

# Ofcom Residential Postal Tracker

## Technical Report Q3 2019 – Q2 2020

### A. Preface

Ofcom is the regulator for the UK communications industries, with responsibilities across television, radio, video-on-demand, telecommunications, wireless and postal communications. Ofcom regularly carries out research into these markets to stay informed on new technology developments and the impact that they might have on the sectors they regulate.

Ofcom's Residential Postal Tracker is a continuous tracking study that measures opinion, usage and attitudes to postal services among UK adults. Between January 2016 and December 2019, data was been collected using a combined methodological approach: face-to-face interviews conducted using random probability sampling and online interviews using quota sampling. The data from both methodologies were then combined and weighted to nationally representative proportions in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, country and socio-economic group (SEG), and then a further 'evaluative' weight was introduced to account for a 'positivity bias'.

From January 2020, Jigsaw Research Limited was commissioned to review and manage the study moving forward. After a thorough review in consultation with Ofcom, a small number of changes were made throughout the questionnaire to improve its readability for the participant and user of the research. Jigsaw Research Limited continued with a combined online and face-to-face methodological approach as per previous years however the decision was taken to adjust the quota and weighting scheme to better represent the UK moving forward.

#### A.1. Covid-19 Impact

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic we were unable to collect a representative sample of face-to-face interviews from March 2020 onwards. To ensure that any trend data within this publication is comparable, we have published data for the Online methodology only, dating back to Q3 2019. We continue to review the ability to conduct face-to-face interviews with a view to continue this methodology in the future.

#### A.2. Q3 2019 – Q2 2020 Data Table Summary

The data tables published in August 2020 includes 5,012 users of the postal service who participated in the Postal Tracker online survey between July 2019 – June 2020. Results were then weighted to correct for over-representation of nations and weights were applied for age, gender and urbanity within nation to match known population profiles. Additional weights for English government region and working status were also applied.

Details of the sample design, research methodologies and weighting procedures are outlined in the following pages. A note on statistical reliability is also included.

## B. Sample Design

### B.1. Face to Face Interviewing<sup>1</sup>

Jigsaw Research adopted a random location interviewing (RLI) approach to ensure that the sample was representative of UK adults. Sample frames were developed separately for each of the four nations (England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland) covering the following key subgroups - age (16-24/25-44/45-64/65-74/75+), gender, socio-economic group (AB/C1/C2/DE) and government region.

#### B.1.1. Random Location Interviewing

The random location interviews (RLI) were conducted using a stratified sample, to ensure an adequate representation of all groups of interest. UK Geographics generated the sampling points as follows:

- Based on the 2011 Census Output Areas, the smallest level at which the Census data is collected, containing approximately 125 addresses in England, Wales and NI and approximately 50 addresses in Scotland.
- Prior to selection, the OAs were sorted by Gov region and within nation/region by the UK Geographics urbanity indicator

#### B.1.2. Targets

Due to the continuous nature of the research, monthly targets are imposed to ensure a representative spread of interviews throughout the quarter. Targets are set on:

- Gender
- Age (16-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74, 75+)
- Socio-economic group (AB/C1/C2/DE)
- Gov Region

There is also a separate target for Highlands and Islands within Scotland to ensure representation among this audience.

Targets applied are below:

	Monthly target	Quarterly target
Male	49	147
Female	51	153
16 – 24 year olds	13	40
25-44 year olds	32	96
45-64 year olds	31	95
65-74 year olds	13	38
75+	10	30
AB	22	66
C1	31	93
C2	21	63
DE	26	78
North East	10	20
North West	10	20

<sup>1</sup> Face to Face interviewing was paused due to the Covid-19 pandemic with the table set only referring to the online methodology. The information provided in this section is to provide a transparent and complete view of the research methodology.

