INTERNATIONAL
FOOD POLICY
STUDY

TECHNICAL REPORT

2018 SURVEY (WAVE 2)

FEBRUARY 14, 2024

SUGGESTED CITATION

HAMMOND D, WHITE CM, RYNARD VL, VANDERLEE L. INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY STUDY: TECHNICAL REPORT – 2018 SURVEY (WAVE 2). UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO. FEBRUARY 2024. AVAILABLE AT WWW.FOODPOLICYSTUDY.COM/METHODS

CONTACT

DAVID HAMMOND PhD
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH & HEALTH SYSTEMS
UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
WATERLOO, ON CANADA N2L 3G1
DHAMMOND@UWATERLOO.CA
WWW.DAVIDHAMMOND.CA

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
FACULTY OF APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES
School of Public Health and Health Systems

INTERNATIONAL
FOOD POLICY
STUDY

RESEARCH TEAM

CANADA

David Hammond, School of Public Health and Health Systems, University of Waterloo (PI)
Lana Vanderlee, School of Public Health and Health Systems, University of Waterloo
Sharon Kirkpatrick, School of Public Health and Health Systems, University of Waterloo
Monique Potvin Kent, School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa

AUSTRALIA

Gary Sacks, Collaborating Centre for Obesity Prevention, Deakin University
Adrian Cameron, Collaborating Centre for Obesity Prevention, Deakin University

MEXICO

Simon Barquera, Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública, Mexico
Alejandra Jáuregui de la Mota, Instituto de Salud Pública, Mexico

UNITED KINGDOM

Martin White, Centre for Diet and Activity Research, University of Cambridge
Jean Adams, Centre for Diet and Activity Research, University of Cambridge
Tarra Penney, Centre for Diet and Activity Research, University of Cambridge

UNITED STATES

James Thrasher, Arnold School of Public Health, University of South Carolina
Christina Roberto, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania

FUNDING AND POLICY ON INDUSTRY SUPPORT

METHODS

The primary objective of the International Food Policy Study (IFPS) is to evaluate the impact of national-level food policies. Repeat cross-sectional studies are being conducted in each of five countries—Australia, Canada, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States—to examine dietary patterns and policy-relevant behaviours across countries. The study provides a quasi-experimental design for evaluating federal-level policies by providing both 'within' and 'between-country' measures over time.

SAMPLE & RECRUITMENT

Online surveys were conducted in 2018 with a total of 22,824 respondents from five countries: Australia (n=4,103), Canada (n=4,397), Mexico (n=4,135), the United Kingdom (n=5,549), and the United States (n=4,640). The baseline survey was conducted in December 2017, and the current wave, a 12-month follow-up, was conducted in November-December 2018. A total of 1,383 respondents completed surveys in both waves (6.1% of the Wave 2 sample).

The sample was recruited from the Nielsen Consumer Insights Global Panel, which maintains and/or has partner panels in each country. The panels are recruited using both probability and non-probability sampling methods. The Nielsen panel provides standardized recruitment sampling across countries. For the current study, Nielsen drew random samples stratified for age and sex from the online panels in each country based on the quotas described below.

Quotas for age and sex were applied to facilitate recruitment of a diverse sample that approximated the known proportions in each country for males and females in four age groups: 18-29, 30-44, 45-64, and 65+. Sample targets were also used to recruit a proportion of respondents with low education resembling the population distribution in each country; this was considered a target rather than a strict quota: the Mexico panel had limited sample with low education so the targets could not be strictly enforced. Sample targets were also used to recruit English- and French- speaking respondents in Canada proportional to the population distribution; and to recruit Spanish-speaking respondents in the US to facilitate comparisons between Hispanic respondents in the US and respondents in Mexico (note: no age quotas were applied in the US Spanish survey).

Individuals were eligible to participate if they were 18 years of age or older, and resided in the target country. Email invitations with unique survey access links were sent to a random sample of panelists within each country after targeting for demographics; panelists known to be ineligible were not invited. A restriction on small screen size was applied to ensure that images presented in the survey could be viewed with a minimum amount of scrolling. Consequently, respondents were only allowed to access the survey using a laptop, desktop computer or tablet (smartphones were disqualified). Potential respondents were screened for eligibility and quota requirements using age, sex, and device screen size. After screening, all potential respondents were provided with information about the study and were asked to provide consent before participating.

