

**New Zealand
ISSP 2015 – Work Orientations IV
Study Description**

2017-02-02

ISSP Study Description Form

Please use this form for reporting on Module 2006 and later!

Study title: 2015 International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) for New Zealand

Fieldwork dates: 2015-07-08 to 2015-11-16

Principal investigators: Professor Peter Boxall
Dr Louise Humpage
Dr Kate McMillan
Dr Barry Milne
Martin von Randow

Sample type: Based on the electoral roll, which includes New Zealanders 18 years and older (2015 version), a random selection of 2,500 initial participants were invited by post (mail survey) to take part in the study (ethical approval granted by university committee; ref: 014807). After the initial mail out (2015-07-08), for those yet to complete the survey, a reminder postcard was sent on 2015-08-01. Final sample size of 901 was taken at 2015-11-16.

Fieldwork institute: Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences (COMPASS) (The University of Auckland, NZ)

Fieldwork methods: (a) Mailed (posted) and (b) online (www.surveymonkey.com) options.

N. of respondents: 901

2017-02-02

Details about issued sample:

Please follow the standards laid down in AAPOR/WAPOR, Standard Definitions: http://www.aapor.org/uploads/standarddefs_4.pdf. The numbers in the parentheses are those used in Tables 2 and 3 of Standard Definitions. (Table 3, page 77 used from here: http://www.aapor.org/AAPOR_Main/media/publications/Standard-Definitions20169theditionfinal.pdf)

1. Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size) *	2,500
2. Interviews (1.0)	901 (751 off-, 150 on-line)
3. Eligible, Non-Interview A. Refusal/Break-off (2.10) B. Non-Contact (2.20) C. Other i. Language Problems (2.33) ii. Miscellaneous Other (2.31, 2.32, 2.35)	220 (126 refused, 94 withdrawn) 5 (5 incompletes) 1356 (did not return) 0 18 (1 death, 17 unable)
4. Unknown Eligibility, Non-Interview (3.0)	0
5. Not Eligible A. Not a Residence (4.50) B. Vacant Residence (4.60) C. No Eligible Respondent (4.70) D. Other (4.10, 4.90)	0 0 0 0

* When new sample units are added during the field period via a new dwelling units list or other standard updating procedure, these additional issued units are added to the starting number of units to make up the total gross sample size. Also, when substitution is used, the total must include the originally drawn cases plus all substitute cases. See AAPOR/WAPOR Standard Definitions, pp. 9-10 for further clarification.

Language(s): English

Weight present: Yes

Weighting procedure: The following seven variables were available on the electoral roll to allow us to determine whether or not the sample respondents were representative of those 2,500 randomly sampled: sex, age, Māori descent, region, rurality, NZ Deprivation Index quintiles, and occupation. Comparisons revealed that the 901 sample was older, contained fewer individuals of Māori descent, under-represented those from Auckland, over-represented those in rural areas, and under-represented those in deprived living areas.

To account for this pattern of over- and under-representation, weights were computed based on the inverse probability of responding. This was achieved by conducting a logistic regression with responded (yes/no) as the outcome, and each of the variables above – except rurality – included as predictors. Rurality was excluded from the model as it was found that the slight deviation from representativeness in this factor could be corrected by including region in the model. Sex was included in the model to ensure that the weights did not inadvertently over-weight one sex relative to the other, and also to allow for the possibility of sex interactions. A main effects model was first computed, and then all fifteen two-way interactions were tested in separate models. Only one interaction

was found to be significant – sex x age – so this and all main effects were included in the final model.

From the final model, a predicted probability of response was generated for each respondent based on their covariates. This probability was then inverted and standardised to have mean=1 to form a response weight, which ranged from 0.46 – 6.22 across the n=901 respondents. The effect of weighting variable was then assessed. This was done by applying the weighting variable to the 901-case dataset and comparing the result with the 2,500 random sample. All percentage counts appeared equivalent across the samples.

Known systematic properties of sample:

No known systemic biases.

Deviations from ISSP questionnaire:

The following 12 variables were omitted from the 2015 New Zealand dataset :

v85 Age of youngest in household
v97 Subjective health of R
MAINSTAT Main employment status of R
PARTLIV living arrangement with partner
SPWRKHRS Spouse work hours
SPWRKSUP Spouse supervise other employees
SPMAINST spouse main employment status
TOPBOT perceived social status
HHTODD Number of toddlers at home
F_BORN father's place of birth
M_BORN mother's place of birth
SUBCASE subsample case not relevant

Publications:

Milne, B. J. (2015). Who wants to change the flag? Results of a national representative survey. *New Zealand Sociology*, 30(4), 126-153. Retrieved from http://ndhadeliver.natlib.govt.nz/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=IE25750784&dps_custom_att_1=ilsdb