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1 Background and purpose

1.1 Introduction

The UK’s food system is complex. It is essential that food continues to remain safe, authentic, affordable and sustainable in a future affected by climate change, global population growth and innovations in the way food is produced, distributed and consumed, both nationally and globally.

The Food Standards Agency (FSA) is set up to protect the interests of the consumer through a range of activities, including regulation of food businesses and developing and targeting messages and initiatives for the public. The FSA’s strategy for 2015 to 2020, Food We Can Trust,\(^1\) renews its commitment to put consumers first.

The Food and You Survey is the FSA’s principal source of methodologically robust and representative evidence on consumers’ reported food-related activities and attitudes. Understanding the UK population’s reported behaviour, attitudes and knowledge in relation to food issues is key to measuring the FSA’s progress towards its strategic objectives, providing evidence that supports the FSA’s campaigns and other activities, and identifying topics for further research or action.

1.2 About the FSA

The FSA was formed in 2000 as an independent non-ministerial government department, governed by a Board whose members have extensive knowledge and experience in a wide range of sectors relevant to the FSA. The FSA was set up to protect public health from risks which may arise in connection with the consumption of food (including risks caused by the way in which it is produced or supplied), and otherwise to protect the interests of consumers in relation to food.

The FSA is responsible for food safety and hygiene in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and is committed to ensuring the general public can have trust and confidence in the food they buy and eat.\(^2\) The FSA enforces standards through its regulatory responsibilities. In 2010 the FSA launched the national Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS)\(^3\) in order to provide the public with information about the hygiene standards in food premises.

The FSA also provides guidance to consumers on best practices for food safety and hygiene in order to minimise the risk of food poisoning. This includes advice on cleaning, cooking, cross-contamination and chilling (collectively known as the ‘4 Cs’). Guidance is also given on the use of date labels (such as ‘use by’ and ‘best before’ dates) and storage instructions on foods to help ensure safety of food eaten at home.

---

\(^1\) [https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/Food-Standards-Agency-Strategy%20FINAL.pdf](https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/Food-Standards-Agency-Strategy%20FINAL.pdf)

\(^2\) In 2010 responsibility for nutrition in England transferred from the FSA to the Department of Health, and subsequently, in 2013, to Public Health England (PHE). Responsibility for nutrition in Wales transferred to the Welsh Government in 2010. Responsibility for nutrition and healthy eating practices remains the responsibility of the FSA in Northern Ireland. Food safety and nutrition in Scotland is the responsibility of Food Standards Scotland (FSS), a non-ministerial government department of the Scottish Government, established by the Food Act 2015.

\(^3\) [https://www.food.gov.uk/safety-hygiene/food-hygiene-rating-scheme](https://www.food.gov.uk/safety-hygiene/food-hygiene-rating-scheme)
Since its inception in 2000, the FSA has commissioned surveys to collect quantitative data on the public’s reported behaviour, attitudes and knowledge relating to food and food safety. Between 2000 and 2007 the FSA ran the Consumer Attitudes Survey (CAS). In 2008 the FSA’s Social Science Research Committee (SSRC) recommended that a new survey – Food and You – be developed.

1.3 The Food and You survey

1.3.1 Background

Food and You is a biennial, cross-sectional survey of adults aged 16 years and over living in private households in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Random probability sampling ensures that everyone in these countries has an equal chance of being selected to take part, so the results are representative of the population. The first three waves of the survey were carried out by TNS BMRB (in 2010, 2012 and 2014 respectively). The National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), in collaboration with the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA), have been contracted to carry out Waves 4, 5 and 6 of the survey.

Food and You has been an important means of measuring progress against the FSA’s strategic objectives and topics have reflected the changing priorities and interests of the FSA, summarised below:

- Wave 1 (2010) assessed consumer attitudes and behaviour to food-related issues falling under the FSA’s remit. Following Wave 1, the questionnaire was reviewed extensively in light of responsibility for nutrition in England and Wales being transferred from FSA to the Department of Health (England) and Welsh Government in 2010.
- Wave 2 (2012) focused on food safety and hygiene issues.
- Wave 3 (2014) was designed to monitor changes since the previous two waves in attitudes and reported behaviour about food issues, to identify at-risk groups for food safety issues, and to explore public understanding of issues regarding the FSA’s targets. For the first time at Wave 3, results from Food and You were published as an official statistic, reflecting the robust methodology of the survey and the development of a regular time series of data.
- Wave 4 (2016) included new questions to cover affordability of food, choice, security and sustainability.
- Wave 5 (2018) continued this focus and additionally included questions about public awareness of and trust in the FSA.

1.3.2 Aims

Food and You provides data about the prevalence of different attitudes, reported behaviour and knowledge about ways in which food is purchased, stored, prepared and eaten. The aims of Wave 5 were to provide the FSA with data on food hygiene and food safety and other food-related issues in order to:

- explore public understanding and engagement with food safety;

---

• assess knowledge of messages and interventions aimed at raising awareness and changing behaviour;

• describe public attitudes to food production and the food system;

• monitor trends in reported behaviour, attitudes and knowledge (compared with data from the previous four waves or from other sources);

• identify target groups for future interventions (e.g. those most at risk or those among whom FSA policies and initiatives are likely to have the greatest impact); and

• provide indicators and evidence for tracking the FSA’s strategic plans.

1.4 Food and You Wave 5 Reports

This report provides detail on the Wave 5 questionnaire development and piloting.

Findings are presented in five reports, published by the FSA. The Combined report presents a descriptive overview of the findings for England Wales and Northern Ireland, based on the core sample. Trends across the five survey waves are reported where available, and Wave 5 results are presented by key socio-demographic factors such as gender, age group, household size, presence of children in household, income and working status.

