

RB: If you need a short comfort break or you need to grab a cup of tea or something then that's fine just turn your camera and your microphone off please, unlike in a meeting recently where we actually heard someone going to the toilet when they had a break: luckily the camera wasn't faced in any particular direction. So yeah anyway, that that would be great. What we want to do today is ... we really want to test out this questionnaire that we've started to develop and use you guys - which you very kindly filled it in beforehand - to use you guys to give us some feedback on how you found filling in some of the questions, did the questions make sense to you etc etc - so that the main thing that we want to do. But in the process of doing that I think we will have some interesting discussions really about your shopping habits, whether you think about animal welfare issues when you're shopping or when you decide what products to buy, and and so on. So I'm hoping we'll have a really good discussion. Let's just whizz round and have some introductions before we start. So my name which is Richard Bennett. I'm a researcher at the University of Reading and leading a research project for the government, which is all about trying to put a value on benefits to animal welfare, particularly farm animal welfare at the moment - to help inform policy. So the feedback that you give us will actually directly help us to better refine the research methods we're going to do to get that information to government - which they will venues for policy purposes, so what you were doing will actually inform policy. Heather:

HM: thank you Richard yes good evening everyone thank you so much for joining us. I'm what's known as a postdoc researcher an I'm working with Richard - he's my boss - on this project for Defra and I've had farm animal welfare and animal welfare experience in the past

RB: shall we go to Charlotte next?

Charlotte: yeah hi I'm Charlotte I'm based up north and I'm a school teacher

RB: Great thank you. Andrew:

Andy: hi I'm Andy. I'm from Hampshire and I work as a project manager for a construction company:

RB: Great thanks. Poppy?

Poppy: hi everyone I'm Poppy and I am from Birmingham in case you couldn't tell and I'm an events planner, so I co-ordinate automotive events for things like F1.

RB: whose next – Sophie?

Sophie: I'm Sophie I'm based in Edinburgh in Scotland and I'm a travel consultant

RB: thank you. Josh?

Josh: I'm Josh, from London. I'm, I'm a student at Nottingham University

RB: that's great and Babatunde - is at the right pronunciation?

Baba: yes that's correct, that's right. Feel free to call me Baba. I'm 30 and I'm based in London and I'm a programmer. I'm really sorry we might hear my voice it sounds a bit broken that's actually because I'm recovering from a cold, so I hope I hope you can hear like the correct 'illustration' for my words

RB: that's fine so sounds fine - but if you you know if you need to take a little break 'cause you're not feeling great then then do that. Aimee?

Aimee: hi I'm Aimee, I live in London but I am a student at the University of Leeds, so spend most of my time in Leeds

RB: great. Nice to meet you Amy and then finally Jude..... Hello Jude? Are you able to say hi put your camera on if you can will be nice to see you. [crackling noise] your connection is breaking up a bit can you hear me?

HM: We were just introducing ourselves Jude, so if you just like say where you're from :

Jude: OK my name is Jude I live in London (?Lydd).

RB: OK that's good thank you very much welcome so let let's ... have I forgotten anything Heather before we get into it

HM: I don't think so Richard - tell me when you want me to share the screen?

RB: OK. Just before we start guys, can you, can you maybe just think a little bit about you know when you go into the supermarket, when you do your shopping, are there any particular products that you choose because of animal welfare considerations - or maybe products that you avoid because of animal welfare? Do you think about animal welfare at all when you're in the supermarket? Does it influence your shopping at all I guess is the question.

Jude: I think the one people always do is eggs

Baba: yeah same as me. It is something that I think about ,but to be first perfectly honest when it comes to actually making the actual product decision, it hasn't shown any real impact but it is something that I do come across, from time to time yeah

Charlotte: I think I'd agree, whenever I go shopping I always buy free range eggs. I think it's the thing that you see most in the news about hens in battery farms and things, and I think that's where I was brought up my parents always said to me you you've got to buy free range eggs because that's better for the animals

Aimee: I also think when it comes to things like chicken, I associate shops like M&S as having better quality - and i think that better quality for me, comes with me hoping and viewing that the animals are being looked after better. And as a result the quality is better, better for me, better for the animals. So I think when it comes to meat products I tend to spend more and go to those more like expensive supermarkets to buy them.

Poppy: all the time probably vouch for corn fed chicken over normal supermarket branded one. Just yeah - I want to try and help as much as possible. It tastes better as well: it's not as like chewy for example and yeah I just feel like I'm giving back as well That's why I try not to go to the more expensive one

RB: Great. Right anyone else?

Josh: That's similar, similar to me. I shop at M&S and sometimes Waitrose as well ... just because it's better quality food and, well it is better for the environment [mumble] better 'cause it is that bit more expensive.

HM: thank you Joseph ... Sophie?

Sophie: I think the welfare is it's definitely something I think about when I'm going to shop, but at the end of the day I think I make my final decision based on cost' cause sometimes things are just so much more expensive than yeah

RB Fair enough

HM: Jude, have you got anything to add?

Jude: for me I think it's fair ... I do have the welfare in mind but then I also have to consider the cost. [unintelligible] definitely portion size (?) I don't really really consider that image

RB: Thank you. Andrew have we heard from Andrew?

Andy: yeah, I talked over someone but I'd also like to mention there's like RSPCA labels on some meat products that I would take note of as well as another one, alongside the eggs as well.

BR: OK that's that's really helpful thank you. OK well that's hopefully got us thinking a little bit about our purchasing decisions an animal welfare. So can we just go through the questionnaire if that's OK with you guys. Some questions we will go through really quickly it's really identifying those where ... so Heather is going to share her screen now just to remind you of the of the questionnaire. I think most of you have done it pretty recently so I'm sure this will spark your memory as we go through it. The first question please Heather?

HM: OK I'm just trying to get it day is that can everyone see I just wanted to just double check - good - thank you

RB: Yep right so there will there we go first question any problems with understanding, answering, any suggestions how we could ask this question better, or was it all straight forward?

Baba: it's perfectly clear

A few (2 -3) talking over each other. One person (male) said yeah, no problem.

RB: Anyone got any other views on this or shall we move on?

?Poppy – Do you potentially – or this may be me being awkward – [want to capture] about potentially how I might do a full shop and then a substitute shop in Tesco or Asda for example and then I might do that type of shop in the Co-op and split it up , does that count?

RB: I suppose it's yeah it, it's a that's difficult isn't it, because this is supposed to be a sort of typical week that you go shopping, but if one week you go ... you do a different shop, then another week you have to sort of try and average it out in your in your mind I guess, I don't ... I'm struggling to think now we could ask the question for different shops that you that you do, if it's a sort of typical shop that you do, or typical expenditure per week.