Respondents received remuneration in accordance with their panel's usual incentive structure, which includes points-based or monetary rewards (redeemed for catalog items, as cash or donated) and/or chances to win monthly prizes. These incentives have been shown to increase response rates and decrease response bias in sub-groups under-represented in surveys, including disadvantaged subgroups.[1,2,3]

All data collection was conducted online, which provides several advantages, including the use of product images to assess beverage consumption and in experimental tasks, and the use of 'skip patterns' and questionnaire routing to account for differential patterns of use. Online surveys can also reduce social desirability bias, compared to in-person and phone surveys, by providing greater anonymity for sensitive topics such as weight bias and stigma.[4,5]

Online survey methods are well-established, and are emerging as the preferred mode for population-based surveys given declining response rates from random digit dialled (RDD) phone surveys.[6,7,8,9] Until recently, online surveys were constrained by limited internet penetration. However, internet penetration now exceeds "landlines", even among lower socioeconomic groups: in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, internet usage in the population approximates 90% or more.[10,11,12,13] Internet penetration is lower in Mexico, but still widespread with nearly two-thirds of Mexicans using the internet.[14]

PARTICIPATION RATES

Table 1 indicates the number of survey invitations sent in each country. The survey was 'closed' when target quotas were met. For commercial panels that include non-probability based sample, the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) recommends reporting the 'participation rate', also referred to a 'completion rate'. The participation rate is defined as "the number of respondents who have provided a usable response divided by the total number of initial personal invitations requesting participation".[15] Participation rates are largely a product of sample management and the amount of sample that is 'released' prior to reaching target quotas.

Participation rates for eligible participants were calculated for the current study as follows:

Participation Rate = Completes / Total Eligible Invites

Total Eligible Invites = Unknown Eligible - [Unknown Eligible * (Ineligible / (Known Eligible + Unknown Eligible + Ineligible))] + Eligible, no consent + Completes

Unknown Eligible = Did not access survey + Accessed survey, unknown eligibility

The total participation rate was 6.5%. As shown in Table 1, 439,821 invitations were sent to panelists; 33,859 potential respondents (7.7%) accessed the survey link; and 22,824 respondents (5.2%) completed the IFPS survey and were retained in the sample.

The cooperation rate represents "the proportion of all cases interviewed of all eligible units ever contacted".[15] Across all countries, the cooperation rate was 69.2%, which was calculated based on AAPOR Cooperation Rate #2, as the percentage of respondents who completed the survey (22,824) of those eligible who accessed the survey link (32,992).

TABLE 1: Dispositions of potential respondents for the International Food Policy Study, by country, 2018

Disposition	Total		Australia		Canada		Mexico		United Kingdom		United States	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Invitations sent	439,821		65,765		69,960		151,978		61,512		90,606	
Did not access survey	405,962	92.3	60,189	91.5	63,221	90.4	145,995	96.1	53,157	86.4	83,400	92.0
Total accessed survey	33,859	7.7	5,576	8.5	6,739	9.6	5,983	3.9	8,355	13.6	7,206	8.0
Accessed survey link, unknown eligibility[a]	646	0.1	70	0.1	104	0.1	194	0.1	131	0.2	147	0.2
Eligible, no consent	3,679	0.8	414	0.6	1036	1.5	360	0.2	932	1.5	937	1.0
Ineligible[b]	850	0.2	72	0.1	181	0.3	151	0.1	195	0.3	251	0.3
Completes	28,684	6.5	5,020	7.6	5,418	7.7	5,278	3.5	7,097	11.5	5,871	6.5
Excluded, data quality[c]	5,860	1.3	917	1.4	1,021	1.5	1,143	0.8	1,548	2.5	1,231	1.4
No/ineligible region	4,765	1.1	704	1.1	822	1.2	991	0.7	1,260	2.0	988	1.1
Fail data quality check	818	0.2	175	0.3	137	0.2	138	0.1	209	0.3	159	0.2
Speeding	224	0.1	31	0.0	60	0.1	7	0.0	66	0.1	60	0.1
Other quality issue	53	0.0	7	0.0	2	0.0	7	0.0	13	0.0	24	0.0
Complete, retained	22,824	5.2	4,103	6.2	4,397	6.3	4,135	2.7	5,549	9.0	4,640	5.1

[a] Respondent closed the survey link before the age and sex screening questions were completed and eligibility determined
[b] Respondent screened ineligible due to ineligible age (<18)
[c] Respondent quit the survey prior to completing the region question, otherwise failed to state their region, or stated their region as in another country or an ineligible region (i.e., a territory in Canada), and/or failed to answer or incorrectly answered the data quality check question,"What is the current month?", and/or completed the survey in less than 15 minutes, indicating "speeding" and presumably lack of attention, and/or had unreasonable or extreme responses to at least three of 16 open-ended measures.