Additional respondents were interviewed in Northern Ireland and Wales to provide sufficient cases to enable country-level analyses of the survey findings. The Combined Report is therefore complemented by additional reports published separately which are based on the boosted sample:

- **Country comparison report** – focusing on differences between the three nations
- **Northern Ireland report** – focusing on the Northern Ireland results
- **Wales report** – focusing on the Wales results.

Each report is accompanied by detailed tables of results in Excel format.

More detail on the Wave 5 background and methodology can be found in the Technical report.  

The complete data set will be available in the UK Data Archive.  

---

5 Reports and data tables for Food and You Wave 5 can be found at [https://www.food.gov.uk/research/food-and-you/food-and-you-wave-five](https://www.food.gov.uk/research/food-and-you/food-and-you-wave-five)

6 [http://data-archive.ac.uk](http://data-archive.ac.uk)
2 Cognitive testing

NatCen’s specialist Questionnaire Development Hub (QDT) employs cognitive testing techniques to test the validity of survey questions. New questions suggested for inclusion in Wave 5, and existing questions identified for wording changes, were subjected to cognitive testing. The primary aim of the cognitive testing was to assess participants’ comprehension of the proposed questions. This enabled the researchers to identify issues with question wording and content and to make informed decisions regarding the content of the mainstage questionnaire.

The cognitive testing methods broadly aimed to explore four stages of participants’ engagement with the questions:

- how they understood and interpreted the questions;
- how they recalled information relevant for answering the questions;
- the judgements they made in evoking information to answer a question; and
- their response-mapping processes.

The following sections detail the questions tested, the key findings and the recommendations made for the Wave 5 questionnaire.

2.1 Protocol

The cognitive testing incorporated think aloud and probing techniques. The think aloud method requires participants to explain their thought process they use in responding to a question. This allows the researcher to assess whether the participant comprehends the question, and that this is captured by the response. Probing involves administering the survey question followed by additional exploratory questions which assess the participant’s understanding of the question and response option. Overall, the testing explored:

- participants’ comprehension of key terms within the questions
- whether participants were able to select a suitable response option
- sensitivity of questions

The cognitive testing was conducted in two rounds, with appropriate adjustments made to the questions before they were re-tested. Participants were interviewed in a neutral venue and interviews were recorded with their consent. Participants were given £20 in cash as compensation for their time.

Audio recordings of each interview were summarised by interviewers in a structured template and subsequently transferred to an analytical matrix. Responses to each test question were recorded, along with observations made by interviewers, any think aloud comments and each of the scripted probes. The data in the matrix were reviewed thematically. The recommendations outlined below were based on a debrief discussion between the interviewers, NatCen researchers and the FSA as well as a full analysis of the data.

2.2 Participant recruitment

Participants were recruited by an experienced recruitment agency specialising in social research recruitment. In Round 1 of cognitive testing all interviews were carried out in
Central London. Fifteen participants were interviewed in total. In Round 2, interviews were carried out in Central London and Crawley. Seventeen participants were interviewed in total.

The table below summarises the composition of the cognitive interviewing sample for rounds one and two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Number achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 years or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest educational qualification</td>
<td>A level or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCSE or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of FSA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Cognitive testing: findings and recommendations

The questions that were tested during cognitive testing and piloting are shown below with a summary of the associated findings and recommendations made for further questionnaire development. The variable names used during testing are shown, and where questions were included in the final Wave 5 questionnaire, the final variable names are shown in brackets.

3.1 Shopping, cooking and eating

The questions outlined in this section relate to Chapter 1: Shopping, cooking and eating in the Food and You Wave 5 report. The chapter explores people’s eating habits in the home (behaviours related to cooking and shopping), their dietary restrictions, and attitudes towards cooking, food shopping and food security.

The following questions have been previously used on other waves of Food and You and were retested to ensure they worked as intended.

3.1.1 Eating behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 cognitive testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CuredMt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcard 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the moment, how often do you eat cured or dried meats, for example ham or chorizo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At least once a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5-6 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3-4 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Once or twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Once a fortnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Less than once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cured meat:** the examples of cured or dried meats (e.g. ham and chorizo) restricted participants to think specifically of the types of meats included. When probed, participants mentioned packs of ham and other lunch meats. This could have suggested by the examples included in the question, e.g. ham. Another participant gave ‘salami’ as an example in probing.

**Recommendations**
- It was recommended that the examples of cured or dried meats are excluded from the question wording.
Round 1 cognitive testing

**Precooked**
Showcard 1
At the moment, how often do you eat pre-cooked meats, for example pre-cooked chicken or turkey?

1. At least once a day
2. 5-6 times a week
3. 3-4 times a week
4. Once or twice a week
5. Once a fortnight
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
8. Never

**Pre-cooked meat**: participants referred to pre-cooked meats as chicken drumsticks, ready meals, meat one could put into sandwiches, such as corned beef and burgers.

*Recommendations*
- For consistency with CuredMt, the examples from the question will be dropped.

Round 1 and Round 2 cognitive testing

**RawMilk**
Showcard 1
At the moment, how often do you eat or drink raw milk, i.e. non-pasteurised?

1. At least once a day
2. 5-6 times a week
3. 3-4 times a week
4. Once or twice a week
5. Once a fortnight
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
8. Never

**Raw milk**: participants who understood that ‘raw’ milk was unpasteurised milk found this question easy to answer. Some participants were unsure of the definition of ‘raw’ milk.

*Recommendations*
- Consider including a definition of raw milk within the question wording.

The revised question was re-tested in Round 2 and participants were clear what raw milk meant in reference to the question.
### Round 2 cognitive testing

**RawEggs**
Showcard 1
At the moment, how often do you eat or drink raw or uncooked eggs, including in things like homemade mayonnaise and homemade royal icing?

1. At least once a day
2. 5-6 times a week
3. 3-4 times a week
4. Once or twice a week
5. Once a fortnight
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
8. Never

**Raw eggs:** Round 2 findings showed that we could consider changing the example of homemade mayonnaise with another food product so that participants do not include shop bought mayonnaise at this question.

