

# Norwegian Citizen Panel

2021, Twenty-first Wave

Methodology report

Øivind Skjervheim

Asle Høgestøl

Olav Bjørnebekk

Amund Eikrem

Joachim Wettergreen

July, 2021



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background.....	2
Technical Aspects of the Survey .....	2
Software.....	2
Pilot, Soft Launch, and Distribution .....	2
Randomization Procedures .....	2
Previous Waves of Recruitment.....	4
Data Collection Wave 21.....	4
Responses by Method of Data Collection.....	4
Response of Existing Panel Members Over Time .....	5
Platforms.....	5
Time Usage .....	6
Representativity.....	7
Factors Explaining Lack of Representativity.....	7
The Representativity of the Norwegian Citizen Panel .....	7
Weighting.....	11
Appendix .....	13

## BACKGROUND

This report describes the procedures of data collection in the twenty-first wave of The Norwegian Citizen Panel. Technical aspects of data collection are discussed, in addition to representativity of the panel, and how survey weights are calculated.

The Norwegian Citizen Panel (NCP) is one of the main components of Digital Social Science Core Facility (DIGSSCORE) at the University of Bergen. NCP is a collaboration between several departments at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Bergen and NORCE.

Wave 21 was the sixth wave of NCP to be fielded during the Coronavirus pandemic. In addition to the ordinary waves 18, 19, 20, and 21, two extraordinary fast track waves were fielded in March 2020 and August 2020 respectively, as a response to the pandemic.

For the first time since the regional reform of 2020, Statistics Norway has published population data stratified on the new regions. This increases the precision of weight calculation, eliminating a small, unknown bias to the weights, documented in the wave eighteen documentation report. In this report, the change will be noticeable in the representativity analyses, as we now use the new regions for all geographic stratification.

ideas2evidence is responsible for the panel recruitment, the administration of the panel, and the technical solutions regarding data collection and computing.

## TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE SURVEY

### SOFTWARE

The surveys are administered through the web-based survey software Confirmit. Confirmit is a "Software-as-a-Service" solution, where all software runs on Confirmit's continuously monitored server park, and where survey respondents and developers interact with the system through various web-based interfaces. This software provides very high data security and operational stability. The security measures are the most stringent in the industry, and Confirmit guarantees 99.7 percent uptime. ideas2evidence programs the survey in Confirmit on behalf of The Norwegian Citizen Panel.

### PILOT, SOFT LAUNCH, AND DISTRIBUTION

The survey went through small-N pilot testing before data collection. In addition, the survey was tested extensively during the development phase by ideas2evidence and the researchers involved in the project.

The pilot testing was regarded as successful, and no major technical revisions were deemed necessary.

The field period started by inviting a random sample of high participation respondents (soft launch). Soft launch is used in order to minimize the consequences if the questionnaire contained technical errors. During the soft launch a technical error was discovered and patched. Five respondents were affected by the error.

### RANDOMIZATION PROCEDURES

Each wave of NCP has an extensive use of randomization procedures. The context of each randomization procedure may vary,<sup>1</sup> but they all share some commonalities.

All randomization procedures are executed live in the questionnaire. This means that the randomization takes place while the respondent is in the questionnaire, as opposed to pre-defined randomizations that are

---

<sup>1</sup> Some examples: sorting respondents in different thematic subsets, randomly allocate treatment values in experiments, randomize order of an answer list/array, order a sequence of questions by random, ask a given question to a subset of the respondents.

uploaded to the questionnaire. All randomizations are independent from another, unless the documentation states otherwise.

The randomization procedures are written in JavaScript. `Math.random()`<sup>2</sup> is used in combination with `Math.floor()`<sup>3</sup>. These functions are used to achieve the following:

- Randomly select one value from a vector
- Randomly shuffle the contents of an array

The first procedure is typically used to determine a random sample of respondents to i.e. a control group. Say for example we wish to create two groups of respondents: group 1 and group 2. All respondents are randomly assigned the value 1 or 2, where each randomization is independent from one another. When N is large enough these two groups will be of equal size (50/50).

