Methodological learnings

#### **Fieldwork period**

#### Telephone survey

22. It took 5 weeks to complete the telephone survey. In the third week, a second batch of sample of 3,000 records was ordered to ensure the target of 200 completions was reached.

#### Post-to-web survey

23. The post-to-web survey lasted five and a half weeks. Reminder letters were sent out two weeks after the first letter. Each reminder letter generated a similar number of completions. After the final reminder was sent out, IFF introduced the option for a respondent to upload a photo of certain household items if the respondent reported they were unsure of the brand. However, none of the respondents utilised this option in the survey. This suggests limited utility of including this in the population survey at extra costs due to lack of evidence that it will generate extra responses or better data.

#### Panel survey

24. The 300 surveys were conducted over the course of three days.

#### Face-to-face

25. The face-to-face survey was conducted over the course of 1 week.

#### Response rate

#### Panel and face-to-face survey

- 26. Response rates cannot be calculated for the panel or face-to-face survey because neither Cint nor Mojo Fieldwork disclose how many people they approached about the survey.
- 27. However, once recruited by Mojo Fieldwork there were no dropouts from participants that agreed to take part, and all 10 interviews were conducted at the time and place recruited for.

#### Telephone survey

- 28. The overall response rate for the telephone survey was 2%, which was lower than anticipated in advance of the fieldwork. IFF initially ordered 6,000 records from the lifestyle sample, but another 3,000 records were ordered to complete the target of 200.
- 29. Part of the issue IFF experienced during telephone engagement was the limited conversion after 5 attempts at calling a number. 11 surveys out of 200 were completed after the 5<sup>th</sup> attempt or later at reaching a number. The average try count per record was 5.
- 30. There was low dropout rate mid-survey. There was concern given the repetitive nature of the questions that this may lead to respondents experiencing survey fatigue and opting not to complete the survey after they had completed it. Only on one occasion did a respondent stop an interview midway through.

#### Post-to-web

- 31. The main success taken from the pilot post-to-web survey can be seen in the response rate of 6%, achieving 249 completes from the 3,000 records that were sent an invitation letter which is a 4% higher response rate in comparison to the telephone survey.
- 32. There were 62 people (2% of the sample) who opened the link after the survey closed, suggesting that if the fieldwork window was open longer there may have been more completes. Not all of those that opened the survey will have gone on to complete it.
- 33.Each reminder letter was successful in generating more completes, with 90 achieved after the first reminder and another 59 achieved after the final reminder letter.
- 34. There were no complaints about intrusion from members of the public about sending letters to their home and impacting their privacy. It is suspected that sending letters addressed to the household rather than to individuals helped in this regard as respondents did not already feel that IFF or OPSS already held personal information about them.

## 1.4 Data quality

#### Mean non-response rate

- 35. Respondents were asked in questions A2-A5 about how many of a list of household products they own. Mean non-response figures relate to the proportion of respondents that at each product question did not enter a figure.
- 36. Generally, panel respondents had significantly higher levels of non-response for most product categories (Electronics: 27%, Toys: 55%, Cosmetics: 24%, Large white goods: 24% and Furniture: 26%) as compared to non-response rates from the telephone survey (Electronics: 5%, Toys: 57%, Cosmetics: 8%, Large white goods: 3% and Furniture: 4%) and post-to-web (Electronics: 8%, Toys: 48%, Cosmetics: 9%, Large white goods: 7% and Furniture: 3%).
- 37. Even after removing responses from panel participants that completed the survey in less than two minutes, the non-response rates among panel completes were still higher than the three other methodologies (telephone, post-to-web and face-to-face).
- 38. There were other data quality concerns with some of the panel responses and a small number of respondents input clearly false numbers. This was not a widespread issue, and the number of obviously fake responses was around 1% of the total completes.
- 39. In a full study, these obviously fake responses would be identified and replaced. However, each fake response eats into the limited sample, and some fake responses are harder to identify than others.
- 40. Interviewers conducting the face-to-face interviews reported positively that they felt the data provided was of high quality and accurate.

#### Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products

#### Electronics

- 41. Most respondents were confident when answering questions about electronic products, with nine in ten (91%) responding they were confident with the answers provided and two-fifths (42%) responding they were very confident.
- 42. When looking into the confidence into responses split by age group, there were no significant differences in the level of confidence.

#### Toys

- 43. Most respondents were confident when answering questions about toys, with eight in ten (91%) overall responding they were confident with the answers provided and over one third reporting they were very confident (36%).
- 44. Respondents who took part in the telephone survey were significantly more likely than average to be not very confident about their responses for toys (8%, compared to 2% overall).
- 45. Those aged between 35 and 44 years old were significantly more likely to report they were confident about the responses provided for toys (94%, compared to 81% average), this could be because this is the age band most likely to have small children with toys.

#### Cosmetics

- 46. Slightly less than nine in ten (88%) respondents were confident with answering questions about cosmetics and more than half (56%) responding that they were very confident. Respondents that took part in the post-to-web survey were significantly more likely than average to be confident about their responses for cosmetics (92%).
- 47. There were no significant differences by age group.

#### Large domestic appliances

- 48. Slightly less than nine in ten (88%) respondents were confident with answering questions about large domestic appliances and almost half (46%) were very confident.
- 49. By age group, those aged between 25 and 34 years old were significantly more likely to report they were confident about the responses provided for large domestic appliances (98%, compared to 88% average).

#### *Furniture / furnishings*

- 50. The majority of respondents were confident when answering questions about furniture, with just under nine in ten (87%) overall responding they were confident with the answers provided and half (50%) very confident. Respondents that took part in the panel survey were significantly less likely than average to be confident in their responses (83%, compared to 88% overall).
- 51. There were no significant differences by age group.

## 1.5 Recommendations for mainstage

52. A full-scale survey based on 2,000 completed interviews will be enough to achieve a sample representative of the UK population.

#### Telephone survey

- 53. Conducting a large-scale representative population study using a telephone survey with a combination of Random Digit Dialling and lifestyle sample would be feasible.
- 54. Methodologically, it would involve scaling up the lifestyle sample ordered and introducing quotas and targets based on demographics, such as age, gender, and living situation.
- 55. The data quality would be reliable, as can be seen by high levels of self-reported confidence in survey responses and low non-response rate to product related questions.
- 56. However, there are concerns about the low overall response rate and high operational costs, which is why IFF has not recommended it for a population-wide survey.

#### Post-to-web survey

- 57.Out of the four methodologies tested, a post-to-web survey using the postcode address file would be IFF's recommendation for a full-scale survey. The post-to-web survey has data costs that are cheaper than a CATI survey with similar levels of data quality.
- 58. The data quality would be reliable, with the pilot study showing that self-reported confidence in the survey was high for each product category and the non-response rate was low.
- 59. There is a risk that the lack of real time feedback may have a detrimental effect on the study, but this could be mitigated by conducting a soft launch to test the approach. Additionally cognitive interviews could be conducted for an extra cost.
- 60. IFF also recommend supplementing this approach with a telephone survey that would target those over the age of 65. This group is most likely to be digitally excluded and less likely to complete a post-to-web survey.

#### Panel survey

61. IFF would not recommend using panels solely for this research. Despite it being quick and cheap, the data would not be as reliable and would be harder to scale to reach national representation due to the limited size and sample profile.

#### Face-to-face survey

- 62.A full-scale survey of 2,000 face to face interviews would result in high quality data, due to interviewers being present with the respondent.
- 63. However, it would be the most difficult to conduct and would have large operational costs. It is likely that multiple agencies would need to be involved in recruiting participants and completing interviews. Face-to-face interviewing is declining in popularity and the number of contractors offering this service is also falling. This may present an issue in terms of replicating future waves of the survey.

64. If a full-scale face-to-face survey was commissioned, IFF would recommend using Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) rather than entering data onto paper surveys and retrospectively entering the data into the software as was done in the pilot.

#### Potential of asking about fewer products for the mainstage survey

- 65.A suggestion from OPSS was to filter the survey further ahead of the mainstage survey. There was a concern that the more products that respondents are asked questions about, the less likely they were to give accurate answers.
- 66. There is potential for re-designing the survey so that respondents are asked about fewer products, this would free up some time to encourage them to think more about their responses and check the accuracy themselves while conducting the survey.
- 67. The benefits of this would be that OPSS could be more certain of the accuracy of individual responses and have a more accurate picture of the number of actual products there are in each household.
- 68. The cons of this approach are that a smaller proportion of respondents are answering questions about each product type, which means that the survey would require a higher total number of completed interviews for OPSS to be confident that the survey responses for each product are representative of the UK wide population. A knock-on effect of the higher targets would be higher costs.

#### Other considerations for the mainstage survey

- 69. The population mainstage survey could be conducted using post-to-web as stratified by the Index of Multiple Deprivation to target a diverse population group.
- 70. This approach can be supplemented with a telephone survey that would target those over the age of 65. This group is most likely to be digitally excluded and less likely to complete a post-to-web survey.
- 71.For a population wide survey, a soft launch can be conducted with a small percentage of the sample receiving letters ahead of the main batch. This would allow OPSS to assess the survey, receive any feedback and iron out any issues ahead of the survey launch.
- 72. There is the potential for re-designing the survey so that each respondent is asked about fewer products. This could help respondents to spend more time thinking about their responses and increase the accuracy of the data.

# **2** Introduction

# 2.1 Background

- 1. OPSS has a primary purpose of protecting people and places from product-related harm, as well as ensuring consumers and businesses can buy and sell products with confidence. It is therefore important for OPSS to understand the markets that it intervenes in.
- 2. OPSS Research Programme was launched in March 2018 to provide high quality strategic research to strengthen the evidence base for OPSS policy development, delivery, and enforcement. OPSS has identified sales data as one of its top priority data gaps. OPSS has also identified a number of ways in which sales data can be defined, with one of these being the population of products that exist in UK households.
- 3. The project was commissioned to address the data gap regarding the specific details of the products that are used in UK households as well as the purchase route of those products. A full-scale survey will enable OPSS to answer the question 'how many OPSS related products are in people's homes' directly, instead of relying on a proxy figure such as sales data. Before commissioning a full-scale survey, OPSS commissioned a pilot survey to establish the most effective, replicable methodology.
- 4. The four methodologies to be tested ahead of the potential full-scale roll out for a population household survey were:
- Telephone interviewing;
- Online interviewing using a proprietary panel;
- Online interviewing using a post-to-web approach; and
- Face-to-face interviewing.
- 5. These methodologies were tested to assess which best suited a household study, with the purpose of identifying the volume of OPSS-related products that households own. The survey would be aimed at only domestic households and would not include businesses.
- 6. As well as understanding the volume of each product owned by each household, OPSS was also interested in the purchase method of each product, whether products were purchased new or second hand.
- 7. For some products, OPSS was interested in knowing where the products were purchased from, how often the products were used and what was the brand or model of the product.

### 2.2 Survey design

- 8. The survey was designed so that respondents were asked the same questions irrespective of which four methodologies they were surveyed by. This ensured that responses were comparable across methodologies.
- 9. Initially, the survey was designed so that all respondents answered all the questions about all the products. However, due to concerns about length and survey fatigue, it was decided that the survey would be stratified into two modules, with half being asked questions about half the products and the other half being asked questions about the other half of the products.

10. This modularisation was done at the sampling stage of the process. Each sample record was randomly assigned a value of one or two which determined their route through the survey. This does not result in exact 50-50 proportions, because the record still needs to be converted into a complete. However, this method is the simplest way to modularise and provides responses that are close enough to a 50% split to mitigate against any response bias from one module over another. See Table 2.1 for the split used in this research.

11.Module 1 was asked about the following products:

- All electronic products;
- All toy products; and
- Half of the cosmetic products including hair dye, foundation, lipstick, and shampoo.

12. Module 2 was asked about the following products:

- Half of the cosmetic products including soap, toothpaste, moisturiser, and shaving cream;
- All large domestic appliances; and
- All furniture items.
- 13. The full list of products in the survey can be seen in Appendix 2. The final split for completes by methodology and module is shown in Table 2.1

#### Table 2.1: Completed interviews split methodology and module

Module	Telephone	Post-to-web	Panel	Face-to-face	Total completes
4	108	124	161	5	398
	54%	50%	48%	50%	51%
2	92	126	169	5	392
2	46%	50%	53%	50%	49%
Total	200	250	330	10	790

# **3 Methodologies**

1. This chapter will present an overview of the fieldwork, including the approach taken for each of the four methods.

## 3.1 Telephone survey

- 2. For the telephone survey, there was a target of 200 responses. The sample frame consisted of a blend of Random Digit Dialling (RDD), and 'Lifestyle' sample. Random Digit Dialling is a technique whereby random landline and mobile phone numbers are computer generated, ensuring a randomised approach to respondent selection.
- 3. To ensure a more representative number of complete responses, IFF supplemented the RDD with 'Lifestyle' sample. This is a large database of individuals compiled from a range of different sources to which it has been possible to match gender and age (for example through matching to the electoral roll).
- 4. The original lifestyle sample order is shown in Table 3.1. The requests were split by gender, age, and nation. Once this sample was processed and calling commenced, IFF conducted the CATI interviews in house with our own interviewing team. After two weeks of the fieldwork period, it was determined that more samples should be ordered to reach the target and another sample order, of the same proportions but for 3,000 records, was ordered.
- 5. Throughout the fieldwork period, IFF did not specifically target any sample, therefore the final demographics from this methodology, as shown in Chapter 4, are what fell out naturally from calling using RDD.