Whilst some participants said they were unsure if they had eaten raw egg in other food products, we suggest the current question wording is retained as they were hypothesising that they might have had raw eggs.

### Round 2 cognitive testing

**CookEggs**
Showcard
At the moment, how often do you eat cooked eggs?

1. At least once a day
2. 5-6 times a week
3. 3-4 times a week
4. Once or twice a week
5. Once a fortnight
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
8. Never

**Cooked eggs:** whilst most participants found this question easy to answer, there was some discrepancy in the types of things people were including when giving a response. Those who said the question was a little difficult needed to think through all of the food items they consumed which contained egg before giving their response.

Some participants were just thinking of eggs such as scrambled, poached, fried etc. whilst others were also thinking of cakes, baked goods, processed foods where an egg
had been added, egg fried rice and pancakes. Some questioned what they should be thinking about before providing a response and one participant changed their response after realising how many foods contained egg.

Recommendations

- As there were differences in the types of foods participants were thinking about, it is recommended that a note is added to the question to provide clarity that participants should be thinking not just of eggs but also about foods containing cooked eggs (e.g. ‘Please also think about food containing cooked eggs.’).

### Round 1 cognitive testing

**RawFish**
Showcard 1
At the moment, how often do you eat raw fish or shellfish, excluding raw oysters e.g. in sushi, sashimi?

1. At least once a day
2. 5-6 times a week
3. 3-4 times a week
4. Once or twice a week
5. Once a fortnight
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
8. Never

**Raw Fish**: participants who never ate raw fish found the question easy to answer. Those who did eat raw fish gave the following examples when probed what raw fish they were thinking of: prawns and pre-cooked crab meat.

Recommendations

- The question wording was retained.

### 3.1.2 Packaging

The question about whether participants pack raw meat and fish separately to other groceries was tested.
Round 2 cognitive testing

[Ask all]

PackSep

Showcard
When you/your household buys raw meat, fish or shellfish, how often would you pack these separately from other general food items? – Think of both fresh and frozen meat, fish or shellfish.

CODE ONE

1. I never do this
2. I rarely do this
3. I sometimes do this
4. I often do this
5. I always do this
6. I do not buy raw meat, fish, or shellfish

[SPONTANEOUS DK or Refusal]

- When answering about packing raw meat, fish or shellfish separately from other general food items, a number of participants were not thinking about what they did when food shopping. They were thinking about packing foods into their fridge or freezer once they had brought them home from shopping.

- Some participants asked for this question to be repeated as they were unsure whether the question was asking about packing foods at a supermarket or at home into the fridge or freezer. These participants made a decision on what they thought the question was asking about (i.e. putting shopping away at home versus packing foods into bags at the supermarket) as interviewers were instructed not to provide assistance during cognitive testing in order to avoid influencing participants’ understanding of the questions.

Recommendations

- If the participant should be thinking about packing meat and fish bought from a butchers or fishmongers as well as supermarkets, we suggest that this is clarified in the question wording.

- Amendment to the question to make it clear that participants should be thinking about packing food in a shop and not at home.
3.2 Food safety in the home

The questions tested in this section related to Chapter 2: Food Safety in the Food and You Wave 5 report. The questions were the same as those included in previous waves, with the addition of questions about the use of sanitising spray to gain further insight into behaviours aimed at preventing cross-contamination.

3.2.1 Cross contamination

Use of surface sanitising spray: we recommend that the question wording is amended to include surface wipes and to also make it clear that participants should be thinking of antibacterial sprays and wipes only. Some participants were correct in not including washing up liquid in their response, but others included non-antibacterial sprays in their answers.
Recommendations

- To avoid ambiguity at option three as to how long someone might leave the spray on before wiping it off, we suggest the following amendment is made:

SanSpray
I would like you to tell me whether you do any of the following things, and if so how frequently:

Use any antibacterial surface sanitising spray or wipes to clean kitchen work surfaces.

INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY NEVER HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DOING THIS, E.G. THEY NEVER USE RAW CHICKEN, THEN CODE AS ‘NOT APPLICABLE’ AND NOT ‘NEVER’.

   1. Never
   2. Sometimes
   3. Most of the time
   4. Always

Round 1 and 2 cognitive testing

[Ask if SanSpray=2-4]

SprayWipe
And when you use surface sanitising spray, which of the things listed on this card do you usually do?

   1. I spray it and don’t wipe it off
   2. I spray it and immediately wipe off
   3. I spray it, leave it for a while, and then wipe it off
   4. I spray it, wipe it off, and repeat
   5. I first clean the surface with soapy water, before using spray.

Use of surface sanitising spray: to avoid ambiguity at option three as to how long someone might leave the spray for before wiping it off, we suggest the following amendment is made:

[Ask if SanSprayT = Spray only or Wipes and Spray]

SprayWipe
When you use surface sanitising spray, which of the things listed on this card do you usually do?

   1. I spray it and don’t wipe it off
   2. I spray it and immediately wipe off
   3. I spray it, leave it for a while, a few minutes, and then wipe it off
   4. I spray it, wipe it off, and repeat
   5. I first clean the surface with soapy water, before using spray.
Wash fruit and vegetables: a range of responses were given to this question and participants said they did not find it difficult to answer. Some participants said they would wash fruits and vegetables for others but not themselves so selected the option ‘sometimes’. Others mentioned washing fruits with peels on such as grapefruits, whilst some said they would only wash a selection of items. One participant hesitated because she would always wash them, but her husband didn’t, and she would eat them, she selected her response based on her own behaviour.

When asked what types of fruits and vegetables they were thinking about, a number of participants mentioned potatoes and sweet potatoes which are vegetables that one would not eat raw. Some participants said they would wash pre-packaged salad anyway whilst others said they would not.

