



Department for
Business & Trade

Export Client Quality Survey for Businesses supported April 2023 to March 2024: Technical report

Publication date: June 2025



Ipsos UK Public Affairs works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.300 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. Combined with our methods and communications expertise, this helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.

Research contractor: Ipsos UK Public Affairs, London UK

Research Authors: Allan Simpson, Nada El-Hammamy, Grace Clarke, Balaji Savatherajan

Acknowledgements:

The team at Ipsos UK would like to thank Kate McAtamney, Christopher Garner, Marios Theocharopoulos and Jessica Ariwa from the Department for Business and Trade for their invaluable inputs during the project. Errors and omissions remain the responsibility of the authors alone.

Ipsos UK Public Affairs is part of the Ipsos Group.
www.ipsos.com/en-uk

This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for Market Research, ISO 20252.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Overview	4
1.2	Overview of survey method	4
2	Questionnaire	7
2.1	Questionnaire changes	7
2.2	Questionnaire content	7
3	Sampling	9
3.1	Development	9
3.2	Sample sources	9
3.3	Eligibility	9
3.4	Building the sample frame	10
3.5	Sample design	14
4	Data collection	15
4.1	Fieldwork outcomes	15
4.2	Response rates	16
5	Weights	18
5.1	Overview of weights	18
5.2	Levels of weights	19
5.3	QS Design weights	20
5.4	Design effects	20
6	Data and analysis	25
6.1	Confidence intervals	25
6.2	Significance testing	26
6.3	Data quality and processing	26
6.4	Derived variables	27
6.5	Reporting	27
6.6	Data handling and security	28
Annex A – International Trade and Investment (ITI) logic model for ECS		29
Annex B — Quality survey weight map		30

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

This technical report summarises the key technical aspects of the DBT Export Client Quality Survey, for businesses supported April 2023 to March 2024.

The main aims of the Export Client Survey (ECS) are:

- Track client perceptions of the quality of support and advice provided by DBT
- Provide a measure of reported impact on businesses from using a DBT service
- Understand what drives performance and how services can be improved over time

The ECS comprises 2 linked surveys: a Quality Survey (QS) and a Reported Impact Survey (RIS). Interviewing for the Quality Survey generally begins 3 months after the specific interaction with DBT. The Reported Impact Survey involves interviewing Quality Survey respondents who agreed to be recontacted for research purposes 12 months after the specified interaction with DBT.

This technical report summarises the technical aspects of the Quality Survey. This is a telephone survey reporting on the number of unique businesses supported by DBT, the perceived quality of the advice and support, and businesses' satisfaction with the service received. The findings in the main survey report are based on interviewing businesses that used DBT services between April 2023 and March 2024 (2023/24). Throughout the main report, findings from businesses that used DBT services in 2023/24 are compared to findings from 2022/23.

1.2 Overview of survey method

1.2.1 Sampling

The Quality Survey is based on a monthly sample of businesses which have used a DBT export promotion service. The sample is designed to be representative of businesses supported by DBT, permitting analysis of each service. The sample design and selection take into account the longitudinal aspect of each business's interactions with DBT products and services, i.e. the varying combinations of historic service deliveries received by a business. Survey questions and analysis of the survey data focus on a single specific interaction with DBT and aims not to consider previous interactions with DBT. However, it is not always possible to fully control what wider experiences the business may draw on when responding.

The sample was drawn from monthly records of service deliveries provided by DBT. These records do not include a unique business identifier. Therefore, each month, core business level information – business names, email domains, postcodes and telephone numbers – were used to identify where multiple records referred to the same business. A monthly sample of businesses is then selected from these records, giving higher probabilities of selection to businesses receiving less common services. In this way, the approach aims to maximise the number of interviews achieved regarding smaller services to facilitate more detailed analysis at the individual service level.

Certain records were not eligible to be sampled each month:

- Records not pertaining to the services covered by the ECS
- Records which were not intended for use (for example, those marked 'DUPLICATE' or 'DO NOT USE')
- Public sector businesses (identified from the business name and email domain)
- Businesses with non-UK telephone numbers (unless there was also a UK telephone number recorded for that business)
- Businesses which had already been sampled for a previous month of the ECS. In order to reduce the burden of participating in research, a business is only included within the Quality Survey once in any 12-month period.

Where a sampled business had received more than one service in the previous month, they were allocated a single main service for the survey. Businesses were given a higher probability of being allocated to less frequently used services than more frequently used services to increase the number of responses related to the less frequently used services.

There is a 3-month break period between when a business interacts with DBT and when the interview is conducted. Interactions in April 2023 are included within the July 2023 sample, interactions in May 2023 are included within the August 2023 sample etc. This is part of the survey design to ensure the interaction was recent enough to be memorable but providing sufficient time for businesses to take action following using the service.

1.2.2 Fieldwork dates

Fieldwork for this report began in July 2023 and ended in June 2024 (interviewing businesses that received support from DBT in March 2024). This means that the report covers DBT export support activity during the 2023-24 Financial Year.

1.2.3 Fieldwork

All eligible respondents with a useable email address were sent an email, prior to being contacted, to let them know the purpose of the research and provide them with an opportunity to contact Ipsos to ask any questions or opt out of the research. Interviews were primarily conducted using a Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) method. As such, the questionnaire was programmed in specialist interviewing software, ensuring that any question filtering was applied accurately during the interview.

A small number of interviews were completed online using Computer-Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI). The online survey option was introduced for the first time in March 2023 at the request of DBT in order to facilitate the accessibility needs of potential respondents. The online survey was made available upon specific request. A link to the online survey was also included in emails sent to contacts classified as 'deadwood' (e.g. uncontactable telephone numbers) in the previous month's sample. For instance, records that had been classified as 'Deadwood' in the January 2024 sample were sent a link to the online survey in early May 2024, taking into account the 3-month break period between when a business interacts with DBT and when

the monthly sample enters CATI fieldwork. A total of 96 interviews were conducted using the online survey option.

