METHODOLOGY REPORT: 2021 INTERNATIONAL HEALTH POLICY SURVEY OF OLDER ADULTS

Prepared by:

Robyn Rapoport, Rob Manley, Sarah Glancey, & Christian Kline

SEPTEMBER 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

The Commonwealth Fund (the Fund) is a private foundation dedicated to promoting a health care system that achieves better access, improved quality, and greater efficiency, with a focus on society's most vulnerable groups. As part of its mission, the Fund has been conducting the International Health Policy (IHP) Survey in 11 countries for more than two decades. In a triennial cycle, the IHP survey targets different populations, including physicians, older adults, and the general adult population. The population for the 2021 survey is older adults, age 65 and older – with an expanded sample of US adults, age 60 and older.

The Commonwealth Fund and other country partners contracted with SSRS to oversee all aspects of survey administration for the 2021 IHP survey conducted among older adults in Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand (NZ), Norway, the United Kingdom (UK), and the United States (US). SSRS fielded the survey in the US and collaborated with fieldwork partners to field the survey in other countries. Specifically, SSRS partnered with: Global Data Collection Company (GDCC) to field the survey in France, the Netherlands, and the UK; Leger to field the survey in Canada; Norstat to field the survey in Norway; and TKW Research Group (TKW) to field the survey in Australia and New Zealand. SSRS also provided project oversight and data integration for Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland. Germany contracted with BQS Institute to manage the data collection process and field the survey instrument in Germany. Sweden contracted with Statistics Sweden and Switzerland contracted with M.I.S. Trend to do the same in Sweden and Switzerland, respectively.

For countries outside the US, the survey was conducted with a nationally representative sample of adults, age 65 and older. In the US, the survey was conducted with a nationally representative sample of adults, age 60 and older. Surveys were conducted via landline and mobile telephone in most countries. In Sweden and Switzerland, the majority of interviews were completed online. Fieldwork took place between March 1 and June 14, 2021.

The 2021 study was designed to explore and collect reliable health-related data for the following topics:

- Patient's access to primary and preventive care, including promptness of attention, such as availability of same-day appointment
- Patient's relationship with regular providers, including experiences with coordination of health care
- Patient's use of and experiences with specialists
- Patient's experiences with prescription medication
- Patient's experiences with care in the hospital & emergency room
- Care assistance at home
- Overall health and medical conditions, including experiences of social isolation and loneliness
- Experiences with material hardship
- End-of-life care wishes
- Health care coverage, affordability of care, and out-of-pocket costs
- Experiences with vaccination during COVID-19 pandemic
- Views on health equity in the national healthcare system

Table 1, below, outlines the total number of interviews conducted in each country.

TABLE 1: Total Number of Interviews Conducted in Each Country

	Total Interviews
Australia	501
Canada	4,484
France	1,751
Germany	1,163
Netherlands	630
New Zealand	500
Norway	500
Sweden	3,018
Switzerland	2,597
UK	1,876
US	1,969

This report is organized into five sections. The first section discusses the sample design. The next section describes data-collection and fielding. The final three sections address the response rate to the survey, weighting procedures, and project deliverables.

SAMPLING METHODS

The target population for IHP 2021 in the US was adults age 60 and older. In the other ten countries, the target population was adults age 65 and older. For each country, the sampling approach was aimed at obtaining a nationally representative sample of the target population by utilizing a probability design. A survey design with a gap in coverage raises the possibility of bias if the individuals missing from the sample frame (e.g., people with no telephone – landline or cell) differ systematically from those in the sample frame. Survey coverage refers to the extent to which the sample frame for a survey includes all members of the target population.

A random digit dial (RDD) overlapping frame telephone design was used to obtain all completes in Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the UK, and the US. Random digit dial-based telephone interviewing has been a mainstay for survey data collection in the US and internationally for decades, given its coverage of the vast majority of the population, the ability to easily administer probability-based random-sampling and the ease of administration of complex survey instruments by phone. The overlapping-frame approach allows us to reach respondents who receive most of their calls on cell phones and are far less likely to be reached on a landline, which produces a more nationally representative sample of respondents.

Interviews in Germany and Norway were completed using a sample list, which covered approximately 31% and 75% of the population age 65 and older in Germany and Norway, respectively. Sweden and Switzerland both used population-based registries to draw their sample.

Sample utilized for each country is described in more detail below. Table 2 below shows the interviews completed in each country by sampling frame.

TABLE 2: Total Interviews by Sampling Frame

	Landline	LL (%)	Cell phone	CELL (%)	Omni Callback	OMNI (%)	ABS	ABS (%)	Total
Australia	400	80%	101	20%	-		-	-	501
Canada	4,484	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,484
France	1,552	89%	199	11%	-	-	-	-	1,751
Germany	1,112	96%	51	4%	-	-	-	-	1,163
Netherlands	539	86%	91	14%	-	-	-	-	630
New Zealand	400	80%	100	20%	-	-	-	-	500
Norway	16	3%	484	97%	-	-	-	-	500
Sweden	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,018	100%	3,018
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,597	100%	2,597
United Kingdom	1,824	97%	52	3%	-	-	-	-	1,876
United States	1,212	62%	306	15%	451	23%	-	-	1,969

Sample Generation by Country

Australia and New Zealand

In Australia and New Zealand, landline and cell phone random digit dial (RDD) samples were drawn by Sample Solutions[1].

For Australia, the landline RDD frame was based on the phone number blocks used in the telephone numbering plan provided by the Australian Communications and Media Authority. The random digit length N was set up for each of the different blocks. This means there is always a starting block for each region and division within Australia followed by a random allocation of two to four random numbers, which leads to a more efficient usage of higher populated numbering blocks. This landline sample was stratified by Australia's eight regions to ensure geographic representativeness. The selection of mobile RDD sample uses roughly the same approach as landline RDD sample in Australia. Notably, geographic information is not available for any mobile sample in Australia; however, for the most part, number ranges or blocks are given to specific providers. Thus, when selecting the sample, the shares of each provider for the entire market are balanced to ensure that all providers have proper representation. Often the blocks consist of too many unknown values (N>8) where a pure random generation of numbers would lead to a very low working rate. Therefore, a seed analysis is used in which residential or business listings are leveraged to more efficiently generate active phone numbers. Those phone numbers are then used as seeds and added with the provider information. Hereafter the seeds with N=2 unknowns are taken from the database and a random 2-digit value is added to that.

For New Zealand, landline sample was based on the numbering plan provided by Telecom of New Zealand and was stratified by New Zealand's 16 regions + Chatham Islands, while the RDD cell sampling is essentially

[1] More information about Sample Solutions can be found at: https://sample.solutions/

the same as in Australia. Cell phone numbers have a length of eight to nine digits of which the first two digits indicate the service provider. All cell numbers are generated and stored in a single database from which a random selection is taken.

For both Australia and New Zealand, Sample Solutions utilized electronic verification to filter out many non-working numbers and used a standardized procedure to pulse each sample type to improve productivity.

Canada

For Canada as a whole, as well as the Canadian oversample interviews[2], landline sample was drawn using RDD sample to ensure the most complete coverage and representation possible. Sample for Canada was provided by Dynata, a premier global provider of sampling solutions. Dynata starts with the most recent monthly Telcordia TPM (Terminating Point Master) Data file. This is Telcordia's master file of NPA-NXX and Block-ID records for the North American Numbering Plan. The file of 1,000-blocks is sorted by Province, Carrier name, and 1,000-block. The intent is to provide a stratification that will yield a sample that is representative, both geographically and by large and small carriers. A sampling interval is determined by dividing the universe of eligible 1,000-blocks by the desired sample size. From a random start within the first sampling interval, a systematic nth selection of 1,000-blocks is performed and a 3-digit random number between 000 and 999 is appended to each selected 1,000-block system.

Deduplication was conducted against both Dynata's Canadian Business file and Do-Not-Call Preferences files. For sampling, landline numbers ported to wireless were included in the landline RDD frame.

France, the Netherlands, and the UK

SSRS's sampling partner, Sample Solutions, provided landline and mobile phone RDD samples for France, the Netherlands and the UK. Generation of the landline RDD frame was based on the phone number blocks used in the telephone numbering plan using pre-codes by region and stratified by provider. The RDD landline sample for France was generated using the national numbering plan provided by The Autorité de Régulation des Communications Électroniques et des Postes, an independent French agency in charge of regulating telecommunications in France. The RDD landline frame for Netherlands was generated using the national numbering plan provided by the Ministry of Economic Affairs. The RDD landline frame for United Kingdom was generated using the national numbering plan provided by The Office of Communications (Ofcom), London, the British Federal Network Agency.

Based on the numbering plan for each country, Sample Solutions developed a probabilistic design for pulling "seed" blocks using a list of active phone numbers from which actual phone numbers were generated (stratified by official regions according to the population distribution).

For the mobile phone RDD sample, it is not possible to identify pre-codes by region; however, the phone numbers were randomly generated similar to the landline sample for each country. For the mobile sample, Sample Solutions identified mobile providers used for residential services and excluded those used for

[2] A total of 750 interviews were completed as part of the Commonwealth Fund's interviews in Canada. Canada-based oversample interviews were completed to reach a minimum N=250 in each Canadian province, a minimum N=100 in Yukon, N=1,000 in Quebec, and N=1,300 in Ontario. Given the relatively small 65+ population in both the Northwest territories and Nunavut, efforts were made to maximize completes there.

commercial sample. The mobile sample was sorted by amount of allocated numbering blocks. Starting blocks are provided by telecommunication authorities, in this case the cell phone numbers have a length of 9 digits, of which the first 2 or 3 digits indicate the service provider. Cell numbers are subdivided into blocks of 100 numbers each, and random digits are appended to each block in order to create a seed.

For both sample types in France, the Netherlands and the UK, Sample Solutions utilized electronic verification to filter out many non-working numbers and used a standardized procedure to pulse each sample type to improve productivity.

In France and the Netherlands, a small portion of interviews were completed by calling back RDD mobile sample previously identified as 65 and older and living in France or the Netherlands. This sample was drawn from another study that used the same RDD sample in France and the Netherlands that was used for IHP 2021, but screened out anyone 65 and older. This recontact sample resulted in 90 completes in France and 8 completes in the Netherlands.

Germany

In Germany, a publicly available list of private phone numbers was used. This list, provided by Liebetrau Listservices, covers approximately 31% of the German population 65 and older. The geographic and age distributions of the sample-source match those of the German population age 65 and older. Additionally, the drawn sample was stratified according to the population's distributions of both age and region to ensure representativeness.

Norway

In Norway, landline and cell phone sample was drawn by Norstat using Data Factory AS. Approximately 71% of the population of adults age 65 or older in Norway[3] is covered by this frame. The generation of the landline and mobile RDD frame was randomly selected from the Data Factory list of known phone numbers. In addition to phone number, the sample also provided name, surname, age, county, municipality, zip code and phone type of the potential respondent. The sample was drawn proportionately to the population by region.

The population that was not covered in the sample are comprised of people[4]:

1. With secret phone numbers[5]
2. Who have no identifying information attached to their number (e.g., age, gender, region)
3. Who have put themselves on a "no-call" list for marketing, surveys, and sales calls and/or elected to be excluded from the phone directory

Sweden

The sample frame for Sweden utilized The Total Population Registry (RTB). The RTB is comprised of more than 8 million individuals, including more than 2.1 million who are age 65 and older, and covers 99% of the

[3] Population coverage is somewhat higher among older adults and lower among younger adults in Norway.
[4] Due to Norwegian legislation, Norstat does not have access to these numbers when conducting surveys.
[5] Approximately 1% of the Norwegian population has a secret number.

Swedish population. To create the sample frame, personal identification numbers were matched with addresses so invitations to partake in the survey could be sent to the respondents selected from the sample.

For IHP 2021, four variables were used to stratify the sample frame: degree of urbanization (three groups), Swedish/foreign background (two groups), level of education (three groups), and age (two groups)[6]. Proportional allocation was used to ensure that the sample size in each stratum proportional to number of individuals in stratum. The sample was initially 7,000 individuals and after removing over coverage, the final sample comprised 6,936 individuals.

