

NAVIGATOR



Front of Pack Signpost Labelling

Exploratory Research

Report

COI 280040
1095 JS

April 2007

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Background	5
Research Objectives	6
Research Sample	7
Procedure	8
Research Findings	
Awareness of ‘new’ food labelling schemes	10
From recall	
– Perceived need for front of pack labelling	13
– Understanding of the schemes	14
– Usage – Sainsbury traffic light	15
– Usage – Tesco gda	19
– Dual usage – Tesco and Sainsbury	20
– Other retailers and manufacturers	21
– System non users	22
– Overall all systems	23
From prompted reactions	
– Sainsbury’s Traffic Light	24
– Marks and Spencer	28
– McCain	29
– Tesco GDA	29
‘Per serving’ / portion size across systems	32
Presence of different systems	33
Front of pack labelling within the wider decision making context	34
Conclusions	35
Appendices	
– Recruitment questionnaire	
– Discussion Guide	
– Foods With TL, GDA or Hybrid schemes Used As Stimulus	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The research was qualitative in nature comprising 8 discussion groups of 6-7 respondents each, with representation of men and women in pre-family, family and 'empty nester' life stages. It should be noted that as with all qualitative research sample sizes are small and therefore care should be taken when extrapolating from the findings. It should also be borne in mind that system preferences could be driven by familiarity arising from the relative balance of use of different supermarkets.

Fieldwork was conducted in the South, Midlands and North of England from the 1st to 7th March 2007.

The main findings and conclusions from the research were as follows.

- There was almost universal awareness that front of pack labelling schemes had been recently introduced.
- Respondents believed there was a need for such schemes (in the assumption that they would be designed to make informed food purchasing decisions simpler) because of increases in diet related health issues, and because they felt 'processed' food is often not what it seems from superficial examination. It was hoped that the schemes would ideally help to make the nature of food decisions clearer.
- While there was almost universal awareness of the launch of the schemes, by no means all respondents felt they had encountered them in the course of their shopping. However, some had noticed the schemes in store, and were now using them in their shopping to a greater or lesser extent.
- The way the schemes were used was dependent on the type of scheme, principally the presence or absence of colour coding or 'traffic lights'. Prompted reactions to examples of schemes on packaging were broadly in line with reported existing usage.
- Traffic light schemes:
 - potentially schemes with a traffic light were thought to offer the opportunity to evaluate choices 'at a glance'
 - users of these schemes felt that the ease and speed of using them had led them to evaluate all of their signposted purchasing decisions
 - a 'glance' could comprise the entire assessment of an item, but often acted as a preliminary filter, with more detailed examination where there seemed to be a need for it

- the initial glance seemed to take in each of the traffic lights, leading to an overall impression of the item's colour mix
 - while a more considered evaluation might put more emphasis on some nutrients than others it seems likely that one effect of this type of scheme will be to raise the profile of nutrients that might not have received so much attention.
- GDA / numerical only schemes
 - GDA / numerical only schemes were seen as an improvement over the detailed nutrition panel in that they were thought to present nutritional information in a much simpler and more easily used format
 - users and intending users of these schemes seemed more likely to look out for them on particular 'culprit' foods, that is, those they suspected might be high on nutrients of concern, usually calories or fats
 - while they were thought to offer an easier and quicker means of assessing an item, GDA schemes still had to be *read*
 - this is perhaps one reason why it seemed that with GDA systems the buyers focus was less likely to be broadened outside their 'nutrients of concern', the other being that 'high content' on less front of mind nutrients was not 'flagged' in an immediately noticeable way as was the case with traffic lights.

BACKGROUND

Front of Pack Signpost Labelling schemes have been introduced by a number of major retailers and manufacturers.

The FSA wished to conduct an initial study to understand consumer response to these schemes in terms of current and potential awareness and use in order to inform the development of the full evaluation of the impact of such schemes.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Overall

- Indicate the consumer segments for whom Front of Pack labelling is likely to be most important
- Indicate the meal intentions and food types for which Front of Pack labelling is felt to be most important and useful
- Explore how Front of Pack labelling is used in conjunction with other cues / information in making decisions
- Understand consumer reactions to there being several systems in the marketplace

Specifically

- Explore current awareness of systems
 - source of this awareness
 - understanding of, and attitudes towards the systems they are aware of
- Explore any existing usage
- Explore prompted reactions to different systems
 - immediate reactions, communication, comprehension
 - perceived ease of use
 - considered reactions
- Explore likely envisaged usage of different labelling systems
 - on different shopping occasions
 - when preparing / consuming food
 - how would they use them in relation to their repertoire of foods purchased
 - would they / do they look at all nutrients, just one or a selection?
 - would they / do they use information on amount per serving? if so, how
 - would they / do they use percentage GDA information? if so, how
 - would they / do they use the traffic light colour code? if so how

PROCEDURE

A copy of the discussion guide is contained in the appendices. In summary, the order of covering topics was as follows.

- Moderator introduction, explanation of purpose of discussion
- Awareness of Front of Pack labelling schemes, exploration from recall, exploration of usage from recall
- Introduction of examples of schemes on products from M&S, McCain, Sainsbury, Tesco, and discussion
 - systems introduced simultaneously in first 4 groups
 - and rotated sequentially in remaining 4 groups
 - schemes selected to represent FSA scheme, colour coded GDA, and non colour coded GDA
- Exploration of likely role and usage of schemes
- Thank and close

RESEARCH FINDINGS

AWARENESS OF 'NEW' FOOD LABELLING SCHEMES

Almost the entire sample was aware that new schemes had recently been introduced. When volunteering more information 'traffic light' schemes, or the words "traffic light system" were most front of mind. There was also recall variously of "GDA", "RDA", "percentages", and "Tesco system".

Sources of awareness of the schemes were as follows:

- media coverage, for example, news and current affairs programmes, "Dispatches", and GMTV.
- FSA advertising – NB the FSA Traffic Light campaign was underway during fieldwork.
- in store from food packaging.
- at home from food packaging.

Awareness from these different sources often overlapped, with the exception of packaging driven awareness which was sometimes a sole source.

Exploring awareness from each of the sources revealed the following.

Media Coverage

Respondents had been made aware that the 'FSA' or the 'government' was to introduce or was recommending introduction of a traffic light system of food labelling, and that many retailers and manufacturers were implementing the scheme.

"It is new, it's got to be on packaging, the supermarkets are under pressure to use it because of obesity and heart problems."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

They were also aware that Tesco, and others who they were unable to name were going their own way with a different system. Respondents spontaneously volunteered the thought that this was probably motivated by the potential effect of the traffic light scheme on sales of certain foodstuffs, and the knock on effect on profits.

