



# seriss

SYNERGIES FOR EUROPE'S  
RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURES  
IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Deliverable Number: 2.6

Deliverable Title: Joint workshop with country representatives of SHARE and ESS to discuss available data sources and potential for subsequent use

Work Package: WP2 – Representing the population

Deliverable type: Report

Dissemination status: Public

Submitted by: SHARE ERIC

Authors: Johanna Bristle (MEA), Michael Bergmann (MEA), Annette Scherpenzeel (MEA), Sarah Butt (ESS ERIC HQ/CITY), Tom Emery (NIDI)

Date Submitted: July 2018

This project has received funding from the *European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme* under grant agreement No 654221.





[www.seriss.eu](http://www.seriss.eu)  @SERISS\_EU

SERISS (Synergies for Europe's Research Infrastructures in the Social Sciences) aims to exploit synergies, foster collaboration and develop shared standards between Europe's social science infrastructures in order to better equip these infrastructures to play a major role in addressing Europe's grand societal challenges and ensure that European policymaking is built on a solid base of the highest-quality socio-economic evidence.

The four year project (2015-19) is a collaboration between the three leading European Research Infrastructures in the social sciences – the European Social Survey (ESS ERIC), the Survey of Health Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE ERIC) and the Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives (CESSDA AS) – and organisations representing the Generations and Gender Programme (GGP), European Values Study (EVS) and the WageIndicator Survey.

Work focuses on three key areas: Addressing key challenges for cross-national data collection, breaking down barriers between social science infrastructures and embracing the future of the social sciences.

Please cite this deliverable as: Bristle, J. et al. (2018). Joint workshop with country representatives of SHARE and ESS to discuss available data sources and potential for subsequent use. Deliverable 2.6 of the SERISS project funded under the *European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme* GA No: 654221. Available at: [www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables](http://www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables)

## **Deliverable 2.6: Joint workshop with country representatives of SHARE and ESS to discuss available data sources and potential for subsequent use**

Johanna Bristle, Michael Bergmann, Annette Scherpenzeel, Sarah Butt, Tom Emery

### **Content**

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Workshop on joint sampling and auxiliary data.....	6
Procedure for facilitating exchange .....	6
Participation of country representatives .....	7
2.1. Sharing experiences from ESS and SHARE Countries.....	8
Portugal .....	8
Germany .....	9
France .....	10
2.2. Improving survey sampling and synergies beyond.....	10
Recommendation letter .....	11
Auxiliary variables.....	12
2.3. Wrap-up and action points .....	12
3. Conclusions.....	13
References .....	14
Annex .....	15

## **Summary**

The European cross-national surveys face similar challenges in their requirement to represent the population well, among which are approaches to tackle non-response and strategies to draw proper probability sample. The goal of this deliverable was to facilitate exchange between country representatives of ESS and SHARE by hosting a joint workshop. Ten survey researchers met for an interactive one-day workshop to discuss obstacles, opportunities for synergies by envisioning joint sampling as well as the potential of auxiliary data and their use for efficient sampling and non-response analyses. The workshop revealed joint obstacles such as difficulties in access to registers at municipal level in Germany, which might be overcome by a joint recommendation letter to the municipalities. The exchange widened the options for registers in Portugal, which needs to be investigated further in bilateral exchange. In France, access might be improved by presenting non-response analyses, for which in turn auxiliary data from registers is valuable and needed. In general, joint action regarding sampling is more difficult if the country teams work together with different agencies, are on different fieldwork schedules and have different prerequisites. However, the underlying obstacles are very similar and it was emphasized that more cooperation and exchange should be prioritized to national competitiveness between surveys. The workshop also showed the need for collaboration in other fields of survey practice, such as survey costs.

## **Acknowledgment**

We would like to thank Stephanie Lasson for the practical organization of the workshop at the premises of SHARE Central in Munich and Rebecca Groh for taking notes. Further, we would like to thank Rory Fitzgerald as principal investigator of the ESS and Annette Scherpenzeel as international coordinator of SHARE for their support of the workshop all the participants for sharing their experiences and ideas enabling a fruitful discussion.