A response rate of 20% was achieved for interviews conducted during the fieldwork period. Overall response rates were calculated using the American Association for Public Opinion Research standard definitions¹, an industry standard metric for calculating response rates where in the calculation of response rate, the eligibility rate of sample for which eligibility is unknown is assumed to be the same as for the known sample. The average (mean) interview length was around 22 minutes between July 2023 and June 2024.

1.2.4 Questionnaire content

The questionnaire collects information on the business's export activity, possible barriers facing exporters and the result of using the service. It also covers aspects of the customer experience using scales of 0 to 10 where 10 is the most positive response and 0 is the least positive response. Respondents could also say 'Don't know' or 'Not applicable'. The questionnaire also collects firmographics which includes annual turnover, number of employees, sector, and length of time trading. At the end of the questionnaire there is a question asking for permission to contact the business again for research purposes. Businesses that agreed to recontact formed the sample for the Reported Impact Survey.

A full copy of the Quality Survey questionnaire is available on the ECS webpage.

¹ [https://www.aapor.org/Standards-Ethics/Standard-Definitions-\(1\).aspx](https://www.aapor.org/Standards-Ethics/Standard-Definitions-(1).aspx)

2 Questionnaire

2.1 Questionnaire changes

A number of changes were introduced to the survey questionnaire from the version used in the previous year (2022/23). Some questions were amended to improve respondent understanding. Other questions were rotated out of the survey in 2023/24 and will be reintroduced in the 2024/25 survey.

Table 2.1 details the changes made to the questionnaire. A full copy of the questionnaire is available on the ECS webpage.

Table 2.1: Questionnaire changes in 2023/24

Question number	Changes made
Q078b_Qoutcome2	Question rotated out of 2023/24 survey
QContDBT	Question rotated out of 2023/24 survey
QcontDBToth	Question rotated out of 2023/24 survey
QDBTadaware	Question rotated out of 2023/24 survey
QTYPEXP	Question reinstated to 2023/24 survey
Q076 – Qcontact	Question rotated into 2023/24 survey, with open text option added to capture responses on any organisations not included in the pre-codes
Q070 – Qyearsell	Question rotated into 2023/24 survey
Q082 – Qresult_conts	Question rotated into 2023/24 survey
QfirstDIT	Question rotated into 2023/24 survey
Q071b – Qcurexpas	Australia and New Zealand answer codes split out
Q131 - QBoardFemaleNum and Q131a - QBoardFemalePer	Minor wording change to question text
Q131a - QBoardFemalePer and Q132a - QBoardEthnicityPer	Minor question routing change and new answer code (Exactly 50%) included

2.2 Questionnaire content

The questionnaire had an average (mean) length of 22 minutes and 23 seconds, which was broadly in line with the previous year (22 minutes and one second) and the specified average length of 20 minutes. A summary of the overall structure is

below. Businesses were eligible to answer most questions. However, there were some sections that were routed by the DBT exporting service that the business had been sampled to interview about. A copy of the 2023/24 survey questionnaire is available on the ECS webpage.

Table 2.2: Questionnaire sections

Questionnaire sections	Routing
Screening questions	All respondents
Export status	All respondents for initial questions, then mainly asked of exporters only
Results of Service: Activities and outcomes	All respondents
Other Services: Quality and relevance of handover / Comparison against other organisations	Routing dependent on outcomes from specified interaction with DBT.
Customer Experience: Harmonised measures of quality / Barriers	Mixture of ask all, questions only asked of certain service types and dependent on previous survey answers.
Firmographics	All respondents
Recontact and Data linkage	All respondents

3 Sampling

3.1 Development

The sampling process for the ECS remained unchanged from the previous year.

3.2 Sample sources

The ECS sample is drawn from records of business interactions with DBT services, collated by teams within DBT.

Eleven eligible services were included in 2023/24. In 2023/24, EISS was renamed to ESS-IM (Enhanced Support Service – International Markets)

Each month, DBT supplied Ipsos with Excel or .csv files containing these records. There were 8 source files in total covering the various services in scope for the ECS, with records for a number of services provided in a single extract from DBT's Data Hub system, a database and reporting system designed to consistently record information across DBT teams.

Typically, the Data Hub extract covered records for: International Trade Advisors (ITAs), Export and Investment Teams (E&I Teams), Missions, Export Academy, Webinars, and Business Profiles.² Records for the remaining services in scope for the ECS – Overseas Market Introduction Service (OMIS), Export Opportunities, Enhanced Support Service – International Markets (ESS-IM), and Selling Online Overseas (SOO) – were provided separately each month, in line with previous years where appropriate.

With many services recorded through Data Hub, it was necessary to develop rules for identifying which records referred to each service (see Eligibility, below).

3.3 Eligibility

The following services were eligible for the ECS from April 2023 to March 2024:

- Selling Online Overseas (SOO)
- Overseas Market Introduction Service (OMIS)
- Business Profiles
- Missions
- Export and Investment Teams
- Export Opportunities
- Posts
- International Trade Advisors (ITAs)
- Webinars

² For various reasons, additional separate extracts were provided for Webinars and Business Profiles. The records in these files were then checked, and where necessary deduped against, the equivalent records included for these services in the Data Hub extract.

- Export Academy
- Enhanced Support Service – International Markets (ESS-IM)

Not all these services have been eligible for the ECS in previous years. Table 3.1 shows the year in which each service that was eligible in 2023/24 was first introduced into the ECS.

Table 3.1 Year in which DBT services were first introduced into the ECS

Service	Year
Selling Online Overseas (SOO)	2018/19
Overseas Market Introduction Service (OMIS)	2018/19
Business Profiles	2018/19
Missions	2018/19
Export and Investment Teams	2018/19
Export Opportunities	2018/19
Posts	2018/19
International Trade Advisors (ITAs)	2018/19
Webinars	2018/19
Export Academy	2021/22
Enhanced Support Service – International Markets (ESS-IM)	2021/22

For the records included in the Data Hub extract, the specific service was identified from a combination of variables: the ‘DBT team’, ‘DBT team role’, ‘service delivery’ and ‘subject’ fields (see appendix). Typically, around half of the records in the Data Hub extract were not mapped to a service in scope for the ECS.