Switzerland

In Switzerland, an individual sample of persons 65+ was drawn by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (SFSO), using Switzerland's nationwide population registry. This registry covers nearly 100% of the Swiss population and is updated on a quarterly basis. The sample was stratified by the three linguistic regions: German, French, and Italian speaking. The cantons of Valais, Basel Stadt, Genève and Vaud were oversampled and extracted separately as their own strata, for a total of seven strata.

United States

Interviews in the US were obtained through two sources: (1) landline and cell RDD 'fresh' samples, and (2) callback sample from the SSR Omnibus[7] to obtain completes with harder to reach groups. Details about the US sample sources and sampling procedures are below.

RDD

The majority of the US interviews were obtained using an overlapping frame telephone design. Both landline and cell phone samples were generated by SSRS's sister company, Marketing Systems Group (MSG), using their proprietary sample generation program.

The RDD landline sample was prepared using MSG's proprietary GENESYS IDplus procedure, which limits sample to non-zero-banks, and identifies and eliminates approximately 90% of all non-working and business numbers. Additionally, the entire sample was run against a database of known cell phone blocks (NPA-NXX-B) as well as those numbers ported from landline to wireless, whereupon identified cell phone numbers as part of the RDD landline frame were flagged in order not to be dialed.

Following procedures similar to those used for the landline sample, SSRS generated a random sample of cell phone telephone numbers. The cell phone sample utilized MSG's proprietary Cell-Wins technology that screens out inactive cell phone numbers with an approximately 95% accuracy rate. This increases the productivity of cell phone sample for reasons identical to those mentioned above for landline IDplus.

Both the landline and cell RDD sample were disproportionately stratified and prepaid cell phone numbers were oversampled to help reach more minority and low-income respondents. The stratification was based on mapping telephone exchanges (for landline sample) and rate centers (for cellular sample) onto counties and oversampling phone numbers in strata with lower-than-average household incomes.

[6] Together, this totals to 36 strata.
[7] The SSRS Omnibus is a national, weekly, dual-frame bilingual telephone survey that reaches 1,000 adults nationwide each week.

SSRS Omnibus Callback Sample

A portion of the interviews in the US were completed using callback sample from the SSRS Omnibus. SSRS recontacted individuals/households with adults age 60 and older who previously completed the SSRS Omnibus survey and had identified as African American, Hispanic, low income, or with a high school education or less to boost the sample of completed interviews with these harder to reach groups.

Household and Respondent Selection

In each sampled landline household where more than one eligible adult resides, the respondent, age 60 or older in the US and age 65 or older in the other countries, was selected using an at-home respondent selection. This within-household selection procedure reduces the bias created when the person responding to the survey is the one more likely to answer the phone or be present at the time of the call.

Cell phones are considered individual devices rather than belonging to a household, and therefore the person answering the cell phone was the one who was interviewed, provided they were an adult.

In Norway, respondents were targeted by name from the sample from Data Factory AS and asked to complete the survey. In Sweden, respondents were targeted via The Total Population Registry (RTB) and asked to complete the survey. In Switzerland, respondents were targeted via the registry per the Federal Statistical Office (FSO).

DATA COLLECTION

Questionnaire Review, Translations and Cultural Adaptations

Throughout the fall and winter of 2020, SSRS reviewed several iterations of the instrument developed by the Fund and its international partners and provided feedback about question wording, order, clarity, logic/programming, and other issues related to questionnaire quality[8].

Upon approval from The Commonwealth Fund research team, SSRS prepared the questionnaire for translation and new and revised questions were translated into Canadian-French, Spanish, German, Dutch, French, Norwegian, Swedish, Swiss-Italian, Swiss-French and Swiss-German. SSRS's translation partner, Language Connect, translated the Canadian-French, Spanish, Dutch, French, and Norwegian instruments. BQS Institute translated the German instrument, M.I.S. Trend translated the Swiss-Italian, Swiss-German, and Swiss-French instruments, and Statistics Sweden translated the Swedish instrument.

The translated documents were reviewed by the Fund's international partners for both new and previously translated questions to confirm that they were comprehensible, meaningful for respondents and comparable to the English-language versions of each question. Throughout the translation process, efforts

[8] Some country partners elected to include additional questions to be asked of respondents in their respective countries. SSRS also reviewed these questions using the same process as the core questionnaire. SSRS additionally worked with the country partners to determine the best location to include each question.

were made to ensure that the question meaning of the translated questions would not deviate from the unified questionnaire or disrupt trend.

Programming and Testing

Prior to the field period, the survey was programmed into SSRS's Confirmit CATI platform for phone administration. Extensive checking of the program was conducted to ensure that skip patterns followed the design of the questionnaire and all the language inserts were working properly. Members of the SSRS team thoroughly tested each country's program in both English and in-language to ensure that everything was working as expected. In addition to programming the US questionnaire, SSRS also programmed the surveys for Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and the UK. SSRS's fieldwork partners utilized unique links created for each sample record to access the program from their respective dialers. BQS Institute, M.I.S. Trend and Statistics Sweden programmed each of their surveys into their respective survey software platform. Each of the international partners contracted to complete the survey in Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland conducted extensive testing of their instruments. Members of the SSRS team also tested the Sweden and Switzerland programs for usability and consistency across countries prior to their surveys going live. After testing these programs, SSRS provided feedback to the international partners.

Pretesting

In January 2021, a total of 68 English-language pretest CATI interviews were conducted in the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the UK. Upon completion of these pretests, SSRS reviewed pretest recordings and provided a memo to the Fund with information about potential areas of confusion in the instrument/with specific questions, recommendations and observations related to both new/highly-modified questions and questions asked in past IHP surveys, and areas of focus for future interviewer training. Also, during these pretest interviews it was identified that the survey instrument was significantly longer than estimated.

Following these pretest interviews, adjustments were made to the questionnaire (e.g., updating question wording for clarity) and some interviewer notes and voluntary codes were added for clarification across all countries. In addition to these adjustments, six questions were removed from the core survey instrument due to the length concerns identified.

SSRS completed a second set of US pretest interviews (n=11) on February 10, 2021 to test the edits and updates made following the initial set of English-language pretests. These additional US pretest interviews also provided an estimate of the revised length of the core instrument. From February 24 through March 1, 2021, a total of 45 pretest interviews were conducted across France, the Netherlands, Norway and Canada (Canadian-French). MIS Trend conducted pretest interviews in Switzerland from February 18 through February 23, 2021 and BQS Institute pretested the survey in Germany between April 5 and 19, 2021[9].

After the additional US interviews and the non-English language pretest interviews were completed, SSRS provided an updated memo to the Fund that included additional observations about new/modified

[9] Statistics Sweden did not complete any pretest interviews prior to beginning data collection for 2021.

questions, feedback based on confusion related to some translations, and recommendations for improvements to the instrument. After providing this updated memo, minor edits were made to a few translations to help with confusion experienced by respondents and an additional ten questions were removed due to length concerns[10].

Table 3 provides a summary of the number of pretest interviews conducted in each country.

TABLE 3: Summary of Pretest Interviews by Country

	Pretest Conducted	Language(s) Pretest Conducted in	Dates Pretests Conducted	# of Pretests
Australia	Yes	English	1/18/21-1/19/21	12
Canada	Yes	English, Canadian-French	1/15/21-1/17/21 (English) 2/24/21-2/26/21 (Canadian-French)	10 (English) 9 (Canadian-French)
France	Yes	French	2/24/21-3/1/21	11
Germany	Yes	German	4/5/21-4/19/21	20
New Zealand	Yes	English	1/18/21-1/19/21	10
Netherlands	Yes	Dutch	2/24/21-3/1/21	12
Norway	Yes	Norwegian	3/1/21	12
Sweden	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Switzerland	Yes	German, French, Italian	2/18/21-2/23/21	10
United Kingdom	Yes	English	1/21/21-1/25/21	11
United States	Yes	English	1/13/21 2/10/21	25 11

Training Materials and Interviewer Training

Prior to both the pretest and the start of the study, interviewers received both written materials on the survey and formal training for conducting the survey. SSRS's project team briefed and trained interviewers in the US on the issues specific to the study, explaining the study's overall objectives, specific procedures, and questionnaire content. SSRS supervisors also walked through each question in the questionnaire with the interviewers and provided instructions to help maximize response and ensure accurate data collection.

For Australia, Canada, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and the UK, SSRS' project team briefed the fieldwork partners, who in turn carried out detailed briefings at the start and during the field period with their interviewers. Similarly, BQS Institute, Statistics Sweden, and M.I.S. Trend managed the briefing and interviewer training in Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland, respectively.

Training procedures included role-playing methodology – assuming interviewer and respondent roles – in order to become comfortable with the CATI script. Throughout the field period, supervisors for each country conducted live monitoring and reviewed a selection of recorded interviews. Supervisors debriefed

[10] A list of all changes made based on pretests completed in the US and other countries is available and can be provided upon request.

interviewers as a group and/or individually, as needed, during fieldwork. GDCC, Leger, Norstat and TKW followed similar procedures with their supervisors and interviewers.

The written materials provided and reviewed prior to the beginning of the field period included:

1. An English-language annotated questionnaire with instructions for interviewers.
2. An in-language questionnaire, if applicable, with translations for each respective country.
3. A test program for fieldwork partners in countries SSRS directly managed, so interviewers could review and familiarize themselves with the survey.
4. A list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) and the appropriate responses to those questions was provided. Additionally, the FAQs were tailored for items that were country-specific, namely the sponsoring organization and contact information.
5. Information about the goals of the study, potential obstacles to be overcome in getting good answers to particular questions, and respondent problems that could be anticipated ahead of time as well as strategies for addressing them.

Call Rule, Contact Attempts, Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies

SSRS carried out several strategies to maximize survey response by minimizing non-response and maximizing refusal conversion by following best-practice procedures. SSRS' fieldwork partners followed out similar strategies to maximize survey response, based on SSRS' recommendations and guidelines.

Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the UK, and the US

- The call rule included one initial call plus four callbacks in the US, one initial call plus five callbacks in Canada, France, the Netherlands, Norway and the UK, and one initial call plus six callbacks in Australia and New Zealand. The call rule for Germany included one initial call plus two callbacks.
- Sample was released in batches to ensure that it would be worked effectively.
- To increase the probability of completing an interview, a differential call rule was established that required that call attempts be initiated at different times of day and different days of the week.
- Interviewers explained the purpose of the study and stated as accurately as possible the expected length of the interview.
- Respondents were permitted to schedule call-back times.
- Cases where a call attempt resulted in a respondent or household refusal or other break-off were dialed again after a period of at least seven days "rest."
- Specially-trained interviewers in Canada, France, the Netherlands, the UK and the US were utilized to attempt refusal conversions, following a rest period of at least seven days. Due to regulations in Australia and New Zealand, respondents who refused to take the survey were not re-contacted.
- In the US, interviews were completed in English and Spanish. Bilingual interviewers called back any sample that was deemed to be Spanish speaking.
- In Australia, New Zealand and the UK, interviews were completed in English. In France interviews were completed in French, in the Netherlands interviews were completed in Dutch, in Norway interviews were completed in Norwegian, and in Canada interviews were completed in both English and Canadian-French.

Sweden and Switzerland

- In Sweden and Switzerland, respondents were recruited via postal mail and invited to participate online or to call in and complete a phone version of the survey.
- In Switzerland, for each stratum, the sample was separated into four replicates in order to be able to manage fieldwork in detail.
    - In total, 5,505 sample records were pulled from the registry and contacted to complete this study. Around three-quarters of the drawn sample was matched with a phone number, however, no outbound dialing was performed for these respondents. Only records that requested an appointment were dialed.
- In Sweden, personal identification numbers from the RTB were matched with addresses in order to send invitations via mail to respondents. In total, 7,000 sample records were pulled from the RTB and contacted to complete this study.
- In both Sweden and Switzerland, all selected persons were sent an initial invitation with information on how to take the survey online or over the phone. This invitation was followed by up to two reminder mailings to reach non-responders. The contact schedules for Sweden and Switzerland are shown below (Tables 4 & 5).

