



Appendix B – Supplier's Tender submitted 2016.10.03

QUESTIONNAIRE 4 – UNDERSTANDING OF THE REQUIREMENT

4.1 Potential Providers are requested to provide two examples of similar projects they have worked on and what the outcomes were.

REDACTED

4.2 Potential Providers are requested to outline their project management team, including the relevant skills and expertise of the team that will be carrying out the requirements outlined in Appendix B.

REDACTED

QUESTIONNAIRE 5 – QUALITY OF APPROACH AND PROPOSED SERVICE DELIVERY

5.1 Potential Providers are required to outline their methodology for delivering the mid and post campaign research including the type of survey proposed, draft questionnaire and sample definition.

Methodology for the campaign evaluation research

Sample structure For the 2015/2016 campaign evaluation, the sample definition was:

- A. Help to Buy: 25-44 ABC1C2s who do not currently own their own home in England, Scotland and Wales
- B. Right to Buy: People who rent from local councils/authorities or housing associations, aged 18-55, and are employed in England, Scotland and Wales

There was naturally some overlap between the two groups, and therefore we achieved a minimum of 500 completed interviews per wave among each of these sample targets in order to have a robust sample size for data analysis.

For the 2016/2017 campaign evaluation, the brief includes a slightly different sample definition:

- A. Help to Buy: 25-44 B1B2s in England who do not currently own their own home (potential first-time buyers), or have bought their first home (second steppers)
 - This now targets a higher socio-economic criteria than in previous years, and also includes “second steppers” – that is, people who already own their first home (and who may be less engaged in and have lower awareness of government housing schemes)
- B. Right to Buy: C2DE council and housing association tenants in England aged 30-55 years old, and who are eligible for Right to Buy
 - The target for this campaign is now older than that in 2015/2016
 - Respondents no longer need to be employed, and can therefore come from all C2DE socio-economic groups

OFFICIAL



- Eligibility for Right to Buy is a criteria for inclusion in the survey. Therefore, they would have to be a council or housing association tenant for a minimum of three years
- C. All English adults; This is a new addition, and includes all English adults whether they are potential house-buyers or influencers of potential home-buyers

We have reviewed the changes to the sampling definition based on our knowledge of the campaign to date, and also balancing the need to represent the campaign audience while also keeping consistency for the identification of trends over campaign years. Cognisant of these aspects, we would recommend the following sample definition for the 2016/2017 campaign evaluation. Note that all respondents this year would live in England only:

A. Help to Buy: 25-44 ABC1s who do not currently own their own home

- We propose keeping the social grade as per 2015/2016 and *including* ABC1s. There are four reasons for our recommendation:
 - i. There are a number of products that may be included in the advertising as they come on stream, and it is therefore better to keep it broad as each product may have a slightly different target audience.
 - ii. It is more important that respondents are not yet home owners, rather than respondents belonging to a specific socio-economic grade. We do not wish to limit our coverage of first time buyers by excluding people based purely on their SEG.
 - iii. Limiting the sample criteria will increase the research cost for little additional benefit.
 - iv. If we limit to SEG Bs, we can only use a relatively small proportion of 2015/2016 data for comparison, and this will detrimentally impact the reliability of year-on-year data. We agree to exclude those in the C2 social grade as they are probably of less relevance to, and less interested in, the campaign. If the Authority has gathered socio-economic data of Help to Buy ISA applicants, this could help inform the socio-economic structure of the sample.

B. Right to Buy: People who rent from local councils/authorities or housing associations and are 30-55 years old, are employed but are not necessarily eligible for Right to Buy

- We agree with the change in target age from 18-55 to 30-55. Last year's evaluation findings indicated that older tenants were less likely to consider Right to Buy, with a hypothesis that those under 30 may feel they have lots of time to take advantage of the scheme. Those with families would be much more motivated to apply, and that will be correlated with age.
- Respondents should be employed, as this would correlate with being more likely to afford to buy their council home and would also enable a greater degree of comparability with historical data.
- Eligibility for Right to Buy would not be a sampling criterion. With a relatively low (three year) threshold, the campaign would aim to increase awareness among all tenants, whether they have already applied. Assuming their circumstances do not change, all respondents this year would be eligible for the scheme within the next three years.