Of the records mapped to an in-scope service, additional eligibility criteria applied for the ECS:

- The ECS only covers UK businesses. Businesses without a UK telephone number were excluded.
- Public businesses were excluded.
- Some records were duplicates or included in the source files in error and were excluded.
- Businesses which had already been invited to the survey in the previous 12 months were excluded.

3.4 Building the sample frame

It is common for a business to receive more than one of DBT’s exporting services over a period of time. However, the ECS was designed to survey any single business no more than twice in a 12-month period: once for the QS and once for the RIS. The reason for this restriction was to limit the data collection burden on businesses.

To administer the ECS, it was therefore necessary to combine the records from the source files into a single sample frame. As there was no common business-level

identifier in the source files, it was also necessary to create such an identifier to make it possible to recognise where different records in the source files referred to the same business.

Table 3.2 shows the number of records shared by DBT each month. These figures include duplicate and ineligible records, that were removed from the sample before fieldwork.

Table 3.2 Number of records shared by DBT per month

Month	Number of records shared by DBT
April 2023	4,588
May 2023	6,259
June 2023	5,212
July 2023	5,133
August 2023	4,873
September 2023	8,176
October 2023	7,611
November 2023	11,067
December 2023	6,433
January 2024	10,666
February 2024	12,026
March 2024	10,287
Total	92,331

Step 1. Combining the source files into a single sample frame

There was some variation in the information available in each file due to differences in the information collected by each service and the recording practices of different teams. The first step each month was therefore to extract the key information from each file necessary for administering the ECS, primarily:

- Business name
- Business address
- Contact name
- Contact telephone number
- Contact email address
- Any fields necessary for identifying which service (if any) was received

This information was then combined into a long file covering all the records received that month.

While other relevant information was recorded for some services – for example, Companies House number, turnover, number of employees, and so on – this was not consistently recorded and was missing for many records. These other fields were therefore not used in the sampling process.

Step 2. Tele-matching

Not all records in the original source files had a valid telephone number recorded. Where possible, information from other ECS records or external business databases were used to fill these gaps:

- First, recorded telephone numbers were checked to see if they were in a valid UK telephone number format. Each record was classified as having (i) a valid UK telephone number, (ii) a non-UK telephone number, (iii) an invalid telephone number/no recorded telephone number.
- Where the telephone number was missing or not in a valid format, Ipsos first checked records from previous months of the ECS. If there was another record with the same business name and postcode, the telephone number from that record was used.
- Where there was still no valid telephone number, Ipsos conducted external tele-matching. This is where information about businesses (business name, address, URL and email address) are checked against third-party business databases to try to find matching telephone numbers.

Step 3. Cleaning of key business information

The following business information was used to derive a business-level identifier:

- Business name
- Business postcode
- Telephone number(s)
- Email domain

These fields were cleaned and standardised to make the information as consistent as possible for deriving a business-level identifier. Specifically, for **business name**:

- All entries were made lower case
- Contact names were used in the very small number of cases where business was missing
- URL tokens (such as 'www.', '.com'), email addresses and punctuation were removed
- Common tokens (such as 'Ltd', 'plc', 'the') were removed
- Any text before 'trading as' or 't/a' was removed

For postcodes, any white space was removed, and all postcodes were checked to be a valid UK postcode format. If a record did not have a valid UK postcode, the postcode was left blank for the purposes of deriving the business-level identifier.

Email domains were taken from recorded email addresses (that is, the text after the '@' sign). Additionally, a list of common domains such as 'gmail.com' and 'hotmail.com' were excluded. If a record had any of these common domains, the email domain was left blank for the purposes of deriving the business-level identifier.

Step 4. 'Fuzzy' matching

From the scoping phase and previous fieldwork, it was clear that there would be inconsistencies (including data entry errors) in how information about businesses was recorded due to information being entered by different people in different teams

and different systems. To try to account for some of this, Ipsos conducted 'fuzzy matching' for all records received that month. This matching compared the business name, postcode and email domain of each record to that of every other record. If 2 (or more) records had 'similar'³ information in these fields (below a given threshold), these records were assumed to refer to the same business.

Inevitably, this process involves errors: false positives (where records are incorrectly assumed to refer to the same business) and false negatives (where records are incorrectly assumed to refer to different businesses). The chosen threshold aimed to reach a reasonable balance between these different kinds of error and the occurrence of false positives and false negatives were both well below one percent of the total records matched.

The fuzzy matching was conducted in 2 stages:

- First, each record from the most recent month was compared to each other record from that month
- Second, the records from the most recent month were appended to the records from all previous months. Then all records (from any month) were compared against all other records.

The reason for conducting the fuzzy matching in 2 stages – one within the most recent month and one across all months – was to use different thresholds for similarity in the 2 steps. For the first step (within-month matching), Ipsos used a less strict threshold and then visually inspected the records which had been assigned to the same business. Where there were errors (false positives) these could then be corrected). However, given the large number of records, it would not be practical to conduct equivalent checks for the second step (between-month matching). In this case, a stricter threshold of similarity was used to limit the risks of false positives.

Step 5. Exact matching

As well as the fuzzy matching described above (Step 4), Ipsos looked for records where key information matched exactly. This matching was applied for all records across all months.

