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Sweden
Gunnar Anderson
Data collection for the Generations and Gender Survey of Sweden
Gunnar Andersson with Johan Dahlberg and Gerda Neyer
1st reminder incl. postal questionnaire
Invitation to web survey are sent out
2nd reminder
3rd reminder incl. postal questionnaire
Data collection ends
### (Non-)Response patterns Swedish GGS 2020 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Relative Odds (ref.=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education (2021)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary education (ref.)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic education or lower (2012)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 (2021)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 (2021)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 (ref.)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 (2012)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (ref.)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (2012)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Swedish GGS 2020: Data evaluations vsv registers

Mean age at 1st, 2nd and 3rd birth by cohort, female cohorts born in 1962-77

Mean age at 1st, 2nd and 3rd birth by cohort, male cohorts born in 1962-77
Denmark
Lisbeth Trille Gylling Loft
SAMPLING FRAME AND RESPONSE RATE

- Population samples based on prespecified demographic measures
- The target population: 18 to 49 year-old legal residents of Denmark
- Collected as online survey.
  
  - Two separate subsamples were drawn and invited via National webportal
    - **Subsample 1**: 18,060 individuals randomly drawn among all Danish legal residents aged 18 to 49.
    - **Subsample 2**: 24,056 individuals drawn among all Danish legal residents aged 18 to 49 (excluding those already invited in subsample 1). Stratified with 2/3 males and 1/3 females
  
- Response rates
  - A total of 10,268 responses were collected (*overall* response rate: 24 pct.)
    - 7275 complete responses (*complete* response rate: 17 pct.)
REPRESENTATIVENESS

Population level and invited individuals: identical on observed characteristics

- Core demographic characteristics
  - Age: a slight trend towards a larger share of respondents at older age
  - Gender: overrepresentation of females among respondents
  - Ethnic origin: overrepresentation of Danish ethnic origin among respondents

Figure 1. Representativeness. Core demographic characteristics. All GGS responses and complete GGS responses compared to the total Danish population of 18 to 49-year-olds. Measured in percentages.

Note: All characteristics are measured by December 31st 2020. DK population is equal to the total Danish population of 18-49-year-olds at the time of the survey (N = 2,359,746). DK-GGS all is equal to all respondents in the Danish GGS (n = 10,268). DK-GGS complete is equal to respondents who completed the survey (n = 7,275). DK-GGS partly is equal to respondents who started but did not complete the survey (n = 2,993). Immigrant ethnic origin is defined as born outside Denmark and none of the parents are Danish citizens and born in Denmark. Descendant ethnic origin is defined as born in Denmark and none of the parents are Danish citizens and born in Denmark. Danish ethnic origin is defined as not being an immigrant or a descendant.
REPRESENTATIVENESS cont.

- Education level
  - Overrepresentation of higher educated (tertiary level) among respondents
  - Underrepresentation of lower educated (primary level) among respondents

- Family demographic characteristics
  - Marital status: Slight underrepresentation of unmarried among respondents

Figure 2. Representativeness. Education level and family demographic characteristics. All of the Danish GGS respondents compared to the total Danish population of 18 to 49-year-olds. Measured in percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>DK population</th>
<th>DK-GGS all</th>
<th>DK-GGS complete</th>
<th>DK-GGS partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary or unknown</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>DK population</th>
<th>DK-GGS all</th>
<th>DK-GGS complete</th>
<th>DK-GGS partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/widowed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition to parenthood</th>
<th>DK population</th>
<th>DK-GGS all</th>
<th>DK-GGS complete</th>
<th>DK-GGS partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any children</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parity</th>
<th>DK population</th>
<th>DK-GGS all</th>
<th>DK-GGS complete</th>
<th>DK-GGS partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All characteristics are measured by December 31st 2020. DK population is equal to the total Danish population of 18–49-year-olds at the time of the survey (N = 2,359,746). DK-GGS all is equal to all respondents in the Danish GGS (n = 10,268). DK-GGS complete is equal to respondents who completed the survey (n = 7,275). DK-GGS partly is equal to respondents who started but did not complete the survey (n = 2,993). All characteristics, including transition to parenthood and parity, is measured for both men and women. Married marital status includes both married and registered partnerships. Divorced/widowed marital status includes both divorced and dissolved registered partnerships.
Estonia