Here is an example of the JavaScript code executed in Confrontit:

```
var form = f("x1");
if(!form.toBoolean()) // If no previous randomization on x1
{
    var precodes = x1.domainValues();// Copies the length of x1
    var randomNumber : float = Math.random()*precodes.length;
    var randomIndex : int = Math.floor(randomNumber);
    var code = precodes[randomIndex];
    form.set(code);
}
```

The second procedure is typically used when defining the order of an answer list as random. This can be useful for example when asking for the respondent's party preference or in a list experiment. However, since i.e. a party cannot be listed twice, the procedure must take into account that the array of parties is reduced by 1 for each randomization.

Here is an example of the JavaScript code executed in Confrontit<sup>4</sup>:

```
Function shuffle(array) {
    var currentIndex = array.length, temporaryValue, randomIndex;
    // While there remain elements to shuffle...
    while (0 !== currentIndex) {
        // Pick a remaining element...
        randomIndex = Math.floor(Math.random() * currentIndex);
        currentIndex -= 1;

        // And swap it with the current element.
        temporaryValue = array[currentIndex];
        array[currentIndex] = array[randomIndex];
        array[randomIndex] = temporaryValue;
    }
    return array;
}
```

---

<sup>2</sup> Please see following resource (or other internet resources): [https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global\\_Objects/Math/random](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/Math/random)

<sup>3</sup> Please see following resource (or other internet resources): [https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global\\_Objects/Math/floor](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/Math/floor)

<sup>4</sup> Code collected from Mike Bostocks visualization: <https://bost.ocks.org/mike/shuffle/>

## PREVIOUS WAVES OF RECRUITMENT

Existing panel members were recruited in wave 1, wave 3, wave 8, wave 11, wave 14, wave 16 and wave 18. All samples were drawn from the *National Population Registry* of Norway. This registry holds information on everyone born in Norway, as well as former and current inhabitants. The Norwegian Tax Administration holds the formal responsibility for this registry, but the administration is partly outsourced to the private IT-company Evry. Evry drew the sample on behalf of the Norwegian Citizen Panel after relevant permissions were acquired from the Norwegian Tax Administration.

Samples consist of people over the age of 18 who were randomly drawn from the registry. The extracted information was a) last name, b) first name, c) address, d) gender, e) year of birth, and f) phone number (the latter was not included in wave 1). Samples exclude persons without a permanent address in Norway.

Table 1 outlines a short summary of previous recruitment efforts. Note that there are some differences between the recruitment processes. For a detailed description of each recruitment process, please refer to the respective methodology reports.

**Table 1: Summary of recruitment processes**

	Sample size	Mode	Contacts	Returned letters	Response Rate (%)
<b>Recruitment 1 (wave 1)</b>	25 000	Postal	2	546	20.1 %
<b>Recruitment 2 (wave 3)</b>	25 000	Postal, phone/SMS	4	543	23.0 %
<b>Recruitment 3 (wave 8)</b>	22 000	Postal/SMS	3	479	19.4 %
<b>Recruitment 4 (wave 11)</b>	14 000	Postal/SMS	2	334	15.1 %
<b>Recruitment 5 (wave 14)</b>	14 000	Postal/SMS	2	389	15.0 %
<b>Recruitment 6 (wave 16)</b>	34 000	Postal/SMS	2	994	14.9 %
<b>Recruitment 7 (wave 18)</b>	15 000	Postal/SMS	2	381	14 %

The response rate of recruitments 4-7 were substantially lower than earlier waves of recruitment. The most important explanation is new restrictions enforced by the Norwegian Tax Administration with regards to how many times the Citizen Panel can contact persons in the net sample. Respondents in recruitments 4-7 were contacted twice at most. Recruitment 1 also had a maximum of two contact points, but achieved a response rate of 20 percent. One explanation for why we cannot replicate a response rate of 20 percent in recruitments 4-7 might be that NCP did a lot of promotion of the panel through media outlets leading up to and during recruitment 1. Additional promotion of the panel was carried out in relation to the Norwegian Parliamentary election the same fall.