Poppy? - I was just going to say if you wanted to go down that route you could potentially ask sort of like how much is your main food shop a week, and then that is just the main one you do and that obviously doesn't include any other top-ups - or it could be how much do you spend on yeah the food which is included in all the top ups as well

RB: Yeah. OK anyone else?

Sophie: I think it could be slightly clearer, just because I'm normally shopping for one person, so obviously it's my household is less than £50 - but if I'm at home with my family my family of five people it's going to be more like £150 - £200 ,so it's like I think it's like quite range. So I think maybe if it could be like based on how many people in your household just make it clearer that like, when I tick less than £50 I do mean for one, not for an actual household.

RB: Yeah, that's fine so if you because you're the main shopper for your household of one you're probably not the main shopper when you go home yeah that's absolutely right then so for the way you've done that. Anyone else?

Charlotte: I think to me the only thing that I noticed is that in our household my partner works shifts so we're not always at home, or will work away sometimes, so maybe if it was like *per* month because we kind of shop - you know it might be every 10 days or so to fit in with what we're doing in our shifts. But yeah it was fine – 'cos I could work it out and average it but we do a monthly shop rather than a weekly yeah

RB: that's that's interesting, thank you. We've had a bit of a dilemma deciding whether it should be weekly or monthly actually, with all with all of the the the numbers that we that we deal with - and we want to be consistent either choose one or we've been a bit you know yeah a bit indecisive in knowing which ones best I think you did you

HM: sorry first Baba and then Andrew

Baba: we think that we could actually the is actually the a typical week is actually the best time frame to use cause over a period of month over month you know it's gonna be much more discrepancies with regards to like your memory of like your shopping throughout the

month. But with a week is much more concretely knows I think a week is a perfectly a reasonable time frame to be honest with you: the question's quite clear. I don't think we need to overcomplicate things if it could be clarified for that or maybe you should just say the word typical - so typical week - so people know that if there's like maybe significant differences in just find average between the two.

RB: thank you that's very helpful thank you. Andy I think was that you going to be you Andy before I saw said

Andy: yeah I was gonna go .so I think it says food each week. we've all I think implied that means a food shop at a supermarket - but it doesn't actually specify that. I think clarifying whether it includes takeaways and going out for food as well might be important.

RB: Very good point, thank you Andy

HM: So maybe something along the lines of spend on your weekly food shop?

Andy: Yeah just, just clarify that, 'cause it might skew it a bit because going out for food is very expensive.

HM: thank you great

RB: yeah brilliant that was really helpful thank you thank you. Let's move on to question 2. Heather if that's right so how much do you spend on meat products for your household during a normal week?

?Female: so again this is really clear, that one. I didn't think there was any issues with this question

RB: OK so you found it easy to decide which box to tick? Yep, good anyone else?

Josh: I thought it was very clear as well yeah, so no, no questions from me.

Poppy: yeah me too. The range of prices works pretty well too having five pound notes each time. I wouldn't want it any wider, or any smaller. The numbers are perfect.

RB: Thank you. Anyone else, any comments?

Charlotte: I think I really liked that you put an Asterix next to meat and specific and specified that it was where it was the sole or main ingredient because you know people might incorporate different things into what they classify as meat. It might be if it's from you know butchers counter or whether you're buying it, pre packaged or frozen, so I think he kind of by specifying that covered all eventualities that people might wonder whether they should include it or not

RB: good thank you. OK should we move on to question 3 if there's no other comments. So this is the same question but about dairy products and again, we try and just remind you of

what dairy products include but there's probably other products there, but we tried to get the main ones in. What do people think of this question?

(Female) Same again

(Male – Baba?) Really clear

(Male – Andy?) I think it's fine

RB: OK let's move on to question 4 then, so this is asking about eggs

(Female?) I thought that was clear I mean how much you spend on eggs I didn't find any confusion in that question at all

(Female,?) Yeah, I agree

Baba: I agree it is mostly clear but from the question, it's not clear if the person who's asked the question is looking for the quantity of eggs that is also bought as well. Because you know, there are different quantities so like you know maybe for example 6 pack or 15 pack and that's something that I did think about briefly. But then I just put what I personally spent

RB: yeah I mean as long as it catches the amount of money that's spent on eggs each week for your household, that's fine - it doesn't matter what you know just to how the eggs of a purchased or whether they purchased from yeah good. OK let's push on question 5 then please

HM: it's actually question two question 2!

RB: so this is, do you purchase or avoid purchasing any particular products because of concerns about the welfare of the animals involved? So sort of two questions here. Did you find this question straightforward to answer and secondly maybe you can give us some examples of some of the answers that you put in here would be useful.

Poppy: you know you have a reason why perhaps? I don't know .. but I'm just trying to be extra

RB: No, it's a good question. I think the reason we we've not put that in there is in case it sort of is a difficult question because people just may say no for you know 'cause they don't care about animal welfare and that's maybe a difficult thing for them to say I I don't know we we could ask we could try it we could try that in the next focus group actually what what do other people think about that yeah:

Amy: I would just say you could have the option just say an optional box where you can explain why so people can say no – they don't have to say if they obviously don't want to say for you know if they just for one second but then there's the option for some people to respond and give a reason why. I don't know if it's possible to have an optional box?

RB: yeah thank you.

Jude: after me I think - when we talking about products where either you try to avoid them I think it will be because of you know probably maybe they're not healthy. that's if you're probably conscious about the fact that you want to know if you know the welfare of the animals actually well taken care of - and of course you want to buy a very healthy products then I think the question is quite clear and very much useful in dealing with opinions.

RB: OK thank you

HM: anyone else before we move on?

RB: No OK thanks, Heather got some ideas there about what we might do why here maybe I should have gotten about that there you go I think we I don't people want to add to anything they've said I think we've just had that discussion with very usefully haven't we

HM: yes we had wondered about whether we should put the why in so it was really interesting Poppy to see that you raised it and we wanted to ask how the obviously about the question as it was written initially, and I think you've just insert question 'cause if we were going to capture the reasons why people said yes, if they said yes, then we were just going to ask would it be a good idea to include a why so anyone got any other comments to support Poppy that we haven't said already?

Andy: I think when I did it, not that long ago I put what it was and why in the box anyway - so it might be sort of specify which products and why - you could save the extra box.

RB: yeah thank you lovely yeah so the question is whether we also do a similar box if people say no I guess was one of the points made?

HM: I've noted that, thank you.

RB: great thank you shall we push on to the next question? Is it possible to make that bigger Heather or is that I I can see it I think but ...

HM: I'm sorry to say no it isn't

RB: Don't worry can everyone see that OK

? - Yes OK

? - yeah OK.

RB: So this is the extent to which you agree or disagree with a number of statements, so the first one says I feel well informed about the how farm animals are treated in the process of producing our food and other products people understood. Did people feel that was clear what was what was meant by that statement and were you OK .. could you easily decide which box you were going to tick here?