Allan Puur
GGS main survey in Estonia

GGP Consortium meeting, June 21, 2022
October 25, 2021– February 28, 2022 (18 weeks)
Sample 32 000 (age 18–59, languages est & rus)
Web-based data collection

Changes after the pilot survey (Spring 2021)
One batch, more information in media
Stronger of package of incentives
(lottery 4*2000€, 20*300€ e-gift cards,
215*50€ e-gift cards, joint donation to NGOs)
Reminders not only by e-mail but also by phone
(ca 7500 respondents in lower response groups)
### Response rates

**Overall response rate:** 26% (18.1% in pilot survey)

**Group-specific response rates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonians</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: response rates are based on fully completed questionnaires*
Germany
Detlev Luck
CAWI Mode and Data Representativity in FReDA and the German GGS

Detlev Lück & Martin Bujard

GGP-Council of Partners Meeting, 21st of June 2022 (13:00-15:00)
THE RECRUITMENT INTERVIEW „W1R“

Mixed-Mode (CAWI + PAPI) and Experiment with Contact Strategies


» Sample: n = 37,417
  » Representative sample from registration offices, resident population of 18- to 49-year-olds

» Mixed-Mode Designs: CAWI + PAPI (sent by mail)
  » Concurrent Design: PAPI questionnaire sent with invitation letter (25% of sample)
  » Push-to-Web Design: PAPI questionnaire sent with 2nd reminder letter (50% of sample)
  » Strong Push-to-Web Design: PAPI questionnaire sent with 3rd reminder letter (25% of sample)
    ... allows simulating a pure CAWI survey (by excluding PAPI interviews)

» Multiple languages
  » Questionnaire was also available in Turkish, Arabic and Russian (with low usage)
BIASES: DEMOGRAPHY

findings from a presentation by Pablo Christmann et al. at the CLOSER Conference (20.1.2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6 (-0,3)</td>
<td>5.1 (0,2)</td>
<td>4.9 (0,0)</td>
<td>5.0 (0,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.3 (0,3)</td>
<td>13.6 (-0,4)</td>
<td>13.9 (-0,1)</td>
<td>14.2 (0,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.6 (-0,4)</td>
<td>14.7 (-0,3)</td>
<td>15.0 (0,0)</td>
<td>15.1 (0,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.2 (0,4)</td>
<td>17.8 (0,0)</td>
<td>17.7 (-0,1)</td>
<td>17.7 (-0,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.9 (+1,7)</td>
<td>17.6 (+1,4)</td>
<td>18.2 (+2,0)</td>
<td>18.3 (+2,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.9 (+0,1)</td>
<td>16.2 (+0,4)</td>
<td>16.2 (+0,4)</td>
<td>16.0 (+0,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.5 (-1,7)</td>
<td>15.1 (-1,1)</td>
<td>14.2 (-2,0)</td>
<td>13.7 (-2,5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>51.1 (-1.8)</td>
<td>51.6 (-1.3)</td>
<td>51.2 (-1.7)</td>
<td>51.45 (-1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married / life-partnership</td>
<td>40.57</td>
<td>43.32 (+2.7)</td>
<td>42.67 (+2.0)</td>
<td>43.22 (+2.6)</td>
<td>43.02 (+2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5 (-0,4)</td>
<td>1.5 (-0,5)</td>
<td>1.5 (-0.4)</td>
<td>1.46 (-0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced / dissolution of life-partnership</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.78 (-0.4)</td>
<td>3.99 (-0.2)</td>
<td>3.86 (-0.3)</td>
<td>3.89 (-0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3 (+0,0)</td>
<td>0.3 (-0,1)</td>
<td>0.2 (-0,1)</td>
<td>0.18 (-0,1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>54.5 (+5.5)</td>
<td>55.2 (+6.2)</td>
<td>54.3 (+5.2)</td>
<td>53.96 (+4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>45.2 (-5.8)</td>
<td>44.5 (-6.5)</td>
<td>45.4 (-5.5)</td>
<td>45.77 (-5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3 (+0,3)</td>
<td>0.3 (+0,3)</td>
<td>0.3 (+0,3)</td>
<td>0.28 (+0,3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-person household</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.5 (-6,4)</td>
<td>14.4 (-6,4)</td>
<td>15.1 (-5,8)</td>
<td>15.32 (-5,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-person households</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>26.8 (+3,6)</td>
<td>26.3 (+3,1)</td>
<td>25.6 (+2,4)</td>
<td>25.7 (+2,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-person households</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.2 (+0,9)</td>
<td>23.5 (+1,2)</td>
<td>24.1 (+1,8)</td>
<td>23.72 (+1,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-person households</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.3 (+1,4)</td>
<td>25.7 (+1,9)</td>
<td>25.0 (+1,2)</td>
<td>24.77 (+0,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with 5 and more persons</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.3 (+0,4)</td>
<td>10.1 (+0,3)</td>
<td>10.3 (+0,5)</td>
<td>10.53 (+0,7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BIASES: SOCIO-ECONOMY AND NATIONALITY

