

# Designing a One-Stop Shop for Businesses on Child Online Safety

Research by the Behavioural Insights Team



## Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Chapter 1: Project background and methodology	4
1.1 Policy background	4
1.2 Project methodology	5
Chapter 2: Exploring business challenges and behaviours	7
Chapter 3: Developing prototypes	17
3.1 Design inspiration from websites and experts	17
3.2 Generating ideas for the One-Stop Shop	18
3.3 The first One-Stop Shop prototypes	19
Chapter 4: Testing the two website prototypes	22
4.1 How we tested the prototypes	22
4.2 Findings from the online experiment	23
Chapter 5: Conclusion	31
Annex A: Exploratory research methodology	32
Annex B: Prototype development	33



### **Executive summary**

As the internet plays an ever-increasing role in children's lives, ensuring children's safety online has never been more important. A range of government and regulatory measures have sought to tackle risks to children online, such as those around data protection, harmful interactions between children, and abuse and exploitation. Companies that run online services have also taken steps to keep children safe from harm. However, given the fast-moving and complex nature of the challenges, some businesses report that they can struggle to navigate and understand their responsibilities when it comes to child online safety.

To better meet businesses' needs, the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport commissioned the Behavioural Insights Team to lead a programme of research to design a One-Stop Shop on Child Online Safety: a single, online resource to help businesses operating an online service to understand their responsibilities regarding children's online safety.

The first phase of the research explored businesses' behaviours, needs and wants when it comes to searching for information on their responsibilities. We designed a bespoke survey, which was completed by over 150 employees in companies with child online safety responsibilities, and supplemented this with follow-up interviews and stakeholder workshops. We generated rich insights into the best ways to support businesses to fulfil their child online safety responsibilities and demonstrate world-leading best practice. We found:

- Businesses are most likely to review their child online safety practices in response to new legislation or knowledge of other Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) practices.
- 2. The SMEs we heard from were generally confident in their ability to find new information and guidance on child online safety.
- 3. Employees in smaller businesses are generally less confident than those in larger businesses in their business' ability to find information on child online safety.
- 4. The biggest barriers to businesses finding information on child online safety appear to be due to the presentation and accessibility of information.
- 5. Businesses want a service that brings together existing content on child online safety, through signposting, practical advice pages and in-depth guides.
- 6. The source of information is a key determinant of whether the advice is taken up.

The second phase of our work drew on the expertise of a range of existing sources and subject-matter experts, as well as behavioural science literature, to design One-Stop Shop prototypes. These aimed to address the specific behavioural barriers that businesses currently face in the process of searching for and implementing new practices.

The two leading designs were structured around four key topics of child online safety and shared a range of key design elements: shortlisted "must do" actions written in plain English; signposting and hyperlinks to further guidance; and sections for each topic on going "above and beyond" mandatory minimum requirements.

The final project phase tested the performance of our website prototypes and pitted our two leading designs (versions A and B) head-to-head. A randomised trial - or A/B test - recruited over 1,000 people to engage with one of the two versions of the site and found:

1. People understood, on average, around two-thirds of the key points on both versions of the website.



- 2. Placing information on the homepage of Version B reduced understanding of information found elsewhere on the Version B website.
- 3. People who saw Version A had slightly more confidence in their ability to find information on the site and take action on the basis of what they had seen.
- 4. On average, people who said that they had higher prior knowledge of data protection regulation actually understood *less* of the content on the site.
- 5. Trust in the information provided and willingness to recommend the website were high for both versions of the website.

Our findings provide the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport with practical insights and rigorously-tested prototypes from which to build the final One-Stop Shop website. Applying the insights presented in this report, we are confident that the One-Stop Shop will be a powerful resource for helping businesses and driving progress in practices that keep children safe online.

# Chapter 1: Project background and methodology

The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) commissioned the Behavioural Insights Team (BIT) to design and test a One-Stop Shop on child online safety. The resource will help businesses of all sizes, with a particular focus on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), to understand what is required of them to ensure that their services keep children safe online.

### **1.1 Policy background**

With rapid technological innovation, the internet continues to permeate our everyday lives. Governments and regulators around the world are paying ever more attention to how companies should be expected to protect users online - from data protection and privacy, to preventing abuse or exploitation - with a range of new regulations, rules and guidelines. As set out in the Government's Online Harms White Paper,<sup>1</sup> many businesses are already putting in place measures to tackle harm online, but more can be done to make it easier for all businesses to understand and fulfil their obligations.

Half of ten year olds now own a smartphone<sup>2</sup> and half of 11 to 12 year olds have social media profiles.<sup>3</sup> The need to safeguard younger users online while preserving opportunities for entertainment, learning, creativity and freedom of expression, is paramount. Protecting younger users online crosses several domains, some of which are outlined in the table below.

Domain	Example issues or challenges for businesses
1. Data protection and privacy	Ensuring children understand what data they are providing and how businesses might use their data, meeting existing data protection legislation and forthcoming requirements under the Age Appropriate Design Code. <sup>4</sup>
<ol> <li>Social media interactions, messaging and content sharing</li> </ol>	Making sure that children send and share appropriate content and are not exposed to harmful material or interactions online.

Table 1. Key domains of child online safety

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> HM Government. (2019). Online Harms White Paper.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ofcom. (2019). <u>Children and parents: Media use and attitudes report 2019</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-42153694

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Information Commissioner's Office. (2019). <u>Age-appropriate design: A code of practice for online</u> <u>services</u>.

3.	Grooming, child sexual exploitation and abuse (CSEA)	Protecting children from potential online CSEA offenders, in compliance with the Home Office's forthcoming national strategy to tackle CSEA and interim code of practice on online CSEA.
4.	Empowerment, access and positive fulfilment of rights	Supporting younger users to build confidence in going online, and promoting all children and young people's rights to leisure, play, culture, appropriate information, and freedom of thought and expression. <sup>5</sup>

As many as 41 per cent of 11 to 18 year-olds surveyed by the NSPCC said that they thought websites, apps and games were not doing enough to keep them safe online.<sup>6</sup> Only half of parents of 5 to 15 year-olds currently feel that the benefits of their child being online outweigh the risks, down from two-thirds of parents in 2015.<sup>7</sup> Ensuring that children are kept safe is likely to be a key means for businesses to earn and maintain well-placed trust in their services.

#### Aims of the One-Stop Shop

The aim of the One-Stop Shop is to provide companies with practical guidance on how to keep children safe online. The Online Harms White Paper set the initial scope of a new regulatory framework (see Part 2, Section 3 - "A new regulatory framework").<sup>8</sup>

It is anticipated that the One-Stop Shop will support smaller companies in particular to better understand their existing regulatory requirements and the direction of travel for child online safety signalled through the Online Harms White Paper. The One-Stop Shop will not create new content or requirements on companies, it will focus on tailoring guidance and supporting businesses' access to existing resources.

### **1.2 Project methodology**

BIT conducted various research activities to support the final recommendations for designing the One-Stop Shop on child online safety. These ranged from exploring business needs and the behaviours of SMEs searching for information; collating and generating ideas for the design of the One Stop Shop; and finally using online experiments to robustly evaluate the performance of the prototypes created.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> <u>https://learning.nspcc.org.uk/research-resources/how-safe-are-our-children/</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Ofcom. (2019). <u>Children and parents: Media use and attitudes report 2019</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> HM Government. (2019). Online Harms White Paper.

