

## Oxford Internet Survey 2013

### Sample Methodology and Weighting

One of the aspects that makes the Oxford Internet Surveys unique is the fact that they are conducted face-to-face. This has resulted in a high response and completion rate over the years. Since 2003, all OxIS surveys have been conducted in the field with respondents through door-to-door home interviews. The OII designed the survey instruments and research methodology. The personal interviews were conducted by ICM's trained interviewers. ICM is a full-service consultancy that specialises in behavioural and opinion research and which has accumulated a national team of interviewers with experience in face-to-face interviewing. The 2013 Oxford Internet Survey employed an identical sampling method to previous waves of the research, which ICM has conducted on behalf of the Oxford Internet Institute biennially since 2003.

This year, however, the core survey was boosted by interviews in rural areas. The sampling process for the rural sample was separate to the core sampling process; details of how Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) were selected are detailed below.

The data from the core survey and the booster element can be treated independently of each other, or merged, depending on user preferences. Separate weighting schemes have been employed which data users can overlay on whichever sample base they choose. The full data is available in SPSS format.

### Survey Outcomes

A total of 2,657 interviews were conducted in-home, face to face, using traditional pen and paper methods. Interviews were conducted on 2<sup>nd</sup> February – 14<sup>th</sup> April 2013 among a representative sample of each of the target populations. Data has been weighted to the profile of each target population.

	Respondents
Main sample	2,053
Rural booster sample	604
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,657</b>
Shallow Rural base	826
Deep rural base	264
<b>Combined total rural base</b>	<b>1,090</b>
<b>Urban base</b>	<b>1,567</b>

## Geographical area definitions

The core survey was a fully representative sample of the GB population aged 14+.

The rural booster sample (and rural area PSUs contained within the main sample) were defined using Office of National Statistics (ONS) urban-rural definitions for England and Wales. A separate classification system is used for Scotland.. Each definition was labelled as urban, shallow rural and deep rural on the following basis:

Urban	1. Urban – less sparse (Scotland: large urban)
Urban	2. Urban – sparse (Scotland: Other urban)
Shallow	3. Town & fringe – less sparse (Scotland: Accessible small town)
Deep	4. Town & fringe – sparse (Scotland: Remote small town)
Shallow	5. Village, Hamlet & isolated dwelling – less sparse (Scotland: Accessible rural)
Deep	6. Village, Hamlet & isolated dwelling - sparse (Scotland: Very remote small towns, Remote rural areas, Very remote rural areas))

## Sampling Design

Although the sampling process for both elements of the survey (main sample plus rural booster sample) were sampled separately, the process of selecting PSUs was common to both.

Sampling was based on a two stage design. Firstly a random sample of 105 paired Output Areas (210 OAs) stratified by region was selected on the main sample; a total of 33 paired Output Areas (66 OAs) stratified by ‘deep rural’ and ‘shallow rural’ geographical areas on the rural booster.

Then within each selected OA a random sample of 20 addresses were selected from the Postal Address File (PAF), with a further 10 addresses also selected but held back as reserves to be issues upon request.

### First Stage. Selection of OA Sample points

- 1) Sampling points were allocated to each of the 10 Government Regions in proportion to the population in each region. On the rural booster, sample points were selected in proportion to incidence of deep and shallow rural areas within each region.
- 2) In each Government Region all OAs were paired with an adjacent OA that is most similar in terms of its ACORN type.
- 3) Within 2) above all paired OA 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 OAs (of all adults aged 14+) were then accumulated down this list. Using a random start and fixed sampling interval the required number of paired OAs was selected giving each OA a probability of selection proportionate to its size.

## Second stage

Within each selected OA, interviewers were issued with 20 randomly selected addresses from which they were asked to achieve a minimum of a 50% response rate. An additional 10 addresses were issued to be used in full or in part if only if their required number of interviews could not be achieved with the original 20 addresses. Interviewers had to contact the office to request them before they could be issued.

## Response breakdown

	Main	Rural booster	Total
Number of primary sample points (PSUs):	210	66	276
Total (base) sample addresses generated:	4200	1320	5520
Pre failure to cover PSU (9/7 PSUs x addresses)	-180	-140	-320
Total addresses issued to interviewers before substitutes:	4020	1180	5200
Substitute addresses issued:	201	20	221
Addresses not used (In-PSU failure):	-76	-27	-103
Total number of addresses visited:	4145	1173	5318
Successful interviews:	2053	604	2657
Preliminary Response rate:	49.5%	51.5%	50.0%
REFUSALS:	1267	358	1625
Soft refusal	143	71	214
Hard refusal	975	214	1189
Non respondent refusal	138	57	195
Quit interview refusal	11	16	27
NO CONTACT:	700	121	821
Cursory contact household level	183	34	217
No contact after 3+ visits	517	87	604
INELIGIBLE PROPERTY:	125	90	215
Business address	1	10	11
Holiday home	0	11	11
Vacant property	36	9	45

	<b>Main</b>	<b>Rural booster</b>	<b>Total</b>
Under construction	1	0	1
Institution	13	1	14
Non-existent property	74	59	133
<b>ELIGIBLE ADDRESSES:</b>	<b>4020</b>	<b>1083</b>	<b>5103</b>
<b>Final response rate:</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>55.8%</b>	<b>52.1%</b>

### **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 124 respondents (5% of the total sample) were selected by the alphabet rule.