Recommendations
- The following amendments were suggested to the question wording. This should ensure that participants are focusing on the fact that the fruits and vegetables to be thought about should be eaten raw as it’s unclear if participants are also thinking of washing vegetables before cooking them as potatoes was given as an example during the probing of this question.
3.2.2 Household appliances

This question about the appliances participants have in their household was asked on the previous wave of the Food and You. The question was tested for Wave 5 with the additional response option ‘1. Fridge with built-in freezer compartment’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 and 2 cognitive testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4_8c</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following appliances do you have in your household? CODE ALL THAT APPLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER: IF NECESSARY EXPLAIN THAT A “HOB” IS “THE FLAT TOP PART OF A COOKING STOVE, OR A SEPARATE FLAT SURFACE, CONTAINING HOTPLATES OR BURNERS”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fridge with built-in freezer compartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Combined fridge and freezer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Separate fridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Separate freezer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dishwasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Microwave oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kettle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. None of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Most participants automatically knew which appliances they had in their home and understood the list of options to choose from.
- Some participants found it difficult to decide whether they had a fridge with a built-in freezer compartment or a combined fridge and freezer as they were unsure of the difference between the two. One participant changed their response as they read down the list after initially selecting option one (Fridge with built-in freezer compartment). They then changed their response to option two combined fridge and freezer.
- Most participants understood the difference between options one and two, describing a fridge with built-in freezer compartment to be a fridge with a small freezer compartment at the top inside of the main fridge door. They described a combined fridge and freezer as a fridge on top of a freezer which have separate doors but are part of the same unit.
- All three options, oven, hob and grill, were selected when participants had these as part of one appliance, however one participant only selected oven, as her hob was part of the oven and she believed you could get separate hobs which sit on the work counters.
- Participants did not believe that any options should be removed from the list and suggested the following appliances could be added:
  - George Foreman grill
  - Food processor
  - Toaster (mentioned by most participants)
  - Washing machine
  - Sandwich maker
  - Slow cooker
• Blender
• Deep fat fryers
• Chicken spit roasters
• Coffee machine

**Recommendations**

• We suggest that small wording changes are made to options one and two to make clear what the differences are between the two. This should allow participants to select the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Fridge with small built-in freezer compartment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Combined fridge and freezer, these have separate doors but are part of the same unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also suggest that wording is added next to grill and hob to ensure that participants are selecting them even if their oven, hob and grill are part of one unit.

Which of the following appliances do you have in your household?

**Code all that apply**

**INTERVIEWER:** If necessary explain that a "hob" is "the flat top part of a cooking stove, or a separate flat surface, containing hotplates or burners".

1. Fridge with small built-in freezer compartment
2. Combined fridge and freezer, these have separate doors but are part of the same unit
3. Separate fridge
4. Separate freezer

### 3.3 Eating outside the home

The questions outlined in this section relate to Chapter 3: Eating outside the home in the Food and You Wave 5 report. Questions within this module explored where and how often people eat out or buy takeaways; the types of information people use to decide where to eat out and which factors they consider important when making these decisions.

#### 3.3.1 Frequency of eating out

These questions are new to the survey for Wave 5 and ask about the frequency of participants’ eating out for breakfast, lunch and dinner. In previous waves people were asked about eating out in general, rather than for specific meals.
Round 2 cognitive testing

[Ask all]
EatOutBrk_W5
Showcard
At the moment, how often would you say you eat out or get food to take away for breakfast from a restaurant or other food outlet?
SINGLE CODE

1. At least once a day
2. 5-6 times a week
3. 3-4 times a week
4. Once or twice a week
5. Once a fortnight
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
8. Never

It varies too much to say (spontaneous only)

Participants found this question easy to answer and were thinking of eating out specifically for breakfast. Participants said they were thinking of having breakfast in:

- Cafes
- Pubs
- Take away, e.g. JustEat
- Examples, such as, McDonalds, Greggs, Pret, Subway

There was a mixed response when participants were asked if they included brunch in their answer. Some participants said they did not include brunch because they did not go out for brunch. Participants who ate brunch tended to include this in their answer.

Round 2 cognitive testing

EatOutLun_W5
Showcard
At the moment, how often would you say you eat out at or get food to take away for lunch from a restaurant or other food outlet?
SINGLE CODE

1. At least once a day
2. 5-6 times a week
3. 3-4 times a week
4. Once or twice a week
5. Once a fortnight
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
8. Never

It varies too much to say (spontaneous only)
Participants found this question easy to answer. Participants said they were thinking of having lunch:

- At the pub
- In McDonalds
- From the supermarket

Some of the participants questioned whether supermarket meal deals should be included in their answer. A number of participants said they did not include meal deals, whilst others did include them in their answer. Some participants asked whether buying sandwiches for their lunch from a car garage should be included in their answer.

Recommendations

- We suggest that an interviewer note is added to help clarify that sandwiches and meal deals should be included when participants are answering this question. An example is illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EatOutLun_W5</th>
<th>Showcard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the moment, how often would you say you eat out at or get food to take away for lunch from a restaurant or other food outlet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF ASKED: PLEASE INCLUDE SANDWICHES AND MEAL DEALS YOU BUY FROM THE SUPERMARKET OR OTHER FOOD OUTLET, SUCH AS A CAR GARAGE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Round 2 cognitive testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EatOutDin_W5</th>
<th>Showcard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the moment, how often would you say you eat out at or get food to take away for dinner from a restaurant or other food outlet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE CODE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At least once a day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5-6 times a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3-4 times a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Once or twice a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Once a fortnight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Once a month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Less than once a month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It varies too much to say (spontaneous only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants found this question easy to answer and a variety of response options were selected. Participants said they were thinking of eating:

- At a pub
- In a restaurant
• Take-away
• Examples, such as Pizza Express, Bella Italia, Nando’s, Zizzi

We therefore suggest that the wording remains the same.