Exploratory research	Design inspiration	Solution generation	Prototype testing
Business survey & interviews	Audit of existing websites	BIT and DCMS workshops using EAST	Online experiment
Rapid evidence review	Expert interviews		
Stakeholder workshop		- Stakeholder workshop	

**Figure 1.** Overview of research activities conducted to inform the design of the One-Stop Shop<sup>9</sup>

The rest of this report is set out as follows:

- Chapter 2 summarises exploratory research findings;
- <u>Chapter 3</u> summarises sources of **design inspiration** and the approach to **solution** generation;
- <u>Chapter 4</u> summarises the approach and results of **prototype testing**;
- <u>Chapter 5</u> presents conclusions.

6

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> The EAST acronym is outlined in <u>Chapter 3</u>. It is a tool developed by BIT for encouraging behaviour change.

## Chapter 2: Exploring business challenges and behaviours

How and where do businesses search for information on child online safety requirements? What forms of information are most helpful for businesses and what barriers prevent businesses from acting on guidance?

To answer these questions and inform the design of the One-Stop Shop we conducted research into the behaviour of businesses when adopting new practices, particularly those related to child online safety. Our research included business surveys, interviews, a desk-based rapid evidence review and a stakeholder workshop, Exploratory research Business survey & interviews

Rapid evidence review

Stakeholder workshop

all focused around the research questions outlined in <u>Table 2</u>. Different research tools were used to corroborate evidence across sources and get insights into the first-hand views of SMEs.

Area	Research Questions	Exploratory research activities			
		Business survey and interviews	Rapid evidence review	Stakeholder workshop	
General business behaviour	<ol> <li>What triggers businesses to begin seeking out information or guidance?</li> </ol>	~	V		
	2. How and where do businesses search for relevant information?	~	v		
	3. What factors influence whether and how businesses translate information into practice?	V	V		
Uptake of Child Online	4. How suitable is existing information on child online safety for businesses?	V		V	
practices	5. What are the most effective ways of communicating child online safety information to businesses?	V		V	
	6. What barriers prevent businesses from implementing child online safety changes to their business (behavioural, legal, technical etc.)?	۷		V	

#### Table 2. Overview of key research questions, and relevant Explore activities

At the core of our approach was a survey for businesses with child online safety responsibilities. We heard from 166 employees of such businesses from June to August 2020 on their experiences of searching for and applying information on child online safety, as well as their views on what new online resources would be most helpful. We used follow-up interviews with two survey respondents to explore their views in more detail.<sup>10</sup>

The survey was complemented by a rapid evidence review of business behaviour when searching for and implementing new practices, and a stakeholder workshop focused on understanding the SME perspective on compliance with child online safety requirements and common barriers. The workshop was attended by representatives from the Coalition for a Digital Economy (Coadec), the Confederation of British Industry, the Federation of Small Businesses, Ofcom, TechUK, The Association for UK Interactive Entertainment (Ukie), Unicef, BIT and DCMS.

This chapter presents six headline findings from the SME survey, interviews and the rapid evidence review, as highlighted in the diagram below.

Headlir	ne Findings: Exploratory re	search
1. Businesses are most likely to review their child online safety practices in response to new legislation or knowledge of other SMEs practices.	2. The SMEs we heard from were generally confident in their ability to find new information and guidance on child online safety.	3. Employees in smaller businesses are generally less confident than those in larger businesses in their business' ability to find information on child online safety.
4. The biggest barriers to businesses finding information on child online safety appear to be due to the presentation and accessibility of information.	5. Businesses want a service that synthesises existing content on child online safety, through signposting, practical advice pages and in-depth guides.	6. The source of information is a key determinant of whether the advice is taken up.

## 1. Businesses are most likely to review their child online safety practices in response to new legislation or knowledge of other SMEs' practices.

Our survey asked businesses to select from a list of nine factors that may cause their firm to start searching for information. These factors were drawn from existing literature on business behaviour. The most commonly selected were changes to legislation (selected by 47 per cent of respondents), internal knowledge gaps (33 per cent) and knowledge of other SME practices (28 per cent).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> People who completed the survey were invited to provide more information via follow-up interviews. Four individuals volunteered, from which were able to schedule interviews with two people.



**Figure 2.** Factors that employees believe might prompt their business to seek out information or guidance on child online safety<sup>11</sup>

The two interviewees highlighted similar factors that encouraged them to review their online safety practices. One interviewee acknowledged that their involvement in the launch of a new game targeted at younger audiences required them to address their internal knowledge gaps about online safety. Knowledge of peer practices was also identified as an important catalyst in interviews. For example, knowledge sharing by SMEs and other organisations about technical weaknesses to an app following an update was identified as one such external factor that may prompt an SME to review their own practices.

This echoes the rapid evidence review, which found that business managers often recognise their own responsibilities as a response to external cues (e.g. competitor practices).<sup>12</sup> Over two-thirds of SMEs surveyed in 2014 said that crisis events had led, at least to some extent, to a change in the way they operate.<sup>13</sup> Existing research also suggests that businesses are influenced by the actions of those around them, from competitors to professional contacts.<sup>14</sup> This is most clearly demonstrated by the effects of social norms, where businesses take cues from similar organisations. For example, in a behavioural experiment in the United States, telling businesses that the majority of other businesses use an online tax account doubled the number making tax payments online, compared to a letter that did not highlight the social norm of what other businesses are doing.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Respondents could select up to three options.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> For example, see HM Government. (2019). <u>Business productivity review</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Saunders, M. N. K., Gray, D. E., & Goregaokar, H. (2014). SME innovation and learning: The role of networks and crisis events. European, Journal of Training and Development, 38(1/2), 136–149.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> HM Government. (2016). <u>ORGANISER: A behavioural approach for influencing organisations</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Behavioural Insights Team. (2019). <u>Boosting businesses: applying behavioural insights to business</u> policy.

The practice of regularly and proactively keeping "up to date" on guidance came up in interviews and the stakeholder workshop. One interviewee felt that it was the responsibility of companies to continually stay on top of guidance, although SMEs will not always have the time or habit to keep refreshing knowledge. The interviewee suggested that organisations may search for information, perhaps following an external prompt, make any changes deemed necessary and move on, with no plan for re-engagement or monitoring of compliance. Participants in the stakeholder workshop shared this view, suggesting that SMEs do not have a habit of continually checking in on guidance.

Both our primary research and the behavioural science literature therefore suggest that timely moments and social comparisons create valuable opportunities to motivate businesses to engage with child online safety guidance. Given the often irregular timing of these cues, building engagement on an ongoing basis is an additional but related challenge to address.

# 2. The SMEs we heard from were generally confident in their ability to find new information and guidance on child online safety.

Two-thirds (66 per cent) of employees in our survey said that it was clear who in their business was responsible for finding and implementing new guidance on child online safety. These employees were also the most confident in their ability to find such information, with 55 per cent being "very confident" in finding new information.