## 1. Introduction

This deliverable is part of work package 2 “Representing the population” which aims at developing strategies to obtain high-quality samples in social surveys. The second task of this work package explores the potential for exploiting the growing amount of pre-existing administrative data to better understand and overcome survey non-response and non-response bias. Understanding and reducing survey non-response is considered an ex-ante solution to having a representative sample of the population, while using auxiliary data that is available for respondents as well as non-respondents can help to improve weighting strategies as a post-fieldwork solution to non-response. During fieldwork, potential error can occur due to non-response and through non-optimal sampling strategies before fieldwork. Non-response and sampling are two components of the error of representation in the total survey errors framework (TSE) (Groves et al., 2004) and for both, auxiliary data can prove useful.

The prior deliverable D2.5 of this work package compiled an inventory of auxiliary data that are available in registers used for sampling in the four cross-national European surveys working together in SERISS: the European Social Survey (ESS), the European Values Study (EVS), the Generations and Gender Programme (GGP), and the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). The main conclusions from this data gathering exercise were that 50 country teams (out of 81) reported using register data for sampling. Most registers contain some auxiliary information, but the availability is often limited to socio-demographic characteristics, which are useful for improving sampling strategies and non-response adjustments but not sufficient. Furthermore, access to these data for researchers is often limited, depends on nationality and affiliation and also on the purpose of use the access is requested for (Bristle et al. 2016).

Building on the experience of prior SERISS work, the goal for this deliverable D2.6 was to facilitate exchange and in-depth discussion between country representatives of two of the four large surveys (ESS and SHARE) on the use of auxiliary data available in registers. Using auxiliary data can either be directed towards non-response analyses, improving contact and cooperation strategies and developing appropriate weighting schemes on the one side or towards improving sampling strategies by tailoring the frame towards the population that should be represented by the survey on the other side. In addition to the discussion of auxiliary data, the workshop also provided an opportunity to facilitate discussion relevant to a sibling task of work package 2 that aims to identify potential opportunities for joint sampling across surveys within countries. The main research goals were to detect common obstacles in using auxiliary data and sampling strategies, sharing experiences with the current use of auxiliary data and discussing potential for improvements, for example by combining efforts and drawing a sample jointly.

During the workshop we addressed the following objectives:

- Get an overview about the diverse difficulties countries are faced with when drawing a probability sample
- Explore potential synergies across surveys, especially regarding a jointly built and shared sampling frame
- Explore the availability and potential of auxiliary data for joint sampling frames in order to draw efficient samples that do justice to the different requirements of ESS and SHARE

For this purpose we carefully evaluated the potential candidates of the ESS and SHARE country teams for whom a discussion about potential synergies with regard to sampling and a discussion on the use of auxiliary data in practice might prove useful. All candidates were invited to meet for a workshop in Munich. The second chapter reports on the discussions at the workshop and highlights the main insights from this exchange. In addition, country teams were encouraged to meet for bi-lateral exchange and the workshop showed the need for discussing synergies beyond auxiliary data and joint sampling. All conclusive remarks and next steps are presented in the third chapter.

## **2. Workshop on joint sampling and auxiliary data**

This chapter provides a summary of the approach taken to facilitate exchange between survey researchers from country teams of the ESS and SHARE and the substantive outcome, a workshop and fruitful in-depth discussion that took place in Munich on June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

### **Procedure for facilitating exchange**

In a first step, it was decided to arrange an interactive one-day workshop in Munich at the premises of SHARE Central and focus the topic on synergies with regard to sampling and the use of auxiliary variables. The date and location was chosen as June 12<sup>th</sup> was an adjacent day of another SHARE meeting taking place in Munich. In a second step, the potential group of participants was defined. For this purpose, the current sampling frames and the planned sampling procedure for the upcoming round/wave of each country team were analysed to map out potential candidates for joint national sampling strategies. The most promising candidates were those where one country team has access to a register and the other team does not. Further, special attention was given to countries where one country team encountered obstacles in accessing sample records while the other gained access or where both teams face similar difficulties due to national regularities. These country teams were invited in personal emails sent out by the ESS headquarters and SHARE Central. In addition to the country teams, we invited the members of the Sampling and Weighting Expert Panel (SWEPEP) of the ESS and the sampling experts at SHARE Central. An official invitation signed by the Principal Investigator of ESS and the International Coordinator of SHARE followed to all

ESS National Coordinators, SHARE country team leaders and operators and to the SWEP members.