"They said that if people found they were picking up too many items with red they would stop buying them."

Family, Female, 35-44, Careful, C1C2, North

"It's all about cheap food, they don't want you to know too much."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

Some had heard an alternative point of view which was that the traffic light system was potentially misleading for certain products, giving milk as an example, as they had heard it would receive a red traffic light.

"I saw it on GMTV, with the traffic light milk would be red, it would be saying that milk is bad for you."

Pre Family, Female, 18-24, Mainstream, C1C2, North

Some expressed irritation and disapproval at the lack of a unified system because they felt this would make the consumer's life harder. The blame for this lack of cohesion was sometimes attributed to 'typical' bureaucratic 'muddle' or 'bungling' and sometimes to Tesco.

Others were not at all surprised at the lack of a unified system, and pointed out that different food manufacturers and supermarkets often did things differently so why should Front of Pack labelling be any different?

FSA Advertising

Respondents recalled having seen the word FOOD in large letters and the use of animated red, amber, and green balls of 'dots' in various different ways in different media including billboards, bus sides, and on television.

Communication was clear, perhaps in part because it stemmed primarily from the concept of a 'traffic light', interpreted as follows:

- red = *"bad", "occasional", "treat"*
- amber = *"ok in moderation", "not every day"*
- green = *"good", "go ahead", "every day"*

This was understood to be an 'official' system sometimes because FSA branding had been registered, and sometimes because of the absence of private sector branding coupled with advertising to do with health.

There was no spontaneous awareness of advertising for other systems.

In Store

Some respondents had first become aware of the systems while shopping with recall primarily from Sainsbury and Tesco, with a sense that more Sainsbury shoppers were aware of their system than Tesco shoppers aware of their system. There was some recall of M&S using a system, and a feeling that one or other system was now 'everywhere', although there was no spontaneous awareness of manufacturer systems attributed to brands.

At Home

Some had become aware of the systems for the first time at home having noticed them while preparing food, or from cereal packs on their tables while eating breakfast.

Packaging Driven Awareness

Packaging driven awareness was variable with some initial surprises. It was perhaps greatest among 'mums', and other women and some men who were more actively 'dieting'. Respondents recruited to be 'careful' over their diets seemed less aware than might have been expected, but on reflection this may have been because for them part of taking care was buying less packaged and processed food so they may have been less exposed to packaging carrying the systems.

PERCEIVED NEED FOR FRONT OF PACK LABELLING FROM RECALL

There was general agreement that there was a need for front of pack labelling, even if respondents saw this as being mainly for the benefit of others, 'who buy a lot of processed food' rather than for themselves.

This perceived need was partly driven by awareness of the nation's health problems, particularly obesity, and also, by a feeling that 'processed' food was often not what it seemed. Respondents used the term 'processed' fairly loosely but essentially to cover anything packaged, and not in a 'natural' state. They felt that 'processed' food was often 'higher' in calories and fat than they might have expected, and also that some foodstuffs could turn out to contain large amounts of unexpected nutrients whose presence was counterintuitive, for example, salt in 'sweet' items such as cereals and biscuits, and sugar in 'savoury' items such as ready meals.

"Cereals, sometimes there's so much salt, you don't expect it."

Empty Nester, Female, 45-54, Careful, BC1, South

Many respondents expressed a view that manufacturers and retailers deliberately set out to manipulate and mislead the food buying public, citing practices such as improving taste by manipulating salt content, or making 'health claims' such as 'low fat' while adding sugar to compensate for loss of taste, or suggesting unrealistically small portion sizes for their products to infer they were less fattening than they might be.

"Like when they say low fat, sometimes there's loads of sugar you have to check for that, 50% more sugar to make up for the flavour loss."

Pre Family, Female, 18-24, Mainstream, C1C2, North

"The ones that are worse they put it on for half a pack not a full pack to make it look better."

Pre Family, Male, 25-34, Mainstream, C1C2, South

Respondents felt that ideally front of pack labelling should make the significance of food choices clearer, and help to expose any manufacturer or retailer contrivances. Having said that the majority felt that they were wise to these tactics, and that it was really up to them to take care in their shopping.

UNDERSTANDING OF THE SCHEMES FROM RECALL

The concept of a 'traffic light' scheme was understood irrespective of the source of awareness of it by all segments within the sample. The words 'traffic light' alone, seemed to convey the 'gist' of the system as the core concept translated more or less directly from roadside traffic lights.

GDA schemes, in this case recalled from Tesco were most likely to be fully and correctly understood from in store contact, and / or by those used to 'counting' calories or fat who had a more front of mind working knowledge of the GDA concept. They described the scheme as working by showing the proportion a food item or portion contributed to a guideline daily amount, or in some cases as showing the calories or grams (of fat) per item. Understanding of GDA systems from media coverage was sometimes correct, but could also be vague and muddled, for example, some thought the scheme would detail the percentage of the food item which was fat, sugar, salt, and others were slightly puzzled as they felt that from what they had heard the information was already available on the nutrition panel.

"Hasn't that always been there?"

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

USAGE FROM RECALL - SAINSBURY'S TRAFFIC LIGHT

Users of this system claimed that they now glanced at it on *all* the items they bought or had considered buying in this store. Further exploration revealed that by this they meant all the *packaged* or *processed* items in their shopping such as ready meals, sauces, pizzas, biscuits, desserts, drinks, etc, etc.

"Convenience foods, sausage rolls, pies, prepared foods, you know it's bad it's just a question of how bad."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

These respondents were using the system against a *category* of food as they perceived it, rather than against specific meals or meals occasions, or for foodstuffs purchased with particular household members in mind.

The system was used to help 'balance' their whole 'basket' (trolley) in the sense of providing a 'rough' check on what was going into the family home. Some claimed that they also attempted to 'balance' main meals or a day's diet when at home, both in terms of what was being eaten, and also in terms of portion size, although they did this without referring further to labelling.

These respondents claimed to use the 'pie' (the colour coded visual) to make an immediate assessment of their choices, using the information in various different ways. Items could be evaluated in a relatively straightforward way, for example, too many reds would lead to rejection, while a predominance of green would lead to selection, with some focussing on specific nutrients (usually calories, sometimes fat or salt) and some working with the overall picture presented by the pie.