SURVEY CONTENT AND DEVELOPMENT

The study assessed seven primary policy domains: price/taxation, food packaging and labelling, retail food policies, food marketing, nutritional labelling in restaurants, nutrition information and education, and food guide/dietary recommendations. The study has a particular focus on sugary drink policies and beverage intake, in addition to the following consumer perceptions and behaviours: sources of food purchases and food preparation, weight loss behaviour, nutrition knowledge, food security, and weight bias/stigma. In Canada only, respondents were also asked to complete a 24-hour dietary recall.

The majority of questionnaire items were drawn or adapted from national surveys or selected based on previous research. Several new measures were also developed by the research team. Cognitive interviewing was previously conducted with 50 young adults in Canada to evaluate and improve several new items including the food source and beverage frequency measures.[16,17]

Surveys were conducted in English in Australia and the United Kingdom; Spanish in Mexico; English or French in Canada; and English or Spanish in the United States (based on the panelist's known language preference). The 2017 baseline questionnaire was translated to French by Communications Parisella, etc. Inc (Montreal, Canada) and Spanish by Benton & Associates (Mexico City, Mexico), with updates to both French and Spanish surveys completed in 2018 by Communications Parisella, etc. Inc. Members of the research team who were native in each language reviewed the French and Spanish translations independently, and confirmed nutrition-related terminology.

Surveys were also adapted for country-specific terminology (e.g., "soda or pop" in Canada vs. "fizzy drinks" in the United Kingdom). Survey teams in each country also reviewed beverage and food lists and images to ensure that the measures were representative of the products available in each market.

The median survey completion time across countries was 40 minutes (see Table 2 for time, by country).

TABLE 2: Median survey time, by country, 2018

Country	Median survey time
	minutes
Australia	39
Canada - overall [a]	37
Canada – English[a]	36
Canada – French [a]	40
Mexico	49
United Kingdom	38
United States - overall	37
United States – English	37
United States – Spanish	48
OVERALL	40

[a] Median survey time for Canada excludes time to complete ASA24 dietary recall.

ASA24 DIETARY RECALL

In Canada, respondents completed the 'main' survey described above, and then were redirected to a US National Institutes of Health website to complete a 24-hour dietary recall. The dietary recall data were collected and analyzed using the Automated Self-Administered 24-hour Recall (ASA24®) system, version ASA24-Canada-2016, developed by the National Cancer Institute.[18] The intake frame was from midnight to midnight of the previous day. Respondents were required to complete reporting in a single session. Modules for 'location', 'ate with' and 'supplements' were turned on in the ASA24 system. Dietary recall data were not collected in Australia, Mexico, the United Kingdom, or the United States. A total of 3,301 respondents in Canada (75.1%) completed the 24-hour dietary recall (subject to additional data cleaning).

DATA INTEGRITY

As a data integrity check, part of the way through the survey, respondents were asked to select the current month from a list. The month selected by the respondent was compared to the month when the survey was submitted (November or December). Respondents who failed to answer the question and those with month discrepancies were excluded from the analytic sample, unless the selected month was within two days of the date the survey was submitted (e.g., selected November but submitted on December 1st or 2nd).

Respondents who completed the survey in less than 15 minutes were considered "speeders". The median survey completion time was substantially longer at 40 minutes, thus those who completed in less than 15 minutes would have presumably lacked attention when responding to the survey questions, and consequently were excluded from the analytic sample.

Additional data integrity analyses were conducted during data cleaning. A total of 16 numeric or text open-ended measures were reviewed within which problematic responses were flagged. The numeric open-ended measures reviewed included beverage intake amounts, fruit and vegetable consumption amounts, and self-reported height and weight. The text open-ended measures reviewed included descriptions of public education campaigns, responses to the newest vital sign allergy measure, as well as 'other' responses for the types of locations where meals were prepared away from home, types of fast-food or quick service restaurants, purchase locations for food prepared at home, occupation, gender, children's age, living situations, special diets or weight loss programs, menu labelling information locations, and ethnicity. Participants who had unreasonable

responses, such as extreme numeric values, nonsensical typing, or response content not related to the survey question, for at least three of these measures were excluded from the analytic sample.

ETHICS CLEARANCE

The study was reviewed by and received ethics clearance through a University of Waterloo Research Ethics Committee (ORE # 21460).

SURVEY WEIGHTS

Post-stratification sample weights were constructed for each country separately based on known population totals by age, sex at birth, region, ethnicity (except in Canada), and education (except in Mexico). Respondents were classified into sex-by-age-by-region groups, ethnicity-by-region groups (except in Canada) and education groups (except in Mexico). Corresponding census data from each country were obtained.[19,20,21,22,23] Separately by country, a raking algorithm was applied to compute weights that are calibrated to these groupings. The SAS macro "RAKE_AND_TRIM_G4_V5" was used, with trimming to 5 (rescaled) if necessary.[24,25] Finally, the weights were rescaled to equal the sample size in each country.

