

Dadansoddi ar gyfer Polisi



Analysis for Policy



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Social Research Number:
06/2025

Publication date:
15/01/2025

Assessing the impact of Minimum Pricing for Alcohol on the wider population of drinkers: Annex Report

Mae'r ddogfen yma hefyd ar gael yn Gymraeg.

This document is also available in Welsh.

OGI © Crown Copyright Digital ISBN 978-1-83625-868-1

Assessing the impact of Minimum Pricing for Alcohol on the wider population of drinkers: Annex Report

Katy Holloway¹, Marian Buhociu¹, Shannon Murray¹, Wulf Livingston², Andy Perkins³

¹ University of South Wales

² Wrexham University

³ Figure 8 Consultancy Services Ltd (Dundee)



Full Research Report: Holloway, Buhociu, Murray, Livingston and Perkins (2025). Assessing the Impact of Minimum Pricing for Alcohol on the Wider Population of Drinkers: Annex Report. Cardiff: Welsh Government, GSR report number 06/2025. Available at: <https://www.gov.wales/assessing-impact-minimum-pricing-alcohol-wider-population-drinkers-final-report>

Views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and not necessarily those of the Welsh Government

For further information please contact:
Social Research and Information Division
Welsh Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ
Email: research.healthandsocialservices@gov.wales

1. Contents

1.	Contents	1
2.	List of Tables	2
3.	Introduction	4
4.	Sampling.....	5
	Longitudinal interview study sample	5
	Demographics	5
	Quality of life	10
	Drinking patterns	12
	Cross-sectional questionnaire survey sample	16
	Demographic characteristics	16
	Geographical area.....	24
	Drinking patterns	26
	Treatment history	27
	Quality of life	28
5.	Findings	30
	Chapter 5 – Awareness of MPA and its implementation.....	30
	Chapter 6 – Changes in alcohol consumption and related behaviours	31
	Chapter 7 – Changes in household expenditure and purchasing patterns	32
	Chapter 8 – Changes in the use of other substances.....	32
	Chapter 10 – Views on the effectiveness and future of MPA.....	33
6.	Interview schedule	35
7.	Questionnaire topics	42

2. List of Tables

Table 1.1	Demographic characteristics of interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (different samples).....	6
Table 1.2	Further demographic characteristics of interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (different samples)	7
Table 1.3	Location and housing status of the longitudinal interview sample (different samples).....	8
Table 1.4	Area type and housing status of the longitudinal interview sample (different samples).....	9
Table 1.5	Financial status of the longitudinal interview sample (different samples)	10
Table 1.6	Quality-of-life scores among interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (different samples).....	11
Table 1.7	Quality-of-life scores among interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (retained sample)	12
Table 1.8	Drinking patterns at baseline and follow-up interviews (different samples)	13
Table 1.9	Drinking patterns at baseline and follow-up interviews (retained sample)	14
Table 1.10	AUDIT scores at baseline and follow-ups (different samples).....	15
Table 1.11	AUDIT scores at baseline and follow-ups (same sample).....	15
Table 1.12	Sex and age group of the cross-sectional survey sample.....	17
Table 1.13	Ethnic group and background of the cross-sectional survey sample (new question wording).....	18
Table 1.14	Ethnic group and background of the cross-sectional survey sample (original question wording)	19
Table 1.15	Marital status and number of children under 18 living at home of the cross-sectional survey sample	20
Table 1.16	Number of children under 18 living at home of the cross-sectional survey sample	20
Table 1.17	Qualifications of the cross-sectional survey sample	21
Table 1.18	Employment status of the cross-sectional survey sample.....	22
Table 1.19	Financial status of the cross-sectional survey sample	23
Table 1.20	Financial status of the cross-sectional survey sample	24
Table 1.21	Local Authority/Health Board of the cross-sectional survey sample ...	25
Table 1.22	Area type of the cross-sectional survey sample.....	25
Table 1.23	Housing status of the cross-sectional survey sample	26
Table 1.24	Alcohol consumption among the cross-sectional survey sample	27
Table 1.25	Drug/alcohol treatment history among the cross-sectional survey sample	28
Table 1.26	Quality of life measures among the cross-sectional survey sample....	29
Table 5.1	Had you heard about MPA prior to completing this survey?	30
Table 5.2	Have you noticed any changes in the price of alcohol since March 2020?	30
Table 5.3	Have you noticed that any alcohol products are no longer available to buy?	30
Table 6.1	Changes in quantity and frequency of drinking since March 2020	31
Table 6.2	Changes in drinking-related behaviours since March 2020	31

Table 7.1	Change in affordability of alcohol since March 2020.....	32
Table 7.2	Change in purchasing patterns since March 2020.....	32
Table 8.1	Changes in the use of other substances.....	32
Table 10.1	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement: “MPA has been effective in reducing alcohol-related harm in Wales”?	33
Table 10.2	How strongly are you in favour of MPA continuing in Wales?	34
Table 10.3	If there was an option to change the minimum unit price what would you recommend?	34

3. Introduction

This Annex Report presents supplementary information relating to the final report of Lot 4 of the Minimum Pricing for Alcohol evaluation. The main report can be accessed here: [Assessing the impact of Minimum Pricing for Alcohol on the wider population of drinkers: Final Report | GOV.WALES](#). The Annex Report includes: further details of the samples of people who participated in the study; further details of the methods of data collection including a copy of the interview schedule and a list of the topics covered in the online questionnaire survey; and some additional tables that present quantitative data relating to Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the main report.

4. Sampling

This section provides supplementary information about the sampling for this strand of the Minimum Pricing for Alcohol evaluation that focuses on drinkers in the general population of Wales. The chapter sets out details of the people who formed the longitudinal interview study samples and information on the cross-sectional survey sample. Details on recruitment can be found in the main report.

Longitudinal interview study sample

[The characteristics of the longitudinal interview study sample are presented in detail in previous reports.](#) Here an overview of the characteristics of the sample of 34 drinkers who were interviewed as part of the final wave of the longitudinal interview study is provided. For comparative purposes, this information has been presented alongside that from the previous waves (baseline, follow-up 1 and follow-up 2). For key variables, changes over time focusing on the sample of 15 interviewees who were interviewed at baseline and at all three follow-up points are presented.

Demographics

In demographic terms, the characteristics of drinkers taking part in the longitudinal study differed at each data collection point (see Table 1.1). At baseline, more women than men were interviewed but in all subsequent waves, the samples included more men than women. The differences in relation to age and ethnic group were less pronounced, although the final two samples included more older people (aged 45+) and people from ethnic minority groups than the first two samples. Broadly speaking, the four samples were similar in that they all included more people 'in a relationship' than people who were not.