"If it's green you don't need to look, you don't have to worry so much."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

Alternatively the colour coding could be used as an initial filter, either providing a source of reassurance or a trigger for more considered evaluation. So typically if the 'pie' was mainly green they would select the item, whereas if it had red and amber slices they might think further, perhaps investigating the nutrition panel.

Some considered the match of the colours displayed for a product against what they might have expected, to see if there were any surprises. For example, if they had thought a product was relatively 'healthy' they might have expected to see primarily greens and perhaps one or two ambers, so the presence of one or two reds might have led them to investigate further.

"It makes you think what's going on here", "helps you spot the surprises."

Family, Female, 35-44, Careful, C1C2, North

Some then brought other factors into play before deciding to select or reject a product, or look for alternatives. For example, whether the product was one that would be eaten frequently or only now and again, whether it was a once a week treat or a daily staple, and whether it was for a family member whose diet needed more vigilance or not.

"If it's an occasional thing and I fancy it I might look at the back."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

"I glance at it, rather than read it, and if its got loads of reds I think should I be buying, it? so if its for the kids I might think, it's once a week, they get a healthy diet, loads of fruit and veg, do plenty of exercise..."

Family, Female, 35-44, Careful, C1C2, North

The initial assessment could prompt comparisons and consideration of other options, partly because the system was thought to make it quick and easy to do so.

"If there's two comparable products and one's got more green or amber you'd have that one."

Pre Family, Male, 25-34, Mainstream, C1C2, South

Users claimed to be most focussed on one or more of 'calories', 'fats', 'saturated fats', and 'salt' with only occasional mentions of 'sugar' with child oriented products in mind. Very broadly areas of focus were as follows.

- Most women were concerned primarily with weight loss, or weight maintenance, which corresponded primarily to a focus on calories and sometimes fat, with some claiming calories reflected overall fat, saturated fat and sugar levels in products.
- Older (35+) women and men could still be monitoring calories and weight, but were often also concerned over saturated fats and salt as their concerns had broadened to encompass health. In some cases the focus had shifted very much to health.

- Parents on behalf of their children were most likely to be concerned with sugar, with a few also looking at fat, with concerns over children's weight.

However, there were strong indications that the nature of the system brought all the nutrients into consideration at least initially, as respondents talked of the overall impression created by the pie's colours, for example, 'a lot of red', 'mainly green', and so on. Each 'slice' played a part in creating that impression, albeit that particular nutrients may have been accorded different levels of significance, depending on the individual, for example salt was a major concern for some, but not others. And, some nutrients might be given less importance if the initial 'glance' led to a more considered evaluation

Some felt the system had helped extend their food - health awareness from calories and weight to include saturated fat and salt with the potential association with future heart problems in mind.

Users valued this scheme because of the speed with which it could be used across all their shopping. Those concerned gave the impression of being very busy, and under time pressure, especially those with younger children and particularly on occasions when they were accompanied by their children in the supermarket.

"I tend to look now, it does make it easier, especially if you're taking a young one shopping, it's just easier to glance."

Family, Female, 35-44, Careful, C1C2, North

These respondents felt this system allowed them to evaluate 'their trolley' without necessarily spending more time in the shop, as they only had to 'pause' when it seemed necessary to do so, that is, when colour combinations suggested more thought was required. They saw the system as a genuinely helpful innovation.

Much of this value derived from the colour coding, and even the fact of not having to use 'reading glasses' could be much appreciated.

Respondents felt that 'the numbers' on the pie might come into play to help in making marginal decisions. Further exploration revealed that this would primarily be 'calories' as the benchmark GDA was most widely known (from dieting), with some knowing fat or saturated fat GDAs also from dieting. Salt was probably the next well known GDA at 6g, while very few knew the sugar GDA.

Some claimed to use the 'numbers' consistently, although these claims were sometimes undermined when those concerned had believed they were percentages!

It is worth noting that current users felt they did not use 'amount per serve' to any great extent. They were using the system as a check on the overall 'feel' of their trolley and to choose between comparable products, and while 'amount per serve', may have come into play for marginal decisions as part of the selection process consistent use of this information was felt to make choices too complex and time consuming, particularly given variations in serving sizes on pack, the appetites and needs of ultimate eaters, the need to think of several family members, different meals across the week, and so on, and so on.

USAGE FROM RECALL – TESCO GDA

Tesco GDA users were likely to describe a relatively focussed usage pattern whereby they tended to look for the system on food items they suspected or knew to be high in calories, and sometimes fat, or salt. This usage pattern was often with their own diet in mind with a view to 'counting' calories and losing weight.

"I picked up a croissant, noticed how high it was in fat. I would have bought it, but I thought twice and put it back."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

The Tesco GDA system was *read* rather than glanced at, and users felt that required a 'pause' even if only a momentary one.

The system could act as a filter for further consideration of a product, for example, was it's calorific content what might have been expected? or had a reduction in calories or fat resulted in an increase in sugar? was it a daily staple or an occasional treat, and who was it for?

This system seemed less likely to extend the individual's 'breadth' of nutrients considered as any 'surprises' were less overtly flagged than in a traffic light colour coded system, especially as the user's initial focus was often on only *one* nutrient - calories, and sometimes fat, so an overall impression across all the nutrients was less readily formed. When questioned over this, respondents felt that considering more than one nutrient would have made their evaluation much harder.

The Tesco GDA system was appreciated by its users as an easier way of accessing information than the nutrition panel because it was simplified, bigger, clearer, and easier to read, although some recalled having been surprised to find that its colours had no significance.

The system made it easier for them to do something they were already doing to a greater or lesser extent, and as a result it may be that they will do it more consistently.

The clear numerical display was most appreciated by dieters or 'calorie counters', who were primarily younger women, and the system may be used as much or more as a *calorie counting system* than as a GDA system. In this mode of usage serving size is more likely to be taken into consideration with an emphasis more on the shopper's (women) dieting than the whole family's diet.

DUAL 'USAGE' FROM RECALL – TESCO AND SAINSBURY

The majority of system users who used both supermarkets talked mainly of using the Sainsbury system. They felt they were not confused by encountering different systems in the two supermarkets, partly because as they felt the GDA system was not much easier to use than the nutrition panel, they were not trying to use it.

A minority of system users who used both supermarkets were perhaps more comfortable with the Tesco GDA system. Their focus was more on calorie counting. However, they also found the Sainsbury system usable.

We feel that findings in relation to system preferences should be treated with caution as they could be driven by familiarity as much as anything arising from the relative balance of use of the two supermarkets.