Note: as described on page 10, the original approach to weighting ethnicity in the United States was enhanced in October 2021, with revised weights constructed retroactively for the 2018-2019 data; any new papers using the 2018-2019 US data should use these revised weights.

The tables below indicate the age, sex at birth, region, ethnicity and education categories used for weighting by country.

AUSTRALIA

Age groups	Sex at birth	Regions	Ethnicity	Education
1) 18-29 years	1) Male	1) New South Wales	1) Speak language other than English in the home	1) Year 12 or lower
2) 30-44 years	2) Female	2) Victoria		2) Trade certificate/diploma/ some university (below bachelor's level)
3) 45-59 years		3) Queensland	2) Speak English only in the home	
4) 60+ years		4) Western Australia		3) Bachelor's degree or more
		5) South Australia		
		6) Tasmania/Australian Capital Territory/ Northern Territory		

Note: Respondents from Tasmania, Australian Capital Territory and Northern Territory were collapsed into one category due to small sample sizes. This means that the Australian data are adjusted to the age, sex and ethnicity of the five larger states but not to Tasmania, Australian Capital Territory, nor Northern Territory individually.

The survey weights for Australia ranged from 0.26 to 5.03.

CANADA

Age groups	Sex at birth	Regions	Education
1) 18-29 years	1) Male	1) Atlantic Provinces	1) Less than high school diploma
2) 30-44 years	2) Female	2) Quebec	2) High school diploma
3) 45-59 years		3) Ontario	3) Trade certificate/diploma/ some university (below bachelor's level)
4) 60+ years		4) Prairie Provinces	
		5) British Columbia	4) Bachelor's degree or more

Note: 2 respondents from the Northwest Territories and 2 respondents from Nunavut were excluded from the sample. Ethnicity was not incorporated in the development of weights for Canada due to inconsistent collection methods/response options used in national surveys/census.

The survey weights in Canada ranged from 0.41 to 5.02.

MEXICO

Age groups		Sex at birth	Regions	Ethnicity
Centre / Mexico City Regions	*North / South Regions*	1) Male	1) North region	1) Indigenous
1) 18-29 years	1) 18-29 years	2) Female	2) South region	2) Not Indigenous
2) 30-44 years	2) 30-44 years		3) Centre region	
3) 45-54 years	3) 45+ years		4) Mexico City region	
4) 55+ years				

Note: Upper age group categories were altered due to small sample sizes for females aged 60+ years, with further collapsing of age groups required for the North and South Regions. Education was not incorporated in the development of weights for Mexico because the proportion of respondents with lower educational attainment was much smaller than in population estimates from census data.

The survey weights for Mexico ranged from 0.19 to 5.03.

UNITED KINGDOM

Age groups	Sex at birth	Regions	Ethnicity	Education
1) 18-29 years	1) Male	1) North East	1) White alone	1) No qualification/Level 1
2) 30-44 years	2) Female	2) North West	2) Other	2) Level 2 (incl. 5+ O level, etc.)/ Apprenticeship/Foreign qualification (level unknown)/ not stated
3) 45-59 years		3) Yorkshire and the Humber		
4) 60+ years		4) East Midlands		
		5) West Midlands		
Northern Ireland		6) East of England		3) Level 3 (incl. 2+ A levels, etc)
1) 18-44 years		7) London		4) Level 4 (incl. degree or higher / professional qualifications)
2) 45+ years		8) South East		
		9) South West		
		10) Scotland		
		11) Wales		
		12) Northern Ireland		

Note: Age group categories were collapsed for Northern Ireland only due to small sample sizes in the region.

The survey weights for the United Kingdom ranged from 0.26 to 5.05.

UNITED STATES

Age groups	Sex at birth	Regions	Ethnicity	Education
1) 18-29 years	1) Male	1) New England	1) White alone and not hispanic	1) 11th Grade or lower
2) 30-44 years	2) Female	2) Middle Atlantic	2) Other	2) High school diploma
3) 45-59 years		3) East North Central		3) Associates's degree / vocational certificate
4) 60+ years		4) West North Central		4) Bachelor's degree or more
		5) South Atlantic		
		6) East South Central		
		7) West South Central		
		8) Mountain		
		9) Pacific		

The survey weights for the United States ranged from 0.21 to 5.01.