Female? yeah I thought it was really clear and easy to understand

Josh: same here with me to be fair

Jude: same here with me

RB: OK anyone disagree? No OK? Second one, I'm concerned about the way farm animals in the UK are treated in the process of producing our food and other products same question was it clear what was what was in the statement and secondly was it easy for you to decide where you were gonna tick?

Aimee: I would just be one thing about the first one is I I feel well informed and the next one is I'm concerned - so it's a bit of a shift in ... the disagree and the agree kind of flips because but if you agree with feeling well informed that's a positive, then you're agreeing with being concerned - I don't know how much this makes sense?

RB: It does, it does Aimee. I mean that I I think there were two arguments for that. One of the arguments is that every you know you ought to have the questions always being positive and not mixed up positive and negative - but the other argument is because it's an online survey, to avoid people flatlining and just ticking the same box all the time.

Aimee: yeah

RB: it's quite it's quite good to get - sort of try and get people to think a little bit more about what the statement means, so I don't know ... if you found it confusing then that's not good

Aimee: no no it wasn't confusing it was more just like just making sure I was answering yeah and I was like just trying to work out which way I wanted to go - to be like on the right side of the scale I wanted to be on - there was no confusion.

RB: OK that's good

HM when Amy started to talk somebody else started to talk at exactly the same point and I couldn't work out who it was so whoever it was who wanted to say something I mean obviously everyone's got the option opportunity but there was somebody I'm sure who wanted to say something?

RB: no OK maybe the point was covered and then let's go onto to statement three. I think that food products from animals with high levels of welfare are healthier. What do people think about that statement

Poppy: I think it's clear. I think it's getting the message across. I don't think anything else needs to be added. I don't think there's any point naming all the different food products because it's just a simple question, so I probably leave it how it is

: OK and how did some people if you're if you're happy to to share your responses with others, how did some people respond to that? Where did you tick on the on the scale? You don't have to say if you don't want to but I'm just wondering as well. OK

Andy?: I would agree

Charlotte: I would agree too

Female? I agreed too

Jude: So did I

RB: OK now that's interesting so we did this survey years ago ,a similar survey to this, and most people who did it, did agree with that particular one

HM: Charlotte, you did want to say something?

Charlotte – yeah, but Poppy's just covered exactly what I was going to say

RB: OK thank you, so the next one is I think that food products from animals with high levels of welfare are better tasting, what do people think about statement? If you can share your response with us that would be interesting?

Josh: I I think I the statements fine – it's pretty clear

RB: OK and Andy can you share with us where you ticked?

Andy: I think I did agree or somewhat agree - I can't remember but yeah

RB: OK, agreed, anyone else?

Jude: yes I did agree

RB: thank you.

Sophie: yeah I put somewhat agree 'cause it's kind of subjective

Charlotte: yeah yeah I did somewhat agree as well because I feel I'm quite a particular eater so different things that better suited to me rather than just based on welfare

RB: yeah yeah thank you. I mean Charlotte just to develop from that do you feel that if a product is, you know, it's higher quality and you may be paying more for it. That you expect it have high levels of animal welfare associated with that product?

Charlotte: yeah definitely. I think if you know something is more expensive and whatever I would expect with the animals are treated in a better way, you know. It's far more ethically

so yeah, regardless of my taste on that I feel that products should be better, based on the price that's it's gone into it.

RB: That's interesting thank you. Anyone else? OK let's move on to the next one: I think that food products from animals with high levels of welfare have better nutritional value.

Poppy: I'd agree with that. I find that animal groups that have this high levels of welfare. I don't know if it's psychological but you almost feel like there is more nutritious and it's not going to have loads of chemicals so I think I put strongly agree for that one.

RB: OK now that's interesting, thanks Poppy. Anyone else?

Andy: I think there's a a lot of overlap with this and healthier for me [yeah yeah] Anyway how I interpret healthier is very much about nutrition.

RB: yeah that's a good point Andy thank you.

Sophie: yeah I, I kind of saw healthier and nutritional value is pretty much the same thing but I did put agree for both of them

RB: Thank you. Maybe we don't need both of those either if we can take a note of that maybe we don't need them both

HM: Which one would the panel suggest we take out? Healthier or nutritional value?

Sophie: I think nutritional value should be taken now I think healthy is I mean they're both pretty subjective what you think's but I think type of healthy is having the high nutritional value to some people and I just think health is just simple you don't really think into it too much and to you know so that it's just purely is it healthy

RB: helpful thank you very helpful thank you and did you agree with that or would you take out the nutritional would you keep in nutritional value and take out the healthier

Andy: yeah I mean it depends if you really worried about the nutritional value particularly 'cause I think healthy is a good umbrella term which includes nutrition that depends on that but I would say if you kept one keep healthier

thank you yeah thank you and then the next year I think that food products from animals with high levels of welfare have better food safety

Sophie: I think that statement is quite clear and I put that I agreed with that as well

RB: OK anyone else?

Josh: Yep I put agree as well

Jude: yeah I put agree

RB: Anyone with a different view on that? No? OK thank you and then finally I think that food products from animals with high levels of welfare are better for the environment. Is that clear first of all?

Male?: yes

Male? yeah

Female?: Yeah

Female?: Yes

RB: OK and how did how did people mark that? Score that?

Andy: I said agree

Sophie: yeah I agreed with that one

RB: OK great. So it would appear that people generally - and this is what we did find in our previous survey - I think that there's an association there between high animal welfare and a broadly higher quality of product that addresses a number of different areas

RB: Is that what most of you feel or is it just what you hope?

Andy: I think that's true for the most part yeah

RB: OK thanks

Sophie: yeah I think it's a bit of both to be honest. 'cause like when you see the advertising like on the just on TV of like ban was like running around in big fields and that their higher welfare and all this I think it all kind of leads into the image that it's just better in every way for the environment and for the product. I think that sort of like ingrained within me

RB: Thank you. That's a very interesting comment, thank you. Anyone else would comment on this before we move on: any of these in this section?

Charlotte: I think for me as much as I feel informed that I kind of know that they're going to be better if the welfare is better for is that hope as well because I feel like you always want to hope the best of the world and you want to think that you're sort of having a positive impact on the world so if you're thinking that you're eating products that are from animals that are being treated well you kind of you feel a little bit better about it. I know it's one of the things that in my head I have that sort of argument between myself do I eat meat I want to be a vegetarian because I do love animals, so for me it's the hope that a good welfare is making a better life for them, it kind of makes me feel a little bit better.

RB: yes, that makes sense, thank you. OK that was a really helpful actually number of comments going through those questions. Let's move on to question four then please.