Findings from a presentation by Pablo Christmann et al. at the CLOSER Conference (20.1.2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In employment</td>
<td>79,4</td>
<td>76,7</td>
<td>76,6</td>
<td>76,2</td>
<td>76,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2,7)</td>
<td>(-2,9)</td>
<td>(-3,2)</td>
<td>(-3,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of employment</td>
<td>16,9</td>
<td>20,9</td>
<td>20,9</td>
<td>21,2</td>
<td>21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+4,1)</td>
<td>(+4,0)</td>
<td>(+4,3)</td>
<td>(+4,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1,3)</td>
<td>(-1,1)</td>
<td>(-1,1)</td>
<td>(-1,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1,000 EUR</td>
<td>7,38</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>6,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,3)</td>
<td>(-0,3)</td>
<td>(-0,3)</td>
<td>(+0,0)</td>
<td>(-0,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,000 EUR</td>
<td>16,65</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>13,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2,3)</td>
<td>(-2,3)</td>
<td>(-2,4)</td>
<td>(-2,9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,000 EUR</td>
<td>21,74</td>
<td>19,6</td>
<td>19,1</td>
<td>20,6</td>
<td>20,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2,2)</td>
<td>(-2,7)</td>
<td>(-1,2)</td>
<td>(-1,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-4,000 EUR</td>
<td>20,38</td>
<td>21,7</td>
<td>21,9</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>21,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+1,3)</td>
<td>(+1,5)</td>
<td>(+0,9)</td>
<td>(+1,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-4,500 EUR</td>
<td>8,54</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>11,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+1,8)</td>
<td>(+2,0)</td>
<td>(+2,6)</td>
<td>(+3,0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4,500 EUR</td>
<td>25,31</td>
<td>27,0</td>
<td>27,1</td>
<td>25,4</td>
<td>26,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+1,6)</td>
<td>(+1,8)</td>
<td>(+0,1)</td>
<td>(+0,8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhabitants at place of residence</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,000</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,2)</td>
<td>(-0,3)</td>
<td>(-0,3)</td>
<td>(-0,5)</td>
<td>(-0,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-5,000</td>
<td>7,7</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>9,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+1,5)</td>
<td>(+1,9)</td>
<td>(+1,8)</td>
<td>(+1,8)</td>
<td>(+1,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-20,000</td>
<td>24,8</td>
<td>26,3</td>
<td>26,6</td>
<td>25,6</td>
<td>25,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+1,5)</td>
<td>(+1,8)</td>
<td>(+1,8)</td>
<td>(+0,8)</td>
<td>(+0,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-50,000</td>
<td>17,8</td>
<td>15,7</td>
<td>15,7</td>
<td>15,6</td>
<td>15,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2,2)</td>
<td>(-2,1)</td>
<td>(-2,3)</td>
<td>(-2,3)</td>
<td>(-2,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-100,000</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>7,7</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1,1)</td>
<td>(-1,5)</td>
<td>(-1,5)</td>
<td>(-1,0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-500,000</td>
<td>16,6</td>
<td>16,9</td>
<td>16,9</td>
<td>17,2</td>
<td>17,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+0,4)</td>
<td>(+0,3)</td>
<td>(+0,3)</td>
<td>(+0,7)</td>
<td>(+0,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 500,000</td>
<td>19,6</td>
<td>19,7</td>
<td>19,6</td>
<td>20,1</td>
<td>20,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+0,2)</td>
<td>(+0,0)</td>
<td>(+0,0)</td>
<td>(+0,6)</td>
<td>(+0,5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>P2W</th>
<th>Strong P2W</th>
<th>CAWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>81,1</td>
<td>92,3</td>
<td>92,9</td>
<td>92,4</td>
<td>92,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+11,2)</td>
<td>(+11,8)</td>
<td>(+11,3)</td>
<td>(+11,7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1,8)</td>
<td>(-1,7)</td>
<td>(-1,8)</td>
<td>(-1,8)</td>
<td>(-1,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,9)</td>
<td>(-1,1)</td>
<td>(-0,8)</td>
<td>(-0,9)</td>
<td>(-0,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,9)</td>
<td>(-0,7)</td>
<td>(-0,7)</td>
<td>(-0,8)</td>
<td>(-0,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,7)</td>
<td>(-0,6)</td>
<td>(-0,6)</td>
<td>(-0,8)</td>
<td>(-0,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,6)</td>
<td>(-0,7)</td>
<td>(-0,7)</td>
<td>(-0,8)</td>
<td>(-0,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,5)</td>
<td>(-0,5)</td>
<td>(-0,5)</td>
<td>(-0,5)</td>
<td>(-0,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Country</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>4,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-5,9)</td>
<td>(-6,6)</td>
<td>(-6,0)</td>
<td>(-6,0)</td>
<td>(-6,0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from a presentation by Pablo Christmann et al. at the CLOSER Conference (20.1.2022)
Reasons for underrepresentation
   Language barriers, high mobility, correlation with (low) education, (dis)trust in institutions, lack of understanding for relevance