At the same time, 61 per cent of survey respondents reported that responsibility for implementing new child online safety practices is often shared across many individuals in an organisation. Those who felt clearest on where responsibility lay for implementing new guidance in their organisation were in organisations where more people were involved in matters of child online safety. This suggests that responsibilities may be clearer in businesses that have more than one person responsible for child online safety, or even a dedicated team whose role is to find and implement new guidance. Those responsible for developing child online safety resources for businesses may therefore need to make efforts to reach out and simplify the information searching process for organisations where team responsibilities are less structured, or otherwise less clearly defined.

It is also worth noting that smaller organisations are less likely to have dedicated teams responsible for child online safety. In these organisations, the responsibility for finding and implementing new guidance may be unclear and particular efforts, such as targeted outreach by trade associations, may be needed to engage and support them.



**Figure 3**. The relationship between (a) the clarity of responsibilities regarding child online safety in an organisation, and (b) the spread of child online safety responsibilities across multiple employees (i.e. the number of people involved)

# 3. Employees in smaller businesses are generally less confident than those in larger businesses in their business' ability to find information on child online safety.

64 per cent of respondents from small companies felt confident or very confident in their businesses' ability to find information on child online safety, compared to 83 per cent of respondents from medium-sized companies and 78 per cent of respondents from large companies (see Figure 4). Smaller businesses may also face greater resource constraints that make it more difficult for them to respond accordingly. Participants at the stakeholder workshop identified that larger companies often have legal teams that can monitor responsibilities, review guidance and recommend changes, but smaller companies do not have the same resources and expertise, making it much more difficult for them to stay up to date with guidance and implement changes.



**Figure 4.** Confidence in respondents' businesses' ability to find information or guidance on child online safety.<sup>16</sup>

Existing research suggests that businesses are more likely to search for external information and advice if they have recognised knowledge gaps.<sup>17</sup> Some of the smaller businesses in our survey may recognise child online safety practices as a knowledge gap, and hence have an unmet need for better information on the topic.

## 4. The biggest barriers to businesses finding information on child online safety appear to be due to the presentation and accessibility of information.

Almost half (49 per cent) of respondents to our survey stated that they had personally sought information on child online safety in the past. When asked how hard it was to find information, 38 per cent of those who had first-hand experience thought that it was somewhat or very easy to find the information they were looking for, while 29 per cent thought it was somewhat or very hard.



Excluded: Answered 'No' to Have you personally sought out information or guidance for your business on child online safety in the last 12 months?

**Figure 5**. Views from employees who have first-hand experience of searching for information on child online safety, on how easy it was to find the information they were looking for

People who had personal experience of searching reported that the most common barriers to finding information were not having information summarised in one place (36 per cent selected this as a barrier) and struggling to identify relevant information (33 per cent).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Survey respondents chose a rating of 1-5 with 1 labelled "Not at all confident" and 5 labelled "Very confident". Due to small cell sizes, ratings of 1-3 are grouped as "Not so confident or unconfident" and ratings of 4-5 are grouped as "Confident".

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Mole, K., North, D., & Baldock, R. (2017). Which SMEs seek external support? Business characteristics, management behaviour and external influences in a contingency approach. Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space, 35(3), 476-499.



Excluded: Answered 'No' to Have you personally sought out information or guidance for your business on child online safety in the last 12 months?

**Figure 6.** Factors selected as barriers to finding information when thinking about one's recent experiences seeking out information for their business.<sup>18</sup>

Similar barriers were identified in the interviews, particularly regarding the scale of information available and the difficulty of sorting through this to find information relevant to a specific business. One interviewee stated:

"It's just an enormous, a really broad topic, and if I just went on Google right now and I said, 'oh what's the best resource for child online safety', I would have like 500,000 results, at least. Some of them would be UK based, some of them would be US based, some of them would be around pornography and some of them might be around gambling. This is my point of entry. I would have to invest quite a lot of time in just at least skimming a lot of things..." - Interview participant

Stakeholder workshop participants identified language as an additional barrier, particularly that the use of policy-heavy terminology and jargon, and lack of clarity on interchangeable terms made it difficult to interpret and understand what guidance documents meant. Interviewees were also concerned about spending time processing information that they may later find is inaccurate or out of date, and that included the government's own published guidance. These challenges of accessibility in language and ensuring information is up-to-date may be affecting businesses' search behaviour: 47 per cent of our survey respondents agreed that, in general, their business would search the internet for a summary of new guidance on child online safety, rather than reading official guidance in full (26 per cent disagreed with this statement).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Respondents could tick all that apply.

These findings suggest that there is a significant number of SMEs struggling to find and process information on child online safety, but that many of the barriers causing this might be possible to overcome through a single, comprehensive, jargon-free and up-to-date One-Stop Shop.

# 5. Businesses want a service that synthesises existing content on child online safety, through signposting, practical advice pages and in-depth guides.

The final section of the survey asked what types of content respondents would find most helpful on a new website dedicated to helping SMEs with child online safety. Figure 7 summarises the responses.





<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Respondents could select up to three options.

The types of resources that were most commonly requested were all text-based forms of content, such as signposting, advice pages and in-depth guides. Interactive features such as surveys, benchmarking tools, and user forums were far less sought after.

This differs from the findings of behavioural evidence identified in the rapid evidence review and anecdotal evidence provided in the interviews. For example, participating in peer knowledge sharing networks is found to make businesses more likely to adopt new formal policies and procedures,<sup>20</sup> yet were flagged as helpful by only 10 per cent of survey respondents. Similarly, competitors are found to have a big influence on organisational behaviour in business research and were the third most commonly reported trigger for SMEs to review their child online safety practices in our survey. However, only 15 per cent of respondents to the survey thought that interactive benchmarking would be a helpful feature of the One-Stop Shop website.

Interviewees highlighted that child online safety is not something that SMEs compete on, and is rather an area where there is broad willingness to collaborate and people already go out of their way to share best practices and refer SMEs to resources for additional help. If competitive pressure is not a significant driver of business improvement in this context, then benchmarking tools may be less effective at motivating change. Alternatively, businesses may say that they prefer to learn from simple and accessible written forms of information, but in practice would also benefit from more proactive engagements such as forums and personalised comparisons.<sup>21</sup> Forums in particular might have potential in this context if businesses wish to work collaboratively and share best practice.

This evidence alone should not be used to determine the content on the One-Stop Shop, but it clearly signals that the most pressing information needs reported by businesses are for simple, text-based content, rather than more complex interactive or video elements. In general, it is clearly important to take businesses' preferences into account, as the One-Stop Shop should be helpful and appealing to businesses as the core users of the service. Further, information provided in an inconvenient or unhelpful format might be disregarded by businesses, especially if it conflicts with existing knowledge.<sup>22 23</sup> It is therefore important that the One-Stop Shop helps to engage and persuade business users (rather than feeling confrontational or accusatory for businesses that have a different understanding of their responsibilities).