## DATA COLLECTION WAVE 21

### RESPONSES BY METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

The survey was distributed via email to 24 397 existing panel members on the 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> of May 2021. In these e-mails, basic information about the Norwegian Citizen Panel was reiterated, and the individual panel members received unique URLs that led to the questionnaire.

The invitation, the first reminder and the second reminder were all distributed via e-mail. The third, and last reminder was, depending on whether the individual panel member had a registered mobile phone number or not, distributed via SMS or e-mail. Prior to wave 21, 42.5 percent of the panel members were registered with a mobile phone number.

**Table 2: Responses and response rate for panel members by the different stages of data collection**

	Response	Cumulative Responses	Response Rate (%)	Cumulative Response Rate
Invitation (26 <sup>th</sup> and 27 <sup>th</sup> of May)	5233	5233	36.2 %	36.2 %
1 <sup>st</sup> reminder (June 2 <sup>nd</sup> )	2345	7578	16.2 %	52.4 %
2 <sup>nd</sup> reminder – email (June 7 <sup>th</sup> )	1327	8905	9.2 %	61.6 %
3 <sup>rd</sup> reminder – email (June 11 <sup>th</sup> )	512	9421	3.5 %	65.1 %
3 <sup>rd</sup> reminder – SMS (June 11 <sup>th</sup> )	619	10 040	4.3 %	69.4 %

In total, 10,040 existing panel members filled out the questionnaire. A response rate of 36.2 percent was reached between the invitation and the first reminder. Following a pattern observed in earlier waves, the email invitation produced a higher number of respondents than the subsequent reminders. For details on the number of respondents after each reminder, see table 2.


When calculating the response rate, following the methodology from earlier waves, respondents who have not participated in any of the last three waves are excluded. This leaves us with 14 458 eligible respondents. The overall response rate, as reported in table 2, is 69.4 percent.

Approximately 1300 of the 24 397 sent invitations were marked as spam, which rounds to about 5 percent. In comparison, 4 percent of all invitations were marked as spam in wave 20.

## RESPONSE OF EXISTING PANEL MEMBERS OVER TIME

Comparing the number of wave 21 respondents (10 040), to the number of respondents in the previous wave 20 (10 421), gives an overall wave-to-wave retention rate of 96.3 percent. Figure 1 shows that the wave-to-wave retention rate normally increases substantially the first three waves after recruitment, before stabilizing around a mean of 95 percent. A peak in the retention rates was also observed in the extraordinary fast track one wave of March 2020<sup>5</sup> and the KODEM-initiative associated with wave 19.

**Figure 1: Wave-to-wave retention rate**



## PLATFORMS

The questionnaire was prepared for data input via smart phones, tablets, and other units capable of running web-browsers. In order to enhance the respondents' experience with the questionnaire, mobile users got a


<sup>5</sup> This extraordinary wave focusing on matters related to the Coronavirus pandemic, yielded particularly high participation.

slightly different visual representation of some questions. For instance is a question grid presented as a set of individual questions on the same page, which is different from the desktop presentation where grid questions are presented in a table. 45 percent of all survey respondents that opened the questionnaire used a mobile phone.

A set number of survey questions must be answered for a person to be included as a survey respondent. 7.5 percent of the mobile users did not reach this minimum requirement, compared to 9.2 percent for non-mobile users.

The share of mobile users is high among respondents between 18 and 45 of age. As shown in figure 2, the share of mobile users declines substantially with age, starting at age 46-55.


**Figure 2: Share of mobile users by gender and age**



**TIME USAGE**

The average respondent used 16.6 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Measuring average time usage poses a challenge, in that respondents may leave the questionnaire open in order to complete the survey later. This idle time causes an artificially high average for completing the survey. The average therefore includes only the respondents that spent 60 minutes or less completing the survey.