- C. **All adults:** We support the addition of this new sample group, and recommend conducting a monthly national barometer of home ownership sentiment. Given that the campaign will run in two bursts with staggered channel activity and an always-on digital element, this monthly approach will provide regular monitoring throughout the campaign life.

Sample size

We recommend increasing the sample size per wave from the 2015/2016 campaign evaluation, as requested. This means that we would aim to achieve n=1000 respondents overall per wave. Across groups (Help to Buy; Right to Buy), in which there is some overlap, we would expect at least 500 respondents per group per wave.

If additional budget is available, we could possibly increase the sample size per group per wave to n=750. This would be beneficial in order to provide a robust basis for the ROI exercise should the campaign not cut through as expected, in order to ensure we have sufficient numbers taking action to provide analysis.

Questionnaire development

We recommend that the questionnaire remain as comparable as possible to previous year's questionnaires, in order to maximise the comparability of data over time. However, this need for consistency would need be balanced with changes to the campaign or new campaign elements that we wish to monitor. We assume that the questionnaire for 2016/2017 evaluation will be at least 80% similar to the questionnaire content from the 2015/2016 survey.

With the input of the Authority, we would look to optimise the questionnaire by reflecting new campaign elements or adding additional insight related to the campaign objectives. We have made comments in the attached questionnaire that outline what changes we would suggest making (all proposed changes are highlighted in yellow). We would want a mix of questions specifically based on the current schemes, as well as more generic questions which are relevant to the wrapper campaign and can be used for any schemes which may come later – thus future-proofing the evaluation.

We understand that the aim of the Own Your Home campaign is to drive behaviour change; in this instance how we can make people think it is worth starting to save towards buying their own home or start the process to Right to Buy. We will ensure that the questionnaire covers various behavioural triggers such as the extent to which the campaign is impacting on different beliefs – e.g. of efficacy (“I will never be able to earn my own home however much I save”), or social norms (“no one I know / my parent never owned their own home”) or one of costs and benefits (“I won’t be able to go out / go on holiday if I have to save”).

Survey Mode

Our choice of online surveying is based on:

- Cost-effectiveness – compared to other survey modes, online surveying is significantly more cost effective and is the only way the Authority can achieve the robust samples desired of 1000 interviews overall per wave within the budget.

OFFICIAL



- Comparability with previous evaluations – all previous campaign evaluations have been undertaken online: using a different method will significantly limit the ability to make comparisons and draw conclusions
- Audio-visual capabilities – there is a need to show campaign materials in the post wave
- Appropriateness for the target audience – it is generally a young population which is very well represented on online panels
- The campaign's call to action in 2015/2016 was to go to www.ownyourhome.gov.uk which suggests that the target audience are internet users

The following procedures are employed to ensure the quality and representative nature of the sample derived:

- We would exclude any respondents who had participated in the survey in the past nine months. This means that no individual would participate in the survey more often than once per campaign year.
- The panel provider offers incentives to respondents in order to maximise the response rate. These incentives are based on a points system, whereby panellists collect points over time to exchange for a financial incentive. Reminder emails are also sent to panellists in order to minimise non-response bias.
- Quotas are put in place to control the profile of respondents that we interview. This ensures that the sample profile – per group and per wave – is comparable over waves. We are assuming broad quotas on age and sex in our proposed sample definition.

Timing of Post Campaign Wave(s)

We would recommend conducting two waves of research when evaluating the 2016/2017 Own Your Home campaign: a mid-wave (between the first and second bursts of above-the-line activity), and a post-wave (after all ATL activity). As with last year, there are two distinct bursts of ATL activity, with a break in December. The mid-wave will be critical to our understanding of how the campaign is working. The mid-wave data contributed to our understanding of the campaign's success and pointed to the importance of broader economic factors. A mid-wave also monitors campaign effectiveness in the middle of a relatively long campaign period, especially given that there are many other (external) influencing factors at play in an individual's feelings towards home ownership. This is particularly pertinent in the current state of the nation where there is uncertainty surrounding the economic situation.

The post-wave questionnaire is assumed to be identical to the mid-wave questionnaire. The sample definition for both waves will also be the same.