TABLE 4: Sweden Contact Schedule

Contact	Timing/Dates	Description
1	3/10/2021	First postal mailing to full sample, including: - A letter (describing the nature of the survey and its objectives) - A web link and unique passcode - A telephone number to take the survey via the phone
2	3/24/2021	First reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing, customized by age-group. - For those identified as 65 to 79, the same information was provided as in the initial letter. - For those 80 and older, more bolded/pronounced information was provided for completing the survey via the phone.
3	4/7/2021	Second reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the first reminder mailing.
4	4/18/2021	End of fieldwork

TABLE 5: Switzerland Contact Schedule

Contact	Timing/Dates*	Description
1	3/16/2021	First postal mailing to full sample, including: - A cover letter (describing the nature of the survey and its objectives) - A web link and unique passcode - A telephone number to take the survey via the phone
2	4/16/2021	Reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
3	5/11/2021	Reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
4	6/1/2021	End of fieldwork

Field Period4

Interviews for the 2021 IHP Older Adult Survey were conducted from March to June 2021. The field times varied by country and are specified in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6: Field Period Per Country

	Field Period
Australia	3/15/2021 - 5/27/2021
Canada	3/13/2021 - 6/14/2021
France	3/25/2021 - 5/28/2021
Germany	4/21/2021 - 6/11/2021
Netherlands	3/25/2021 - 5/17/2021
New Zealand	3/15/2021 - 5/15/2021
Norway	3/1/2021 - 5/26/2021
Sweden	3/10/2021 - 4/18/2021
Switzerland	3/16/2021 - 6/1/2021
United Kingdom	3/12/2021 - 5/26/2021
United States	3/11/2021 - 5/27/2021

Table 7 outlines the language/s and length of interview for each country in the 2021 IHP Older Adult Survey.

TABLE 7: Language/s and Length of Interview per Country

	Language(s)	Average length in minutes
Australia	English	18
Canada	English, Canadian-French	22
France	French	23
Germany	German	24
Netherlands	Dutch	21
New Zealand	English	18
Norway	Norwegian	17
Sweden	Swedish	35 (phone), 23 (web)
Switzerland	German, French, Italian	28 (phone), 27 (web)
United Kingdom	English	20
United States	English, Spanish	21

Field Monitoring

Prior to fielding, SSRS provided reporting data and disposition reporting templates to GDCC, Leger, TKW, Norstat, BQS Institute, Statistics Sweden, and M.I.S. Trend, which they reviewed together during a kickoff call with each partner. On these calls, SSRS also reviewed all documentation, study procedures, and answered any questions about the IHP 2021 Older Adult Survey.

While in field, on a bi-weekly basis, SSRS reviewed the status of data collection and provided feedback to the fieldwork partners regarding the distribution of completes (e.g., in cases where the interviews were overly skewed by gender), field progress, and dispositions. During field, on a weekly basis, SSRS reviewed non-response across Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the UK and the US. Any questions with high item non-response were addressed with supervisors and closely monitored.

SSRS also provided GDCC, Leger, TKW, and Norstat with the ability to review data as needed on SSRS's platform via a Confirmit reporting tool called Reportal. Reports were set up to allow for data to be reviewed across and within different sample variables and demographics to accurately track study progress against targets in real time.

The SSRS project team monitored and listened to recordings of interviews in the US (English and Spanish), Canada (English), Australia, New Zealand, and the UK throughout the field period and provided feedback, when necessary, to ensure that best practices were being followed. SSRS's partner, cApStAn, reviewed recordings for Canada (Canadian-French)[11], France, the Netherlands, and Norway. Where necessary, SSRS provided corrective feedback to the project teams at GDCC, Leger, TKW, and Norstat.

In addition, while in field, SSRS participated in weekly calls with GDCC, Leger, TKW, and Norstat to discuss field progress and anything questions that needed to be addressed.

Weekly and Periodic Updates

Throughout the field period, SSRS provided the Fund with weekly updates that tracked key information and overall progress in each country. These reports, designed to provide snapshot information of key variables of interest, included tables for completes per sample type by gender, age, region, and language of interview (where relevant). Along with the weekly updates, SSRS provided a narrative regarding field progress and reported on any field-related concerns.

SSRS and the Fund also participated in bi-weekly calls where they could review the updates and overall progress in each country and discuss any other project related items.

[11] During the recording review process, cApStAn noticed that the income breaks provided to respondents in the Canadian French version of the questionnaire differed from the breaks provided in the English version for Canada. SSRS addressed this difference in the final data through created variables.

Final Counts

Tables 8 to 18 below show final counts per country by gender, age, region, and language of interview, where relevant.

TABLE 8: Final Counts Australia

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 65-69	26	7%	65%	14	14%	35%	40	8%
Male / 70-74	28	7%	68%	13	13%	32%	41	8%
Male / 75+	89	22%	86%	14	14%	14%	103	21%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Male Total	**143**	**36%**	**78%**	**41**	**41%**	**22%**	**184**	**37%**
Female / 65-69	35	9%	69%	16	16%	31%	51	10%
Female / 70-74	60	15%	73%	22	22%	27%	82	16%
Female / 75+	159	40%	88%	22	22%	12%	181	36%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	3	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	3	1%
Female Total	**257**	**64%**	**81%**	**60**	**59%**	**19%**	**317**	**63%**
TOTAL	**400**		**80%**	**101**		**20%**	**501**	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
NSW	131	33%	81%	31	31%	19%	162	32%
Victoria	107	27%	76%	33	33%	24%	140	28%
Queensland	77	19%	85%	14	14%	15%	91	18%
Western Australia	39	10%	71%	16	16%	29%	55	11%
South Australia	30	8%	91%	3	3%	9%	33	7%
Tasmania	14	4%	93%	1	1%	7%	15	3%
Australian Capital Territory	1	0%	25%	3	3%	75%	4	1%
Northern Territory	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Unknown Region	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	**400**		**80%**	**101**		**20%**	**501**	

TABLE 9: Final Counts Canada

GENDER / AGE	TOTAL LANDLINE	Gender/Age (%)
Male / 65-69	466	10%
Male / 70-74	430	10%
Male / 75+	657	15%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	26	1%
Male Total	**1,579**	**35%**
Female / 65-69	709	16%
Female / 70-74	786	18%
Female / 75+	1,346	30%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	52	1%
Female Total	**2,893**	**65%**
Other or Unknown / 65-69	2	0%
Other or Unknown / 70-74	3	0%
Other or Unknown / 75+	7	0%
Other or Unknown / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%
Other or Unknown Total	**12**	**0%**
TOTAL	**4,484**	

REGION	TOTAL LANDLINE	Region (%)
Newfoundland and Labrador	252	6%
Prince Edward Island	257	6%
Nova Scotia	254	6%
New Brunswick	250	6%
Quebec	1,000	22%
Ontario	1,302	29%
Manitoba	255	6%
Saskatchewan	251	6%
Alberta	251	6%
British Columbia	251	6%
Yukon	144	3%
Northwest Territories	14	0%
Nunavut	3	0%
TOTAL	**4,484**	

TABLE 10: Final Counts France

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 65-69	157	10%	84%	30	15%	16%	187	11%
Male / 70-74	186	12%	84%	36	18%	16%	222	13%
Male / 75+	247	16%	91%	23	12%	9%	270	15%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	3	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	3	0%
Male Total	**593**	**38%**	**87%**	**89**	**45%**	**13%**	**682**	**39%**
Female / 65-69	241	16%	86%	40	20%	14%	281	16%
Female / 70-74	258	17%	87%	39	20%	13%	297	17%
Female / 75+	455	29%	94%	31	16%	6%	486	28%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	5	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	5	0%
Female Total	**959**	**62%**	**90%**	**110**	**55%**	**10%**	**1069**	**61%**
TOTAL	**1552**		**89%**	**199**		**11%**	**1751**	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Grand Est	135	9%	88%	18	9%	12%	153	9%
Nouvelle Aquitaine	171	11%	88%	23	12%	12%	194	11%
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	198	13%	90%	22	11%	10%	220	13%
Bourgogne-Franche-Comté	99	6%	94%	6	3%	6%	105	6%
Bretagne	70	5%	88%	10	5%	13%	80	5%
Centre-Val-de-Loire	60	4%	94%	4	2%	6%	64	4%
Corse	6	0%	75%	2	1%	25%	8	0%
Île-de-France	212	14%	86%	35	18%	14%	247	14%
Occitanie	146	9%	85%	25	13%	15%	171	10%
Hauts-de-France	131	8%	89%	16	8%	11%	147	8%
Normandie	88	6%	90%	10	5%	10%	98	6%
Pays de la Loire	70	5%	88%	10	5%	13%	80	5%
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	166	11%	92%	14	7%	8%	180	10%
French region missing	0	0%	0%	4	2%	100%	4	0%
TOTAL	**1552**		**89%**	**199**		**11%**	**1751**	

TABLE 11: Final Counts Germany

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 65-69	139	13%	93%	11	22%	7%	150	13%
Male / 70-74	137	12%	96%	6	12%	4%	143	12%
Male / 75+	326	29%	96%	14	27%	4%	340	29%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Male Total	**602**	**54%**	**95%**	**31**	**61%**	**5%**	**633**	**54%**
Female / 65-69	139	13%	95%	8	16%	5%	147	13%
Female / 70-74	149	13%	98%	3	6%	2%	152	13%
Female / 75+	222	20%	96%	9	18%	4%	231	20%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Female Total	**510**	**46%**	**96%**	**20**	**39%**	**4%**	**530**	**46%**
TOTAL	**1112**		**96%**	**51**		**4%**	**1163**	

TABLE 11 cont'd: Final Counts Germany

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Schleswig-Holstein	42	4%	100%	0	0%	0%	42	4%
Hamburg	25	2%	100%	0	0%	0%	25	2%
Bremen	12	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	12	1%
Niedersachsen	137	12%	98%	3	6%	2%	140	12%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	279	25%	98%	7	14%	2%	286	25%
Rheinland-Pfalz	50	4%	94%	3	6%	6%	53	5%
Saarland	17	2%	100%	0	0%	0%	17	1%
Hessen	82	7%	98%	2	4%	2%	84	7%
Baden-Württemberg	105	9%	91%	10	20%	9%	115	10%
Bayern	130	12%	91%	13	25%	9%	143	12%
Berlin	48	4%	92%	4	8%	8%	52	4%
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	23	2%	92%	2	4%	8%	25	2%
Brandenburg	43	4%	98%	1	2%	2%	44	4%
Sachsen-Anhalt	37	3%	97%	1	2%	3%	38	3%
Thüringen	36	3%	95%	2	4%	5%	38	3%
Sachsen	46	4%	94%	3	6%	6%	49	4%
German region missing	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	**1112**		**96%**	**51**		**4%**	**1163**	

TABLE 12: Final Counts Netherlands

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 65-69	54	10%	75%	18	20%	25%	72	11%
Male / 70-74	44	8%	70%	19	21%	30%	63	10%
Male / 75+	120	22%	91%	12	13%	9%	132	21%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Male Total	**218**	**40%**	**82%**	**49**	**54%**	**18%**	**267**	**42%**
Female / 65-69	44	8%	75%	15	16%	25%	59	9%
Female / 70-74	77	14%	90%	9	10%	10%	86	14%
Female / 75+	196	36%	92%	17	19%	8%	213	34%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	4	1%	80%	1	1%	20%	5	1%
Female Total	**321**	**60%**	**88%**	**42**	**46%**	**12%**	**363**	**58%**
TOTAL	**539**		**86%**	**91**		**14%**	**630**	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Drenthe	15	3%	83%	3	3%	17%	18	3%
Flevoland	13	2%	93%	1	1%	7%	14	2%
Friesland	26	5%	90%	3	3%	10%	29	5%
Gelderland	76	14%	82%	17	19%	18%	93	15%
Groningen	13	2%	87%	2	2%	13%	15	2%
Limburg	48	9%	91%	5	5%	9%	53	8%
Noord-Brabant	77	14%	84%	15	16%	16%	92	15%
Noord-Holland	73	14%	86%	12	13%	14%	85	13%
Overijssel	39	7%	87%	6	7%	13%	45	7%
Utrecht	40	7%	91%	4	4%	9%	44	7%
Zeeland	21	4%	91%	2	2%	9%	23	4%
Zuid-Holland	98	18%	84%	19	21%	16%	117	19%
Dutch region missing	0	0%	0%	2	2%	100%	2	0%
TOTAL	**539**		**86%**	**91**		**14%**	**630**	