It should be noted that both interviewees felt that reading reports or websites is not always the best format for processing new information and that initial conversations with experts are generally preferred. Key reasons for this were experts' ability to tailor information to the businesses' interests and help people make a quick assessment of whether new information is relevant to a business, both of which it may be possible to do to some extent via digital

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Wu, N., Bacon, N., & Hoque, K. (2014). The adoption of high performance work practices in small businesses: The influence of markets, business characteristics and HR expertise. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25(8), 1149–1169.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> If we were to speculate, it may be that businesses feel it is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> See Box 1 of <u>Boosting businesses: applying behavioural insights to business policy</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Golman, R., Hagmann, D., & Loewenstein, G. (2017). Information avoidance. Journal of Economic Literature, 55(1), 96-135.

diagnostic tools in the One-Stop Shop. As the One-Stop Shop develops, it is worth exploring whether access to expert advisors, alongside digital content, may be helpful for SMEs.

# 6. The source of information is a key determinant of whether the advice is taken up.

Research into business behaviour shows that organisations' willingness to take an action or follow advice depends on how decision-makers perceive the source of the message,<sup>24</sup> echoing the finding in individual-level decision-making studies.<sup>25</sup> Whether an action is taken up by businesses depends at least in part on the perceived trustworthiness and expertise of the source.<sup>26</sup>

The SME survey found that the most trusted sources for information on child online safety were official government websites (40 per cent of respondents trust "a lot") and formal external advice (e.g. legal advisor) (22 per cent) (see Figure 8). Interviewees highlighted the ways that SMEs may determine whether information is credible, which included researching the organisation that had posted it and the accuracy and fit of information in relation to other regulatory requirements. This suggests that hosting the One-Stop Shop on official government websites such as GOV.UK, with clear references to how guidance fits with wider requirements such as data protection regulation, would help to maximise users' trust in the content.



Figure 8. Reported levels of trust in different sources if searching for information on child online safety

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Bartholomew, S. and Smith, A. D. (2006). Improving Survey Response Rates from Chief Executive Officers in Small Firms: The Importance of Social Networks. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 30(1), 83-96; The Behavioural Insights Team. (2018). Increasing private-sector innovation: evidence review (forthcoming); Jack, K. (2013). Market inefficiencies and the adoption of agricultural technologies in developing countries.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Behavioural Insights Team. (2018). <u>One letter that triples energy switching</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Behavioural Insights Team. (2019). <u>Boosting businesses: applying behavioural insights to business</u> <u>policy</u>.

### **Chapter 3: Developing prototypes**

With the knowledge from our exploratory work, we generated ideas for designing a One-Stop Shop taking account of businesses' needs and the barriers they encounter when searching for information on child online safety. This chapter describes the evidence we drew on, our sources of inspiration and the prototypes we created as a result.

### 3.1 Design inspiration from websites and experts

One-stop shops already exist in many domains, bringing together multiple sources of information into one place and minimising any gaps or overlaps in content and any divergences in terminology.

A One-Stop Shop for child online safety has the potential to address two of the most commonly reported barriers that businesses face when searching for this information: identifying relevant information and having it all in one place.



Beyond this core purpose and the resources most requested by businesses (see Figure 7), we explored the features and techniques used in existing one-stop shop services, searching for inspiration and collating design ideas to consider.

<u>Table 3</u> captures the key insights from the behavioural audits we conducted of existing one-stop shop-style websites as well as informal interviews we conducted with digital services experts who have led development of new government resources.<sup>27</sup>

The business survey, interviews, stakeholder workshop and expert advice all suggested that sites on the GOV.UK domain were likely to be a central and highly trusted source when businesses search for guidance on their responsibilities. We therefore prioritised design ideas that would be feasible to implement within the constraints of standard GOV.UK page templates.

**Table 3.** Summary of design recommendations drawn from existing sources, focusing on elements that are feasible to build using standard GOV.UK page templates

Recommenda	tion	Explanation
Facilitate engagement from the home page	1. Choose 3-4 core topics as the focus of the homepage.	Identify and focus on a small selection of common user needs to minimise information overload and disengagement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> We spoke to a digital project lead involved in developing <u>Be the Business</u>, an advice platform for businesses on improving productivity, and a member of the <u>GREAT.gov.uk</u> digital team.

	2.	Minimise the use of colour, big fonts and salient visuals.	As above, it is easy to overwhelm people. The websites we visited often fell into the trap of trying to do too much and becoming cluttered.
Serve a diverse audience	3.	Create multiple ways for people to engage (e.g. free text search and navigation bars)	Different organisations and different user groups will have different needs and objectives when browsing the site, and hence different preferences for navigating.
	4.	Use formatting or site functionality to separate or tailor content for different types of user (e.g. based on a person's role with an organisation).	Direct or tailor content to support different types of user, such as those with varying degrees of motivation, ambition, awareness and starting knowledge. Accommodate those who need basic, essential advice as well as those looking for tips on how to excel.
Transform information into action	5.	Break down tasks into simple steps, using progress bars and checklists for longer processes.	Step-by-step action plans and checklists make longer processes feel more manageable and ensure people have tangible next steps.
	6.	Allows users to bookmark or save information for future reference.	Allow users to save progress if they have inputted information rather than forcing them to start again. Simple buttons to "export" or "email me this page" can also be helpful.

### 3.2 Generating ideas for the One-Stop Shop

BIT ran two idea generation workshops with policy, digital and behavioural science experts in BIT and DCMS, as well as an idea generation exercise at a stakeholder workshop.

These sessions drew on the findings from the exploratory research and used the EAST framework<sup>28</sup> for developing design ideas informed by behavioural science. The EAST framework is a tool for encouraging behaviour change drawing on the evidence-based techniques of making desirable

Solution generation



behaviours easy, attractive, social and/or timely. In this case, we generated ideas for increasing access to information on the one-stop shop site, and taking subsequent action on the basis of that information.

We shortlisted ideas and specific design elements on the basis of their anticipated impact and feasibility, for example if ideas were likely to be a significant help to businesses, and feasible to implement at scale. This process for generating, prioritising and iterating the constituent elements of the prototypes ensured that they are underpinned by behavioural science and evidence of what is likely to be effective.

The prioritised ideas were then grouped and organised into the first One-Stop Shop prototypes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Behavioural Insights Team. (2014). EAST: Four simple ways to apply behavioural insights.

### 3.3 The first One-Stop Shop prototypes

We envisioned the core structure of the website as a homepage which introduces the One-Stop Shop and four core topic areas. These topic areas were chosen to build on the OECD typology of risks that children face online.<sup>29</sup> The homepage also links to a small number of topic-based advice pages, as shown in <u>Figure 9</u>.



Figure 9. Overview of the website core structure

In our exploratory work, two different approaches to organising content across these pages emerged. We built prototypes to demonstrate both options:

- 1. **Version A**: A simple, minimalist homepage which identifies key topic areas and encourages users to explore each in turn. Tries not to overwhelm the user and allows them to get to the page they are looking for with minimal user friction.
- Version B: Includes the headline requirements for businesses under each topic on the homepage itself. Presents the core topics in a proposed step-by-step order and offers links beneath the headline information to access the full advice pages. This imparts key points on core topics to all users, without them having to leave the homepage.

While version A and B differ in the amount of content presented on the homepage, the advice pages are the same.