### **Participation of country representatives**

Overall, the workshop group consisted of ten motivated survey researchers from different backgrounds with the common goal to improve sampling strategies and the use of auxiliary data in Europe and in their countries. A participant list of the workshop can be found in the Annex.

Out of the nine explicitly invited countries, four country teams followed our invitation to Munich. For Portugal, the SHARE team was represented, for France the ESS team participated and for Germany both teams joined the discussion. Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Israel and Switzerland were not able to participate in the workshop, but could partly be won for bi-lateral meetings (see below). We were able to have the sampling experts from both surveys, ESS and SHARE for all three respective countries present at the workshop. This was highly beneficial as it allowed an exchange of the perspectives of both surveys although for France and Portugal only one of the teams joined the workshop, and second, it allowed for an in-depth discussion of the respective situation in the countries present. In addition, the sampling expert for the Generations and Gender Programme was present and contributed cross-country experience from another SERISS study.

In general, the interest in the workshop following the invitations was less than expected. Reasons for non-participation were mainly directed towards the workshop's overlap with other obligations (for example the start of translation and fieldwork preparations for ESS Round 9) and an inconvenient date of the workshop. However, some countries reported that the workshop had no relevance to them due to an already well working sampling strategy (e.g. Bulgaria) or the fact that they had already obtained their sample for the current survey round (e.g. Israel). Other invitees like Hungary declined, replying that they expected more burden than benefit from the cooperation across surveys as the proposed approach promises to be more resource-intensive (both in terms of money and manpower) than doing the sampling separately.

For countries with potential for joint sampling that could not attend the workshop, bi-lateral meetings between country representatives in the respective countries were encouraged. In addition, a bi-lateral meeting on potential synergies between ESS and SHARE was held with the country team of Israel and the agency representative of both surveys. The conclusion was that in Israel, the access to the register is straightforward as is the drawing of the sample. The drawing comes at very little monetary and timely costs, so joint sampling does not appear beneficial in this case. The main drawback of drawing a joint sampling here is that it could not adapt to the differing fieldwork schedules of the two surveys.

For the actual workshop, the relatively small group size of ten researchers offered the opportunity to have an open dialogue and lively in-depth discussion. The situation of the participating countries could be discussed in detail and investigated from different perspectives.

The agenda of the workshop was divided into two main sections. While the morning was dedicated to discussing the country- and survey-specific situation with the country representatives, the afternoon was used to indulge in in-depth discussion on topics that emerged from the situations discussed in the morning. Topics that were proposed for the afternoon discussion were broader in scope and of relevance to several countries. They also were characterised by their potential for further synergy effects and collaboration across cross-national surveys. The full agenda can be found in the Annex and the summaries of the discussions in the respective workshop slots are described in the following subchapters.

## **2.1. Sharing experiences from ESS and SHARE Countries**

### **Portugal**

The first part of the workshop consisted of presentations from three country representatives: Portugal, Germany and France. First, Mara Silva, the representative of SHARE Portugal described the current situation in Portugal: In 2010 SHARE used a stratified multi-stage sampling design (4-digit zip codes, municipalities/parishes, 7-digit zip codes, addresses, screening of eligible respondents) using the national health system database. With this database it should, in principle, be possible to link addresses with names of persons. However, it turned out that a screening phase for respondents over 50 years was necessary in the end. The main obstacle in this respect is to gain access to this database again for SHARE wave 8. Currently, SHARE Portugal is waiting for a response from the responsible authorities. In this context, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) needs to be considered when it comes to individual information.

After that presentation, Peter Lynn as the sampling expert for ESS Portugal responded with a description of the sampling design for Portugal that was first used in ESS Round 8 and is planned to be used for Round 9, too. It is based on a list of (billing) addresses provided by an electricity company (Energias de Portugal, EDP). As the frame consists of billing units from private households, more than one household may share a bill. In addition, there is no access to names, i.e. interviewers have to randomly select persons in the households. During ESS Round 8, it emerged that the list of billing addresses did not fit the population very well for certain regions (based on 7-digit zip codes) as the boundaries of smaller areas were not precisely identified. Therefore, selection probabilities differed a lot. For Round 9, the same frame is proposed but, learning from the Round 8 experience, it will be ensured that all information necessary to calculate selection probabilities is obtained from the sample source and requested at the time the sample is drawn.

