Oxford Internet Survey 2011

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.

Sampling was based on a two stage design. Firstly a random sample of 175 paired Output Areas (OAs) stratified by region was selected. Then within each selected OA 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 OAs were paired with an adjacent OA that is most similar in terms of it's ACORN type

3) Within 2) above all paired OA 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 OAs (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 OA a probability of selection proportionate to its size.

Second stage

Within each selected OA, interviewers were issued with 10 randomly selected addresses from which they were asked to achieve a 60% response rate. An additional 10 addresses were issued to be used in full or in part if only if 6 interviews could not be achieved with the original 10 addresses. Interviewers had to contact the office to request them before they could be issued. An additional 990 addresses were issued.

Out of a total of 4,490 addresses issued, 330 lay in areas that interviewers felt unable to work in. Overall, 4,160 addresses were visited by ICM staff. The outcome of these visits is shown in the table below.

Address Occupied	96.3%	4,005
Interviewer unable to locate address	1.8%	75
Commercial Property	0.5%	21
Property vacant/no longer a dwelling/new build not occupied	0.5%	21
Property vacant – old building	0.8%	35
Property vacant – new building	0.1%	3
Total	**100%**	**4,160**

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 155 addresses visited by ICM staff for the purpose of this research 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 201 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	4,160	100%
Productive interview obtained	2,057	49.4%
Refusal by person answering the door	482	11.6%
Refusal by selected respondent including terminated interviews	842	20.2%
Quit during interview	41	1.0%
Unable to contact after repeated visits to address during fieldwork period	583	14.0%
Replacement address	155	3.7%

The 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 Oxfam for every successful interview.

Reasons for refusal are given in the table below

Not interested. No wish to participate	1032	77.9%
Too busy	64	4.8%
Ill/Not well	70	5.3%
Away for duration of fieldwork	55	4.2%
Language barrier	39	2.9%
Not stated unavailable	60	4.5%
Institutionalised	4	0.3%
Total refusals	**1,324**	**100%**

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	43%	48%
Female	57%	52%
Age		
14-17	3%	6%
18-24	9%	10%
25-34	14%	18%
35-44	16%	18%
45-54	14%	16%
55-64	16%	12%
65+	28%	19%
ACORN Group		
Wealthy Executives	8%	9%
Affluent Grays	9%	8%
Flourishing Families	7%	9%
Prosperous Professionals	2%	2%
Educated Urbanites	4%	6%
Aspiring Singles	3%	4%
Starting Out	4%	3%
Secure Families	14%	16%
Settled Suburbia	7%	6%
Prudent Pensioners	3%	3%
Asian Communities	-	-

Post Industrial Families	5%	5%
Blue-collar roots	9%	8%
Struggling Families	12%	14%
Burdened Singles	6%	4%
High rise hardship	3%	1%
Inner City Adversity	2%	2%
Govt office region		
North East	5%	5%
North West	11%	12%
Yorks and H'side	9%	9%
East Midlands	7%	7%
West Midlands	8%	9%
Eastern	10%	10%
London	10%	13%
South East	15%	14%
South West	8%	9%
Wales	6%	5%
Scotland	13%	9%