

1 Preface

This volume contains the full computer tabulations for the 2011 Q1 Technology Tracker, study, which has been run by Saville Rossiter-Base on behalf of Ofcom. The objective of the survey is to track the attitudes and behaviour of the general public with respect to the residential telecommunications market as well as broadcasting more generally.

Fieldworks interviewed a quota sample of 3,474 adults, aged 16+, in the UK. Interviews were carried out across 294 different sampling points in the UK, face-to-face, in-home. All interviews were conducted between 4th January and 28th February 2011.

The data are initially weighted to correct the over-representation of nations, regions and areas to produce a geographically representative sample. They are then weighted by age, gender, social class, working status, and region to match the known population profile.

Details of the sampling frame, research methodology, and weighting procedures are outlined in the following pages. A note on statistical reliability is also included.

Sample Design

To ensure consistency with trend data, the sample approach to sampling has been used as in previous waves, using Output Areas (OAs)¹ as the basic building block for sampling, then using quota control by three key variables (age, gender and SEG) to control the sample interviewed within each sampling point.

First Stage

The OAs in the UK were grouped into sampling units (SUs), which were then stratified by region and rural/urban:

- firstly, all the SUs were sorted by region,
- the SUs were then sorted within region by rural/urban.

The sample extracted was checked for close correspondence to the UK population on two key variables:

- Deprivation Index for Great Britain. Currently there is no deprivation index for Northern Ireland.
- Cable/ non-cabled area

Since region has been used as the first sorting variable, regional distribution of SUs will be more or less in proportion to the number of residential addresses in each region.

¹The 1991 Census Data was classified using Enumeration Districts (ED's). The 2001 Census data has been classified using Output Areas (OAs). These areas are essentially the same, but with slightly different boundaries.

Second stage

The size of a SU is measured by the number of addresses it contains. The SUs were selected with a probability proportionate to size. This ensures that all households within an SU have an equal chance of being selected, regardless of the size of the SU in which a household is situated. The number of interviews per SU was 12.

Quotas

The following quotas were set (within each SU) to represent the population within that SU, which means the overall quotas across the UK will closely match the UK population. Quotas were set using 2001 Census data for Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

- Age (16-24, 25-44, 45+)
- Socio-economic grade (SEG)
- Gender

Fieldwork

Interviewers were provided with specific addresses. The average SU contains around 130 households in England and Wales and 160 households in Scotland, thus affording tight control over the addresses the interviewers called at. All interviews were conducted in the home, using pen and paper.

Reporting

The sample is drawn on the basis of households within SUs, while quotas are set on the basis of adult population profiles. The data is then weighted to the profile of UK adults and so the data is representative of adults aged 16+. Therefore, when reporting it is necessary to state that the data represents the percentage of adults rather than the percentage of households.

Weighting

The data are weighted to the national UK profile using target rim weights for age, gender, socio-economic group (SEG), working status, region and cable/ non-cable. The following table shows the initial unweighted sample and the final weighted sample profile.

Figures are based on UK adults	% Weighted	% Unweighted
	Census profile	Interviews achieved
Gender – Male 16+	48%	48%
Gender – Female 16+	52%	52%
Age – 16-34	33%	29%
Age – 35-54	35%	35%
Age – 55+	33%	37%
SEG – AB	25%	23%
SEG – C1	30%	29%
SEG – C2	18%	20%
SEG – DE	27%	28%
Working Status – working	56%	48%
Working Status – not working	43%	52%
Region – London	12%	7%
Region – South East	14%	7%
Region – East of England	9%	7%
Region – South West	8%	7%
Region – East Midlands	7%	7%
Region – West Midlands	9%	8%
Region – Yorkshire & Humber	8%	7%
Region – North East	4%	2%
Region – North West	11%	5%
Region – Scotland	9%	14%
Region – Wales	5%	14%
Region – Northern Ireland	3%	15%
Cable	44%	39%
Non cable	56%	61%

The percentages described above as ‘% Weighted’ are the figures from the 2001 Census data describing the UK adult profile and these figures were used to weight the data. The ‘% Unweighted’ column shows the actual percentage of interviews achieved in the January/ February 2011 fieldwork.

2 Appendix A – Deprivation

Business Geographics' 'Small Area Deprivation Index' is designed to detect 'pockets' of deprivation within wards. The deprivation index is created using a combination of socio-economic variables. Please note that the deprivation index only applies to Great Britain.