In the subsequent discussion, the potential for using a joint sampling frame for ESS and SHARE was discussed. The first question for SHARE was if getting the addresses from EDP proves useful as EDP only provides billing units to ESS and not individual information. For SHARE sampling, age is a crucial auxiliary variable needed for narrowing down the sampling frame to target the population 50 plus efficiently. In the discussion, it remained unclear if age is available information from the EDP. This has to be investigated further (see action points, Table 1). The second discussion point concerned the new GDPR legislation. The consensus was that GDPR most likely does not affect the use of EDP as a sampling frame as no personal information such as names is provided but it may make gaining access to the national health system database more difficult than in previous waves.

The discussion evolved into the question, which criteria should be given priority when selecting a sampling frame. Peter Lynn answered that the sampling frame that offers the best coverage should be preferred. If coverage is the same in two or more frames, an individual sample like health system data would be better than data based on households as then no random selection of respondents by interviewers would be needed. Therefore, SHARE Portugal should carefully evaluate their chances of getting access to the national health system database but also investigate the possibilities regarding a probability sample from EDP (preferably with information on age). An alternative would be to assess the usability of the electoral register.

## **Germany**

The second presentation was given by Christian Schnaudt from the German ESS team. In contrast to Portugal, Germany allows legal access to person registers for scientific research. The sampling design consists of two main stages: the selection of a list of municipalities and the selection of registered individuals in these municipalities by the administration. Although the situation in Germany seems less complicated than in Portugal, the main obstacle is to actually get the addresses in time from the municipalities' administration as the federal government doesn't instruct them to guarantee access. As there is no national register available in Germany, surveys depend on the goodwill of the selected municipalities to actually provide the required data even though access is legally permitted.

The main discussion points raised for the German case were the development of an official letter to be signed by the federal government to the municipalities, which states that the survey is of public interest and should be supported in their sampling procedure. Additionally, this could be used for an agreed "white list" of well-accepted surveys. This would directly benefit and ease the obstacle encountered in the German setting. It remained unclear if it would be most beneficial to cooperate for this letter with the responsible state government or on the federal level. All participants agreed that such a letter could also be a joint SERISS initiative as all surveys face the same obstacle in Germany. This led on to a discussion of whether the advance letter to the respondents states the origin of the respondents' addresses. While this is currently not the case for ESS Germany,

the German SHARE team reports the sampling frame to gain the trust of the respondents and to be transparent (although the GDPR doesn't formally require it).

Regarding possible synergies and joint sampling strategies between ESS and SHARE, it was argued that having different agencies might hamper cooperation. In addition, ESS and SHARE are on different timelines, which makes synchronization of sampling strategies difficult. The most fruitful avenue for co-operation is likely to be in combining resources to successfully negotiate access to separate samples.

## **France**

The third presentation was by Valentin Brunel from the French ESS team. He started with a detailed description of the sampling procedure in France that is carried out by INSEE, the national institute of statistics and economic studies. The sampling frame of their master sample consists of households with individual information on age and is mainly based on a rotating Census with different procedures for small and large communes. The main obstacle for ESS is to actually obtain the sample from INSEE. The French National Statistical Label Committee, which examines the request of using the census for ESS sample in France, frequently criticized the content of attitudinal questions being asked in ESS (although, item non-response regarding sensitive questions doesn't seem to be a big issue for ESS). In this respect, SHARE has an advantage, as behavior and objective measures are the focus of the study. Another point of critique from the Label Committee concerns the question of how non-response is corrected for. Here, the Label Committee would like to have more analyses from ESS. It remained unclear if this is also true for SHARE.

The further discussion resulted in the suggestion to summarize existing research on non-response in the ESS with an explicit focus on France. This should be written as a short paper in French. However, it should be clarified that comprehensive non-response analyses are only feasible if auxiliary data is provided by INSEE, which is currently not the case. Again, the possible advantages of a "white list" including ESS and SHARE were mentioned. In this respect, more cooperation between ESS and SHARE to try and ensure that both surveys are considered by the Label Committee. Further discussion and a meeting of the two country teams of ESS and SHARE in Paris would be the next step.