There was a mix of responses when participants were asked which period they were thinking of when answering these questions. Some participants thought of the past month or year, whereas others were thinking more generally.

Participants said they were thinking of ‘other food outlet’ to mean:
• Street food
• Market stall
• Take away
• Meal from supermarket/petrol station
• Local coffee shops/cafés.

3.3.2 Information sources about where to eat out

Both EatOutInf and Q2_35 are questions taken from previous waves of the Food and You; however, the response options have been amended since Wave 5. In order to ensure that these amendments do not alter the clarity of these questions, they were tested in this round. The first question is concerned with the sources of information available to participants before eating out or getting takeaway food. The second question asks about the important factors one takes into account when deciding where to eat out.
Showcard
In the last 12 months, when deciding where to eat out or get food to takeaway, have you got any information from any of the following sources?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Own experience of the place
2. Appearance of the place
3. Word of mouth
4. Recommendations from friends/family
5. Customer reviews on websites or mobile apps e.g. TripAdvisor, Yelp, Google reviews etc.
6. Print or online editions of newspaper/magazine features or reviews
7. Online restaurant guides e.g. Time Out, Square Meal
8. Television programmes
9. Books e.g. restaurant guides
10. Leaflets/flyers
11. Media advertising e.g. television/radio/magazines/newspapers
12. Other (please specify)

All participants found the response options clear. One participant said the options were clear, but she had not heard of ‘Yelp’ or ‘Square Meal’. However, this did not affect her answer. Participants thought that response options 3 (word of mouth) and 4 (recommendations from friends/family) were very similar but could identify the differences. Generally, participants were able to explain the difference between print or online editions of newspaper/magazine features or reviews.

Participants thought the following could be added to the response options:

- Social media
- Billboards
- Emails with voucher codes

Recommendations

- We recommend adding social media to the response options as participants highlighted that this would be a popular option.
Showcard
Generally, when you’re deciding where to eat out, which of the following are important to you?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY
1. Price
2. Recommendations or invitation from someone you know/good reviews
3. Good service
4. A good hygiene rating/score
5. Calorie information of the food is provided
6. Allergy information of the food is provided
7. Healthier foods/choices
8. Food for restricted diets such as Vegetarian, Halal, Kosher etc.
9. None of these
10. Something else SPECIFY

Participants found this question easy to answer. Some participants were thinking quite generally about importance and listed a number of options whilst others thought about those which were most important to them.

Participants thought ‘healthier foods/choices’ meant; someone wanting a salad, food that wasn’t greasy or refined, food without meat, somewhere that didn’t only sell burgers and chips, smaller portions sizes, less calories and sugar and food which wasn’t processed.

When asked, participants said the following could be added to the list of response options:
- Location
- Value for money (it was felt this is difference to price)
- Children’s menus
- Ambiance and décor of a place
- Adventure of trying different cultural foods
- Familiarity of a brand such as Starbucks

One participant felt that the option ‘Food for restricted diets’ had negative connotations to it, although they did not suggest how this could be reworded.

Recommendations
- We suggest the following options are amended or added based on those we believe would be most commonly chosen by participants.
[Ask all]
Q2_35
Generally, when you’re deciding where to eat out, which of the following are important to you?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY
1. Price/ value for money
2. Recommendations or invitation from someone you know/good reviews
3. Good service
4. Atmosphere/ character of a place
5. Branding/ familiarity
6. A good hygiene rating/score
7. Calorie information of the food is provided
8. Allergy information of the food is provided
9. Healthier foods/choices
10. Food for restricted diets such as Vegetarian, Halal, Kosher etc.
11. Availability of a children’s menu
12. None of these
13. Something else SPECIFY

[SPONTANEOUS DK or Refusal]

3.4 Healthy eating (Northern Ireland)

The questions outlined in this section were asked only in Northern Ireland and relate to Chapter 6: Healthy eating in the Food and You Wave 5 report. This question asked where participants would like to see more information displayed about how healthy the food options are. It is an existing question from the survey asked in Northern Ireland only but has been tested for Wave 5 with amended response options.
Showcard
In which, if any, of these places would you like to see more information displayed about how healthy different options are?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY
IF RESPONDENT QUERIES: FOR EXAMPLE, INFORMATION SHOWING THE CALORIE CONTENT OF DIFFERENT OPTIONS OR HOW MUCH FAT, SUGAR OR SALT THEY CONTAIN

1. Restaurants
2. Pubs
3. Cafes, coffee shops and sandwich shops
4. Fast food restaurants
5. Workplace canteens
6. Food outlets in cinemas, bowling alleys, theme parks or other leisure facilities
7. Takeaway outlets e.g. Indian, Chinese, pizza, fish and chips
8. Street food stalls
9. Pop-up restaurants
10. None of these

[SPONTANEOUS DK or Refusal]

- Most participants found this question easy to answer and a range of outlets were selected. Participants talked through their responses outlining the outlets where this information was displayed already and those where they wished it was.
- Some participants said they wanted to enjoy themselves and not worry about what they might eat when going out, while others questioned the practicalities around outlets displaying the information, for example street food stalls.
- Participants included the following things when asked about what they thought ‘how healthy different options are’ meant:
  - Ingredients
  - Calories
  - Whether the item was vegan or vegetarian
  - Whether the item was gluten free
  - How much sugar, salt or fat the food item contained
  - Whether the meat was processed or ethically sourced
  - That the meat was what it said it was
  - Whether the item contained allergens
- Some participants thought pop-up restaurants and street food stalls were similar types of venues. Others thought of a pop-up restaurant as a temporary venue that
might offer seating, while a street food stall was more likely to involve eating while standing or taking the food away.