TABLE 13: Final Counts New Zealand

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 65-69	14	4%	38%	23	23%	62%	37	7%
Male / 70-74	26	7%	63%	15	15%	37%	41	8%
Male / 75+	78	20%	81%	18	18%	19%	96	19%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Male Total	**118**	**30%**	**68%**	**56**	**56%**	**32%**	**174**	**35%**
Female / 65-69	48	12%	74%	17	17%	26%	65	13%
Female / 70-74	57	14%	79%	15	15%	21%	72	14%
Female / 75+	176	44%	94%	12	12%	6%	188	38%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Female Total	**282**	**71%**	**87%**	**44**	**44%**	**13%**	**326**	**65%**
TOTAL	**400**		**80%**	**100**		**20%**	**500**	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Auckland	109	27%	69%	48	48%	31%	157	31%
North	123	31%	82%	27	27%	18%	150	30%
Central	54	14%	79%	14	14%	21%	68	14%
South	114	29%	91%	11	11%	9%	125	25%
New Zealand region missing	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	**400**		**80%**	**100**		**20%**	**500**	

TABLE 14: Final Counts Norway

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 65-69	3	19%	5%	55	11%	95%	58	12%
Male / 70-74	1	6%	1%	66	14%	99%	67	13%
Male / 75+	5	31%	5%	106	22%	95%	111	22%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Male Total	**9**	**56%**	**4%**	**227**	**47%**	**96%**	**236**	**47%**
Female / 65-69	3	19%	5%	59	12%	95%	62	12%
Female / 70-74	1	6%	2%	63	13%	98%	64	13%
Female / 75+	3	19%	2%	135	28%	98%	138	28%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Female Total	**7**	**44%**	**3%**	**257**	**53%**	**97%**	**264**	**53%**
TOTAL	**16**		**3%**	**484**		**97%**	**500**	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Agder	3	19%	11%	24	5%	89%	27	5%
Innlandet	1	6%	2%	46	10%	98%	47	9%
Møre og Romsdal	0	0%	0%	18	4%	100%	18	3%
Nordland	0	0%	0%	18	4%	100%	18	4%
Oslo	4	25%	7%	55	11%	93%	59	12%
Rogaland	0	0%	0%	31	6%	100%	31	6%
Troms og Finnmark	0	0%	0%	21	4%	100%	21	4%
Trøndelag	0	0%	0%	39	8%	100%	39	8%
Vestfold og Telemark	1	6%	2%	55	11%	98%	56	11%
Vestland	2	13%	4%	45	9%	96%	47	9%
Viken	5	31%	4%	132	27%	96%	137	27%
Norwegian region missing	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	**16**		**3%**	**484**		**97%**	**500**	

TABLE 15: Final Counts Sweden

GENDER / AGE	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	Web (%)	PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 65-69	325	12%	99%	3	1%	1%	328	11%
Male / 70-74	442	16%	96%	19	8%	4%	461	15%
Male / 75+	622	22%	91%	61	26%	9%	683	23%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Male Total	**1389**	**50%**	**94%**	**83**	**36%**	**6%**	**1472**	**49%**
Female / 65-69	376	14%	98%	8	3%	2%	384	13%
Female / 70-74	455	16%	96%	19	8%	4%	474	16%
Female / 75+	565	20%	82%	123	53%	18%	688	23%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Female Total	**1396**	**50%**	**90%**	**150**	**64%**	**10%**	**1546**	**51%**
TOTAL	**2785**		**92%**	**233**		**8%**	**3018**	

TABLE 16: Final Counts Switzerland

GENDER / AGE	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	Web (%)	PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 65-69	294	14%	90%	33	6%	10%	327	13%
Male / 70-74	299	15%	89%	38	7%	11%	337	13%
Male / 75+	399	20%	74%	140	25%	26%	539	21%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Male Total	**992**	**49%**	**82%**	**211**	**37%**	**18%**	**1203**	**46%**
Female / 65-69	292	14%	86%	47	8%	14%	339	13%
Female / 70-74	326	16%	79%	89	16%	21%	415	16%
Female / 75+	422	21%	66%	216	38%	34%	638	25%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Female Total	**1040**	**51%**	**75%**	**352**	**63%**	**25%**	**1392**	**54%**
Other or Unknown / 65-69	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / 70-74	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Other or Unknown / 75+	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Other or Unknown / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown Total	**2**	**0%**	**100%**	**0**	**0%**	**0%**	**2**	**0%**
TOTAL	**2034**		**78%**	**563**		**22%**	**2597**	

LINGUISTIC REGION	WEB	Language (%)	Web (%)	PHONE	Language (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Language (%)
German	967	48%	80%	243	43%	20%	1210	47%
French	847	42%	79%	220	39%	21%	1067	41%
Italian	215	11%	68%	100	18%	32%	315	12%
Rhaeto-Romansch	5	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	5	0%
TOTAL	**2034**		**78%**	**563**		**22%**	**2597**	

TABLE 16 cont'd: Final Counts Switzerland

REGION	WEB	Region (%)	Web (%)	PHONE	Region (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Zurich	165	8%	87%	25	4%	13%	190	7%
Bern	129	6%	78%	36	6%	22%	165	6%
Luzern	36	2%	86%	6	1%	14%	42	2%
Uri	5	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	5	0%
Schwyz	14	1%	82%	3	1%	18%	17	1%
Obwalden	2	0%	67%	1	0%	33%	3	0%
Nidwalden	5	0%	83%	1	0%	17%	6	0%
Glarus	5	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	5	0%
Zug	21	1%	84%	4	1%	16%	25	1%
Fribourg	48	2%	94%	3	1%	6%	51	2%
Solothurn	31	2%	89%	4	1%	11%	35	1%
Basel-Stadt	254	12%	70%	110	20%	30%	364	14%
Basel-Landschaft	50	2%	93%	4	1%	7%	54	2%
Schaffhausen	9	0%	82%	2	0%	18%	11	0%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	11	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	11	0%
Appenzell Innerrhoden	1	0%	50%	1	0%	50%	2	0%
St. Gallen	52	3%	85%	9	2%	15%	61	2%
Graubunden	32	2%	76%	10	2%	24%	42	2%
Aargau	77	4%	82%	17	3%	18%	94	4%
Thurgau	36	2%	92%	3	1%	8%	39	2%
Ticino	206	10%	68%	97	17%	32%	303	12%
Vaud	270	13%	77%	82	15%	23%	352	14%
Valais	244	12%	81%	59	10%	19%	303	12%
Neuchatel	31	2%	74%	11	2%	26%	42	2%
Geneva	286	14%	81%	68	12%	19%	354	14%
Jura	14	1%	67%	7	1%	33%	21	1%
TOTAL	**2034**		**78%**	**563**		**22%**	**2597**	

TABLE 17: Final Counts United Kingdom

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 65-69	164	9%	94%	10	19%	6%	174	9%
Male / 70-74	181	10%	95%	9	17%	5%	190	10%
Male / 75+	422	23%	98%	10	19%	2%	432	23%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	6	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	6	0%
Male Total	**773**	**42%**	**96%**	**29**	**56%**	**4%**	**802**	**43%**
Female / 65-69	173	9%	93%	13	25%	7%	186	10%
Female / 70-74	231	13%	97%	6	12%	3%	237	13%
Female / 75+	635	35%	99%	4	8%	1%	639	34%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	12	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	12	1%
Female Total	**1051**	**58%**	**98%**	**23**	**44%**	**2%**	**1074**	**57%**
TOTAL	**1824**		**97%**	**52**		**3%**	**1876**	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Northeast	49	3%	98%	1	2%	2%	50	3%
Yorks & Humber	61	3%	90%	7	13%	10%	68	4%
East Midlands	61	3%	95%	3	6%	5%	64	3%
Eastern	27	1%	96%	1	2%	4%	28	1%
London	32	2%	71%	13	25%	29%	45	2%
South East	140	8%	94%	9	17%	6%	149	8%
South West	99	5%	95%	5	10%	5%	104	6%
West Midlands	58	3%	98%	1	2%	2%	59	3%
North West	65	4%	94%	4	8%	6%	69	4%
Wales	415	23%	99%	4	8%	1%	419	22%
Scotland	415	23%	100%	1	2%	0%	416	22%
Northern Ireland	402	22%	99%	3	6%	1%	405	22%
UK region missing	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	**1824**		**97%**	**52**		**3%**	**1876**	

TABLE 18: Final Counts United States

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL	Gender / Age (%)	Cell (%)	Omni Call back	Gender / Age (%)	Omni Call back (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 60-64	58	5%	31%	43	14%	23%	88	20%	47%	189	10%
Male / 65-69	83	7%	35%	41	13%	17%	111	25%	47%	235	12%
Male / 70-74	98	8%	48%	26	8%	13%	80	18%	39%	204	10%
Male / 75+	211	17%	72%	36	12%	12%	47	10%	16%	294	15%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	6	0%	75%	1	0%	13%	1	0%	13%	8	0%
Male Total	**456**	**38%**	**49%**	**147**	**48%**	**16%**	**327**	**73%**	**35%**	**930**	**47%**
Female / 60-64	77	6%	57%	36	12%	26%	23	5%	17%	136	7%
Female / 65-69	108	9%	55%	33	11%	17%	56	12%	28%	197	10%
Female / 70-74	113	9%	68%	30	10%	18%	22	5%	13%	165	8%
Female / 75+	430	35%	85%	57	19%	11%	20	4%	4%	507	26%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	21	2%	84%	2	1%	8%	2	0%	8%	25	1%
Female Total	**749**	**62%**	**73%**	**158**	**52%**	**15%**	**123**	**27%**	**12%**	**1030**	**52%**
Other or unknown / 60-64	2	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	2	0%
Other or unknown / 65-69	2	0%	67%	1	0%	33%	0	0%	0%	3	0%
Other or unknown / 70-74	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / 75+	3	0%	75%	0	0%	0%	1	0%	25%	4	0%
Other or Unknown / Exact age unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or unknown Total	**7**	**1%**	**78%**	**1**	**0%**	**11%**	**1**	**0%**	**11%**	**9**	**0%**
TOTAL	**1212**		**62%**	**306**		**16%**	**451**		**23%**	**1969**	

TABLE 18 cont'd: Final Counts United States

LANGUAGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL	Gender / Age (%)	Cell (%)	Omni Call back	Gender / Age (%)	Omni Call back (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
English	1198	99%	63%	283	92%	15%	415	92%	22%	1896	96%
Spanish	14	1%	19%	23	8%	32%	36	8%	49%	73	4%
TOTAL	**1212**		**62%**	**306**		**16%**	**451**		**23%**	**1969**	

REGION	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL	Gender / Age (%)	Cell (%)	Omni Call back	Gender / Age (%)	Omni Call back (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
North East	207	17%	56%	30	10%	8%	135	30%	36%	372	19%
North Central	270	22%	65%	63	21%	15%	80	18%	19%	413	21%
South	489	40%	65%	146	48%	19%	123	27%	16%	758	38%
West	246	20%	58%	67	22%	16%	113	25%	27%	426	22%
TOTAL	**1212**		**62%**	**306**		**16%**	**451**		**23%**	**1969**	

Data Processing and Integration

For countries that SSRS directly managed, data file preparation began soon after the study entered the field. Data were readily downloaded from the SSRS server and were checked using multiple methods including a "data cleaning" procedure in which data processors recreated skips pattern instructions in order to ensure that all variables were created correctly and had the appropriate number of cases. This procedure involved a check of raw data by a program that consisted of instructions derived from the skip patterns designated on the questionnaire. The program confirmed that data were consistent with the definitions of codes and ranges and matched the appropriate bases of all questions. In addition, the project director conducted an independent check to confirm that all variables were created correctly, had the correct number of cases, and were coded according to specifications.

