

German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS): Methodology and Data Manual of the Baseline Survey (Wave 1)

Ette, Andreas; Décieux, Jean Philippe; Erlinghagen, Marcel; Genoni, Andreas; Auditor, Jean Guedes; Knirsch, Frederik; Kühne, Simon; Mörchen, Luisa; Sand, Matthias; Schneider, Norbert F.; Witte, Nils

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Forschungsbericht / research report

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Ette, A., Décieux, J. P., Erlinghagen, M., Genoni, A., Auditor, J. G., Knirsch, F., ... Witte, N. (2020). *German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS): Methodology and Data Manual of the Baseline Survey (Wave 1)*. (BiB Daten- und Methodenbericht, 1-2020). Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung (BIB). <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bib-dmb-2020-010>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-SA Lizenz (Namensnennung-Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-SA Licence (Attribution-ShareAlike). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>



BiB Daten- und Methodenberichte 1/2020

German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS): Methodology and Data Manual of the Baseline Survey (Wave 1)

Andreas Ette, Jean Philippe Décieux, Marcel Erlinghagen, Andreas Genoni, Jean Guedes Auditor, Frederik Knirsch, Simon Kühne, Luisa Mörchen, Matthias Sand, Norbert F. Schneider, Nils Witte



The series BiB Daten- und Methodenberichte contains data set descriptions and technical reports on population surveys carried out by the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB). The series is primarily aimed at external researchers interested in the data of the BiB as well as in secondary analyses of these data. The reports include detailed descriptions of data sets and document methodological aspects of data collection. The data and technical reports are written in English or German and are published only electronically at irregular intervals.

Recommended citation:

Ette, Andreas; Décieux, Jean Philippe; Erlinghagen, Marcel; Genoni, Andreas; Guedes Auditor, Jean; Knirsch, Frederik; Kühne, Simon; Mörchen, Luisa; Sand, Matthias; Schneider, Norbert F.; Witte, Nils (2020): German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS): Methodology and Data Manual of the Baseline Survey (Wave 1). BiB Daten- und Methodenberichte 1/2020. Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung.

Published by:

Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB)
Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4
D-65185 Wiesbaden
Germany
Telephone: +49 611 75 2235
Fax: +49 611 75 3960
E-mail: post@bib.bund.de
De-Mail: kontakt@bib-bund.de-mail.de

Editor: Andreas Ette
Layout: Sybille Steinmetz

ISSN: 2196-9582
Urn: [urn:nbn:de:biB-dmb-2020-010](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:biB-dmb-2020-010)

All Data and Technical Reports are available online at:
<http://www.bib-demografie.de/methodenberichte>

© Ette, Andreas; Décieux, Jean Philippe; Erlinghagen, Marcel; Genoni, Andreas; Guedes Auditor, Jean; Knirsch, Frederik; Kühne, Simon; Mörchen, Luisa; Sand, Matthias; Schneider, Norbert F.; Witte, Nils 2020

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>



German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS): Methodology and Data Manual of the Baseline Survey (Wave 1)

Abstract

International migration between economically highly developed countries is a central component of global migration flows. Still, surprisingly little is known about the international mobility of the populations of these affluent societies. The aim of the German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS) is to collect data to analyse the individual consequences of international migration as well as the consequences for the country of origin. GERPS is based on an origin-based multistage probability sample using the German population registers as a sampling frame. The realised net sample includes more than 11,000 persons who recently moved abroad from Germany and persons returning to Germany after having lived abroad. The study follows a multi-destination country design and allows comparative analyses of migrants and non-migrants who stayed in the country of origin. GERPS is a panel study with at least four waves during a period of at least 24 months. This documentation, however, presents the methodology and the data for the first wave providing the baseline survey. Detailed information is provided to invite external researchers to apply the new data infrastructure to their own research and to disseminate the innovative research design to construct migrant samples.

Authors

Andreas Ette, Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4,
D-65185 Wiesbaden, Germany, Tel.: +49 611 75 4360,
E-mail: andreas.ette@bib.bund.de

Jean Philippe Décieux, Institut für Soziologie, Fakultät für Gesellschaftswissenschaften,
Universität Duisburg-Essen, Lotharstr. 63, D-47057 Duisburg, Tel.: +49 203 379 2575,
E-mail: jean.decieux@uni-due.de

Marcel Erlinghagen, Institut für Soziologie, Fakultät für Gesellschaftswissenschaften,
Universität Duisburg-Essen, Lotharstr. 63, D-47057 Duisburg, Tel.: +49 203 379 2733,
E-mail: marcel.erlinghagen@uni-due.de

Andreas Genoni, Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4,
D-65185 Wiesbaden, Germany, Tel.: +49 611 75 2096,
E-mail: andreas.genoni@bib.bund.de

Jean Guedes Auditor, Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4,
D-65185 Wiesbaden, Germany, Tel.: +49 611 75 3370,
E-mail: jean.guedesauditor@bib.bund.de

Frederik Knirsch, SOKO Institut GmbH, Voltmann Straße 271, D-33613 Bielefeld,
Tel.: +49 521 5242 103, E-mail: knirsch@soko-institut.de

Simon Kühne, Universität Bielefeld, Universitätsstraße 25, D-33615 Bielefeld,
Tel.: +49 521 106 4681, E-mail: simon.kuehne@uni-bielefeld.de

Luisa Mörchen, Institut für Soziologie, Fakultät für Gesellschaftswissenschaften,
Universität Duisburg-Essen, Lotharstr. 63, D-47057 Duisburg

