

# Is retirement bad for health? A matching approach

## *Il pensionamento fa male alla salute? Una analisi causale*

Elena Pirani, Marina Ballerini, Alessandra Mattei, Gustavo De Santis

**Abstract** The aim of this paper is to assess the causal impact of the transition from work to retirement on individual health in various European countries in recent years. The health effects of this transition are far from clear: the specialized literature reports both positive and negative consequences, however, most of the early studies focus on associations rather than causal relationships. We estimate causal effects of retirement on three measures of health and well-being – self-rated health, depression, quality of life – using a propensity score matching approach under the assumption of selection on observables on data coming from SHARE, the longitudinal Survey on Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe, in the years between 2004 and 2016. Our results suggest that the transition from work to retirement negatively affect self-rated health almost everywhere in Europe; nevertheless, the quality of life seems to improve, especially in Continental and Mediterranean countries.

**Abstract** L'obiettivo di questo lavoro è valutare l'impatto causale del pensionamento sulla salute individuale in vari paesi europei. La letteratura riporta effetti sia positivi che negativi del pensionamento sulla salute e benessere degli individui, tuttavia, la maggior parte degli studi precedenti si concentra sulle associazioni piuttosto che sulle relazioni causali. Considerando tre misure di salute – salute percepita, depressione e qualità della vita – sulla base dei dati delle indagini SHARE svolte tra il 2004 e il 2016, stimiamo gli effetti causali del pensionamento sulla salute utilizzando l'approccio del propensity score matching sotto l'ipotesi di assenza di confondimento. I risultati suggeriscono che il pensionamento ha effetti negativi sulla salute percepita in tutti i paesi europei, mentre la qualità della vita sembra beneficiarne, soprattutto nei paesi dell'Europa continentale e mediterranea.

**Key words:** Retirement; Europe; Share; Causal inference.

---

<sup>1</sup> Elena Pirani, University of Florence, [elena.pirani@unifi.it](mailto:elena.pirani@unifi.it);  
Marina Ballerini, University of Florence, [marinaballerini.21@gmail.com](mailto:marinaballerini.21@gmail.com);  
Alessandra Mattei, University of Florence, [mattei@disia.unifi.it](mailto:mattei@disia.unifi.it);  
Gustavo De Santis, University of Florence, [desantis@disia.unifi.it](mailto:desantis@disia.unifi.it).

## 1 Retirement and health: a complex connection

The effects on health of the transition from work to retirement are unclear. Several scholars argue that retirement itself is a stressful event (e.g., Carp 1967; MacBride 1976), which can lead to a break with support networks and friends, and may be accompanied by feelings of loneliness, uselessness, or obsolescence (MacBride 1976). Others claim instead that retirement is a health-preserving life event: it is a relief from work-related stress (Eibich 2015), and encourages health-improving behaviors – such as quit smoking – or increased physical activity (Eibich 2015; Insler 2014).

A strand of the literature reports a significant increase in health after retirement (e.g. Blake and Garrouste 2012; Charles 2004; Coe and Zamarro 2011; Insler 2014; Latif 2013; Neuman 2008), whereas other researchers find significant negative effects on both objective and subjective health measures (e.g. Behncke 2012; Dave et al. 2008; Sahlgren 2012), and also on cognitive functions (Bonsang et al. 2012; Mazzonna and Peracchi 2012). Bound and Waidmann (2007) showed a short-term positive relationship between retirement and health for men but not for women.

In a large part of the previous studies, the focus was on the *association* between health and retirement, and comparisons between the retired and those still working were usually not adjusted for health characteristics before retirement: this adjustment is instead crucial for drawing inference on the causal effects of retirement on health (Coe and Zamarro 2011).

In this paper, we aim to assess the *causal* impact on health of the transition from work to retirement by applying a propensity score matching approach under the assumption of selection on observable to the data of the Survey on Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). We refer to several European countries, and analyse the heterogeneity of the causal effects across different geographical areas.

## 2 Data and method

Our empirical analyses were based on SHARE, the Survey on Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe, which is a panel including five regular waves plus a wave on people's life histories (wave 3, SHARELIFE, which, however, is not considered here because it collected very different information compared to the regular waves and excluded some of the variables we need). In each wave, SHARE data cover the key areas of life (health, socio-economic status social and family networks, etc.) of more than 60,000 individuals aged 50 or over. We focused on the period between 2004 and 2016 and on a subset of the SHARE countries that participated in at least three consecutive waves (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and Spain), and for which we had all the information we needed for our analysis.