Table 1.1 Demographic characteristics of interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Sex				
Male	17 (42%)	17 (53%)	28 (64%)	20 (59%)
Female	24 (59%)	15 (47%)	16 (36%)	14 (41%)
Age				
Under 45	20 (49%)	16 (50%)	19 (43%)	15 (44%)
45 and older	21 (51%)	16 (50%)	25 (57%)	19 (56%)
Ethnic group [1]				
White British	38 (93%)	30 (97%)	37 (84%)	31 (91%)
White Other	3 (7%)	1 (3%)	3 (7%)	2 (6%)
Mixed [2]	-	-	1 (2%)	-
Asian – Pakistani	-	-	1 (2%)	-
Black – African	-	-	2 (4%)	1 (3%)
Marital status				
In a relationship	25 (61%)	22 (69%)	23 (52%)	22 (65%)
Not in a relationship	16 (39%)	10 (31%)	21 (48%)	12 (35%)
TOTAL	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

Notes: [1] One missing case. [2] White and Black African.

In line with the previous waves, most of the follow-up sample had no children under the age of 18 living in their household and most had qualifications of Level 5¹ or above (see Table 1.2).

¹ [What qualification levels mean \(gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk).

Table 1.2 Further demographic characteristics of interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Highest qualification				
Level 7+	4 (10%)	4 (10%)	10 (24%)	11 (27%)
Level 5-6	15 (37%)	15 (37%)	10 (24%)	7 (17%)
Level 3-4	9 (22%)	7 (17%)	11 (27%)	8 (20%)
Level 1-2	8 (20%)	3 (7%)	4 (10%)	7 (17%)
Entry level/No qualifications	3 (7%)	1 (2%)	8 (20%)	-
Employment status				
Other	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Pupil/student/FT education	8 (20%)	8 (20%)	4 (10%)	-
Retired	7 (17%)	6 (15%)	7 (17%)	6 (15%)
Looking after home/family	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Unemployed but not looking	7 (17%)	3 (7%)	14 (34%)	8 (20%)
Unemployed but looking	2 (5%)	-	2 (5%)	2 (5%)
Self-employed	-	-	-	2 (5%)
Employed part-time (<30h)	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)	2 (5%)
Employed full-time (30+h)	9 (22%)	7 (17%)	12 (29%)	13 (32%)
TOTAL	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

As with the previous waves, this follow-up sample included drinkers living in a variety (n=11) of different Local Authority areas with nearly half resident in Cardiff (n=15), followed by Powys (n=4), Wrexham (n=4) and Rhondda Cynon Taf (n=4)² (see Table 1.3). The sample also included people living in a variety of different area types including urban areas (n=17), suburban areas (n=5), and more rural areas (n=12) (see Table 1.4)³.

² The over-representation of drinkers from Cardiff reflects, in part, the fact that the hostel sample was recruited wholly from this area.

³ A significant proportion (9/22) of those living in urban areas were recruited through a third sector homelessness charity. Any comparisons across area types must therefore be made with this in mind.

Table 1.3 Location and housing status of the longitudinal interview sample (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Local Authority/Health Board Area				
Wrexham – BCUHB	5 (12%)	5 (16%)	4 (9%)	4 (12%)
Vale of Glamorgan – CVUHB	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	-	1 (2%)
Torfaen – ABUHB	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Rhondda Cynon Taf – CTHB	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	4 (10%)	4 (10%)
Powys – PTHB	4 (10%)	4 (10%)	4 (10%)	4 (10%)
Newport – ABUHB	4 (10%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Monmouthshire –ABUHB	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)
Flintshire – BCUHB	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	-
Conwy – BCUHB	1 (2%)	-	-	1 (2%)
Ceredigion - HDHB	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	3 (7%)	-
Carmarthenshire - HDHB	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	-
Cardiff – CVUHB	11 (27%)	8 (20%)	21 (51%)	15 (37%)
Caerphilly - ABUHB	1 (2%)	-	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Bridgend	-	-	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Total	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

Notes: ABUHB (Aneurin Bevan University Health Board); BCUHB (Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board); CTHB (Cwm Taf Health Board); CVUHTB (Cardiff and Vale University Health Board); HDUHB (Hywel Dda Health Board); PTHB (Powys Teaching Health Board).

Table 1.4 Area type and housing status of the longitudinal interview sample (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Area type				
Rural	17 (41%)	15 (47%)	16 (36%)	12 (35%)
Suburban	8 (20%)	7 (17%)	6 (15%)	5 (12%)
Urban	16 (39%)	10 (24%)	21 (51%)	17 (41%)
Housing status				
Street homeless	1 (2%)	-	2 (5%)	1 (3%)
Hostel/other supported	8 (20%)	4 (10%)	10 (24%)	7 (17%)
Living with family/friends	4 (10%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)	-
Renting (social, council)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	4 (10%)	1 (2%)
Renting (private)	8 (20%)	7 (17%)	7 (17%)	6 (15%)
Homeowner (mortgage)	10 (24%)	8 (20%)	11 (27%)	9 (22%)
Homeowner (no mortgage)	9 (22%)	9 (22%)	9 (22%)	10 (24%)
TOTAL	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

In line with previous waves, most of the interviewees were not in receipt of benefits at the time of interview (see Table 1.5). The sample was also mixed in terms of the amount of household income, with 11 reporting income of no more than £10,400 and seven reporting income of more than £52,000 per year.

Table 1.5 Financial status of the longitudinal interview sample (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Are you currently receiving any state benefits				
Universal credit	6 (15%)	1 (3%)	9 (20%)	6 (18%)
Other benefits	6 (15%)	3 (7%)	7 (17%)	6 (15%)
No	27 (66%)	26 (63%)	28 (68%)	22 (54%)
Prefer not to say	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	-	-
Household income				
I prefer not to say	4 (10%)	3 (9%)	2 (5%)	-
£52,000 pa or more	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	9 (22%)	7 (17%)
£36,400-£51,999	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)	5 (12%)
£26,000-£36,399	9 (22%)	7 (17%)	7 (17%)	8 (20%)
£20,800-£25,999	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)
£15,600-£20,799	6 (15%)	5 (12%)	6 (15%)	1 (2%)
£10,400-£15,599	4 (10%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	-
£5,200-£10,399	7 (17%)	4 (10%)	9 (22%)	3 (7%)
Up to £5,199	3 (7%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	8 (20%)
TOTAL	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

Quality of life

When asked how well they were managing financially at the time of interview, most of the responding interviewees indicated they were managing either quite well or very well, but a small number were not managing well or not managing at all well (see Table 1.6)⁴. Compared with baseline, more interviewees reported managing very well at the third follow-up point (26% compared with 10%).