There was some confusion and muddle in the way the two schemes were described and recalled, for example, respondents talked of "Tesco's traffic light system", and "Sainsbury percentages". However, this did not seem to have resulted in confusion in use, and may have resulted from a muddling of sources of awareness, for example they may have been aware of media coverage of the 'traffic light system', discovered a new system in Tesco, and assumed that this must be the traffic light system.

OTHER RETAILERS AND MANUFACTURERS SYSTEMS

There was some awareness of the M&S system, although respondents seemed less likely to use the system when in M&S. This was partly because the halo of M&S quality was very powerful to the extent that respondents found it hard to believe M&S food wouldn't be good for them. Also, no one shopped exclusively at M&S, and those who used the store often used it for only relatively few items as their M&S purchases were regarded as a 'treat' element of their overall shop whether because they were more indulgent (eg, dessert), or of higher quality (eg fresh meat). For these reasons M&S purchases were not likely to be interrogated so closely.

There was no spontaneous specific recall of other systems.

SYSTEM NON – USERS

When asked why they were not using the systems non-users gave one of three reasons.

Some claimed they had simply not spotted the system on shelf.

Some claimed they would only need it for items 'new' to them, and that most of their shop was a known quantity comprising items that they had previously checked.

"You'd have made comparisons once, and you would if it's something new, but you wouldn't do your whole shop."

Empty Nester, Male, 45-54, Mainstream, C1C2, South

Some claimed that they emphasised 'fresh' ingredients, and so did not need to worry overly about the relatively few processed elements in their shopping.

"It's more for things like ready meals, they're the biggest culprits, processed food high in fat, calories. I don't buy a lot of that stuff."

Empty Nester, Female, 45-54, Careful, BC1, South

OVERALL FROM RECALL – ALL SYSTEMS

All respondents felt that any of the systems would go at least some way to making decisions about food easier to make, even if they did have a preference for one or other system.

PROMPTED REACTIONS

An array of product examples was introduced into the groups following discussion of the systems from recall. In some groups examples of M&S, McCain, Sainsbury and Tesco packaging were introduced together, in others they were introduced sequentially.

Initial Response

Irrespective of perceived ultimate ease of use, systems were not noticed on pack as quickly as might have been expected, and they also differed in their initial impact and stand out on pack. Tesco's GDA system was perhaps most easily spotted, M&S and McCain were perhaps hardest and Sainsbury's 'Traffic Light' was somewhere in the middle. This suggests that there may still be considerable 'build' to come in terms of consumers noticing the systems in store and using them.

Sainsbury's Traffic Light

Some found they spotted this 'traffic light' system less quickly on pack than they might have expected to. This seemed to partly be a simple stand out issue, as many of the packaging examples were busy and cluttered in appearance. As a result on some packs the 'pie' could be lost in its background, particularly where the pack used the traffic light colours elsewhere or if the 'lights' were predominantly one colour. Also, it was possible that prior discussion of 'traffic lights' had formed expectations of something of similar shape to a traffic light, and equally noticeable.

Once respondents registered the presence of the system they felt they would be likely to notice it when they encountered it in future.

Some were initially confused by the 'pie' assuming from its shape and the slices that it would be a 'pie chart' and that the size of each 'slice' would therefore be significant. This often seemed to be referencing memories of lessons at school and was assumed with some conviction, with several respondents insisting that the size of the slices were different! This did not seem to interfere with interpretations of the colour codes themselves, as those concerned still responded to the presence of greater or lesser proportions of red, amber and green slices.

There was a range of different reactions from those seeing or registering the system for the first time to the idea of using the system.

Some were immediately positive. These were primarily similar respondents to those already using the system, that is busy housewives with children, as well as others.

"Now I've seen that one with the traffic light it's much better, you can pick it up and see, you haven't got to look at the numbers."

Empty Nester, Female, 45-54, Careful, BC1, South

"I see shopping as encroaching on leisure, and this would cut that down."

Pre Family, Male, 25-34, Mainstream, C1C2, South

These respondents were likely to see potential in the system as a 'quick guide' or a first filter on what they put in their shopping trolley.

"You can see it on the shelf, you don't have to pick it up, you just get a feel."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

"It would be good for a general balance otherwise you'd be there all day."

Empty Nester, Female, 45-54, Careful, BC1, South

Some felt that it would also act as a way of signalling the potential significance of seemingly 'minor' items in their diet, for example, salt and fat in gravy and in cashew nuts, or the overall effect of eating several biscuits over the course of a day.

Respondents felt that they might use the system in home, as well as in store in the sense that it might remind them of the potential significance of for example, serving several 'convenience' meals in a week, or adding mayonnaise to salads, or gravy to meals, or 'snacking' on nuts and biscuits.

"If you were going to have it for dinner and it was red it would have an influence."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

Respondents who reacted positively to the packaging examples commented that they would look out for the system when next shopping in Sainsbury's.

Some felt the system was more difficult to use than they had thought would have been the case. A significant proportion of these respondents were men, although some were women. It may have been that the descriptor 'Traffic Light' had set up expectations of something very similar to a roadside traffic light both visually *and* conceptually, that is a very simple device that delivers an instruction. Those concerned felt that this was not the case, and that they still had to make a decision themselves. This related partly to the overall balance of colours on packaging examples shown to the group. In some cases this was felt to be clear cut, for example, where the slices were mainly green at one extreme, or mainly red at the other extreme. It was thought to be much harder to arrive at a decision where the balance of colours was less clear cut, for example sausages with two red slices, two ambers and a green, or a pizza with three ambers and two greens. It could also be thought hard to compare colour combinations across different foodstuffs, for example sausages and burgers which were expected to be 'fatty', compared to quiche which they did not.

'Portion sizes, or 'amount per serve' also created confusion for these respondents. Some suggested portion sizes were seen to be unrealistic, for example, ½ pizza was seen to be too small for men or teenage boys, whereas other portion sizes were hard to evaluate, for example how did 125g of chips compare to their 'average' serving. This led them to question how they were supposed to use the colours with *their* typical serving in mind.

It also seemed that 'per serving' information led some respondents to think of using the system in a relatively precise way, and this tendency may have been reinforced by the presence of 'calories' and 'grams' on the pie slices. This may have had the effect of making them feel the system would be harder for them to use as it could suggest they should be using this information, for example, by 'adding' across products, and categories and in turn across days of the week, a prospect which they found daunting, particularly as many did not know GDAs, or perhaps only knew them for calories.

Presence of 'grams' and 'calories' also prompted these respondents to voice fears that manufacturers or retailers would deliberately set out to manipulate the system by adjusting portion size and nutrient content so as to bring products into an amber or green rating. Respondents did not realise that the colour code was determined on a different basis to the amount per serving.

