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SHARE – Overview

- Study of population ageing
- Started in 2004 with representative samples of individuals age 50+ in 11 European countries (now 28 countries in Wave 7)
- Panel: F2F interviews with the same persons, every two years
- Broad range of measurements: Subjective and objective measures, cognitive tests, linkage to administrative data
- Free data access for researchers: http://www.share-eric.eu
Adaptive and responsive design

- Tested in SHARE Germany in wave 6

  Michael Bergmann, Wednesday, 09:00 - 10:30, D17
  Fieldwork Monitoring Tools for Large-Scale Surveys

- One of the effects found in the monitoring:

- Income missing in w5 → lower response prob in w6

- In other waves too, and in other panels
Other panels found it

1. German Socio-Economic Panel (Schräpler, 2004; Frick and Grapka, 2005)


3. Belgian General Election Study (Loosveldt, Pickery and Billiet, 2002)

4. English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing (Taylor, 2006)

5. British Household Panel Survey (Uhrig, 2008)
Adaptive and responsive design

- Use this relationship in an adaptive design
- Tailored letter, extra incentive, more contact attempts, or...?
  - Who are they?
  - Do they never give their income?
  - Why?

First: explore the available SHARE data
Response pattern over waves

- No pattern of consistently not answering income questions across waves while remaining in the panel
- Income non-responders drop out of the panel in an early stage
Who are they?

- NOT the oldest old, ill or cognitively challenged sample members
- BUT Working, highly educated and high income, good numerical abilities

BUT: what is the reason??
Ask respondents: In-depth interviews

- Summer 2018
- 12 Interviews
- Respondents selected from online panel:
  - Same pattern!
Ask respondents!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three groups of factors affecting the process of (not) answering a question are generally distinguished:

- Cognitive factors
- Sensitivity of the question or question topic
- Motivational or attitudinal factors

Hypotheses

- Reluctance / lack of motivation for surveys

| Zero propensity to respond to interview & questions | Low relative propensity to respond to interview & questions | High relative propensity to respond to interview & questions | Certain propensity to respond to interview & questions |

(Yan and Curtin, 2010)

- Privacy concerns

- Don’t Know (health and cognition)
Results

- Reluctance for surveys: Changes in situation
- Privacy concerns: disclosure, spam, hacking
- Don’t Know: hidden refusal?
- Relatives/Proxies concern
- Taboo to talk about money

Hypotheses

In-depth interviews
Structured questionnaire for Wave 8

- General survey attitude
- Survey enjoyment
- Privacy concerns
- Concerns of proxies
- Fear of standing out
- Taboo to talk about money
- Trust
- Change in situation
- Relevance of topics

In-depth interviews

Data collection
Quantitative test

- Large refreshment sample SHARE Germany Wave 8
- Structured questionnaire as “drop-off”
- Relation CAPI income item missing x answers drop-off
- Develop targeted measures
- Prevent attrition in Wave 9: Test
Steps to take for each identified group?

A lot of time and effort for one group!
Pass by at our booth