We selected three health and well-being indicators. As a general measure of health, we used self-rated health, dichotomizing the original 5-point scale into good

(excellent, very good, good) and poor (fair, poor) perceived health (preliminary analyses considering the original formulation proved consistent results). Because of its subjective nature, self-rated health may change across populations (Prinja et al., 2012); however, various studies proved its power in predicting objective health conditions (Egidi and Spizzichino, 2006), physical and emotional well-being (Bayliss et al., 2012), and even mortality (Idler and Benyamini, 1997). Moreover, we used a composite indicator of depression constructed from the 12 basic items of the EURO-D scale (Prince et al., 1999): depressed mood, pessimism, suicidality, guilt, sleep, interest, irritability, appetite, fatigue, concentration, enjoyment and tearfulness. This scale, which ranges from 0 (not depressed) to 12 (very depressed), was developed in an effort to derive a common scale of depression symptoms, especially in later life, based on different indicators in several European countries. Finally, we considered a theoretically grounded measure of quality of life, i.e., a composite indicator based on four subscales corresponding to four life domains (Hyde et al., 2003; Mehrbrodt et al., 2017): control (C), autonomy (A), self-realization (S) and pleasure (P). After reversing the original scale, this indicator, which was proved to represent a reliable indicator of quality of life in the context of research on ageing (Wiggins et al., 2008), scored between 0 (high quality of life) and 36 (low quality of life).

Because our objective was the estimation of a causal effect of entering retirement on individual well-being in the short run, we focused on the subsample of those who were in the labor market (employed or self-employed) in the waves  $t=1,2,4$  of the survey and were either in the labor market or retired in the waves  $t=2,4,5$ . Those who got out of the labor market for other reasons (e.g., unemployment) were discarded from our subsample.

We followed the “potential outcome” approach (e.g., Imbens and Rubin, 2015). For each unit  $i, i=1, \dots, n$ , we considered a vector  $X_i$  of background variables. Let  $D_i$  denote the treatment variable indicator, equal to 1 if unit  $i$  retires between two consecutive waves of the survey – waves  $w1$  and  $w2$ ; waves  $w2$  and  $w4$ , or waves  $w4$  and  $w5$  – and zero otherwise. Under the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA) (Rubin, 1980), for each unit  $i$  there are two potential outcomes at a future point in time after treatment (at waves  $w4, w5$  or  $w6$ ): the value of the health outcome  $Y$  if unit  $i$  retired –  $Y_i(1)$  – and the value of  $Y$  at the same future point in time if the unit did not retire –  $Y_i(0)$ . The causal effect of the transition from work to retirement for each unit is defined as a comparison of the treatment and control potential outcomes,  $Y_i(1)$  and  $Y_i(0)$ , typically their difference. In this paper we focus on Average Treatment Effects on the Treated (ATT effects), that is, the effects of the transition from work to retirement averaged over the subpopulation of units who actually retired:  $ATT = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | D=1]$ .

Because we used observational data, we needed to introduce some assumptions on the treatment-assignment mechanism to draw inference on the causal effects of interest. We assumed unconfoundedness (or selection on observables), which implies that, conditioning on the observed covariates, an experimental-like context is reproduced. Formally, unconfoundedness requires that the treatment assignment is independent of the potential outcomes:  $D_i \perp (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) | X_i$ . We also assumed that

there was sufficient overlap in the joint distribution of the covariates between treated and control subjects:  $0 < P(D_i=1|X_i=x) < 1$  for each  $i$ . Under these assumptions, we applied a statistical matching technique, the purpose of which was to select a sub-group of control subjects (who did not retire between two subsequent waves) who were, in all respects, as similar as possible to the treated subjects, i.e., those who retired from work. We matched individuals based on the propensity score, or the probability of entering retirement conditional on the observed covariates. The propensity score is a balancing score, that is, covariates are independent of the treatment conditional on the propensity score. Moreover, if the unconfoundedness and the overlap assumptions hold conditional on covariates, they also hold conditional on the propensity score (Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983). Therefore, matching on the propensity score is sufficient to remove confounding.