Efficient measures, but out of budget
   Face-to-face interviews with native speakers as interviewers

Realistic measures, considered in FReDA
   Simply language (in all communication)
   Shorten texts, use more visual elements (figures, podcasts etc.)
   More communication in foreign languages – apart from the questionnaire
   Ambassadors from low educated and migrant subpopulations, advertising for participation
Thank you!

Detlev Lück & Martin Bujard

FReDA – The German Family Demography Panel Study
Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB)
Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4
D-65185 Wiesbaden
Tel.: +49 611 75 -866 / -3309
E-Mail: frda@bib.bund.de

www.freda-panel.de
Hong Kong
Joy Christian Cruz
Data quality and representativeness of the HK-GGS pilot

Christian Joy Pattawi Cruz\textsuperscript{1,2} & Stuart Gietel-Basten\textsuperscript{1,2,3}

\textsuperscript{1} Division of Public Policy, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
\textsuperscript{2} Center for Aging Science, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
\textsuperscript{3} Division of Social Science, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
HK-GGS

Push-to-web: May 17 - July 18, 2022

Incentive experiment: 9 incentive groups + 1 control group

Address-based sampling

Invitation and 3 reminders: via post
Data quality

Indicators: item non-response, straight lining or patterning (simple non-differentiation, scale point variation, coefficient of variation)

Variables: 17 questions on attitudes

Findings: Low item-non-response; Differences (TG1 vs Control; TG1 vs TG9) Low straight lining; no significant differences across groups
Representativeness

Indicators: Compare the of the HK-GGS sample with population

Variables: sex, age, education, employment, and marital status

Findings: Overrepresentation of more educated, employed, partnered; no significant differences across groups
THANK YOU!