As with the previous sweeps, most interviewees reported high levels of satisfaction with their lives and most felt the things they did in their lives were worthwhile (see Table 1.6). Furthermore, the majority reported high levels of happiness and most indicated low levels of anxiety.

For those who took part in the baseline and all three follow-up interviews, it was possible to look at changes over time. In relation to how well they were managing financially, nine interviewees reported changes between baseline and the third follow-up interview. For six of these interviewees, the change was in a positive direction (e.g., from managing quite well to very well) but for three it was a change for the worse (e.g., from managing quite well to not managing well).

⁴ Interviewees were advised prior to the interview there was no obligation to answer questions if they did not wish to do so. They were reminded of this prior to being asked any sensitive questions (e.g., about their quality of life and financial status). In some cases, based on interviewee's answers to previous questions, sensitive questions such as these were not asked. The findings should therefore be interpreted bearing this in mind.

Table 1.6 Quality-of-life scores among interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Managing very well	4 (10%)	10 (33%)	11 (25%)	8 (26%)
Managing quite well	19 (46%)	11 (37%)	14 (32%)	16 (52%)
Neither well nor not well	7 (17%)	6 (20%)	7 (16%)	6 (19%)
Not managing well	6 (15%)	1 (3%)	5 (11%)	-
Not managing at all well	5 (12%)	2 (7%)	7 (16%)	1 (3%)
Satisfied with my life				
Low	5 (13%)	1 (4%)	3 (7%)	-
Medium	5 (13%)	7 (25%)	12 (29%)	6 (21%)
High	29 (74%)	20 (71%)	26 (63%)	22 (79%)
Things I do are worthwhile				
Low	7 (18%)	1 (4%)	6 (15%)	-
Medium	3 (8%)	3 (11%)	6 (15%)	4 (14%)
High	29 (74%)	24 (86%)	28 (70%)	24 (86%)
Happiness yesterday				
Low	4 (10%)	1 (4%)	3 (8%)	2 (7%)
Medium	9 (23%)	5 (18%)	12 (30%)	1 (4%)
High	26 (67%)	22 (79%)	25 (63%)	25 (89%)
Anxiety yesterday [1]				
Low	19 (49%)	19 (68%)	23 (58%)	21 (75%)
Medium	8 (21%)	8 (29%)	13 (33%)	4 (14%)
High	12 (30%)	1 (4%)	4 (10%)	3 (11%)
Total	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

Notes: Some missing cases. [1] While low scores on the other questions are negative, a low score in relation to anxiety is a positive thing.

The scores on the quality-of-life measures remained stable or improved between baseline and third follow-up for most of the sample of interviewees (see Table 1.7). However, a small group reported a worsening in overall life satisfaction (n=2), feeling that the things that they do are worthwhile (n=1), happiness (n=2), and anxiety (n=2) at follow-up.

Table 1.7 Quality-of-life scores among interviewees at baseline and follow-ups (retained sample)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Managing very well	4 (27%)	8 (53%)	6 (40%)	6 (40%)
Managing quite well	6 (40%)	4 (27%)	6 (40%)	6 (40%)
Neither well nor not well	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)
Not managing well	2 (13%)	-	1 (7%)	-
Not managing at all well	-	-	-	-
Satisfied with my life				
Low	-	1 (7%)	-	-
Medium	-	3 (20%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)
High	15 (100%)	11 (73%)	13 (87%)	13 (87%)
Things I do are worthwhile				
Low	-	1 (7%)	-	-
Medium	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)
High	14 (93%)	13 (87%)	13 (87%)	14 (93%)
Happiness yesterday				
Low	-	-	-	2 (13%)
Medium	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	-
High	11 (73%)	13 (87%)	13 (87%)	13 (87%)
Anxiety yesterday [1]				
Low	7 (47%)	10 (67%)	12 (80%)	12 (80%)
Medium	4 (27%)	4 (27%)	3 (20%)	-
High	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	-	3 (20%)
Total	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)

Notes: Some missing cases. [1] While low scores on the other questions are negative, a low score in relation to anxiety is a positive thing.

Drinking patterns

As with the baseline and first two follow-up samples, the third follow-up sample members varied in terms of the frequency and quantity of alcohol consumed each week (see Table 1.8). In terms of frequency, the sample included 18 drinkers who drank at least twice a week and 12 who drank no more than once a week. In terms of quantities consumed on typical drinking occasions, the sample included nine who drank at least 10 units and two who drank no more than two units per drinking event. It is important to note the follow-up sample included four interviewees who had given up drinking in the period since MPA had been introduced.

Table 1.8 Drinking patterns at baseline and follow-up interviews (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
How often do you drink alcohol?				
Never	-	-	4 (9%)	3 (9%)
Monthly or less	5 (12%)	3 (9%)	6 (14%)	4 (12%)
2 to 4 times per month	8 (20%)	11 (34%)	6 (14%)	8 (24%)
2 to 3 times per week	11 (27%)	4 (13%)	7 (16%)	6 (18%)
4 or more times per week [1, 2]	17 (42%)	14 (44%)	21 (48%)	12 (36%)
How many units do you drink on a typical day of drinking?				
0 units	-	-	4 (9%)	3 (9%)
1 to 2 units	9 (22%)	6 (19%)	9 (20%)	3 (9%)
3 to 4 units	6 (15%)	9 (28%)	8 (18%)	8 (24%)
5 to 6 units	7 (17%)	5 (16%)	5 (11%)	5 (15%)
7 to 9 units	7 (17%)	4 (13%)	4 (9%)	5 (15%)
10 or more units [1, 2]	12 (29%)	8 (25%)	14 (32%)	9 (27%)
Total [1]	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

Notes: Some missing cases. [1] including the replacement interviewee at the first follow-up who had been a dependent drinker for many years and for whom answers to these questions at baseline were extrapolated from their interview transcript. [2] including four replacement 'hostel sample' interviewees for whom answers to these questions were extrapolated from their interview transcripts.

Of the 15 drinkers interviewed on all four occasions, two had stopped drinking alcohol in the period following the baseline interview (see Table 1.9). One of these drinkers changed from drinking four or more times per week at baseline to abstaining totally by the time of the second follow-up interview. The other reduced their frequency from drinking monthly or less at baseline to not drinking at all by the time of the third follow-up interview. Of those who continued to drink (n=13), most made no changes in terms of the frequency of alcohol consumed (n=8). Of those who did make changes, two reported increases in frequency while three reported decreases. In relation to the quantity of alcohol consumed, eight interviewees reported an increase in the number of units consumed on a typical drinking day, two reported a decrease, and five reported no change.