Yorks/Humberside	5	20
East Mids	10	25
West Mids	5	20
East Anglia/East of England	5	20
London	5	20
South East	5	20
South West	10	20
Northern Ireland – urban		
Northern Ireland – rural	10	35
Northern Ireland – remote rural		
Wales – urban		
Wales – rural	10	35
Wales – remote rural		
Scotland – urban		
Scotland – Rural	10	35
Scotland - remote rural		
Highlands & Islands of Scotland	5	15

## B.2. Online Interviewing

Jigsaw Research adopted a quota sample approach to online interviewing to ensure that the sample was representative of UK adults. Due to the continuous nature of the research, monthly targets are imposed to ensure a representative spread of interviews throughout the quarter. The sample frame was developed at a UK level covering the following key subgroups:

- Gender
- Age (16-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74, 75+)
- Socio-economic group (AB/C1/C2/DE)
- Gov Region

Additional targets were applied for urbanity (Urban, Rural, Remote Rural) within Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland but these were applied on a 'best efforts' basis as they are not targetable through online panel sample.

Jigsaw Research also applied an additional target for Highlands and Islands of Scotland, again this was applied on a 'best efforts' basis.

	Monthly target	Quarterly target
Male	196	588
Female	204	612
16 – 24 year olds	54	162
25-44 year olds	129	388
45-64 year olds	127	382
65-74 year olds	49	148
75+	40	121
AB	88	264
C1	124	372
C2	84	252
DE	104	312
North East	22	67
North West	22	67
Yorks/Humberside	22	67
East Mids	22	67
West Mids	22	67
East Anglia/East of England	22	67
London	22	67
South East	22	67
South West	22	67
Northern Ireland – urban	22	67
Northern Ireland – rural	14	43
Northern Ireland – remote rural	17	50
Wales – urban	22	67
Wales – rural	22	67
Wales – remote rural	22	67
Scotland – urban	22	67
Scotland – Rural	22	67
Scotland - remote rural	22	67
Highlands & Islands of Scotland	13	39

## C. Data Quality

Upon review of existing data prior to 2020, Jigsaw Research in combination with Ofcom implemented an additional data quality process (beyond survey speed checks and verbatim analysis) to ensure that participants had provided considered responses to the survey.

Questions of particular focus included:

- QD1 – The volume of post sent
- QD4 – The amount spent on sending post
- QE1 – The volume of post received
- QF2 and QF3 – The price of a 1<sup>st</sup> Class or 2<sup>nd</sup> Class stamp

Upon review of data from these questions we developed rules that would identify participants who provided non-sensical or extreme answers. Namely these rules are:

- Providing too high a spend for no post being sent (spent over £20 in the last month but have not sent any post)
- Providing too low a spend for the amount of post being sent (spent under £1 but sent over 21 pieces of post, spent £1-£2 but sent over 31 pieces of post, spent £2-£4 but sent over 41 pieces of post, spent £4-£6 but sent over 51 pieces of post, spent £6-£40 but sent over 101 pieces of post, spent £40-£50 but sent over 200 pieces of post)
- Received more than 200 pieces of post in the last week
- Provided a 1<sup>st</sup> class price less than a 2<sup>nd</sup> class price AND provided an outlier answer of over £5 for either 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> class

This set of rules removed 1.5% of the total data provided to date (*roughly c.20 people per quarter of data*). These rules have now been applied to all historic data and will be actioned for future quarters of data.

## D. Weighting

At the analysis stage, data is rolled up into 4 quarters of the year. Both online and offline methodologies are combined into one dataset. We then conduct weighting to correct for skews in regions and where we have set specific quota targets, aligning the data to the known UK profile.

### D.1. Demographic weights

The data was weighted within each nation by interlocked gender and age with urbanity. We also include weights for region and working status at a total UK level. Rim weights were applied using targets from the 2011 Census, UK Geographics measure of Urbanity and the Labour Force Survey.