Christian Joy Pattawi Cruz

cjcruzaa@connect.ust.hk

@CJoyPCruz1

Stuart Gietel-Basten

sgb@ust.hk

@stuartbasten
Uruguay
Ignacio Pardo
The GGS in Uruguay:
Implementing a mixed-mode strategy

Ignacio Pardo (Programa de Población, Universidad de la República)
Data collection strategy

- Sample frame: households (dwellings) from the 2011 National Census
- Sample design (Uruguayan National Statistical Office)
  - House selection by sampling
  - Respondent selection (last birthday celebration)
    - Interview mode (previously selected at random):
      - 90% face-to-face
      - 10% push-to-web
- Sampling size: 8,000
- Target population: urban Uruguayan population (cities > 5000), age 18-79
Data collection strategy

- Sample frame: households (dwellings) from the 2011 National Census
- Sample design (Uruguayan National Statistical Office)
  - House selection by sampling
  - Respondent selection (last birthday celebration)
  - Interview mode (previously selected at random):
    - 90% face-to-face
    - 10% push-to-web

- Sampling size: 8,000
- Target population: urban Uruguayan population (cities > 5000), age 18-79
Fieldwork (June 2022)

• 2,987 interviews were completed -up to June 16, 2022-

• Mode
  • 2625 interviews (87.9%) face-to-face
  • 362 interviews (12.1%) push-to-web

• Data quality is similar, so far
• Some problems in push-to-web mode (incomplete interviews), but mostly solved after insisting by phone
Response rate by mode

- Push-to-web: 24.6%
- Face-to-face: 31.2%
Response rate by mode

- Push-to-web: 24.6%
- Face-to-face: 31.2%
France
Milan Bouchet-Valat
The French GGS

- Milan Bouchet-Valat, Laurent Toulemon

GGP-Council of Partners
Tuesday 21 June, 2022
GGS in France: a pilot survey in 2022

- A pilot test was conducted in Nov. 2021 – Feb. 2022
  - CAWI or CATI, pre- and post-incentives
  - Response rates, quality of answers, drop-offs
- Results from the pilot
  - Data quality OK in CAWI
  - Switching to CATI is useful to finish the questionnaires and even more to conduct new interviews
  - CAWI-CATI with pre+post incentives is as good as CATI-CAWI without incentives (but much cheaper)
  - Response rates: from 10% to 30% before switching, 20% to 50% after switching to CATI, from D1 to D10 (living standard deciles)
GGS in France: preparing wave 1 in 2023

• Conclusions and decisions for data collection
  → Sequential multi-mode: CAWI plus partial switch to CATI
  → 8,000 interviews on CAWI, 2000 in CATI
  → Over-representation of individuals with low standard of living, in order to compensate for low response rates
  → Over-representation of individuals living in same-sex couples

• Availability of administrative data
  → Sampling of individuals
  → Enrichment of data (including follow-up)

• Provisional agenda
  → Presentation to statistical Council, privacy authorities in 2022
  → Fieldwork from late 2023 to summer 2024
Czechia
Martin Kreidl
CAWI and CAPI in Czechia

Recruitment by “interviewers”

- “Fieldwork” - randomly selected addresses
- Personal contact necessary
- Most “interviewers” were trained to contact HHs, but not to interview
- Respondents choose the mode
  - If CAWI – email is sent (N=1774 completed)
  - If CAPI – a “real” interviewer is sent to HH
- CAPI was carried out in 151 cases
- 7.8 % of this “fieldwork” sample, 3.3 % of the total sample

