

How do retirement dynamics influence mental well-being in later life? A 10-year panel study ¹

by Ellen Dingemans, ² Kène Henkens Prof

¹ Supplementary tables A and B

² Correspondence to: Ellen Dingemans, Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI-KNAW), University of Groningen (UMGC-RUG), P.O. Box 11650, 2502 AR, The Hague, The Netherlands. [E-mail: dingemans@nidi.nl]

Table A. Estimates from the mixed effects models on standardized measure of self-efficacy ^a.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Constant	-0.21 **	0.06	-0.21 **	0.06	-0.21 **	0.06
Age	-0.15 **	0.00	-0.15 **	0.02	-0.15 **	0.02
<i>Retirement decision:</i>						
Working in career job (reference)						
Voluntarily retired	-0.01	0.03				
Involuntarily retired	-0.10 *	0.04				
<i>Bridge employment:</i>						
Working in career job (reference)						
Bridge job			-0.00	0.05		
Fully retired			-0.05	0.03		
<i>Combined effects:</i>						
Working in career job (reference)						
Voluntarily retired – fully retired					-0.02	0.04
Voluntarily retired – bridge job					0.03	0.06
Involuntarily retired – fully retired					-0.10 *	0.05
Involuntarily retired – bridge job					-0.09	0.08
Women (versus men)	-0.09	0.05	-0.09	0.05	-0.09	0.05
High occupational level (pre-retirement) (versus middle/low)	0.29 **	0.05	0.29 **	0.05	0.29 **	0.05
Public sector (versus private)	-0.06	0.04	-0.06	0.04	-0.06	0.04
Living with a partner	0.12 **	0.04	0.13 **	0.04	0.12 **	0.04
Health problems	-0.12 **	0.03	-0.12 **	0.03	-0.12 **	0.03
Personal monthly income	0.06 **	0.02	0.06 **	0.02	0.06 **	0.02
sd (age)	0.16 **	0.03	0.16 **	0.03	0.16 **	0.03
sd (constant)	0.67 **	0.02	0.67 **	0.02	0.67 **	0.02
sd (residual)	0.59 **	0.01	0.59 **	0.01	0.59 **	0.01
r (age, constant)	0.14	0.08	0.14	0.08	0.14	0.08

Source: NIDI Work and Retirement Panel (2001–2011), N = 4419, person-period file.

* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$.

a We used an accelerated cohort design in which information on age and the study wave of observation are combined (Singer & Willett, 2003). Self-efficacy, as well as age and personal monthly income. The coefficients of the dummy variables can be interpreted as Cohen's d effect sizes.

Note: The Hausman test revealed that the estimates of these analyses might be biased (chi-square = 143.24, $p < 0.001$, for Model 3)

Table B. Estimates from the mixed effects models on standardized measure of life satisfaction ^a.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Constant	-0.34 **	0.06	-0.35 **	0.06	-0.34 **	0.06	-0.28 **	0.05
Age	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02
<i>Retirement decision:</i>								
Working in career job (reference)								
Voluntarily retired	0.09 **	0.04						
Involuntarily retired	-0.18 **	0.04						
<i>Bridge employment:</i>								
Working in career job (reference)								
Bridge job			0.10 *	0.05				
Fully retired			-0.01	0.04				
<i>Combined effects:</i>								
Working in career job (reference)								
Voluntarily retired – fully retired					0.07	0.04	0.08 *	0.04
Voluntarily retired – bridge job					0.16 **	0.06	0.15 **	0.05
Involuntarily retired – fully retired					-0.22 **	0.05	-0.19 **	0.05
Involuntarily retired – bridge job					-0.03	0.08	-0.01	0.08
Women (versus men)	0.16 **	0.05	0.17 **	0.05	0.16 **	0.05	0.19 **	0.04
High occupational level (pre-retirement) (versus middle/low)	0.11 **	0.04	0.10 *	0.04	0.11 *	0.04	0.02	0.04
Private sector (versus public)	-0.16 **	0.04	-0.16 **	0.04	-0.16 **	0.04	-0.14 **	0.03
Living with a partner	0.49 **	0.04	0.50 **	0.04	0.49 **	0.04	0.45 **	0.04
Health problems	-0.18 **	0.03	-0.19 **	0.03	-0.18 **	0.03	-0.15 **	0.03
Personal monthly income	0.06 **	0.02	0.07 **	0.02	0.06 **	0.02	0.04 **	0.02
Self-efficacy							0.30 **	0.01
sd (age)	0.13 **	0.03	0.13 **	0.03	0.13 **	0.03	0.09 *	0.04
sd (constant)	0.57 **	0.02	0.58 **	0.02	0.57 **	0.02	0.51 **	0.02
sd (residual)	0.62 **	0.01	0.62 **	0.01	0.62 **	0.01	0.61 **	0.01
r (age, constant)	-0.03	0.12	-0.00	0.12	-0.04	0.13	-0.16	0.23

Source: NIDI Work and Retirement Panel (2001–2011), N = 4419, person-period file.

* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$.

a We used an accelerated cohort design in which information on age and the study wave of observation are combined (Singer & Willett, 2003). Life satisfaction, as well as age, personal monthly income, and self-efficacy are standardized. The coefficients of the dummy variables can be interpreted as Cohen's d effect sizes.

Note: The Hausman test revealed that the estimates of these analyses might be biased (chi-square = 35.86, $p < 0.001$, for Model 4).