"This is 7.3 and its amber, this is 7.5 and its red, so that half a gram and it goes into the red. They would strip off a tiny bit just to get into amber."

Pre Family, Male, 25-34, Mainstream, C1C2, South

The majority of these (male) respondents who felt the system would be difficult to use did not undertake autonomous 'weekly' shops, and were either sent with a list by their partner for 'the big shop', or only undertook relatively small 'top up'

shops which they did independently. Of these respondents the younger men were likely to only be buying 'a meal' or a day's food at a time in which case it may have been relatively feasible for them to consider their whole basket.

The research environment may have driven these responses in part, leading respondents to think of making more 'perfect' decisions than they would in reality. The perceived difficulty was such that these respondents felt that they would only use the system if shopping for someone on a strict diet either to lose weight, or to limit salt intake or so on.

Reactions to individual food items from those less familiar with the system from recall demonstrated the system's potential for quickly signalling nutrient content. Respondents were most likely to remark on examples which were at odds with expectations. This was sometimes in a negative sense, for example, 'Be Good To Yourself' burgers, which were red on fat, saturated fat, and salt, "*worse than I thought*", or quiche with 4 reds out of 5, much 'worse' than expected. However, it was also sometimes in a positive sense, 'better than I thought', for example, e.g., a (any) pizza with 3 greens and 2 ambers.

"I knew quiche could be fattening, but not as fattening as that! And I can't believe the pizza isn't red."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

"Fish, look at that! You would have thought that fish would be okay!"

Pre Family, Male, 25-34, Mainstream, C1C2, South

"I was surprised that pizza was amber and green because I would have always thought that any pizza would be all red."

Empty Nester, Female, 45-54, Careful, BC1, South

Several indicated that the surprise factor would lead them to reassess the healthiness or otherwise of some food categories and products, and led some to think they might not know the contents of their trolley as well as they had thought.

The system was also felt valuable in underlining the 'treat nature' of some products, for example, cheesecake, with 4 red slices and 1 amber.

"I'd still have it for when we had people round, but I'd make sure I only had a really small slice and give everyone else big ones."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

Respondents also felt that it might help to remind them of the potential contribution of repeatedly 'snacking' on seemingly incidental items such as nuts or biscuits.

"Cashew nuts! I know they're high but that would make me put them straight back."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

Finally that the system might also bring nutrients into play that they might not have looked out for, particularly saturated fat and salt (associated with heart problems).

M&S

The M&S system was relatively easy to miss on pack, which may have been due partly to its size, and partly because the examples from the 'Count On Us' range were all identical in having 4 greens and 1 amber which may have made the significance of the colours harder to appreciate. The effect of these elements may have been exacerbated because the colours employed were not stereotypical 'traffic light' colours, that is, they were not 'primary' reds and greens, and as such they stood out less. Nevertheless, the majority of respondents felt that once they had identified it as such, the colour coding would make the system easy to use.

Perhaps as a result attention focussed more on the 'numbers', whose size made them a challenging read for many late 30s plus respondents.

The comprehensive nature of this system also received positive comment from these respondents as it offered traffic lights, %GDA, amount per serving and calories. Some preferred %GDA as a second line of information as they found it more meaningful than amount per serve, either because they did not know the relevant GDAs or because they were not confident of them. They also thought it was helpful to have additional information on artificial colouring, preservatives, and flavours in the same part of the pack as the nutrition information. Having said this, for some the extent of information made the system less approachable for others as it had the effect of making it seem like a lot to read and take in.

"Mmmm it's not complicated but it looks complicated."

Empty Nester, Female, 55-64, Mainstream, C2DE, Midlands

The strength of the brand, respondents trust in it, and the more occasional and less central place in their repertoires' of the store were also seen to make the system less necessary when shopping in M&S.

McCain

This system also seemed relatively easy for respondents to miss on pack, as with the examples shown the colours of the 'traffic lights' were also used elsewhere on the pack, which led to the assumption that the panel was part of the wider pack design rather than having a purpose in its own right. The smaller size of the traffic lights was thought to make them a little hard to use. However, the majority were positive towards the system once the signpost panel was pointed out due to its including colours, amount per serve, calories, and %GDA. Respondents felt that this gave the user the option of using as much or as little of the information as they felt they wished to.

The signpost design's inclusion of the words 'low', 'medium', and 'high' was appreciated by the 6 colour blind respondents in the sample.

Tesco GDA

The Tesco GDA 'panel' was usually readily spotted. This seemed primarily due to its execution with the numerical information 'sitting within' its own background allowing it to stand out more consistently. Seeing the system prompted some to remember that they had seen it in store.

There were generally positive reactions to the system's presentation of information, as it was thought clear and relatively easy to read, particularly when compared to the nutrition panel, and if those concerned were focussed on one or perhaps two nutrients, for example, calories and fat.

There was some irritation at the scheme's use of colours as there was often an initial assumption that the colours selected would mean something, perhaps driven by awareness of 'traffic light' labelling systems. On closer examination of several packs respondents realised that the colours had no significance, which was confirmed to them by those with previous experience of the system.

"It's really confusing if they're using different colours, especially when there's five, and they're not using them to mean anything."

Family, Female, 35-44, Careful, C1C2, North

Some respondents missed the text, 'of your guideline daily amount' at the bottom of the panel, which led to them reading %GDA, as for example '30% of this item is made of fat', distorting judgement on the item as a result.

The system was thought to offer an easier to use alternative to the nutrition panel, having a more accessible, less daunting feel due to its relative simplicity, its focus on fewer 'key' numbers, and it being bold and easy to read. Those who were most positive tended to be concerned primarily with calories and sometimes calories and fat.

All in all the system seemed most appealing to those who were either in the habit of 'counting' calories or fat or did so from time to time. Those in question were primarily concerned with their own weight, although some had begun to use the same approach for their family's diet more generally as a broad indicator of how healthy or unhealthy an item was.

The system might lead to more consistent 'counting' of nutrients (most likely to be calories, to a lesser extent fat and salt) across a wider variety of food types because it offers a more easily used alternative to the nutrition panel.

Some men who were not in the habit of counting nutrients appreciated this style of presentation, as they liked its provision of clear numerical information. They found %GDA relatively easy to grasp, and not knowing GDAs themselves they felt that they could get a sense of cumulative intake from %GDA figures on individual items.

"2.8 g of salt means nothing to me, but 47% of my GDA does."