Table 1.9 Drinking patterns at baseline and follow-up interviews (retained sample)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
How often do you drink alcohol?				
Never	-	-	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
Monthly or less	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)
2 to 4 times per month	2 (13%)	6 (40%)	4 (27%)	4 (27%)
2 to 3 times per week	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
4+ times per week	4 (27%)	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	4 (27%)
How many units do you drink on a typical day when you drink alcohol?				
0 to 2 units	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	6 (40%)	2 (13%)
3 to 4 units	3 (20%)	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	5 (33%)
5 to 6 units	3 (20%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)
7 to 9 units	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
10 or more units	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
Total	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)

It was possible to calculate AUDIT scores for all of the 34 interviewees at the 42-month follow-up (see Table 1.10). The sample was evenly split in terms of the number of people drinking within government guidelines (i.e., moderate drinkers) and those who were exceeding them (i.e., hazardous and harmful drinkers). Thirteen of the interviewees had scores indicating that they were drinking at harmful levels, which is a similar number to the baseline sample but double that of the first follow-up⁵. At the second and third follow-ups, however, there were considerably more lower risk drinkers than at baseline. This difference appears to be due to a combination of factors including features of the replacement sample and changes in drinking patterns among the original sample.

⁵ The comparatively small number of harmful drinkers in the first follow-up was largely due to the lockdown restrictions, which prevented the evaluation team from conducting face-to-face interviews within third sector organisations' premises.

Table 1.10 AUDIT scores at baseline and follow-ups (different samples)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Lower risk/Moderate [1]	13 (34%)	13 (41%)	22 (50%)	18 (53%)
Increasing risk/Hazardous	13 (34%)	13 (41%)	9 (21%)	6 (18%)
High risk/Harmful [2]	12 (32%)	6 (19%)	13 (29%)	10 (29%)
Total	41 (100%)	32 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)

Notes: Some missing cases. [1] Includes three drinkers who had stopped drinking in the period since MPA (one by follow-up 2 and two by follow-up 3) had been implemented and one drinker who did not complete the AUDIT but for whom it was clear from their interview responses, that they were still a low-risk drinker. [2] Includes four interviewees at the first and the third follow-up who did not complete the AUDIT but for whom it was clear from their interview responses that they were harmful drinkers.

In terms of changes over time, it was interesting to note most of the AUDIT scores remained stable between baseline and third follow-up (n=10) and that the small number of changes (n=7) were mostly in a positive, less harmful, direction (n=4) rather than in a more harmful direction (n=1) (see Table 1.11).

Table 1.11 AUDIT scores at baseline and follow-ups (same sample)

	Baseline	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2	Follow-up 3
Lower risk/Moderate [1]	8 (53%)	9 (60%)	10 (67%)	10 (67%)
Increasing risk/Hazardous	4 (27%)	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	3 (20%)
High risk/Harmful	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	-	2 (13%)
Total	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)

Notes: Some missing cases. [1] Includes two drinkers who had stopped drinking in the period since MPA had been implemented.

Cross-sectional questionnaire survey sample

The characteristics of the survey respondents are presented below. For comparative purposes, the characteristics of the baseline sample are presented alongside those of the second and third follow-up samples (NB the survey was not included at the first follow-up point at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic). It should be noted, however, the three samples are not the same (i.e., they are composed of different individuals) and that any differences in the findings may be the result of different features of the sample rather than any external factor such as MPA.

Demographic characteristics

Sex, age, ethnic group, marital status

At follow-up 3, more men than women completed the online survey (52% compared with 45%) (see Table 1.12). Four respondents described themselves as non-binary/third gender and one other preferred not to state their sex. It is noteworthy that the proportion of men who completed the follow-up survey⁶ was far larger than at baseline (24%) and follow-up 2 (38%).

Like the interview sample, the survey sample was diverse in terms of age with nearly two-fifths (38%) of respondents aged 45 or older, just over one-quarter (28%) aged 35 to 44, just under one-quarter (23%) aged 25 to 34, and 9% aged between 18 and 24 (see Table 1.12). This age distribution was broadly similar to the distribution of ages in the previous survey samples with perhaps the exception of younger people aged under 25.

⁶ The number of men who took part in the interview study was also higher at the second follow-up point than at baseline (64% compared with 42%).

Table 1.12 Sex and age group of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex						
Female	135	75%	113	61%	82	45%
Male	43	24%	70	38%	94	52%
Non-binary/third gender/other	1	1%	2	1%	4	2%
I prefer not to say	0	0%	1	<1%	1	1%
Age						
75+	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%
65-74	3	2%	6	3%	11	6%
55-64	8	5%	17	9%	16	9%
45-54	26	15%	40	22%	40	22%
35-44	35	20%	50	27%	50	28%
25-34	50	28%	44	24%	41	23%
20-24	40	23%	23	12%	15	8%
18-19	15	8%	4	2%	2	1%
Prefer not to say	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
Total	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Unlike the interview sample, the survey sample included respondents from a range of ethnic groups (see Table 1.13 and Table 1.14)⁷. However, the sample cannot be considered diverse in ethnic group terms as the majority (90%) defined themselves as White – English, Scottish, Welsh, Northern Irish, British. Nevertheless, the sample did include a small number of respondents from several other ethnic groups including Irish, Gypsy or Irish Traveller, Roma, White and Black Caribbean, White and Asian, African background and Chinese.

⁷ The ethnic group categories that were used in the final sweep of the survey were updated and therefore differ to those used in the previous waves. The results from each wave are presented in separate tables (i.e., Tables 1.13 and 1.14).

Table 1.13 Ethnic group and background of the cross-sectional survey sample (new question wording)

	Follow-up 3 [1]		Follow-up 3 [2]	
	N	%	N	%
White				
Welsh, English, Scottish, Northern Irish or British	154	85%	137	90%
Irish	11	6%	5	3%
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	3	2%	1	1%
Roma	4	2%	1	1%
Other – any other White background	2	1%	2	1%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups				
White and Black Caribbean	15	8%	2	1%
White and Black African	4	2%	0	0%
White and Asian	11	6%	1	1%
Other – any other Mixed or multiple background	1	1%	0	0%
Asian, Asian Welsh or Asian British				
Indian	3	2%	0	0%
Pakistani	5	3%	0	0%
Bangladeshi	3	2%	0	0%
Chinese	6	3%	1	1%
Other – any other Asian background	2	1%	0	0%
Black, Black Welsh, Black British, Caribbean or African				
Caribbean	6	3%	0	0%
African background	9	5%	1	1%
Other – any other Black, Black British or Caribbean background	2	1%	0	0%
Other ethnic group				
Arab	15	8%	0	0%
Other – any other ethnic group	1	1%	0	0%
Total	181	100%	153	100%

Notes: Some missing cases. [1] Includes 28 respondents who ticked boxes in more than one ethnic group category when the question only asked them to pick one section and tick one box. [2] Excludes 28 respondents who ticked boxes in more than one ethnic group category.