Matthias Sand, GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, B2,1,
68159 Mannheim, Tel.: +49 621 1246 201, E-mail: matthias.sand@gesis.org

Norbert F. Schneider, Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4,
D-65185 Wiesbaden, Germany, Tel.: +49 611 75 2577,
E-mail: norbert.schneider@bib.bund.de

Nils Witte, Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4,
D-65185 Wiesbaden, Germany, Tel.: +49 611 75 3115, E-mail: nils.witte@bib.bund.de

Table of contents

List of figures and tables.....	9
List of abbreviations	13
1 Introduction.....	15
2 Research design and sampling procedure.....	17
2.1 Pitfalls of existing strategies to study internationally mobile populations	17
2.2 Research design to study individual consequences of international migration	19
2.3 Identification of migrants in the public register	22
2.4 Sampling procedure	24
2.4.1 Selection of municipalities	25
2.4.2 Data cleaning procedures of register data.....	26
2.4.3 Clustered sampling of individuals.....	28
3 Questionnaire development.....	30
3.1 Structure of the questionnaires.....	30
3.2 Comparing internationally mobile and non-mobile populations	32
3.2.1 SOEP-related study: Enhancing the comparability with the non-mobile population	32
3.2.2 Additional surveys as frames for questions and bases for comparisons.....	32
3.3 Recording paradata, panel consent and address information	33
4 Pretest.....	34
4.1 Technical and cognitive pretests.....	34
4.2 Set-up of pretest panel	35
4.2.1 Sampling and recruitment process	35
4.2.2 Interview duration.....	35
4.2.3 Response rates	35
4.2.4 Consent to pretest panel participation and the collection of address information	36
4.2.5 Maintenance of the pretest panel	37
5 Survey mode and survey implementation	38
5.1 Survey modes and mixed-mode approaches.....	38
5.1.1 Mixed-mode: Offline contact and online response	38
5.1.2 Testing sequential and concurrent mixed-mode designs.....	39
5.2 Survey implementation.....	40
5.2.1 Invitation and reminder letters.....	40
5.2.2 Questionnaire design and technical infrastructure.....	42

5.2.3	Data protection and respondent information	45
5.2.4	Incentives	46
5.3	Field process	49
5.4	Interview duration.....	50
5.5	Processing incentives in an international context	51
5.6	Participant requests.....	54
6	Response rates and unit nonresponse	56
6.1	Components of unit nonresponse	56
6.2	Response rates	58
6.3	Correlates of unit nonresponse and available data sources	60
6.3.1	Effects of personal and regional factors on unit nonresponse	64
6.3.2	Effects of survey-related factors on unit nonresponse	66
7	Survey completion and item nonresponse	68
7.1	Missing data conventions	68
7.2	Prevalence of item nonresponse	69
7.3	Correlates of item nonresponse	70
7.3.1	Effects of respondent-related factors on item nonresponse.....	71
7.3.2	Effects of survey-related factors on item nonresponse	73
8	Conditions for future panel participation	75
8.1	Consent to panel participation.....	75
8.2	Correlates of panel consent	75
8.2.1	Effects of respondent-related factors on consent to panel participation	76
8.2.2	Effect of survey-related factors on consent to panel participation	77
8.3	Collecting address information	78
8.4	Panel maintenance	79
9	Data processing and variable generation	80
9.1	Plausibility checks during the survey	80
9.2	Plausibility checks after the survey	81
9.3	Open-ended questions	82
10	Generated variables.....	83
10.1	Design information	84
10.2	Migration background.....	84
10.3	Family status, partnership, and typology of household	85
10.4	Wages and salary.....	92
10.5	Employment status	94
10.6	Occupational classification.....	96
10.7	Education	99

11	Preparation of a scientific use file	102
11.1	Basic concepts and principles	103
11.2	General processes of anonymisation	104
11.3	Non-perturbative masking of information.....	104
12	Generation of weights and data quality.....	106
12.1	Weighting to adjust selection probabilities and unit nonresponse	106
12.2	Comparing the GERPS sample to data from official statistics.....	108
13	Summary	112
14	Bibliography	115
15	Appendix	129
15.1	Invitation and reminder letters.....	129
15.2	Data protection information	137
15.3	Panel maintenance mailings.....	139
15.4	Original variables not included in the SUF due to anonymization	141
15.5	Emigrant questionnaire and codebook	142
15.6	Remigrant questionnaire and codebook	241
15.7	PAPI questionnaire	340

List of figures and tables

Figures

Figure 2-1:	Schematic representation of the GERPS research design.....	20
Figure 2-2:	Sampling process	26
Figure 5-1:	Survey landing page.....	43
Figure 5-2:	Example of the responsive questionnaire design	44
Figure 5-3:	Development of interviews in the emigrant sample	50
Figure 5-4:	Development of interviews in the remigrant sample	50
Figure 5-5:	Development of participant requests	54

Tables

Table 1-1:	German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS): A brief overview	16
Table 2-1:	Results of register data cleaning procedures and sampling of individuals	28
Table 3-1:	Thematic structure of the questionnaires	31
Table 4-1:	Response rates by pretest sample.....	36
Table 4-2:	Availability of panel consent by pretest sample	36
Table 4-3:	Availability of address information by pretest sample	37
Table 4-4:	Delivery protocol of panel maintenance mailing.....	37
Table 5-1:	Chronology of field work by sample and contact option.....	41
Table 5-2:	Gross sample size of incentive schemes by sample and contact option.....	47
Table 5-3:	Interview duration by questionnaire.....	51
Table 5-4:	Type of contact details provided by respondents for receiving incentives	51
Table 5-5:	Respondents selection of Amazon vouchers for nationally localised stores.....	52
Table 5-6:	Donations to charity organisations.....	53
Table 6-1:	Components of unit nonresponse and response rates by sample and contact option.....	57
Table 6-2:	Differentiated response rates in GERPS and overall response rates of other probability-based European online surveys.....	59
Table 6-3:	Overview of independent variables in unit nonresponse analyses by sample.....	62
Table 6-4:	Average marginal effects (AMEs) on unit response (=1) based on separate multiple logistic regressions by sample....	65
Table 6-5:	Response rates by survey mode	66
Table 6-6:	Response rates (RR1) in percentage by incentive scheme, sample and contact option.....	67