Pre Family, Male, 25-34, Mainstream, C1C2, South

They claimed they were more comfortable with a seemingly more 'precise' system and some said they would use the system in their shopping although these claims seemed somewhat unconvincing, given that they were not in the habit of reading nutrition information on packs at all, and this would be highly atypical male behaviour anyway.

Views on the use of %GDA compared to amount per serve and calories divided among women. Younger women perhaps favoured %GDA and older women 'measurements'. This may have been because older women tended to think only in calories where they knew the benchmark GDA whereas younger women were more likely to be thinking in terms of fat and calories.

'Calories' is perhaps a case apart as almost all women and some men knew their respective GDAs to be 2000 / 2500.

There was a strong sense that this system was unlikely to extend nutrients of concern outside those already monitored, as the user would have to actively look for and read the information, and it did not stand out from the panel respondents were not looking for it.

Overall, there was a mixed response to the Tesco GDA system from those not previously aware of it. It was dismissed by some as it was not felt to make the job appreciably easier than using the nutrition panel, or because they were not confident in their ability to interpret the information presented correctly. It was welcomed by others as an easier alternative to the nutrition panel.

'PER SERVING' / PORTION SIZE ACROSS SYSTEMS

Only the most determined dieters and 'counters' (usually of calories, less often fat and salt claimed to consistently use the per serving / portion size information, or seemed at all likely to do so.

Otherwise it seemed likely to only come into play for marginal decisions as part of the evaluation process rather than as a serving size that might actually be used.

For some, particularly men, it created a level of complexity around decisions which they felt would leave them unable to reach a decision,

There were strong feelings that portion size was used in a way that was deliberately misleading, for example to understate the fat or calories a 'normal' person would really consume by eating a product.

"A 30 g bowl of cereal is not a portion."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

It was thought hard to work from a weight for a typical serving, as many felt they then had to work back to what they might actually serve because they assessed the product and a serving via *volume* rather than weight. For example, per serving of 125g = x, a pack is 1000g = y, looking at the pack I might serve ¼ pack, that is 250g.

Overall there was a preference for measures 'per item' in the case of packs of products that contained separate items, for example, biscuits and yoghurts and per pack in most other cases, eg, a 'cottage pie', bags of frozen chips, etc.

"I have good intentions, but when I read it hits per 30 g or 100 g and I don't want to know that I want to know how much is in a pack of cereals."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

PRESENCE OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS

Respondents felt that ideally there would be one standardised system as this would be easier to apply across retailers and products, and it would also be easier to be confident in the consistency of the scheme.

Accepting that this is not the case there may be some need for reassurance over the consistency of 'traffic light' light systems. While some assumed that a colour on one retailer or manufacturer's system would mean the same on another's, some questioned whether this would be the case. This is perhaps less an issue for major chains and those with an 'upmarket' positioning such as Sainsbury, M&S and Waitrose, than it might be for others such as Budgens and Spar. It may be more an issue for manufacturer brands who opt for their own system such as McCain. While manufacturers may be well regarded in the categories in which they operate they may not have sufficient presence within a supermarket for their products to create the sense of 'a system'.

"You'd think is this just McCain's own amber grading."

Empty Nester, Female, 45-54, Careful, BC1, South

Ideally, shoppers would be made aware of the brands that conform to a 'national' scheme and that the colours are used with consistency in the wider market place, although it was felt to be less of an issue for 'iconic' brands such as Heinz, and Kellogg's in their 'heartland' categories due to the trust placed in them.

"If you know it's a traffic light system, and there's a set of national guidelines."

Empty Nester, Female, 45-54, Careful, BC1, South

%GDA systems were thought less requiring of reassurance, as 'numbers are numbers', and would have to be wrong to be misleading and this was thought unlikely to happen irrespective of perceived ease of use or likelihood of use.

Otherwise there seemed little likelihood of confusion resulting from different systems assuming that each main system has sufficient weight to become established in the sense of being adopted by enough major grocers and brands. There was no surprise that different retailers and brands might do things differently even if there was some disappointment that this had turned out to be the case.

Respondents felt they would 'transfer' learning about a food type in one system to a different system, for example, if alerted to the nutrition content of quiche via the Sainsbury traffic light scheme they would assume similar characteristics of a similar Tesco quiche but without necessarily interrogating %GDA information on the Tesco pack.

FRONT OF PACK LABELLING WITHIN THE WIDER DECISION MAKING CONTEXT

Respondents were asked how they thought the systems might affect and fit within wider considerations in food purchasing. The following section deals with these responses but should be treated with caution as front of pack labelling is only a very small part of a large and very complex equation.

Some felt they would favour a supermarket whose system they preferred assuming they currently used two or more supermarkets / systems.

"I mainly shop in Tesco, and I'm thinking I'd prefer to shop more in Sainsbury's because you can see at a glance."

Family, Female, Mainstream, 25-34, BC1, South

Price is to some extent part and parcel of choice of supermarket, given that different retail brands have different price positions. Price is clearly an 'absolute' issue for the vast majority, although there was a feeling that there would be a price range at any broad price point and respondents claimed they would pay a small premium for more 'healthy' products. It is also possible that systems might signal that some 'cheap' products carry a 'health' premium in the sense that while they are cheap, they are 'worse' in health terms, a thought which resonated with suspicions some already had.

"If you buy a decent brand you expect it to be okay, if you buy an 8p can of beans it might not be."

Empty Nester, Male, 45-54, Mainstream, C1C2, South

In terms of the way that retailer and manufacturer brands present themselves there was a common view that presentation may not match reality, and the systems could potentially highlight these discrepancies with the potential for loss of positive brand equity if a brand is seen to be duplicitous.

Most felt the systems may help to make the nature of some decisions clear. Many know or suspect that they are making trade-offs between 'healthy eating' on the one hand and ease, convenience, and immediate 'appetite appeal' on the other.

Assuming the schemes became well established respondents felt that their absence 'on pack' would make them suspicious, although this would to some extent be product and category dependent, for example a known 'healthy' product such as pasta compared to a known 'culprit' product such as a ready meal.

CONCLUSIONS

There was almost universal awareness that front of pack labelling schemes had been recently introduced.

Respondents believed there was a need for such schemes (in the assumption that they would be designed to make informed food purchasing decisions simpler) because of increases in diet related health issues, and because they felt 'processed' food is often not what it seems from superficial examination. This was coupled with a belief that some vendors deliberately set out to manipulate and mislead the food buying public in the way they presented their products. Having said that, some respondents pointed out that they themselves could be equally guilty of 'going along' with such minor deceptions for reasons of taste, ease and convenience. So, in a sense it was hoped that the schemes would ideally help to make the nature of food decisions clearer.