Telephone recruitment (CATI)

- Random cell phone numbers
- If a person agrees to complete, email is sent (CAWI)
- CAPI is offered as an “rescue” option in one (last) reminder
- No respondent in the CATI sample changed from CAWI to CAPI
- N=2555
Part II. Strategies for funding, data for policies, and new participating countries (10 countries/regions)
Moldova
Aliona Cristei
Generations and Gender Programme in the Republic of Moldova

Cristei Aliona, Project Officer on GGP
Generations and Gender Survey

- 20,000 of households visited
- Over 10,000 persons interviewed
- 10,000 interview hours
- 500 questions on demographic changes
- 200 days for data collection
- 150 field operators

#GenerationsAndGender
Development of 4 policy documents

4 policy documents on family friendly policies were developed in cooperation with the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection and Center “Partnership for Development”

01 Expanding the work arrangements for families with children

02 How do we foster equitable engagement of parents in upbringing and care of children

03 Creation of the National Crèche Fund

04 Expanding alternative individual childcare services
GGS data was used for

- Development of Theory of Change for Demographic Resilience
- Country Gender Assessment,
- Active Ageing Index for 2020
- 4 policy documents on promoting Family Friendly policies
- National Program on Healthy and Active Ageing
- Monitoring of SDG 3.7.1., 5.6.1, 17.8.1
- Estimation of more than 100 demographic indicators
GGS data dissemination

- 2 MoU with academia signed, students are using the GGS data in the development of academic thesis and research
- Launch the Fellowship research Programme based on GGS data (9 targeted policy analysis)
- Establish a research community that are exploring GGS for innovation and research
Thank you!
UNFPA

Željko Blagojević
Lithuania
Aušra Maslauskaitė
GGS funding, national roadmap and strategies: Lithuania

Aušra Maslauskaitė,
Vytenis Deimantas

Council of Partners meeting,
2022 June 21
National roadmap

• Call for a new roadmap issued in 2018
• Application submitted
  • Consortium: Vytautas Magnus University and Lithuanian Social Research Center
• 2019 the Lithuanian Research Council approved including the RI GGP.LT in the National Roadmap
• National Roadmap not accepted yet
Current developments

• Contacts and discussions at the Office of the Prime minister
  • Interested, acknowledge the relevance

• Meetings and discussions:
  • with Statistics Lithuania (possibly could take the responsibility for the data collection)
  • with the Ministry of Social Security and Labor
  • advisor to the Prime Minister

• National RI works on increasing the visibility of RI (launch of the website, raising awareness etc.)
Croatia
Ivan Čipin
GGS funding in Croatia

Ivan Čipin & Petra Međimurec
• Search for funding: **10 years** → first approached NIDI in 2012

• **CBS** (Croatian Bureau of Statistics) not interested due to overload of work; internationally, they do what EUROSTAT assigns, nothing extra

• Rejection from **CSF** (Croatian Science Foundation) **2x**
  • Just below threshold in first attempt
  • Max. points in second attempt, but project halted by the board – why?

• Unsuccessful attempts to get funding from a number of international funding sources

• Finally a successful attempt: **State Office for Demography and Youth**

• They perceived the significance of GGP

• Demography as one of the Government’s priorities (this helped)

• Negotiation and contracting process lasted for almost **2 years**
• Unsuccessful attempt of including GGP in the National Roadmap
• New Roadmap in preparation: chances high!