**Figure 3: Time usage distribution of survey respondents in subgroups**



The questionnaire consisted of five subsets of questions, given to groups 1-5. The respondents were randomly assigned to one of the five groups. While the time usage of the groups varied, many questions in wave twenty-one were assigned based on previous panel participations, leaving survey group less of an important explanatory factor than is usually the case.

**Table 3: Average time usage (minutes) in each subset**

	All	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
All users	16.6	15.1	15.8	19	16.6	16.8
Non-mobile users	17.4	15.9	16.4	19.8	17.5	17.2
Mobile users	15.6	13.9	15	17.9	15.4	16.2

## REPRESENTATIVITY

In this section, we describe the representativity of the panel as a whole. First, we will discuss factors explaining representativity. Thereafter we apply demographic variables to present data on representativity by different strata. The data on representativity is the foundation for the section on weighting.

### FACTORS EXPLAINING LACK OF REPRESENTATIVITY

There are two main points that can serve as explanations to non-response and lack of representativity when recruiting panel members and maintaining panel members:

- ◆ access to and familiarity with the internet (given that a web-based questionnaire was the only response mode made available)
- ◆ the motivation and interest of the respondents

The first challenge is strongly related to the age composition of the survey respondents. Although Norway has a very high computer and internet density, the probability of having an e-mail address, and the skills required to access and fill in an online questionnaire, normally decreases with increasing age. The second challenge, motivation and interest, is often explained by the respondents' level of education. In addition to age and education, we added the variables of geography and gender in order to test the representativity of the survey respondents. The variables have the following categories:

- ◆ Age: 19-29 years, 30-59 years, 60 and above.
- ◆ Highest completed education: no education/elementary school, upper secondary, university/university college.
- ◆ Geography: Oslo, Eastern Norway, Southern Norway, Western Norway, Trøndelag, Northern Norway.

Please note that starting wave twenty-one, the former county of Akershus is part of Eastern Norway, rather than being part of the traditional Akershus/Oslo stratum. This has implications for weighting and representativity analyses, as discussed below.

### THE REPRESENTATIVITY OF THE NORWEGIAN CITIZEN PANEL

The sampling frame of the survey equals to the Norwegian population above the age of 18, comprising a population of approximately 4.3 million individuals. Earlier reports have documented a systematic underrepresentation of respondents belonging to the two lowest educational groups, independent of gender and age. The underrepresentation is particularly strong for young men. As expected, individuals with education from universities or university colleges are overrepresented. All of these observations hold true for wave 21.

**Table 4: Age distribution in the population and the net sample**

	18-29 years	30-59 years	60 years and above
Population	19.6 %	50.5 %	29.9 %
Net sample	5.3 %	44.9 %	49.7 %




From the age distribution presented in table 4, we see that 18-29 year olds are underrepresented in the net sample of wave 21. The age group 30-59 years in the net sample is underrepresented compared to the distribution in the population, while respondents aged 60 years and above are overrepresented.

Over time, we have observed a drift away from perfect representativity of age groups (figure 6). While the oldest respondents started out as underrepresented in wave one, they have become increasingly overrepresented over time. The youngest respondents, on the other side, have become increasingly underrepresented. This can be explained by a difference in panel membership loyalty; younger panel members are more likely to stop responding to new NCP waves after having been an active member of the panel. It is noteworthy that the rate of misrepresentation of age groups has picked up the last two waves.

In wave 21, we observe a slight and unusual improvement in representativity of age groups. With exception for Fast track one, representativity is previously only improved in recruitment waves (wave 1, 3, 8, 11, 14, 16, and 18), as the newly recruited respondents more closely represent the population.

**Figure 6: Representativity of age groups**



In table 5, the population and net samples are broken down by age and gender. This reveals a slight gender-age interaction in the panel representativity. Younger men are slightly more underrepresented than younger women, while older men are more overrepresented than women in the same age bracket.