While there was almost universal awareness of the launch of the schemes, by no means all respondents felt they had encountered them in the course of their shopping. Given the 'rush' of the typical supermarket shop, and the fact that most trolleys are filled with repeat purchases ostensibly removing the need to examine products with any degree of care, this is perhaps not surprising. However, some had noticed the schemes in store, and were now using them in their shopping to a greater or lesser extent.

The way the schemes were used was dependent on the type of scheme, principally the presence or absence of colour coding or 'traffic lights'. Prompted reactions to examples of schemes on packaging were broadly in line with reported existing usage.

Potentially schemes with a traffic light were thought to offer the opportunity to evaluate choices 'at a glance'. Existing users claimed to 'glance' at the traffic lights of every item they were about to put in their trolley because they felt this made it relatively easy to form a quick impression of how healthy or otherwise the item might be. They felt that they would simply not have had the time to assess every item in their trolley if they had only the nutrition panel as a guide. The 'glance' could comprise the entire assessment of an item, but often acted as a preliminary filter, with more detailed examination where there seemed to be a need for it, either by referring to the other information on front of pack, or to the nutrition panel on the back of the pack. So, other than for choices considered to be clear cut, this type of scheme may have the effect of moving consumers to engage more with more of their purchasing decisions. The initial glance seemed to take in each of the traffic lights, leading to an overall impression of the item's colour mix. While a more considered evaluation might put more emphasis on some nutrients than others it seems likely that one effect of this type of scheme will be to raise the profile of nutrients that might not have received so much attention. So for example it might lead those who would have checked calories

to be more aware that an item has a 'saturated fat' or 'salt' content as well, and that this is something they should also give some attention to.

GDA / numerical only schemes were seen as an improvement over the detailed nutrition panel in that they were thought to present nutritional information in a much simpler and more easily used format. Users and intending users of these schemes seemed more likely to look out for them on particular 'culprit' foods, that is, those they suspected might be high on nutrients of concern, usually calories or fats. While they were thought to offer an easier and quicker means of assessing an item, GDA schemes still had to be read, and this is perhaps one reason why it seemed that with GDA systems the buyers focus was less likely to be broadened outside their 'nutrients of concern', the other being that 'high content' on less front of mind nutrients was not 'flagged' in an immediately noticeable way.

APPENDICES

Recruitment Questionnaire

Discussion Guide

List of Foods Used as Stimulus

RJ3201

RECRUITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Q1 I am conducting a market research survey. Can you tell me if you or any of your friends or relations work, or have ever worked in any of these occupations? **READ OUT:**

ADVERTISING	1
MARKET RESEARCH	2
PUBLIC RELATIONS	3
MARKETING	4
PUBLISHING	5
JOURNALISM	6
BROADCASTING	7
NUTRITIONISTS/DIETICIANS	8
MEDICAL PROFESSION	9
CATERING	10
RESTAURANTS/CAFES/TAKE AWAY	11
MANUFACTURE, SALES & DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD AND GROCERY	12
SUPERMARKETS, GROCERS AND CONVENIENCE STORES	13

IF ANY OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED, CLOSE

Q2 a) Have you ever attended a market research group or interview?
 Yes 1 – **GO TO Q2b**
 No 2 – **GO TO Q3**

b) when did you last attend a group or interview?
 In the last year 1 – **CLOSE**
 Over a year ago 2 – **GO TO Q2c**

c) how many groups/interviews have you ever attended?_____

d) what was the subject of the groups/interviews you attended?

WRITE IN _____

RESPONDENTS SHOULD NOT HAVE ATTENDED MORE THAN 3 GROUPS EVER, AND NEVER ON THE SAME SUBJECT AS THE CURRENT ONE

- Q3 a) Do you have any children?
 No 1
 Yes 2
 Empty nesters 3
GROUPS 1-4: ALL TO HAVE CHILDREN.
GROUPS 5-8: EMPTY NESTERS/NO CHILDREN

b) **ASK RESPONDENTS WITH CHILDREN:**
 How old are your children who are living at home?

WRITE IN AGES OF BOYS _____

WRITE IN AGES OF GIRLS _____

- Q4 a) Do you or your partner have any food allergies or intolerances?
 Yes 1 – **CLOSE**
 No 2 – **CONTINUE**

b) **ASK THOSE WITH CHILDREN:**
 do any of your children have food allergies or intolerances?
 Yes 1 – **CLOSE**
 No 2 – **CONTINUE**

- Q5 Do you or any other household member suffer from any specific dietary illnesses/conditions e.g. Coeliac, Diverticular disease, Crohn's?
 Yes 1 – **CLOSE**
 No 2 - **CONTINUE**

- Q6 Do you, for any reason, try to completely exclude additives, preservatives and e numbers from your own or your children's diets?
 Yes 1 – **CLOSE**
 No 2 – **CONTINUE**

- Q7 a) Can you tell me which store you use most often for food and grocery shopping?
 b) and which other stores do you use?

	a)	b)
Tesco	1	1
Sainsbury's	2	2
Waitrose	3	3
Asda	4	4
Somerfield	5	5
Morrison's	6	6
Marks & Spencer	7	7
Co-op	8	8

CLOSE IF NONE OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED. RECRUIT A SPREAD.

Q8 Thinking about how healthy or unhealthy the food you buy and eat, and the food you buy on behalf of your family is, which best describes you or your family?

I haven't really given it much thought A

I can't see the point of being concerned about what's in the food I or my family eat, I never have been and I never will be B

I'm quite concerned about what is in the food we eat and try to watch what is in the food I/we eat, but I don't always manage to C

I would like to watch what is in the food I/we eat but I don't think I would find it very easy D

I watch what is in the food I/we eat from time to time E

I watch what is in the food I/we eat, but I don't do it all the time F

Overall I make sure I eat sensibly but I don't worry about every single thing I eat G

I'm really concerned about what is in the food we eat for health reasons, and I always look carefully when buying H

GROUPS 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8: MAINSTREAM RESPONDENTS SHOULD SELECT STATEMENTS C-G.

GROUPS 2 AND 5: CAREFUL RESPONDENTS SHOULD SELECT STATEMENT H.

Q9 How much of a role do you play in buying and preparing food in your household?

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Do all of the buying | A |
| Do most of the buying | B |
| Do some of the buying | C |
| Do very little buying | D |
| Do none of the buying | E - CLOSE |

GROUPS 1-3 AND 5-7 (WOMEN): ALL TO CODE A, B OR C.

