

# Sampling Design Report: Oxford Internet Survey 2003

Sampling was based on a two stage design. Firstly a random sample of 175 paired Enumeration Districts (EDs) stratified by region was selected. Then within each selected ED a random sample of 10 addresses was 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 its ACORN type.
- (3) Within (2) above, all paired EDs 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 accumulated down this list. Using a random start and fixed sampling interval the required number of paired EDs 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 six interviews could not be achieved with the original 10 addresses.

Out of a total of 3500 addresses issued, 74 lay in areas that interviewers felt unable to work in, such as very deprived inner city areas with very significant drugs problems and an area used by prostitutes. In all, 3426 addresses were visited by ICM staff.

The outcome of these visits is shown in the table below.

Address occupied	90%	3077
Property vacant/no longer a dwelling/new building not occupied	2%	80
Commercial property	1%	51
Interviewer unable to locate address	6%	200
Not stated	1%	18
Total	100%	3426

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 3426 addresses visited by ICM staff for the purpose of this research, 276 were substitute addresses used because the original address proved to fall into one of these categories.

### **Selection of respondents**

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 244 respondents were selected by the alphabet rule; all others were selected by the birthday rule.

## Outcomes

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

Addresses visited	3077	100%
Productive interview obtained	2030	66%
Refusal by person answering the door	547	18%
Refusal by selected respondent including four terminated interviews	126	4%
Unable to contact after repeated visits to address during fieldwork period	348	11%
Not stated	22	1%

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	426	63%
Too busy	146	22%
Ill/not well	30	4%
Away for duration of fieldwork	9	1%
Inadequate English	25	4%
Other reason	27	4%
Don't know	12	2%
Total refusals	674	

## 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	46%	49%
Female	54%	51%
Age		
14–17	6%	6%
18–24	12%	10%
25–34	17%	18%
35–44	20%	18%
45–54	15%	16%
55–64	13%	12%
65+	14%	19%
Social Economic Grade		
AB	15%	23%
C1	29%	27%
C2	22%	22%
DE	29%	28%
Refused	5%	5%
Government office region		
North East	4%	4%
North West	11%	12%

Yorks and Humberside	10%	9%
East Midlands	5%	7%
West Midlands	8%	9%
Eastern	8%	9%
London	15%	13%
South East	12%	14%
South West	8%	9%
Wales	6%	5%
Scotland	13%	9%

ACORN		
A1 Wealthy achievers		
Suburban areas	15%	14%
A2 Affluent greys		
Rural communities	3%	2%
A3 Prosperous pensioners	2%	3%
B4 Affluent executives	4%	3%
B5 Well-off workers		
Family areas	6%	7%
C6 Affluent urbanites	4%	3%
C7 Prosperous professionals		
Met areas	2%	3%
C8 Better-off executives. Inner city	5%	4%

D9 Comfortable middle agers		
Mature home owners	10%	14%
D10 Skilled workers home owning	16%	11%
E11 New home owners		
Mature communities	6%	10%
E12 White collar workers home-owning areas	6%	4%
F13 Older less prosperous areas	2%	4%
F14 Council estate better-off homes	11%	11%
F15 Council. High unemployment	2%	4%
F16 Council. Greatest hardship	3%	2%
F17 Multi-ethnic low income	4%	2%