Technical Report. Oxford Internet Institute Survey 2007

Sampling was based on a two stage design. Firstly a random sample of 175 paired ED's stratified by region was selected. Then within each selected Enumeration District (ED) a random sample of 10 addresses were selected from the Postal Address File (PAF).

First Stage. Selection of ED Sample points

1)   Sampling points were allocated to each of the 10 Government Regions in proportion to the population in each region.

2)   In each Government Region all EDs were paired with an adjacent ED that is most similar in terms of it's ACORN type

3)   Within 2) above all paired ED with a combined population of 60 or more people were listed in descending order of ACORN type, the most affluent pair at the top of the list and the poorest pair at the bottom.

4)   The populations of each set of paired EDs (of all adults aged 14+) were be accumulated down this list. Using a random start and fixed sampling interval the required number of paired ED's was selected giving each ED a probability of selection proportionate to its size.

Second stage

Within each selected ED, interviewers were issued with 10 randomly selected addresses from which they were expected to achieve a 60% response rate. A further three addresses were issued to be used only if 6 interviews could not be achieved with the original 10 addresses.

Out of a total of 3,500 addresses issued, 457 lay in areas that interviewers felt unable to work in. Overall, 3,043 addresses were visited by ICM staff. The outcome of these visits is shown in the table below.

Address Occupied	95%	2904
Interviewer unable to locate address	3%	78
Commercial Property	1%	28
Property vacant/no longer a dwelling/new build not occupied	0.5%	17
Property vacant – old building	0.5%	14
Property vacant – new building	-	2
Total	**100%**	**3043**

In cases where the selected addresses proved to be vacant, demolished or were commercial property interviewers were allowed to go to the closest inhabited dwelling. In all, out of 3,043 addresses visited by ICM staff for the purpose of this research 139 were substitute addresses used because the original address proved to fall into one of these categories.

Selection of respondent

At each address respondents for interview were selected by asking the person who answered the door if it would be possible to interview the person normally resident at that household aged 14 or over with the next birthday.

A person normally resident was defined as someone living in the household who is related to the person answering the door or living with someone in the household as a partner. In cases where the person answering the door did not know which household member had the next birthday a respondent was selected by choosing the person with a first name starting with a letter nearest the beginning of the alphabet. This rule was employed by interviewers on the first such occasion, and a person with a first name starting with a letter nearest the end of the alphabet on the second such occasion and so on.

In all, only 283 respondents were selected by the alphabet rule.

Outcome

The results of the successful contacts made at each address is shown in the table below.

Addresses visited	3043	100%
Productive interview obtained	2350	77%
Refusal by person answering the door	497	16%
Refusal by selected respondent including terminated interviews	74	2%
Unable to contact after repeated visits to address during fieldwork period	112	4%
Not stated	9	0.3%

The high response rate achieved on this survey was aided by the fact that respondents understood that the research was being conducted for Oxford University and by the promise that ICM would pay £1 to the Red Cross for every successful interview.

Reasons for refusal are given in the table below

Not interested. No wish to participate	351	61%
Too busy	181	32%
Ill/Not well	15	3%
Away for duration of fieldwork	12	2%
Not stated	9	2%
Don't know	3	1%
Total refusals	**571**	

Weighting

The profile of the sample achieved and the targets to which the sample was rim weighted are shown in the table below

	Unweighted	Weighted
Gender		
Male	41%	48%
Female	59%	52%
Age		
14-17	6%	6%
18-24	10%	10%
25-34	18%	18%
35-44	21%	18%
45-54	17%	16%
55-64	14%	12%
65+	15%	19%
Social Economic Grade		
A	2%	2%
B	14%	17%
C1	34%	30%
C2	18%	18%
D	21%	21%
Govt office region		
North East	5%	5%
North West	11%	12%
Yorks and H'side	9%	9%
East Midlands	7%	7%
West Midlands	9%	9%
Eastern	9%	10%
London	16%	13%
South East	13%	14%
South West	8%	9%
Wales	6%	5%
Scotland	10%	9%

ACORN	Unweighted	Weighted
A1 Wealthy achievers. Suburban areas	7%	9%
A2 Affluent greys. Rural communities	8%	8%
A3 Prosperous pensioners	8%	9%
B4 Affluent executives	3%	2%
B5 Well off workers. Family areas	6%	5%
C6 Affluent Urbanites	4%	4%
C7 Prosperous Professionals. Met areas	4%	3%
C8 Better off executives. Inner city	13%	16%
D9 Comfortable middle agers. Mature home owners	7%	6%
D10 Skilled workers home owning	3%	3%
E11 New home owners. Mature communities	1%	2%
E12 White collar workers home owning areas	5%	5%
F13 Older less prosperous areas	7%	8%
F14 Council estate better off homes	12%	14%
F15 Council. High unemployment	5%	5%
F16 Council. Greatest hardship	2%	2%
F17 Multi ethnic low income	2%	2%