

Weighting Data in Ex-Post Harmonization Process: The Consequences of Different Practices of Survey Organizations for Comparative Studies

Marcin W. Zieliński

Polish Academy of Sciences

University of Warsaw

Przemek Powałko

Polish Academy of Sciences

About the project...

- 22 international projects
- 130 countries
- years: 1966-2013
- 1721 studies

No of studies per country



Weights: avlbl in 1035 studies (60%)



Weights in time (cor=0,22)

WEIGHT AVAILABILITY

0

1



YEAR

Properties of weights

- mean
- standard deviation
- minimum
- maximum

Mean of the weights

- Incorrect weights mean(*wght*) ≠ 1: 70% of studies
- Assuming tolerance of error <0,001: 15% incorrect
- Range mean(wght):
 - 3,29 (Philippines, ISSP 1996)
 - 0,83 (Philippines, ASB 2010)

wghts ≠1 (with tolerance) per country (%)



WEIGHT (IN)CORRECTNESS

0

1

11111111111111111111111111111111111111	1992 1992 1993 1995	1996 1997 1998 1999	2000 2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012 2013

wghts ≠ 1 (with tolerance) per year (cor=-0,20)

YEAR

mean(std) per country



MIN; MAX

MINIMUM (range):

- 0.000 (42 studies)
- 1.900 (Philippines, ISSP 1991)

MAXIMUM (range):

- 0.921 (Lithuania, NBB 2001)
- 90.320 (New Zealand, ISSP 2007)

Weight components

- Poststratification factors:
 - Gender (70%)
 - Age (57%)
 - Country region (42%)
 - Education (36%)
 - Other (42%)
- Design factors:
 - Household+other factors (25%)

Summary of results

- Weighting is a common practice
- Data are weighted using different procedures
- Some weights have errors or are suspicious
- Weights are constructed using different factors

What to do?

• Calculate new weights using external sources of information (like e.g. UN data)

Advantages:

- The same factors taken into account
- Avoiding mistakes

Disadvantages:

- Practically weighting only by age and gender
- Loosing information about design weight factor
- Loosing information about other factors

What to do?

An example:

AFB, 2000, Republic of South Africa:

weight components:

province, race, gender, residental area, language (among Whites), housing type (among Blacks)

What to do?

 Do we know better than the authors of the study what factors should be included? Leave as it is?

Advantages:

- Taking into account authors perspective
- Design component where it was available

Disadvantages:

Comparability problem