The key information used was:

- Business name
- Email domain
- Postcode
- Telephone number(s)

Where at least 2 of these fields were identical, the assumption was made that the records referred to the same business. From analysis of historic data, it was decided that it would not be enough for only one field to match exactly, even if this was the

³ 'Similarity' is defined here using Levenshtein distances. In brief, the Levenshtein distance is the number of character changes necessary to convert one string (such as a business name) into another. A small distance indicates that the information for the 2 records is very similar.

business name. This was because there were enough errors associated – due to common business names, data entry errors and so on – that such an approach would not be reliable. However, should any 2 of these fields match exactly then it was considered very likely that the records do indeed refer to the same business.

While there will again be errors – primarily due to data entry errors – the exact matching step is likely to have very low false positive rates as it is generally unlikely that equivalent errors will be made on 2 or more of these fields simultaneously.

3.5 Sample design

Some services covered by the ECS had relatively few interactions. The QS sample was designed to target additional interviews for these smaller services to increase the sample size available for analysis. There were 2 ways in which smaller services were disproportionately targeted:

- **The probability of a business being selected.** Initially, businesses that had received less frequently used services were given a higher probability of selection. This was to increase the sample size available for analysis for smaller services.
- **The allocation of services for the questionnaire.** Where a sampled business had received more than one service, they were more likely to be asked about the less frequently used service in the survey.

In practice, however, for all months of the 2023/24 survey fieldwork, all of the businesses that were eligible were included and issued, so no sampling of businesses was required.

To increase the sample size for the 4 less frequently used, and so higher priority, services (Selling Online Overseas, OMIS, Business Profiles and Missions), businesses were sampled separately (and in preference) to the remaining services. For those higher priority services, if a business had used more than one service in the wave, then those services were all given the same probability of being sampled, equal to one divided by the total number of services received.

For the remaining services, a weighted sampling approach was employed to increase the sample sizes for the services that were used less. This involved allocating a loading to each service and then using that loading to generate the adjusted probability of selection for that service (see Table 3.3). So for example, if a business had received both ITAs (loading = 1) and Export Opportunities (loading = 2) in April 2023, then the probability that it was asked about ITAs in the questionnaire would be $= 1/(1+2) = 1/3$, and the probability that it was asked about Export Opportunities would be $= 2/(1+2) = 2/3$. These probabilities were adjusted throughout the fieldwork year, in order to react to the changing volumes of eligible businesses per service over the course of the year.

Once a business had participated in the survey, it could not be sampled again for another year, and so was removed from the sampling frame. It was however still included in the population counts that were used for the weighting.

Table 3.3 Probability of selection weights by service

Service	April to September 2023	October 2023 to March 2024
Selling Online Overseas	1	1
OMIS	1	1
Business Profiles	1	1
Missions	1	1
Export and Investment Teams	1.75	1.5
Export Opportunities	2	2
Posts	1.25	1.25
ITAs	1	1.25
Webinars	1.5	1.5
Export Academy	1.25	1
ESS-IM	1.5	1.66

4 Data collection

4.1 Fieldwork outcomes

Respondents selected during the sampling process were sent an advance email notifying them about the study before fieldwork began. The advance emails offered more information about the business's interaction with DBT and the survey itself – such as date of interaction, which DBT service was used, and the purpose of the research. They also provided businesses with an opportunity to contact Ipsos to ask any questions or opt out of taking part the research.

The survey was administered by Ipsos's team of specialist business interviewers. Interviewers received a detailed briefing from the research team prior to fieldwork, with a view to ensuring that they understood the policy background to the study and were fully appraised of how to deal with any queries which respondents were likely to raise during the course of the interview.

The interviewers conducted the interviews using Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). The findings report covers DBT services delivered between April 2023 and March 2024.

4.2 Response rates

Table 4.1 below shows response rates achieved for the QS for April 2023 to March 2024 sample. Overall response rates have been calculated using the American Association for Public Opinion Research standard definitions⁴, an industry standard metric for calculating response rates where in the calculation of response rate, the eligibility rate of sample for which eligibility is unknown is assumed to be the same as for the known sample. A response rate of 20% was achieved for interviews conducted during this period⁵.

Table 4.1 Fieldwork outcomes April 2023 to March 2024 sample

Fieldwork outcomes	
	Number of cases (N)
Number of cases issued	17,152
Live sample – not interviewed or partial contact	4,767
Deadwood (e.g. uncontactable phone numbers)	4,325
Refusal	4,447
Ineligible	192
Complete interview	3,421
Response rate	20%

⁴ [https://www.aapor.org/Standards-Ethics/Standard-Definitions-\(1\).aspx](https://www.aapor.org/Standards-Ethics/Standard-Definitions-(1).aspx)

⁵ Response rate = (complete interviews / (complete interviews + partial interviews + refusal and break off + non-contact + other + (estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible) x (unknown eligibility non-interview))

4.2.1 Response rates for each DBT service

Table 4.2 below breaks down the response rates by each product or service.

Table 4.2 Response rates April 2023 to March 2024 sample

	SOO	OMIS	Missions	Business Profiles	E&I Teams	ESS-IM	Export Opportunities	Posts	ITAs	Webinars	Export Academy	Total
Number of cases issued	38	43	807	101	1,510	1,336	306	2,863	4,378	1,385	4,385	17,152
Complete	5	8	167	25	272	225	45	408	984	331	951	3,421
Complete – CATI	5	8	160	25	266	220	42	392	956	326	925	3,325
Complete - Online	0	0	7	0	6	5	3	16	28	5	26	96
Response rate	13%	19%	21%	25%	18%	17%	15%	14%	22%	24%	22%	20%

5 Weights

5.1 Overview of weights

Two sets of weights were produced for the sample dataset: a **business-level weight** for any analyses of the businesses that are not dependent on the actual service received; and a **service-level weight** for analyses of the services received. Applying the business-level weights makes the sample of businesses representative of all the businesses that received the eligible DBT services in the survey period (April 2023 to March 2024). The service-level weights adjust the sample of businesses based on the services that they were asked about in the questionnaire so that those services are representative of all the eligible DBT services that were delivered in the survey period.

