



mea

Please sign here
Asking for consent without interviewers

Michela Coppola
(MEA-MPISOC)

Bettina Lamla
(MEA-MPISOC)

**mea**

Challenges for social surveys...

- Declining response rates
- Increasing survey costs

- Need to change data collection process
 - Record linkage
 - Self-administered surveys (e.g. web surveys)

What happens if we combine both?

**mea**

A promising way but...

- Consent to data linkage is not universal
- Interviewers are of key importance
 - Help to process relevant information
 - Can influence cost-benefit analysis of respondents
- In self-admin. surveys
 - More effort to understand request
 - Benefits might be less clear
 - Privacy concerns might dominate

Empirical evidence needed!

**mea**

The SAVE experience

➤ What is SAVE?

- Sparen und AltersVorsorgE (Saving and Old-age provision)
- It is a longitudinal study (since 2001)
- Focused on the analysis of households' saving behavior and portfolio decisions
- Mainly conducted as a self-administered Paper and Pencil questionnaire

**mea**

The SAVE experience

➤ **SAVE 2011**

- Consent question in order to link responses of main respondent and partner to their admin. records stored at IAB

➤ **Results:**

- Response rate: 81%
- Consent rate: 57%
 - 63% of couples have sent two consent forms
- Quality of information: good

**mea**

Selectivity of consent?

- **Background characteristics** (e.g. sex, income, education)
- **Privacy concerns and social environment**
 - Employment history
 - Number of missing sensitive items
 - Education in GDR
 - Internet usage in 2005
 - Electoral participation (district level)
 - ...
- **Decision making style and resistance indicators**
 - Cognitive reflection test score
 - Character traits, e.g. dispositional optimism
 - # personal interviews in previous waves

	background characteristics	
	M.E.	S.E.
age <35	ref.	
age 35-54	-0.03	0.07
age 55+	0.22 ***	0.07
male	0.00	0.04
foreign	-0.05	0.23
living with partner	0.00	0.05
number of children at home	0.00	0.03
Hauptschule	ref.	
Realschule	0.10 **	0.05
Abitur	0.15 **	0.06
no post-secondary education	ref.	
vocational Training	-0.09	0.07
university degreee	-0.16 *	0.09
hh income: Q1	ref.	
hh income: Q2	0.11 *	0.07
hh income: Q3	0.29 ***	0.07
hh income: Q4	0.16 **	0.08
hh income: Q5	0.18 **	0.08
hh net worth: Q1	ref.	
hh net worth: Q2	-0.05	0.07
hh net worth: Q3	-0.09	0.07
hh net worth: Q4	-0.03	0.06
hh net worth: Q5	-0.11	0.07
never subject to social insurance contribution	-0.04	0.09
unemployed: never	ref.	
unemployed: up to 6 months	-0.04	0.05
unemployed: 6 months up to 2 years	0.13 ***	0.05
unemployed: longer than 2 years	-0.09	0.06
receiving unempl. benefits		
missings to sensitive questions / # of sensitive questions		
education in the GDR		
internet usage in 2005		
electoral turnout (district level)		
urban		
CRT score		
optimist		
open for change		
self-confident		
cheerful		
# of personal interviews in previous waves		
Pseudo R2	0.0737	

	background characteristics		privacy concerns & social envi.	
	M.E.	S.E.	M.E.	S.E.
age <35	ref.		ref.	
age 35-54	-0.03	0.07	-0.05	0.07
age 55+	0.22 ***	0.07	0.20 ***	0.08
male	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.04
foreign	-0.05	0.23	-0.02	0.22
living with partner	0.00	0.05	-0.03	0.05
number of children at home	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03
Hauptschule	ref.		ref.	
Realschule	0.10 **	0.05	0.07	0.05
Abitur	0.15 **	0.06	0.11 *	0.07
no post-secondary education	ref.		ref.	
vocational Training	-0.09	0.07	-0.11	0.07
university degreee	-0.16 *	0.09	-0.20 **	0.09
hh income: Q1	ref.		ref.	
hh income: Q2	0.11 *	0.07	0.11	0.07
hh income: Q3	0.29 ***	0.07	0.31 ***	0.07
hh income: Q4	0.16 **	0.08	0.17 **	0.08
hh income: Q5	0.18 **	0.08	0.20 **	0.08
hh net worth: Q1	ref.		ref.	
hh net worth: Q2	-0.05	0.07	-0.05	0.07
hh net worth: Q3	-0.09	0.07	-0.09	0.07
hh net worth: Q4	-0.03	0.06	-0.02	0.07
hh net worth: Q5	-0.11	0.07	-0.09	0.07
never subject to social insurance contribution	-0.04	0.09	-0.04	0.09
unemployed: never	ref.		ref.	
unemployed: up to 6 months	-0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05
unemployed: 6 months up to 2 years	0.13 ***	0.05	0.12 **	0.05
unemployed: longer than 2 years	-0.09	0.06	-0.11 *	0.07
receiving unempl. benefits			-0.03	0.08
missings to sensitive questions / # of sensitive questions			-0.29 **	0.12
education in the GDR			0.08	0.05
internet usage in 2005			0.02	0.04
electoral turnout (district level)			0.00	0.00
urban			0.00	0.04
CRT score				
optimist				
open for change				
self-confident				
cheerful				
# of personal interviews in previous waves				
Pseudo R2	0.0737		0.0839	