At the beginning of the field period, SSRS reviewed data from each country programmed internally and requested preliminary SPSS files from each of the other-country survey providers to confirm that all skip instructions and variables were working as intended.

In order to facilitate an efficient data integration process across countries, SSRS developed a standardized data map to be utilized by Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland when structuring their data in ASCII format. This data map contained the same data locations and formats used by the eight country programs that were programmed internally by SSRS. Once the integrated data were compiled, an independent checking of all variables was carried out to ensure that all variables were accurately constructed.

For Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland, the international partners, sent formatted ASCII files matching the locations of the data map for SSRS to review during fieldwork. SSRS and the partners worked together to resolve any issues with the format, if needed, to ensure that the data could be integrated properly. These data were then checked by SSRS's back-end data processor and the SSRS team according to the data cleaning and quality check procedures described above. This process was repeated with the final data once those ASCII files were delivered.

As described in the Data Memo provided to all partners in August 2021, additional quality control checks were performed on the final data, as needed. The memo included a description of checks for internal data consistency, logic checks, trending, and reviews of modal differences (applicable for Sweden and Switzerland).

RESPONSE RATES

The response rates for this study (shown in Tables 19 to 23 below) were calculated using AAPOR's RR3. The detailed summary table for Sweden and Switzerland are shown at the end of this section, as they used address/registry-based designs.

TABLE 19: Response Rates by Country by Frame

	Total
Australia	16.6%
Canada	22.3%
France	13.6%
Germany	20.8%
Netherlands	15.4%
New Zealand	24.4%
Norway	13.6%
Sweden	45.7%
Switzerland	47.7%
United Kingdom	7.2%
United States	11.2%

TABLE 20: Landline Response Rates by Country

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Netherlands
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	400	4,484	1,552		539
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	0	39,412	0		0
Break off	3	11,922	1,040		44
Answering machine	0	516	0		0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	1,864	0		0
Language problem	0	2,697	0		0
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	31	16,159	403		77
No answer	1,634	97,404	40,228		3,928
Answering machine-don't know if household	4,303	99,307	14,816		658
Call blocking	0	0	0		2
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	2,318	805	22,900		5,728
No screener completed	375	0	3,429		0
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	33	12,038	58		2
Non-working number	32,884	342,560	242,091		226,867
Business, government office, other organizations	181	4,721	159		41
No eligible respondent	258	18,550	5,069		523
Quota filled	0	84	0		0
Total phone numbers used	42,420	652,525	328,336		238,416
Response Rate 3	**18.0%**	**22.3%**	**12.6%**		**14.8%**

TABLE 20 Cont'd: Landline Response Rates by Country

	New Zealand	Norway	United Kingdom	United States
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)				
Complete	400	16	1,824	1,212
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)				
Refusal and breakoff	0	0	0	8,152
Break off	1	0	0	254
Answering machine	0	0	0	648
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	0	74
Language problem	0	0	0	3
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)				
Always busy	53	0	1,485	1,359
No answer	1,449	0	42,009	37,113
Answering machine-don't know if household	1,098	0	70,884	43,329
Call blocking	0	0	7	285
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	1,797	305	52,264	37
No screener completed	247	0	0	0
Not eligible (Category 4)				
Fax/data line	19	1	78	7,598
Non-working number	35,325	2	402,462	369,297
Business, government office, other organizations	168	0	184	7,309
No eligible respondent	286	16	2,812	930
Quota filled	0	0	0	0
Total phone numbers used	40,843	349	574,006	477,850
Response Rate 3	**25.0%**	**11.8%**	**7.0%**	**15.7%**

TABLE 21: Cell phone Response Rates by Country[12]

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Netherlands
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	101	-	199		91
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	0	-	0		0
Break off	0	-	97		9
Answering machine	0	-	0		0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	-	0		0
Language problem	0	-	0		0
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	73	-	11		263
No answer	2,113	-	748		866
Answering machine-don't know if household	4,969	-	2,108		2,264
Call blocking	0	-	0		2
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	2,665	-	1,853		3,041
No screener completed	300	-	207		0
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	1	-	1		2
Non-working number	513	-	1,104		26,366
Business, government office, other organizations	39	-	53		68
No eligible respondent	1,022	-	1,662		832
Quota filled	0	-	0		0
Total phone numbers used	11,797	-	7,839		33,806
Response Rate 3	**10.9%**	**-**	**22.0%**		**19.3%**

[12] France cell phone response rate includes 7,396 pieces of RDD mobile sample and 443 pieces of recontact RDD sample in France.

TABLE 21 Cont'd: Cellphone Response Rates by Country

	New Zealand	Norway	United Kingdom	United States
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)				
Complete	100	484	52	306
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)				
Refusal and breakoff	0	20	0	171
Break off	0	0	0	0
Answering machine	0	0	0	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	0	0
Language problem	0	0	0	1
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)				
Always busy	10	0	348	2,009
No answer	372	0	1,627	24,163
Answering machine-don't know if household	1,418	0	4,390	15,919
Call blocking	0	0	3	920
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	1,959	3,847	4,322	8,596
No screener completed	50	27	0	262
Not eligible (Category 4)				
Fax/data line	0	1	6	517
Non-working number	33	0	1,622	44,933
Business, government office, other organizations	58	0	61	1,412
No eligible respondent	944	143	1,331	2,040
Quota filled	0	0	0	0
Total phone numbers used	4,944	4,519	13,763	101,249
Response Rate 3	**21.7%**	**13.7%**	**14.5%**	**8.2%**

TABLE 22: Overall Response Rate for Germany

	Germany
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)	
Complete	1,163
Eligible, non-Interview (Category 2)	
Refusal and breakoff	2,894
Break off	31
Answering machine	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0
Deleted interview	16
Language problem	0
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)	
Always busy	0
No answer	2,012
Answering machine-don't know if household	996
Call blocking	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	0
No screener completed	0
Not eligible (Category 4)	
Fax/data line	28
Non-working number	142
Business, government office, other organizations	49
No eligible respondent	167
Quota filled	1
Total phone numbers used	7,499
Response Rate 3	20.8%

TABLE 23: Omnibus Callback Sample Response Rate for the US

	United States
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)	
Complete	451
Eligible, non-Interview (Category 2)	
Refusal and breakoff	0
Break off	0
Answering machine	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0
Language problem	16
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)	
Always busy	100
No answer	1,416

Answering machine-don't know if household	683
Call blocking	15
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	715
No screener completed	5
Not eligible (Category 4)	
Fax/data line	6
Non-working number	186
Business, government office, other organizations	35
No eligible respondent	69
Quota filled	0
Total phone numbers used	3,697
Response Rate 3	**24.4%**

TABLE 24: ABS Response Rate for Sweden and Switzerland

	Sweden	Switzerland
Total records	7,000	5,505
Ineligibles	115	33
Valid sample	3,867	2,875
Completed interviews	3,018	2,597
Response Rate	**45.7%**	**47.7%**

WEIGHTING

Data from each country were weighted to ensure the final outcome was representative of the 65+ (60+ in the US) adult population[13]. The weighting procedure accounted for the sample design and probability of selection, as well as systematic non-response across known population parameters. To the extent possible, the weighting procedure replicated the 2017 weighting protocol.[14]

Survey data in each country were weighted by key demographic variables (e.g., region, age, gender, educational attainment)[15][16]. Population parameters were derived, for each country, from the most recent census information available (year of census varied) or from the country's population registry (i.e., Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland).

The following table shows the post-stratification parameters per country and outlines whether any oversampling was put in place.

TABLE 25: Post-Stratification Variables[17]

	Post-stratification Variables	Oversamples
Australia	age by gender, region, education, urban status	None
Canada	age by gender, region, education, knowledge of official language[18]	At least 250 completes per province except the territories[19], and with larger sample sizes for Ontario and Quebec
France	age by gender, region, education	None
Germany	age by gender, region, education	None
Netherlands	age by gender, region	None
New Zealand	age by gender, region, education	None
Norway	age by gender, region, education	None
Sweden[20]	age by gender, education	None
Switzerland	age by gender, region, education, linguistic region by phone status	Valais, Basel Stadt, Geneva, Vaud
UK	age by gender, region	Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland

[13] This is accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables to known population parameters using a GENLOG procedure. To handle missing data among some of the parameter variables, consistent with prior waves of this study, we employed a technique called hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data. We use an SPSS macro detailed in 'Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handing Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).

[14] Except for the USA where the age 60+ population was surveyed for IHP 2021.

[15] Given the overall low expected incidence of cell phone-only status for this age-group and there not being always reliably available data about phone status for this group, phone-status was not used as a weighting parameter.

[16] Missing data for gender, age and other variables were imputed using a Hot Deck procedure prior to raking.

[17] Detailed post-stratification variables and distributions are included in the detailed weighting procedures section per country

[18] Knowledge of Official Language was a benchmark only for Quebec, New Brunswick, and for Canada as a whole

[19] For Yukon and Northwest Territories, a total of 144 and 14 completed interviews, respectively, were obtained. Nunavut was not oversampled, however.

[20] Unlike prior IHP waves, Sweden data were not weighted by region upon consultation with Vårdanalys. SSRS checked to ensure that the region distribution was reasonable.

US	age by gender, region, race, education	Lower income areas oversampled

How to Analyze Data with Oversamples

It is a common practice to oversample certain groups of interest to provide larger sample sizes for analysis. When groups are oversampled, weighting will correct for the oversampling by "weighting down" the groups to their proper proportion of the sample.

It is important for researchers to understand the weighting implications of these oversamples. SSRS typically computes "balancing weights" which means that the weights across the entire sample sum to the total number of interviews. If we have oversampled a group, the sum of that group's balancing weight will then be less than the number of interviews we completed with the group because that groups has been weighted down in the aggregate. If such data were analyzed with a basic statistics package like SPSS, the margin of error for the oversample population would reflect the weighted n-size and not the number of interviews, which would lead to an overestimate of the sample variance.

The following table shows an example of population and interview n-sizes when an oversample is used. For this example, a main cross-section sample of 1,000 was combined with an oversample of 800 among some subpopulation of interest. While the researcher did 920 interviews with the oversample population, the statistical software will run statistical tests as though only 216 interviews were completed.

TABLE 26: Example of Oversample N-Sizes

	Natural Population Distribution (%)	Example Study Sample Completes:			
		Main Sample	Over-sample	Total	Weighted N-size
Non-oversample population	88%	880 (88%)	0	880 (49%)	1,584 (88%)
Oversample population	12%	120 (12%)	800	920 (51%)	216 (12%)
Total	100%	1,000	800	1,800	1,800

There are two solutions to this problem. The first is to utilize a statistics package that can apply a Taylor Series Linearization to the data. Under this procedure, the researcher would enter a strata variable into the statistics package that indicates the sample selections upon which under/oversampling occurred. In effect, this will allow the statistics package to calculate proper margins of error for estimates based on the true sample sizes of groups. Taylor Series Linearization will also account for the impact of any complex sample design features, such as stratification, on sample variances. The researcher will also attain a margin of error appropriate to the number of interviews rather than the weighted N-size, which can be a problem in some statistical software packages such as SPSS. Statistics packages with the capability to compute linearized variances estimates include SAS with the survey procedures module, R with the *survey* package, Stata, and SPSS with the Complex Samples module.

If one does not have access to such a package, SSRS can provide a secondary weight to be used to conduct analyses within oversampled groups or between oversampled groups and other respondents, as the main weight supplied with the data will be appropriate for analysis of the overall population only.

Researchers should be aware that these two methods will obtain equivalent point estimates; however, they may not obtain equivalent sample variances, meaning that results of statistical tests could differ depending on the method used. In general, when the two methods differ, Taylor Series Linearization will obtain the most accurate sample variances and statistical tests, both overall and within subgroups. Therefore, if the researcher has access to software that can conduct Taylor Series Linearization, this is the preferred method.