The initial unweighted sample and the weighted sample profiles are illustrated below:

Category	England		NI		Wales		Scotland	
	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted	Weighted
<b>Male 16-24</b>	5%	7%	2%	7%	1%	7%	2%	7%
<b>Male 25-44</b>	15%	16%	9%	16%	8%	14%	10%	15%
<b>Male 45-64</b>	16%	16%	19%	16%	17%	16%	20%	16%
<b>Male 65-74</b>	6%	6%	7%	5%	11%	7%	10%	6%
<b>Male 75+</b>	8%	4%	2%	4%	3%	5%	6%	4%
<b>Female 16-24</b>	12%	6%	8%	7%	5%	6%	4%	6%
<b>Female 25-44</b>	17%	16%	30%	17%	22%	15%	20%	16%
<b>Female 45-64</b>	11%	16%	17%	17%	21%	17%	21%	17%
<b>Female 65-74</b>	5%	6%	3%	6%	8%	7%	7%	7%
<b>Female 75+</b>	4%	6%	1%	5%	2%	6%	2%	6%
<b>Gender not specified/ other</b>	0.07%	0.1%	0.17%	0.1%	0.14%	0.1%	0.13%	0.1%
<b>Urban</b>	88%	87%	68%	69%	78%	76%	77%	83%
<b>Rural</b>	12%	13%	32%	31%	22%	24%	23%	17%

Category	UK	
	Unweighted	Weighted
<b>North East</b>	6%	4%
<b>North West</b>	6%	11%
<b>Yorkshire/Humberside</b>	6%	8%
<b>East Midlands</b>	6%	7%

<b>West Midlands</b>	7%	9%
<b>East Anglia/ East of England</b>	6%	9%
<b>London / Greater London</b>	8%	13%
<b>South East</b>	7%	14%
<b>South West</b>	6%	9%
<b>Scotland</b>	15%	8%
<b>Wales</b>	14%	5%
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	12%	3%
<b>Working</b>	51%	60%
<b>Not working</b>	49%	40%

## E. Statistical reliability and significance

### E.1. Effective sample size

This section details the variation between the sample results and the “true” values, or the findings that would have been obtained with a census approach. 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 and actual samples for some of the main analysis groups:

Category	Sub-group	Actual online interviews achieved	Effective sample size (ESS)
Nation	England	2950	2396
	Scotland	767	465
	Wales	704	480
	Northern Ireland	591	380
Gender	Male	2375	1628
	Female	2632	1521
Age	16-24	664	459
	25-34	732	463
	35-44	902	594
	45-54	705	422
	55-64	889	527
	65-74	638	371
	75+	461	316
SEG	AB	1214	710
	C1	1559	981
	C2	997	665
	DE	1242	798



## E.2. Confidence interval

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

Effective sample size	10% or 90% ±	20% or 80% ±	30% or 70% ±	40% or 60% ±	50% ±
<b>3,143</b> (Total)	1.05%	1.40%	1.60%	1.71%	1.75%
<b>2,396</b> (England)	1.20%	1.60%	1.83%	1.96%	2.00%
<b>1,628</b> (Male)	1.46%	1.94%	2.23%	2.38%	2.43%
<b>465</b> (Scotland)	2.73%	3.64%	4.17%	4.45%	4.54%

For example, if 30% or 70% of a sample of 3,143 gives a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the “true” value will fall within the range of +/- 1.60 percentage points from the sample results.

## E.3. Significant differences

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:

Effective Sample sizes being compared	10% or 90% ±	20% or 80% ±	30% or 70% ±	40% or 60% ±	50% ±
<b>1,628 vs 1,521</b> Male vs Female	2.10%	2.80%	3.20%	3.42%	3.49%
<b>459 vs 316</b> 16-24 vs 75+	4.30%	5.73%	6.57%	7.02%	7.16%

For example, comparing a score of 12% for Males and 15% for Females, the scores will need to be at least 2.10% different (using the table) to indicate a significant difference.