	Approximate proportion of population	Sample order
Male	49%	2940
Female	51%	3060
18-24	11%	880
25-34	17%	1360
35-44	17%	816
45-54	16%	768
55+	39%	1872
England	84%	5040
Wales	5%	300
Scotland	8%	480
Northern Ireland	3%	180

Table 3.1: Lifesty	le sample order
--------------------	-----------------

## 3.2 Post-to-web survey

- 6. For the post-to-web survey, a target of 250 interviews was set. The sample frame was taken from the Postcode Address File (PAF).
- 7. The PAF includes all households within the United Kingdom and is regarded as the 'gold standard' for this survey method. A selection of the PAF was downloaded and stratified into quintiles using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). IFF then drew 3,000 records from this selection with 600 records from each quintile included in the draw. This meant that around 600 addresses were from post-codes in the top 20% of the most deprived areas of the UK and 600 from the least deprived areas of the UK, with 600 each coming from the middle three-fifths.
- 8. Three thousand letters were sent out to invite respondents to take part in the survey online by following a link included in the invite and entering their unique survey ID. The letter also included a list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) about the study, information about how their data will be used, and a link to IFF's privacy notice. Additionally, as an incentive, participants who completed the survey through the post-to-web survey method were offered a £10 Amazon e-voucher or payment via BACS transfer.

## 3.3 Panel survey

- 9. The sample was sourced from Cint, a panel company offering a panel of prerecruited respondents who generally have demographic information already available. The target number of completes for this methodology was 300.
- 10. The sample all came from the Cint panel, but the online survey itself was hosted and managed by IFF on our in-house servers. IFF sent links to the survey, to the panel provider, who tested the links before passing them on to their panel.
- 11. From initial quotes to data delivery the process took 2-3 weeks inclusive of agreeing the sample, setting up the survey, running fieldwork and having data processed. Throughout this process, IFF had a single point of contact at Cint who managed fieldwork at the panel and took queries about data and responses from IFF while fieldwork was ongoing.

### 3.4 Face-to-face survey

- 12. Ten face-to-face interviews were completed by our qualitative interviewing team.
- 13. The participants were recruited using an external recruitment company, Mojo Fieldwork, whose details were passed over to IFF. IFF's internal team then contacted the individual to confirm a time and a date that worked for both the respondent and the interviewer. Following this, interviews were conducted by the IFF qualitative interviewing team.
- 14. Mojo Fieldwork are a qualitative market research recruitment agency who IFF have used regularly for research projects on behalf of government departments, including projects for ONS, BEIS and the Cabinet Office.
- 15. Interviews were conducted using paper surveys with digital video recorders used by interviewers. Most of the face-to-face interviews were conducted at the respondents' home. Respondents were offered a £50 incentive for taking part.

16. Part of the issue with face-to-face surveys is the time and cost required to reach the participant. For the pilot study, this meant that IFF had only two London based interviewers available for this study. As a result, Mojo Fieldwork only recruited interviews in London to prevent interviewers from having to travel very far, which enabled fieldwork to be conducted efficiently and cost effectively.

# **4 Methodological learnings**

1. This Chapter will cover the key learnings from the pilot survey. It is split into sections covering length of the fieldwork period, response rates, average length of survey and demographics. Table 4.1 shows the key comparisons by methodological group.

Methodology	Length in field	Overall response rate	Average length of survey	
Telephone	5 weeks	2%	21 minutes	
Post-to-web	5.5 weeks	6%	16 minutes	
Panel	3 days	N/A	10 minutes	
Face-to-face	1 week	N/A	20 minutes	

Table 4.1: Key comparisons by methodology

## 4.1 Fieldwork period

#### **Telephone survey**

2. It took 5 weeks to complete the telephone survey. A breakdown of weekly completions is shown in Table 4.2. In the third week, a second batch of sample was ordered.

Table 4.2: Completed interviews by weeks in field

Number of weeks in field	Number of completes	Proportion complete
After week 1	35	18%
After week 2	47	24%
After week 3	104	52%
After week 4	170	85%
After week 5	200	100%

3. The research team were given real time feedback by IFF's in-house interviewing team about how well the sample was performing, as well as any questions that respondents were finding particularly challenging.

#### Post-to-web

4. The post-to-web survey took place over five and a half weeks. Reminders were sent to non-completers. As can be seen in Table 4.3, each letter was successful in generating more completes. Those that did not complete the survey received three letters inviting them to take part.

Outcome	Number of completes	Proportion of completes
After initial invite letter	100	40%
After first reminder letter	90	36%
After final reminder letter	59	24%

#### Table 4.3: Completes following each letter invitation

- 5. IFF was able to monitor completes as they came in but, due to the nature of the methodology, could not get feedback on questions or the survey during the fieldwork period. Respondents were provided an email address to contact in their invitation letter if they had any queries about the survey, but none used the email for this purpose.
- 6. It is worth noting that, while there was a lack of real time response compared to a telephone survey, this also means that operating the post-to-web survey during the fieldwork period was cheaper than a telephone survey. However, it is worth reiterating that participants in the post-to-web survey were offered a £10 incentive for taking part.
- 7. Another benefit of using an online survey is that it allows the option to include visual elements as part of the survey.
- 8. OPSS decided to test this by introducing the option for participants who had not completed after two invitations to upload photos of product labels, if they could not remember or were unaware of the brand or model of some products. IFF would then code up the brand internally. Around 20 respondents should have been routed to this question and seen this as an option, but none of the respondents utilised this option in the survey.
- 9. This suggests that there is limited benefit in including this for the mainstage population survey, because there are extra costs that would be unlikely to encourage extra responses.

#### Panel survey

10. The 300 panel surveys were conducted over the course of three days.

#### Face-to-face survey

11. For the face-to-face survey, a lead time of one week was required for Mojo Fieldwork to recruit respondents. The 10 face-to-face surveys were conducted over the course of one week.

#### 4.2 Response rates

12. This section will cover the response rates of the pilot survey from each methodology.

- 13. Response rates cannot be calculated for the panel surveys because the panel providers did not provide information on the number of people on their panel that they approached for their survey or the proportion that opted to complete it.
- 14. Similarly, for the face-to-face fieldwork, IFF had no sight of the number of people Mojo Fieldwork approached. However, once recruited by Mojo Fieldwork, there were no drop-outs from participants that agreed to take part, and all 10 interviews were conducted at the time and place recruited for.

#### **Telephone survey**

- 15.As can be seen in Table 4.4, the overall response rate for the telephone survey was 2%, which was lower than anticipated in advance of the fieldwork. IFF initially ordered 6,000 records from the lifestyle sample, but another 3,000 records were ordered to complete the target of 200.
- 16. IFF experienced a high attrition rate after repeated calling and there was limited success after a record was called for a 5<sup>th</sup> time. 11 surveys out of 200 were completed after the 5<sup>th</sup> attempt or later at reaching a number. The average try count per record was 5.

Call outcome	Number of records	Proportion of records
Completed interviews	200	2%
Connected but interview not completed	1210	13%
Voice mail / no answer	5420	60%
Refused	1042	12%
Unreachable	1128	13%
Total records	9000	100%

#### Table 4.4: Sample outcomes from the telephone survey.

17. One benefit revealed of the telephone survey was the low dropout rate mid-survey. There was a concern, given the repetitive nature of the questions, that this may lead to respondents experiencing survey fatigue and opting not to complete the survey after they had started it (this was a partial reason for modularisation alongside survey length). Only on one occasion did a respondent stop an interview midway through. There were 31 occasions of the interviews breaking down during the call these may have been caused by a respondent hanging up but also may have been due to lost connection or another reason for the call breaking up.

#### Post-to-web

18. The main benefit established from the pilot post-to-web survey can be seen in the response rate of 6%. 249 surveys were completed from the 3,000 records that were sent an invite letter. This was a 4% higher response rate in comparison to the telephone survey.

- 19.As also shown in Table 4.5, there were 62 people (2% of the sample) who opened the link after the survey closed, suggesting that there was potential for more completions had the fieldwork window been open longer. This can be also be seen by the fact that 55 additional respondents who clicked the link and began the survey while was open but did not go on to complete the survey, showing an increased number of respondents could have been reached if desired.
- 20. Around 88% of invitation letters were either ignored or did not reach the respective respondents.

Outcome	Number of records	Proportion of records
Completed surveys	249	6%
Opt outs in advance of survey	0	0%
Over quota (attempts to open since survey closed)	62	2%
Clicked but did not complete	55	2%
Unreachable	1128	88%
Total number	3000	100%

#### Table 4.5: Sample outcomes by post-to-web

21. Additionally, as shown in Table 4.6, each reminder letter was successful in generating more completes. 100 were achieved after the initial invitation, 90 after the initial reminder letter and 59 after the final invitation letter was sent. This demonstrates the effectiveness of sending out reminder letters when using the post-to-web survey method.

#### Table 4.6: Post-to-web completes after each reminder letter

Outcome	Number of completes	Proportion of completes
After initial invite letter	100	40%
After first reminder letter	90	36%
After final reminder letter	59	24%

22. On a similar note, there were very few complaints from members of the public about sending letters to their home. One of the concerns about the survey was that some respondents may have considered their household possessions a private issue and may not want to disclose details of the products they owned within their household. It is suspected that sending letters addressed to the household rather than to individuals helped in this regard as respondents did not already feel that IFF or OPSS already held personal information about them.

## 4.3 Average length of survey

- 23. Table 4.7 shows the average length of each survey by method, splitting out the average by module.
- 24. For three of the four methodologies, the average length of each survey came in at the anticipated survey length, with Module 1 taking longer than Module 2 to complete. This suggests that a survey of a similar design would be appropriate for a population survey.
- 25. What is notable is that the average lengths of the two online surveys were less than the other methodologies, and the responses from the panel surveys were significantly less than post-to-web, coming in at 9 and 11 minutes for each respective module.
- 26. Online surveys are generally quicker than telephone or face-to-face surveys due to the lack of interaction from an interviewer. However, an issue faced when online is that some respondents will click through without reading the questions properly or thinking about their responses.
- 27. This is particularly an issue for panel surveys as panel populations are incentivised by panel providers for completing a certain number of surveys. Some respondents choose to 'blindly' click through to achieve a completed survey, which will contribute to their reward. Around 10 percent of the panel completes for the pilot were conducted in under 2 minutes, raising questions about the validity of these responses. For a full-scale survey using a panel provider, a threshold would be agreed to discard responses that fall below a certain length of time, and these responses would be replaced by the panel provider. However, this threshold is not an exact science and could still include non-valid responses or exclude valid responses.
- 28. A similar issue is possible for the post-to-web survey because it is also online and has an incentive for participation. However, only two of the post-to-web surveys were completed in under 2 minutes, suggesting that most respondents conducted the survey in good faith. As with a panel methodology, if the post-to-web survey was commissioned for the mainstage population survey, a timing threshold would be agreed, and surveys would be discounted from the total responses if they did not meet this threshold.

#### Table 4.7: Survey length by methodology and module

Outcome	Module 1 Module 2		Average time
Telephone	22 minutes	19 minutes	21 minutes
Post-to-web	18 minutes	14 minutes	16 minutes
Panel	9 minutes	11 minutes	10 minutes
Panel (excluding less than 2 minutes)	11 minutes	12 minutes	11 minutes
Face-to-face	25 minutes	15 minutes	20 minutes

## 4.4 Demographics

- 29. For the pilot survey, no hard quotas were enabled or enforced, however for each methodology, apart from the face-to-face interviews, efforts were made to try and achieve a spread of household types taking part. Demographic results of each method, compared to the approximate proportion of the UK population, are shown throughout this section.
- 30. As shown in Chapter 3, the telephone lifestyle sample order was split according to population estimates by gender, age, and UK nation. For the post-to-web survey, the Postcode Address File (PAF) was used, and stratified into quintiles using the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, so that an equal number of records were selected in each quintile.
- 31. At the end of the survey, respondents were asked a number of demographic questions. This section shows the reported responses to these questions and highlights any differences observable by methodology.

