

data files and put on a secured web site. The so-called keystroke files, files that register all keystroke activity during the fieldwork, formed the basis for additional files containing information about times spent on different modules and the interview in total.

### 7.3 Translation Process

*Janet Harkness*

Due to the complex nature of the SHARE questionnaire, the translation process constituted a considerable challenge. Often, the costs and the effort called for in survey translation are underestimated. Thus, although each participating country in SHARE organised its own translation effort, the central co-ordinator initiated several activities to support the individual translation efforts:

- First, SHARE countries were provided with guidelines recommending how to go about hiring translators, testing translators, organising the translation, and reviewing and assessing the translation. The model advocated followed in simplified form that used in the European Social Survey (see ESS documents at <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org>). The guidelines advocated organising a team to complete the translation and to review translations. The team would bring together the language and translation skills, survey questionnaire know-how and substantive expertise needed to handle the SHARE questionnaire modules. In the ESS the translation guidelines are closely linked to procedural specifications that participating countries have to meet. This was not the case in SHARE; participants were offered the guidelines as recommendations. Ultimately each country decided on its own procedures.
- Second, the project co-ordinator commissioned an expert in survey translation to advise SHARE participants on any translation queries they might have.
- Third, the project co-ordinator commissioned a professional review of a sample of the first draft of SHARE translations. SHARE countries were provided with feedback from an external set of translators, each working in their language of first expertise. The translators commented in detail on selected questions and submitted a brief general appraisal of the translation draft, pointing out areas where improvements could be made. This procedure was repeated for a later draft of the questionnaire and feedback again provided to SHARE participants. The pretest-and-pilot design of the SHARE study, coupled with the translation guidelines and appraisals, provided the SHARE project with a rare opportunity to refine and correct the source questionnaire and the translated versions.

### 7.4 Sample Design

*Anders Klevenmarken*

In the participating SHARE countries the institutional conditions with respect to sampling are so different that a uniform sampling design for the entire project was infeasible. Good sampling frames for our target population of individuals 50+ and households with at least one 50+ individual did not exist or could not be used in all countries. In most countries there were registers of individuals that permitted stratification by age. In some countries these registers were administered at a regional level, Germany and The Netherlands are two examples. In these cases we needed a two or multi-stage design in which regions were sampled first and then individuals selected within regions. In the two Nordic countries Denmark and Sweden we could draw the samples from national population registers and thus use a relatively simple and efficient design. In France and Spain it be-

came possible to get access to population registers through the co-operation with the national statistical office, while in other countries no co-operation was possible. In three countries, Austria, Greece and Switzerland we had to use telephone directories as sampling frames and pre-screening in the field of eligible sample participants. As a result the sampling designs used vary from simple random selection of households to rather complicated multi-stage designs. These differences are reflected in the design weights that are all equal in Denmark, that use simple random sampling of households, but very different in, for instance, Italy. There are also national differences in efficiency. The simple Nordic designs are likely to be more efficient than some of the complex multi-stage designs used in central and southern Europe.

In the three countries that used telephone directories and in Denmark the final sampling unit was a household, while in all other countries the final unit of selection was an individual. Since all 50+ individuals of a household and any of their partners were included in the sample independently of how it was selected, the inclusion probability of a household is by design the same as that of any of the included household members. In the countries that used an individual as the finite unit of selection, the inclusion probabilities are proportional to the number of household members 50+, data that only became available in the interviews. In these countries it was thus only possible to compute design weights for responding households.

Unit non-response was compensated by adjusting the design weights. This was done in a calibration approach. In most countries the calibration was done to national population totals decomposed by age and gender, in two countries more information could be used and in two countries just national totals by gender were used.

## 7.5 The SHARE-SRC Train-The-Trainer Programme

*Kirsten Alser and Grant Benson*

A train-the-trainer (TTT) programme was developed by the Survey Research Center (SRC) of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor for the SHARE project, providing centralised training of local survey agency trainers in order to facilitate standard training of interviewers and standardisation of the data collection processes in the respective countries. Training tools were developed by SRC in close co-operation with MEA and CentERdata, including an Interviewer Project Manual describing all SHARE field protocols; a Facilitator Guide with power point slides and training scripts; a CD-based training on gaining respondent co-operation; and training videos to illustrate (a) the correct interpretation and recording of call attempts, and (b) physical measurements. All materials were translated from the English deliverables into the language of the country before being distributed to the local interviewers.

A TTT was conducted prior to each pilot/pretest and production data collection. After the initial TTT training, subsequent training sessions were abbreviated, covering primarily changes or additions to SHARE, as these evolved. A final product included a prototype agenda for the two-day training of SHARE interviewers in the host countries (see Table 1).