**Table 5: Combined distribution of age and gender in the population and the net sample**

	18-29 years		30-59 years		60 years and above	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<b>Population</b>	10.1 %	9.5 %	25.9 %	24.6 %	14.2 %	15.6 %
<b>Net sample</b>	2.1 %	3.2 %	21.8 %	23.1 %	27 %	22.7 %

The inclusion of educational level in table 6 reveals a systematic underrepresentation of respondents with little or no education, independent of age and gender. The underrepresentation is present in all age brackets, but is especially strong for young respondents.

**Table 6: Combined distribution of age, gender and education in the population and the net sample**

		Population		Net sample	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
No education/elementary school	18-29 years	3.7 %	2.8 %	0.1 %	0.1 %
Upper secondary education		4.1 %	3.1 %	0.9 %	1.4 %
University/university college		2.3 %	3.6 %	1.1 %	1.7 %
No education/elementary school	30-59 years	5.3 %	4.3 %	0.7 %	0.5 %
Upper secondary education		11.1 %	7.7 %	7.1 %	5 %
University/university college		9.5 %	12.7 %	14.2 %	17.7 %
No education/elementary school	60 and above	3.2 %	4.4 %	1.9 %	1.5 %
Upper secondary education		7.1 %	7.4 %	9.3 %	6.8 %
University/university college		4.0 %	3.9 %	15.9 %	14.1 %

Respondents who have completed upper secondary education as their highest completed education are underrepresented in all groups, except for men with upper secondary education aged 60 years or above. Those who have university or university college education are clearly overrepresented in the two oldest age brackets, irrespective of gender.

**Figure 7: Representativity of education groups**




Figure 7 illustrates the representation of education groups since wave one. The general trend is that the highly educated are overrepresented compared to those with less or no education. Except for slight adjustments, improving representativity of the education groups when new respondents are recruited (wave 1, 3, 8, 11, 14, 16 and 18), the overall pattern has remained stable throughout all waves.


With regard to geography, (table 7) we observe that the representation of panel members living in Trøndelag are on level with the population, while Oslo is clearly overrepresented. Western Norway is also overrepresented, but not as prominent as Oslo. Northern Norway, Southern Norway and Eastern Norway meanwhile are underrepresented among the respondents in the twenty-first wave.

**Table 7: Combined distribution of age, gender and geography in the population and the net sample**

		Population			Net sample		
		Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
<b>Oslo</b>	18-29 years	1.5 %	1.6 %	3.1 %	0.4 %	0.6 %	1 %
	30-59 years	3.8 %	3.5 %	7.3 %	4 %	4.5 %	8.5 %
	60 and above	1.3 %	1.5 %	2.8 %	3.2 %	3.2 %	6.5 %
	<b>In total</b>	<b>6.5 %</b>	<b>6.6 %</b>	<b>13.2 %</b>	<b>7.6 %</b>	<b>8.4 %</b>	<b>16 %</b>
<b>Eastern Norway</b>	18-29 years	3.4 %	3.1 %	6.5 %	0.6 %	1.1 %	1.7 %
	30-59 years	9.7 %	9.4 %	19.1 %	7 %	7.7 %	14.7 %
	60 and above	5.8 %	6.4 %	12.2 %	10.6 %	9.1 %	19.7 %
	<b>In total</b>	<b>18.8 %</b>	<b>18.9 %</b>	<b>37.8 %</b>	<b>18.2 %</b>	<b>17.9 %</b>	<b>36.1 %</b>
<b>Southern Norway</b>	18-29 years	0.6 %	0.5 %	1.1 %	0.1 %	0.2 %	0.3 %
	30-59 years	1.4 %	1.4 %	2.8 %	1.1 %	1.1 %	2.2 %
	60 and above	0.8 %	0.9 %	1.7 %	1.5 %	1 %	2.5 %
	<b>In total</b>	<b>2.8 %</b>	<b>2.8 %</b>	<b>5.6 %</b>	<b>2.7 %</b>	<b>2.3 %</b>	<b>5 %</b>
<b>Western Norway</b>	18-29 years	2.6 %	2.4 %	5 %	0.5 %	0.8 %	1.3 %
	30-59 years	6.6 %	6.2 %	12.8 %	6.2 %	6.2 %	12.4 %
	60 and above	3.6 %	3.9 %	7.5 %	7.3 %	6 %	13.3 %
	<b>In total</b>	<b>12.8 %</b>	<b>12.5 %</b>	<b>25.2 %</b>	<b>14.1 %</b>	<b>12.9 %</b>	<b>27 %</b>
<b>Trøndelag</b>	18-29 years	1.1 %	1 %	2.1 %	0.3 %	0.3 %	0.6 %
	30-59 years	2.2 %	2.1 %	4.3 %	1.9 %	1.7 %	3.6 %
	60 and above	1.3 %	1.4 %	2.6 %	2.1 %	1.7 %	3.7 %
	<b>In total</b>	<b>4.6 %</b>	<b>4.4 %</b>	<b>9 %</b>	<b>4.3 %</b>	<b>3.7 %</b>	<b>8 %</b>
<b>Northern Norway</b>	18-29 years	1.0 %	0.9 %	1.9 %	0.2 %	0.2 %	0.4 %
	30-59 years	2.2 %	2.1 %	4.3 %	1.6 %	1.8 %	3.4 %
	60 and above	1.5 %	1.5 %	3 %	2.3 %	1.7 %	4 %
	<b>In total</b>	<b>4.7 %</b>	<b>4.5 %</b>	<b>9.2 %</b>	<b>4.1 %</b>	<b>3.8 %</b>	<b>7.8 %</b>