### **2.2. Improving survey sampling and synergies beyond**

The second part of the workshop consisted of a discussion regarding issues that were raised during the morning and topics that gained general interest.

The following topics were collected for discussion:

- Implementation of a recommendation letter with key arguments to convince authorities to give access to the existing register

- Discuss the quality of available registers and promising alternatives
- Use of auxiliary variables for sampling and especially non-response corrections (e.g. weights)
- Sampling cost strategies

Out of the four topics raised, the recommendation letter and the auxiliary variables were discussed in detail. The other two topics were postponed due to time constraints. Further information on a prior evaluation of quality of available registers can be found in the SERISS deliverable D2.2 (Maineri et al. 2017). The sampling cost strategies received a lot of interest and would be also a good topic for a future event (see action points, Table 1). The following describes the discussions on the recommendation letter and the auxiliary variables.

### **Recommendation letter**

The idea of a recommendation letter builds on previous work from the ESS and a case in Belgium where access to a register was re-gained by an initiative of survey researchers. Access to personal register was denied some years ago for ESS Belgium; however, after writing many letters and putting forward a variety of arguments access was achieved again. Based on this experience, a neighbouring SERISS task identified successful strategies and analysed arguments that were most effective in convincing the authorities. Preliminary results show that one successful argument in the Belgium case was the protection of data privacy. In contrast, mentioning scientific research was (perhaps surprisingly) not very successful. The idea is hence to produce a template letter to request register access that all directors of the surveys in SERISS could sign in order to bring more weight to the topic. One important argument in the letter should be that GDPR allows access for scientific research. The results of this analysis and the letter template are available as SERISS Deliverable D2.3 (Scherpenzeel et al. 2018). This initiative resonated well with the workshop participants.

A discussion evolved around who the addressee and/or the signatories of the letter should be. It was emphasized that there might be no specific addressee, but that the letter should be adjusted to certain situations to reflect differences between countries. Tailoring the letter to different circumstances could be helpful. For instance, in Germany it seems most useful if the infrastructures send the letter to the ministry who would then send a letter to the selected municipality, which emphasizes that the study is of public interest and is supported by the federal/state government. In contrast, in France, a letter signed by all the principal investigators of the studies would be more appropriate. In the case of Croatia, collaboration between SHARE and GGP would be beneficial as neither of the surveys currently has access to a register despite previously having been granted access and the surveys share the same country team. It was agreed that it should be investigated for which countries such a recommendation letter would be helpful and if access should be sought for all surveys (see action points, Table 1). In this context, it was also discussed if the existing

overview of sampling frames used by the SERISS surveys, as reported in Deliverable D2.1 (Scherpenzeel et al. 2016), should be updated. This might be especially relevant for EVS as the documented sampling of EVS refers to the 2008 wave and the most recent sampling for the 2017 wave is not reflected yet. In general, an update was supported and will be addressed (see action points, Table 1).

### **Auxiliary variables**

Regarding the second topic on auxiliary variables, the main question was which variables (except basic variables such as age, gender and rather broad regions) could be used for weight adjustments and which other variables could be collected. With respect to experiences in the German context, it was noted that the use of aggregated auxiliary variables was not very successful. Auxiliary data should therefore be at the individual level in order to be effective. The very high initial refusal and subsequent drop-out rates in Germany prompted the idea that it might be informative to investigate why individuals actually do participate in surveys rather than studying why they don't, as the standard behaviour seems to shift towards non-participation. More generally speaking, it was questioned whether the collection of auxiliary data is actually as promising as often stated as the variables most commonly available do not explain non-response very well. Most often, auxiliary variables are restricted to demographic information, which are not necessarily the most predictive variables for non-response. The most predictive information would stem from the respondents' social activities, their involvement in politics and their general attitudes towards surveys and the government. Panel studies provide a better pool of variables explaining non-response than register data and auxiliary information, for example prior research shows that for panel studies people who have more item non-response are more likely to drop out in a future wave (Bristle et al. forthcoming). However, it was also argued that the use of auxiliary data might need more sophisticated research instead of abandoning the idea of using auxiliary variables in general.

It was further discussed if the selection of auxiliary variables in ESS and SHARE should be based on the bare minimum but be consistent across all countries, or if a country-specific selection would produce better weights and in the end would improve data quality. Currently, both ESS and SHARE apply the standardized approach across all countries but will re-open the discussion on effective weighting strategies to consider more country-specific approaches.