Business-level weights

The business level weights were generated using a single stage of calibration weighting. The calibration weighting produced weights that adjust the sample so that the weighted sample matches the profiles of all the businesses that had used an eligible DBT service in the survey period for a range of measures.

The measures that were included in the calibration weighting (Tables 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3 and 5.1.4) were:

- Counts of the number of businesses receiving each service in the survey period
- Counts of the number of businesses receiving a DBT service each month
- The number of interactions that each business had a DBT service in the survey period
- The number of different services that the business received in the survey period.

The first 2 measures were counts of the total number of services received ($n = 42,081$); whereas the last 2 measures were counts for the total number of businesses ($n = 24,778$). One of the advantages of using calibration weighting was that it was possible to adjust to these profiles which were at 2 different levels: counts of the businesses, as well as all the services that had been received.

The final weights from the calibration weighing were scaled so that the sum of the weights equalled the sample size (i.e. to have mean 1) and these scaled weights were used as the business-level weights.

Service-level weights

The service-level weights were also generated using calibration weights, but with initial selection (design) weights. These selection weights were required because, for each business, the service that was asked about in the questionnaire was sampled from all the services that it had received over the survey period. The calculation for the selection weight also included the loadings (W_{ij}) that had been used when selecting the service. These were the loadings that had been employed to increase the sample sizes for the less common services.

The selection weight for a business for which service k was selected was calculated as:

$$wt_sel = \sum_i \sum_j (W_{ij} Z_{ij}) / \sum_j (W_{kj} Z_{kj})$$

where i is the service and j is the month. $Z_{ij} = 1$ if the business had received service i in month j ; and $Z_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The selection weights were trimmed at 8 (the 97.5th percentile) to reduce the impact of large weights on the statistical efficiency.

The measures that were included in the calibration weighting (Tables 5.2.1 and 5.2.2) were:

- The number of services received by month, quarter or in total
- Whether a business had received a DBT service in just a single month or more than one month.

Whether a service was calibrated by month, quarter or in total was dependent on the size, and distribution by month, of the service in the sample. The least common services (Selling Online Overseas, OMIS, Business Profiles, Export Opportunities, Missions, ESS-IM, and Export and Investment Teams) were all included with annual counts. The most common, ITAs, was included with monthly counts. The rest were all included with quarterly counts. As an approximately rule of thumb, the allocation of the services to the time period (month, quarter and in total) was set to avoid counts of less than 30 in any of the sampling cells.

The final weights from the calibration weighing were scaled so that the sum of the weights equalled the sample size (i.e. to have mean 1) and these scaled weights were used as the service-level weights.

5.2 Levels of weights

The reason for producing 2 levels of weights – a business-level weight and a service-level weight – is that many businesses received more than one service from DBT over the time covered by the QS. As a result, there was more than one service for which that business could have been sampled. In short, the business-level weight is intended to account for differences in the probability of a business taking part in the ECS for any service. The service-level weight is intended to account for differences in the probability of a business taking part in the ECS for a particular service.

Much of the ECS questionnaire is focused on a business' experience of a particular DBT service. For these questions, the responses depend on which service the business was asked about. The service-level weight is used for these questions to provide estimates which are representative of the businesses receiving each service.

However, there are some questions where it is reasonable to assume that the responses do not depend on which service the business was sampled for. Examples include the number of employees a business has, turnover, and prior exporting activities. Effectively, the business-level weight assumes that the answer to these questions would have been the same had the business been sampled for a different service. The advantage of using the business-level weight for these questions is that the survey estimates will tend to be more precise than when using the service-level weight. This is because the service-level weight will include some cases where the probability of being selected for that particular service is very low. These will produce more extreme values for the service-level weight, reducing the effective sample size for analysis. Annex B has a map of which weight is used for each survey question.

5.3 QS Design weights

The design weights are derived as 1 divided by the probability of selection:

$$DW_{\text{company}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{\text{service}} P(S_{\text{service}})}; \quad DW_{\text{service}} = \frac{1}{P(S_{\text{service}})}$$

Where DW_{company} and DW_{service} are the business- and service-level design weights respectively, $\sum_{\text{service}} P(S_{\text{service}})$ is the probability of a business being selected for any service, and $P(S_{\text{service}})$ is the probability of being selected for a particular service.

Businesses with high probabilities of selection are given less weight (as they will be relatively over-represented in the dataset), while businesses with low probabilities of selection are given more weight (as they will be relatively under-represented).

However, the selection probabilities are not known exactly because of the complexity of the sample structure. Primarily, this complexity is due to the exclusion criteria applied: once a business was selected for the ECS, it was excluded from selection for the next 11 months (so that it would only be selected once in a twelve-month period). In effect, this means that the probability of a business being selected in a given month depended on the selections made in all previous months.

Other factors of the sample structure affecting the probability of selection were:

- The number of businesses selected that month;
- The number of interactions/service deliveries recorded for each service;
- Which service(s) a given business had received that month.

The generated weights appear as variables in the SPSS file, and applying the relevant weight should replicate the weighted %s shown in the charts.

As a basic example, using the satisfaction question in SPSS:

- Filter on the relevant DBTService value, e.g. code 12 for Export Academy.
- Weight Cases on QSweight_service
- Run frequencies on the relevant question, e.g. Q093_Qsatis, which should match the equivalent weighted tables provided by Ipsos – the 'Missing' -1 cases are Not applicable responses (code 97 on the questionnaire).

Slight rounding differences may be experienced depending on the exact software used – e.g. Ipsos uses Quantum for data processing.

5.4 Design effects

The weighting impacts on the efficiency of the sample when carrying out analyses. In general, the more variable the weights, the greater the loss of efficiency in the sample. Tables 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 show estimates of the impact of the weighting on the precision for analyses of the businesses, and for each separate service, as both effective sample sizes and design effects. The effective sample size is the size that a hypothetical sample with no weighting would have to be to give the same level of precision. The design effective is the relative loss in the effective sample size and is calculated as the actual sample size divided by the effective sample size.