Table 1.14 Ethnic group and background of the cross-sectional survey sample (original question wording)

Ethnic group	Baseline		Follow-up 2	
	N	%	N	%
White – E/W/S/NI/B	157	88%	166	89%
White – Irish	2	1%	2	1%
White – Gypsy, Irish Traveller, Roma	1	1%	0	0%
White – Other	15	8%	13	7%
Mixed – White and Black Caribbean	1	1%	0	0%
Mixed – White and Black African	1	1%	0	0%
Mixed – White and Asian				
Mixed – Other	0	0%	2	1%
Asian – Other	0	0%	1	<1%
Black - African	1	1%	0	0%
Black – Caribbean	0	0%	1	<1%
Prefer not to say	0	0%	1	<1%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%

More than three-quarters of the sample (78%) were in a relationship at the time of completing the final follow-up survey, while 14% were single (see Table 1.15). The remainder were either separated, divorced, widowed (7%) or preferred not to divulge their marital status (<1%). Compared with the two previous survey samples, this one included a broadly similar proportion of people in a relationship (78% compared with 74% and 67%).

Unlike the previous two survey samples where most respondents lived in households without children, more than half of the survey respondents reported living in a household where there was at least one child under the age of 18 (51%). This included 8% living with three or more children, 21% living with two children and the remaining 23% living with one child under the age of 18 (see Table 1.16).

Table 1.15 Marital status and number of children under 18 living at home of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Marital status						
Married	46	26%	79	43%	98	54%
In a civil partnership	1	1%	2	1%	9	5%
Cohabiting/living together	28	16%	32	17%	22	12%
Single	52	29%	39	21%	25	14%
In a relationship	42	24%	25	13%	13	7%
Widowed	2	1%	1	<1%	1	1%
Divorced	3	2%	4	2%	9	5%
Separated	3	2%	3	2%	2	1%
Prefer not to say	2	1%	1	<1%	1	1%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: some missing cases.

Table 1.16 Number of children under 18 living at home of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	109	61%	117	64%	87	49%
1	27	15%	30	16%	41	23%
2	29	16%	36	19%	38	21%
3 or more	14	8%	3	2%	13	8%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: some missing cases.

Education, employment and training

The survey sample included people with a mix of types of educational attainment. This ranged from people with Entry level or Level 1 qualifications (9%) through to people with Level 8 (doctoral level) qualifications (5%) (see Table 1.17). More than one-third of the sample had qualifications at Level 3 or below (35%), which included 15% with Level 3 (A or AS level) qualifications. More than one-quarter (29%) of the sample had post-graduate level qualifications at Level 7 (master's degree) or above. Compared with the previous follow-up sample (but not unlike the baseline sample), this third sample included fewer people with qualifications at Level 6 or above (48% compared with 70%).

Table 1.17 Qualifications of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Highest qualification						
Entry level	5	3%	0	0%	8	5%
Level 1	1	1%	1	<1%	7	4%
Level 2	8	5%	8	4%	19	11%
Level 3	57	32%	22	12%	27	15%
Level 4	11	6%	13	7%	13	7%
Level 5	22	12%	11	6%	19	11%
Level 6	40	22%	59	32%	33	19%
Level 7	29	16%	50	27%	43	24%
Level 8	6	3%	21	11%	9	5%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

In terms of employment status, again, the sample was mixed (see Table 1.18), albeit over-representing people in employment (78%), including full-time employment (62%), part-time employment (12%) and self-employment (4%). The large number of employed respondents in the sample means generalisations from the survey findings must be made with caution. It is noteworthy the over-representation of university students within the baseline survey sample was not repeated in either of the follow-up samples. Indeed, only 5% cent of the final follow-up were students compared with nearly half of the baseline sample.

Table 1.18 Employment status of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Employment status						
Employed full-time (30+h)	52	29%	118	63%	112	62%
Employed part-time (<30h)	16	9%	26	14%	21	12%
Self-employed	5	3%	5	3%	7	4%
Unemployed but looking for a job	6	3%	0	0%	10	6%
Unemployed but not looking	4	2%	1	<1%	1	1%
Looking after home/family	2	1%	2	1%	1	1%
Retired	4	2%	4	2%	17	9%
Pupil/student/FT education	87	49%	27	15%	9	5%
Other	3	2%	3	2%	2	1%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Financial status

The financial status of the survey respondents was varied and included people earning less than £5,199 per year (3%) as well as people earning over £52,000 (23%) (see Table 1.19). Perhaps unsurprisingly, unemployed people were more likely than those in other employment categories to report earning the lowest levels of income. However, students in full-time education and part-time workers also reported far lower levels of income than those in full-time employment and self-employment.

Table 1.19 Financial status of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Are you currently receiving any state benefits						
Universal credit	10	6%	11	6%	18	10%
Other benefits	20	11%	8	4%	13	7%
No	143	80%	164	88%	134	74%
Prefer not to say	6	3%	3	2%	15	8%
Household income (annual)						
Up to £5,199	19	11%	5	3%	6	3%
£5,200-£10,399	22	12%	6	3%	13	7%
£10,400-£15,599	18	10%	6	3%	11	6%
£15,600-£20,799	16	9%	11	6%	17	9%
£20,800-£25,999	13	7%	12	7%	19	11%
£26,000-£36,399	19	11%	32	17%	29	16%
£36,400-£51,999	31	17%	44	23%	26	14%
£52,000 pa or more	23	13%	48	26%	42	23%
I prefer not to say	18	10%	22	12%	17	9%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Similar to the baseline and first follow-up sample, most of the final sample were not receiving benefits at the time of completing the survey (see Table 1.19). However, 17% did report being in receipt of benefits, which included 10% who were receiving Universal Credit.

When asked how well they were managing financially, most of the respondents indicated they were managing quite well (38%) or very well (24%) (see Table 1.20). Just under one-quarter expressed a neutral answer while 11% indicated they were not managing well and 2% not managing at all well. These figures closely match those of the baseline sample and the first follow-up survey sample.