Table 7-1:	Survey completion rates by migration status.....	70
Table 7-2:	Overview of independent variables in item nonresponse analyses by data source and migration status.....	71
Table 7-3:	Respondent-related factors as determinants of overall item nonresponse in completed interviews (measured by the percentage of individual item non-response (Pinr)) by migration status (OLS regressions).....	72
Table 7-4:	Survey-related factors as determinants of item nonresponse in completed interviews (measured by the percentage of individual item non-response (Pinr)) by migration status (OLS regressions).....	74
Table 8-1:	Panel consent rates by migration status.....	75
Table 8-2:	Overview of independent variables in the analyses of panel consent by data source and migration status	76
Table 8-3:	Respondent-related factors as determinants of panel consent by migration status (multiple logistic regression, AMEs)	77
Table 8-4:	Survey-related factors as determinants of panel consent by migration status (multiple logistic regression, AMEs)	78
Table 8-5:	Availability of panel consent and address information by migration status.....	79
Table 8-6:	Delivery protocol of the panel maintenance mailing following the baseline survey.....	79
Table 9-1:	Plausibility checks during the survey by emigrant and remigrant questionnaire.....	81
Table 10-1:	Born in Germany	85
Table 10-2:	Migration background.....	85
Table 10-3:	Partner indicator	86
Table 10-4:	Age of partner	87
Table 10-5:	Marital status.....	87
Table 10-6:	Change in partner status	88
Table 10-7:	Household typology (2 digits)	89
Table 10-8:	Household typology (1 digit)	90
Table 10-9:	GERPS household typology (1 digit)	91
Table 10-10:	Number of children in household (by age group).....	91
Table 10-11:	Age of youngest child in household	92
Table 10-12:	Change in household composition.....	92
Table 10-13:	Gross labour income (in euros)	93
Table 10-14:	Net labour income (in euros).....	93
Table 10-15:	Current net labour income 2 (in euros) (incl. income imputation).....	94
Table 10-16:	Flag for imputation of current net labour income 2	94
Table 10-17:	Main activity	95
Table 10-18:	Partner's current main activity.....	95
Table 10-19:	Current working hours/week.....	96
Table 10-20:	Current working hour arrangements	96

Table 10-21:	International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO08)	97
Table 10-22:	Classification of Occupations (KIDB2010)	98
Table 10-23:	International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (ISEI08)	98
Table 10-24:	Standard Index of Occupational Prestige Scala (SIOPS88)	99
Table 10-25:	ISCED 2011 classification	99
Table 10-26:	CASMIN classification	100
Table 10-27:	School-leaving degree.....	101
Table 10-28:	Highest attained vocational or university degree.....	101
Table 10-29:	Highest received vocational or university degree of current partner	102
Table 11-1	Recoding of categories of residential status	105
Table 12-1:	Distribution of sex in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent	109
Table 12-2:	Distribution of age in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent	109
Table 12-3:	Distribution of the region of destination of emigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent.....	110
Table 12-4:	Distribution of the region of origin of remigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent	110
Table 12-5:	Distribution of the timing of the migration event of emigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent ...	111
Table 12-6:	Distribution of the timing of the migration event of remigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent ..	112

List of abbreviations

AAPOR	American Association for Public Opinion Research
ADM	Working Group of German Market and Social Research Institutes
ALLBUS	German General Social Survey
ALWA	Working and Learning in a Changing World
AME	Average Marginal Effect
BA	German Federal Labour Office
BDSG	Federal Data Protection Act
BIB	Federal Institute for Population Research
BMG	Federal Act on Registration
CAPI	Computer-assisted Personal Interview
CASI	Computer-assisted Self-interviewing
CASMIN	Comparative Analysis of Social Mobility in Industrial Nations
CAWI	Computer-assisted Web Interviewing
DAAD	German Academic Exchange Service
Destatis	Federal Statistical Office
DFG	German Research Foundation
DIW	German Institute of Economic Research
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
ELIPSS	Étude Longitudinale par Internet Pour les Sciences Sociales
ESS	European Social Survey
EULFS	European Union Labour Force Survey
EU	European Union
EVS	European Value Study
F2F	Face-to-Face Interviewing
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union
GERPS	German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study
GESIS	German Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences
GIP	German Internet Panel
HH	Household
ILO	International Labour Office
INFAS	Institute of Applied Social Sciences
INS	Incentive Scheme
ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
ISCO	International Standard Classification of Occupations
ISEI	International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status
KLDB	German Classification of Occupations

LISS	Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences
MSF	Médecins sans Frontières
NABU	Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union
NEPS	National Educational Panel Study
NLSY97	National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAPI	Paper and Pencil Interviewing
PSID	Panel Study of Income Dynamics
RR	Response rate (Formulas according to AAPOR)
SHARE	Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe
SIOPS	Standard Index of Occupational Prestige Scala
SOEP	Socio-Economic Panel
TOP	Transitions and Old Age Potentials
UDE	University of Duisburg-Essen
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
SOKO	Institute for Social Research and Communication
SUF	Scientific Use File

