

## Understanding Society User Support - Support #258

### High number of 0 weights

05/05/2014 01:30 PM - Jan Eichhorn

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Start date:</b>	05/05/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>% Done:</b>	100%
<b>Assignee:</b>			
<b>Category:</b>	Weights		
<b>Description</b> Dear support team,  I am conducting an analysis where I want to compare life-satisfaction means (n_scflsato) between particular groups from waves 2 and 3. The selected respondents are all classified as unemployed in wave 3 (c_jbstat). I compare the results for different groups depending on their economic activity in wave 2(c_ff_jbstat). Don't knows etc. are excluded.  When I compute my analyses unweighted I get just under over 2000 valid respondents (2026), who are unemployed in wave 3 and for whom I have the data on economic activity from wave 2. When taking into account my key variables (b_scflsato from wave 2 and c_scflsato from wave 3) I still retain 1669 respondents for whom data is available at both instances.  However, when I now apply weights the number of respondents drops substantially. As I am dealing with the data from both waves I assume I need to use longitudinal data. As the life-satisfaction questions stem from the self-completion section I assume I should use the respective weights - i.e. c_indscus_lw. When I do this however, the estimated number of cases stands at 1237. I wanted to check whether this is actually accurate (i.e. a reflection that those unemployed are oversampled in the dataset) or whether there might be some mistake in my thinking here. If it is the former - could you advise me of an appropriate way forward? An over-representation of those unemployed would not be a problem for my analysis - as I am only focussing on them, so would there be a possibility to adjust the weights for other factors but not have the figures changed so substantially (which has a massive impact on the results - in terms of direction of means comparisons).  Thank you for your advice.			

#### History

##### #1 - 05/05/2014 01:31 PM - Jan Eichhorn

Dear support team - just a short note: The title is misleading (I first misread the problem, please ignore the title)  
Thank you and best,  
Jan

##### #2 - 05/21/2014 03:25 PM - Redmine Admin

as for [#259](#) we would like a bit of time to get the best possible answer for you.  
Jakob

##### #3 - 05/22/2014 12:29 PM - Olena Kaminska

Jan,  
  
Thank you for your question. The drop of cases you observe is because with the c\_indscus\_lw you lose cases from BHPS part of the sample. If your analysis includes only wave 2 and wave 3 then we recommend you use the weight for BHPS+UKHLS combined samples (c\_indscUB\_lw). If you use waves 1 to 3 then you will have to use c\_indscUS\_lw weight though.  
  
Hope this helps,  
Olena

##### #4 - 05/28/2014 12:59 PM - Redmine Admin

- Target version set to X M  
- % Done changed from 0 to 50

##### #5 - 06/02/2014 10:00 AM - Redmine Admin

- Status changed from New to Closed  
- % Done changed from 50 to 100