Respondents aged 60 years and above are overrepresented in all parts of the country, especially in Oslo and Western Norway. Conversely, young people aged 18-29 years are underrepresented in all regions.

**Figure 8: Representativity of regions**



In wave twenty-one, population data stratified on the new regions is available for the first time since the regional reform of 2020. While this data eliminates some small uncertainty in the representativity analyses<sup>6</sup>, it also introduces a break in time series for Oslo (previously including Akershus) and Eastern Norway (now including Akershus). Eastern Norway now makes up almost one fourth of the population, the diversity of which

<sup>6</sup> Note that Oslo (including Akershus), and Eastern Norway diverge in wave eighteen, due to the regional reform implemented 1st of January 2020.

we are no longer able to account for in full in the respondents' weights. Compared to age and education, geography does, however, not seem to be a strong determinant of survey participation. Apart from effects from the regional reform, the geographic representativity is more or less stable over time.

## WEIGHTING

To compensate for the observed biases, we have calculated a set of weights. The weights are equal to the relation between a given strata in the population and the total population, divided by the relation between a given strata in the net sample and the total net sample.<sup>7</sup> This procedure returns values around 1, but above 0. Respondents belonging to a stratum that is underrepresented will receive a weight above 1 and respondents belonging to an overrepresented stratum will receive a weight below 1. We have listed the weights of the different strata in table 10 in the appendix.

When calculating the weights, information regarding the respondents' geographical location, gender and age is based on registry data. Information on these variables was included in the sample file we received from the Norwegian National Registry. Information regarding the level of education is collected from NCP surveys. 1.3 percent of the twentieth wave net sample have not answered the question about level of education. Because of this, two different weights have been calculated:

- ◆ **Weight 1** is based on demographic variables only (age, gender and geography)
- ◆ **Weight 2** combines the demographic variables with education. Respondents with missing data on the education variable are only weighted on demography (the education component of the weight is in these cases set to 1).

The variables have the following categories:

- ◆ **Age:** 18-29 years, 30-59 years, 60 and above.
- ◆ **Highest completed education:** no education/elementary school, upper secondary, university/university college.
- ◆ **Geography:** Oslo, Eastern Norway, Southern Norway, Western Norway, Trøndelag, Northern Norway.

The method for calculating weights is the same as in previous waves, yet the stratification method for geographic regions is changed.