#### Region

- 32. Table 4.8 shows the split by region. Most methodologies achieved a relatively even split, and there was only one significant difference by methodology 13% of the responses via telephone came from the North-West, significantly higher than average.
- 33. Due to restrictions on the location of available interviewers and the budget allocated to the face-to-face interviews, all of these were conducted in London.

Region	Telephone	Post-to-web	Panel	Face-to-face	Total
South-East	11%	14%	12%	0%	12%
London	8%	11%	17%	100%	13%
South-West	9%	10%	7%	0%	9%
East of England	4%	8%	8%	0%	7%
West Midlands	11%	11%	12%	0%	11%
East Midlands	11%	8%	6%	0%	8%
Yorkshire	9%	8%	8%	0%	8%
North-West	13%	7%	8%	0%	9%
North-East	6%	6%	6%	0%	6%
Wales	5%	5%	5%	0%	5%
Scotland	13%	9%	8%	0%	10%
Northern Ireland	2%	3%	3%	0%	3%

#### Table 4.8: Regional response by methodology

	Telephone	Post-to-web	Panel	Face-to-face	UK population
England	72%	86%	79%	100%	84%
Wales	5%	5%	5%	0%	5%
Scotland	10%	13%	9%	0%	8%
Northern Ireland	3%	2%	3%	0%	3%

### Table 4.9: Representativeness of response by UK country population

#### Age

- 34. Figure 4.9 shows the split by age. More than half (55%) of respondents in the telephone survey were over 55 years old, and a third (33%) were 65 years or older this was significantly more than the other methodologies. Conversely, almost a quarter (23%) of the panel respondents were aged between 18 and 24, significantly more than the other methodologies.
- 35. Quotas could be put in place to mitigate for this during the full-scale survey, but findings from the pilot survey highlight the natural split of age between the two survey methodologies.



#### Figure 4.9: Age band split by methodology

Base: What is your age? All respondents: 789

	Telephone	Post-to-web	Panel	UK population
18-24	9%	4%	23%	8%
25-34	7%	19%	13%	13%
34-44	13%	18%	15%	13%
45-54	31%	15%	14%	25%
55+	33%	19%	16%	19%
PNTS	7%	25%	19%	N/A

### Table 4.10: Age breakdown by methodology across overall UK population

Note : PNTS stands for 'prefer not to say'

#### Gender by methodology

36. Figure 4.10 shows the gender split by methodology. Overall, more females took part than males, but there were no significant differences by methodology.



Figure 4.10: Gender by methodology

Base: Which gender do you identify with? All respondents: 789

	Telephone	Post-to-web	Panel	UK population
Male	46%	41%	41%	49%
Female	52%	56%	57%	51%

### Table 4.11: Representativeness of response by gender in UK population

#### Number of people living in the home of the respondent

37. Figure 4.12 shows the number of people living in the household of the respondent, including the person answering the survey. Around a third (35%) of people lived in a house with two people and around a fifth (21%) lived by themselves. There were no significant differences by methodology.

# Figure 4.12: Number of people living in the household of the respondent split by methodology



Base: How many people live in your household? All respondents: 789

#### Living situation of respondents

38. Figure 4.13 shows the living situation of respondents. Over half (57%) of respondents owned their own home and similar amount rented from a local authority, council, or housing association (18%) or rented their home from a private landlord (15%). There were no significant differences by methodology.

Figure 4.13: Number of people living in the household of the respondent split by methodology



Base: How many people live in your household?

# **5 Data quality**

## **5.1 Introduction**

- 1. This Chapter will assess the quality of the data gathered in the pilot study and draw comparisons by methodology.
- 2. As a way of assessing data quality, IFF looked at both the mean number of nonresponses to questions of how many of a particular product did the household own, and the self-reported confidence in answering questions around each product.

#### 5.2 Mean non-response rate

- 3. Respondents were asked in questions A2-A5 about how many of the following products they own. A1 related to electronic products; A2 to toy products; A3 to cosmetic products; A4 to large domestic appliances and A5 to furniture. Each question had a list of in-scope products the full questionnaire with the list of products can be found in Appendix 2.
- 4. Mean non-response figures relate to the proportion of respondents at each product question that did not enter a figure for the product shown. Using this method shows comparable responses between different methodologies. This is not a foolproof method but, if all methods were reaching the same demographics and all respondents were answering legitimately, then it would be expected that the number of non-responses across methodologies would be similar. Therefore, where there were higher levels of non-responses it suggests that the data quality among that methodology group was lower.
- 5. As shown in Table 5.1, panel respondents had significantly higher levels of nonresponse for most product categories. Non-response rates from the telephone and post-to-web were consistent with each other. Face-to-face surveys are not shown as a percentage due to the small number of surveys conducted but there were similarly a small proportion of non-responses by this method.

# Table 5.1 Mean non-response rate from survey questions A1 to A5 split by methodology type

Mode	Telephone	Post-to-web	Panel	Face-to-face
Electronics	5%	8%	27%*	1 out of 5
Toys	57%	48%	55%*	3 out of 5
Cosmetics	8%	9%	24%*	1 out of 5
Large white goods	3%	7%	24%*	1 out of 5
Furniture	4%	3%	26%*	1 out of 5

6. Table 5.2 shows that, when responses of less than 2 minutes were excluded from the response rate calculations (marked with a \* in the table above), then the non-response rate of the panel surveys falls to a level that is closer to, but still larger than, the other methodologies.

# Table 5.2 Mean non-response rate from survey questions A1 to A5 by panel providers that conducted the survey in more than 2 minutes

Mode	Panel excluding <2min completes		
Electronics	12%		
Toys	48%		
Cosmetics	15%		
Large white goods	14%		
Furniture	17%		

- 7. Additionally, there were other data quality concerns raised by the panel survey. There were some survey responses that were clearly false – for example one respondent said that they owned 99 of each furniture product. This was not a widespread issue, and the number of obviously fake responses was around 1% of the total completes.
- 8. In a full study, these obviously fake responses would be identified and replaced. However, each fake response eats into the limited sample and some fake responses are harder to identify than others.
- 9. Additionally, when looking for spoiled responses, analysis would need to be undertaken to identify high proportions of 'don't know' or 'prefer not to say' responses; any unrealistically high or low responses; and unlikely patterns within the data (for example, a respondent saying they owned 2 of everything).
- 10. The majority of the panel data input was of good quality and informative. In line with the advantages mentioned above, greater time to think accurately about the range and number of possessions found within respondents' homes may have lent itself to comprehensive data.
- 11. This can be seen in the open-ended questions where respondents were asked to outline why they obtained a particular item through an 'other, please specify' code. In these open-ended questions, there were often detailed responses, which highlights the high quality of data that can be received when the data is subject to quality control and assurance.

#### Face-to-face

- 12. A benefit of face-to-face, and to a lesser extent telephone interviews, is that interviewers are able to pick up in real time the extent they feel respondents are answering honestly and thoughtfully. Analysis of the data aside, this provides us with a degree of reassurance as to the quality of the data. Interviewers conducting the face-to-face interviews reported positively that they felt the data provided was of high quality and accurate.
- 13. Part of the reason for this is that being physically present in the respondent's house is likely to have encouraged greater engagement.

14. One risk associated with data quality for the face-to-face interviews was the extra step required to enter the data into the software. Interviewers conducted the surveys by marking respondent's answers on paper and then input that data into a computer after the interview. Part of the mitigation for this was that interviews were also recorded, so interviewers could verify they had correctly marked the response. Furthermore, if OPSS were to pursue a face-to-face approach for a scaled up national survey, we would recommend using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI), where interviewers enter responses directly into the data collection software using tablets.

# 5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions around different products

- 15. After respondents finished questions on the different product groups, they were then asked how confident they felt in the responses they provided, and extra text in the coded response options were given to the respondents to help them quantify their confidence. Confidence was given in a scale, as follows:
- Very Confident (I am confident that I gave accurate responses for all items in this category);
- Quite confident (I gave accurate responses to questions about most items, but estimates for a few);
- Neither confident nor unconfident (I was able to provide some accurate responses, but I also gave some estimates);
- Not very confident (I estimated my responses to most questions but was accurate with a few);
- Not at all confident (I was estimating all or nearly all the time).
- 16.Self-reported confidence was consistent and high across all methodologies. There was a risk that telephone respondents were going to be less confident because they would not have conducted the survey in their own time, but this did not appear to be the case.
- 17. Additionally, high levels of confidence suggests that the structure of the survey was appropriate for the scope of the study. Although, it is worth noting that this is self-reported confidence and that levels of confidence were high among panel providers, despite a number of dubious responses.
- 18. Non-confidence levels were steady overall between 2% and 4%, which shows that a small number of respondents based their answers on estimates. The proportion that was neither confident nor unconfident, which is the number that were estimating as much as they were providing accurate responses, varied between 6% for electronic products and large domestic appliances, and 15% for toys.

#### Electronics

19. The majority of respondents were confident when answering questions about electronic products, with nine in ten (91%) overall responding they were confident with the answers provided and two-fifths (42%) responding they were very confident. When taking a look into the split across method, no significant differences could be seen by confidence in answers split by survey method. Additionally, 5 out of 5 respondents in the face-to-face interviews were confident in their responses.

# Figure 5.3 Confidence of respondents answering questions about electronic products split by methodology



Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the responses you gave? (Electronics: 365)

20. Similarly, as shown in Figure 5.4 there were no significant differences in the level of confidence when answering questions around electronic products.





Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the response you gave? (All electronics: 365, 18-24 years old: 32, 25-34 years old: 55, 35-44 years old: 66, 45-54 years old: 40, 55-64 years old: 67 and 65 years plus: 78)

### Toys

- 21.Most respondents were confident when answering questions about toys, with eight in ten (91%) overall responding they were confident with the answers provided and over one third (36%) reporting they were very confident.
- 22. Those who took part in the telephone survey were significantly more likely than average to not be confident about their responses about toys (8%, compared to 2% overall).
- 23. Additionally, 5 out of 5 respondents in the face-to-face interviews were confident in their responses.

# Figure 5.5 Confidence of respondents answering questions about toy products split by methodology



Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the responses you gave? (Toys: 208)

24. However, when looking into the confidence into responses split by age group, those aged between 35 and 44 years old were significantly more likely to report they were confident about the responses provided for toys (94%, compared to 81% average).





Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the response you gave? (All toys: 208, 18-24 years old: 28, 25-34 years old: 42, 35-44 years old: 48, 45-54 years old: 24, 55-64 years old: 25 and 65 years plus: 29)

#### Cosmetics

- 25. Similar to the previous product groups, the majority of respondents were confident when answering questions about cosmetics. Slightly less than nine in ten (88%) respondents said they were confident with the answers provided and more than half (56%) responded that they were very confident.
- 26. Methodologically, those who took part in the post-to-web surveys were significantly more likely than average to be confident about their responses regarding cosmetic products than average (92% for post-to-web compared to 85% for telephone and 67% for panel surveys).
- 27. Additionally, 7 out of 10 respondents to the face-to-face interviews were confident in their responses, whilst 2 responded they were not confident.

# Figure 5.7 Confidence of respondents in answering questions about cosmetic products split by methodology



Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the responses you gave? (Cosmetics: 707)

28. However, unlike the survey method, there were no significant differences by age group when answering questions around cosmetics, as shown in Figure 5.6.





Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the response you gave? (All cosmetics: 707, 18-24 years old: 84, 25-34 years old: 100, 35-44 years old: 107, 45-54 years old: 89, 55-64 years old: 120 and 65 years plus: 160)

#### Large domestic appliances

29. As with the other product types, most respondents were confident when answering questions about large domestic appliances, with just under nine in ten (88%) confident overall and almost a half (46%) very confident. When taking a look into the split across method, no significant differences could be seen by confidence in answers split by survey method. Additionally, 4 out of 5 respondents in the face-to-face interviews were confident in their responses.





Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the responses you gave? (Large domestic appliances: 355)

30. By age group, those aged between 25 and 34 years old were significantly more likely to report they were confident about the responses provided for large domestic appliances (98%, compared to 88% average).

# Figure 5.10 Confidence of respondents in answering questions about large domestic appliances split by age band



Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the response you gave? (All large domestic appliances: 355, 18-24 years old: 50, 25-34 years old: 44, 35-44 years old: 45, 45-54 years old: 48, 55-64 years old: 55 and 65 years plus: 86)

#### Furniture

- 31. The majority of respondents were confident when answering questions about furniture, with just under nine in ten (87%) overall responding they were confident with the answers provided, and half (50%) very confident. Respondents that took part in the panel survey were significantly less likely than average to be confident in their responses (83%, compared to 88% overall).
- 32. Additionally, 5 out of 5 respondents in the face-to-face interviews were confident in their responses.