- Recommendations
  - We suggest combining pop-up restaurants and street food stalls, as participants generally considered them to be very similar types of outlets.

### 3.5 Trust

The questions tested in this section relate to Chapter 5: Trust in the Food and You Wave 5 report. A new set of questions covering people’s perceptions of and trust in the FSA and the food system were tested in Wave 5.

#### 3.5.1 OECD recommended questions

Questions A1 to A4 were taken from the OECD recommended questions on trust and were included in Round 1 testing to understand how well they would work in the context of the wider trust module.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 cognitive testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The next questions are about whether or not you trust various institutions in the UK. If you have had very little or no contact with these institutions, please give an answer based on your general impression of these institutions. Using this card, please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much, if at all, you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3
Showcard 1
The British Parliament?
Not at all
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Completely 9 10

A4
Showcard 1
The police?
Not at all
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Completely 9 10

A5
Showcard 1
The civil service?
Not at all
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Completely 9 10

A1 to A5: lack of knowledge and understanding of organisations (e.g. British Parliament and Civil service) meant that some participants chose a score of ‘5’ or said they would have selected a ‘don’t know’ if this option was available.

---

### 3.5.2 Familiarity with the FSA

Two questions covering current levels of familiarity with the Food Standards Agency (FSA) (**HeardFSA**) and other Government departments (**HeardOrg**) were also tested, along with a description of the FSA’s role and responsibilities.

#### Round 1 cognitive testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HeardOrg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following, if any, have you heard of?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

Showcard 2

1. Department of Health
2. Department for Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS)
3. Public Health Agency (PHA)
4. Food Standards Agency
5. Safefood
6. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE)
7. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)
8. Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD)
9. Office of Communications (OfCOM)
10. Health & Safety Executive
11. None of these

**HeardOrg**: participants were referring to both the full names and the acronyms of the organisation's when answering HeardOrg. Some participants recognised the organisation solely through the acronym, in particular OfCom.

#### Recommendations

- We propose that the list of organisations is reviewed to ensure that they are still accurate and relevant.

#### Round 1 cognitive testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HeardFSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had you heard of the Food Standards Agency before you were contacted to take part in this interview?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No, I hadn’t heard of the Food Standards Agency at all
2. Yes, I had heard of the Food Standards Agency but didn’t know much about them and/or their responsibilities
3. Yes, I had heard of the FSA and know about their responsibilities

**HeardFSA**: participants were able to provide details and examples of when they had heard of the FSA and their levels of knowledge around the FSA’s remit, e.g. dealing with food hygiene standards. Participants did not identify any issues with this question.

#### Recommendations

- Propose that the current wording is retained.
3.5.3 New trust questions
Questions C3 to C6 are the new trust questions developed specifically for Wave 5, based on OECD recommendations. Based on the findings from the first round, amendments were made to the questions and it was suggested they were retested in the second round to ensure that the amendments improved the comprehensibility and clarity of the question.

### Round 2 cognitive testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DescFSA</th>
<th>The Food Standards Agency, or the FSA for short, is the independent Government department that is responsible for protecting the public from risks relating to food. The following questions are about the responsibilities of the Food Standards Agency and your views on how they might respond to food related issues. Please answer these questions on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means very unlikely and 10 means very likely.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>If new evidence about food safety came to light, how likely or unlikely do you think it would be that the Food Standards Agency would inform the public?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcard</td>
<td>Very unlikely 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>If new evidence about food safety came to light, how likely or unlikely do you think it would be that the Food Standards Agency would respond as soon as possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcard</td>
<td>Very unlikely 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>In general, how likely or unlikely do you think it is that the Food Standards Agency is impartial? By this we mean that the FSA acts independently of external sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcard</td>
<td>Very unlikely 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C3**: we suggest no changes to this question as it worked as intended. There were no significant differences between the answers of participants who had heard of the FSA and those who had not heard of the FSA. However, it must be acknowledged that there is a caveat to asking these questions as the findings illustrate that not everyone has the knowledge to answer them with complete understanding of the FSA’s role and responsibilities.

**C6**: some of the participants had difficulty understanding the term ‘acts independently of external sources’ and the word ‘impartial’.

**Recommendations**
- **C3**: no changes.
- **C6**: to help clarify the terms ‘acts independently of external sources’ and ‘impartial’ an interviewer note could be added as illustrated below.
- **C3 to C6**: for consistency, we recommend adding ‘don’t know’ to the response options and a showcard for this question.
C6

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF ASKED WHAT IMPARTIAL MEANS: BY IMPARTIAL WE MEAN NEUTRAL AND UNPREJUDICED.

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF ASKED WHAT THE QUESTION MEANS: WHETHER INDIVIDUALS THINK THE FSA IS GENERALLY INFLUENCED BY OUTSIDE BODIES E.G. GOVERNMENT, FOOD INDUSTRY ETC.

In general, how likely or unlikely do you think it is that the Food Standards Agency is impartial? By this we mean that the FSA acts independently of external sources.

Showcard
Very unlikely
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
Don’t know

[SPONTANEOUS Refusal]
4 Pilot testing protocol

A pilot study was conducted for Wave 5 of the Food and You survey. The pilot study used a version of the questionnaire that incorporated recommendations made in the cognitive testing. The purpose of this was to test:

- the efficacy of the participant and interviewer materials,
- the briefings,
- the questionnaire program including appropriate question routing (particularly new content),
- and the length of the questionnaire.

In particular, new content around perceptions of and trust in the FSA was tested, which included a trial to assess the inclusion of ‘don’t know’ in the list of response options available to participants, versus ‘don’t know’ being included as a spontaneous response only. This trial was included following cognitive testing of these questions, which found that people sometimes felt that they did not know enough about the FSA or the food system to be able to choose an option. These participants often said that they chose the middle option (a five out of ten) as they did not realise they could say ‘don’t know’ spontaneously.