Table 5.1.1 Business-level weights: population totals and sample profile - Number of services received

Service	Population (n)	Population n (%)	Sample (n)	Sample (%)
Selling Online Overseas (SOO)	33	0.1%	6	0.1%
OMIS	93	0.2%	12	0.2%
Business Profiles	177	0.4%	31	0.4%
Missions	1,667	4.0%	327	4.6%
Export and Investment Teams	2,664	6.3%	492	6.9%
ESS-IM	2,989	7.1%	276	3.8%
Export Opportunities	532	1.3%	85	1.2%
Export Academy	14,203	33.8%	2,200	30.7%
Posts	7,173	17.0%	1,100	15.3%
Webinars	3,012	7.2%	578	8.1%
ITAs	9,538	22.7%	2,064	28.8%
Total	42,081	100%	7,171	100%

Table 5.1.2 Business-level weights: population totals and sample profile: Number of services received each month

Month	Population (n)	Population n (%)	Sample (n)	Sample (%)
April 2023	2,138	5.1%	400	5.6%
May 2023	3,316	7.9%	576	8.0%
June 2023	2,849	6.8%	487	6.8%
July 2023	2,794	6.6%	507	7.1%
August 2023	2,551	6.1%	462	6.4%
September 2023	3,726	8.9%	606	8.5%
October 2023	3,561	8.5%	595	8.3%
November 2023	4,698	11.2%	822	11.5%
December 2023	2,709	6.4%	471	6.6%
January 2024	4,441	10.6%	758	10.6%
February 2024	4,947	11.8%	744	10.4%
March 2024	4,351	10.3%	743	10.4%
Total	42,081	100%	7,171	100%

Table 5.1.3 Business-level weights: population totals and sample profile: Number of business-level interactions with DBT

Number of business-level interactions with DBT	Population (n)	Population n (%)	Sample (n)	Sample (%)
1	17,030	68.7%	1,935	56.6%
2	4,018	16.2%	689	20.1%
3	1,602	6.5%	291	8.5%
4 or more	2,128	8.6%	506	14.8%
Total	24,778	100%	3,421	100%

Table 5.1.4 Business-level weights: population totals and sample profile: Number of services used by each business

Number of services used by each business	Population (n)	Population (%)	Sample (n)	Sample (%)
Single service	20,138	81.3%	2,494	72.9%
2 or more services	4,640	18.7%	927	27.1%
Total	24,778	100%	3,421	100%

Table 5.2.1 Service-level weights: population totals and sample profile: Number of services received (by time period)

Service	Population (n)	Population (%)	Sample (n)	Sample (%)
Selling Online Overseas	33	0.1%	5	0.1%
OMIS	93	0.2%	8	0.2%
Business Profiles	177	0.4%	25	0.7%
Missions	1667	4.0%	167	4.9%
Export and Investment Teams	2664	6.3%	272	8.0%
ESS-IM	2989	7.1%	225	6.6%
Export Opportunities	532	1.3%	45	1.3%
Export Academy: Q1	1631	3.9%	211	6.2%
Export Academy: Q2	2183	5.2%	198	5.8%
Export Academy: Q3	4166	9.9%	248	7.2%
Export Academy: Q4	6223	14.8%	294	8.6%
Posts: Q1	1676	4.0%	81	2.4%
Posts: Q2	1954	4.6%	99	2.9%
Posts: Q3	1848	4.4%	126	3.7%
Posts: Q4	1695	4.0%	102	3.0%
Webinars: Q1	348	0.8%	38	1.1%
Webinars: Q2	807	1.9%	90	2.6%
Webinars: Q3	941	2.2%	66	1.9%
Webinars: Q4	916	2.2%	137	4.0%
ITAs: April 2023	627	1.5%	94	2.7%
ITAs: May 2023	907	2.2%	81	2.4%
ITAs: June 2023	1002	2.4%	84	2.5%
ITAs: July 2023	876	2.1%	90	2.6%
ITAs: August 20232023	803	1.9%	104	3.0%
ITAs: September 2023	832	2.0%	80	2.3%
ITAs: October 2023	766	1.8%	79	2.3%
ITAs: November 2023	1114	2.6%	113	3.3%
ITAs: December 2023	406	1.0%	39	1.1%
ITAs: January 2024	761	1.8%	75	2.2%
ITAs: February 2024	681	1.6%	72	2.1%
ITAs: March 2024	763	1.8%	73	2.1%
Total	42081	100%	3421	100%

Table 5.2.2 Service-level weights: population totals and sample profile: Number of months that services were received

Number of months that services were received	Population (n)	Population (%)	Sample (n)	Sample (%)
Used DBT service in single month	17030	40.5%	1935	56.6%
Used DBT service in more than one month	25051	59.5%	1486	43.4%
Total	42081	100%	3421	100%

Table 5.3.1 Estimated design effects and effective sample sizes: Company-level weights

Weight	Sample size	Design effect	Effective sample size
Company-level weight	3,421	1.11	3,076

Table 5.3.2 Estimated design effects and effective sample sizes: Service-level weights

Service	Sample size	Design effect	Effective sample size
Selling Online Overseas (SOO)	5	1.51	3
OMIS	8	1.16	7
Business Profiles	25	1.62	15
Missions	167	1.42	117
Export and Investment Teams	272	1.31	207
ESS-IM	225	1.04	217
Export Opportunities	45	1.08	42
Export Academy	951	1.47	647
Posts	408	1.45	282
Webinars	331	1.52	218
ITAs	984	1.43	688
All	3,421	1.50	2,276

6 Data and analysis

6.1 Confidence intervals

Charts and tables in the report display the confidence interval for each survey estimate. When a survey is carried out, the respondents who take part are only a subset of those in the population and as such may not give an exact representation of the 'true' average in the population. The reporting uses 'Confidence Intervals' to account for the fact that we have interviewed a subset of the population. A 95% Confidence Interval is a margin of error around an estimate, which gives a range of values within which you can be 95% confident that the true mean will lie.