The design of the homepages and the supporting advice pages incorporate a range of ideas drawn from behavioural science literature and our primary research. Various other ideas could not be taken forward within the time and budget constraints, such as interactive functionality that personalised content for certain audiences (e.g. legal professionals). These ideas are still noted in <u>Table 3</u> and <u>Annex B: Prototype Development</u> as inspiration for future design iterations.

Having built two designs, we could then test the two prototypes head-to-head using an online experiment or "A/B test", as described in <u>Chapter 4</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> OECD (2011), "The Protection of Children Online: Risks Faced by Children Online and Policies to Protect Them", OECD Digital Economy Papers, No. 179, OECD Publishing, Paris, <u>https://doi.org/10.1787/5kgcjf71pl28-en</u>.

#### 20



Figure 10. Screenshot of the Version A homepage

Figure 11. Screenshot of the Version B homepage



Figure 12. Screenshots of the data protection advice page

### Chapter 4: Testing the two website prototypes

To test the performance of the two prototype websites, we recruited 1,003 people from the general population to interact with them via an online experiment. The experiment collected metrics including participants' understanding of key information, confidence in understanding the information, views on the trustworthiness of the content on the site, and time spent finding key information.

#### **Prototype testing**

**Online experiment** 

#### 4.1 How we tested the prototypes

Using BIT's online experiment platform, <u>Predictiv</u>, we had 1,003 adults from across the UK interact with the prototypes between 17 and 21 February 2021. People were allocated randomly to see either Version A or Version B of the website. This random allocation ensured we generated robust findings on how the different website designs impact upon people's understanding, views and behaviour.

Participants were first asked to search for information on a given topic, either data protection or age-appropriate content, on behalf of a hypothetical company. They were then allowed to freely engage with the website while answering five multiple-choice questions about the specified topic. There was no time limit, and participants were able to see the questions alongside the website. Once they had completed the first task, participants repeated the task with the second topic, using the same version of the website and five new questions. In total, participants completed two tasks, one on each topic, and answered 10 multiple-choice questions.

This methodology was chosen to simulate the behaviour of a typical future user of the site: someone in a company searching for information on their organisations responsibilities on a topic such as data protection. It was also designed to allow people to answer questions as they browsed, in the way that a real user might take notes. Importantly, this meant that we were testing understanding of content at the moment it was present, rather than ability to recall information after navigating the site.

Before they were set the task, we asked participants to rate their existing knowledge on child online safety regulations. As participants were interacting with the website, we automatically collected data on the time that they spent on each webpage and the total time they spent completing the task. After each task, we asked people to indicate how many of the 5 multiple-choice questions they thought they got right, to gauge their task-specific confidence about their performance. After completing the two tasks, we asked for participant's views on their:

- Rating of the trustworthiness of the information provided, on a scale from 0 • (distrust completely) to 10 (trust completely).
- Confidence in being able to (i) find and (ii) take action based on the information on the webpage, if they were working in a digital services company.
- Willingness to recommend the website to businesses looking for information • on child online safety. Calculating the percentage of people who would promote the site, minus the percentage who would not, resulting in a Net Promoter Score for each version of the website.<sup>30</sup>

#### 4.2 Findings from the online experiment

There are five headline findings from the online experiment, which are described in more detail in the following subsections.



#### 1. People understood, on average, around two-thirds of the key points on both versions of the website.

On average, people who viewed either version of the website correctly answered 67 percent of the 10 questions we asked about the website content. For comparison, we asked the same 10 understanding questions used in the experiment to a sample of 127 people in the general population without showing them the website prototypes. The average score in this baseline survey was 54.9 per cent. Baseline understanding was reassuringly high given the specificity of the questions, although setting harder questions would likely have generated a lower baseline and hence a larger increase in understanding between users and non-users of the website.<sup>31</sup> Still, this confirmed that interaction with the website prototypes increased

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> The Net Promoter Score is a widely used metric by businesses to track people's sentiment towards a product, service or brand. The metric is explained further in Table 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> This point highlights the somewhat arbitrary levels of understanding in Figure 13, as the levels are driven by the difficulty of the questions we set. The more interesting finding is the robust difference in understanding between respondents to the baseline survey and those who engaged with a version of the website.

understanding of the content, as we would expect. Participants who interacted with one of the website prototypes got, on average, one additional question correct compared to those in the baseline survey.



**Figure 13**. Understanding of key information, as measured by the average number of correct answers to 10 multiple-choice questions.

This first headline finding gives us confidence that both website prototypes would be effective at imparting key pieces of information to businesses looking for guidance on child online safety. The experiment finding is based on giving members of the general population a hypothetical task with small financial incentives for correctly answering questions, but we consider this promising evidence for future website users with personal or corporate motivations for using the site.

# 2. Placing information on the homepage of Version B reduced understanding of information found elsewhere on the Version B website.

Figure 13 shows that there was a small divergence in understanding depending on which version of the website people saw: people who saw Version A answered, on average, 68.2 per cent of the 10 multiple-choice questions correctly, compared to 65.2 per cent for those who saw Version B.<sup>32</sup> This is a very small difference, equivalent to a third of a question for the average website user.

People understood just as many of the pieces of information that were on the Version B homepage in both Version A and Version B, as shown by the two bars on the left side of <u>Figure 14</u>. This suggests that easy navigation to the "What must you do" content on the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> This difference of 3.0pp is weakly statistically significant, as indicated by the "+" in Figure 13. A p-value between 0.05 and 0.1 means that there is 5-10% probability that we would observe this big a difference in performance between the two websites even if in reality these were no difference. A lower p-value indicates a lower probability that a difference was observed by chance and therefore implies higher statistical significance.

Version A website was just as effective as giving these "must do" points immediate visibility on the Version B homepage.

The small difference between the two website versions arises because people who saw Version B understood less of the information that was not contained on the Version B homepage, i.e. they did not understand as much information that was contained on the advice pages. This is shown in the two bars on the right of Figure 14. This is likely due to the fact that fewer participants shown Version B of the website visited an advice page (49 per cent) than participants shown Version A of the website (81 per cent). That, in turn, may be due to these individuals being reluctant to navigate to an advice page if they have already been shown reasonably comprehensive information on the homepage, as discussed below.



**Figure 14.** Understanding of key information, split by the information that was available on the Version B homepage (six of the ten multiple-choice questions) or was not available on the Version B homepage (four of the ten multiple-choice questions).

Combining the level of understanding of information which is on the Version B homepage with the level of understanding of information which is *not* on the Version B homepage, to get the total amount of information understood, the simplified homepage (Version A) performed slightly better. There are interesting behavioural insights and policy implications here.

First, in the set-up that we tested, the Version A website (with a simplified homepage) was marginally more effective than the Version B website (which placed some of the content on the homepage).

Designers can have confidence that around six pieces of information presented upfront on the homepage will be well-understood, if taking the approach of Version B, but should note that such provision of information upfront might detract from and reduce understanding of information that is relegated to advice pages.