• Roadmap ≠ Funding BUT helpful with getting funding from other sources (especially EU structural funds)
• ESFRI Roadmap of greater importance: significant impact on getting national funding for GGP

• **Advice**: find a ministry or a governmental body in charge for demographic issues → explain how longitudinal data (international as well) help tackle demographic challenges, then convince them they can not do without!
Poland
Monika Mynarska
Poland
How have we made it to the Polish roadmap for RIs and why it matters for the GGS 2.0?
2009 & 2013
GGS-I wave 1 & 2 funding (research grant money)

2015
Polish Ministry grants political support to GGP ESFRI application

2018
Joining forces with SHARE to form Polish Research Infrastructure for Life Course Studies (PRILS)

2019
re-submission of the PRILS application

2017
Failed grant application for GGS-I wave 3
Clear message: Structural funds needed!

January 2020
PRILS on the Polish Roadmap!

Later in 2020
Polish Ministry grants political support to GGP ESFRI application

!! Now
Eligible to apply for structural funds for RIs (5 years funding)
Important for the application to the national roadmap:

- Collaboration with other RIs (in our case: SHARE)
  - Shared resources
  - Overlapping research teams
  - Exchange of knowledge and skills
  - Joint activities (complementarities)

- Collaboration between different institutions
- Socio-economic impact *

* For SHARE-ERIC – the Ministry of Family and Social Policy is the leading institution; some socio-economic impact is imposed by the formal links
Austria
Norbert Neuwirth
How Austria comes in again ...

[1] GGP.at – Consortium found in 2019
- Austrian Institute for Family Studies, University Vienna (lead)
- Vienna Institute for Demography, Austrian Academy of Sciences
- Institute for Sociology, University Vienna
- Institute for Demography, University Vienna
- Institute for Sociology, University Salzburg

Austria finally supported the GGP joining the ESFRI

- GGP.at – team negotiated for surveying the GGP in CAWI – CAPI modes.
- Due to COVID the CAPI-mode had to be withdrawn.
- As inflation in rolling ... although „cheaper“ modes are employed, the survey will have to exploit all the budgets
How Austria comes in again ...

[4] National Social Science Data Archive (AUSSDA - CESSDA) by June 2022
   To stress out the importance of the GGP for scientific research all GGP.at waves are implemented to the AUSSDA. Additional items as well as the replacement sample of wave#2 can be used from this site.

[5] Preparing & running the Call for Tender 2021 - 2022
   • As the GGP.at clearly exceeds all budget-limits, the call had to be published throughout the EU.
   • Two promising candidates came in.
   • We’re still deciding ... some negotiations running
   • The fielding agency should be contracted within the next weeks
   • WE HAVE A TIGHT TIME SCHEDULE FOR ENTERING THE FIELD
How Austria comes in again …

[6] Some Points on the GGP.at fielding strategy

- Preparation over summer 2022
  - Drawing gross sample
  - Finishing & testing the add.items on the impact of
    - Inflation
    - Covid
    - Global developments
      ... on future plans of the respondents
  - Implementation of landing pages at start & end of survey
- Fielding Procedure
  - Invitation letter for CAWI
  - 2 reminders after ~7 days each
    - In second reminder: Possibility to participate in CATI
  - Reminders for R who broke up CAWI
    - In second reminder: Possibility to participate in CATI
- Incentives
  - Unconditional pre-incentive (2 € coin attached in first letter)
  - Conditional post-incentive (20 € voucher)
How Austria comes in again ...

[6 cont.] Some Points on the GGP.at fielding strategy

Sample waves
1. Wave#1: More than 50% of gross sample contacted. Pure random draw.
2. Wave#2: After 4-6 weeks we see the sample composition of the completed interviews. 
   ➔ Second draw from gross sample. Some stratification.
3. Wave#3: Same procedure like in #2.
4. (Wave#4:) Certain parts of the population will stay difficult to get in. Perhaps a handful 
   respondents will have to be contributed from the panel sample of the fielding agency.