4.1 Recruitment of the pilot sample

The target was to achieve 100 interviews across England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Eleven interviewers were required to recruit ten participants each within a pre-assigned postcode sector. The quota specifications were:

- At least 3 males and 3 females
- At least 1 participant aged 16-24
- At least 1 participant aged 65 and over
- At least 2 adults aged 16 and over who were currently in work

Interviewers were asked to exclude households where:

- They knew a person in the household
- The household contained someone whom they have interviewed for another survey.

In total 100 interviews were achieved for the pilot study. Tables 2 and 3 show their characteristics.
Table 2 Number of productive pilot interviews by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Number of productive interviews achieved by age, sex and working status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex and working status</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>65 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Pilot testing: findings and recommendations

5.1 Participant engagement

One of the aims of the pilot study was to assess the following participant documentation:

- advance letter from the FSA and NatCen inviting people to take part in Food and You
- survey leaflet containing further information about the FSA and Food and You
- doorstep laminate used as an aid for interviewers to use on the doorstep when ‘selling’ the survey
- thank you letter, and information sheet given to participants at the end of the interview

Interviewers were asked about how these documents were used, how effective they were in engaging participants, and whether they sufficiently answered all of the participants’ questions.

5.1.1 Advance letter

Interviewers commented favourably on the advance letter, finding it clear, easy to follow and giving the right level of information on the study. Interviewers made recommendations for making the Post Office vouchers clearer for participants - these will be used and included on the letter for the mainstage. They also made some other recommendations for tweaks to the letter, for example including information on how long the survey has been running and covering that the household is one of only a small number selected for the survey.

One interviewer pointed out that there was no specific mention of the Data Protection Act and that being more specific about the legislation would be preferable.

Recommendations

- Include instructions on the Post Office voucher to make it clearer how participants should use it. For example, ‘Tear here’ and instructions for the Post Office to scan the barcode.
- Retain the current wording on the advance letter and not incorporating new information about how long the survey has been running as this is more beneficial for annual surveys, which have been running for a long time.
- Wording relating to data protection will need to be updated for the mainstage following the change in legislation to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in May 2018.
5.1.2 Survey leaflet
The Food and You survey leaflet contains further information about the FSA and the survey. It is handed out by interviewers on the doorstep in the mainstage, when they first make contact with someone at the selected address.

Overall, we received positive feedback about the leaflet. Interviewers felt it was presented well, contained the right level of information and explained the survey clearly.

Interviewers would have preferred that the FSA logo was made bigger in order to draw people’s attention.

During the debrief interviewers discussed whether it would be useful to include an image of the FHRS in the leaflet to help participants understand the type of work the FSA carry out. They also mentioned this could potentially affect people’s answers when we ask them whether they have heard of the scheme during the interview.

Recommendations

- Increase the size of the FSA logo on the front page.
- Due to the potential risk of affecting people’s answers to the FHRS questions during the interview, we recommend that an image of the FHRS is not included in the leaflet.

5.1.3 Doorstep laminate
The doorstep laminate is another aid for the interviewers to use on the doorstep when ‘selling’ the survey.

Interviewers were generally very positive about the laminate and felt that it was a good addition to their pack of materials. They liked to have it on display when approaching an address so that it differentiated them from people selling products on the doorstep.

Again, interviewers would have liked the FSA logo to be bigger, and also suggested that the logos should be included on both sides of the laminate.

Recommendations

- Increase the size of the FSA logo.
- Include logos on both sides of the laminate

5.1.4 Thank you leaflet
The ‘thank you’ leaflet was included in the survey at Wave 4 following ethical guidance that signposting to services should be made available for participants relating to the questions about affordability of food. The leaflet also includes links to the FSA website if people want to find out more about the topics covered during the interview. It is handed out to all participants at the end of the interview.

In general, the concept of the leaflet was well received and easy to understand. Interviewers fed back that they would prefer the thank you leaflet to include more specific guidance and links to organisations who can help with food affordability issues,
for example The Trussell Trust. The leaflet currently directs people to their local authority, as there is a referral process for getting help from a foodbank.

Interviewers also mentioned that we ask a number of questions during the interview relating to knowledge about food safety practices. Some interviewers suggested including some key pieces of advice about food safety in the leaflets.

Recommendations

- Consider whether it is possible to include more specific links to information about foodbanks and food affordability issues.
- Ensure that wording introducing links to the FSA makes it clear that this is where people can find out more information about the questions covered during the interview.
- Replace references to previous ‘waves’ of the survey with previous ‘years’ of the survey.
- Include a box for interviewers to record their name and ID number on the leaflet.
- Wording relating to data protection will need to be updated for the mainstage following the change in legislation to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in May 2018.

5.2 Interview length

An estimate of interview length was gathered from the pilot data. This served to inform questionnaire development: where specific sections were longer than expected these became candidates for revision or removal.

In general, feedback provided by interviewers and participants on the questionnaire length was that the interview felt fairly long. Interviewers mentioned that towards the end of the interview, participants seemed to be losing interest, particularly during some of the general perceptions and trust questions.

Start and end times for each module of questions were also recorded automatically by the Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) program. The data were checked and cleaned to ensure that no outliers were present. Seven outliers (over two standard deviations above the mean questionnaire length) were removed from analysis. Average overall questionnaire length was then computed for both versions of the questionnaire (the England/Wales version, and the longer Northern Ireland version), as well as average lengths for each module.

5.2.1 England, Wales and Northern Ireland, core content only

The interviews in Northern Ireland included an additional module covering ‘Healthy Eating’. Analysis of the core questionnaire across England, Wales and Northern Ireland, excluding the additional ‘Healthy Eating’ module in Northern Ireland, showed a mean questionnaire length of 47 minutes and a median length of 45 minutes.
5.2.2 Northern Ireland questionnaire

Given the smaller sample size, rather than assessing the average length of the entire questionnaire, the length of the Healthy Eating module was calculated and added on to the average length computed for the England, Wales and Northern Ireland questionnaire. The mean length of the healthy eating module was 12 minutes and a median of 11 minutes, therefore the questionnaire length of interviews in Northern Ireland was a mean of 59 minutes and a median of 56 minutes.

