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Background
Survey Methods

- Traditional survey methods (face-to-face, mail, phone) have faced declining interest and response rates
- Online methods have advantages of cost, speed, internet coverage, and ease of administration
  - Typically non-probability samples (volunteers, opt-ins, members of programs)
    - Probability samples allow estimates to be derived with known precision (based on sampling theory)
    - Non-probability samples do not, and have long been shown to produce errors in estimation

Despite overall decrease, response rates have stabilized over past four years

Response rate by year (%)

Note: Response rate is AAPOR RR3. Only land lines sampled 1997-2006. Rates typical for surveys conducted in each year.
Source: Pew Research Center surveys conducted 1997-2016 "What Low Response Rates Mean for Telephone Surveys"
PEW RESEARCH CENTER
## Background:

*Probability vs non-probability samples*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive variables</th>
<th>Benchmark value (%)</th>
<th>Dual Frame Prob Sample</th>
<th>Non-probability Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction (8 out of 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point error</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress - Kessler 6 (Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point error</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>-26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Health Status (SF1) (Very good)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point error</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Health Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point error</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily smoker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point error</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumed alcohol in the last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point error</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled to vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point error</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neiger, Penay, Ward & Lavrakas, “Investigation into the use of weighting adjustments for non-probability online panel samples”, Joint Conference of the Survey Research Methods (SRM) and European Survey Research Association (ESRA), Match 2017, Paris
Background

Survey Panels

Survey panels involve individuals who complete different (or sometimes repeat) surveys over time
- Cost effective (cost and effort of recruiting incurred once)
- Can investigate change over time
- Can avoid fatigue (don’t have to collect everything in one go)

Online survey panels
- Often non-probabilistic (all in NZ to date)
  - No list of internet users to choose from; exclude non-users and net-averse
  - Tends to more likely include: heavy internet users; the unemployed; multi-panellists
- Probabilistic (developing internationally)
  - Recruitment often by offline means (e.g. address lists or random dialling methods)
  - Produce more accurate results (Neiger et al., 2017; Yeager et al., 2011)
Background

Probabilistic Online Panels

- NatCen Panel (UK)  [http://natcen.ac.uk/taking-part/studies-in-field/natcen-panel/]
  - N≈4,000, Face-to-face recruitment from Social Attitudes Surveys

- LISS (Netherlands)  [https://www.lissdata.nl/]
  - N≈8,000, Multimode recruitment, household design
  - Don’t have internet connection or computer? They provide.

- Amerispeak (USA)  [https://amerispeak.norc.org/]
  - N≈20,000 households (& growing)
  - Sample frame covers 97% of US households

  - N=3,500, dual telephone frame recruitment
Background
Probabilistic Panel Feasibility Investigation

- Video chat with Darren Pennay (Life In Australia)
  - “Spent about a year (and a large amount of money) thinking about it”
- COMPASS and PPI decided to fund feasibility investigation:
  - Lara Greaves, “An Investigation into the Feasibility of an Online National Probability Panel Study in New Zealand”
    https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/arts/research-centres/compass/documents/panel-prefeasibility-report.pdf
- Reviewed what others had done, and the NZ context, and found:
  - Pilot study recommended
  - Electoral roll and phone sampling are possible
    - COMPASS has experience with the former (ISSP, NZES), but not the latter
  - Around N~3,000 would be suitable (depending on sub-population needs)
  - Cheaper and more efficient to maintain rather than top-up participants
  - Contingent incentives most effective
Or… Probabilistic Online Panel for New Zealand

Basic idea:

- Stratified (age, gender, ethnicity) random sample of 3,000–4,000 panel members sampled from 18–74 year olds from the electoral roll.
- Offline (likely mail – for the ‘net averse’) as well as online completion mode.
- An initial frequency of eight 10–20 min surveys per year; at least four on the full sample, and up to four on a sample subgroup (e.g. by age, gender, ethnicity, region).
- ‘Public good’ research topics (health, social, political; not for commercial gain).
- Privacy and confidentiality for panel members, and ethics approval for all surveys.
- Single topic surveys as well as ‘omnibus’ surveys.
- Researchers from university, government and council contract POPNZ for conducting surveys (and other services: dataset; analysis and reporting; questionnaire design).
POPNZ
Why?

- Key piece of research infrastructure for UoA (and NZ)
- Allows researchers to ask their research questions on a representative panel without needing to recruit a sample
- Allows UoA to bid for survey requests for government, local government (e.g. Auckland Council)
- Possibility for international collaborations (e.g. Life In Australia; ISSP)
- Training opportunity for researchers and students
Who?