Table 1.20 Financial status of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Managing very well	17	10%	23	12%	43	24%
Managing quite well	92	51%	101	54%	69	38%
Neither managing nor not managing	37	21%	40	22%	44	24%
Not managing well	22	12%	20	11%	20	11%
Not managing at all well	11	6%	2	1%	4	2%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Geographical area

Survey respondents were resident in a range of locations across Wales at the time of completing the final follow-up survey (see Table 1.21). Twenty-one of the 22 Local Authority areas in Wales were represented in the survey with the largest proportions being resident in Cardiff (16%), Rhondda Cynon Taf (RCT) (13%) and Wrexham (12%). While not all Local Authority areas were represented, all seven of the Health Board areas were represented in the study as they also had been at baseline.

Table 1.21 Local Authority/Health Board of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Blaenau Gwent - ABUHB	3	2%	6	3%	4	2%
Bridgend - CTHB	8	5%	12	7%	10	6%
Caerphilly - ABUHB	8	5%	11	6%	13	7%
Cardiff – CVUHB	23	13%	46	25%	28	16%
Carmarthenshire - HDHB	1	1%	2	1%	6	3%
Ceredigion - HDHB	0	0%	2	1%	5	3%
Conwy – BCUHB	2	1%	2	1%	8	5%
Denbighshire – BCUHB	6	3%	0	0%	5	3%
Flintshire – BCUHB	13	7%	5	3%	9	5%
Gwynedd – BCUHB	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%
Isle of Anglesey - BCUHB	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%
Merthyr Tydfil - CTHB	2	1%	6	3%	6	3%
Monmouthshire –ABUHB	1	1%	4	2%	1	1%
Neath Port Talbot - ABMUHB	2	1%	5	3%	3	2%
Newport – ABUHB	12	7%	23	12%	17	10%
Pembrokeshire - HDHB	7	4%	1	<1%	1	1%
Powys – PTHB	6	3%	1	<1%	7	4%
Rhondda Cynon Taf – CTHB	24	14%	30	16%	23	13%
Swansea - ABMUHB	0	0%	10	5%	1	1%
Torfaen – ABUHB	2	1%	7	4%	3	2%
Vale of Glamorgan – CVUHB	5	3%	9	5%	5	3%
Wrexham – BCUHB	52	29%	3	2%	21	12%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: Some missing cases. ABMUHB (Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Health Board); ABUHB (Aneurin Bevan University Health Board); BCUHB (Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board); CTHB (Cwm Taf Health Board); CVUHTB (Cardiff and Vale University Health Board); HDUHB (Hywel Dda Health Board); PTHB (Powys Teaching Health Board).

The sample was fairly evenly split in terms of the type of area residing in (see Table 1.22). Similar to the previous follow-up sample, most of the final follow-up sample lived in urban and suburban areas (68%), with only a minority in rural areas (32%).

Table 1.22 Area type of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Urban	48	27%	61	33%	53	30%
Suburban	46	26%	80	43%	67	38%
Rural	84	47%	44	24%	56	32%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: some missing cases.

In terms of housing status, the final sample of respondents was mixed and included people living in their own homes without mortgages (30%), people renting from a private landlord (7%) and people renting from the council or in social housing (7%) (see Table 1.23). The most commonly reported status was ‘homeowner – with mortgage’ (42%). When compared with the previous samples, far more of the follow-up sample were homeowners without a mortgage (30% compared with 7% at baseline) and far fewer were renting from the council or in social housing (7% compared with 16% at baseline).

Table 1.23 Housing status of the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Housing status						
Homeowner (mortgage)	50	28%	98	53%	75	42%
Homeowner (no mortgage)	13	7%	27	15%	53	30%
Renting (private)	41	23%	30	16%	12	7%
Renting (social, council)	28	16%	5	3%	12	7%
Living with family/friends	34	19%	23	12%	19	11%
Hostel/other supported	11	6%	0	0%	6	3%
Street homeless	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	3	2%	2	1%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Drinking patterns

AUDIT scores

On the basis of their AUDIT scores, two-fifths of the sample (40%) fell into the ‘lower risk’ category and could be considered ‘moderate’ drinkers (Table 1.24). One-third (33%) were measured to be at ‘increasing risk’ or as ‘hazardous’ drinkers, and the remainder (23%) were in the ‘higher risk’ category and considered ‘harmful’ drinkers. This distribution differs substantially to that reported by the baseline and first follow-up samples, which were both skewed in favour of moderate drinkers. The inclusion of more harmful drinkers is useful in that it means that the sample is more balanced and allows a broader range of perspectives to be represented. It also means the sample more closely matches the risk classification of adult drinkers across Wales. Indeed, of the 1000 respondents who completed the [Wales Omnibus Survey in June 2022](#), 41% were categorised as ‘lower risk’ and 45% as increasing or higher risk.

Table 1.24 Alcohol consumption among the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
AUDIT Score						
Lower risk	92	52%	103	55%	71	40%
Increasing risk	64	36%	68	37%	59	33%
Higher risk	10	6%	5	3%	18	10%
Possible dependence	11	6%	10	5%	31	17%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Treatment history

While this project focuses on the wider population of drinkers in Wales, the recruitment methods meant it was still possible for drinkers currently in treatment to complete the online survey. When asked about their treatment histories, 16 respondents indicated that they were currently receiving treatment for alcohol problems and seven for drug problems (see Table 1.25). These figures are somewhat higher than the numbers included in the previous survey samples (and may reflect the larger number of drinkers with high scores on the AUDIT in the final sample). However, the sample is still predominantly composed of people with no recent, or past, history of treatment.

Table 1.25 Drug/alcohol treatment history among the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ever treatment for alcohol problems	7	4%	3	<1%	25	14%
Ever treatment for drug problems	3	2%	5	3%	21	12%
Not ever received treatment for either	169	94%	179	97%	142	79%
Current treatment for alcohol problems	3	2%	2	1%	16	9%
Current treatment for drug problems	0	0%	3	2%	7	4%
Not receiving treatment for either	176	98%	181	97%	156	86%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

Notes: Some missing cases. Multiple responses possible.

Quality of life

Four questions covering different aspects of quality of life⁸ were included in the survey (see Table 1.26). More than two-thirds of interviewees expressed high levels of satisfaction with their lives and a similar proportion felt the things they did in life were worthwhile. When asked how happy they were yesterday, nearly two-thirds expressed high scores and 38% indicated they had low levels of anxiety yesterday. However, while many of the interviewees appeared to have a good quality of life (based on these four measures), a sizeable minority were far less fortunate. Indeed, 7% had low levels of satisfaction, and the same proportion (7%) did not think the things they did were worthwhile. Furthermore, nearly one-tenth of respondents indicated they were not happy yesterday and more than a half described having medium (33%) or high (28%) levels of anxiety yesterday. Compared with the previous samples, this follow-up sample had higher levels of satisfaction (67% compared with 52% at baseline) and higher levels of happiness (62% compared with 48%). However, the three samples were similar in terms of how worthwhile they felt their lives were and their levels of anxiety.