So this is where it starts to get you need to spend a little bit more time don't you, on actually reading this and absorbing it. I'm just going to read it through fairly quickly just to remind you so this says: the animal welfare scientists and veterinarians have developed a method for measuring the welfare farm animals that takes account of the extent to which the needs and wants of the animal on mix and results in an overall welfare score from zero to 100 the score accurately represents the welfare of the animal in terms of its freedom from hunger thirst discomfort pain injury disease fear and distress and the extent to which the animal can express normal behaviours and has a happy and contented life school of 0 denotes extreme suffering whereas a score of 100 denotes the highest level of welfare that could possibly be achieved the method covers the entire life of the animal from birth to slaughter and involves regular independent monitoring of farms by the RSPCA launch. What did people think about that statement in terms of understanding and what did id you feel that it was too long or too detail you're not detailed enough what did people feel about that:

Baba: I thought it was too long

RB: OK

Poppy: yeah I'd agree. I think it could be put into bullet point form just summarising the points. I know the next sentence going on to a few examples is which I'd like to see as well, you know some examples and statistics and current backs but yeah it can definitely be condensed slightly

Aimee yeah other points just a lot easier to see; not such a big chunk to read

Sophie: yeah same I agree 'cause I do think it's too long, but at the same time I don't think that any of that information should necessarily be cut. So I think the bullet point form would be a just a better way to see the information .

OK thank

Josh: I wonder if there's any way you could visually represent the scale in any way, if that's possible?

RB: Ah ... well that's interesting OK: represent it, so obviously we can show a scale from zero to 100. What else do you think would help if we have a little diagram? What else do you think might help on that diagram?

Josh: I guess if on that scale how they worked out from zero to 100 if this certain practises that reduce certain point marking those on the scale ,so I don't know sort the point where you have free range and etc etc you could show that the few major sort of milestones, I guess with different types of welfare that they have in place.

RB: that's that's very interesting idea thank you.

HM: Could I just ask everyone though to bear in mind that the information in that first paragraph is important but you prefer it in bullet points, adding a slider with more information in it isn't that going to be information overload do you think?

Sophie I don't know. I feel like 'cause it's a bit more visual and a bit more interactive it might just be an easier way to take information on right OK

Poppy: I agree with that. I'm quite a visual learner so to see it visually and you can interact with it, it's just a little bit more engaging

Aimee – yeah, we've just done a load of CPD at work about dual-coding things, to make it more accessible for people who learn in different ways, so by having in a written format but also a diagram or a graph or something, that might make it more accessible to people who interpret things differently.

RB: So what about if on the scale for example we put where you know beef cattle or pigs or whatever currently on the scale, would that sort of information help do you think?

Sophie: I think so yeah 'cause I mean right now like the score of a hundreds like I can't picture what 100 would be like it means nothing to me so obviously like 45 out of 100 seems really low but I can't picture what that actually means.

RB: yeah good point, good point. That's quite a challenge.

HM: What about other people? What do they think about Sophie's comment?

Poppy: yeah I do agree as well. I mean 45 out of 100 or 55 out of 100 or whatever the number is ... it ...I don't, I don't know what that looks like, you know? What's the potential? What it could be? What's it been previously? What is 70 out of 100 for beef cattle that doesn't, they don't currently have now? What's the, you know visually what's it missing?

Charlotte: I was gonna say I always feel like it while place within that like is there a country that has 100 so you know - are we traditionally lower than that, or is it something that realistically averages involving no animal really gets above 80 out of 100 I think, 'cause I agree but idea of this hundred, what does 100 mean, what does that look like in reality?

HM: thank you. Josh and Baba what are your thoughts on this? Josh first and then Baba.

Josh: what, on the stat, on the 45 out of a 100?

Heather: providing a slider – whether that would help you visualise this 0 – 100 do you think?

Josh: Yeah, maybe it would be a bit better like, if it was on a chart, or a diagram to just help you see what it would look like visually ... maybe like, just take that information in better and

it would have more impact? I don't know ... I would interpret it in a different way just saying it might have more of an impact or something like that

HM: yeah thank you. Baba?

Baba: yes I agree a slider would be much more beneficial. In fact, when I was actually reading it I was wondering why it wasn't included or why was it short so I definitely believe that a slider, would like would really really help, like, make things much clearer.

HM: thank you and Jude? Have you got any comments on this one?

Jude: yes same with what Baba said. I think is scale or perhaps a chart would be informative so we would know how far they've gone into previous and also what would 50 or 70 look like compared to what we have for the five [?event] we have right here

HM: This is an idea that we've considered from previous research in the health field - not necessarily animal welfare - and that's to use some sort of maybe thermometer scale, nought to 100 with using the red amber green so and you're saying you can't visualise what 100 would be - and obviously this survey like this it would be very difficult to provide all the information around that - but do you think a colour - a red amber green type coding on a nought to 100 scale would be useful? and I'm sorry I asked this is really difficult if you're not visual I can't think of this until I've actually seen it put in front of me. But I just sort of thought I'd throw it out there and see what you thought of it?

Poppy: yeah I like that. I like the idea of that: so if it kind of fell in the amber it would be a not really there: yeah not not doing anything - that is easier for me then potentially 55 that maybe would fall in that amber category

RB: Great. Thank you very much. Let's just continue reading this bit so we've covered some of this but I'll read it anyway so currently in the UK dairy cattle have an average welfare score of around 45 out of 100 beef cattle 55 out of 100 sheep 60 add 400 pigs 45 out of out of 100 and meat chickens and laying hens 40 out of 100. Any comments on that other than the comments you already made which I think you're saying well what is 60 look like what does 45 look like which are very good questions actually so we'll try and address those but anything else about that information? I mean is it is it worth telling you that information at this stage?

Poppy: yeah but it would be good to get some sort of statistics. So who made this up - or you know ... so I know this came from the RSPCA but where is the evidence? We don't know if this is pretty accurate, or perhaps have some references in there for example just to back it up a little bit more?

RB: OK thanks Poppy. Anyone else?

Sophie: I'm I guess maybe just like a bit of a comparison as well like that's what it is in the UK is that like average for everywhere, is it wildly different in the rest of the world, is it wildly

different in other parts of Europe like - is that good compared to other places or should we really be doing a lot more?

RB: Yeah good point thank you.

Baba: yeah I agree with the points raised by both Poppy and Sophie. In fact actually I was just about to say what Sophie had just stated as well

HM: Thank you Baba.

RB: OK, so the next bit is now sort of setting people up for the questions that follow so it says that assume that in your usual food store there is a section that sells meat, milk, dairy products and eggs with high welfare stores so these schools could actually be on product labels for example these have higher prices than similar products with lower. Regarding your preferred weekly shop of meat dairy products and eggs from the three options presented to you. Did someone want to say something like that at that stage please let let's stop there and get your feedback on those two lines. Does that make sense and is it a believable scenario? Are you believing all this?

Charlotte: yeah I think it makes sense and it's also believable. Particularly thing about this section food style because I know that currently when you go in you know you've got the organic sections and things like that so it's kind of like real life, already

RB: OK good. Anyone else?