The variables on which we constructed our propensity score included individual socio-demographic characteristics (e.g., age, living arrangement, relatives alive, level of education) and health-related behaviours and health conditions (e.g., smoking and drinking, mobility index, as well as self-rated health, quality of life, and depression). We also introduced the type and the sector of work, even if we acknowledge that these aspects only partially account for important aspects of working life, such as stressing factors or autonomy in decisions, which could importantly contribute to individual's health and wellbeing. We imposed an exact matching on country of residence and gender. On the basis of the estimated propensity score, for each of the 1124 retired individuals we selected as a match the closest individual – i.e., a person of the same sex, from the same country and with very similar pre-treatment characteristics – among the 6250 potential controls (1-to-1 nearest neighbor matching; Abadie and Imbens 2011).

### 3 Preliminary results

The check of the covariate balance (i.e., similarity of treated and controls individuals in terms of covariates) proved that the matching procedure was successful: after matching, the differences between the two groups (retired and non-retired) in terms of socio-demographic, work-related and health covariates either disappeared (best case) or were drastically reduced (not shown here). We proceeded then to the estimation of the causal effect of retirement on health, by computing the Average Treatment Effects on the Treated (ATT) using a matching estimator.

The first part of Table 1 reports the ATT effects of retirement on the three well-being indicators considered, computed for all the SHARE countries together. Our results show a worsening of self-rated health after retirement; conversely, they also convey the impression of a slightly improvement in terms of (less) depression and (higher) quality of life. Note however that these two latter estimated effects are very small in absolute terms and not statistically significant.

In order to account for the heterogeneity of people living in the different European countries, we estimated the ATT effects separately for the Nordic

countries (Denmark and Sweden), Continental countries (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland), Mediterranean countries (Spain and Italy), and East European countries (Czech Republic, Slovenia, Estonia). The negative effect of retirement on self-rated health persisted for all European areas, even if with a loss of significance for East European countries.

Considering European countries altogether masks some territorial differences for the other two well-being indicators: both depression and quality of life levels increase for retired people in Continental and Mediterranean countries (although the effect is not statistically significant for the second group, maybe due to the small sample size). On the contrary, in Nordic countries retirement seems to determine a detrimental effect also on depression and quality of life (but again results are not statistically significant), whereas for Eastern European countries the effect on the two well-being variables diverges.

**Table 1:** Estimated ATT effects and their standard errors, for all countries, and by groups of countries. SHARE 2004-2016.

			Self-rated health	Depression	Quality of life
All countries	treated (n=1124),	ATT	0.09	-0.12	-0.17
	matched controls (n=1124)	<i>Std Err</i>	<i>0.01</i>	<i>0.07</i>	<i>0.21</i>
By group of countries:					
Nordic	treated (n=194),	ATT	0.09	0.13	0.29
	matched controls (n=194)	<i>Std Err</i>	<i>0.03</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.44</i>
Continental	treated (n=474),	ATT	0.08	-0.10	-0.91
	matched controls (n=474)	<i>Std Err</i>	<i>0.02</i>	<i>0.11</i>	<i>0.31</i>
Mediterranean	treated (n=116),	ATT	0.12	-0.14	-0.13
	matched controls (n=116)	<i>Std Err</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.22</i>	<i>0.68</i>
East European	treated (n=340),	ATT	0.04	-0.24	0.68
	matched controls (n=340)	<i>Std Err</i>	<i>0.03</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.44</i>

In our analysis the richness of background (i.e., pre-treatment) information allowed us to adjust treatment comparisons for a large set of pre-treatment characteristics – in terms of health, life-style behaviors, socio-demographic characteristics and factors linked to the (previous) working condition – and thus the assumption of selection on observable appears to be plausible. Under this assumption, we found that the effects of retirement on health vary not only according to the context of reference, but also depending on the specific health/well-being indicator considered.

It is thus worth to investigate more in detail the mechanisms through which retirement affects the various dimensions of health and well-being. Specifically, aspects such as family types and intergenerational relationships, social relationships, embeddedness in social network, and job characteristics will be examined in our future research.

**Acknowledgements:** We thank the CREW group for early feedback on this paper (CREW=Care, Retirement and Wellbeing of Older People across Different Welfare Regimes; <https://crew-more-years-better-lives.org/>).