### **2.3. Wrap-up and action points**

After the discussion, the main issues and achievements of the workshop were briefly summarized. It was emphasized that some sort of recommendation letter and/or an additional white list might be extremely helpful for many countries and surveys. The

participants will be kept up to date on this issue (see action points, Table 1). The workshop showed several difficulties that might complicate cooperation and synergies regarding sampling (e.g. different agencies in one country, different prerequisites in ESS and SHARE). However, it was possible to find tailored approaches for each participating country on what next steps could look like, such as evaluating the concrete possibilities for moving to a different sampling frame in Portugal, the recommendation letter to convince reluctant municipalities in Germany or writing a memo on non-response analyses based on ESS findings in France. Finally, it was emphasized that more cooperation should be prioritized over national competitiveness between surveys. The workshop also showed the need for collaboration in other fields of survey practice, such as survey costs.

Table 1: Action points of workshop

<b>Action point</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
Finalize recommendation letter (SERISS deliverable D2.3, due end of June 2018) and inform participants about it	SHARE Central
Make a list of countries for which such a letter might be helpful and who should be the addressee	SHARE Central
Send request to countries in order to update list of used sampling frames (SERISS deliverable D2.1)	SHARE Central
Establish contact between ESS and SHARE country teams (especially Portugal and France)	SHARE Central
Evaluate the concrete possibilities to get access to the sampling frame from EDP also for SHARE (clarify availability of information on age)	SHARE Portugal
Write memo with a short summary on non-response analyses based on ESS results in French for the Label Committee and engage in further discussion with them on how best to do this	ESS France
Think about a separate workshop on sampling cost/survey cost strategies	ESS HQ

### 3. Conclusions

The European cross-national surveys face similar challenges in their requirement to represent the population well, among which are approaches to tackle non-response and strategies to draw proper probability sample. The goal of this deliverable was to facilitate exchange between country representatives of ESS and SHARE by hosting a joint workshop.

Ten survey researchers met for an interactive one-day workshop to discuss obstacles, opportunities for synergies by envisioning joint sampling as well as the potential of auxiliary

data and their use for efficient sampling and non-response analyses. As the participation was lower than expected, separate bi-lateral meetings between country representatives in the respective countries were also encouraged.

The workshop revealed tailored approaches and next steps for each of the three participating countries. In Germany, the joint obstacle of difficulties in access to registers on municipal level might be overcome by a joint recommendation letter to the municipalities, which was developed within the SERISS framework and work package 2. The exchange widened the options for potentially suitable registers in Portugal, which needs to be investigated further in bi-lateral exchange. In France, access might be improved by presenting non-response analyses to the institution holding the register, for which in turn auxiliary data from registers is valuable and needed. In addition, bi-lateral meetings with Bulgaria and Israel as well as the email conversation with Hungary and Switzerland showed that joint sampling strategies might not always generate synergies, especially if there is already a well working sampling procedure in place.

However, some countries reported that the workshop had no relevance to them due to an already well working sampling strategy (e.g. Bulgaria) or the fact that they had already obtained their sample for the current survey round. Other invitees like Hungary declined, replying that they expected more burden than benefit from the cooperation across surveys as the proposed approach promises to be more resource-intensive (both in terms of money and manpower) than doing the sampling separately.

In general, joint action regarding sampling is likely to be more difficult if the country teams work with different agencies, are on different fieldwork schedules and have different specifications of the target population. However, the underlying obstacles are very similar and it was emphasized that more cooperation and exchange should be prioritized over national competitiveness between surveys. The workshop also showed the need for collaboration in other fields of survey practice, such as survey costs.

## References

Bristle, J., Butt, S., Emery, T., Luijkx, R., Maineri, A.M., Pflüger, S-M., Scherpenzeel, A. and Zins, S. (2016). Report on auxiliary data in available country registers. Deliverable 2.5 of the Synergies for Europe's research infrastructures in the Social Sciences (SERISS). Available at [www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables](http://www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables).

Bristle, J., Celidoni, M., Dal Bianco, C., Weber, G. (forthcoming). The contributions of paradata and features of respondents, interviewers and survey agencies to panel cooperation in the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*.