Sophie: I agree I can definitely visualise what the higher welfare section would look like so I think it is very believable to normal shopping.

RB: OK

HM: Poppy - you know in answer to a previous question, you said about higher welfare and corn fed chicken for example - do you find those currently sold in separate sections or are they just in the chicken section and you have to search them out - you know in amongst all the other types of chicken?

Poppy: Predominantly yeah they're in the same section in in in in the chicken area. It would potentially be good to have an area where it is maybe just like the corn-fed or the welfare meat for example, so it's easy to navigate so you're not getting lost in the different brands - supermarkets - so yeah sometimes it can be quite challenging to find, depending on where you are.

HM: and leading on from that, is it because the labelling is quite inadequate with regards to the information it provides you at the point of sale?

(47.24) Poppy: Yeah definitely. it's not always clear as you mentioned. I think you know like when you're in the aisles and you've got like the little posters that say like chicken, beef,

lamb? Potentially they could have one for corn-fed or welfare food for example, just just to make it a little bit clearer in terms of where it is in the aisle?

HM: Thank you. Do other people find the same as Poppy?

Andy: Depends where you go with the most part in general yeah

Sophie yeah I think it's pretty much the same. I haven't seen anything being like separated or anything just with everything else.

HM: thank you anybody else? Sorry Andrew I hope you didn't think I was picking on you. Richard I'll hand back to you.

RB: OK thanks. Let's just finish this point off then: these two - three sentences you may find that you don't particularly like any of the given options nevertheless the task is to indicate your preferred option out of the three provided if you find option B or C too expensive please choose option A which represents no change to current animal welfare levels or to your weekly food bill only the welfare levels of the animals shown will be affected by your choices the welfare levels of other animals will remain unaffected Please remember that you have a limited budget and that the more money spent on higher welfare food products means less money for you to spend on other things. Was that clear to everyone?

Poppy: yeah I think it was really clear it it also explained the potential confusion in the task, so it tells you what to do if you do feel a bit confused. I didn't think that the levels of other animals would be affected based off of the task so I mean that point now was really I'd like it was a bit unnecessary - doesn't need to be said it doesn't you know add anything doesn't not do anything but I thought how to pick the options and how to do each one was really clear and cleared up any confusion that I've had when I read the task.

RB: Thank you that's very useful feedback thanks. Anyone else?

Andy: I think the only thing is with the budget ... it said you've got a limited budget but it doesn't quantify it. I just think with some people their budget could easily afford ethical products, whereas for others it would be very different. So I don't know you could monetize the options anyway and specify budget, or something like that?

RB: That's a good point. I think the idea of this is just to remind people that they haven't got ... no one's got unlimited amounts of money and that if they do spend more money on high welfare things they haven't maybe got as much money to spend on, you know what other things they want to want to purchase.

RB: thank you everyone. Let's move on to the choice questions themselves. OK so that set the choice questions up trying to explain to people the sort of rules of the game if you like and this one now says suppose you could only choose one from the three options show so it's just reminding you what you need to do please check the option you would choose numbers represent welfare scores of the animals and products shown and the impact on your weekly food bill but then highs optionally no changing weekly food bill or welfare

scores so the scores are the same as the information given above 40 for laying hands 45 for pigs 45 for dairy cattle and to the food products that come from those animals then you've got two other options so option a is same as we've got now in other words same as you set your same expenditure same welfare levels option B would be a 4 LB increase in weekly food bill and for that your eggs would have a well and the hens that produce them would have a welfare score 60 for pigs and pig meat that would be 50 and for dairy cattle dairy products would be 70 and then option C is a slightly more bigger increase in your weekly food bill £6 but for that you get higher welfare level of 70 for laying hens 90 for pigs and pig meat on the daily one stays the same as option B but is increase from option A. How did people find that question because there's quite a lot there isn't there, to look at and think about ?

Poppy: for me, it was like, with the numbers they seemed a bit random, like the jump from pig in option B to the pig in option C - it's got up by like 40 points, so there are kinda wanna know why? Why has it gone up so much, where is the cow is pretty much stayed the same. There's no difference there, so yeah maybe just been evidence in terms of what they're doing and why I should pay the extra £2 there

HM: sorry, who was trying to talk there? I thought somebody else was going to sort of come in there - who else would like to add to what Poppy's just said?

Charlotte: (a bit crackly) Oh yeah: I think it's I'd like to know why some have jumped so much but some have jumped so little I think in my head it was kind of like I

HM: oh oh Charlotte dropped out I think her connection was quite unstable there - so Josh would you like to carry on while we wait for Charlotte to come back?

Josh: yeah sure. I didn't hear what she said?

HM: What do you feel about the numbers? Both in the £pound increases in money and the the animals welfare scores?

Josh: yeah I think it's presented well on the on the chart – it's easy to understand and yeah I understood it ; it really well is clear. yeah it was eye opening 'cause I didn't know that about this so it was interesting to understand.

RB: so, did you find it an easy question to ... well not easy necessarily ... but but were you OK coming to a to a decision about which option you were going to tick?

Josh: uh yeah yeah I would say so. Yes, it was clear. I kind of knew which one, which ones I would tick.

RB: OK thanks - sorry Jude, I think it was Jude that was wanted to come in? Jude I

HM: I don't know whether he's frozen actually sorry Jude are you there? Charlotte back - while waiting for Jude, Charlotte's company she's obviously having an unstable connection bless her.

Jude: I think the increase in the numbers are for option B and option C is quite ... there's not much difference - and less for the pig meat, so for me I would go with option B and also I would like to know why this, why is the price for option B and option C - there's a huge increase. For option B it's actually four, then for option C it's actually six. Or if we look at the charts for the eggs just 60 then for the that option C is 70. So the numbers are quite ... I would say that's not too much difference as compared to how much I'm actually paying for Option C. I think option C is quite expensive compared to option B, whilst there's a little bit of increase you know in the welfare levels or the welfare score rather. So for me, I will go with option B [good] but then if I'm actually going to choose option C I would like to know, why the difference is actually quite low and also why is the money which is being added is quite, you know expensive compared to option B, so I would like to know about that also too.

RB: thank you I think your reasoning makes complete sense. I suppose in a practical way the increase in the money - it would cost a lot to get pigs from 50 to 90 – ninety's are very high welfare level so farmers would have to do a lot of things to get pigs up to 90

HM: and then of course the farmers won't do that for nothing

Jude: how about how about the the the eggs and also the cattle? Because the cattle didn't change - for dairy rather sorry. It didn't change a thing which option B and option C which says 70, so I would like to know what would they do to, you know, kind of push the score from 70 to something like, I would say 90? Then for the dairies it could be something like 90 also too but it's it's not change. It means that there's a lot of work that's being put in for the pig meat compared to the eggs and also the dairy product .