Regardless, SSRS can identify the applicable strata variables, so that researchers can properly analyze their data with the correct margins of error.

Below are the detailed procedures by country.

Detailed Weighting Procedures by Country

Australia

The weighting procedure for Australia needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ adult Australian population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
    a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other 65+ adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other 65+ adults.
    b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
    a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more 65+ adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other 65+ adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
    b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
    c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the Australia sample were age-by-gender, educational attainment, urban status (major city or not), and region. Population parameters were derived from the 2016 Census data via the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

3. Weights were trimmed at the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 27 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Australia as a whole.

TABLE 27: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Australia

	AUS Total- Unweighted	AUS Total - Weighted	AUS Total - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	8.0%	15.0%	15.8%
Male 70-74	8.2%	11.9%	11.7%
Male 75+	20.6%	19.0%	18.8%
Female 65-69	10.2%	16.6%	16.5%
Female 70-74	16.6%	12.6%	12.4%
Female 75+	36.5%	25.0%	24.7%
Education			
High School or Less	50.5%	59.5%	59.8%
Some Post-Secondary	22.0%	26.4%	26.3%
University Degree or more	27.5%	14.1%	13.9%
Urban Status			
Major City	59.9%	65.3%	65.1%
Not Major City	40.1%	34.7%	34.9%
Region/Strata			
NSW	32.3%	32.6%	33.1%
Victoria	27.9%	25.3%	25.1%
Queensland	18.2%	19.6%	19.5%
Western Australia	11.0%	9.5%	9.4%
South Australia	6.6%	8.4%	8.3%
Tasmania	3.0%	2.7%	2.7%
Australian Capital Territory	0.8%	1.4%	1.4%
Northern Territory	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%

Canada

The weighting procedure for Canada needed to address several issues:

1. Over- and under-representation of provinces as a result of sample design.
2. The need to accurately represent overall 65+ adult Canadian population as well as the overall 65+ adult populations in each of the provinces.
3. Household size: Respondents who live with no other 65+ adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other 65+ adults.
4. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. Data for each province were weighted separately, so that each subsample (and the country as a whole) accurately represent the corresponding population.

2. To address different probabilities of selection:
    a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more 65+ adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other 65+ adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
    b. A base weight was created equaling the within household correction.
3. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for each subsample (each of Canada's 10 provinces, Yukon Territory, and the Northwest Territories) and the entire national sample were age-by-gender, educational attainment, knowledge of official languages (only for Quebec, New Brunswick, and on Canada as a whole). Population parameters were derived from the Canada 2016 Census. SSRS obtained populations estimates from Statistics Canada for the 65+ adult population for each of the provinces and for Canada as a whole.
4. Weights were trimmed at the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.
5. Geographic representation: In the final weighting step, the weights within each province were adjusted to their correct share among Canadian adults 65+.

Three weights were developed for varying analytical purposes:

1. **Weights** is to be used for total country estimates. This weight excludes the territory oversamples.
2. **WeightProvinces** is valid for all Canada cases in the data, including the territory oversamples. This is the weight that should be used for estimates within province or territory (for Yukon, only). This is basically each province weighted within, but not rebalanced at the end to, the distribution each brings to the total.
3. **CAN_WEIGHTPROVINCES2** was developed where the weights within each province were adjusted to sum to the 65+ adult population size. This weight can be used for either total country estimates or those within provinces or territories (for Yukon, only).

Tables 28 through 34 compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for each subsample and for Canada as a whole[21].

[21]The tables per province are populated using the CAN_WEIGHTPROVINCES2 weight variable, while the table for Canada as a whole is populated using the Weights weighting variable.

TABLE 28: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island

	NL-Unweighted	NL-Weighted	NL-Adults	PEI-Unweighted	PEI-Weighted	PEI-Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 65-69	11.9%	18.1%	18.1%	8.9%	16.3%	17.4%
Male 70-74	12.3%	12.6%	12.6%	6.6%	11.3%	11.4%
Male 75+	11.9%	16.0%	16.0%	15.2%	17.1%	16.8%
Female 65-69	17.5%	19.0%	19.0%	14.8%	18.7%	18.4%
Female 70-74	18.3%	13.3%	13.3%	19.1%	12.7%	12.5%
Female 75+	28.2%	21.0%	21.0%	35.4%	23.9%	23.5%
Education						
High School or Less	40.5%	63.4%	63.4%	34.2%	52.4%	53.2%
Some Post-Secondary	35.3%	27.9%	27.9%	30.0%	34.1%	33.5%
University Degree or more	24.2%	8.7%	8.7%	35.8%	13.5%	13.3%

TABLE 29: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick

	NS-Unweighted	NS-Weighted	NS-Adults	NB-Unweighted	NB-Weighted	NB-Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 65-69	9.4%	16.6%	16.8%	12.8%	16.8%	17.2%
Male 70-74	10.2%	11.8%	11.7%	12.8%	12.0%	11.9%
Male 75+	15.7%	16.9%	16.9%	14.8%	17.0%	16.9%
Female 65-69	17.7%	17.9%	17.9%	18.0%	18.0%	17.9%
Female 70-74	16.1%	12.8%	12.8%	18.4%	12.4%	12.3%
Female 75+	30.7%	24.0%	23.9%	23.2%	23.7%	23.8%
Education						
High School or Less	46.1%	52.3%	52.5%	43.6%	58.4%	58.8%
Some Post-Secondary	31.5%	33.2%	33.1%	28.0%	29.5%	29.3%
University Degree or more	22.4%	14.5%	14.5%	28.4%	12.0%	11.9%
Language						
English Only	-	-	-	71.2%	60.6%	60.1%
French Only	-	-	-	5.2%	10.7%	10.9%
Both	-	-	-	23.6%	28.7%	29.0%

TABLE 30: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Ontario and Quebec

	QC-Unweighted	QC-Weighted	QC-Adults	ON-Unweighted	ON-Weighted	ON-Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 65-69	11.6%	15.8%	15.8%	9.0%	14.6%	15.7%
Male 70-74	10.4%	11.6%	11.8%	9.2%	11.2%	11.1%
Male 75+	11.6%	17.0%	17.1%	16.1%	18.5%	18.3%
Female 65-69	17.4%	17.0%	16.8%	15.5%	17.3%	17.1%
Female 70-74	19.4%	13.4%	13.2%	17.7%	12.6%	12.4%
Female 75+	29.6%	25.2%	25.2%	32.4%	25.7%	25.4%
Education						
High School or Less	45.2%	57.5%	57.5%	33.0%	54.2%	54.8%
Some Post-Secondary	26.4%	28.4%	28.6%	32.6%	28.0%	27.6%
University Degree or more	28.4%	14.1%	13.9%	34.3%	17.8%	17.6%
Language						
English Only	2.3%	5.1%	5.8%	-	-	-
French Only	54.0%	60.9%	60.6%	-	-	-
Both	43.7%	34.0%	33.6%	-	-	-

TABLE 31: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Manitoba and Saskatchewan

	MB-Unweighted	MB-Weighted	MB-Adults	SK-Unweighted	SK-Weighted	SK-Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 65-69	10.2%	15.0%	15.7%	10.8%	15.2%	15.4%
Male 70-74	9.0%	11.1%	11.0%	8.4%	10.7%	10.7%
Male 75+	16.1%	18.2%	18.0%	15.1%	19.3%	19.2%
Female 65-69	15.3%	17.0%	16.9%	13.9%	15.9%	15.8%
Female 70-74	14.5%	12.2%	12.1%	16.7%	11.5%	11.4%
Female 75+	34.9%	26.5%	26.3%	35.1%	27.5%	27.4%
Education						
High School or Less	37.3%	56.2%	56.6%	33.5%	57.3%	57.4%
Some Post-Secondary	27.5%	29.2%	29.0%	37.8%	30.6%	30.4%
University Degree or more	35.3%	14.6%	14.5%	28.7%	12.2%	12.1%

TABLE 32: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Alberta and British Columbia

	AB-Unweighted	AB-Weighted	AB-Adults	BC-Unweighted	BC-Weighted	BC-Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 65-69	12.4%	16.6%	17.1%	8.8%	15.1%	16.4%
Male 70-74	8.8%	11.4%	11.3%	11.2%	11.7%	11.5%
Male 75+	21.1%	18.0%	17.9%	17.5%	19.0%	18.7%
Female 65-69	15.1%	17.7%	17.6%	12.0%	17.6%	17.4%
Female 70-74	15.1%	12.2%	12.1%	21.1%	12.6%	12.3%
Female 75+	27.5%	24.1%	23.9%	29.5%	24.0%	23.7%
Education						
High School or Less	25.5%	50.5%	50.8%	26.7%	49.1%	49.9%
Some Post-Secondary	44.6%	32.3%	32.1%	36.7%	31.6%	31.1%
University Degree or more	29.9%	17.2%	17.1%	36.7%	19.3%	18.9%

TABLE 33: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Yukon Territory

	YT-Unweighted	YT-Weighted	YT-Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	17.4%	22.4%	22.9%
Male 70-74	9.7%	14.4%	14.2%
Male 75+	11.8%	14.7%	14.9%
Female 65-69	26.4%	20.7%	20.4%
Female 70-74	11.8%	11.5%	11.4%
Female 75+	22.9%	16.3%	16.1%
Education			
High School or Less	26.4%	43.5%	44.2%
Some Post-Secondary	41.7%	38.0%	37.6%
University Degree or more	31.9%	18.4%	18.2%

TABLE 34: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Canada as a whole

	Canada-Unweighted	Canada-Weighted	Canada-Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	10.6%	16.0%	16.1%
Male 70-74	9.8%	11.3%	11.4%
Male 75+	14.9%	18.0%	17.9%
Female 65-69	16.3%	17.2%	17.2%
Female 70-74	17.8%	12.7%	12.5%
Female 75+	30.6%	24.9%	24.9%
Education			
High School or Less	36.8%	54.5%	54.7%
Some Post-Secondary	32.1%	29.2%	29.1%
University Degree or more	31.1%	16.3%	16.2%
Language			
English Only	67.6%	69.4%	69.3%
French Only	12.5%	16.1%	16.1%
Both	19.9%	14.5%	14.6%
Region/Strata			
Newfoundland and Labrador	5.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Prince Edward Island	5.7%	0.5%	0.5%
Nova Scotia	5.7%	3.1%	3.1%
New Brunswick	5.6%	2.5%	2.5%
Quebec	22.3%	25.0%	25.2%
Ontario	29.0%	37.5%	37.9%
Manitoba	5.7%	3.4%	3.4%
Saskatchewan	5.6%	2.9%	2.9%
Alberta	5.6%	8.3%	8.4%
British Columbia	5.6%	14.2%	14.3%
Territories	3.2%	1.1%	0.1%

France

The weighting procedure for France needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ adult French population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by
    a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other 65+ adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other 65+ adults.
    b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
    a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more 65+ adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other 65+ adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
    b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
    c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the France sample were age-by-gender, educational attainment, and region. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
        i. Gender and age are based on 2019 data from the Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE).
        ii. Region is based on 2020 data from the INSEE.
        iii. Education was based on data from the 2017 data from the INSEE for the age 65 plus segment of the population.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 5^{th} and 95^{th} percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 35 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for France as a whole.