1 Introduction

International migration between economically highly developed countries accounts for a considerable proportion of global migration flows. So far, however, scholars have mainly investigated migration flows from less to more developed countries. Surprisingly little is known about the international mobility of the populations originating from precisely these affluent countries. Alongside a geographical broadening of migration studies, there is a necessity for a theoretical broadening. Whereas migration scholars traditionally concentrate on consequences of migration flows for receiving societies, the individual consequences of migration from the perspective of origin countries and over the life course of migrants are rarely investigated. Several spheres of migrants' lives are likely to change with international movement: Working life and economic living conditions, partnership and family life, health and well-being, and social participation and relationships. However, adequate research designs that address these two – geographical and theoretical – omissions in migration research are the exception in contemporary studies on international migration. The German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS) aims to address both research gaps. It is a project funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) and carried out by the Federal Institute for Population Research and the University of Duisburg-Essen.

GERPS contributes to the geographical broadening of migration studies by providing information about more than 11,000 international migrants who originate from Germany, a highly developed country. The main pillars of GERPS' research design were extensively tested in a complex pilot study (Etté et al. 2015). The study is based on two probability samples drawn from the German population registers (*origin-based sampling design*). The survey follows a *push-to-web design* and aims to recruit German citizens who recently emigrated from Germany in their countries of destination (emigrants) as well as to recruit German citizens who recently returned from a previous stay abroad in Germany (remigrants).

GERPS additionally contributes to the theoretical broadening of migration studies by three further characteristics of its research design. All three of them enable the analysis of the individual consequences of international migration. The first characteristic concerns temporal comparisons of individual lives before migration, with the situation after migration, and throughout the migration process. This *longitudinal design* includes the collection of comprehensive retrospective biographical data as well as its panel character with at least four measurement points during a period of two years. The second characteristic is its *both-way design* surveying recent emigrants from Germany as well as remigrants who recently returned to Germany in a comparative setting. The third characteristic is the *multi-sited design*. The simultaneous collection of data in several countries enables comparative analyses between migrants in various destinations. In addition, they can be compared to the reference population of German non-migrants. Comparative data on non-migrants is not collected within the GERPS study itself but is provided by the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) as the most durable representative panel study about the population in Germany (cf. Giesselmann et al. 2019; Goebel et al. 2019; Wagner, Frick, Schupp 2007). As GERPS is realised as a "SOEP-related study," the questionnaires for interviewing emigrating and remigrating German migrants are consequently designed so that they can be easily harmonised with SOEP data to support the analysis of individual consequences of international migration. Table 1-1 presents central methodological characteristics of GERPS.

Table 1-1: German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS): A brief overview

Purpose	Individual consequences of international migration for the life course of citizens from economically highly developed countries
Project start	2018
Initiator	Federal Institute for Population Research (BIB), University Duisburg-Essen
Sponsor	German Research Foundation (DFG), Federal Institute for Population Research (BIB)
Survey data collector	Institute for Social Research and Communication (SOKO), Bielefeld
Target populations	International adult migrants with German citizenship who (1) either recently moved abroad from Germany (emigrants) or (2) recently returned to Germany after previously living abroad (remigrants)
Sampling frames	Information from Germany's population register about migration events of German citizens, 20-70 years old, who either moved abroad from Germany, or returned from abroad between July 2017 and June 2018
Sampling design	Multistage stratified probability sample. First stage: Sampling of 81 municipalities proportional to their total number of emigrants and remigrants in previous years. Second stage: Sampling of two separate samples for emigrants and remigrants; one individual per household.
Sample size	11,010 complete interviews. 4,545 interviews with persons living abroad (emigrants) and 6,465 interviews with persons who recently returned to Germany (remigrants)
Use of interviewer	None. Interviewers are only used for panel maintenance (e.g. updating address information)
Mode of administration	Computer-assisted web interview (CAWI); additional mixed-mode studies using paper-and-pencil interviews (PAPI) in subsamples
Level of observation	Person
Time dimension	During a period of 24 months, eligible sample members are invited to participate in four waves. This report presents only information about the baseline study (first wave). Fieldwork of first wave lasted from 7 November 2018 until 11 February 2019.
Web link	https://www.gerps-project.de

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1; adapted from (Groves et al. 2004).

This report documents the methodological approach of the first wave of GERPS and is structured as follows. Chapter 2 discusses the research design for studying individual consequences of internationally mobile persons and the probability sampling procedure. The structure of the questionnaires and corresponding data about the non-mobile population in Germany is presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 discusses the questionnaire pretests before survey mode and implementation are presented in Chapter 5. Chapters 6 and 7 address various dimensions of data quality issues. While

Chapter 6 deals with unit nonresponse, Chapter 7 presents analyses of survey completion and item nonresponse. The preconditions for the panel study, including consent on panel participation and the collection of address information, are discussed in Chapter 8. The remaining chapters provide information on data processing procedures (Chapter 9) and on the development of generated variables (Chapter 10). The preparation of the scientific use file (SUF) is presented in Chapter 11. Chapter 12 presents the generation of design and nonresponse weights before the data quality of the GERPS samples is assessed against the background of official migration statistics. The conclusion in Chapter 13 summarises and discusses the main findings of GERPS' first wave with regard to its potential as a new and unique data source for studying international migration of individuals from highly developed countries and the consequences of migration across the life course.

