

Independent Test Results for the Cuprinol PowerPad system vs the leading branded competitor's product

Objective of the testing:

To independently test the Cuprinol PowerPad system against the leading competitor's equivalent product in order to identify customer preference.

Methodology:

The randomised blind testing was carried out by SPA Future Thinking [Limited] [whose staff are Associates of the Market Research Society (MRS) and members of the Association of Qualitative Research (AQR) and as such adhere to the professional code of conduct of these bodies. The Market Research Society best practice guidelines for product testing were also followed.]

Tests were conducted on the 9th-10th, 16th-17th, 23rd-24th October 2010.

Respondents were pre-recruited to attend the central location at a specified time and tested both products on temporary decking that was set up individually for each respondent.

The products were de-branded and the order in which they were trialled was rotated. All respondents owned decking and would be responsible for treating them at home.

In total 204 respondents completed the test.

The respondents were asked a series of questions on the performance and features of the deck staining products and to score each criterion out of 10. They were then asked which of the two products tested they preferred.

Results:

Of the 204 respondents, 75% preferred Cuprinol PowerPad, 5% had no preference and 20% preferred the leading competitor's equivalent product.