## Weighting – sample type weighting targets

		Britain	Rural (net)	Shallow rural	Deep rural
<b>Gender</b>	Male	49.3%	49.5%	49.6%	49.2%
	Female	50.7%	50.5%	50.4%	50.8%
<b>Age</b>	14-17	5.5%	5.4%	5.5%	5.1%
	18-24	11.2%	7.8%	7.9%	7.4%
	25-34	16.2%	10.8%	10.9%	9.5%
	35-44	16.0%	15.4%	15.7%	13.3%
	45-54	16.8%	19.2%	19.4%	18.2%
	55-64	13.8%	17.3%	17.1%	18.6%
	65-74	10.9%	13.5%	13.2%	15.7%
	75-84	6.8%	7.5%	7.3%	8.7%
	85+	2.8%	3.1%	3.0%	3.6%
<b>Region</b>	East Midlands	7.4%	10.3%	11.4%	2.5%
	East of England	9.7%	14.2%	15.4%	6.0%
	London	13.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
	North East	4.3%	3.9%	3.8%	4.7%
	North West	11.4%	6.6%	6.5%	7.1%
	Scotland	8.6%	12.7%	9.7%	33.9%
	South East	14.1%	14.9%	17.0%	1.0%
	South West	8.7%	13.9%	14.2%	11.9%
	Wales	5.0%	8.3%	6.1%	24.1%
	West Midlands	9.0%	6.7%	7.2%	3.5%
Yorkshire & the Humber	8.8%	8.3%	8.6%	6.2%	
<b>ACORN Group</b>	A - Lavish Lifestyles	9.4%	20.0%	22.2%	4.4%
	B- Executive Wealth	7.5%	21.6%	18.4%	44.4%
	C - Mature Money	8.0%	12.2%	12.8%	7.5%
	D - City Sophisticates	2.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%
	E - Career Climbers	6.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%
	F - Countryside Communities	3.8%	0.9%	0.8%	1.4%
	G - Successful Suburbs	4.6%	3.3%	3.4%	2.2%
	H - Steady Neighbourhoods	14.9%	13.9%	14.8%	7.6%
	I - Comfortable Seniors	5.7%	6.7%	6.6%	7.5%
	J - Starting Out	2.4%	1.9%	1.7%	3.0%
	K - Student Life	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	L - Modest Means	4.7%	2.1%	2.2%	1.3%
	M - Striving Families	7.5%	4.4%	4.3%	4.7%
	N - Poorer Pensioners	13.0%	9.6%	9.3%	11.7%
	O - Young Hardship	4.1%	1.9%	1.7%	2.8%
P - Struggling Estates	1.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	

		<b>Britain</b>	<b>Rural (net)</b>	<b>Shallow rural</b>	<b>Deep rural</b>
	Q - Difficult Circumstances	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Urban-rural</b>	1. Urban – less sparse (Scotland: large urban)	76.0%	-	-	-
	2. Urban – sparse (Scotland: Other urban)	2.8%	-	-	-
	3. Town & fringe – less sparse (Scotland: Accessible small town)	8.0%	37.7%	43.1%	-
	4. Town & fringe – sparse (Scotland: Remote small town)	0.7%	3.5%	-	28.6%
	5. Village, Hamlet & isolated dwelling – less sparse (Scotland: Accessible rural)	10.6%	49.9%	56.9%	-
	6. Village, Hamlet & isolated dwelling - sparse (Scotland: Very remote small towns, Remote rural areas, Very remote rural areas)	1.9%	8.8%	-	71.4%

### **Weighting limitations**

The main GB sample was weighted to all the variables shown with an efficiency of 63.1%.

For Rural areas as a whole (base 1090) the data were weighted by gender, age, region, Rurality (Shallow/deep), ACORN, and household size, with weighting efficiency 62.1%

For the Shallow rural sample (base 826), the data were weighted by gender, age, region, Rurality (less sparse/sparse), ACORN and household size with a weighting efficiency 61.6%

For the Deep rural sample (base 264), the very small base implied that we had to cut out ACORN and rurality from the weighting scheme due to low levels of weighting efficiency. The data were weighted to gender, age, region, and household size only – with a weighting efficiency 60.3%