	background characteristics		privacy concerns & social envi.		decision making style & resistance indicators	
	M.E.	S.E.	M.E.	S.E.	M.E.	S.E.
age <35	ref.		ref.		ref.	
age 35-54	-0.03	0.07	-0.05	0.07	-0.04	0.07
age 55+	0.22 ***	0.07	0.20 ***	0.08	0.20 ***	0.08
male	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.04
foreign	-0.05	0.23	-0.02	0.22	-0.01	0.22
living with partner	0.00	0.05	-0.03	0.05	-0.03	0.05
number of children at home	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03
Hauptschule	ref.		ref.		ref.	
Realschule	0.10 **	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.05
Abitur	0.15 **	0.06	0.11 *	0.07	0.12 *	0.07
no post-secondary education	ref.		ref.		ref.	
vocational Training	-0.09	0.07	-0.11	0.07	-0.11	0.07
university degreee	-0.16 *	0.09	-0.20 **	0.09	-0.20 **	0.09
hh income: Q1	ref.		ref.		ref.	
hh income: Q2	0.11 *	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.10	0.07
hh income: Q3	0.29 ***	0.07	0.31 ***	0.07	0.30 ***	0.07
hh income: Q4	0.16 **	0.08	0.17 **	0.08	0.17 **	0.08
hh income: Q5	0.18 **	0.08	0.20 **	0.08	0.19 **	0.08
hh net worth: Q1	ref.		ref.		ref.	
hh net worth: Q2	-0.05	0.07	-0.05	0.07	-0.05	0.07
hh net worth: Q3	-0.09	0.07	-0.09	0.07	-0.10	0.07
hh net worth: Q4	-0.03	0.06	-0.02	0.07	-0.03	0.07
hh net worth: Q5	-0.11	0.07	-0.09	0.07	-0.09	0.07
never subject to social insurance contribution	-0.04	0.09	-0.04	0.09	-0.04	0.09
unemployed: never	ref.		ref.		ref.	
unemployed: up to 6 months	-0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.05	0.05
unemployed: 6 months up to 2 years	0.13 ***	0.05	0.12 **	0.05	0.12 **	0.05
unemployed: longer than 2 years	-0.09	0.06	-0.11 *	0.07	-0.12 *	0.07
receiving unempl. benefits			-0.03	0.08	-0.02	0.08
missings to sensitive questions / # of sensitive questions			-0.29 **	0.12	-0.21 *	0.12
education in the GDR			0.08	0.05	0.07	0.05
internet usage in 2005			0.02	0.04	0.02	0.05
electoral turnout (district level)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
urban			0.00	0.04	-0.01	0.04
CRT score					0.01	0.04
optimist					0.09 *	0.05
open for change					0.05	0.04
self-confident					-0.06	0.05
cheerful					-0.03	0.05
# of personal interviews in previous waves					-0.04 **	0.02
Pseudo R2		0.0737		0.0839		0.0956

**mea**

Conclusion

- **P&P design and request for consent are compatible**
 - Response rate and consent rate are comparable to interviewer based surveys
- **Selectivity of consent**
 - Not much is significant
 - Privacy concerns main determinant
 - Omitted variables might confound results
 - Consent is conditional on survey participation
 - Limited possibility to control for e.g. order effects

**mea**

Conclusion

➤ **Lessons learnt**

- Interviewers require special training to learn how to mitigate privacy concerns
- Need to improve knowledge on how to communicate consent request in different modes

More empirical evidence is needed!



mea

Thank you!