RB: yeah that's a good point I think in reality too but what we'll end up doing in the questionnaire is giving people five or six of these questions to answer and in some of those scenarios some of those choices the welfare score of capital will increase a lot more as indeed will the score for eggs and some people have different species as well to look at so I think when we, you know when we do a big survey of probably thousands of people across the UK on this we'll be at a cover over species and all the levels. But I think what you're saying is, it makes it slightly confusing for the one person filling out a questionnaire why have why have they got you know why they got here

Jude: yes – that's it, yeah

RB: OK that's a good point thank you. We'll think about that one and see how we can overcome it.

HM: Charlotte sorry you obviously fell out - your connection was a little bit unstable you were halfway through saying what you were thinking

Charlotte: yeah sorry I don't know what's happening with my Internet. I think I agree. I think it's difficult to know, you know how is that been affected. Like is it easier to get one animal to a really high level vs a more medium level - which suggests for 6 ? increase or you know is it particularly difficult to get you know dairy products to a really high amount. I think that

would just something that maybe would need to be clarified, which I think some other people have said

RB: Thank you

HM: yeah thanks. Poppy?

Poppy: I was gonna just say - it's already been said, so we just rewording things differently - how the consistency, just about the the consistency: from A to B of 20 for eggs, 5 for the pig and then quite a bigger increase for dairy - but it just doesn't, like yeah I'd be willing to pay the £4 for perhaps the dairy and egg increase, but for a 5 increase to £4 for me isn't justified. But I don't fit into that category but then I don't want to press £6 so it was just ... I think you covered it though - how there would be more options and that would probably sort that issue out. But yeah, it's just about the varying jumps between the numbers

RB: Very good, very good points. We're going to have to have to think about that because the scores are moving around a lot between the species. When we do the stats on people's responses we can work out whether their particular species that they that they are prepared to pay more to increase their welfare than other species

Poppy: yeah I mean the alternative could be just having a couple questions on eggs, a couple of questions on pig meat and a couple of questions on dairy, rather than like putting them all together. You know would you pay X amount for X to go from 40 to 60, 60 to 70 etc etc then another question ... You know separate them, rather than putting them all into the same category. I don't think ... there's no benefit to having them all in the same category, and that could avoid certain confusion potentially?

Baba: I disagree. I prefer having them in the same categories sorry shows like maybe you have a preference to a certain kind of animal, it does like make it much much easier

HM: sorry Baba your connection is slipping in and out a bit there

Baba: I'm sorry I'm sorry if you might have missed me. I said that I prefer to have it as it is right now

HM: yeah we heard that you disagreed, and you were just explaining why. Thank you

RB: yeah that's good thanks

HM: Sophie:

Sophie: I think my main thing for this one again, is just that I can't really picture what that increase looks like, especially with the massive jumps- so you're paying I know that it's also a group together but the way that I see that you're paying £4 extra for a 5% increase, or whatever it is, and then an extra £2 to go up 40%. This seems a bit unrealistic to me. I'm also what does that mean like what what's it going from too like *how* much better is the animal

welfare and, as a knock-on effect how much better is the product that I'm buying? Like is it worth that extra money or I don't know and (1.04.48)

HM: Andy, have you any thoughts on that?

Andy: not really - nothing to add to be honest.

RB: OK I think at the end of the day the important thing for us, even if some of these options look slightly weird to you, is: was it easy - reasonably straightforward - for you to decide which options that you would go with?

Poppy: yeah like you clear what I have to do (I think someone else agreed at the same time but can't work out who) I have to do what I had to decide on,

Charlotte: yeah I think it was really simple - it was clear for me

Jude: It was clear for me

Charlotte: Sorry one thing I was thinking about after we've spoken before about point until I could read amber or green - you could almost highlight the number in a red amber or green if you chose to do that throughout the survey because then people might see if it's going from a red to an amber but that's not as good as going from an amber to a green. I don't know it depends if you adapted that idea.

RB: Thank you that's a really interesting idea. yeah thank you. We've got a lot to think about here with how we present these questions.

HM: and the other thing is of course this is going to be an online questionnaire and we've already we think that we've already provided the people who are going to fill it in with a lot of information. Giving the information as to what a 60 versus a 70 for each of the species or a 40 versus a 90 would take an awful lot of further information. I take Poppy's point about putting references in, but this is exploratory work and we will hope to publish and hope to get references to approve what we're doing, but I'm finding it difficult from our side of the fence to how we get that information into the questionnaire for you that you're saying that you want - to make those sort of decisions. I mean it's good that you obviously find it the question well written and clear and easy as to what to do - but I'm not sure how we can provide the information that a lot of you are saying you want to make those decisions and I don't I'm just trying to ... I mean this is for Richard and me to obviously go away and square that circle but I just thought I'd throw it over there and see if there's any any of you who can think of how we get you the information you want in what format because obviously it would be in probably another very dense copy filled slide like the previous one and I'm not sure whether that's acceptable in a quick online survey really but if we if we have to do it to get the you know to make it as good a survey as we can be but we would do that but I thought I'd ask you what you thought?

Sophie: I don't know maybe if there was like a compilation of some information at the end of the survey, with some references and with some like - you know if you're interested to read

more here are some articles or whatever. And then, I don't know - as though maybe if there was a follow-up kind of being like having read these articles, if you did read them would you change your answers, and sort of see if that has any effect?

HM: that's a really interesting idea, thank you

RB: Yeah A depth bit of research: that would be interesting wouldn't it? I'm aware that time is ticking and I do want to get on with the with the get to the to the two weddings to pay questions let's just go to the next slide because this is very similar but slightly different slightly different welfare levels and different monetary amounts any just any points about this one that are different from the points you've made in the previous slide. Again could you choose the options? Was it a task you could do?

Sophie: I think it was something you could do but this one did feel slightly harder - just because a £5 increase feels like quite a lot for some reason. If it's less than £5 it feels like it's quite easy to make that back somewhere else. But I think here, if there was an option for a three-point increase I'd probably tick that straight away and not really think about it - but the fact that my only option is no change or £5 feels like a bigger decision.

RB: Ah. OK that's interesting.

Poppy: yeah I'd agree with that as well, it seems quite sharp: £5 does seem a lot with comparisons like £3 or £4. I don't know if that's just like psychological but it does feel like a big increase, especially if there's £7 as well. And again yeah with a point system which just seems a little bit random.

Aimee: I also think yeah sorry I also think going from the £5 increase and the £7 increase but then a decrease in both dairy and eggs - significant for eggs - it it it's just about it's not I don't know: that's just too much of an increase for two things to be decreasing

RB: yeah yeah

Aimee: it didn't really feel like the increase and the decrease - didn't really like match together.

RB: But then does that make it easier for you to know which box you gonna tick Aimee, because yeah what you said you're going to say well I'm not doing options C because that's not going in the right direction for me so

Aimee: I guess I just justified the option that I picked!