Data processing and analysis

Data will be cleaned and checked before being tabulated for ease of analysis. The research team will also conduct significance tests on data between waves and sub-groups so that differences that are real and outside the margin of error are highlighted in the analysis.



Data would not be weighted, as we have no accurate view of what the real profile of the target groups is. We would have set quotas to ensure a consistent profile across the waves.

After each wave of fieldwork, we would provide PDF data tables to the Authority. Following the delivery of data tables, we would also produce topline charts of the data to show the data at a total sample level, including a two-slide summary.

Reporting

We would provide a full presentation with in-depth analysis and recommendations after the post-campaign fieldwork wave only. We would also provide a short written summary of main findings and recommendations, consisting of up to 5 pages in Word, after the presentation has been delivered.

We strive for a thorough knowledge of the campaign itself. If we are to properly evaluate the campaign, then information pertaining to the communication strategy, spend, intended reach and OTS, media strategy – helps make our evaluation of the campaign much more insightful and aligned to the campaign objectives. We welcome the opportunity to be involved in conversations with partner agencies, and to integrate their data into our reporting in order to provide recommendations that are pertinent to all parties.

We place great emphasis on providing results in the most impactful way. Our analysis will build on the GCS evaluation model (see Section 5.5) and use it as a basis for reporting so that what we produce has a clear, consistent and holistic structure. We expect to start with headline results against KPIs, and then work through the model to tell the story of the campaign – which elements are more/less effective, and what needs to be done to optimise it for future campaigns and waves.

ROI Methodology

We discuss our approach to ROI against question 5.2. Here we consider what impact including ROI has on the evaluation design.

REDACTED

5.2 Potential Providers are required to outline their approach to developing an ROI methodology along with likely data requirements and assumptions.

The campaign evaluation data will enable the Authority to measure the extent to which the campaign has affected knowledge, attitudes and intended/claimed behaviour.

REDACTED

5.3 Potential Providers are required to evidence additional innovation that could assist in gathering audience insight and help contribute to the future campaign strategy.

REDACTED



5.4 Potential Providers are required to outline their proposed project timeline for the Contract, taking into account the milestones outlined in Appendix B. Potential Providers are permitted to suggest alternative timings, as outlined in 6.1 of Appendix B.

Set out below is our suggested timeline for the survey. Note that due to needing two weeks for each wave of fieldwork, the post-wave fieldwork starts one week earlier than that in the brief in order to reflect the final deadline requested. This means there may be a slight overlap with the tail end of the campaign, but this may be desirable as discussed earlier to better evaluate the main part of the campaign.

Given that Kantar Public (formerly TNS BMRB) has previously undertaken the Own Your Home campaign evaluations, this will considerably assist us to efficiently and quickly conduct another campaign evaluation. In particular:

- Kantar Public's previous experience of the Own Your Home evaluations will greatly contribute to the completion of the mid-wave by December/January (dates dependent on media spend, as noted previously);
- The existing questionnaire will form the basis for the new questionnaire. This will make the process of scripting the online version much quicker and reduce the chance of any error;
- The familiarity of Kantar Public and our panel partner in conducting this evaluation previously will also expedite the sample definition and fieldwork set-up;
- After fieldwork, much of the data processing and analysis specifications are already established and will simply need amending for the revised questionnaire and sample definitions (rather than starting from scratch) which will greatly assist in meeting the topline deadline;
- If the sample structure is amended to reflect the 2016/2017 strategy, Kantar Public will be able to re-cut previous data to that new specification and provide comparable data for that new sample (target audience). We would be happy to provide costs to re-cut historical data;
- **REDACTED**

5.5 Potential Providers are required to outline any improvements or improved approaches to the questionnaire that better fulfil the brief.

In addition to the suggested improvements to the sample structure outlined in 5.1, we recommend further analysis to take into account external factors. We have seen that such factors can inhibit the potential impact of the campaign. Understanding these factors better will highlight where the campaign can be most effective within the wider context.

We can use existing insight to identify potential barriers: Barriers which can be overcome by a marketing campaign, such as self-efficacy, knowledge and perceived social norms; and barriers which are more fundamental such as availability of housing stock, house price to earnings ratio and economic optimism.

REDACTED