⁸ The same measures were used for assessing quality of life among the interviewees and were based on the Measuring National Wellbeing Programme.

Table 1.26 Quality of life measures among the cross-sectional survey sample

	Baseline		Follow-up 2		Follow-up 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
How satisfied are you with your life?						
Low (0-3)	21	12%	20	11%	12	7%
Medium (4-6)	64	36%	47	25%	48	27%
Higher (7-10)	92	52%	119	64%	120	67%
How worthwhile are the things you do?						
Low (0-3)	19	11%	16	9%	12	7%
Medium (4-6)	44	25%	43	23%	44	24%
Higher (7-10)	114	64%	127	68%	124	69%
How happy were you yesterday?						
Low (0-3)	35	20%	21	11%	15	8%
Medium (4-6)	58	33%	50	27%	54	30%
Higher (7-10)	84	48%	115	62%	111	62%
How anxious were you yesterday?						
Low (0-3)	69	39%	82	44%	69	38%
Medium (4-6)	49	28%	52	28%	60	33%
Higher (7-10)	59	33%	52	28%	51	28%
TOTAL	179	100%	186	100%	181	100%

5. Findings

The tables in this section provide additional quantitative detail to the findings presented in Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the main report. For clarity, the sub-sections below are each headed with the number and title of the chapter where the tables are discussed.

Chapter 5 – Awareness of MPA and its implementation

The tables below are discussed in Chapter 5 of the main report.

Table 5.1 Had you heard about MPA prior to completing this survey?

	N	%
Yes	110	62%
No	43	24%
Not sure	24	14%
TOTAL	177	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Table 5.2 Have you noticed any changes in the price of alcohol since March 2020?

	N	%
Yes	122	68%
No	57	32%
TOTAL	179	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Table 5.3 Have you noticed that any alcohol products are no longer available to buy?

	N	%
Yes	27	15%
No	152	85%
TOTAL	179	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Chapter 6 – Changes in alcohol consumption and related behaviours

The tables below are discussed in Chapter 6 of the main report.

Table 6.1 Changes in quantity and frequency of drinking since March 2020

	N	%
Quantity		
I am drinking a lot more	5	3%
I am drinking a little more	29	16%
I am drinking the same amount	84	47%
I am drinking a little less	41	23%
I am drinking a lot less	15	8%
I have stopped drinking	5	3%
Frequency		
I am drinking a lot more frequently	2	1%
I am drinking a little more frequently	24	13%
I am drinking at the same frequency	84	47%
I am drinking a little less frequently	45	25%
I am drinking a lot less frequently	20	11%
I have stopped drinking altogether	4	2%
TOTAL	179	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Table 6.2 Changes in drinking-related behaviours since March 2020

	Yes	No	Total
Type of alcohol	22% (40)	78% (139)	100% (179)
Brand of alcohol	22% (39)	78% (141)	100% (180)
Where you drink alcohol	22% (39)	78% (138)	100% (177)
Who you drink alcohol with	24% (42)	76% (135)	100% (179)
Your use of low/zero alcohol drinks	21% (37)	79% (142)	100% (180)

Notes: Some missing cases.

Chapter 7 – Changes in household expenditure and purchasing patterns

The tables below are discussed in Chapter 7 of the main report.

Table 7.1 Change in affordability of alcohol since March 2020

	N	%
Much more affordable	4	2%
More affordable	24	13%
No difference	94	53%
Less affordable	47	26%
Much less affordable	10	6%
TOTAL	179	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Table 7.2 Change in purchasing patterns since March 2020

	Yes	No	Total
How much you spend on alcohol	36% (64)	64% (113)	100% (177)
Where you purchase alcohol	29% (51)	71% (127)	100% (178)
How you fund your use of alcohol	16% (28)	84% (147)	100% (175)

Notes: Some missing cases.

Chapter 8 – Changes in the use of other substances

The tables below are discussed in Chapter 8 of the main report.

Table 8.1 Changes in the use of other substances

	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the same	Stayed at zero	Total
Illegal drugs	3% (6)	7% (13)	12% (22)	77% (137)	100% (178)
Drugs prescribed to someone else	2% (4)	6% (11)	17% (31)	74% (132)	100% (178)
Over-the-counter medication	3% (6)	8% (14)	44% (78)	44% (78)	100% (178)
Drugs prescribed to you	10% (18)	7% (13)	41% (74)	41% (74)	100% (179)
Any other substances	1% (1)	6% (10)	15% (26)	79% (138)	100% (175)

Notes: Some missing cases.

Chapter 10 – Views on the effectiveness and future of MPA

The tables below are discussed in Chapter 10 of the main report.

Table 10.1 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement: “MPA has been effective in reducing alcohol-related harm in Wales”?

	N	%
Strongly agree	13	7%
Moderately agree	33	19%
Neither agree nor disagree	58	33%
Moderately disagree	34	19%
Strongly disagree	40	23%
TOTAL	178	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Table 10.2 How strongly are you in favour of MPA continuing in Wales?

	N	%
Strongly in favour	15	8%
Somewhat in favour	41	23%
Neither for nor against	52	29%
Somewhat against	25	14%
Strongly against	39	22%
I don't know	7	4%
TOTAL	179	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

Table 10.3 If there was an option to change the minimum unit price what would you recommend?

	N	%
Make it higher	31	17%
Make it lower	37	21%
Keep it at 50p	55	31%
Remove MPA have no MUP	55	31%
TOTAL	178	100%

Notes: Some missing cases.

6. Interview schedule

Evaluation of the Minimum Pricing for Alcohol in Wales Impact on the wider population of drinkers (Lot 4)

Introduction and preamble

My name is [researcher] and I am part of a team of researchers that have been commissioned by Welsh Government to evaluate the impact of Minimum Pricing for Alcohol in Wales. Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. Please can I check that you have read the privacy notice and information sheet and also that you consent to being interviewed? The interview will take approximately 30 minutes and will be based on a series of mostly open questions where you will be asked to tell us about your drinking patterns since MPA was introduced back in March 2020 and subsequently. Please try to answer as fully as possible. After the interview I will send you by Royal Mail a £10 Argos voucher (plus a bonus voucher if you have participated in at least two previous interviews). I will ask you for your postal address and will store this securely until the voucher has been safely received.