RB: OK now that's good, that helps.

Josh: yeah the same with me to be fair. I didn't really understand the eggs to go from 90 to 50 and you're for a £7 increase didn't make sense - but the pig, I get that the pig is increasing from 45 to 90 so that's that kind of covered in a way - if you understand what I mean but ... and then the dairy's also decreasing from 70 to 60 - so I just don't think I could justify

spending £7 increase. £5 is it is quite a lot - just psychological pricing but yes five just does sounds just a lot.

RB: thank you that's really great insight into into your thinking: how you know your thought process is as you were answering these questions that's that's really really useful actually. any anyone else?

Jude: OK for me I think it's the same. I would definitely ... it's quite it's quite easy for me to understand, if if I was to go, it's quite easy for me to understand and which one I would pick. but then seeing the decrease in decrease for the eggs and the increasing the price I would be quite sceptical as to why. I wouldn't pick the option C. I would go with the B. But then I would want to know why. You know there's a decrease in, you know the score level and an increase in the amount you're paying for, so I would want to know why definitely.

RB: OK thank you thanks Jude. OK, let's just spend our last few minutes looking at the next two questions if we can please.

HM: should we skip that one Richard?

RB: I think we will if you don't mind. I'm anxious to get onto OK so this is as you probably realise a different way of asking about your you know how much you be prepared to pay so this says how much per week again as an increase to your usual household food bill would you be willing to pay for a 10 point welfare score increase from their current levels for pigs dairy cows and laying hens that produce your food so this is a 10 point increase from where they currently are for all three of them the species that we've been talking about just now and it gives you some money amounts. How did you find this question and did you feel that it was a clear and B) was it easy for you to decide which box to tick?

Poppy: yeah I think in terms of looking at the question and understanding what to do and if I find it difficult to make a choice I did - and I think it clearly lays out by good options, good money frames, clear content straight to the point I just found this question pretty simple. It doesn't need to be over complicated. I don't. ... I think it was just great. I think it was fine.

RB: Thank you anyone else?

Baba: I actually have a different response. I found the question quite abstract. It was .. I prefer the other questions where [crackle interference] it reminded me a lot of ... because I come from an economics background it reminded me of regression analysis and statistics and it just seems very abstract so for me I found other questions much clearer compared to this

RB: Ah OK thank you Baba

Poppy: Yeah, I quite liked the other question where it told you about what they're currently sitting on level wise, so - you don't know with this question if they're sitting on like level 10 or 20 and you only getting a 10 point increase and potentially you could be ticking more than

50 about (£50?) so I would like to know yeah whereabouts ... is it at 50, is it 60? I'd quite like to know what each species are on first.

RB: interesting yeah sorry carry on ...

Sophie: I was just going to say that I think a reminder of what all the scores currently are would be helpful. but also what that 10 points *actually* does 'cause if it's one of those things of like oh you pay £2 extra and that means that *this* happens ... that this specific thing happened but you pay £4 extra and that means that *this* happens and it you know it's more action then I would be more inclined to pay the £4 extra rather than the £2 extra if I knew like, what was actually happening to that extra money – 'cos the 10 point increase right now just seems a bit abstract, like I have no idea what that means, in real terms

RB: OK so so if there let's just quickly go back to the scale idea. So if it said you know remind you you're quite right reminded you that you know pigs or whatever they were can't member now 50 or 45, dairy cows were fifty laying hens 40 or whatever - and so that that would increase them to 10 and maybe that would move them from red to amber or from amber to green would that give you enough information do you think?

Sophie: [thinking time] Um, Maybe? I think I'd probably still want a little bit more - just a little bit more specifics, like what exact action is being taken? And yeah a visual like amber to green is obviously positive, so

RB: but still two abstract?

Sophie: a little bit yeah yeah

RB: That's that's that's a valid comment. Anyone else?

HM: Andy, did you have any comments on this one as this is quite a differently written question?

RM: Yeah, is this a better question? Do you like this question? Is it easier to think about the previous questions?

Jude: For me I think it's actually, just like Baba said: it seems too too abstract and the increase in the points it's really really - it's not encouraging, so I would definitely just go for the first one. Let's say it's actually £4 on pain for a welfare point of 60 for eggs and let's see: it's an increase of 10 points which makes it 70 and I'm paying an extra £5 on six. I think that it's it's actually not quite ideal, so I would just stick with the initial one

Andy: You need to quantify the 10 points, that's the main thing, yeah

RB: Thank you let's go to the next one and then we'll finish off I think. OK, so this looks to be a very similar question but it is asking you for your value for something very different so this says again how much per week is an increase to your usual household bill food bill would you be willing to pay to support legislation for a 10 point welfare increase from their current

level, for all the pigs, dairy cows and laying hens in the UK that produce our food so before it was for the animals that produce your food you're buying that specifically and other people won't buy that this is for an increase in the welfare score for all animals produced in the UK so all animals would be produced to these levels and all of the food that's produced in the UK would be produced to those levels. So first of all, did you understand that difference and was it, you know was this question clear and then secondly did you find it easy to decide which box to tick?

Charlotte: I think I actually found this question a little bit confusing. When you explained it there it's kind of different to what I initially had, because when I first read it, it kind of suggested to me but we were just sort of paying to have like the legislation put through and put into the law, rather than actually making sure it happened. So the way you explained it was better than the question, I think.

RB: Thank you. Anyone else?

Sophie: I think again it would just be useful to have a bit more information on where exactly the money is going - like is it going towards flyering, is it going towards campaigning? Like what exactly am I actually doing to help by paying that little bit more. And also I think some form of ... yeah when you know when you sign a petition and you can like sign up to be notified about what's going on with the petition and what progress is being made - I'd want something like that where I could see how it was actually progressing, and how close we are to getting to a point where it could be written into law.

RB: OK thank you Sophie; good comments there. Anyone else:

Josh: just like the last question that was worded well and easy to understand it is very similar to the last one I think. Yeah just the way the way it was worded and the context of it.

RB: thank you so I think just to follow on from a couple of those points I think they the reasoning behind this is if there was you legislation to ensure this then the cost of production would necessarily go up 'cause it costs cost money usually to improve welfare. So you would automatically be paying more for the for the food products that you buy for the meat products and dairy products that you buy. And I guess there's an issue here as well that you wouldn't actually have the choice because all producers would have to pay to that would have to produce those higher levels the price of your food would go up and you wouldn't be able to buy cheaper food in the way that you do now: cheaper food that has lower welfare you wouldn't have the option. So I don't know whether that's something that occurs to people or not. And also can I just ask before we close whether people which we're prepared to pay a bit more for this scenario for all of the animals in the UK compared with the previous question where it was really just the animals that produce your food?