In October 2021, revised US weights were constructed retroactively for the 2018-2019 datasets, and should be used in any new papers. Papers completed before 2022 using data from the 2018-2019 survey waves employed weights for US respondents where ethnicity was coded as 'White alone' (regardless of Hispanic status) or 'Other'. When calculating the revised weights, ethnicity was categorized as 'White alone and not Hispanic' or 'Other' to better align with census estimates. Any new papers using the 2018-2019 US data should use these revised weights.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The demographic characteristics of the sample, by country, are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3: Sample Demographics, by country, 2018 n=22,824

Disposition	Australia n=4,103		Canada n=4,397		Mexico n=4,135		United Kingdom n=5,549		United States n=4,640	
	Unweighted % (n)	Weighted % (n)	Unweighted % (n)	Weighted % (n)	Unweighted % (n)	Weighted % (n)	Unweighted % (n)	Weighted % (n)	Unweighted % (n)	Weighted % (n)
Sex										
Male	48.5% (1,988)	49.1% (2,015)	47.8% (2,100)	49.3% (2,168)	52.8% (2,182)	47.6% (1,967)	48.8% (2,709)	48.8% (2,709)	48.2% (2,235)	48.7% (2,260)
Female	51.5% (2,115)	50.9% (2,088)	52.2% (2,297)	50.7% (2,229)	47.2% (1,953)	52.4% (2,168)	51.2% (2,840)	51.2% (2,840)	51.8% (2,405)	51.3% (2,380)
Age										
(mean; SD)	49.1 years (SD=16.77)	46.5 years (SD=16.87)	49.5 years (SD=16.38)	48.1 years (SD=17.02)	36.2 years (SD=12.42)	39.4 years (SD=13.92)	49.0 years (SD=17.41)	48.0 years (SD=17.24)	48.0 years (SD=16.66)	46.8 years (SD=16.69)
Education										
Low	30.9% (1,266)	42.0% (1,724)	24.6% (1,081)	42.3% (1,859)	19.4% (803)	19.9% (822)	27.6% (1,529)	48.3% (2,679)	32.5% (1,506)	58.7% (2,723)
Medium	35.4% (1,454)	32.2% (1,320)	38.6% (1,699)	33.1% (1,455)	11.5% (477)	13.2% (547)	28.0% (1,551)	22.9% (1,272)	22.0% (1,023)	9.7% (452)
High	33.6% (1,377)	25.6% (1,052)	36.3% (1,596)	24.1% (1,061)	68.9% (2,848)	66.8% (2,761)	44.0% (2,443)	28.2% (1,563)	45.3% (2,102)	31.4% (1,455)
Not stated	0.1% (6)	0.2% (7)	0.5% (21)	0.5% (22)	0.5% (7)	0.1% (6)	0.5% (26)	0.6% (35)	0.2% (9)	0.2% (9)
Ethnicity										
Majority	85.8% (3,521)	75.2% (3,087)	77.2% (3,394)	76.6% (3,367)	82.7% (3,420)	77.5% (3,205)	89.9% (4,990)	88.0% (4,883)	74.9% (3,476)	63.7% (2,954)
Minority	13.8% (567)	24.4% (1,002)	20.1% (882)	20.0% (879)	15.4% (636)	20.8% (862)	9.1% (507)	11.1% (615)	24.5% (1,135)	35.5% (1,648)
Not stated	0.4% (15)	0.3% (14)	2.8% (121)	3.4% (151)	1.9% (79)	1.7% (68)	0.9% (52)	0.9% (50)	0.6% (29)	0.8% (38)
BMI										
Underweight	2.6% (106)	3.0% (125)	3.0% (133)	3.2% (142)	2.2% (93)	2.1% (88)	2.9% (162)	3.0% (165)	2.9% (136)	3.2% (148)
Normal weight	34.6% (1,418)	35.7% (1,465)	33.7% (1,481)	33.1% (1,457)	40.9% (1,691)	39.8% (1,647)	36.0% (1,997)	34.3% (1,901)	32.0% (1,484)	30.7% (1,424)
Overweight	27.6% (1,131)	25.9% (1,063)	29.7% (1,307)	28.4% (1,247)	29.6% (1,222)	29.5% (1,221)	27.5% (1,524)	26.3% (1,460)	28.8% (1,336)	27.2% (1,260)
Obese	22.2% (911)	20.6% (846)	23.5% (1,034)	23.9% (1,051)	14.9% (616)	15.4% (639)	15.7% (869)	16.4% (912)	26.1% (1,209)	26.5% (1,229)
Missing	13.1% (537)	14.7% (603)	10.1% (442)	11.4% (500)	12.4% (513)	13.1% (541)	17.9% (997)	20.0% (1,111)	10.2% (475)	12.5% (578)

COMPARISONS WITH NATIONAL BENCHMARK SURVEYS

Australia

Table 4 compares estimates of education, ethnicity, and BMI from Wave 2 (2018) with Australian estimates from the Australian Census of Population and Housing conducted in August 2016 and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) collected in 2014.