# Figure 5.11 Confidence of respondents in answering questions about furniture products by methodology



Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the responses you gave? (Furniture / furnishings: 350)

33. By age group, those aged between 18 and 24 years old were significantly less likely to report they were confident about the responses provided for furniture products (82%, compared to 88% average).



Figure 5.12 Confidence of respondents in answering questions about furniture products by age band

Base: For each product group can you say how confident you felt in the response you gave? (All furniture / furnishings: 350, 18-24 years old: 47, 25-34 years old: 46, 35-44 years old: 45, 45-54 years old: 47, 55-64 years old: 54 and 65 years plus: 85)

# **6** Recommendations for mainstage

1. This section will summarise the methodological findings with the advantages and disadvantages of each methodology that should be considered in order to develop a survey that is representative of the UK population.

## 6.1 Telephone survey

- 2. Conducting a large-scale representative population study using a telephone survey with a combination of random digit dialling and lifestyle sample would be feasible.
- 3. Methodologically, it would involve scaling up the lifestyle sample ordered and introducing quotas and targets based on demographics, such as age, gender, and living situation.
- 4. A full-scale telephone survey using this method would have no issue reaching all areas of the UK. As already shown in Table 4.9, even without enforced quotas, the survey achieved a spread across all regions.
- 5. The data quality would be reliable, as can be seen by high levels of self-reported confidence in survey responses and low non-response rate to product questions. Furthermore, having an interviewer on the phone to provide clarifications to respondents if they experience any issues would help provide more reliable data.
- 6. However, concerns around a telephone survey would include a low response rate, just 2% of the sample completed the pilot survey. For a full-scale survey of 2,000 interviews, IFF would be looking at purchasing around 90,000 records.
- 7. The biggest concern about a telephone survey issue would be the cost. A telephone survey would be more expensive than the other survey methods due to high data and operational costs.

#### Advantages of the proposed telephone method

- Telephone interviewing allows for 'fresh' sample to be used in comparison to panel respondents which are subject to panel 'conditioning.'
- Allows screening at the beginning of the interview to ensure that the respondent is eligible for the interview.
- It is possible to control responses and quotas set out in real time.
- Typically, there is minimal dropout during the interview, as the presence of an interviewer can maintain participation to the end. This can ensure they complete every question, and probe on open-ended questions.

#### Disadvantages of the proposed telephone method

- It is not possible to include visuals as part of the survey (at least not without supplementing with an online element).
- It is not particularly reliable for complex/numerical data collection.
- It is not possible to transfer between different people in the middle of an interview.
- It is a relatively expensive data collection method due to the number of interviewing hours required.
- The "random digit dialling" and "lifestyle" sample frames that a telephone approach uses have become less reliable over time. It is not comprehensive, and it has become more and more difficult to persuade individuals to take part over the telephone, meaning responses rates are typically low.

### 6.2 Post-to-web survey

- 8. Out of the four methodologies tested, a post-to-web survey using the Postcode Address File would be IFF's recommendation for a full-scale survey. The data costs are cheaper than a CATI survey with similar levels of data quality.
- 9. A post-to-web survey can be targeted at different population groups using the Index of Multiple Deprivation, helping to reach respondents UK wide.
- 10.A post-to-web survey would also be easier to manage than a full-scale telephone survey as fewer parties are involved during the fieldwork period.
- 11. Similarly, data quality would be reliable. The pilot study showed that self-reported confidence in the survey was high for each product category and the non-response rate was low.
- 12. One concern about a post-to-web survey would be that it is not possible to verify data quality in real time. However, this could be mitigated by conducting a soft launch to test the data in real time. If OPSS wanted to go further, cognitive interviews could also be conducted to test questions on respondents and get early feedback about how they found answering the survey. It is worth noting that any cognitive interviews would come at an additional cost.
- 13. Another potential risk of a post-to-web survey would be excluding those who are digitally excluded and less inclined or able to take part. One way of mitigating this would be to include a small-scale, supplementary, telephone element. Through targeted proactive calling, interviewers can persuade respondents to take part who may otherwise be unlikely or unwilling to do so using self-completion modes.
- 14.IFF's recommended approach to this would be to undertake targeted telephone interviewing those aged 65 and above, which can be used as a proxy for likelihood to be digitally excluded. As demonstrated in the pilot survey this is an age group that telephone surveys can easily reach.
- 15. The sample frame for this would be the same as we deployed for our pilot telephone approach, i.e. a blend of RDD and Lifestyle sample, and this would come at an extra cost.

#### Advantages of the proposed online post-to-web survey method

- Similarly to the telephone survey method, a post-to-web survey method uses 'fresh' sample and is not subject to panel 'conditioning.'
- As with other online approaches, it is possible to use visuals as part of the survey process.

• Online interviewing works well to collect complex / numerical data. It can be presented in a way that makes it straightforward for the respondent and allows them time to check / look things up.

#### Disadvantages of the proposed online post-to-web survey method

- In order to achieve good levels of response, it is necessary to conduct multiple mailouts and incentivise respondents.
- This means that it is not necessarily a 'cheap' option, but nevertheless it remains a more cost-effective option than either a full telephone or face-to-face approach.

### 6.3 Panel survey

- 16. IFF would not recommend using panels solely for this research. Despite it being quick and cheap, the data would not be as reliable and would be harder to scale to reach national representation due to the limited size and sample profile.
- 17. Furthermore, the data would not be as reliable as other methodologies, as shown by the high non-response levels in the survey.

#### Advantages of the proposed online panel survey method

- Fieldwork can be carried out quickly.
- Online panel interviewing is cheaper than other methodologies.
- As with other online approaches, it is possible to use visuals as part of the survey process.
- Online interviewing also works well for collecting complex/numerical data. It can be presented in a way that makes it straightforward for the respondent, and it allows them time to check/ look things up.
- Panel providers typically collect a range of demographic information at the point of recruitment, which means fieldwork can be targeted accordingly. It also enables screening at the beginning of interviews to ensure that everyone is eligible for interview.

#### Disadvantages of the proposed online panel survey method

- By definition, this approach relies on pre-recruited panels. These are individuals who have previously signed up to taking part in research and are called upon to do so regularly. This creates an effect known as panel 'conditioning,' meaning they will be different (albeit in an unobservable way) to regular members of the public and, accordingly, provide different responses.
- It is not possible to transfer between different people in the middle of an interview.
- Depending on the scale of the requirement for mainstage, it is possible that online panels will not be able to meet the interview numbers needed.

### 6.4 Face-to-face survey

18.A full-scale survey of 2,000 face-face interviews would result in high quality data, due to interviewers being present with the respondent and able to field questions about the survey, pick up on cues from the respondents and encourage them to think about their responses more if it is felt they have not.

- 19. However, it would be the most difficult method to conduct operationally and therefore would have large operational costs. It is likely that multiple agencies would be involved in conducting interviews to ensure that enough interviewers are available in the correct places at the correct times.
- 20. In order to reach all areas of the UK, interviews would need to be done in different regions and interviewing at this scale would risk times, dates and places being missed which would have financial implications.
- 21. Face-to-face interviewing is declining in popularity and the number of contractors offering this service is also falling. This may present an issue in terms of replicating future waves of the survey.
- 22. If a full-scale face-to-face survey was commissioned IFF would recommend using Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) which involves interviewers directly entering responses into data processing software using tablets as opposed to paper surveys and interviewers retrospectively entering the data. This would save time and mitigate the risks of interviewers inputting incorrect data.
- 23.As with the pilot study, conducting face-to-face surveys in people's homes would require a significant incentive to motivate them to take part, which would be another cost to the survey.

#### Advantages of the proposed face-to-face survey method

- A face-to-face methodology uses 'fresh' panel. This means there is no panel 'conditioning.'
- The presence of an interviewer 'in real life' means that face-to-face surveys can sustain longer questionnaire lengths than other approaches.
- It is possible to use visuals as part of the survey process.
- Face-to-face interviewing also works well for collecting complex/numerical data. It can be presented in a way that makes it straightforward for the respondent, and it allows them time to check/ look things up.

#### Disadvantages of the proposed face-to-face survey method

- The primary disadvantage is cost. To scale up the survey for mainstage using a faceto-face approach would require a strong case to offset the additional outlay.
- A secondary consideration is that there are not many contractors who can provide face-to-face interviewing at scale. This would limit the options available to OPSS.

# 6.5 Potential of reducing the number of products asked about in the survey

24.A suggestion from OPSS was to filter the survey further ahead of the mainstage study by reducing the number of products each individual was asked about. There was a concern that the more products that respondents are asked about, the less likely they were to give accurate answers.

- 25. The pilot study found high levels of self-reported confidence about the products respondents were answering about. However, there is potential for re-designing the survey so that each respondent is asked about fewer products. This would free up some time to encourage them to think more about their responses and check the accuracy themselves while conducting the survey.
- 26. The benefits of this would be that OPSS could be more certain of the accuracy of individual responses and have a more accurate picture of the number of actual products there are in each household.
- 27. The cons of this approach are that a smaller proportion of respondents are answering questions about each product type, which means that the survey would require a higher total number of completed interviews for OPSS to be confident that the survey responses for each product are representative of the UK wide population. A knock-on effect of the higher targets would be higher costs.

### 6.5 Other considerations for the main study

- 28. The population mainstage survey could be conducted using post-to-web as stratified by the Index of Multiple Deprivation to target a diverse population group.
- 29. This approach can be supplemented with a telephone survey that would target those over the age of 65. This group is most likely to be digitally excluded and less likely to complete a post-to-web survey.
- 30. For a population wide survey, a soft launch can be conducted with a small percentage of the sample receiving letters ahead of the main batch. This would allow OPSS to assess the survey, receive any feedback and iron out any issues ahead of the survey launch.
- 31. There is the potential for re-designing the survey so that each respondent is asked about fewer products. This could help respondents to spend more time thinking about their responses and increase the accuracy of the data.

## 7. Appendix 1 – Survey results

 This section presents the survey results. The aim of the survey was to learn about the best methodology that can be used to count the number of OPSSrelated products in UK households. The data presented in the section is for the purposes of methodological learning. Hence, the numbers presented below are not representative of the UK population and should not be considered accurate.

### 7.1 Electronics

2. On average respondents owned 8 main lights. Lamps and mobile phone chargers were second and third with e-scooters being the item least owned per household.



Figure 7.1 Mean number of electrical products owned

Base: How many of the following electrical appliances do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

3. Online purchase routes tended to be more common for electronic items which connect to, or would be used in relation to, the internet. Smart home devices (63% online), Bluetooth headphones (63% online) and games consoles (52% online) were most likely to be bought online, and main lights (40% in person), irons (65% in person) and lamps (55% in person) were more likely to be bought in person.



### Figure 7.2 Most recent purchase route of electronic products

Base: For each of the following items please say whether the most recent purchase was through an online store; an online marketplace; in store or some other way?

4. Across all electronic items the majority were purchased new, although more than a third (36%) of those that owned e-scooters purchased them second hand.

Figure 7.3 Whether electronic products were purchased new or second hand



Base: For each of the following items please say whether the most recent purchase was for a new or second-hand item?

5. Respondents had on average owned their main lights for six years, and lamps for four years.



#### Figure 7.4 Age in years of electronics currently in each household

Base: In months how old are the following items currently in your household?

6. Domestic household appliances, such as kettles, irons and vacuum cleaners were more likely to be purchased as a replacement for a damaged or broken product. Conversely, luxury items such as smart home devices, games consoles and Bluetooth headphones were more likely to be bought as an upgrade or purchased for the first time.



#### Figure 7.5 Reason for purchasing electronics

Base: You said that the following items are less than one year old. Can you explain the reason why you purchased each item in this time frame?

### 7.2 Toys

7. Stuffed toys were the most commonly owned items amongst those who owned toys, with board games as a second most popular option. Dolls were the least commonly owned item.





Base: How many of the following types of toys do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

8. The high street was the most common purchase location of all toy products as shown in Figure 7.7.

Figure 7.7 Typical purchase route of toy products



Base: For each of the following items please say whether you typically purchase them new or second hand?

9. Stuffed toys were the item most commonly bought new, with 90% of respondents buying these items this way. Action figures were the most likely item to be bought second hand, with nearly a quarter of respondents (24%) buying this item this way.





Base: For each of the following items please say whether you typically purchase them new or second hand?