Aimee: I think I kind of did the same: I think I kind of just took from both the questions that the outcome is going to be the same for me. If I'm going to be choosing the food with the higher welfare score, I'll be paying this amount. If there's UK legislation I'm still willing to pay that amount - is I've kind of viewed it as the same sort of outcome

Poppy: yeah I agree and it's almost like giving back to the animal itself, and making you feel better about yourself, so the same both them.

RB: OK anyone else? OK so we've got two minutes and then we'll finish. Heather, I'm not going through any remaining questions if you want to just stop sharing your screen. Thank you. thank you very much.

I just wondered if there any final comments that people had obviously the questionnaire you had is not the question that that will that we're using we're experimenting with a number of different question formats and combinations of questions and so on, but I just wondered if there are any other comments that you have about the about the questionnaire that you filled in?

Jude: I do have a question. I would like to know ... I I think that the whole idea of this project is just to kind of give consumers an idea of you know the product, or how healthy the product they're consuming is. Now I would like to know if if where's the point ... what's the point of 60, 70 and also there's also more like ah more like an option whereby the welfare score is low from the charts which is actually displayed previously, so we have normal when you don't have to pay an extra charge or any extra amount, and also that's the one whereby you pay an extra charge, an extra amount because of how healthy the welfare level is. I think probably why not if you're trying to sell you know healthy products and how you consume food why not to make it probably like a general approach to the public? How to effect the costs attached to it, because if we're also if there's this other place to choose I think everybody would want to go with the one which is *far* more healthy than the other one, but then there's a price for it. So why not take the first option and leave the second one? And also then we can start scaling up the price, probably maybe welfare points of 70, welfare points of 100, that would be very helpful to the environment of course, because we want to you know eat healthy products on the [can't make out] about the idea of what you're trying to say I think, it should be that way - rather than just putting all the options together

RB: OK thank you, thank you. We'll take that into account. Anyone else before we close in the last minute?

Baba: Yes the last thing I I would like to point out is that towards the end of this study it asks about your education - and I found that question not clear because it says full time education and I was confused like does it mean secondary school, sixth form, university and even with you if you want to say university is not clear because it like for example if you do an undergraduate degree OK like they did you got full time or part time or if you do the postgraduate to do that full time or part time so I think that question really does need to be clarified I found out the most confusing question of all the questions in this.

RB: Ah thank you thank you well we will investigate that we paid less attention to that as you can tell we paid less attention to those final questions.

HM: I was just going to say thanks for the feedback Baba.

RB: I'm not gonna keep you any longer because we've literally got two minutes before the end and I'm sure you're already for your dinner, or whatever you're gonna do. Thank you all so much. I can't tell you how helpful that feedback has been for us. I hope it's not been too painful for you but it really has been very useful for us. Thank you so much and enjoy the rest of your evening. Thank you thank you bye everyone bye alright bye thank you bye bye

Heather do you want to stay on for just a good OK we got there just about just about didn't we through yes that was not quite as easy I didn't think but I felt we got fantastic feedback actually did you not I

HM: yes I did I thought they were young and I think that came across actually

RB: yeah yeah but we I think we got great feedback. I mean obviously some things that are just there are some issues that are just embedded in the method and of course we would never dream of in the conversation that we had we would never dream of giving them, you know two choice sets and then those two more open questions together because clearly that had you could see the issues that came as a result of one following the other which I think was was was not surprising but also in interesting yeah now I I mean when they switched on you know yeah very very interesting very useful yeah I thought that was equally as useful as the as the first one actually from the point of view of young people feeding back or just generally just generally just generally this did that that they'd obviously really some of them had really thought about what's going on here and it's quite a big leap of faith isn't it

HM: yes but you see I think it's really difficult for you and I, who are immersed and versed in the animal welfare systems yes the information is out there and if you care and you're an activist you will have gone out and seen the stuff online - the chicken welfare stuff for example. But I mean I one or two little niggles for me was the in the spreadsheet provided I mean some of them earning a £150,000!

RB: I know. I was going to raise that with you and one was a student. that was right I know so I don't know whether they were just messing about and thinking oh I'm not telling them what my income is and let's just take that or whether they are fantastically wealthy individuals.

HM: I didn't know Richard and I obviously you can't ask, but you know when Charlotte said she was a primary school ... primary [?] school teacher ... anyway yeah I was thinking there was one person on a low income who was a student from Scotland that might have been Charlotte actually yeah. I looked at those profiles as well I just thought really either they're very atypical in terms of your normal student or I mean that's all the salaries were high apart from one – actually, it was Sophie actually who was still under £20,000. It was Charlotte the teacher was saying she works for £75,000 to £99,999!

RB: You almost have to be a head teacher for that I would have thought you would have to be a head teacher to earn that sort of money

HM: well my my niece is a teacher and I don't think she's on £75k to £99K!

RB: no, no my daughter's a teacher as well and she's certainly not on that

HM: anyway ... I thought that was interesting. The thing for me, I suppose is that we didn't get a discussion going ... and I'm really sorry Richard - I could see all ten of them in small boxes because I had looked into this with FieldworkHub earlier in the week. I don't know if you could? And of course I'd meant to say we should have joined maybe 5 minutes earlier so I could show you. but I mean Charlotte had already joined.

RB: don't worry, you have to do it we do that for next time: not a problem at all. I mean I felt it all went well. I mean it's raised some uncomfortable questions - but that's the point of that that's the point of this, to identify things but no I I I thought it's very helpful. I mean in particular slightly worried that no one said they saw this distinction between the legislation and all animals being affected - and just there's but on the other hand that question was just thrown in there at the end wasn't it yeah the legend suddenly suddenly the ballpark changes without any any fanfare or introduction and that maybe the simplest that

HM: it just felt a bit like me on occasions like pulling teeth - oh what the the focus group did yeah trying to get the info I mean and you say something and where is last week they were all not or whenever it was you know they all willing to contribute there was a lot of long silences and having to prod people I suppose this through and I'm not saying that when we pointed them you didn't get some excellent information 'cause we did but and I if you got the impression you either had to prod what all of them you couldn't just single one out and yet Andy had a different way of thinking - like Baba and Jude did

RB: yeah yeah maybe it's that maybe it's the mixture again you see that I I I don't think you often you don't get such a good debate with a mixture of genders is what I found you know we're doing it in person but no I I mean I yeah I I I actually thought it it went it went very well I mean it may have been I may have just damped down the discussion because I was on a mission to get to that question to get to the to that question at least finally to get through and yeah

HM: I'm sorry I forgot that knows me burbling on something that was really a bit tangential I thought I thought

RB: no no that's fine that's fine but you know I was on a mission to get through to to that question is the final one we discussed which I only just just did but I think sufficiently anyway look go and have a rest thank you again for your your input we have we have one one bold that were set up for that I'll I'll do a final check of the the questionnaire and then we can send off to a FWH next week.