TABLE 4: Prevalence estimates for education, ethnicity and BMI in Australia

Table 4a. Education	Census of Population and Housing 2016, age 15+ [a]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,103)
	%	Weighted %
No qualification	39.9	42.0 [b]
Vocational	18.8	12.3
Advanced diploma or diploma	8.9	19.8 [c]
Bachelor or higher degree	22.0	25.7
Not stated	9.5	0.3

[a] Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2016 Census of Population and Housing: Highest qualification achieved 2016. Available at: https://profile.id.com.au/australia/qualifications.
[b] IFPS estimate includes 'Did not complete secondary school' and 'Year 12 or equivalent'.
[c] IFPS estimate includes 'Diploma or certificate from CAE' and 'Some university, or university certificate/diploma below the bachelor's level'.

Table 4b. Ethnicity	Census of Population and Housing 2016, all ages [d]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,103)
	%	Weighted %
Only speaks English at home	72.7	76.5
Speaks a language besides English at home	20.8	23.2
Not stated	6.5	0.3

[d] Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2016 Census of Population and Housing: Language spoken at home, 2016. Available at: https://profile.id.com.au/australia/language.

Table 4c. BMI	OECD 2014, age 15+, measured [e]	IFPS 2018, age 18+, self-reported (n=4,103)
	%	Weighted %
Overweight or obese	63.4	54.6

[e] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Overweight or obese population: Measured, 2014. Available at: https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm. Source data obtained from 2014 National Health Survey.

Canada

Table 5 compares estimates of education, ethnicity, and BMI from Wave 2 (2018) with Canadian estimates from the Canadian Census conducted in 2016, the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) conducted in 2015 and 2016, and OECD collected in 2015 and 2016.

TABLE 5: Prevalence estimates for education, ethnicity and BMI in Canada

Table 5a. Education	Census 2016, age 15+ [a]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,397)
	%	Weighted %
No certificate, diploma or degree	18.3	16.3
Secondary (high) school diploma or equivalency certificate	26.5	26.0
Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma	9.8	7.4
College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma	19.4	17.2
University certificate or diploma below bachelor level	2.8	8.5
University certificate, diploma or degree at bachelor level or above	23.3	24.2

[a] Statistics Canada. Census 2016 – Education Highlight Tables: Highest level of educational attainment (general), age groups 15 years and over, both sexes, 2016. Available at: https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/hlt-fst/edu-sco/Table.cfm?Lang=E&T=11&Geo=00&SP=1&view=2&age=1&sex=1

Table 5b. Ethnicity	CCHS 2015, age 12+ [b]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,397)
	%	Weighted %
White / European only	77.0	76.6
Chinese only	3.3	5.3
South Asian only	3.4	2.1
Black only	2.0	1.7
Indigenous inclusive	4.7	4.0
Mixed/other/not stated/missing	9.6	10.4

[b] Statistics Canada. 2015 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS): Ethnic origin, 2015.

Table 5c. BMI	OECD 2015, age 18+, measured [c]	OECD 2016, age 15+, self-reported [d]	CCHS 2016, age 18+, adjusted self-report [e]	IFPS 2018, age 18+, self-reported (n=4,397)
	%	%	%	Weighted %
Overweight or obese	64.1	53.1	--	59.0
Obese	--	--	26.5	27.0

[c] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Overweight or obese population: Measured, 2015. Available at: https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm. Source data obtained from the 2015 Canadian Health Measures Survey (CHMS).

[d] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Overweight or obese population: Self-reported, 2016. Available at: https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm. Source data obtained from the 2016 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS).

[e] Statistics Canada. Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS): Body mass index, overweight or obese, self-reported, adult, age groups (18 years and older), 2016. Available at: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1310009620.

Mexico

Table 6 compares estimates of education, ethnicity, and BMI from Wave 2 (2018) with Mexican estimates from the Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI) conducted in 2010, Encuesta Intercensal conducted in 2015, and OECD collected in 2016.