2 Research design and sampling procedure

Internationally mobile individuals constitute a typical example of a “rare” (Lavrakas 2008) and “hard to reach” (Kalton, Anderson 1986) population. Immigrants living in specific countries of destination constitute a comparatively small population. Once the population is confined to those who migrated in the previous year, we deal with a rare population because only a fraction of the overall population of a country is internationally mobile and leaves the country of birth per year. Additionally, internationally mobile individuals constitute a hard to reach population almost by definition. They are a highly dispersed population potentially living in several destination countries, which makes them difficult to track through conventional sampling procedures.

Against the background of these challenges when sampling internationally mobile individuals, the following chapter first discusses previous attempts to study this population. Then it presents a research design, which provides the opportunity to study the individual consequences of international migration across migrants' life courses. Finally, we present a new procedure of sampling migrants in their countries of origin instead of their countries of destination.

2.1 Pitfalls of existing strategies to study internationally mobile populations

National population censuses, national household surveys, and national labour force surveys are the most common data sources for studying international migration (Bilsborrow et al. 1997; Font, Méndez 2013). Although these data sources collect valuable information, the data they provide generally refer to the resident population only, including immigrants. Internationally mobile populations, including emigrants living abroad and remigrants who returned from abroad, rarely appear in national survey data. There are various reasons why emigrants and remigrants are absent from these data sources: Although remigrants are part of the resident population and consequently appear in such data sources, these data sources regularly fail to capture the fact that some people have previously lived abroad. The absence of emigrants from national survey data is a consequence – by definition – of not being part of the resident population that usually constitutes the sample frame of national surveys.

In order to overcome these difficulties, recent studies have strived to set up data sources to study internationally mobile populations. Focusing on emigration in particular, they share a common approach by compiling data on immigration for major destination countries to get an understanding of the overall emigrant population of specific

countries of origin. These specific compilations are based on administrative or census data (e.g. Beine, Docquier, Rapoport 2006; OECD 2015). In addition, researchers have taken a similar approach based on major national surveys such as the European Social Survey (ESS) or the European Union Labour Force Survey (EULFS) to get a better understanding of emigrant populations (e.g. Erlinghagen 2012; Ette, Sauer 2010). One advantage of the compiled information is that it enables researchers to analyse emigrants' socio-economic background and – using EULFS or ESS data – their living conditions in the destination country as well. That approach still has major shortcomings. Information about the situation of emigrants before they left their country of origin is completely missing and information about the migration process itself is limited. This inhibits the investigation of causes and consequences of migration (Groenewold, Bilsborrow 2008). Moreover, the observed emigrants in such major national surveys are highly selective because they only cover emigrants who still stay abroad but cannot – by definition – account for emigrants who previously left the country again. Therefore, analyses relying on this information are in danger of selectivity bias. These shortcomings also apply to remigrants: Some national labour force surveys include questions about the place of residence twelve months before, which allows the identification of internationally mobile persons returning to their country of origin (Martí, Ródenas 2007). However, the problems of missing information about the situation of remigrants before they returned to their country of origin and the limited information about the migration process itself remain. These problems reduce the potential of national population censuses and national surveys to study the causes and consequences of migration.

The problem of selectivity as well as the problem of missing information about the situation before migration and the migration process itself do not exist in more specific new immigrant surveys that are now being conducted in many major destination countries (e.g. Diehl et al. 2015; Jasso et al. 2000; Prandner, Weichbold 2019; Reher, Requena 2009). Theoretically, the compilation approach discussed above could be applied to those new immigrant surveys as well. Practically speaking, these data collection initiatives are hardly comparable and allow only very restrictive pooling of data from different surveys. A final limitation of new immigrant surveys concerns migrants from economically highly developed countries. Most new immigrant surveys concentrate on immigrant groups from major countries of destination instead of sampling immigrants proportional to the size of their origin group. Immigration from economically highly developed countries, like Germany, is therefore regularly excluded from these otherwise rich data sources.

Researchers have used several strategies for obtaining more information on the internationally mobile population from developed countries. A first set of strategies draws on survey data collected in the countries of origin of potential emigrants. These studies either analyse emigration and its underlying determinants by focusing on migration intentions (e.g. Cai et al. 2014; van Dalen, Henkens 2007), or they make use of retrospective questions to obtain information on temporary stays abroad after migrants have returned to their country of origin (e.g. Gerhards, Hans 2013; Kratz, Netz 2018). Data about intended behaviour are, however, only weak proxies of actual emigration behaviour and of actual emigration motives. Data gathered through retrospective questions referring to events regularly dating back many years generally suffer from problems of reliability and they exclude permanent emigrants altogether (cf. Kalter 1997; Lugtig, Glasner, Boevé 2016; Smith, Thomas 2003).

A second set of strategies aimed to sample the emigrating population directly but were regularly confronted with serious data quality issues. For example, surveys that focused on specific subgroups of emigrants such as students or academics working abroad generally suffer from highly selective sample frames (e.g. van Mol 2014). Emigrant surveys in selected destination countries have resulted in better sampling frames, at

least for countries with appropriate population registers. Yet, the data produced by such strategies appear to be highly selective as well, because most of the participating emigrants had been living in their respective country of destination for many years. Furthermore, temporary and return migrants – who have become more common regarding migration between developed countries – were not adequately taken into account by such strategies (e.g. Recchi, Favell 2009). So far, the most ambitious strategy that has been developed from a methodological perspective tracked participants of large-scale national panel surveys after they moved abroad (Schupp et al. 2008). However, this resulted in unsatisfactory response rates, making originally planned analyses impossible and calling into question this otherwise appealing research strategy.