From a behavioural science perspective, the information upfront led to quite a busy homepage with a lot of text. This may draw people's attention away from the links to the full advice pages (reducing the salience of the links<sup>33</sup>) or otherwise reduce the sense of necessity of reviewing the full information on the advice page. It might also be that forced exposure to some of the website content on the homepage, only some of which may be relevant to the user's needs, depletes people's cognitive energy to engage with relevant content elsewhere on the website, or triggers feelings of irritation.<sup>34</sup>

A subsequent policy-relevant implication is that designers need to think carefully about the information that is chosen to appear on the homepage, if choosing to use a content-heavy homepage similar to Version B. This echoes a finding of BIT's past work on Terms and Conditions: presenting a subset of information upfront and prominently, rather than hidden behind another click, will increase people's understanding of the prioritised information, but may have little to no effect on people's understanding of content elsewhere.<sup>35</sup>

# 3. People who saw Version A had slightly more confidence in their ability to find information on the site and take action on the basis of what they had seen.

We asked participants to rate, on a 0 - 10 scale, their confidence to (a) **find** information on child online safety from the website and (b) **take action** based on this information. People had high confidence on both of these measures having seen either version of the website. Average confidence was marginally higher among those who had seen Version A: 7.5 confidence to find information and 7.6 confidence to act on information, compared to scores of 7.3 and 7.2 respectively for Version B, as shown in Figure 15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Salience refers to anything that is prominent, conspicuous or otherwise noticeable in its surroundings. People are more likely to attend to and engage with things that are salient.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> A study looking at forced exposure to pop-up ads found they caused irritation and avoidance: Edwards, S. M., Li, H., & Lee, J. H. (2002). Forced exposure and psychological reactance: Antecedents and consequences of the perceived intrusiveness of pop-up ads. Journal of advertising, 31(3), 83-95.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Behavioural Insights Team (2019). <u>Improving consumer understanding of contractual terms and privacy policies: evidence-based actions for businesses</u>. See in particular Figures 7 and 8 of the Technical Report.



\*\* p < .01, \* p < .05, + p < 0.1 Exploratory analysis, with covariates

**Figure 15.** Reported confidence in one's own ability (a) find information or guidance on child online safety from the webpage, and (b) take action based on the information.

In addition to the previous headline finding, that people understood marginally more of the content having seen Version A than Version B, this is another signal of the better performance of Version A. In practice, either version of the site is likely to be effective at empowering people to find and act on the content presented on the site.

# 4. On average, the higher people rated their prior knowledge of GDPR and privacy regulations, the less content on the site about these topics they actually understood.

Participants who stated that they were "extremely" knowledgeable about GDPR<sup>36</sup> and privacy regulation answered 55 per cent of the 5 questions on that topic correctly. This is notably below the average of 64 per cent among all participants, and the lowest score among any grouping according to prior knowledge on the topic. Put another way, participants who said that they were "extremely knowledgeable" on the topic of data protection scored, on average, eight percentage points lower in the multiple-choice questions than people who said they were "slightly" or "not at all" knowledgeable.

We can only speculate what caused this effect, but it may be that participants with a high level of perceived prior knowledge were overconfident in their knowledge and answered the understanding questions without fully consulting the information on the website. Importantly, general awareness of GDPR, or simply recognising the acronym, does not necessarily mean

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> GDPR refers to the General Data Protection Regulation, an EU law on data protection and privacy that has been transposed into UK law. For background, see the UK Government <u>Guide to the General</u> <u>Data Protection Regulation</u>.

that people know how data protection regulation (both current and forthcoming) applies to children, as it is a unique branch with additional responsibilities.

Those with less familiarity may be more attentive and open-minded in their reading of the website. This finding is supported by two insights from our secondary analysis. First, people who considered themselves to be "extremely" knowledgeable spent an average of 3 minutes and 30 seconds less time browsing the website compared to the average of those who said they were "not at all knowledgeable". As shown in <u>Table 4</u>, there is a clear inverse relationship between perceived understanding and time spent on the site. Second, we asked people how many correct answers they thought they had given to the 10 understanding questions. The people who reported to be "very" or "extremely" knowledgeable about data protection regulation thought, on average, that they had given correct answers to 75 per cent of the questions. In practice, they gave correct answers to 58 per cent of the questions. This is in comparison to those who reported to have no knowledge "at all", "slight" or "moderate" knowledge who, on average, estimated that they had answered 70 per cent of the questions correctly and did in fact, on average, answer 70 per cent correctly.

Metric	Grouped answer options		Original answer options to question: How would you rate your existing knowledge of privacy/GDPR regulation				
	Less knowled geable*	More knowled geable⁺	Not at all knowled geable	Slightly knowled geable	Moderat ely knowled geable	Very knowled geable	Extrem ely knowle dgeabl e
Understanding across both tasks (out of 10 questions)	70%	58%	66%	71%	71%	60%	56%
Understanding on data protection and privacy task (out of 5 questions) <sup>37</sup>	66%	56%	61%	69%	67%	58%	55%
Predicted percentage of correct answers	70%	75%	64%	72%	73%	73%	78%
Time to complete both tasks (mm:ss)	10:00	08:30	11:30	10:00	09:20	08:40	08:00

 Table 4.
 Summary of actual understanding, estimated understanding and time spent

 completing tasks, separated by self-reported level of prior knowledge on privacy

Notes: \* "Less knowledgeable" includes not at all knowledgeable and slightly and moderately knowledgeable. \* "More knowledgeable" includes very and extremely knowledgeable.

The design of the final One-Stop Shop should aim to mitigate the risk that people with some prior knowledge of the issues around data protection and/or child online safety regulation are overconfident in their understanding and this limits their engagement with the website.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> The questions following the two separate tasks tested understanding of different areas of child online safety. The five questions following one task were all on the topic of privacy and data protection. The five questions following the other task were about age-appropriate content.

Mitigations might involve, for example, statements to highlight that child online safety has important differences to general online safety regulations, or prompts on the advice pages themselves that ask people if they would like to double-check that they have understood the guidance. Ultimately, the site needs to minimise the risk that people leave the site with ambiguity or misunderstandings around their responsibilities, especially in cases where people think they understand more than they actually do in practice.

# 5. Trust in the information provided and willingness to recommend the website were high for both versions of the website.

Both websites performed well on metrics assessing people's confidence in their understanding of the content, trust in the content, and willingness to recommend the website, as shown in <u>Table 5</u>. Both versions of the website that we tested performed similarly well across all of these metrics.<sup>38</sup> This section therefore focuses on the promising signals of these metrics overal, regardless of which of the two website designs is taken forward.

Finding	Description	Interpretation
Very high levels of trust in the information provided on the website	The websites averaged a trust score of 7.7 on a 0-10 scale from "distrust completely" to "trust completely". There was little difference between Version A (average 7.8) and Version B (average 7.6).	High trust signals that people are willing to believe the information. The high trust score is further confirmation of the findings in our exploratory work that GOV.UK is a trusted information source. Interestingly, the trust score for both website designs is higher than the average scores attained when BIT used exactly the same trust question to test branded Bank of England communications in 2018: trust scores ranged from 6.4 to 6.7. <sup>39</sup>
High willingness to recommend the website to businesses looking for information on	The average willingness to recommend the two sites on a 0-10 scale was 7.5. Following the standard Net Promoter Score (NPS) calculations <sup>40</sup> which generates a score from -100 to +100, the headline NPS was +12	Having a NPS score above 0 means that the website has more promoters than detractors. Finding more than a third of users to be highly positive - and hopefully vocal - proponents of the website is a good sign that use of the site in the real world would spread via positive word of mouth.