## 7.3 Cosmetics

10. Lipstick was the most owned item, with respondents averaging 4 lipsticks per household. An average of 3 soaps and shampoos were owned by household.

Figure 7.9 Mean number of cosmetic products owned



Base: For each of the following items please say whether you typically purchase them new or second hand?

11. Across all items, a majority of respondents were likely to purchase their everyday, domestic cosmetics on the high street, with the items least likely to be bought on the high street being lipstick (71%), moisturiser (71%), and foundation (72%).



#### Figure 7.10 Typical purchase route of cosmetic products

Base: For each of the following items please state whether you typically purchase the item through an online store; an online marketplace; in store or some other way?

## 7.4 Large domestic appliances

12. When rounded to the nearest whole number, on average respondents owned one of each of the large domestic appliances.

Figure 7.11 Mean number of large domestic appliances owned



Base: How many of the following large domestic appliances do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

13. Typically, respondents were as likely to purchase large domestic appliances online as they were on the high street. Stoves and ovens had the highest likelihood of not being purchased by the respondent themselves.



### Figure 7.12 Typical purchase route of large domestic appliances

Base: For each of the following items please say whether the most recent purchase was through an online store; an online marketplace; in store or some other way?

14. Across all domestic appliances an overwhelming majority of respondents purchased their appliances new and firsthand, with freezers being the item which was most likely to be bought second hand (12%).

Figure 7.13 Whether toy products were purchased new or second hand



Base: For each of the following items please say whether the most recent purchase was for a new or second-hand item?

15. Across all domestic appliances an overwhelming majority of respondents purchased their appliances new and firsthand, with freezers being the item which was most likely to be bought second hand (12%).



Figure 7.14 Age in years of large domestic appliances in each household

Base: In months how old are the following items currently in your household?

16. For most large domestic appliances, replacing a damaged or broken product was the reason for purchasing the item. However, a considerable number of respondents bought the item in question as an upgrade.



Figure 7.15 Reason for purchasing large domestic appliances

Base: You said that the following items are less than one year old. Can you explain the reason why you purchased each item in this time frame?

## 7.5 Furniture

17. On average respondents owned 4 sets of curtains and cushions.



Figure 7.16 Mean number of furniture products owned

Base: How many of the following types of furniture / furnishings do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

18. Typically, respondents bought their furniture on the high street. This was the most common purchase route for all furniture products. The second most common purchase route for all furniture products was an online store.

Figure 7.17 Typical purchase route of furniture



Base: For each of the following items please select whether the most recent purchase was through an online store; an online marketplace; in store or some other way?

19. A significant majority of respondents purchased each item of furniture new, as opposed to second hand. Items most likely to be bought second hand were dining tables and sofas.



Figure 7.18 Whether toy products were purchased new or second hand

Base: For each of the following items please say whether the most recent purchase was for a new or second hand item?

20. Dining tables tended to be the oldest items people had in the household, with a mean age of 7 years amongst respondents who owned one. Similarly, both beds and sofas tended to have a mean age of 5 years amongst those who owned them. Cushions tended to be the item owned for the shortest period of time.

Figure 7.19 Age in years of furniture products in each household



Base: In months how old are the following items currently in your household?

## Bibliography

- 1. Alreck, P., Settle., R. (2004) Survey Research Handbook. (third ed.), McGraw Hill, New York, NY.
- Beullens, K., Loosveldt G., Vandenplas C. & Stoop I. (2018). Response Rates in the European Social Survey: Increasing, Decreasing, or a Matter of Fieldwork Efforts? Survey Methods: Insights from the Field. <u>Response Rates in the European Social Survey</u>: <u>Increasing, Decreasing, or a Matter of Fieldwork Efforts?</u> | Survey Methods: Insights from the Field (SMIF) (surveyinsights.org)
- 3. Block, E & Erskine, L (2012). Interviewing by Telephone: Specific Considerations, Opportunities, and Challenges. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* (PDF) Interviewing by Telephone: Specific Considerations, Opportunities, and Challenges (researchgate.net).
- 4. Brosnan, K., Kemperman, A., & Dolnicar, S. (2021). Maximizing participation from online survey panel members. *International Journal of Market Research*. <u>Maximizing participation from online survey panel members Kylie Brosnan, Astrid Kemperman, Sara Dolnicar, 2021 (sagepub.com)</u>.
- 5. Brüggen E., van den Brakel J. A., Krosnick J. (2016). *Establishing the accuracy of online panels for survey research* <u>IPS047-P1-A.pdf (isiproceedings.org)</u>.
- 6. Chandler, J., Rosenzweig, C., Moss, A.J. *et al.* (2019). Online panels in social science research: Expanding sampling methods beyond Mechanical Turk. <u>Online panels in social science research: Expanding sampling methods beyond Mechanical Turk | Behavior Research Methods (springer.com)</u>.
- Cornick, P; d'Ardenne, J; Maslovskaya, O; Mesplie-Cowan, S; Nicolaas G; Smith, P; (2022). Review of Options for the National Survey for Wales. <u>Report template long</u> (ncrm.ac.uk).
- Davies L, LeClair KL, Bagley P, et al. (2020). Face-to-Face Compared with Online Collected Accounts of Health and Illness Experiences: A Scoping Review. Qualitative Health Research. <u>Face-to-Face Compared with Online Collected</u> <u>Accounts of Health and Illness Experiences: A Scoping Review - PubMed (nih.gov)</u>.
- De Leeuw, E., Hox, J., & Luiten, A. (2018). International Nonresponse Trends across Countries and Years: An analysis of 36 years of Labour Force Survey data. Survey Insights: Methods from the Field. International Nonresponse Trends across Countries and Years: An analysis of 36 years of Labour Force Survey data | Survey Methods: Insights from the Field (SMIF) (surveyinsights.org)
- 10. Drabble L., Trocki KF., Salcedo B., Walker PC., Korcha RA. (2016). Conducting qualitative interviews by telephone: Lessons learned from a study of alcohol use among sexual minority and heterosexual women. Qual Soc Work. <u>Conducting</u> <u>qualitative interviews by telephone: Lessons learned from a study of alcohol use among sexual</u> <u>minority and heterosexual women - PMC (nih.gov)</u>.
- 11. Endres, K., Heiden, E., Park, K., Losch, M., Harland, K., Abbott, A. (2023). Experimenting with QR Codes and Envelope Size in Push-to-Web Surveys. *Journal or Survey Statistics*. <u>Experimenting with QR Codes and Envelope Size in Push-to-Web Surveys</u> Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology | Oxford Academic (oup.com).

- 12. Enoch, J., Subramanian A., & Willig, C. (2023). "If I don't like it, I'll just pop the phone down!": Reflecting on participant and researcher experiences of telephone interviews conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Qualitative Research in Health*. "If I don't like it, I'll just pop the phone down!": Reflecting on participant and researcher experiences of telephone interviews conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic ScienceDirect.
- 13. Groves, R. M., & Kahn, R. L. (1979). Surveys by telephone: A national comparison with personal interviews. Surveys by Telephone, a National Comparison with Personal Interviews - Spitz - 1980 - Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (General) -Wiley Online Library.
- 14. Hays RD, Liu H, & Kapteyn A. (2015). Use of Internet panels to conduct surveys. Behav Res Methods. <u>Use of Internet panels to conduct surveys - PubMed (nih.gov)</u>.
- 15. Holbrook, A., Geen, M., Krosnick, J. (2003) Telephone versus face-to-face interviewing of national probability samples with long questionnaires: comparison of respondent satisfying and social desirability response bias. <u>Telephone versus Face-to-Face Interviewing of National Probability Samples with Long Questionnaires: Comparisons of Respondent Satisficing and Social Desirability Response Bias1 | Public Opinion Quarterly | Oxford Academic (oup.com).</u>
- 16. IPSOS (2019), Push to web best practice guide. Push To Web Best Practice Guide | Ipsos.
- 17. Keen, S., Lomeli-Rodriguez, M., Joffe, H. (2022). From Challenge to Opportunity: Virtual Qualitative Research During COVID-19 and Beyond. *Int J Qual Methods*. <u>From Challenge to Opportunity: Virtual Qualitative Research During COVID-19 and Beyond - Sam Keen, Martha Lomeli-Rodriguez, Helene Joffe, 2022 (sagepub.com)</u>.
- 18. Kees, J., Berry, C., Burton, S., & Sheehan, K. (2017). An analysis of data quality: Professional panels, student subject pools, and Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Journal of advertising*. <u>An Analysis of Data Quality: Professional Panels, Student Subject Pools, and Amazon's Mechanical Turk: Journal of Advertising: Vol 46, No 1 (tandfonline.com)</u>.
- 19. Lobe, B., Morgan D., & Hoffman, K. (2022), A systematic comparison of in-person and video based online interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. <u>A</u> <u>Systematic Comparison of In-Person and Video-Based Online Interviewing - Bojana Lobe, David L.</u> <u>Morgan, Kim Hoffman, 2022 (sagepub.com)</u>.
- 20. Lynn, P. (2020). Evaluating push-to-web methodology for mixed-mode surveys using address-based samples. *Survey Research Methods*. <u>Evaluating push-to-web methods</u> <u>SRM accepted version (essex.ac.uk)</u>.
- 21. Lutgig, P., Toepel, V., Emery, T., Canaco, S., Naderi, R., Schumann, A., & Luck, D. (2020) Can we Successfully Move a Cross-national Survey online? Results from a Large Three-country Experiment in the Gender and Generations Programme survey. *Center for Open Science*. <u>Can we Successfully Move a Cross-national Survey online? Results from a Large Three-country Experiment in the Gender and Generations Programme survey (repec.org)</u>.
- 22. Maliski, S., Rivera, S., Connor, S., Lopez., G. & Litwin, M.S. (2008). Renegotiating masculine identity after prostate cancer treatment. *Qual Health Research*. <u>Renegotiating masculine identity after prostate cancer treatment PubMed (nih.gov)</u>.
- 23. Miller, D. C., & Salkind, N. J. (2003). *Handbook of research design and social measurement* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.).

- 24. Moss A., Hauser D., Rosenzweig C., Jaffe S., Robinson J., & Litman L. (2023) Using Market-Research Panels for Behavioral Science: An Overview and Tutorial. Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science. <u>Using Market-Research</u> Panels for Behavioral Science: An Overview and Tutorial - Aaron J. Moss, David J. Hauser, <u>Cheskie</u> Rosenzweig, Shalom Jaffe, Jonathan Robinson, Leib Litman, 2023 (sagepub.com).
- 25. Pennay D., Neiger D., Lavrakas P. J., & Borg K. (2018). The Online Panels Benchmarking Study: A total survey error comparison of findings from probability based surveys and non-probability online panel surveys in Australia. *Centre for Social Research and Methods*. <u>The Online Panels Benchmarking Study: A Total Survey Error</u> <u>comparison of findings from Probability-based surveys and Non-probability online panel surveys in</u> <u>Australia | ANU Centre for Social Research & Methods</u>.
- 26. Rogers, T. F. (1976). Interviews by telephone and in person: Quality of responses and field performance. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. <u>Interviews by telephone and in person: Quality of responses and field performance. (apa.org)</u>.
- 27. Saarijarvi, M., & Bratt, E. (2021). When face-to-face interviews are not possible: Tips and tricks for video, telephone, online chat, and email interviews in qualitative research. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*. <u>When face-to-face interviews are not possible: tips and tricks for video, telephone, online chat, and email interviews in qualitative research | European Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing | Oxford Academic (oup.com)</u>
- 28. Schonlau, M; Fricker, R & Elliott, M. (2002), Conducting Research Surveys via E-mail and the Web. *RAND Corporation*. <u>Conducting Research Surveys via E-mail and the Web | RAND</u>
- 29. Shook-Sa, B., Currivan, D., Roe, D., & Warren, L. (2016). Random Digit Dialing versus Address-Based Sampling Using Telephone Data Collection. *Survey Practice*. Random Digit Dialing versus Address-Based Sampling using Telephone Data Collection | Published in Survey Practice
- 30. Sturges, J., & Hanrahan, K. (2004) Comparing telephone and face-to-face qualitative interviewing: A research note. <u>Comparing Telephone and Face-to-Face Qualitative</u> Interviewing: a Research Note - Judith E. Sturges, Kathleen J. Hanrahan, 2004 (sagepub.com)
- 31. Szolnoki, G; Hoffmann, D (2013). Online, face-to-face and telephone surveys— Comparing different sampling methods in wine consumer research. *Wine Economics and Policy*. <u>Online, face-to-face and telephone surveys</u>—<u>Comparing different sampling methods in</u> <u>wine consumer research - ScienceDirect</u>
- 32. Thomas, K. A., & Clifford, S. (2017). Validity and Mechanical Turk: An assessment of exclusion methods and interactive experiments. *Science Direct*. <u>Validity and Mechanical Turk: An assessment of exclusion methods and interactive experiments ScienceDirect</u>

## 8. Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Household Population Baseline Survey Pilot J12989 Telephone

## S Online Landing Page

DISPLAY IF METHOD=1 OR 2

Thank you for choosing taking part in this survey of household items.