Do remember that your participation is entirely voluntary and that you are free to skip any questions or stop the interview at any point. Your identity will be kept confidential (except for in the circumstances outlined in the information sheet) and your responses will be anonymised in any reports or articles that we write. Please can I check that you are still happy for me to record the interview on this digital recorder? Do be careful not to mention any names while the recorder is on, but don't worry if you do as we will delete them from the written transcript as soon as it has been transcribed. Thanks again for helping us with this important project.

State the interviewee's unique ID at the start of the interview on the recording.

Theme	Question	Prompts
<p>Socio-demographic characteristics</p> <p>You provided lots of information about your socio-demographic characteristics in the first interview. Thank you for doing that.</p>	<p>1. Please may I ask you whether anything has changed since we spoke last (June 2022)? I have a list of things to check with you:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Gender b. Ethnic group c. Local Authority Area d. Type of area e. Age category (ask how old they are) f. Marital status g. Children aged 17 and under living at home h. Highest qualification i. Benefits j. Employment status k. Housing situation l. Income category m. Treatment history
	<p>2. How well would you say that you are managing financially these days?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well • Quite well • Neither managing nor not managing • Not well • Not at all well
	<p>3. And, would you mind answering four questions about your quality of life at the moment, please?</p> <p>On a scale from 0-10, overall:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How satisfied are you with your life? • To what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile? • How happy did you feel yesterday? • How anxious did you feel yesterday?
<p>Post-implementation – awareness of MPA</p>	<p>1. Since we spoke last, can you recall seeing any publicity about MPA?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When did you notice this? • What did you see? • Where was this? • What did it say? • What did you think/feel about it?

Theme	Question	Prompts
	2. Since we spoke last, have you noticed any significant changes in the price of alcohol?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, please describe the changes in terms of what products, sizes, etc.
	3. Since we spoke last, have you noticed (a) any products being no longer available or (b) any products returning to the shelves that had been missing previously?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What product(s) (type, brand, sizes) • Everywhere or just one location? • Short-lived or continuing?
Current drinking pattern	4. You may recall in the first interview that we asked you to complete an online survey prior to the interview. We have not asked you to do that again for this additional round of interviews. But, we would still like to ask you the key questions about your general pattern of alcohol use over the past year so that we can see if anything has changed. We hope that this is ok with you?	<p>Administer AUDIT questions (see end of schedule for the questions) or this link:</p> <p>Alcoholism and Alcohol Misuse Doctor</p>
	5. Please could you describe a typical week (from within the last month or two) in terms of what type of alcohol you currently drink, what brands, how much, how often, where you tend to consume it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What type of alcohol • What brands • How much • How often • Where purchase • Where consume
	6. Since we spoke last, has your drinking pattern changed in any way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantities • Frequency • Types of alcohol • Brands • Drinking out more/less/same

Theme	Question	Prompts
	7. If any changes have been made, why would you say these changes occurred?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA • Other factors
	8. Have you sought any support (professional or personal) for your drinking since we last spoke?	<p>If yes, how easy was it to find help?</p> <p>If yes, who did you seek help from?</p> <p>If yes, was the reason related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA • Other factors
Purchasing patterns	9. On average, how much are you currently spending on alcohol each week?	
	10. How does the amount of money that you are currently spending on alcohol each week compare with the last time that we spoke?	<p>If spending more/less, is this related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA • Other factors
	11. If spending more, how are you funding this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have you absorbed the price increase into your existing budgets • To what extent have you shifted around your finances to free up money (probe for details) • To what extent have you borrowed money (probe from whom, how often, how much) • To what extent have you committed any/more crimes (probe for type of crime, how often) • Was there some other method?

Theme	Question	Prompts
	12. Since we spoke last, have you changed where and how you purchase alcohol? Please describe the changes and explain why you made those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA • Other factors
Use of other substances	13. Since we spoke last, has there been a change in your use of other substances (i.e. illegal drugs, prescription drugs obtained legally, prescription drugs obtained illegally, non-beverage alcohol, food). If yes, please describe the changes.	<p>If yes, why did you change and were these changes related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA • Other factors
Other aspects of your life	<p>14. Since we last spoke, have you experienced changes in any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationships family • Relationships friends • Physical health • Mental health • Employment • Financial circumstances • Housing/living arrangements • Offending <p>Any other aspect of your life</p>	<p>What are the reasons for these changes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA • Other

Theme	Question	Prompts
	15. So far, we have asked you about your own personal experiences. Would you like to comment more generally about changes in drinking patterns and related behaviours among others? It would be helpful if you could provide examples of things you have noticed, please.	Probe for evidence and examples rather than perceptions and assumptions. Ask why they think the changes occurred and probe for the impact of MPA or other factors.
The future of MPA in Wales	16. What are your overall views on the effectiveness of MPA in Wales?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it reducing alcohol-related harm? • What makes you think this?
	17. Do you think that MPA should be continued?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do you feel this way? • How strongly do you feel about this?
	18. It has been suggested that increasing the value of the minimum unit price could potentially increase the positive impact on alcohol consumption and related harms. If there was an option to change the MUP from 50p, what would you recommend that Welsh Government do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher, lower, same, remove • What price would you recommend? • Why do you feel this way?
	19. What things should WG do to reduce alcohol-related harm in Wales?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA-related (improving/changing it in some way) • Other initiatives
Final comments	20. Is there anything else that you think might be relevant to our study on MPA?	

Thank you very much for your time.

[Before switching off the recorder, check that they are happy with their experience and thank them for their contribution over the study period. After switching off the recorder, check that you have the correct postal address.]

7. Questionnaire topics

1. Preamble and information sheet
2. A few questions about you (gender, ethnic group, Local Authority area, type of area, age, marital status, number of children under 17, qualifications, employment, household income, housing status)
3. A few questions about your quality of life (satisfaction, worthwhile, happy, anxious)
4. A few questions on your usual use of alcohol (how often, how many units, impact on your life)
5. A few questions on substance misuse treatment
6. A few questions on awareness of the implementation of MPA (i.e. awareness of price changes or product availability)
7. A few questions about changes in your alcohol consumption and related behaviours since March 2020 (e.g. changes in quantity, frequency, type, brand, where you purchase from, how much you spend, how you fund your use, where you drink, who you drink with, use of low/zero alcohol drinks)
8. A few questions about the most important factors that caused any changes
9. A few questions on your use of other drugs (illegal drugs, prescription drugs not prescribed to you, over the counter medicines, food, non-alcoholic beverages, non-beverage alcohol)
10. A few questions about the effectiveness of MPA and your views on its future in Wales
11. A few questions on what you think Welsh Government could do to make MPA more effective and how else they might reduce alcohol-related harm in Wales
12. Anything else that you would like to tell us about MPA.