2.2 Research design to study individual consequences of international migration


The strategy developed in GERPS constitutes an immediate response to the shortcomings of other research designs that aim to investigate individual consequences of international migration. It relies on an innovative and relatively new “origin-based sampling” (Ghimire et al. 2019: p. 4; see also Hugo 2014) approach to provide longitudinal survey data about the internationally migrating population between economically highly developed countries. The approach turns usual procedures to set up samples of international migrants upside down: Whereas international migrants are traditionally sampled in their countries of destination, this new approach samples the internationally mobile population in their respective countries of origin (Beauchemin, González-Ferrer 2011; Ghimire et al. 2019; Massey, Espinosa 1997; Parrado, McQuiston, Flippen 2005; Teruel, Rubalcava, Arenas 2012).

In order to apply the origin-based sampling approach for the German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study, internationally mobile German citizens had to be recruited for participation in a population survey. With respect to remigrants, all individuals in Germany are legally obliged to indicate every change of their address to their local registration offices. If an individual moves from abroad to Germany, this information is stored together with information about the country where the migrant lived previously. This information together with the information about citizenship is available to identify German remigrants. With respect to emigrants, the principal idea of GERPS was to make use of a reform concerning Germany’s population registers (Süßmuth 2016). Previously, the population register documented emigrants’ countries of destination without specific addresses that would allow for contacting individuals abroad. Ever since that reform, registers now enable the identification of German emigrants and provide emigrants the opportunity to leave behind their new postal address in their designated country of destination. It is not obligatory for emigrants to provide their future address abroad, but there are high incentives to do so. For example, it provides them the opportunity to receive invitations to take part in elections in Germany as well as information about other administrative and welfare state-related processes. The availability and quality of emigrants’ postal addresses in the respective destination country was already assessed in a comprehensive pilot study, successfully demonstrating its principal applicability for sampling purposes (Ette et al. 2015). Besides this recent address abroad, the population register provides information about the former address in Germany. This address is available for all German emigrants who did not provide the registers with information about their recent address abroad. It can be used as an alternative contact option because a substantial number of emigrants are expected to arrange some mechanism to receive postal items and correspondence either by established forwarding orders offered by the *Deutsche Post*, other courier companies, or by personal

contacts with former household members or neighbours still living at the former address in Germany.

Figure 2-1 presents an overview of the research design and its application of the origin-based sampling approach. GERPS focuses on recent migration of German citizens for whom the register indicates that they emigrated or remigrated in the past twelve months before the sampling took place (“ t_0 ” in Figure 2-1). Based on the postal addresses provided by the registers, potential survey participants were invited offline using postal letters to participate online in the first wave of GERPS (“ t_1 ” in Figure 2-1). While German emigrants were contacted at their recent addresses abroad, German remigrants – returning to Germany from abroad – were contacted at their recent addresses in Germany. Within the framework of GERPS, no sample of the internationally non-mobile population in Germany was drawn. Instead, the survey instruments used by GERPS were developed closely in line with the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). Consequently, GERPS data can be harmonised easily with SOEP data, which provides detailed information on the non-mobile German population. A further research design element of GERPS is its longitudinal approach. Within the panel framework of GERPS, participants are interviewed several times over a predefined period. Only repeated measurement of central variables in a comparatively short time interval allows for investigating the dynamics of international migration processes, as well as their individual causes and consequences. A minimum of three follow-up surveys will be realised after the first wave (“ t_{1+x} ” in Figure 2-1). The conceptualisation of GERPS as a panel survey makes it possible to capture further movements and thereby potential multiple migrations of participants. Examples include remigrants in Germany who emigrate again, or emigrants who decide to move on to another destination country, or back to Germany (survey documentation of the follow-up waves 2, 3, and 4 will be published separately).

Figure 2-1: Schematic representation of the GERPS research design



Source: Authors' representation

Compared to traditional samples of international migrants, the GERPS research design has four major advantages for comparative and longitudinal analyses about the individual consequences of international migration:

1. **Comparative analysis of migrants and non-migrants in the origin country:** Traditional samples of international migrants are regularly used to analyse group-level structural integration outcomes of immigrants in comparison to natives of the destination country. For an analysis of the individual causes and consequences of migration, the destination society is not the only appropriate comparison group. Instead, migration-related consequences have to be studied in comparison to non-migrants in the country of origin. It is only more recently that transnational approaches have suggested the study of migration in both the origin and destination countries. On the one hand, there are multi-sited research designs that sometimes include a direct link between the samples from origin and destination countries (Amelina, Faist 2012; Guveli et al. 2016; cf. Mazzucato 2008) and are mainly developed to investigate specific migrant networks connected across national boundaries (e.g. Massey 1987; Parrado, McQuiston, Flippen 2005; Teruel, Rubalcava, Arenas 2012). On the other hand, there are unmatched samples, like GERPS, which compare migrants in destination countries with the non-mobile population in their respective countries of origin. In such studies, data on non-migrants is either sampled directly or data about the migrant sample in the country of destination is pooled with existing data on non-migrants (e.g. Groenewold, Bilsborrow 2008; Guarnizo, Portes, Haller 2003). The GERPS research design provides the opportunity to compare individuals who left their country of origin with those who did not in order to shed light on the causal relationship between international migration and social mobility or other individual-level consequences for migrants' life course.
2. **Comparative analysis of multiple destination countries:** The traditional approach to sampling migrants focuses on countries of destination and studies immigrant populations. A downside of this approach is that a survey in one destination country naturally only captures those emigrants who live in that particular country. Although international migration constitutes a highly structured process with distinct migration systems between a relatively small number of origin and destination countries, individuals migrate to countries all over the world. Consequently, focusing on emigrants in one destination country ignores the possibility that migration motives and selection mechanisms might differ between destination countries of emigrants from the same country of origin. Furthermore, potentially different paths of structural integration – responding to different opportunity structures offered by different countries of destination – are hardly studied within migrant samples concentrating only on one destination country (Ghimire et al. 2019; Groenewold, Bilsborrow 2008). The GERPS research design turns this traditional approach of migration research upside down: Instead of investigating immigrants from a variety of countries of origin in a single destination country, it focuses on interviewing persons from a single country of origin in a variety of destination countries and provides the opportunity for comparative analyses between multiple destination countries.
3. **Comparative analysis of emigrants and remigrants:** Migrant samples drawn in the traditional way in countries of destination are regularly biased because they do not capture the selective migration of individuals returning home (Rallu 2008). Although the principal need to survey both pathways of migration – emigration and remigration – was been acknowledged long ago, it is only more recently that emigration and remigration have been considered in large-scale migration surveys (e.g. Groenewold, Bilsborrow 2008). Both-ways migration samples avoid bias. In addition to the methodological advantages, there are also theoretical reasons to include return migrants in migrant samples. On the one hand, it provides the opportunity to understand migration processes from both ends, namely regarding the time before and after emigration, and before and after remigration. On the other hand, research on remigration provides information on the individual adjustment

