# **Understanding Society User Support - Support #735**

## Weighting reducing sample numbers

03/01/2017 10:43 AM - Kirsty Tiernan

Closed	Start date:	03/01/2017
High	% Done:	100%
Kirsty Tiernan		
Weights		
		es etc. of variables I was using. Then when I
2	High Kirsty Tiernan Weights Iser guide, if you want to general a so therefore applied the releva	High % Done: Kirsty Tiernan

#### History

#### #1 - 03/02/2017 10:37 AM - Victoria Nolan

- Status changed from New to In Progress
- Assignee set to Kirsty Tiernan
- % Done changed from 0 to 10
- Private changed from Yes to No

## Dear Kirsty,

Many thanks for your enquiry. This has been passed on to our weighting team who will get back to you shortly.

#### Best wishes, Victoria

On behalf of the Understanding Society Data User Support Team

## #2 - 03/21/2017 03:15 PM - Peter Lynn

- Category set to Weights
- Target version set to X M
- % Done changed from 10 to 50

#### Kirsty,

Sorry for slow reply. The provision of weights requires the ability to estimate probabilities of continuing to respond over multiple waves. This is true of cross-sectional weights as well as longitudinal ones, as they are derived from the longitudinal ones (how thi8s was done is described in section 3.8.3.10 of the User Guide). In consequence, a person in a household where there is no person who has been enumerated at every wave (up to wave 5, in your case) will get a weight of zero. Such people should not be given a weight, as the weights for all other sample members are calculated in a way that compensates for these "missing" people.

You should not need to apply any additional filtering to your analysis, as this is done automatically by application of the weights.

Peter

## #3 - 04/05/2017 03:09 PM - Victoria Nolan

- Status changed from In Progress to Closed
- % Done changed from 50 to 100