[IF METHOD =1 As covered in the invitation letter this IF METHOD=2 This] survey is being conducted by IFF Research, an independent market research company, on behalf of the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) and the Department for Business and Trade.

The Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) is conducting a pilot survey to gather data on the number of OPSS-related products found within homes in the UK. Your participation will help to inform the volume of different products within the UK and will help to inform future research and policy decisions to ensure safety and quality for both consumers and businesses.

[IF METHOD=2] To thank you for your time, we are offering a £10 amazon voucher or payment via PayPal or Wise transfer.

The survey should take around 20 minutes to complete depending on your answers. You can pause the survey at any time by clicking on the pause symbol at the bottom of the screen and can re-enter by clicking on the link again.

All data will be held securely, and you have the right to a copy of your data, change your data or withdraw from the research at any point. If you would like to take part, the survey will be conducted on an anonymised basis and responses will be treated as strictly confidential in accordance with the principles of GDPR and the Market Research Society's Code of Conduct.

When completing the survey, please only use the 'next' button on the page, rather than the 'back' and 'forward' buttons in your browser.

If you have any questions or would like more information about the survey, please see how IFF keeps your data secure here: <u>iffresearch.com/gdpr.</u>

If you would like to contact IFF Research about the study, or withdraw from the research at any point, please contact IFF via the freephone at 0800 368 5469 or via email at householdproductsurvey@iffresearch.com.

READ OUT IF METHOD=4

Thank you for agreeing to taking part in this survey of household items.

As covered in the invitation letter this is being conducted by IFF Research, an independent market research company, on behalf of the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) and the Department for Business and Trade.

This pilot survey is being conducted to gather data on the number of OPSS-related products found within homes in the UK. Your participation will help to inform the volume of different products within the UK as well as helping inform future research and policy decisions that will ensure safety and quality for both consumers and businesses.

To thank you for your time, we are offering a £50 amazon voucher or payment via PayPal or Wise transfer.

The survey should take around 30 minutes to complete depending on your answers. You can pause or end the survey at any time by letting me know.

All personal data will be held securely, and you have the right to a copy of your data, change your data or withdraw from the research at any point. The survey will be conducted on an anonymised basis and responses will be treated as strictly confidential in accordance with the principles of GDPR and the Market Research Society's Code of Conduct.

If you have any questions or would like more information about the survey, please see how IFF keeps your data secure here: <u>iffresearch.com/gdpr.</u>

If you would like to contact IFF Research about the study, or withdraw from the research at any point, please contact IFF via the freephone at 0800 368 5469 or via email at householdproductsurvey@iffresearch.com. We can send these details via email following the survey.

## **CATI** Screener

ASK PERSON WHO ANSWERS PHONE

S1 Good morning / afternoon / evening. My name is <NAME> and I'm calling from IFF Research on behalf of the Office for Product Safety and Standards and Department of Business and Trade. I'm looking to speak to the person responsible for the household decisions or purchases, please?

ADD IF NECESSARY:

- The Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) is a UK government agency responsible for product safety and standards across various sectors. Part of the Department for Business and Trade.
- It's to do with important research being conducted on the products found within people's homes. This is to help OPSS make informed decisions around product safety legislation that ultimately benefit consumers and ensure safer, better-regulated markets.
- I'm looking to speak with the person with household responsibility that doesn't specifically mean they are the bill payer.
- To reassure you this call is not about selling you anything.

Respondent answers phone	1			
Transferred to respondent	2	CONTINUE		
Hard appointment	3			
Soft Appointment	4			
Engaged	5	CALL BACK		
Refusal	6			
Not available in deadline	7			
Fax Line	8	CLOSE		
No reply / Answer phone	9			
Business Number	10			
Deadline	11			
Request reassurance email		COLLECT EMAIL ADDRESS THEN CONTINUE OR MAKE APPOINTMENT (SEE APPENDIX FOR EMAIL TEXT)		

#### ASK ALL

S2 [IF S1=1] That's great, the reason for my call today is to assist the Office for Product Safety and Standards in understanding more about products within households to help them make informed decisions. Your input plays a crucial role in enhancing future product safety for households like yours, it would be helpful to run through some important questions with you today, please?

[IF S1=2] Good morning / afternoon/ evening. My name is <NAME>, and I'm calling on behalf of the Government Office for Product Safety and Standards from IFF Research. The reason for my call today is to assist the OPSS in understanding more about products within households to help them make informed decisions. Your input plays a crucial role in enhancing future product safety for households like yours, it would be helpful to run through some important questions with you today, please?

ADD IF NECESSARY:

• IF RESPONDENT HASN'T ASKED FOR CLARITY ON CALL LENGTH – MAKE SURE TO COVER: Depending on your answers the interview will take around 20 minutes to complete, but we can always begin now, see how far we get, and if you need to go at any point, we can easily set an appointment to call back.

- Please be reassured that your answers WILL NOT be reported to the Office for Product Safety and Standards in any way that would allow you or your home to be identified. All data will be reported anonymously.
- The Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) is a UK government agency responsible for product safety and standards across various sectors. Part of the Department for Business and Trade.
- This survey is being carried out by IFF Research on behalf of the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) as a part of wider research to help OPSS understand the types of products found in households.
- The purpose of this survey is to gather data on the number of OPSS-related products found in people's homes, to help OPSS make informed decisions around product safety legislation that ultimately benefit consumers and ensure safer, better-regulated markets.
- We obtained your details through the lifestyle database and this number has been selected using random digit dialling.

Continue	1	CONTINUE		
Request to complete online	2	COLLECT EMAIL ADDRESS AND THEN ACTION ONLINE		
Referred to someone else in household	0	TRANSFER AND RE-		
NAME	2	INTRODUCE		
Hard appointment	3			
Soft appointment	4			
Refusal	5			
Refusal – company policy	6	THANK AND CLOSE		
Refusal – taken part in recent survey	7	MANK AND CLOSE		
Not available in deadline	8			
Request reassurance email	9	COLLECT EMAIL ADDRESS THEN CONTINUE OR MAKE APPOINTMENT (SEE APPENDIX FOR EMAIL TEXT)		

S3 That's great, thank you. Before we proceed any further, I want to reassure you that all information collected will be treated in the strictest confidence. Under data protection law, you have the right to have a copy of your data, change your data, or withdraw from the research at any point. In order to guarantee this, and as part of our quality control procedures, all interviews are recorded automatically. Is that, OK?

#### Are you happy to continue with the survey?

Yes	1	CONTINUE
Νο	2	THANK AND CLOSE

#### REASSURANCES TO USE IF NECESSARY

The interview will take around 20 minutes to complete.

Please note that all data will be reported in aggregate form and your answers will not be reported to our client in any way that would allow you to be identified.

IF METHOD =1 CATI- Your details were obtained through a lifestyle database is compiled by a sampling company called Sagacity from various sources. These are matched through public records like the electoral roll. All information has been handled securely according to MRS data protection regulations.

Your details and responses will be stored securely and deleted 6 months after the completion of the research, due to finish in spring 2025.

## A Household product information

Firstly, I'd just like to find out the types of products you have in your household.

ASK ALL

A1 Do you or anyone else within the household own any of the following? [IF METHOD=2/3 Please select all the apply]

READ OUT. MULTICODE.

[SHOW MODULE 1] Electrical appliances e.g. laptop,		
toaster, hairdryer, vacuum, electric kettle, lights, and	1	
smart home devices.		
[SHOW MODULE 1] Toys e.g. board games, battery	2	
powered toys, dolls, stuffed toys, and action figures.	2	
[SHOW MODULE 1 AND 2] Cosmetics e.g. toothpaste,		
shaving cream, hair dye, foundation, lipstick, shampoo,	3	
soap, and moisturiser.		
[SHOW MODULE 2] Large domestic appliances e.g.		
freezer, refrigerator, tumble dryers, washing machine,	4	
oven, stove, or dishwasher.		
[SHOW MODULE 2] Furniture / furnishings e.g. sofa,	5	
bed, dining table, curtains, and cushions.	5	
Dop't know	6	THANK AND
DOILT KHOW		CLOSE
None of these	7	THANK AND
None of these	1	CLOSE
Drafar not to any	0	THANK AND
Fieler not to say	0	CLOSE

#### IF HAVE ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES (A1=1)

A2 How many of the following electrical appliances do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

Please only include appliances that are still in use. *READ OUT. MULTICODE.* 

Laptops inc. work laptops that are taken home	1	ENTER FIGURE
Toasters	2	ENTER FIGURE
Hairdryers	3	ENTER FIGURE
Electric kettles	4	ENTER FIGURE
Electric shavers	5	ENTER FIGURE
Main Lights (please think in terms of sets of light fittings, rather than individual bulbs)	6	ENTER FIGURE
Lamps	7	ENTER FIGURE

Vacuum cleaners	8	ENTER FIGURE	
Games consoles	9	ENTER FIGURE	
Smart home devices e.g. smart speakers	10	ENTER FIGURE	
Mobile phone chargers	11	ENTER FIGURE	
Laptop chargers	12	ENTER FIGURE	
Bluetooth headphones	13	ENTER FIGURE	
E-scooters	14	ENTER FIGURE	
Irons	15	ENTER FIGURE	

IF HAVE TOYS (A1=2)

A3 How many of the following types of toys do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

Please count games or toys that were purchased as a singular transaction. E.g. if multiple action figures came from the same set, please include that as 1.

#### Please provide an estimate or an approximation if you are not sure.

READ OUT. MULTICODE. PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER FOR ALL THAT APPLY, IF YOU DON'T KNOW OR DON'T WISH TO SAY, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

Board games	1	ENTER FIGURE
Battery powered toys	2	ENTER FIGURE
Dolls	3	ENTER FIGURE
Action figures	4	ENTER FIGURE
Building blocks	5	ENTER FIGURE
Electric toys	6	ENTER FIGURE
Stuffed toys	7	ENTER FIGURE

ASK IF HAVE COSMETICS (A1=3)

A4 How many different types of the following cosmetic products do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

By different types we mean brands or products. For example, if you have multiple bottles of the same brand of shampoo, please count that as 1.

#### Please provide an estimate or an approximation if you are not sure.

PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER FOR ALL THAT APPLY, IF YOU DON'T KNOW OR DON'T WISH TO SAY, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

[SHOW MODULE 1] Hair dye	1	ENTER FIGURE
[SHOW MODULE 1] Foundation	2	ENTER FIGURE
[SHOW MODULE 1] Lipstick	3	ENTER FIGURE
[SHOW MODULE 1] Shampoo	4	ENTER FIGURE
[SHOW MODULE 2] Soap	5	ENTER FIGURE
[SHOW MODULE 2] Toothpaste	6	ENTER FIGURE
[SHOW MODULE 2] Moisturiser	7	ENTER FIGURE
[SHOW MODULE 2] Shaving cream	8	ENTER FIGURE

READ OUT. MULTICODE.

ASK IF HAVE LARGE DOMESTIC APPLIANCES (A1=4)

A5 How many of the following large domestic appliances do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

Please provide an estimate or an approximation if you are not sure. *READ OUT. MULTICODE.* 

PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER FOR ALL THAT APPLY, IF YOU DON'T KNOW OR DON'T WISH TO SAY, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

Freezers	1	ENTER FIGURE	
Refrigerators	2	ENTER FIGURE	
Tumble dryers	3	ENTER FIGURE	
Washing machines	4 ENTER FIGURE		
Ovens	5	ENTER FIGURE	
Stoves	6	ENTER FIGURE	
Dishwashers	7	ENTER FIGURE	
Don't know	9	EXCLUSIVE	

None of these	10	EXCLUSIVE
---------------	----	-----------

ASK IF HAVE FURNITURE / FURNISHINGS (A1=5)

A6 How many of the following types of furniture / furnishings do you or anyone else within your household have in your home?

Please provide an estimate or approximation if you are not sure. READ OUT. MUTLICODE.

PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER FOR ALL THAT APPLY, IF YOU DON'T KNOW OR DON'T WISH TO SAY, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

Sofas	1	ENTER FIGURE
Beds	2	ENTER FIGURE
Dining tables	3	ENTER FIGURE
Curtains	4	ENTER FIGURE
Sets of cushions	5	ENTER FIGURE
Don't know	7	EXCLUSIVE
None of these	8	EXCLUSIVE

ASK ALL WHO HAVE SELECTED ITEMS (ANY OF A2\_1-14, A5\_1-7 OR A6\_1-5 > 0)

A7 We'd now like to find out about your <u>most recent purchase</u> each of the following items. For each of the following items please [if method= 1 or 4 tell me; IF METHOD=2 or 3 select] whether the <u>most recent purchase</u> was through an online store; an online marketplace; in store or some other way?

ADD IF NECESSARY: An online store is a website run by a single seller or business where they sell their own products directly to customers.

An online marketplace is a website where multiple sellers can list and sell their products to customers, like Amazon or eBay.

A high street or in-person store is a physical retail location where customers can visit to browse and purchase products directly from the seller.

SINGLE CODE PER ROW.

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES SELECTED AT QUESTIONS A2, A3, A4, A5 AND A6.

			Online	High	Not	Some	Don't
		Online	marketplace	street /	purchased	other	know
		store		in-	by	purchase	
				store	respondent	method	
_1	[A2_1>0] Laptop	1	2	3	4	5	6
_2	[A2_2>0]: Toaster	1	2	3	4	5	6
_3	[A2_3>0]: Hairdryer	1	2	3	4	5	6
_4	[A2_4>0]: Electric kettle	1	2	3	4	5	6
_5	[A2_5>0]: Electric shaver	1	2	3	4	5	6
_6	[A2_6>0]: Main lights	1	2	3	4	5	6
_7	[A2_7>0]: Lamps						
_7	[A2_8>0]: Vacuum cleaner	1	2	3	4	5	6
_8	[A2_9>0]: Games console	1	2	3	4	5	6
_9	[A2_10>0]: Smart home device e.g. smart speaker	1	2	3	4	5	6
_10	[A2_11>0]: Mobile phone chargers	1	2	3	4	5	6
_11	[A2_12>0]: Laptop chargers	1	2	3	4	5	6
_12	[A2_13>0: Bluetooth headphones	1	2	3	4	5	6
_13	[A2_14>0]: E- scooter	1	2	3	4	5	6
_14	[A2_15>0]: Iron	1	2	3	4	5	6
_15	[A5_1>0]: Freezer	1	2	3	4	5	6
_16	[A5_2>0]: Refrigerator	1	2	3	4	5	6
_17	[A5_3>0]: Tumble dryer	1	2	3	4	5	6
_18	[A5_4>0]: Washing machine	1	2	3	4	5	6
_19	[A5_5>0]: Oven	1	2	3	4	5	6
_20	[A5_6>0]: Stove	1	2	3	4	5	6
_21	[A5_7>0]: Dishwasher	1	2	3	4	5	6
_22	[A6_1>0]: Sofa	1	2	3	4	5	6

_23	[A6_2>0]: Bed	1	2	3	4	5	6
_24	[A6_3>0]: Dining table	1	2	3	4	5	6
_25	[A6_4>0]: Curtains	1	2	3	4	5	6
_26	[A6_5>0]: Cushions	1	2	3	4	5	6

ASK ALL WHO HAVE SELECTED ITEMS (A3=1-7, A4=1-8)

A8 We'd now like to find out about how you <u>typically</u> purchase the following items. For each of the following items please [if method= 1 or 4 tell me; IF METHOD=2 or 3 select] whether you typically purchase the item through an online store; an online marketplace; in store or some other way?

*IF NECESSARY*: An online store is a website run by a single seller or business where they sell their own products directly to customers.

An online marketplace is a website where multiple sellers can list and sell their products to customers, like Amazon or eBay.

A high street or in-person store is a physical retail location where customers can visit to browse and purchase products directly from the seller.

		Online	High	Not	Some	Don't
		marketplace	street / in-	purchased	other	know
	Online		store	by	purchase	
	store			respondent	method	
				e.g. gifted		
				or landlord		
				owned		
[A3_1>0]: Board games	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A3_2>0]: Battery	1	2	3	4	5	6
powered toys		0	0	4		0
[A3_3>0]: Dolls	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A3_4>0]: Action figures	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A3_5>0]: Building blocks	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A3_6>0]: Electric toys	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A3_7>0]: Stuffed toys	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A4_1>0]: Hair dye	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A4_2>0]: Foundation	1	2	3	4	5	6

[A4_3>0]: Lipstick	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A4_4>0]: Shampoo	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A4_5>0]: Soap	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A4_6>0]: Toothpaste	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A4_7>0]: Moisturiser	1	2	3	4	5	6
[A4_8>0]: Shaving cream	1	2	3	4	5	6

ASK ALL WHO HAVE PURCHASED ITEMS USING SOME OTHER PURCHASE METHOD (AT LEAST ONE OF A7\_X OR a8\_X=5)

A9 You said that you purchased [IF MORE THAN ONE SELECTED >1 OF A7\_X OR A8\_X=5 some of these items using some other purchase method. What were these?; IF ONE SELECTED 1 OF A7\_X=5 OR A8\_X=5 one of the items using some other purchase method. What was this?]

WRITE IN		
Don't know	1	
Prefer not to say	2	

ASK ALL SAID THAT THEY HAVE PURCHASED ITEMS AT A7 (A7\_X=1, 2 OR 3)

A10 For each of the following items please say whether the <u>most recent purchase</u> was for a new or second-hand item? SINGLE CODE PER ROW.

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES SELECTED AT QUESTIONS A2, A3, A5 AND A6.

		Purchased	Second	Don't
		new	hand	know
_1	[A7_1=1/2/3]: Laptop	1	2	5
_2	[A7_2=1/2/3]: Toaster	1	2	5
_3	[A7_3=1/2/3]: Hairdryer	1	2	5
_4	[A7_4=1/2/3]: Electric kettle	1	2	5
_5	[A7_5=1/2/3]: Electric shaver	1	2	5
_6	[A7_6=1/2/3]: Main lights	1	2	5

_7	[A7_7=1/2/3]: Vacuum cleaner	1	2	5
_8	[A7_8=1/2/3]: Games console	1	2	5
_9	[A7_9=1/2/3]: Smart home device e.g. smart speaker	1	2	5
_10	[A7_10=1/2/3]: Mobile phone chargers	1	2	5
_11	[A7_11=1/2/3]: Laptop chargers	1	2	5
_12	[A7_12=1/2/3]: Bluetooth headphones	1	2	5
_13	[A7_13=1/2/3]: E-scooter	1	2	5
_14	[A7_14=1/2/3]: Iron	1	2	5
_15	[A7_15=1/2/3]: Freezer	1	2	5
_16	[A7_16=1/2/3]: Refrigerator	1	2	5
_17	[A7_17=1/2/3]: Tumble dryer	1	2	5
_18	[A7_18=1/2/3]: Washing machine	1	2	5
_19	[A7_19=1/2/3]: Oven	1	2	5
_20	[A7_20=1/2/3]: Stove	1	2	5
_21	[A7_21=1/2/3]: Dishwasher	1	2	5
_22	[A7_22=1/2/3]: Sofa	1	2	5
_23	[A7_23=1/2/3]: Bed	1	2	5
_24	[A7_24=1/2/3]: Dining table	1	2	5
_25	[A7_25=1/2/3]: Curtains	1	2	5
_26	[A7_26=1/2/3]: Cushions	1	2	5

ASK ALL SAID THAT THEY HAVE PURCHASED ITEMS AT A8 (A8\_X=1, 2, 3)

# A11 For each of the following items please say whether you <u>typically</u> purchase them new or second hand?

SINGLE CODE PER ROW.

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES SELECTED WHERE 1/2/3/4 WERE SELECTED AT A7.

		Purchased new	Purchased second hand	Don't know	Prefer not to say
_1	[A8_1=1/2/3]: Board games	1	2	3	4
_2	[A8_2=1/2/3]: Battery powered toys	1	2	3	4
_3	[A8_3=1/2/3]: Dolls	1	2	3	4
_4	[A8_4=1/2/3]: Action figures	1	2	3	4
_5	[A8_5=1/2/3]: Building blocks	1	2	3	4
_6	[A8_6=1/2/3]: Electric toys	1	2	3	4
_7	[A8_7=1/2/3]: Stuffed toys	1	2	3	4

ASK IF HAVE ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, LARGE DOMESTIC APPLIANCES OR COSMETICS (A2=1-14, A4=1-8, A5=1-7)

A12 Please could you provide a description of the following items found in your household, including brand name/s and model number?

For example, MacBook Pro. Brand: Apple and Model number: A2338.

ADD IF NECESSARY: Model numbers are unique identifiers given to a specific version or configuration of a product made by a manufacturer. They are often located on the bottom or back of products, e.g. the bottom of a laptop.

If you or anyone else within your household own more than one of these items , please provide the model that is <u>most commonly in use</u>.

IF YOU DON'T KNOW EITHER THE BRAND OR MODEL NUMBER, OR DON'T WISH TO SAY, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

			Model		Don't
		Brand name	number	Don't Know	Know (Model
				(Brand	number)
				name)	
_1	[A2_1>0]: Laptop	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_2	[A2_2>0]: Toaster	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_3	[A2_3>0]: Hairdryer	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_4	[A2_4>0]: Electric kettle	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES SELECTED AT QUESTIONS A2 and A5.

_5	[A2_5>0]: Electric shaver	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_6	[A2_6>0]: Main lights	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_7	[A2_7>0]: Vacuum cleaner	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_8	[A2_8>0]: Games console	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_9	[A2_9>0]: Smart home device e.g. smart speaker	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_10	[A2_10>0]: Mobile phone chargers	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_11	[A2_11>0]: Laptop chargers	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_12	[A2_12>0]: Bluetooth headphones	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_13	[A2_13>0]: E-scooter	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_14	[A2_14>0]: Iron	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_15	[A5_15>0]: Freezer	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_16	[A5_2>0]: Refrigerator	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_17	[A5_3>0]: Tumble dryer	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_18	[A5_4>0]: Washing machine	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_19	[A5_5>0]: Oven	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_20	[A5_6>0]: Stove	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2
_21	[A5_7>0]: Dishwasher	WRITE IN	WRITE IN	1	2

ASK IF ONLINE AND DON'T KNOW BRAND OF LAPTOP (METHOD= 2 OR 3 AND A13 1= DK)

A13 If you're unsure of the brand of your laptop, please take a photo of the label and upload it here. Our researchers will then use it to determine the model.

To do this please take a photo of the product and save it on the device you are using to complete the survey.

To find the photo, select choose file, find the folder you saved the photograph in and double click on the file to select it. Once the correct file is selected, click upload and the photo should appear on your screen. You can then press next to go to the next question.

A14

UPLOAD PHOTO		
Don't know	1	
Refused	2	

ASK IF ONLINE AND DON'T KNOW BRAND OF TOASTER (METHOD= 2 OR 3 AND A13 2= DK)

A15 If you're unsure of the brand of your toaster, please take a photo of the label and upload it here. Our researchers will then use it to determine the model.

To do this please take a photo of the product and save it on the device you are using to complete the survey.

A16 To find the photo, select choose file, find the folder you saved the photograph in and double click on the file to select it. Once the correct file is selected, click upload and the photo should appear on your screen. You can then press next to go to the next question.

UPLOAD PHOTO		
Don't know	1	
Refused	2	

ASK IF ONLINE AND DON'T KNOW BRAND OF FREEZER (METHOD= 2 AND A13\_15= DK)

A17 If you're unsure of the brand of your freezer, please take a photo of the label and upload it here. Our researchers will then use it to determine the model. Our researchers will then use it to determine the model.

To do this please take a photo of the product and save it on the device you are using to complete the survey.

A18 To find the photo, select choose file, find the folder you saved the photograph in and double click on the file to select it. Once the correct file is selected, click upload and the photo should appear on your screen. You can then press next to go to the next question.

UPLOAD PHOTO		
Don't know	1	
Refused	2	

ASK IF HAVE COSMETICS (AT LEAST ONE A4\_1-8>0)

#### A19 Please could you provide the brand name of the following items found in your household?

If you or anyone else within your household own more than one brand name of each item, please name the one <u>most commonly in use</u>.

IF YOU DON'T KNOW EITHER THE BRAND OR MODEL NUMBER, OR DON'T WISH TO SAY, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK.

		Brand name	Don't Know
_1	[A4_1>1]: Hair dye	WRITE IN	1
_2	[A4_2>0]: Foundation	WRITE IN	1
_3	[A4>0]: Lipstick	WRITE IN	1
_4	[A4>0]: Shampoo	WRITE IN	1
_5	[A4>0]: Soap	WRITE IN	1
_6	[A4>0]: Toothpaste	WRITE IN	1
_7	[A4>0]: Moisturiser	WRITE IN	1
_8	[A4>0]: Shaving cream	WRITE IN	1

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES SELECTED AT QUESTIONS A4.