**Table 5.** Summary of metrics on trust, willingness to recommend the website, and accuracy of people's own estimates of their understanding of content

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> There were minor differences of 2-3 percentage points but these differences were not statistically significant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Behavioural Insights Team (2018). <u>Enhancing central bank communications with behavioural insights</u>. The research was also published in an academic journal: Bholat, D., Broughton, N., Ter Meer, J., & Walczak, E. (2019). Enhancing central bank communications using simple and relatable information. Journal of Monetary Economics, 108, 1-15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> The Net Promoter Score figure is calculated as the percentage of promoters (scores of 9-10) minus the percentage of detractors (scores of 0-6), with both percentages written as a whole number from 1-100. For an introduction to Net Promoter Score metrics, see Qualtrics (2020). <u>What is Net Promoter Score? (Updated 2020)</u>.

child online safety	for Version A and +4 for Version B. 39 and 36 per cent of users, respectively, were "promoters" (giving a score of 9 or 10), while 27 and 32 per cent, respectively, were detractors (score of 0 to 6).	As a benchmark for the NPS scores of +4 and +12, recognised brands such as Google had a NPS of +53 in 2018, Facebook had a score of +19 and Tumblr had a score of +2.
Accurate assessment of one's own understanding of the content	On average, people estimated that they answered 72 per cent of the 10 questions correctly. This is fairly close to the average actual score of 67 per cent, although the average hides many over- and under-estimates given by different individuals (as demonstrated in the finding described above on people who	This is reassuring evidence that users of the website <i>feel</i> that they have understood a majority of the information they set out to explore, and are not systematically optimistic or pessimistic about the amount of information extracted. It would be concerning if users left the website thinking that they knew much more or less than they actually did Overestimated
	have higher self-reported knowledge).	knowledge, may, for example, signal future real-world users who proceed to implement changes in their businesses on the basis of a misunderstanding.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> ForeSee (8 November 2018). <u>New Quarterly Report from ForeSee Ranks the Top 50 Websites in U.S. on Digital Experience</u>. The report can be accessed via this link: <u>Digital Experience Index and NPS Rankings</u>.

### **Chapter 5: Conclusion**

Our research indicates that an online One-Stop Shop on child online safety will go a long way to addressing the challenges that businesses face when searching for information on their responsibilities. Insights from a survey of businesses, interviews with SMEs, an evidence review and stakeholder workshops, highlighted that smaller businesses are likely to be the main beneficiaries of the new resource. These sources also highlighted the importance of making content comprehensive and jargon-free. The site should be hosted on GOV.UK and focus on doing the basics well: signposting to all resources on key topics, using advice pages to help interpret formal guidance, and offering simple lists of "must do" actions.

Online experiments to test two One-Stop Shop website prototypes, designed on the basis of our exploratory research and behavioural research, show promising results. Engagement with one of the two prototypes increased people's understanding of key content by at least 10 percentage points relative to baseline knowledge among the general public. Confidence and trust in the website content, as well as people's willingness to recommend the website they saw to businesses seeking information on child online safety, were all very high. This gives us confidence that a real website using the same design elements as those presented in <u>Chapter 3</u> will be effective at imparting information that businesses have the confidence and trust to enact.

We found that a simple homepage that allows users to easily navigate advice topic-by-topic was slightly more effective at imparting information than a homepage with key pieces of information upfront on the homepage itself. We also found that understanding of the website content was lower for people who thought that they had higher levels of prior knowledge. These findings suggest that the final website should maximise ease of navigation across key topics, as we did in the Version A design, and take steps to fully engage and perhaps double-check the understanding of users who arrive on the site with prior knowledge.

DCMS should conduct testing of the live version of the website to see if the results from our online experiments hold for users in practice. For example, using occasional quizzes to test people's understanding of content on different parts of the website. Further testing and iterative improvement, building on the findings of the research described in this report, will ensure that the One-Stop Shop is as helpful as possible for businesses seeking to comply with their child online safety responsibilities.

Our findings are focused on the design of the One-Stop Shop on Child Online Safety but have broader relevance for the design of other business-facing websites, especially those built to comply with GOV.UK design principles. We have demonstrated that behavioural insights can be applied to great effect, even within strict design guidelines. We hope that the findings of our research as well as the longlist of ideas we considered, set out in Annex B, offer insights and inspiration for designers in future.

### Annex A: Exploratory research methodology

We used a range of primary and secondary (desk-based) research techniques:

- **Business survey and interviews**: a bespoke survey of 166 businesses, roughly two-thirds of which are SMEs, conducted between 26 June and 21 August 2020.
- **Rapid evidence review**: a focussed search of relevant and published academic, public and private sector research, structured around (a) the triggers for businesses to search for information, (b) how and where businesses search for information, and (c) how businesses translate information into practice.
- Stakeholder workshop: a 90 minute workshop on 11 June 2020 with representatives from the Confederation of British Industry, Coadec, Federation of Small Businesses, Ofcom, TechUK, Ukie, Unicef, BIT and DCMS. We explored the current challenges for SMEs searching for information on child online safety, and generated ideas for one-stop shop resources that would help SMEs.

Our approach was designed to allow us to corroborate findings across sources, with at least two activities contributing evidence to each research question, as shown in <u>Table 2</u>.

The headline findings from these activities are contained in Chapter 2.

### Annex B: Prototype development

#### Approach to idea generation

We began the process with a number of ideation activities to encourage a broad range of ideas. In subsequent reviews we ranked these ideas according to a number of specific criteria, helping to identify which ideas to turn into prototypes to trial.

#### Workshops

BIT ran two workshops with experts in BIT, DCMS and Government Digital Services experts in July 2020. Attendees brought expertise on child online safety, business behaviours, behavioural science and design of digital services (on GOV.UK). The workshop gave participants an overview of the key observations arising from the exploratory work and used the EAST framework for generating ideas informed by behavioural science. We generated ideas for each of the three stages required for SMEs to perform the target behaviour:

- Stage 1: prompts to start searching for information,
- Stage 2: finding relevant information, diagnosing needs and navigating content,
- Stage 3: understanding information and putting it into practice.

#### **Shortlisted ideas**

We shortlisted ideas and specific design elements based on the following criteria:

- 1. **Impact**: What magnitude of behaviour change do we think this solution is likely to achieve, based on existing evidence?
- 2. **Feasibility**: Does this offer a realistic and scalable solution to the challenges that businesses currently experience?

The following ideas were identified as the most promising to take forward. Those in green were incorporated into the prototypes we tested. We recommend exploring the other ideas in subsequent iterations and testing of the One-Stop Shop.