The index composition score is based on the following four variables:

1. Unemployment – unemployed residents
2. Overcrowding – households with more than one person per room
3. Non-car ownership – households without a car
4. Non-home ownership – households not owning (or buying) their own home

The deprivation index ranges from 0, equalling the least deprived, to 100, equalling the most deprived. This is broken down into a high/medium/low classification for the overall population. The higher the index, the more deprived the area.

Q1 2011 fieldwork achieved the following break-down of interviews:

	GB Profile (SU based)	GB Interviews achieved: Weighted	GB Interviews achieved: Unweighted
Low Deprivation (0-33.33)	61%	63%	67%
Medium Deprivation (33.34 – 66.66)	36%	36%	32%
High Deprivation (66.67 – 100)	3%	2%	1%

3 Appendix B – Quotas

The following quotas were set at the outset of the project:

Great Britain

Adults 16+	Quotas set	Interviews achieved January-February 2011: Weighted	Interviews achieved January-February 2011: Unweighted
Gender – Male	49%	48%	48%
Gender – Female	51%	52%	52%
Age – 16-24	13%	15%	13%
Age – 25-44	37%	38%	35%
Age – 45-64	30%	30%	31%
Age – 65+	20%	18%	21%
SEG – AB	23%	25%	23%
SEG – C1	29%	30%	29%
SEG – C2	20%	18%	20%
SEG – DE	27%	27%	28%

4 Appendix C - Guide to Statistical Reliability

The variation between the sample results and the “true” values (the findings that would have been obtained if everyone had been interviewed) can be predicted from the sample sizes on which the results are based, and on the number of times that a particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually chosen to be 95%, that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the “true” values will fall within a specified range. However, as the sample is weighted, we need to use the effective sample size (ESS) rather than actual sample size to judge the accuracy of results. The following table compares ESS & actual samples for some of the main analysis groups.

	Actual	ESS
Total	3,474	2,281
URBANITY: RURAL	1,016	443
URBANITY: URBAN	2,458	1,892
GENDER: MALE	1,679	1,110
GENDER: FEMALE	1,795	1,171
AGE: 16-24	460	296
AGE: 25-44	1,216	795
AGE: 45-64	1,063	708
AGE: 65-74	407	266
AGE: 75+	328	223
SEG - AB	784	524
SEG - C1	1,014	671
SEG - C2	701	466
SEG - DE	975	629
HOUSEHOLD INCOME: UNDER £11.5K	697	445

HOUSEHOLD INCOME: £11.5K-£17.5K	383	236
HOUSEHOLD INCOME: £17.5K-£29.9K	408	273
HOUSEHOLD INCOME: £30K+	596	437
WORKING: YES	1,659	1,094
WORKING: NO	1,799	1,265
ETHNIC ORIGIN: WHITE	3,228	2,084
ETHNIC ORIGIN: EMG	241	196
PERSONAL DISABILITY: ANY	602	393
PERSONAL DISABILITY: VISUAL	90	56
PERSONAL DISABILITY: HEARING	118	79
PERSONAL DISABILITY: MOBILITY	232	153
MOBILE PHONE USER	3,091	2,035
INTERNET ACCESS AT HOME	2,534	1,679

The table below illustrates the required ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the “95% confidence interval”:

Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels

Effective sample size	10% or	20% or	30% or	40% or	50%
	90%	80%	70%	60%	±
	±	±	±	±	
2,281 (All respondents)	1.2%	1.6%	1.9%	2.0%	2.1%
1,110 (Male)	1.8%	2.4%	2.7%	2.9%	2.9%
671 (SEG C1)	2.3%	3.0%	3.5%	3.7%	3.8%
443 (Rural)	2.8%	3.7%	4.3%	4.6%	4.7%

For example, if 30% or 70% of a sample of 2,281 gives a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the “true” value will fall within the range of ± 1.9 percentage points from the sample results.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be “real”, or it may occur by chance (because not everyone has been interviewed). To test if the difference is a real one – i.e. if it is “statistically significant” – we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentages giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume “95% confidence interval”, the difference between two sample results must be greater than the values given in the table below to be significant:

Differences required for significant at or near these percentages

Sample sizes being compared (sub-groups or trends)	10% or 90%	20% or 80%	30% or 70%	40% or 60%	50%
	±	±	±	±	±
1,110 v 1,171 (male vs. female)	2.4%	3.3%	3.8%	4.0%	4.1%
524 v 671 (SEG AB vs. C1)	3.4%	4.6%	5.2%	5.6%	5.7%