TABLE 35: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for France

	France-Unweighted	France-Weighted	France-Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	10.8%	12.0%	12.1%
Male 70-74	12.7%	11.9%	11.6%
Male 75+	15.4%	18.9%	19.8%
Female 65-69	16.3%	13.9%	13.5%
Female 70-74	17.0%	13.7%	13.2%
Female 75+	27.8%	29.7%	29.7%
Education			
High School or Less / Some Post-Secondary	60.8%	84.4%	85.0%
University Degree or more	39.2%	15.6%	15.0%
Region/Strata			
Grand Est	8.7%	8.5%	8.5%
Nouvelle Aquitaine	11.1%	11.0%	10.9%
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	12.6%	12.1%	12.1%
Bourgogne-Franche-Comté	6.0%	5.1%	4.9%
Bretagne	4.6%	5.5%	5.7%
Centre-Val-de-Loire	3.7%	4.4%	4.4%
Corse	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
Île-de-France	14.1%	13.8%	13.9%
Occitanie	9.8%	10.1%	10.2%
Hauts-de-France	8.5%	8.3%	8.3%
Normandie	5.6%	5.6%	5.5%
Pays de la Loire	4.6%	5.9%	6.1%
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	10.3%	9.1%	8.9%

Germany

The weighting procedure for Germany needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ adult German population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
    a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other 65+ adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other 65+ adults.
    b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
    a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more 65+ adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other 65+ adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
    b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
    c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the Germany sample were age-by-gender, educational attainment, and region. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
        i. Gender, age, and region were based on 2019 estimates from the 2011 Census data via Statistiches Bundesamt.
        ii. Education was based on the 2019 Microcensus data from Statistiches Bundesamt.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 36 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Germany as a whole.

TABLE 36: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Germany

	Germany-Unweighted	Germany -Weighted	Germany -Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	12.9%	13.0%	12.8%
Male 70-74	12.3%	9.8%	9.5%
Male 75+	29.2%	22.2%	21.5%
Female 65-69	12.6%	14.4%	14.1%
Female 70-74	13.1%	11.1%	10.8%
Female 75+	19.9%	29.6%	31.3%
Education			
High School or Less	56.5%	57.4%	57.3%
Some Post-Secondary	21.9%	23.1%	23.5%
University Degree or more	21.6%	19.5%	19.1%
Region/Strata			
Schleswig-Holstein	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%
Hamburg	2.1%	1.9%	1.9%
Bremen	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Niedersachsen	12.0%	10.1%	9.8%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	24.6%	21.3%	21.0%
Rheinland-Pfalz	4.6%	5.1%	5.0%
Saarland	1.5%	1.3%	1.3%
Hessen	7.2%	7.3%	7.2%
Baden-Württemberg	9.9%	12.2%	12.5%
Bayern	12.3%	14.4%	14.9%
Berlin	4.5%	3.9%	3.9%
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%
Brandenburg	3.8%	3.5%	3.5%
Sachsen-Anhalt	3.3%	3.2%	3.3%
Thüringen	3.3%	3.2%	3.1%
Sachsen	4.2%	5.8%	6.0%

The Netherlands

The weighting procedure for The Netherlands needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ adult Dutch population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
    a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other 65+ adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other 65+ adults.
    b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
    a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more 65+ adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other 65+ adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
    b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
    c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the Netherlands sample were age-by-gender and region. Population parameters were derived from 2019 data from the statistical office of the European Union (Eurostat).
3. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 37 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for the Netherlands as a whole.

TABLE 37: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the Netherlands

	Netherlands-Unweighted	Netherlands -Weighted	Netherlands -Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	11.4%	14.5%	14.5%
Male 70-74	10.0%	13.5%	13.5%
Male 75+	21.0%	18.5%	18.3%
Female 65-69	9.4%	14.2%	14.8%
Female 70-74	14.3%	14.3%	14.2%
Female 75+	34.0%	25.1%	24.6%
Region/Strata			
Drenthe	3.0%	3.4%	3.4%
Flevoland	2.2%	1.8%	1.8%
Friesland	4.6%	4.0%	4.1%
Gelderland	14.8%	12.8%	12.6%
Groningen	2.4%	3.2%	3.4%
Limburg	8.4%	8.0%	7.9%
Noord-Brabant	14.6%	15.3%	15.3%
Noord-Holland	13.5%	15.1%	15.3%
Overijssel	7.1%	6.8%	6.7%
Utrecht	7.1%	6.6%	6.6%
Zeeland	3.7%	2.8%	2.7%
Zuid-Holland	18.6%	19.9%	20.1%

New Zealand

The weighting procedure for New Zealand needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ New Zealand adult population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
    a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other 65+ adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other 65+ adults.
    b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
    a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more 65+ adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other 65+ adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
    b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
    c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the New Zealand sample were age-by-gender, educational attainment, and region (in 4 groups). Population parameters were derived from the 2018 Census of Population and Dwellings via Statistics New Zealand.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 38 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for New Zealand as a whole.

TABLE 38: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for New Zealand

	New Zealand - Unweighted	New Zealand - Weighted	New Zealand -Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	7.4%	12.9%	15.4%
Male 70-74	8.2%	12.6%	12.6%
Male 75+	19.2%	19.3%	18.5%
Female 65-69	13.2%	16.5%	16.3%
Female 70-74	14.4%	13.8%	13.5%
Female 75+	37.6%	24.9%	23.6%
Education			
Secondary or less (Up to Level 6)	69.0%	84.8%	85.7%
University Degree or more (Levels 7 through post grad)	31.0%	15.2%	14.3%
Region/Strata			
Auckland	31.4%	27.3%	27.8%
North	30.0%	30.6%	30.1%
Central	13.6%	15.8%	15.9%
South	25.0%	26.3%	26.2%

Norway

The weighting procedure for Norway needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ adult Norwegian population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
    a. Telephone use: respondents with more than one phone in the registry have a higher probability of selection than those with one phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection, a phone probability base weight adjustment was added matching the share of respondents, in the final data, that could be reached by more than one phone number to their share in the sample.

TABLE 39: Phone Probability

	Benchmark (%)	Data (%)	Weight
Single telephone number	79.6	77.8	1.02
More than one telephone number	20.4	22.2	0.92

2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the Norway sample were age-by-gender, educational attainment, and region. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

i. Gender, age, and region were based on the Norwegian population registry's 2019 data via Statistics Norway.
ii. Education was based on the 2019 Population and Housing Census data for adults 60-66 and 67+, with the Norwegian population registry's 2019 data for 65+ adults, via Statistics Norway[22].

3. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 40 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Norway as a whole.

TABLE 40: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Norway

	Norway-Unweighted	Norway - Weighted	Norway - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	11.6%	13.8%	14.6%
Male 70-74	13.4%	13.7%	13.5%
Male 75+	22.2%	18.9%	18.4%
Female 65-69	12.4%	14.0%	14.7%
Female 70-74	12.8%	14.2%	14.0%
Female 75+	27.6%	25.4%	24.8%
Education			
HS or LESS (Basic + Upper)	36.0%	74.9%	75.6%
University up to 4 years (tertiary short)	36.8%	18.4%	18.0%
University more than 4 years (tertiary long)	27.2%	6.6%	6.4%
Region/Strata			
Agder	5.4%	6.0%	5.8%
Innlandet	9.4%	8.9%	8.7%
Møre og Romsdal	3.6%	5.5%	5.6%
Nordland	3.6%	4.6%	5.3%
Oslo	11.8%	9.2%	9.3%
Rogaland	6.2%	7.7%	7.6%
Troms og Finnmark	4.2%	4.9%	4.8%
Trøndelag	7.8%	8.9%	8.9%
Vestfold og Telemark	11.2%	9.3%	9.0%
Vestland	9.4%	11.4%	11.8%
Viken	27.4%	23.6%	23.1%

[22] The estimates were adjusted to account for the fact that the data from the 2019 Population and Housing Census were for the 60 and older population, rather than adults 65 and older. The overall share of 65-66 year-olds within the 60-66 year-old demographic was estimated and those cases removed from the estimated population totals.

Sweden

The weighting procedure for Sweden needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ adult Swedish population.
2. Sampling rates within sample strata.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. A base weight was incorporated that accounted for sampling rates within strata. The base weight for all cases in stratum i is computed as $BW_i = N_i/n_i$ were N_i is the size of stratum i and n_i is the sample size in stratum i.
2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the Sweden sample were age-by-gender and educational attainment.[23] Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
        i. Gender and age were based on the Swedish Tax Agency's 2020 data on registered persons via Statistics Sweden.
        ii. Education was based on 2019 data from Statistics Sweden's Register of Education.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 41 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Sweden as a whole.

TABLE 41: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Sweden

	Sweden - Unweighted	Sweden - Weighted	Sweden - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	10.9%	12.7%	12.7%
Male 70-74	15.3%	12.9%	12.8%
Male 75+	22.6%	21.2%	21.2%
Female 65-69	12.7%	13.0%	13.0%
Female 70-74	15.7%	13.5%	13.5%
Female 75+	22.8%	26.9%	26.9%
Education			
High School or Less	59.4%	72.3%	72.3%
Some Post-Secondary	15.4%	11.5%	11.5%
University Degree or more	25.1%	16.2%	16.2%

[23] Unlike the IHP 2017 survey, Sweden data were not weighted by region upon consultation with Vårdanalys. SSRS, however, checked to ensure that the region distribution was reasonable relative to the official benchmark (within less than 2% difference from the benchmark).

Switzerland

The weighting procedure for Switzerland needed to address several issues:

1. The need to correctly represent the proportion of respondents with and without a phone number match to the Swiss population registry by linguistic region (German-, French-, and Italian-speaking), excluding the cantons of Valais, Vaud, Geneva, and Zurich, which were adjusted separately[24].
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. The sample was weighted to balance the number of completed interviews with and without a phone number match in the registry, according to the sampling stratification plan. Data were weighted to the breakdown in the sample frame (Swiss Federal Statistical Office (SFSO), 2019).

TABLE 42: Linguistic Region Base Weight

Linguistic Region	Statistics Switzerland (%)	Data (%)	Weight[25]
Phone			
German (NOT Valais, NOT Vaud, NOT Geneva, and NOT Basel-Stadt)	54.3	25.0	2.18
French (NOT Valais, NOT Vaud, NOT Geneva, and NOT Basel-Stadt)	5.0	3.5	1.42
Italian (NOT Valais, NOT Vaud, NOT Geneva, and NOT Basel-Stadt)	3.5	8.8	0.40
Valais	2.8	8.2	0.34
Vaud	6.2	10.1	0.61
Geneva	3.6	9.7	0.37
Basel-Stadt	1.7	10.4	0.17
No Phone			
German (NOT Valais, NOT Vaud, NOT Geneva, and NOT Basel-Stadt)	14.4	5.4	2.65
French (NOT Valais, NOT Vaud, NOT Geneva, and NOT Basel-Stadt)	1.1	1.0	1.13
Italian (NOT Valais, NOT Vaud, NOT Geneva, and NOT Basel-Stadt)	1.5	3.4	0.44
Valais	1.5	3.5	0.42
Vaud	2.2	3.5	0.61
Geneva	1.6	3.9	0.40
Basel-Stadt	0.7	3.7	0.19

[24] Even though outbound dialing was not implemented, for consistency's sake relative to prior waves and for an accurate representation of the registry, this adjustment was kept in similar to what was done in prior IHP waves of this study.
[25] To avoid extremely large or small weights, the maximum weight-value was capped at 2.

2. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the Switzerland sample were age-by-gender, educational attainment, and region (Canton). Population parameters were derived from the Swiss population registry's 2019 data via SFSO.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 43 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Switzerland as a whole.