5.2.3 Individual module lengths

The table below shows the average time it took to complete each module (in minutes). Note that the sum of the individual modules does not equal the overall interview length as placement of the timings variables varied occasionally depending on whether all or only some of the participants were routed to the final question in each module.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Average length (minutes: seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household information</td>
<td>02:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating patterns</td>
<td>09:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>03:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>01:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety</td>
<td>13:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food issues</td>
<td>04:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>02:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy eating(^1)</td>
<td>11:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of the FSA</td>
<td>05:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>04:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End module</td>
<td>04:23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Northern Ireland only

Recommendations
- Review questionnaire and identify questions that could be removed in order to reduce the overall average interview length to 40 minutes in England and Wales and 55 minutes in Northern Ireland.

5.3 Question-specific feedback

This section outlines some of the feedback on specific questions/sections of the questionnaire given by interviewers in the debriefs.

5.3.1 Perceptions of the FSA

Overall, interviewers felt that this module worked well once participants started to answer questions about the FSA and the food system specifically. However, they reported that participants found it difficult to understand why the general questions about trust and trust in organisations were included in a questionnaire about food and food safety. They suggested either asking the general questions after the FSA and food system trust questions, or including a clear preamble explaining why these questions are being asked in a survey about food.

Recommendations
- Retain current order of questions in this module, but add a preamble to the general trust questions explaining why these questions are being asked, such as 'We are
interested in finding out your views on food and food supply. First I will ask you some general questions about trust in people and organisations, then I will move on to ask you about your views on food and food supply in more detail.’

Perceptions of the FSA (C1 – C7)

Interviewers felt that these questions were particularly wordy, and would benefit from a preamble and then removal of the full title of ‘the Food Standards Agency’ at each question.

Recommendations

- Replace ‘Food Standards Agency’ with ‘they’ from C2 – C7.
6 Final W5 questionnaire changes

The following sections detail the final list of changes made to the mainstage questionnaire for Food and You Wave 5, relative to Wave 4.

Show cards were used for longer lists of response options or any questions that were deemed sensitive. In order to reduce any potential order effects, a small number of questions had two show cards; with the response options reversed on the second card. One show card, randomly determined by the questionnaire programme, was presented to the participant. The final questionnaire and show cards are appended to the Food and You Wave 5 Technical report.

Household information

- Response options were revised for questions about marital status and living arrangements (Q1_6, Q1_4a, Q1_4b) to reflect ONS harmonised questions.

Shopping, cooking and eating (Chapter 1 in Wave 5 reports)

- The fourth response question about dietary choices (Q2_7W5) was amended to replace ‘religious or cultural reasons’ with ‘other reasons, excluding allergies’.
- VegeChk, VeganChk, AdvRStrE were removed.
- Response options for foods causing an adverse reaction (FdReac) were reordered and fruit and vegetables split into separate categories.
- Questions Q2_7a, Q2_8a, Q2_7b, Q2_8c, Q2_7c, Q2_8e were removed.
- Food categories in Q2_14 were added or amended: pre-cooked meats; cured or dried meats; raw milk; cooked eggs; raw or uncooked eggs; raw oysters; frozen fruits. Raw cheeses, and raw fish and shellfish were removed.
- A new question (PackSep) asked about packing raw meat, fish and shellfish separately from other food items when shopping.
- Q3_4, Q3_7, Foodcut, Shopbag, PlasBFL, CloBFL, Plasbag, Paperbag were removed.

Food safety in the home (Chapter 2 in Wave 5 reports)

- New questions looking at the use of antibacterial sprays and wipes were added (Sanspray, Spraywipe).
- Additional response options and prompts were added to the question about domestic appliances (Q4_8c).
- Q4_13, Q4_13a, Q4_21, Q4_23a, MWPwr, MWUses, MWRMeal, MWDiff were removed.
- An additional response option was added to Q4_27: ‘There is too much plastic used in food packaging’.
- FdlssIntro, Label, FdAuthCon, FdAuthAct were removed.

Eating outside the home (Chapter 3 in Wave 5 reports)

- EatOutOft was removed.
• Questions were added looking at the frequency of eating breakfast, lunch and dinner out (EatOutBrk, EatOutLun, EatOutDin).
• Social media was added to the options for EatOutInf.
• Additional response options were added to Q2_35W5: ‘Calorie information of the food is provided’, ‘Allergy information of the food is provided’, ‘Healthier foods/choices’.
• Q12_2 was removed.

Healthy eating (Northern Ireland only: Chapter 6 in Wave 5 reports)
• H2_16info was removed.
• The following response options were removed from H2_18: ‘Keeping to a healthy weight’, ‘Eating breakfast every day’, Eating white meat such as chicken or turkey’.
• H2_21: response options ‘To cut down on saturated fat’ and ‘To cut down on sugar’ were added; ‘Reduce cholesterol’ was removed.
• H2_22: the following response options were amended: ‘Already eat healthier’, ‘Lack of choice of healthier options when eating out’, ‘Not enough information on labels’, ‘Don’t know enough about which foods are healthier’.
• H2_29, H2_31, H2_32, H2_39b, H2_39c were removed.
• H2_40: response option ‘Street food stalls or pop out’ was added; ‘Pop-up restaurants’ was removed.

Health
• Q6_2W5 was amended in line with ONS harmonised principles.
• IllAft added as the ONS harmonised question, replacing Q6_3, Mobil, Dex.

Trust (Chapter 5 in Wave 5 reports)
• New questions on awareness and perceptions of the FSA.