- Barry Milne, COMPASS, Social Science Researcher
- Jen Curtin, Public Policy Institute, Politics Researcher
- Catherine Frethey-Bentham, Marketing, Online Panel expert
- Pauline Gulliver, SOPH, Researches views on data use/sharing
- Lara Greaves (Ngāti Kuri, Ngāpuhi), COMPASS/AUT, Survey Researcher
- Cinnamon Lindsay Latimer (Ngāpuhi, Ngāti Porou, Ngāti Whatua), COMPASS, Survey Administrator
- Thomas Lumley, Statistics, Survey Statistician
- Danny Osborne, Psychology, Survey Researcher
- James Henare Māori Research Centre
- Other helpers (COMPASS or otherwise)
Vice Chancellor’s Strategic Development Fund

- Liked the idea but wanted evidence people would use it (partial funding)
- Survey of potential users (UoA, government) found that:
  - Nine researchers said they would use POPNZ for their research
  - Seven had concrete ideas of what they would use POPNZ for (one additional since)
  - Quality (representative and unbiased; also data and documentation) most commonly mentioned as a factor for whether to use POPNZ. Other factors mentioned included:
    - Timeliness of data delivery
    - Cost (though ‘paying more’ for quality was mentioned)
    - “a great idea and goes well beyond the limitations of commercially available panels”
- Now have full VCSDF funding
- Also, currently responding to a request for proposal to conduct a survey
  - On a topic we had suggested doing as part of the VCSDF application!
Hui held at James Henare Māori Research Centre (December 2017)

**Explained**

- Researchers can access a representative sample of Māori (n~1,000) without the higher costs of survey sampling
  - Achieved good numbers of Māori in previous surveys by oversampling
  - Reduce one barrier (cost) to Māori researchers

- Aiming to utilise Kaupapa Māori research principles in POPNZ
  - cover letter; ‘Equal explanatory power’ as other groups (Fink et al., 2011)

- Add to literature on recruiting Māori participants for research
Feedback

- The need to protect Māori participants and data is paramount
- Needs to be a charter for good research practice, with Māori specific guidelines and around comparative research/deficit framing etc.
  - Draft currently, being reviewed by James Henare Māori Research Centre; to be reviewed by all POPNZ researchers
- Participants should have power to influence and shape the research
  - Participant reference panel? ‘Ethical lens’ from participants point of view
- Board to screen projects with Māori, Pacific and Asian representation
- Is n~1,000 Māori enough to capture diversity? (A: not fully; not of iwi)
- Who are the Māori not on electoral roll? (A: Can’t find good data on this)
Current activities

- Ethics now approved; have applied to access electoral roll data
- Initial “About you” survey
- Awaiting to hear about RFP
  - All go if we get it; pressure off (somewhat) if we don’t
- Planning logistics (a lot involved)
- Arranging meetings with potential users
Current thinking

May not have the luxury for the pilot

- Main reason was to estimate likely response rates, but have a backup (additional mailing) if we get that wrong

Recruitment packs sent will enable respondent to immediately undertake online survey OR send a postcard (or phone) to request a paper survey

- Similar methodology as Census

Three ‘incentive’ options

- Vouchers, charity donation, paypal (…same as Life in Australia)
**Stratified random sample**

32 Strata. Mail ~20,000 to achieve ≥100 in each stratum (n~3,500)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**POPNZ**  
*Current thinking*

- **Stratified random sample**
  - 32 Strata. Mail ~20,000 to achieve ≥100 in each stratum (n~3,500)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18–29</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–44</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–59</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–74</td>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>≥100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **European**  
  - Everyone else: ≥100

- **Māori**  
  - Māori descent: ≥100

- **Pacific**  
  - High Pacific meshblock: ≥100

- **Asian**  
  - High Asian meshblock: ≥100
Stratified random sample

- 32 Strata. Mail ~20,000 to achieve >=100 in each stratum (n~3500)
- Why?
  - Good numbers in all groups (equal explanatory power)
  - Can easily weight back to represent population
  - Best chance to enable surveys for specific ages, ethnicities, genders, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>30-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori descent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pacific meshblock</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Asian meshblock</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
<td>&gt;=100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are your thoughts?

- A good idea?
- What are we doing right/wrong?
- What should we be considering that we aren’t (currently)?
- Would you use it? Or do you know someone that would?
- Any other comments?
NZ Market Research Panels

- Consumerlink (https://consumerlink.co.nz/)
- SAYit (http://www.umr.co.nz/)
- The Reid Research panel (http://www.reidresearch.co.nz/)
- Horizon Research (https://www.horizonpoll.co.nz/)
- Perceptive Research Panel (https://www.perceptive.co.nz/)
- Buzzthepeople (http://www.buzzchannel.co.nz/)
- Opinionworld (https://www.opinionworld.co.nz/en-nz)
- Marketpulse International (https://www.marketpulse.co.nz/)
- Auckland Council (www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/peoplespanel)
- Dunedin Council (http://www.dunedin.govt.nz/your-council/peoples-panel)