processes after some time spend abroad to better understand the individual consequences of international migration (Fawcett, Arnold 1987).

4. **Longitudinal analysis of the individual consequences of migration across the life course:** International migration is an event that can have far-reaching consequences for various dimensions in individuals' lives, leading to diverse adjustment processes in countries of destination and after return. Understanding individual consequences of migration calls for a longitudinal research design since this is the only way to identify causal relationships between different variables. The GERPS research design with its repeated measurement of central variables within a comparatively short time interval allows us to understand and explain the dynamics of international migration processes and their consequences. An additional advantage of GERPS is its focus on a cohort of emigrants and remigrants whose migration took place within the same period. Many studies in migration research are confronted with methodological problems resulting from the different lengths of stay of immigrants in the destination country and from selective remigration. The experiences of a person who moved abroad only a few months ago and plans to return soon differ greatly to the experiences of a person who has been living in the destination country for several years with the intention to stay. Confronted with this problem, GERPS follows the experiences of some of the new immigrant surveys and accounts for heterogeneity in migrant experiences by concentrating on specific immigrant generations who arrived during the past few years only (e.g. Diehl et al. 2015).

2.3 Identification of migrants in the public register

In most countries, high-quality population surveys make regular use of population registers to draw random samples. Using population registers is particularly established if researchers aim at identifying rare populations such as different migrant groups (Bilsborrow et al. 1997). In Germany, residents are legally required to register their current postal address at their local resident registration office and update this information within two weeks in case of a change in address. With respect to international migration events, population registers record whether persons moved to Germany from a foreign country. Similarly, in case of migration from Germany to another country, the population register adds the information "move from Germany to a foreign country" (Statistisches Bundesamt 2006). Most concretely, the following information is recorded by the population registers and allows for identifying and sampling migrants (Section 34, Federal Act on Registration, see also Lederer 2004: p. 52 ff.):

- Surname and family name;
- current and previous address;
- address abroad, including country (only persons who moved abroad);
- previous country of residence (only persons who returned from abroad);
- date moved in or date moved out;
- date and place of birth, including country for persons born outside Germany;
- citizenship;
- sex.

Population registers primarily serve administrative purposes and therefore have a number of limitations that must be taken into account when they are used to sample migrant populations. These limitations are best discussed as potential coverage errors arising between the target population – the internationally migrating German population – and the population register as a sampling frame (Groves et al. 2004). A first potential

error arises because population registers document events. While person-centred statistics may identify several moves of one person, population registers principally count each change of residence as a separate case. Consequently, there is a risk of over-coverage of mobile persons if some of them have been mobile more than once during a particular period. In practice, however, this does not impede data quality because multiple migration events of the same person can be identified (see Chapter 2.4.2 for relevant data cleaning procedures). A second potential over-coverage error arises because of deregistrations “ex officio” concerning, for example, homeless persons who left their former address. Technically, these persons are registered as having left Germany and are therefore principally counted as emigrants. Regarding the sampling in GERPS, migration events caused by those official deregistrations are easily identified in the registers and will not form part of the gross sample.

More problematic than over-coverage are potential under-coverage errors. Population registers are often criticised for their failure to adequately document emigration. This criticism concerns in particular the problem of foreign immigrants who return to their countries of origin. Here, population registers seriously underestimate remigration because those migrants have few incentives to legally deregister before leaving. This is less problematic, however, if migrants hold the citizenship of their country of origin because their incentives are much higher to conform to legal obligations. For example, if households with children of school age refrained from deregistration, this would cause requests by the education authority. In cases of migrants holding the citizenship of their country of origin, emigrants have been found to be more likely to deregister upon departure (Poulain, Perrin, Singleton 2006). Nevertheless, it is highly likely that population registers still underestimate the prevalence of migration. This is particularly true for short-term stays abroad, for example of students in exchange years, short-term assignments of employers, or retired people living abroad part of the year.