TABLE 43: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Switzerland

	Switzerland - Unweighted	Switzerland - Weighted	Switzerland - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	12.6%	13.0%	12.9%
Male 70-74	13.0%	11.9%	11.8%
Male 75+	20.8%	20.0%	20.0%
Female 65-69	13.1%	14.0%	13.9%
Female 70-74	16.0%	13.2%	13.1%
Female 75+	24.6%	28.0%	28.3%
Education			
High School or Less	67.2%	79.4%	79.2%
Some Post-Secondary	8.0%	11.1%	11.3%
University Degree or more	24.8%	9.5%	9.4%
Region/Strata			
Zürich	7.3%	16.3%	16.3%
Bern / Berne (French speaking)	0.5%	0.7%	0.7%
Bern / Berne (German speaking)	5.9%	13.0%	12.9%
Luzern	1.6%	4.5%	4.6%
Uri	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
Schwyz	0.7%	1.7%	1.8%
Obwalden	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%
Nidwalden	0.2%	0.6%	0.6%
Glarus	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
Zug	1.0%	1.4%	1.4%
Fribourg / Freiburg (French speaking)	1.6%	2.3%	2.3%
Fribourg / Freiburg (German speaking)	0.4%	0.9%	0.9%
Solothurn	1.3%	3.4%	3.4%
Basel-Stadt	14.0%	2.4%	2.4%

Basel-Landschaft	2.1%	4.0%	4.0%
Schaffhausen	0.4%	1.1%	1.1%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%
Appenzell Innerrhoden	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
St. Gallen	2.3%	5.8%	5.9%
Graubünden / Grigioni / Grischun	1.6%	2.7%	2.7%
Aargau	3.6%	7.7%	7.7%
Thurgau	1.5%	3.1%	3.1%
Ticino	11.7%	5.0%	5.0%
Vaud	13.6%	8.3%	8.3%
Valais / Wallis (French speaking)	9.4%	3.2%	3.2%
Valais / Wallis (German speaking)	2.2%	1.1%	1.1%
Neuenburg	1.6%	2.1%	2.1%
Genève	13.6%	5.2%	5.2%
Jura	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%

The United Kingdom

The weighting procedure for the United Kingdom needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall 65+ adult UK population.
2. Disproportionate sample stratification across Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.
3. Differences in the probability of selection by:
    a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other 65+ adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other 65+ adults.
    b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
4. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. Data for each oversampled country were weighted separately, so that each subsample (and the UK as a whole) accurately represent the corresponding population.
2. To address different probabilities of selection:
    a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more 65+ adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other 65+ adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
    b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).

c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.

3. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. With the base weight applied Parameters used for each subsample (Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) and the entire national sample were age-by-gender and educational attainment. Population parameters were derived from 2019 data from the Office of National Statistics in the UK.
4. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Tables 44 through 46 compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for each subsample and for the UK as a whole.

TABLE 44: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Wales and Scotland

	Wales - Unweighted	Wales - Weighted	Wales - Adults	Scotland - Unweighted	Scotland - Weighted	Scotland - Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 65-69	6.7%	13.4%	13.4%	11.5%	14.0%	13.8%
Male 70-74	9.3%	13.1%	13.1%	10.8%	12.1%	12.7%
Male 75+	22.7%	19.8%	19.7%	22.8%	18.6%	18.4%
Female 65-69	8.4%	13.7%	14.1%	9.9%	15.0%	14.8%
Female 70-74	15.3%	14.0%	14.0%	12.0%	13.9%	14.0%
Female 75+	37.7%	25.9%	25.8%	32.9%	26.4%	26.2%

TABLE 45: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Northern Ireland and the Rest of the UK

	N. Ireland - Unweighted	N. Ireland - Weighted	N. Ireland - Adults	Rest of the UK - Unweighted	Rest of the UK - Weighted	Rest of the UK - Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 65-69	10.9%	14.0%	14.1%	8.5%	12.9%	13.1%
Male 70-74	10.9%	12.1%	12.3%	10.1%	12.7%	12.8%
Male 75+	23.0%	19.5%	19.1%	24.1%	19.9%	19.8%
Female 65-69	10.6%	13.8%	14.5%	11.0%	14.0%	13.9%
Female 70-74	11.6%	13.9%	13.6%	12.4%	14.0%	14.0%
Female 75+	33.1%	26.8%	26.4%	34.0%	26.5%	26.3%
Region/Strata						
North East	--	--	--	7.9%	5.1%	5.1%
Yorks & Humber	--	--	--	10.7%	9.9%	10.0%
East Midlands	--	--	--	10.1%	9.1%	9.1%
Eastern	--	--	--	4.4%	12.0%	12.0%
London	--	--	--	7.1%	10.4%	10.4%
South East	--	--	--	23.4%	17.4%	17.3%
South West	--	--	--	16.4%	12.1%	12.1%
West Midlands	--	--	--	9.3%	10.7%	10.7%
North West	--	--	--	10.8%	13.3%	13.3%

TABLE 46: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the UK

	UK - Unweighted	UK - Weighted	UK - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 65-69	9.3%	12.4%	13.2%
Male 70-74	10.2%	13.1%	12.8%
Male 75+	23.2%	19.1%	19.7%
Female 65-69	10.1%	15.0%	14.0%
Female 70-74	12.8%	12.9%	14.0%
Female 75+	34.4%	27.6%	26.3%
Region/Strata			
Northeast	2.7%	4.3%	4.3%
Yorks & Humber	3.6%	8.3%	8.3%
East Midlands	3.4%	7.6%	7.6%
East	1.5%	10.0%	10.0%
London	2.4%	8.7%	8.7%
South East	7.9%	14.5%	14.5%
South West	5.5%	10.1%	10.1%
West Midlands	3.1%	8.9%	8.9%
North West	3.7%	11.1%	11.1%
Wales	22.3%	5.4%	5.4%
Scotland	22.2%	8.4%	8.4%
Northern Ireland	21.6%	2.5%	2.5%

The United States

The weighting procedure for the United States needed to address several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the target population of 60+ adult U.S. population.
2. Probabilities of respondent selection within and across sample frame.
3. Overlap of the landline and cellular frames.
4. Disproportionate sampling rates across sample strata.
5. Oversampling of prepaid cell phones from the cell frame.
6. Oversampling of 60+ exclusive listed households.
7. Propensity to respond to recontact interview.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. An adjusted base weight was first computed for each piece of sample using an approach outlined by Buskirk and Best.[26] The base weight accounts for selection probabilities from the landline and cell phone frames, and the sampling of one eligible 60+ adult within households that have a landline. Additionally, this base weight accounts for the overlapping sample frames and each respondent's access to a landline and/or a cell phone.
2. A correction was applied to adjust for the disproportionate sampling across strata in the landline and cell phone frames. The strata were based on income, with lower income strata were sampled at higher rates.

TABLE 47: US RDD Stratification Adjustment

Strata	Population Distribution	Landline frame	Landline screener-completes	Cellphone frame	Cellphone screener-completes
1-Poorest	10.0%	9.4%	16.0%	11.0%	13.6%
2	9.7%	9.8%	17.9%	10.6%	12.1%
3	9.2%	9.9%	12.2%	11.0%	14.4%
4	10.9%	10.6%	14.0%	11.4%	12.1%
5	10.2%	10.1%	12.1%	10.8%	10.6%
6	9.7%	9.4%	7.3%	9.3%	10.5%
7	10.1%	10.1%	8.0%	10.2%	8.4%
8	10.2%	10.3%	3.7%	9.9%	8.5%
9	10.0%	10.0%	3.8%	8.0%	5.5%
10-Richest	10.0%	10.4%	5.1%	7.8%	4.2%

3. A Prepaid Cellphone Adjustment was applied to account for the oversampling of prepaid cell numbers in the cell frame. The prepaid cellphone adjustment corrects for this oversampling by applying an adjustment to balance the proportion of prepaid cell numbers in the sample to match the proportion in the RDD cell sample frame.
4. An Age 60+ Listed Sample Adjustment was applied to correct for the oversampling of 60+ exclusive households. This adjustment matches the proportion of age 60+ listed household in our sample to the estimated proportion in the population.

[26] Buskirk, T. D., & Best, J. (2012). Venn Diagrams, Probability 101 and Sampling Weights Computed for Dual Frame Telephone RDD Designs. Journal of Statistics and Mathematics, 15, 3696-3710.

TABLE 48: Age 60+ Base Weight

Age 60+ listed adjustment	Population Estimate (%)	Data (%)	Age 60+ Listed Adjustment
Age 60+ exclusive households	21.7	57.0	0.38
Age 60+ any households	31.0	15.0	2.02
Other	47.3	28.0	1.70

5. A Recontact Propensity Adjustment was applied to cases from pre-screened Omnibus sample completes. This adjustment was applied to the original Omnibus base weight which accounted for sampling probabilities associated with the original Omnibus interview. The propensity weight (PROPWT) was calculated as the inverse of the predicted probability of completing the callback interview in a logistic regression model. Variables used in this model include demographics from the original Omni data (home ownership, marital status [married, or not], employment status [employed, part time, retired], age [60-69, 70 plus], educational attainment [high school or less, college or more], income, and population density) and behavioral items such as voter registration, and cellphone-only usage.
6. Post-stratification weighting:
    a. Parameters used for the US sample were Census region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, and race/ethnicity. Population parameters were derived from the 2020 U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) March supplement.[27]
7. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 49 compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for the US as a whole.

[27] Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles and J. Robert Warren. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 7.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2020. https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V7.0

TABLE 49: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the US

	US - Unweighted	US - Weighted	US - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 60-64	9.7%	13.6%	13.4%
Male 65-69	12.1%	11.3%	11.0%
Male 70-74	10.4%	9.4%	9.1%
Male 75	15.3%	13.2%	12.8%
Female 60-64	7.3%	12.9%	14.4%
Female 65-69	10.4%	12.4%	12.4%
Female 70-74	8.5%	9.9%	10.2%
Female 75	26.3%	17.3%	16.7%
Education			
Less than High School	11.6%	11.1%	10.9%
High School	27.8%	30.5%	30.6%
Some Post-Secondary	30.1%	26.1%	25.8%
University Degree or more	30.6%	32.2%	32.7%
Region/Strata			
Northeast	18.7%	18.6%	18.2%
South	38.5%	37.8%	37.8%
Midwest	21.0%	21.3%	21.4%
West	21.8%	22.3%	22.5%
Ethnicity			
White non-Hispanic	72.7%	74.4%	74.5%
Black non-Hispanic	13.2%	10.2%	9.9%
Hispanic	9.6%	9.5%	9.3%
Other non-Hispanic	4.5%	5.9%	6.3%

Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error

Weighting procedures increase the variance in the data, with larger weights causing greater variance. Complex survey designs and post-data collection statistical adjustments affect variance estimates and, as a result, tests of significance and confidence intervals. These are weight-adjusted margins-of-error for countries and targeted regions. The margins of error reported apply to estimates of 50%; for smaller or larger estimates, the margin of sampling error will be smaller. Sampling error is only one type of error that could affect survey outcomes.

TABLE 50: Design Effect and Margin of Error by Country

	N-Size	Design Effect	Margin of Error
Australia	501	1.52	5.4
Canada[28]	4,332	2.09	2.2
Newfoundland	252	1.56	7.7
Prince Edward Island	257	1.59	7.7
Nova Scotia	254	1.25	6.9
New Brunswick	250	1.44	7.4
Quebec	1000	1.40	3.7
Ontario	1302	1.50	3.3
Manitoba	255	1.53	7.6
Saskatchewan	251	1.54	7.7
Alberta	251	1.54	7.7
British Columbia	251	1.51	7.6
Yukon Territory	144	1.38	9.6
France	1,751	1.43	2.8
Germany	1,163	1.22	3.2
Netherlands	630	1.22	4.3
New Zealand	500	1.47	5.3
Norway	500	1.82	5.9
Sweden	3,018	1.09	1.9
Switzerland	2,597	1.96	2.7
UK	1,876	3.00	3.9
Wales	419	1.34	5.5
Scotland	416	1.20	5.3
Northern Ireland	405	1.18	5.3
Rest of the UK	636	1.42	4.6
US	1,969	1.80	3.0

[28] The design effect and margin of error reported for Canada as a whole are based on the main weight (Weights), while the design effects and margins of error per province are based on the population weight for Canada (CAN_WEIGHTPROVINCES2). Using the population weight, Canada's overall design effect is 1.99, with a margin of error of +/-2.1 percentage points, based on n=4,484 interviews, including the territory oversamples.

DELIVERABLES

SSRS delivered the following to the Commonwealth Fund and sponsoring organizations: (1) final weighted dataset[29], (2) final weighted all-country and country-specific banners in Microsoft Word and Excel format, (3) final methodology report, (4) a memo on the final survey data and trends, (5) final versions of the questionnaires in English as well as the translated versions, (6) final created variable and banner specification memos, (7) two trending banners that included results from 2014, 2017 and 2020 among questions that could be tracked, and (8) a questionnaire crosswalk to compare the questions asked year over year.

[29] This was provided in SPSS or the preferred file format of the partner.