Groves, R.M., Fowler Jr., F.J., Couper, M.P., Lepkowski, J.M., Singer, E. and Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey Methodology*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.

Maineri, A., Scherpenzeel, A., Bristle, J., Pflüger, S-M., Butt, S., Zins, S., Emery, T., Luijkx, R. (2017). Evaluating the quality of sampling frames used in European cross-national surveys. Deliverable 2.2 of Synergies for Europe's research infrastructures in the Social Sciences (SERISS). Available at: [www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables](http://www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables).

Scherpenzeel, A., Maineri, A., Bristle, J., Pflüger, S-M., Mindarova, I., Butt, S., Zins, S., Emery, T., Luijkx, R. (2016). Report on the use of sampling frames in European studies, Deliverable 2.1 of Synergies for Europe's research infrastructures in the Social Sciences (SERISS). Available at: [www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables](http://www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables).

Scherpenzeel, A. et al. 2018. Template letter including background information to request access to population registers for sample drawing. Deliverable 2.3 of Synergies for Europe's research infrastructures in the Social Sciences (SERISS). Available at: [www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables](http://www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables).

## **Annex**

Workshop agenda with participants list



# seriss

SYNERGIES FOR EUROPE'S  
RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURES  
IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

## SERISS Workshop

*'Auxiliary data and potential synergies for improving sampling across surveys'*

**Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA)  
Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy  
Amalienstr. 33  
80799 Munich, Germany  
12<sup>th</sup> June 2018,  
10:30-16:30**

## Agenda

10:30-10:45	Registration and Coffee
<b>10:45-11:00</b>	<b>Welcome and introduction of participants</b> Michael Bergmann, SERISS WP2 Leader, SHARE Central Johanna Bristle, SERISS WP2, SHARE Central
<b>11:00-12:30</b>	<b>Sharing experiences with sampling from ESS and SHARE Countries</b> <i>(current approach, obstacles, using auxiliary data for sampling, potential for improvements)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 11:00-11:30 Portugal</li><li>• 11:30-12:00 Germany</li><li>• 12:00-12:30 France</li></ul>
12:30-13:30	LUNCH
<b>13:30-15:00</b>	<b>Improving survey sampling and synergies beyond: Open format for discussion and exchange (one-on-one, break out groups, all)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Follow-up on topics raised in the morning</li><li>- Main drawbacks, re-occurring obstacles</li><li>- Opportunities provided by auxiliary data</li><li>- Suggestions for improvements</li><li>- Potential synergies, e.g. joint sampling</li><li>- Other topics where you see potential for synergies</li></ul>
15:00-15:15	COFFEE BREAK
<b>15:15-16:15</b>	<b>Side meetings</b> (optional) Room for any other topic you would like to discuss with one or more of the other participants
<b>16:15-16:30</b>	<b>Plenary wrap-up and next steps</b> Michael Bergmann, SERISS WP2 Leader, SHARE Central
Afterwards	Informal continuation of the exchange at a Munich beer garden (optional)

## Registered participants

Name	Role and Organization
Annette Scherpenzeel	International Coordinator of SHARE, SHARE Germany, ESS Sampling Expert for Germany and France <i>MEA, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy</i>
Arne Bethmann	SHARE Sampling, SHARE Central <i>MEA, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy</i>
Christian Schnaudt	ESS Germany <i>GESIS-Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences</i>
Johanna Bristle	SHARE Central, SERISS WP2 <i>MEA, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy</i>
Mara Silva	SHARE Portugal <i>University of Minho</i>
Michael Bergmann	SHARE Sampling, SERISS WP2 Lead, SHARE Central <i>MEA, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy</i>
Peter Lynn <i>(participation via Skype)</i>	Professor of Survey Methodology, ESS Sampling Expert for Portugal <i>University of Essex</i>
Sarah Butt	Deputy Director of ESS, Project coordinator of SERISS <i>City, University of London</i>
Thomas Emery	Project Manager of the GGP, SERISS WP2 <i>Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI)</i>
Valentin Brunel	ESS France <i>Sciences Po</i>

Note: The roles are intended to provide you with a rough idea on the perspectives which will be contributed. They do not claim completeness or perfect accuracy in title descriptions.