GROUPS 4 & 8 (MEN): 3 PER GROUP SHOULD AGREE WITH A OR B AND 3 PER GROUP SHOULD AGREE WITH C OR D.

Q10 Have you been advised **by your GP or practice nurse or company doctor** to keep an eye on the amount of salt, fat or sugar you eat, or to lose weight for health reasons?

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Yes - salt | 1 |
| Yes – fat | 2 |
| Yes – sugar | 3 |
| No | 4 |

NO MORE THAN 1-2 RESPONDENTS PER GROUP IN GROUPS 1-4 AND NO MORE THAN 2-3 RESPONDENTS PER GROUP IN GROUPS 5-8 SHOULD CODE YES TO THE ABOVE.

CLASSIFICATION

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

OCCUPATION OF HOUSEHOLD'S MAIN INCOME EARNER

PROBE FOR FULL DETAILS

SOCIAL GRADE:	B	1
	C1	2
	C2	3
	D	4
	E	5

BC1: GROUPS 1 AND 5

C1C2: GROUPS 2, 4, 6 & 8

C2DE: GROUPS 3 AND 7

OWN OCCUPATION _____

AGE:	25-34	1 – GROUP 1
	35-44	2 – GROUPS 2-4
	45-54	3 – GROUPS 5, 6 & 8
	55-64	4 – GROUP 7

SEX:	Female	1 – GROUPS 1-3 & 5-7
	Male	2 – GROUPS 4 & 8

MARITAL STATUS:	Married/cohabiting	1
	Divorced/separated	2
	Widowed	3
	Single	4

DATE OF GROUP _____ TIME _____

I AM NOT A FRIEND OR RELATION OF THE RESPONDENT, AND TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE HE/SHE IS NOT KNOWN TO ANY OTHER RESPONDENT IN THE GROUP

RECRUITER'S SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

1095 COI / FSA: FRONT OF PACK LABELLING (FOP) DISCUSSION GUIDE

- Moderator introduction, explanation of purpose and nature of discussion

- Are they aware of any new labelling systems for food? on the front of packs rather than the nutrition panel that is on the back
 - if so, where has this awareness come from?
 - in store, from promotion or packaging? from advertising? from coverage in the media?
 - what is their understanding of the systems, from these various sources, get respondents to describe the systems and how to use them
 - has anyone used them or tried to use them, if so for what, - eg, meal intention, type of food, different family members, etc
 - how do they feel about the systems if aware, - a good idea, helpful, unhelpful
 - if there is awareness of more than one system does this seem to create any confusion
 - is this greater depending on source of awareness, eg, from advertising or from packaging, or would they expect different retailers / manufacturers to do things differently anyway

- Prompted reactions to different systems, introduce different packaging, and boarded examples of different systems (FSA to provide), rotate with advertising above
 - do the examples remind them of anything they have seen advertised or in store
 - immediate reactions, how noticeable would the FOP labelling be in real life
 - communication, comprehension, likely ease of use
 - do they think they would use the labelling, if so how

- Usage of different labelling systems (using examples available in the marketplace)
 - how do consumers imagine they would use the systems on different shopping occasions, and when preparing / consuming food
 - would they use the labelling for every item purchased or in relation to specific foods / food types / categories
 - would this vary according to the ultimate eater, eg, themselves, a child, a partner watching their weight or with a health problem
 - which combinations of meal intention, category, food, eater would be most important and why
 - would they use the information to work out their overall intake of different nutrients? to evaluate a single product / category? or to compare between products / categories?
 - when making choices would they think about meals, intake over a day, a week, or for example, the overall look of their 'shopping basket'

 - would they / do they look at all nutrients, just one or a selection?
 - would they / do they use information on amount per serve? if so, how
 - would they / do they use percentage GDA information? if so, how
 - would they / do they use the traffic light colour code? if so how

 - would they find it confusing if they went into eg, Tesco one trip and found one system, and Sainsbury's on the next and found a different system
 - how would they cope with this, and what is the source of the confusion
 - what would they think about food / manufacturers / retailers who did or didn't use the system or used one or other different systems

 - using pack examples explore how FOP labelling is used in conjunction with other cues / information, eg, price, retailer / manufacturer brand, presentation, positioning, etc
 - where would they feel they needed to pay most attention to it, where would they pay least attention

- Overall what are their feelings about FOP labelling
 - is it helpful or not and why
 - where would it be most important to apply it and why

- Thank and close

Foods With TL, GDA or Hybrid schemes Used As Stimulus

	Marks and Spencer	Sainsburys	Tesco
Complete meals			
Ready	Count on us beef lasagne	Taste the difference beef lasagne	Finest beef lasagne
Meals	Count on us chilli con carne and rice	BGTYS chilli con carne and rice	
	Count on us cottage pie	Traditional cottage pie	Healthy living cottage pie
Pizza	McCain cheese and tomato micro pizza	Thin and crispy margherita	Italian margherita
		Deep pan ham and pineapple	Thin crust Hawaiian
		Deep and loaded meat feast	Deep crust meat feast
Sandwiches		BLT	BLT
		BGTYS Ham and mustard	Healthy living ham salad
		BGTYS Egg and Cress	Healthy living egg and cress
Meal components			
Burgers		100% beef quarter pounders	Finest beef burgers with shallots
Kievs		Cheese and ham kievs	Standard garlic butter kievs
Sausages		Ultimate British pork sausages	Finest traditional pork sausages
Oven chips	McCain oven chips	BGTYS oven chips	Finest chunky oven chips
Quiche		Quiche lorraine	Quiche lorraine
Cheese		Basics mild cheese	English mild cheddar
Snacks			
Crisps		Onion rings/bacon rashers	Onion rings/bacon rashers
Sausage roll		8 basics sausage rolls	20 mini sausage rolls
Nuts		Jumbo salted cashews	Cashew nuts
Treats			
Chocolate		White chocolate bar/caramel bar	Milk Belgian chocolate/dark f+n
Biscuits		Shortbread fingers/garibaldi/rich tea	Shortbread fingers/garibaldi/rich tea
Desserts			
Trifle		Raspberry trifle	Strawberry trifle
Cheesecake		Lemon cheesecake	Lemon cheesecake
Ingredients			
Pasta		Tricolour fusili	Finest linguine
Rice		Basics long grain rice	Easy cook long grain rice
Mayonnaise		Light mayonnaise	Standard mayonnaise
Gravy		Taste the Difference beef gravy	Beef gravy granules