- Identify and structure information around 3-4 main topic areas.
- Navigation bar for people who know what they are looking for.
- Shortlist concrete next steps.
- Indicate clearly what is legally required vs. nice to have and lay out practical steps for implementation.
- Draft boxes on "how this benefits your businesses".
- Highlight "trusted", "verified", or "endorsed" safety by design products or other user tools.
- Show all content with hyperlinks to further information.
- Provide ready-to-implement solutions, e.g. a child-friendly privacy consent form.
- "Topic of the month" and/or guest blog features.
- Link to a jargon buster / terminology dictionary at top right of screen.
- Focus content for particular audiences (e.g. different professions).

- Let people filter or highlight content based on their needs or role in an organisation ("e.g. general interest" or "legal professional).
- Audio and visual content to suit individual styles in consuming information.
- Have explanations for key terms coming up if the cursor is placed on a word.
- Highlight common pitfalls, errors, and/or incorrect assumptions of other firms.

#### Longlist of ideas generated

The table below summarises the ideas generated in the workshops, organised under the headings of the EAST framework. We include the longlist here because it contains ideas for designing aspects of the one-stop shop which are outside the focus of this project, e.g how to signpost to it, as well as ideas for iterating the final prototypes in future.

**Table B.1.** Summary of ideas to help businesses search for, find, understand and act upon their child online safety responsibilities

Stage 1: P	rompts to start searching for information
Easy	<ul> <li>Partner with other websites already used by SMEs to include signposting</li> <li>Partner with Facebook to signpost owners of business pages</li> <li>Make sure the key topic areas/calls to action of the one-stop shop are visible on the search engine preview to ensure that users who start their journey on a search engine see them</li> </ul>
Attractive	<ul> <li>Explore if risk/negative framing or gain framing is more likely to spark SME action         <ul> <li>Prompts could stress the need to comply with the existing law to avoid being prosecuted</li> <li>Prompts could provide clear and simple guidance/signposts around how the business can best communicate the value of being on top of child online safety regulation/guidance to their users</li> </ul> </li> <li>Link prompts with an opportunity to win business awards/accolades</li> </ul>
Social	<ul> <li>Rank content on the page via user votes/rating</li> <li>Promote content in a Facebook group where people can also ask questions and/or build on business forums and membership organisations who may have relevant sub-groups to target specifically</li> <li>Put agreements like the DCMS/Twitter agreement on 5G in place for topics like cyberbullying</li> </ul>
Timely	<ul> <li>Link usage of the one-stop shop to other milestones like the submission of business accounts</li> <li>Have time-limited offers of more hands-on support (e.g. a free call with an expert for first X people to use a triaging tool on a given day)</li> <li>Link comms to the growth journey to SMEs, e.g. send them a prompt on company anniversaries</li> <li>Link usage of the one-stop shop to being incorporated/registered on Companies House</li> </ul>
Stage 2: F	inding relevant information, diagnosing needs and navigating content
Easy	<ul> <li>Create a simple but powerful search function, e.g. "I am a [social medial company] that wants to know about [legislation] on [cyberbullying]"</li> <li>Ask businesses to answer a short list of questions (e.g. size, industry, what they are trying to do etc.) and then show materials relevant to this business type</li> </ul>

	<ul> <li>Let SMEs save their profile so that they don't have to do the triaging questions again when they return (profile can also be used to send regular prompts)</li> <li>Link to jargon buster / terminology index at top right of screen or have explanations for key terms coming up if the cursor is placed on a word</li> <li>Make the page as concise as possible</li> <li>Optimise the page for mobile usage</li> <li>Use decision trees, e.g. to visualise filtering down of requirements for a specific business or provide a visual map / diagram of responsibilities, with key topic areas and hyperlinks</li> <li>Separate action from context - people just want what they have to do and don't care about context, i.e. put content first and context last</li> <li>Ensure the language reflects the audience group - this is not about company size but about job roles (Is the site for legally trained employees, for strategists? Consider how different roles will use the information in their role) <ul> <li>If there are multiple audiences, layer the information accordingly</li> </ul> </li> <li>Make very clear statement on what the aim of the content is, why SMEs should bother with it , and what SMEs will get from it if they invest the time</li> </ul>	
Attractive	<ul> <li>Build and promote tools such as "Try the 30-second / 3-click diagnostic tool"</li> <li>Consider creating 'business personas' to help demonstrate how different types/size of company may need to consider and respond to child online safety requirements</li> <li>Colour code the main tabs of the website to differentiate 3-4 main topic areas</li> <li>Don't expect OSS visitors to do all at once - have a "topic of the month" or similar to keep the website dynamic</li> <li>Don't focus on text only - include a range of audio and visual content to suit individual styles in consuming information</li> <li>Let people filter content by prior knowledge, <ul> <li>e.g. "How much do you know? A little - tell me everything; A lot - what might I be missing?; Everything - quiz me"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Social	<ul> <li>Have a page on common pitfalls / errors / incorrect assumptions of other firms</li> <li>Connect firms looking to learn from each other</li> </ul>	
Timely	Campaign as part of an annual awareness week	
Stage 3: Understanding information and translating it into practice		
Easy	<ul> <li>Build partnerships with 'trusted' / 'verified' / 'endorsed' safety by design products or other user tools, e.g. for content filtering</li> <li>Indicate clearly what is legally required vs. nice to have and lay out practical steps for implementation</li> <li>Include decision trees where there are a number of options</li> <li>Signpost to organisations that can provide support with questions/issues</li> <li>Have an overview page of the steps to take where each section is expandable with a click (see right hand side of <u>https://www.gov.uk/starting-to-export</u> for an example)</li> <li>Use plain English and restrict information to one point per sentence/paragraph</li> <li>Help businesses prioritise required actions</li> <li>Where applicable, provide ready-to-implement solutions, e.g. child-friendly privacy consent form / interface; design patterns for implementing changes</li> </ul>	
Attractive	<ul> <li>Showcase examples of positive impact ("Implementing this feature has increased trust ratings of company X by")</li> <li>Offer SMEs simple tools to track the impact of their changes (e.g. provide draft questionnaires on aspects like user trust)</li> </ul>	

	<ul> <li>Shortlisting concrete next steps, and with a normative call to action ("The next steps for a business like yours should be to X, Y, Z")</li> <li>Assign SMEs a profile page which shows where they are now, compares them to others and has a progress bar. SMEs can also see tips on what actions they need to take to progress</li> <li>Start each advice page with a box on "how this benefits businesses"</li> <li>Present all the content as highly customised (use wording like "Your personal Child Online Safety canvas" for outputs of any triaging)</li> </ul>
Social	<ul> <li>Provide strong examples of best practice that demonstrate the approach that other companies have taken (across a range of business sizes/sectors)         <ul> <li>clearly state why the qualify as best practice and who decided they are best practice</li> </ul> </li> <li>Draw attention to research around trust in online organisations being driven by users feeling firms take these kinds of issues seriously etc.</li> </ul>
Timely	<ul> <li>Include prompts such as "Sign up for notifications when your responsibilities change" after answering triaging questions or reading guidance</li> <li>Offer time-limited discounts for businesses to adopt technology or software that helps or protects users</li> <li>Reach out to new online businesses when they launch and receive or engage with other government communications or services</li> <li>Give advice on how long implementation is likely to take, including examples across a range of business sizes/sectors</li> </ul>