[7] So ... we’re ready for take off!
Switzerland
Jacques-Antoine Gauthier and Jean-Marie Le Goff
The situation in Switzerland

No participation to the GGP round 1
BUT prior experience with:

- Fertility and Family Survey (FFS) in 1994-95
- Families and generations survey in 2013 and 2018 (Swiss Federal Statistical Office)

Large consensus and strong interest in implementing the GGP survey in Switzerland

- December 2021: (online) meeting on the GGP and how to join it made by the University of Lausanne (UNIL) and the Swiss center of expertise in social sciences (FORS)
- Participation of 50 scholars, support letter signed by 126 scholars representative of most Swiss universities and universities of applied sciences
A timely opportunity to implement the GGP survey in Switzerland

- December 2021: Official demand (by UNIL and FORS) to the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation for durably implementing the GGP in Switzerland (roadmap 2025-2029)
  - Evaluation in progress (decision first semester 2023)
  - First participation to GGP expected in 2025

- Research Team
  - Stephanie Steinmetz (UNIL-FORS), Jacques-Antoine Gauthier (UNIL), Jean-Marie Le Goff (UNIL)
United Kingdom

Brienna Perelli-Harris
The GGS in the UK

Brienna Perelli-Harris
Olga Maslovskaya
Ann Berrington

GGP Council of Partners Meeting
June 21, 2022
Phase 1 – further develop the existing Blaise questionnaire to improve data collection

- Workshop to discuss online collection of life histories (e.g. calendars) on smartphones
- Simple redesign for Smartphones using online first design
- Test multiple types of date entry, including soft and hard range checks
- Table summaries to help highlight inconsistent dates and allow entry of revised dates
- User testing
Phase 2 – data collection

• Probability-based survey using Push-to-Web
• Aim to produce 7000 online interviews of UK adults aged 18-59
• Sample drawn from Postcode Address File
• Invitation letter and 2 reminder letters
• Incentive experiment on half the sample: £10, £15, £30 vouchers

• Data collection: first half in August/September; second half in October
• Data with weights delivered January 2023
Ireland
Carmel Hannan
Generations and Gender Programme

Council of Partners
June 21st at 1pm (Amsterdam time)

Ireland

Dr. Carmel Hannan
Department of Sociology, University of Limerick, Ireland.
carmel.hannan@ul.ie
The Irish Context

Ireland has never participated in the FFS nor in the GGS despite interest in demographic changes here.
We do not have a population register.
Near impossible to get an agency to collect data from a large random sample (RedC, Amárach, Behaviour and Attitudes)
- Lost interviewers (Covid)
- Costs have gone up
- Little engagement on the ground (low response rates)
Move to online panels (RedC max n 2000) or use of Reddit forum to recruit participants. Online mode (move to CAWI).
Funding GGS Ireland

A detailed proposal was submitted to the Irish Research Council in 2021 (sample 18-59) push-to-web design. Many thanks to Anne Gauthier and Stuart Gietel-Basten for all their help. Although ranked high, funding was not awarded. Currently, UL have provided seed funding:

- The Eircode Address File (ECAF) and Database (ECAD) contain 2.2 million address points and information for each address.
- Matching this GeoDirectory to Census SAPs (profile each area in terms of age, educational, family and employment status).
- Build an internet panel.

Plan- continue to apply for funding.
Buenos Aires
Maria Eugenia Lago
Gender and Population Survey in Buenos Aires
First stage – all household surveys

- Primary sampling units (PSU) are the “census radios” each has 350 houses
- List of houses updated annually
- PSU are stratified into 5 socioeconomic strata
- 310 PSUs were selected (Sampford Method)
- The size measure used to assign probability was the total dwellings of each PSU.

Second stage - GGS

- 20 houses will be selected in each of the PSUs, totaling 6,200 dwellings.
- Expected effectiveness 40%
- The target population people aged 18 and 79 years of old
AWNARNESS –COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

- Institutional letter explaining the purpose of the survey and reasons for selection
- The interview is CAPI, so an interviewer goes by the house and leaves a notice of his visit “Aviso de visita”, if he does not find anyone, he leaves a "Notice of visit" with his data to agree on the day and time of the interview.
¡GRACIAS!
Thank you