

Topic	Length (Minutes)
Day 1:	
Introductions, welcome, logistics	15
SHARE project and questionnaire overview	45
Laptop overview and instrument installation check	30
Overview of Case Management System	75
Overview of the Blaise interview program	45
SHARE questionnaire walk-through (scripted mock scenario recommended): First half session	150
Day 2:	
Question and Answers from Day 1	15
SHARE questionnaire walk-through (scripted mock scenario recommended): Second half session	120
Proxy interviews	45
Importance of response rates	30
Contacting household	60
Practice using the Case Management system	60
Gaining respondent cooperation	60
Total time in training (excluding breaks):	12.5 hours

7.6 Fieldwork and Sample Management

Oliver Lipps and Giuseppe De Luca

Each individual survey agency managed their own field following their established protocols, subject to a set of requirements from the SHARE co-ordinating team, enforced by the design of the common electronic case management system (CMS). Most important among these requirements were measures to minimise the number of households who are unwilling or unable to participate in the survey. For example, advance letters explaining the importance of the study were sent to each household in the gross sample before the interviewer contacted them in person. At this stage, some countries also offered monetary or other incentives for participation. If a first attempt to gain the household's co-operation had been unsuccessful, the address was given to a new interviewer with special experience in gaining co-operation. If respondents were unable to participate due to health reasons, we asked for consent to have the interview done by a proxy respondents, e.g. an adult child.

During the field period, the SHARE co-ordinator set up a procedure to monitor the fieldwork in each participating country in real-time—in parallel to the survey agencies. Every two weeks, at pre-specified dates, the survey agencies sent their updated CAPI and CMS data to CentERdata, where the data was processed and then made available to the project co-ordinator. This data was then used by the co-ordination team to follow the progress made in each country. At each time during the entire field period it was thus possible to monitor (with a maximum lag of two weeks):

- how many households had been contacted
- how many interviews had been conducted
- which interviewers were actively working on SHARE and which were currently inactive
- what were the main reasons for non-contact
- what were the main reasons for non-interviews

Given this information, the co-ordinator was able to identify possible problems in the field and their reasons very early in the process. Strategies how to cope with such problems could be discussed with the country teams and survey agencies and implemented without unnecessary delay.

7.7 Survey Response

Giuseppe De Luca and Franco Peracchi

Survey participation may be viewed as the result of a sequential process involving eligibility, contact of the eligible units and response by the contacted units. For SHARE, the analysis of survey participation depends crucially on whether or not the sampling frame contains preliminary information on the eligibility status of the sample units. Countries that use telephone directories as sampling frames (namely Austria, Greece and Switzerland) have a higher probability of selecting ineligible sample units. However, once the effects of the different frames on eligibility rates are taken into account, one can compare response rates across all countries involved in the project.

Overall, the SHARE data release on which all results presented in the present volume are based (“Release 0”) contains 18,169 individuals in 12,512 households. The unweighted country-average of household response rates is 55.4% (57.4% among the countries under EU-contract), see Table 2. France and the Netherlands have the highest response rates (69.4% and 61.6%, respectively), Switzerland the lowest (37.6%). Focusing attention on the reasons for household non-response, refusal to participate to the survey is the main reason (28.9%), although in some countries a non negligible fraction of non-response is also due to non-contact (12.4% in Spain) and other non-interview reasons (17.1% and 14.2% in Sweden and Germany respectively). An analysis of individual response rates and within-household response rates suggests that most of non-response in SHARE occurs at the household level, and that the response behaviour of individuals within a household is strongly and positively related. The unweighted country-average of within-household individual response rates is 86.3%. Preliminary response analysis by subgroup of the target population reveals only small differences in the patterns of survey participation by gender and age group.

Country	Household Response Rate	Individual Response Rate (within household)
Sweden	42.1 %	83.8 %
Denmark	61.1 %	93.0 %
Netherlands	61.6 %	87.9 %
Germany	60.2 %	86.5 %
France	69.4 %	91.7 %
Switzerland	37.6 %	86.9 %
Austria	57.3 %	87.4 %
Italy	54.1 %	79.7 %
Spain	50.2 %	73.8 %
Greece	60.2 %	91.8 %
Total	55.4 %	86.3 %
Total (EU-funded)	57.4 %	86.0 %