TABLE 6: Prevalence estimates for education, ethnicity and BMI in Mexico

Table 6a. Education	INEGI 2010, age 15+ [a]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,135)
	%	Weighted %
Ninguno	6.9	0.1
Prescolar	0.3	0.0
Primaria	28.9	0.4
Secundaria	27.3	3.7
Estudios técnicos o comerciales con primaria terminada	0.6	0.3
Educación media superior [b]	19.4	18.5
Educación superior [c]	16.6	76.9

[a] Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI): Censo de Población y Vivienda 2010: Tabulados del Cuestionario Básico. Fecha de elaboración: 28/02/2011. Available at: https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/programas/ccpv/2010/tabulados/Basico/07_14B_ESTATAL.xls.
[b] Includes: Preparatoria o bachillerato; Normal básica; Estudios técnicos o comerciales con secundaria terminada
[c] Includes: Estudios técnicos o comerciales con preparatoria terminada; Normal de licenciatura; Licenciatura/professional; Maestría; Doctorado

Table 6b. Ethnicity	Encuesta Intercensal 2015, all ages[d]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,135)
	%	Weighted %
Indigenous	21.5	20.8
Not indigenous/not stated	78.5	79.2

[d] National Institute of Statistics, Geography and Data Processing. Encuesta Intercensal: Principales resultados, 2015. Available at: http://internet.contenidos.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/productos/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/nueva_estruc/promo/eic_2015_presentacion.pdf.

Table 6c. BMI	OECD 2016, age 15+, measured [e]	IFPS 2018, age 18+, self-reported (n=4,135)
	%	Weighted %
Overweight or obese	72.5	51.8

[e] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Overweight or obese population: Measured, 2016. Available at: https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm. Source data obtained from the 2016 Encuesta Nacional de Salud y Nutrición (ENSANUT).

United Kingdom

Table 7 compares estimates of education, ethnicity, and BMI from Wave 2 (2018) with British estimates from the UK Census conducted in March 2011 and OECD collected in 2016.

TABLE 7: Prevalence estimates for education, ethnicity and BMI in the United Kingdom

Table 7a. Education	UK Census 2011, age 18+, England and Wales [a]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=5,549)
	%	Weighted %
No qualifications	22.6	9.6
Level 1	13.0	27.4
Level 2	14.1	18.2
Apprenticeship	3.7	2.6
Level 3	12.2	12.1
Level 4+	28.6	28.2
Other[b]	5.8	1.8

[a] Office for National Statistics. 2011 Census – Key Statistics for England and Wales, 2011. Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/2011censuskeystatisticsforenglandandwales/2012-12-11.

[b] In the IFPS 2018 data, the 'other' category includes foreign qualifications (if level unknown) and 'not stated' responses.

Table 7b. Ethnicity	UK Census 2011, all ages [c]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=5,549)
	%	Weighted %
White (including Gypsy/Traveller/Irish Traveller)	87.2	88.0
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups	2.0	3.7
Asian/Asian British	2.3	4.8
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	3.0	2.3
Other Ethnic Group	0.9	0.3

[c] Office for National Statistics. 2011 Census – Ethnic group, local authorities in the United Kingdom, 2011. Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/2011censuskeystatisticsandquickstatisticsforlocalauthoritiesintheunitedkingdompart1.

Table 7c. BMI	OECD 2016, age 16+, measured [d]	IFPS 2018, age 18+, self-reported (n=5,549)
	%	Weighted %
Overweight or obese	61.4	53.5

[d] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Overweight or obese population: Measured, 2016. Available at: https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm. Source data obtained from 2016 Health Survey for England (England only).

United States

Table 8 compares estimates of education, ethnicity, and BMI from Wave 2 (2018) with American estimates from the US Current Population Survey conducted in 2017, American Community Survey (ACS) conducted in 2018 and OECD collected in 2016.

TABLE 8: Prevalence estimates for education, ethnicity and BMI in the United States

Table 8a. Education	Current Population Survey 2017, age 18+ [a]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,640)
	%	Weighted %
8th grade or lower	3.7	3.1
9th grade	1.4	1.5
10th grade	1.7	2.2
11th grade	4.2	4.2
High school graduate or some college with no degree	47.7	47.8
Associate's degree	9.8	9.8
Bachelor's degree or more	31.4	31.4

[a] U.S. Census Bureau. Current Population Survey: Educational Attainment in the United States: 2017. Available at: https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2017/demo/education-attainment/cps-detailed-tables.html.

Table 8b. Ethnicity	ACS 2018, all ages [b]	IFPS 2018, age 18+ (n=4,640)
	%	%
White only (and not Hispanic)	61.1	63.7
Black or African American only (and not Hispanic)	12.3	9.3
Other race only (and not Hispanic)	6.5	6.4
Two or more races, and/or Hispanic	20.2	19.8
Not stated	--	0.8

[b] U.S. Census Bureau. 2016 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2018. Available at: https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?d=ACS%205-Year%20Estimates%20Data%20Profiles&table=DP05&tid=ACSDP5Y2018.DP05.

Table 8c. BMI	OECD 2016, age 20-74, measured [c]	OECD 2016, age 15+, self-reported [d]	IFPS 2018, age 18+, self-reported (n=4,640)
	%	%	Weighted %
Overweight or obese	71.0	65.1	61.3

[c] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Overweight or obese population: Measured, 2016. Available at: https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm. Source data obtained from the 2016 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES).