For instance, if 1,000 people are interviewed, and 500 (50%) of them say that they agree with a statement, then you can be 95% confident that true proportion of people who agree with the statement is between 50% +/- 3% (47%, 53%).

When a smaller number of people are interviewed, it means that there is a larger margin of error around the estimate. The size of the margin of error also varies depending on the estimate itself. As an example, the table below provides several different confidence intervals for different estimates with different sample sizes.

Table 6.1 Confidence intervals by different sample sizes: 95% Confidence intervals around various estimates with different sample sizes

Estimates (%)	100 interviews	500 interviews	1000 interviews
10% or 90%	+/- 6%	+/- 3%	+/- 2%
30% or 70%	+/- 9%	+/- 4%	+/- 3%
50%	+/- 10%	+/- 4%	+/- 3%

The ECS has a complex sample design. One of the effects of using this complex design (and weighting) is that standard errors for survey estimates are generally higher than the standard errors that would be derived from an unweighted simple random sample of the same size. To obtain an accurate measure of a confidence interval one needs to take into account more than just the unweighted sample size and survey estimate into consideration as this does not adjust for the true 'standard error' around any estimate. The ECS is weighted to correct for variation in sampling probability and variation in response probability.

The true standard errors of the complex design are calculated by multiplying the standard error (of an estimate from a simple random sample) by the design factor (deft).

The ratio of the standard error of the complex sample to that of a simple random sample of the same size is known as the design factor.

The 95% confidence interval of a complex survey design is equal to:

$p \pm (1.96 \times \text{true standard error})$

where true standard error = design factor x standard error of a simple random sample; and

p = the point estimate, which is the percentage or proportion estimated from our sample (or sample mean)

The analysis of Confidence Intervals uses the Complex Samples Module within the analytical software package, Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) to correct for these effects. This provides a more precise estimate of the confidence intervals.

6.2 Significance testing

Where the results for one group of businesses are compared with the results for another group, any differences discussed in the text are statistically significant at a 95% confidence level, unless otherwise stated. This means that there is a 5% chance that we have reported a significant difference where in fact there was none (The Null Hypothesis was wrongly rejected). This also applies for any comparisons made between years of the survey. Two-tailed t-tests were used throughout.

6.3 Data quality and processing

Interviews were conducted using a Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) method. As such, the questionnaire was programmed in specialist interviewing software, ensuring that any question filtering was applied accurately during the interview. A number of logic and consistency checks were built into the CATI script. These were of 2 types: hard checks and soft checks. Hard checks are ones where the interviewer is unable to move to the next question until the discrepancy or inconsistency has been resolved. Soft checks are ones where the interviewer is asked to confirm that the information entered at a specific question is correct but is able to pass on to the next question.

A small number of interviews were conducted online using Computer-Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI). These interviews were also manually reviewed for quality assurance before their data was combined into the overall dataset. No interviews that were completed online were removed from the final dataset as a result of quality assurance checks.

Ipsos produced datasets using SPSS. The dataset was checked and cleaned by researchers within the Ipsos team. This included:

- Routing checks on questionnaire variables
- Checks on all sample variables included in the data and weighting scheme
- Cleaning of variable names, variable labels and value labels
- Comparison checks with previous datasets
- Sense checks on key variables.

Derived variables were also created for analytical purposes.

With the exception of the coding of responses to open-ended questions, or option to provide an 'other' response within a pre-coded list question, no data entry phase was required for this CATI survey. The programmed script ensured that all question routing was performed automatically, and no post-editing of the data was required in the way that might be necessary for surveys administered using a 'Pencil and Paper' method. Data in the report is based on estimates and responses provided by the respondents. While steps are taken during interviewing to ensure that data is accurate caution should be taken as

there is the potential for respondents to 'guess' at some answers where they do not know the precise figure.

Responses from fully open-ended questions and 'other' responses were collated and code frames created to reflect all key themes in the responses. Responses from questions with an 'other – specify' option were analysed and, if appropriate, back-coded into one of the pre-coded categories. If the response could not be assigned to an existing code but gained a sufficient number of mentions, a new code was created which all relevant responses were assigned to. Coding was carried out by a specialist team. All coders who worked on the study were briefed and a written set of instructions was made available. Code frames were created by the coding team in the first instance and approved by the research team.

6.4 Derived variables

Several questions in the survey asked respondents to give a rating using a scale from 0 to 10, where 10 was the most positive response and 0 was the least positive response. Responses have mostly been grouped into positive (a score of 7 or higher), neutral (a score of 4 to 6), and negative (a score of 3 or below). Respondents could also say 'Don't know' or 'Not applicable'. The exception to this was responses to the question 'Qlikrec' which was used to calculate the Net Promoter Score (NPS) for each export product or service⁶. NPS is a summary of how likely it is that businesses would recommend using the service or product. Businesses were asked to provide a score between 0 and 10, with 10 being the most positive response. Scores of 9 and 10 were banded together as 'promoters' and scores of 0 to 6 as 'detractors'. NPS is calculated as the difference between the percentage of 'promoters' and 'detractors'. A positive NPS means more people would recommend the service than would not.

Respondents who said the question did not apply ('Not applicable') to them were excluded from the analysis. Those who answered 'Don't know' or 'Refused' are usually included in the charts unless no respondents gave this answer for that particular question. However, 'Don't know' and 'Refused' answers were excluded from the business turnover breakdowns in the Quality Survey report for maximum comparability so that significant differences between years are genuine and not due to varying levels of these responses. Levels of 'Don't know' and 'Refused' responses for other questions and measures used for analysis are comparable between years.