When applied, both weights will provide a weighted N equal to the number of cases in the dataset. In other words, the weights are calculated using the whole dataset. NCP has an extensive use of (randomized) sub-groups, which might alter the demographic profile of the sub-group compared to the whole dataset. Consequently, the weights might be less precise for some sub-groups. Note that the dataset is provided with necessary information<sup>8</sup> to calculate custom weights if needed, following the procedure described above.

As discussed above, level of education is the greatest source of observed bias. Therefore, weight 2 provides the most accurate compensation for the various sources of bias in the net sample.

Table 8 shows the effects of weight 2 on the distribution of self-reported level of education in the net sample. As we can observe, the weight gives the sample a distribution close to the population. It is, however, important

---

<sup>7</sup> The applied formula for weight  $w_i$  for element  $i$ , in strata  $h$  is:  $w_i = \frac{N_h/N}{n_h/n}$

<sup>8</sup> See columns r21Weight1\_stratapop and r21Weight2\_stratapop

to stress that the unweighted distribution is far from ideal, with a clear underrepresentation of people with low levels of education.

**Table 8: Effect of weight 2 on self-reported level of education**

	<b>Sample - not weighted</b>	<b>Sample - weighted</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Difference between sample and population</b>	<b>Difference between weighted sample and population</b>
<b>No education/elementary school</b>	4.8 %	23.4 %	23.6 %	-18.9	-0.3
<b>Upper secondary education</b>	30.6 %	40.5 %	40.4 %	-9.8	0.1
<b>University/university college</b>	64.7 %	36.1 %	36 %	28.7	0.1

Table 9: Weights applied to different strata (weight 2)

		Men	Women			Men	Women		
Oslo/Akershus	18-29 years	No education/elementary school	19.8	15.1	Western Norway	18-29 years	No education/elementary school	44.1	33.5
		Upper secondary education	5.5	2.3			Upper secondary education	4.9	2.3
		University/university college	2.4	2.1			University/university college	1.9	2.2
	30-59 years	No education/elementary school	9.7	13.8		30-59 years	No education/elementary school	7.1	8.4
		Upper secondary education	1.5	1.1			Upper secondary education	1.4	1.4
		University/university college	0.6	0.6			University/university college	0.6	0.7
	60 and above	No education/elementary school	1.6	2.3		60 and above	No education/elementary school	1.3	2.8
		Upper secondary education	0.7	0.8			Upper secondary education	0.7	1
		University/university college	0.2	0.3			University/university college	0.2	0.3
Eastern Norway	18-29 years	No education/elementary school	66.7	19.9	Trøndelag	18-29 years	No education/elementary school	21.6	16.7
		Upper secondary education	5.4	1.9			Upper secondary education	2.1	3.6
		University/university college	2.2	2.1			University/university college	2.2	1.7
	30-59 years	No education/elementary school	9.9	9.8		30-59 years	No education/elementary school	4.9	6.1
		Upper secondary education	1.7	1.7			Upper secondary education	1.7	1.9
		University/university college	0.8	0.8			University/university college	0.6	0.8
	60 and above	No education/elementary school	2	3		60 and above	No education/elementary school	1.3	7.6
		Upper secondary education	0.8	1.1			Upper secondary education	0.8	1.4
		University/university college	0.2	0.3			University/university college	0.3	0.3
Southern Norway	18-29 years	No education/elementary school	5	2.1	Northern Norway	18-29 years	No education/elementary school	21.6	31.1
		Upper secondary education	2.9	2			Upper secondary education	4.4	2.5
		University/university college	7	12.8			University/university college	2.3	3.4
	30-59 years	No education/elementary school	1.5	1.4		30-59 years	No education/elementary school	6	6.3
		Upper secondary education	0.8	0.8			Upper secondary education	1.8	1.7
		University/university college	2.3	3.8			University/university college	0.7	0.8
	60 and above	No education/elementary school	0.9	1.4		60 and above	No education/elementary school	1.7	2.4
		Upper secondary education	0.2	0.3			Upper secondary education	0.8	1.6
		University/university college	19.8	15.1			University/university college	0.3	0.3