ASK IF HAVE ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES (A2=1-14 OR A6=1-5)

## A20 How often are the following items used?

SINGLE CODE PER ROW. READ OUT.

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES SELECTED AT QUESTIONS A2 AND A6.

		Daily	Several times a week	Weekly – around once a week	Monthly – around once a month	A few times a year	Yearly – around once a year	Not used at all in the past year	Don't know
_1	[A2_1>0]: Laptop	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_2	[A2_2>0]: Toaster	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_3	[A2_3>0]: Hairdryer	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_4	[A2_4>0]: Electric kettle	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_5	[A2_5>0]: Electric shaver	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9

		Daily	Several times a week	Weekly – around once a week	Monthly – around once a month	A few times a year	Yearly – around once a year	Not used at all in the past year	Don't know
_6	[A2_6>0]: Main Lights	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_7	[A2_7>0]: Lamps	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_8	[A2_8>0]: Vacuum cleaner	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_9	[A2_9>0]: Games console	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_10	[A2_10>0]: Smart home device e.g. smart speaker	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_11	[A2_11>0]: Mobile phone chargers	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_12	[A2_12>0]: Laptop chargers	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_13	[A2_13>0]: Bluetooth headphone s	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_14	[A2_14>0]: E-scooter	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9
_15	[A2_15>0]: Iron	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9

ASK IF HAVE ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, LARGE DOMESTIC APPLIANCES, OR FURNITURE (A2=1-14, A5=1-7 OR A6=1-5)

#### A21 In months how old are the following items currently in your household?

Please enter the number months you've had the products. Do not worry if you don't know the exact timeframe, an estimate is fine.

If you own multiple of any item here, please think about the item you most regularly use

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES SELECTED AT QUESTIONS A2, A5 AND A6

	Months	Don't Know
[A2_1>0]: Laptop	WRITE IN	1
[A2_2>0]: Toaster	WRITE IN	1
[A2_3>0]: Hairdryer	WRITE IN	1
--	----------	---
[A2_4>0]: Electric kettle	WRITE IN	1
[A2_5>0]: Electric shaver	WRITE IN	1
[A2_6>0]: Main Lights	WRITE IN	1
[A2_7>0]: Lamps	WRITE IN	1
[A2_8>0]: Vacuum cleaner	WRITE IN	1
[A2_9>0]: Games console	WRITE IN	1
[A2_10>0]: Smart home device e.g. smart speaker	WRITE IN	1
[A2_11>0]: Mobile phone chargers	WRITE IN	1
[A2_12>0]: Laptop chargers	WRITE IN	1
[A2_13>0]: Bluetooth headphones	WRITE IN	1
[A2_14>0]: E-scooter	WRITE IN	1
[A2_15>0]: Iron	WRITE IN	1
[A5_3>0]: Tumble dryer	WRITE IN	1
[A5_4>0]: Washing machine	WRITE IN	1
[A5_5>0]: Oven	WRITE IN	1
[A5_6>0]: Stove	WRITE IN	1
[A5_7>0]: Dishwasher	WRITE IN	1
[[A5_8>0]: Sofa	WRITE IN	1
[[A5_9>0]: Bed	WRITE IN	1
[[A5_10>0]: Dining table	WRITE IN	1
[A5_11>0]: Curtains	WRITE IN	1
[[A5_12>0]: Cushions	WRITE IN	1

## IF PURCHASED AN ITEM IN THE PAST YEAR (ANY OF A19<1 YEAR)

## A22 You said that the following items are less than one year old. Can you explain the reason why you purchased each item in this time frame? SINGLE CODE PER ROW. READ OUT IF NECESSARY.

DS: ONLY PULL THROUGH CODES THAT WERE PURCHASED LESS THAN ONE YEAR AGO

	As a replacement for a damaged or broken product	As a replacement for a lost or stolen product	As an upgrade	To purchase a product that I did not own previously	Some other reason
[A2_1>0] Laptop	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_2>0]: Toaster	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_3>0]: Hairdryer	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_4>0]: Electric kettle	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_5>0]: Electric shaver	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_6>0]: Main lights	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_7>0]: Lamps	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_8>0]: Vacuum cleaner	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_9>0]: Games console	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_10>0]: Smart home device e.g. smart speaker	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_11>0]: Mobile phone chargers	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_12>0]: Laptop chargers	1	2	3	4	5
[A2_13>0: Bluetooth headphones	1	2	3	4	5
[A2=14]: Iron	1	2	3	4	5
[A5=1]: Freezer	1	2	3	4	5
[A5=2]: Refrigerator	1	2	3	4	5
[A5=3]: Tumble dryer	1	2	3	4	5
[A5=4]: Washing machine	1	2	3	4	5
[A5=5]: Oven	1	2	3	4	5
[A5=6]: Stove	1	2	3	4	5
[A5=7]: Dishwasher	1	2	3	4	5

	As a replacement for a damaged or broken product	As a replacement for a lost or stolen product	As an upgrade	To purchase a product that I did not own previously	Some other reason
[A6=1]: Sofa	1	2	3	4	5
[A6=2]: Bed	1	2	3	4	5
[A6=3]: Dining table	1	2	3	4	5
[A6=4]: Curtains	1	2	3	4	5
[A6=5]: Cushions	1	2	3	4	5

ASK ALL WHO HAVE PURCHASED ITEMS FOR SOME OTHER REASON (AT LEAST ONE OF A19\_X=5)

A23 You said that you purchased [IF MORE THAN ONE OF A19\_X=5 some of these items for some other reasons. What were these?; IF ONE OF A19\_X=5 one of the items for some other reason. What was this?]

WRITE IN		
Don't know	1	
Prefer not to say	2	

## B Confidence around responses

We'd like to get an idea on how confident you feel in the accuracy of your responses so far.

ASK ALL

B1 Thinking about the questions that have already been asked, including questions on the number of items in the home, how old they are and the brand. For each product group can you say how confident you felt in in the responses you gave? *SINGLE CODE PER ROW. READ OUT.* 

DS: ONLY SHOW RESPONSES SELECTED AT A1

	Very Confident (I am confident that I gave accurate responses for all items in this category)	Quite confident (I gave accurate responses to questions about most items, but estimates for a few)	Neither confident nor unconfident (I was able to provide some accurate responses, but I also gave some estimates)	Not very confident (I estimated my responses to most questions but was accurate with a few).	Not at all confident (I was estimating all or nearly all the time)	Don't Know
<b>_1 Electrical appliances</b> e.g. laptop, toaster, hairdryer, vacuum, electric kettle, lights, and smart home devices.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>_2 Toys</b> e.g. board games, battery powered toys, dolls, stuffed toys, and action figures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>_3 Cosmetics</b> e.g. toothpaste, shaving cream, hair dye, foundation, lipstick, shampoo, soap, and moisturiser.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>_4 Large domestic</b> <b>appliances</b> e.g. freezer, refrigerator, tumble dryers, washing machine, oven, stove, or dishwasher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>_5 Furniture / furnishings</b> e.g. sofa, bed, dining table, curtains, and cushions.	1	2	3	4	5	6

ALL THAT GAVE AT LEAST ONE UNCONFIDENT RESPONSE AT B1 B1\_X = 3/4/5

## B2 Can you provide more detail on the questions and / or items you were unable to provide accurate information on?

PLEASE THINK ABOUT SPECIFIC ITEMS AND SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

WRITE IN		
Don't know	1	
Refused	2	

## C General household information

Lastly, the next set of questions are about your household. The answers you provide will be used to help us understand the different types of products found within households of people.

ASK ALL

#### C1 How many people live in your household?

Please include yourself and anyone else who lives with you, whether or not they are related to you. For example, if you are living in a shared house, please include your housemates. SINGLE CODE. DO NOT READ OUT.

1	1	
2	2	
3	3	
4	4	
5 or more	5	
Don't know	6	
Refused	7	

ASK ALL

C2 **Do you or another member of your household own or rent your home?** *SINGLE CODE.* 

Own the home – either outright or with a mortgage/loan	1	
Part own and part rent the home (shared ownership)	2	
Rent from a local authority/council or social housing association	3	
Rent the home from a private landlord	4	
Living with parents or family and paying rent	5	
Living with parents or family and not paying rent	6	
Other (PLEASE WRITE IN)	7	
Don't know	8	
Refused	9	

ASK ALL

### C3 Which of the following regions do you live in? SINGLE CODE.

South East	1	
London	2	
North West	3	
East England	4	
West Midlands	5	
South West	6	
Yorkshire	7	
Scotland	8	
East Midlands	9	
Wales	10	
North East	11	
Northern Ireland	12	

### IF C1>1 MORE THAN ONE PERSON LIVING IN THE HOUSEHOLD

C4 Which of the following best describes your living situation? SINGLE CODE.

Flat or house share	1	
Live with long term partner	2	
Live with adult family	3	
Live with family and children	4	
Other (specify)	5	
Don't know	6	
Prefer not to say	7	

ASK ALL

C5 What is your age?

WRITE IN

<DS: Add validation, numeric only>

Prefer not to say	1	

ASK ALL

## C6 Can you please confirm which gender you identify with?

SINGLE CODE.

Male	11	
Female	22	
Other gender identity (please specify)	33	WRITE IN
Prefer not to say	4	

ASK ALL

### C7 Which of the following best describes your ethnicity? SINGLE CODE.

White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	1	
White - Irish	2	
White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller	3	
White - Roma	4	
White - Any other White background	5	
Mixed - White and Black Caribbean	6	
Mixed - White and Black African	7	
Mixed - White and Asian	8	
Mixed - Any other Mixed / multiple ethnic background	9	
Asian - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	10	
Asian - Indian	11	
Asian - Pakistani	12	

Asian - Bangladeshi	13	
Asian - Chinese	14	
Asian - Any other Asian background	15	
Black - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	16	
Black - African	17	
Black - Caribbean	18	
Black - Any other Black / African / Caribbean background	19	
Other - Arab	20	
Other - Any other ethnic group	21	
Prefer not to say	22	

## D Thank and close

ASK ALL

D1 Thank you very much for taking part in our survey, on behalf of the Office for Product Safety and Standards. Would you be willing for IFF Research to contact you if we need to clarify and information you provided today?

SINGLE CODE.

Yes	1	
No	2	

IF CONSENT TO RECONTACT (D1=1)

### D2 Thanks, and could you confirm your contact details for recontact?

Phone number	1	
Email	2	
IF CATI: Details same as sample	3	
Prefer not to say	4	

ASK METHOD 2

# D3 To thank you for taking part in this survey, we are also providing a £10 amazon voucher, payment via PayPal or via Wise Transfer a BACS transfer. Would you like to receive the voucher or would prefer payment via PayPal or Wise Transfer?

*IF NECESSARY:* Wise Transfer is a payment sent using your name and email address. You will then receive an email from Wise notifying them that we have sent you the payment with the instruction to provide your bank details so that Wise can securely transfer the payment to your bank. If you choose this option, you will need to claim the payment within one week of receiving the email.

Payment via Amazon voucher	1	
Payment via PayPal	2	
Payment via Wise Transfer	3	
None of these	4	

IF SAMPLE SOURCE 1 WOULD LIKE INCENTIVE VIA AMAZON OR WISE TRANSFER (D4=1 OR 3)

D4 Thank you. Please confirm the following details, even if you have provided them previously. This information will only be used to send you your incentive payment.

Name	WRITE IN DS – AUTOFILL FROM SAMPLE
Email	WRITE IN DS – AUTOFILL FROM SAMPLE OR D3

### IF WOULD LIKE INCENTIVE VIA PAYPAL (D4=2)

D5 Thank you. Please can you enter your PayPal email address to allow us to send you your £10 payment. This information will only be used to send you your payment.

Name	WRITE IN DS – AUTOFILL FROM SAMPLE
Email	WRITE IN
I do not have a PayPal account	GO BACK TO C4.

SHOW ALL

D6 Thank you for completing this survey, on behalf of the Office for Product Safety and Standards.

© Crown copyright 2025

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated.

To view this licence, visit <u>licence/version/3/</u> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: <u>psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk</u>. Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Contact us if you have any enquiries about this publication, including requests for alternative formats, at: <u>OPSS.enquiries@businessandtrade.gov.uk</u>

## **Office for Product Safety and Standards**

Department for Business and Trade, 4th Floor Multistory, 18 The Priory Queensway, Birmingham B4 6BS https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-for-product-safety-and-standards