

INTRODUCTION

1. RESEARCH BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVES

To conduct a survey amongst residents within the South Worcestershire area to assess both food and non-food shopping habits.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A total of 1503 telephone interviews were conducted between Thursday 3rd May and Friday 18th May 2007. Interviews were conducted using NEMS in-house CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) Unit. Respondents were contacted during the day, in the evening and at the weekend. All respondents were the main shopper in the household, determined using a preliminary filter question.

A random sample of live interviews were listened in to and assessed by our CATI Team Leaders to verify that the quality of interviewing was being maintained.

2.1. Sampling

Selection was done using random stratified sampling from all legally available telephone numbers within the defined survey area. The survey area was segmented into 9 zones, defined using ward codes. The zone details were:

Zone	Postal Sectors	Interviews
1	DY14 8, DY14 0, DY14 9	30
2	DY12 1, DY12 2, DY12 3, DY13 0, DY13 8, DT13 9, DY11 5, DY11 6, DY11 7, DY10 1, DY10 2, DY10 3, DY10 4	408
3	B61 9, B61 8, B61 7, B61 0, B60 1, B60 2, B60 3	185
4	WR15 8	29
5	WR6 6	24
6	WR2 6, WR2 5, WR2 4	112
7	WR1 1, WR1 2, WR1 3, WR3 7, WR4 0, WR4 9	187
8	WR5 1, WR5 2, WR5 3	118
9	HR7 4	29
A	WR6 5, WR13 5	32
B	WR14 1, WR14 2, WR14 3, WR14 4	139
C	HR8 1, HR8 2	58
D	WR13 6	18
E	WR8 0, GL20 6	35
F	GL20 5, GL20 7, GL20 8	99
	Total area	1503

2.2. Weightings

As sample sizes within each zone were not in proportion to the number of households, the final tabulated data was weighted to make the overall results representative of the total number of households within the defined survey area. Details of those weightings are given in the table below:

Zone	Number of Households *	%ge Households	Interviews Achieved	Weighting
1	3211	2.0	30	0.5000
2	43960	27.1	408	5.1000
3	19975	12.3	185	2.6429
4	3104	1.9	29	0.3580
5	2631	1.6	24	0.3000
6	12115	7.5	112	0.7467
7	20171	12.5	187	0.9350
8	12691	7.8	118	0.7867
9	3122	1.9	29	0.4833
A	3478	2.1	32	0.3516
B	14939	9.2	139	0.6950
C	6234	3.8	58	0.9508
D	1925	1.2	18	0.2571
E	3733	2.3	35	0.3889
F	10671	6.6	99	1.6500
	161960	100	1503	

* Source: PAF (Postal Address File), 2007

Both unweighted and weighted tabulations are contained within this report.

2.2. Statistical Reliability

As with any data collection where a sample is being drawn to represent a population, there is potentially a difference between the response from the sample and the true situation in the population as a whole. Many steps have been taken to help minimise this difference (e.g. random sample selection, questionnaire construction etc) but there is always potentially a difference between the sample and population – this is known as the standard error.

The standard error can be estimated using statistical calculations based on the sample size, the population size and the level of response measured (as you would expect you can potentially get a larger error in a 50% response than say a 10% response simply because of the magnitude of the numbers).

To help understand the significance of this error, it is normally expressed as a confidence interval for the results. Clearly to have 100% accuracy of the results would require you to sample the entire population. The usual confidence interval used is 95% - this means that you can be confident that in 19 out of 20 instances the actual population behaviour will be within the confidence interval range.

The 95% confidence intervals for this survey are as follows:

%ge Response	95% confidence interval
10	± 1.6
20	± 2.1
30	± 2.4
40	± 2.5
50	± 2.6