## References

1. Abadie A, Imbens GW. (2011). Bias-corrected matching estimators for average treatment effects. *J Bus Econ Stat.*; 29(1), 1–11.
2. Bayliss E.A., Ellis J.L., Shoup J.A., Zeng C., McQuillan D.B., Steiner, J.F. (2012). Association of patient-centered outcomes with patient-reported and icd-9-based morbidity measures. *Ann. Fam. Med.*, 10, 126-133.
3. Behncke S. (2012). Does retirement trigger ill health?, *Health Economics*, 21, 282-300
4. Blake H., and Garrouste C. (2012). Collateral effects of a pension reform in France, *Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers* 12/16, University of York
5. Bonsang E., Adam S., and Perelman S. (2012), Does retirement affect cognitive functioning?, *Journal of Health Economics*, 31, 490– 501
6. Bound J., and Waidmann T. (2007). Estimating the Health Effects of Retirement, University of Michigan Retirement Research Center working paper 2007-168
7. Carp F.M. (1967). Retirement crisis, *Science* 157, 102–103
8. Charles K. (2004). Is retirement depressing? Labor force inactivity and psychological well-being in later life, *Research in Labor Economics*, 23, 269-299
9. Coe N.B., and Zamarro G. (2011), Retirement effects on health in Europe, *Journal of Health Economics*, 30, 77-86
10. Dave D., Rashad I. and Spasojevic J. (2008). The Effects of Retirement on Physical and Mental Health Outcomes, *Southern Economic Journal*, 75, 2, 497-523
11. Egidi V., Spizzichino D. (2006). Perceived health and mortality: a multidimensional analysis of ECHP Italian Data. *Genus* LXII (3e4), 135e154
12. Eibich P. (2015). Understanding the effect of retirement on health: Mechanisms and Heterogeneity, *J. Health Econ.*, 43, 1–12
13. Hyde M., Wiggins R.D., Higgs P., & Blane D.B. (2003). A measure of quality of life in early old age: the theory, development and properties of a needs satisfaction model (CASP-19). *Aging & mental health*, 7(3), 186-194.
14. Idler L.E., Benyamini Y. (1997). Self- rated health and mortality: a review of 27 community studies. *J. Health Soc. Behav.*, 38, 21-37.
15. Imbens GW, Rubin DB (2015). *Causal inference for statistics, social, and biomedical sciences: an introduction*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.
16. Insler M. (2014). The Health Consequences of Retirement, *The Journal of Human Resources*, 49, 1
17. Latif E. (2013). The impact of retirement on mental health in Canada, *Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics*, 16(1), 35-46.
18. MacBride A. (1976). Retirement as a life crisis: myth or reality? *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal* 72, 547–556
19. Mazzonna F. and Peracchi F. (2014). Unhealthy Retirement?, *EIEF Working Paper* 14/09
20. Mehrbrodt T., Gruber S. & Wagner S. (2017). Scales and Multi-Item Indicators. Share Manuals, retrieved on [www.share-project.org/fileadmin/pdf\\_documentation/SHARE\\_Scales\\_and\\_Multi-Item\\_Indicators.pdf](http://www.share-project.org/fileadmin/pdf_documentation/SHARE_Scales_and_Multi-Item_Indicators.pdf)
21. Neuman K. (2008). Quit Your Job and Get Healthier? The Effect of Retirement on Health, *Journal of Labor Research*, 29, 177-201
22. Prince M.J., Reischies F., Beekman A.T., et al.(1999). Development of the EURO-D scale-a European, Union initiative to compare symptoms of depression in 14 European centres. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 174, 330–8.
23. Rosenbaum P.R, Rubin D.B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1), 41–55.
24. Rubin DB. (1980). Discussion of “Randomization analysis of experimental data in the Fisher randomization test”, by Basu, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 75, 591–593.
25. Sahlgren G. (2012), Work ‘til you drop: Short- and longer-term health effects of retirement in Europe, *IFN Working Paper* n. 928
26. Wiggins R.D., Netuveli G., Hyde M., Higgs P., Blane D. (2008). The Evaluation of a Self-enumerated Scale of Quality of Life (CASP-19) in the Context of Research on Ageing: A Combination of Exploratory and Confirmatory Approaches. *Social Indicators Research*, 89, 61–77.