6.5 Reporting

Where percentages shown in charts or tables do not total to exactly 100% (or where they do not exactly total to a summary statistic given, such as agree/disagree) this is due to a combination of rounding to the nearest whole number and because some questions allowed participants to choose more than one response option. All figures shown in the main report are weighted. The exceptions are base figures and instances where base sizes are too low to report percentage findings ($n < 30$), in which case the figures reported are unweighted.

Where the results for one group of respondents are compared with the results for another group, any differences discussed in the text of this report were statistically significant at the 95% probability level, unless otherwise stated. This means that you can be 95% confident

⁶ Annex B of this reports details specific wording of questions, as asked in the survey.

that the differences observed between the subgroups are genuine differences and have not just occurred by chance.

Base sizes, displaying the number of people who gave a response to any question (excluding those who said that the question did not apply to them), are shown on each chart. Throughout the report percentages corresponding to a base size of fewer than 10 responses have been suppressed for confidentiality reasons.

Data in this report is based on estimates provided by the respondents. While steps are taken during interviewing to ensure that data is accurate (interviewers reading back responses on questions with numeric responses, respondents being offered the chance to provide a banded response rather than an exact numeric answer if they are unsure), caution should be taken as there is the potential for respondents to 'guess' at some answers where they do not know the precise figure.

6.6 Data handling and security

This section describes the data handling and security processes that Ipsos and DBT have in place to ensure that personal information is kept safe, and all relevant corporate, legal, statutory and regulatory requirements are met including:


- MRS and ESOMAR professional code of conduct and frameworks published by the SRA, ESRC, GSR and UK Statistics Authority
- ISO 20252: international market research quality standard
- ISO 9001: international standard for quality management systems
- ISO 27001: international standard for data security
- 2018 Data Protection Act
- Cyber Essentials
- Fair Data

Each month, the ECS sample is drawn by DBT and then securely transferred to Ipsos and stored in line with the requirements of the 2018 Data Protection Act and GDPR. The data security procedures in place minimise the risk of data loss and ensure that respondents' confidentiality is protected at all times. Ipsos ensure that their processes are updated with the most recent regulations by conducting regular cycles of internal security audits, which feed into their continuous improvement process.

Once received, Ipsos process the sample and securely transmit a portion of the sample without telephone numbers to an approved supplier to obtain telephone details of the businesses. Once the telephone interviews are complete personal identifiers (contact details/disclosive verbatims) are separated from data files during data processing. All personally identifiable information is removed from DBT ECS datasets before they are transmitted outside Ipsos (to DBT). All reporting is non-disclosive, including any presentations of findings, topline and reports.

The data is stored and deleted according to the requirements of the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the UK Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018 and the Market Research Society Code of Conduct. Network personal data files are deleted within 12 months of project closure. For an overview of the data processes detailed above, please refer to figure 1.

Figure 1: data flow diagram




Description:

Flow chart displaying how sample data is transferred and kept secure and who of DBT or Ipsos is responsible for it at each stage of this project.

Annex A – International Trade and Investment (ITI) logic model for ECS

Frontier Economics created the logic model used to help develop the ECS questionnaires. It focussed on services provided by the International Trade and Investment Group within DBT. The International Trade and Investment (ITI) Group is the most substantial element of the 3 DBT business areas which make up the Department's expenditure. Before the foundation of the then Department for International Trade, ITI was known as UK Trade and Investment (UKTI), a non-ministerial government department.



Description:

Flow chart, in this case a “logic model” demonstrating the way in which a business might, at first, come into contact with DBT export support services. This is followed by the specific services they might work with, and delineation between those services classed as “direct support” and those classed as “indirect support”.

Annex B — Quality survey weight map

Variable	Weight
Qexportstatus	weight_business
Qexportstatus2	weight_business
Qexportfuture	weight_business
Qyearsell	weight_business
Qcurexp	weight_business
Qcurexpeur	weight_business
Qcurexpna	weight_business
Qcurexpla	weight_business
Qcurexpas	weight_business
Qtypexp	weight_business
Qonexp	weight_business
Qresult	weight_service
Qcontact	weight_business
Qreadiness	weight_business
Qbarrier	weight_business
Qoutcome	weight_service
Qoutcome2	weight_service
Qrelserv	weight_service
Qrelorg	weight_service

Qsathand	weight_service
Qreg	weight_service
Qevent	weight_service
Qfindinfo	weight_service
Qupdate	weight_service
Qknowstaff	weight_service
Qcomp	weight_service
Qclarity	weight_service
Qtimetaken	weight_service
Qqualinfo	weight_service
Qresult_1	weight_service
Qresult_2	weight_service
Qresult_invest	weight_service
Qresult_opps	weight_service
Qexoppcontract	weight_service
Qresult_conts	weight_service
Qsatis	weight_service
Qwhydis	weight_service
Qlikrec	weight_service
Qimprove	weight_service
Qknowchange	weight_service
QfirstDBT	weight_business
QContDBT	weight_business
QcontDBTOth	weight_business
QDBTadaware	weight_business
Qturnover	weight_business
Qturnexp	weight_business
Qturnexpest	weight_business
Qturnprop	weight_business
Qnumemp	weight_business
Qactivities	weight_business
Qactivities_2	weight_business
Qtradetime	weight_business
Qboardprofile	weight_business
Qboardfemale	weight_business
Qboardethnicity	weight_business

Department for Business and Trade

The Department for Business and Trade is an economic growth department. We ensure fair, competitive markets at home, secure access to new markets abroad and support businesses to invest, export and grow. Our priorities are the industrial strategy, make work pay, trade and the plan for small business.

Legal disclaimer

Whereas every effort has been made to ensure that the information in this document is accurate, the Department for Business and Trade does not accept liability for any errors, omissions or misleading statements, and no warranty is given or responsibility accepted as to the standing of any individual, firm, company or other organisation mentioned.

© Crown Copyright 2025

You may re-use this publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

Where we have identified any third party copyright information in the material that you wish to use, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holder(s) concerned.

Published by
Department for Business and Trade
June 2025