[d] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Overweight or obese population: Self-reported, 2016. Available at: https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm. Source data obtained from the 2016 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS).

REFERENCES

1. Groves RM. Fowler FJ, Couper MP, Lepkowski JM, Singer E, Tourangeau R. Survey Methodology, 2nd Edition. John Wiley & Sons. 2009.

2. Groves R. Non-response rates and non-response bias in household surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly. 2006; 70(5):646–75.

3. Juan D, Barón JK, Bruenig RV, Cobb-Clark D, Gørgens T, Sartbayeva A. Does the Effect of Incentive Payments on Survey Response Rates Differ by Income Support History? Institute for the Study of Labor. 2008. Discussion Paper No. 3473. Available from: http://ftp.iza.org/dp3473.pdf

4. Dennis MJ, Li R. More honest answers to surveys? A study of data collection mode effects. Journal of Online Research. 2007.

5. Braunsberger K, Wybenga H, Gates R. A comparison of reliability between telephone and web-based surveys. Journal of Business Research 2007; 60(7):758-64.

6. Groves, R.M. Three eras of survey research. Public Opinion Quarterly. 2011; 75(5): 861-871.

7. Statistics Canada. Residential telephone service survey. Government of Canada. 2010. Available from: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/110405/dq110405a-eng.htm

8. Blumberg S, Luke JV, Ganesh N, Davern ME, Boudreaux MH. Wireless Substitution: State-level Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, 2010–2011. National Health Statistics Reports. 2012; 61.

9. Blumberg S, Luke JV. Re-evaluating the need for concern regarding noncoverage bias in landline surveys. Am J Public Health. 2009; 99(10):1806–10.

10. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Household use of information technology, Australia, 2016-17. Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2018. Available from: https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/8146.0

11. Statistics Canada. The internet and digital technology. Government of Canada. 2017. Available from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-627-m/11-627-m2017032-eng.htm

12. Office for National Statistics. Internet users, UK: 2018. Office for National Statistics. 2018. Available from https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/itandinternetindustry/bulletins/internetusers/2018

13. Pew Research Center. Internet/Broadband Fact Sheet. Pew Research Center. 2018. Available from: https://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/internet-broadband/

14. Statista. Percentage of population using the internet in Mexico from 2000 to 2018. Statista. 2019. Available from: https://www.statista.com/statistics/209112/number-of-internet-users-per-100-inhabitants-in-mexico-since-2000/

15. The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2016. Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 9th edition. AAPOR. Available at: https://www.aapor.org/AAPOR_Main/media/publications/Standard-Definitions20169theditionfinal.pdf

16. O'Neill M, White CM, Vanderlee L, Reid JL, Acton RB, Hammond D. Validation of a brief measure to assess food source and preparation: the Food Source Dietary Recall. [Under review].

17. Vanderlee L, Reid JL, White CM, Hobin EP, Acton RB, Jones AC, O'Neill ML, Kirkpatrick SI, Hammond D. Evaluation of the online Beverage Frequency Questionnaire (BFQ). Nutrition Journal. 2018; 17:73. doi: 10.1186/s12937-018-0380-8.

18. National Cancer Institute. Automated Self-Administered 24-Hour (ASA24®) Dietary Assessment Tool. National Institutes of Health. Available at: https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/asa24/

19. Statistics Canada. Table 17-10-0005-01 - Population estimates on July 1st, by age and sex, 2018. Accessed March 29, 2019. Available from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1710000501

20. Office for National Statistics. Statistical Bulletin: Population estimates for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland: mid-2017, 2018. Accessed January 14, 2019. Available from

https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/annualmidyearpopulationestimates/mid2017

[21] United States Census Bureau. (2017, June). National Population by Characteristics: 2010-2016, 2017. Accessed October 19, 2018. Available from https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/2017/demo/popest/nation-detail.html

[22] Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. Intercensal Survey 2015, 2016. Accessed January 14, 2019. Available from http://en.www.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/intercensal/

[23] Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Demographic Statistics, September 2018, 2019. Accessed March 28, 2019. Available from: http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/3101.0

[24] Abt Associates. SAS Macro: Rake and Trim G4 V5. Accessed October 19, 2021. Available from: https://www.abtassociates.com/sites/default/files/files/Insights/Tools/rake_and_trim_G4_V5.sas

[25] Battaglia MP, Izrael D, Ball SW. Tips and Tricks for Raking Survey Data with Advanced Weight Trimming. Accessed October 19, 2021. Available from: https://www.abtassociates.com/sites/default/files/files/Insights/Tools/SD_62_2017.pdf