Although the true size of under-coverage is unknown, several methods exist to assess the potential bias when sampling migrants based on population registers. This includes, for one, the comparison of register information about emigration in the country of origin with information on immigrants in the population registers or large-scale surveys of destination countries (e.g. Raymer et al. 2013). In addition, large-scale population surveys in the countries of origin can be used to assess rates and the demographic structure of remigrants to control for certain bias in population registers (Ette et al. 2008). Since the most recent reform of the Federal Act on Registration, assessing bias related to under-coverage is also possible by using the population register in Germany itself. The population register now assumes that a person moved abroad if he or she is no longer living at the registered address in the respective municipality and has not registered anywhere else in Germany (Carow, Mundil-Schwarz, Vigneau 2019; Statistisches Bundesamt 2019). All these persons are deregistered “ex officio” and official statistics label these persons as emigrants. Compared to the years before the reform, numbers on official emigration of German citizens therefore substantially increased. Previously, deregistered individuals who return to Germany after some time abroad are consequently reregistered as movement back to Germany from abroad. This new system of recording the failure of individual persons to correctly register is increasing the overall level of emigration of German citizens. Likewise, numbers on official remigration will increase as well, because persons deregistered “ex officio” are recorded as “returning from abroad” in case they return after some years abroad. This is exactly what official figures on the international migration of German citizens show: Whereas the numbers of emigrants deregistered “ex officio” remains relatively stable since 2016 (2018: 137,972 emigration events), the numbers of persons officially reregistered as remigrants have been increasing since 2016 (2018: 89,585 remigration events). This discussion shows that the actual number of emigrants and remigrants is obviously much higher than the number of persons correctly registering their movement to or from

abroad. Nevertheless, there are few indications that the people registering themselves compared to the ones registered “ex officio” differ fundamentally along basic demographic characteristics, supporting the decision to exclude deregistrations “ex officio” from the sample frame (see also Chapter 12.2 for a comparison between the demographic structures of persons who are deregistered “ex officio” with the overall emigrant population).

The previous discussion shows that population registers as sample frames of international migrants have their limits. Coverage error may exist because not every member of the target population is also part of the sampling frame. Under-coverage thereby poses a greater problem than over-coverage. Nevertheless, using population registers as sampling frames provides many advantages: First, population registers include key demographic characteristics (e.g. sex, age, nationality), which allow the identification of the population of interest. Second, they allow random sampling and regional stratification on local and regional levels. Third, they provide valuable information to weigh the data and correct for potential biases. Finally, population registers are more cost efficient, particularly with respect to sampling rare populations (Careja, Bevelander 2018). The advantages of population registers outweigh the existing disadvantages. It is therefore not surprising that the use of the registration system as a sample frame for high-quality population surveys in Germany has recently been labelled as a “best practice” strategy (Häder 2015: p. 10; see also Zabal 2014), particularly for surveys dealing with rare populations (Diehl 2007; Glowsky 2013). Also internationally, the most promising way forward to study and sample international migrants between economically highly developed countries appears to be the use of surveys based on appropriate population registers (e.g. Poutvaara, Munk, Junge 2009).

2.4 Sampling procedure

Recent years have seen a trend to sample rare and hard-to-reach populations using non-probability samples (Forgasz et al. 2017; Pötzschke, Braun 2016; Schneider, Harknett 2019; Thornton et al. 2016). Instead, the main objective of the sampling strategy used for GERPS was to provide probability samples of the target population. The major advantage of probability samples compared to non-probability samples is their characteristic that the probability of being in the sample is known for all elements in the population and allows us to infer from the sample to the target population. The target population of GERPS encompasses internationally mobile German citizens. More specifically, two separate samples were collected – a sample of emigrants and a sample of remigrants. Only German citizens aged between 20 and 70 years were considered for the samples.


The emigrant sample only included German citizens that deregistered in Germany between July 2017 and June 2018 as moving from Germany to a foreign country. Correspondingly, the remigrant sample only included German citizens that registered in Germany between July 2017 and June 2018 as moving from a foreign country to Germany. The sample frame is defined as the aggregation of all population registers of all municipalities within Germany. Sampling based on the population register in Germany is always a two-stage procedure, with a stepwise sampling of municipalities and individuals. This is because Germany’s population registers are decentralised and no aggregated register exists (ADM 2014; Albers 1997).

2.4.1 Selection of municipalities

In Germany, population registers are also used to provide detailed statistical information about migration events. This information is regularly published by the Federal Statistical Office (Destatis 2019) and the research data centres of official statistics provide access to this data for detailed analyses. For GERPS, we applied this data to sample municipalities using data for the year 2015, which was the most recent data available when drawing the sample in late 2017. The sampling frame was constructed based on official migration statistics, restricting the sample to 20 to 70-year-old emigrants and remigrants with German citizenship. This resulted in 105,936 deregistrations of persons moving abroad and 82,770 registrations of persons moving to Germany from abroad. For practical reasons, two additional adjustments were necessary: First, the sample frame excluded municipalities with small numbers of international German migrants (i.e. < 5 emigrants and < 5 remigrants in the year 2015) because the number of required municipalities would have otherwise increased disproportionately. Second, the municipality of Friedland was dropped from the sampling frame to exclude the immigration of ethnic Germans (*Spätaussiedler*) from the sampling frame, constituting a completely different form of international migration that is not the focus of this study. In principal, ethnic Germans cannot be identified in the registers because they are registered as German citizens. The specific immigration regime regulating the movement of ethnic Germans, however, specifies that all ethnic Germans moving to Germany be registered for the first time in the local population register of the municipality of Friedland. Omitting Friedland from the sampling frame consequently serves a good proxy particularly to exclude ethnic Germans from the remigrant sample. Altogether, these restrictions reduce the number of municipalities in the sampling frame from 11,168 to 2,142, potentially increasing sampling errors. This obvious reduction of municipalities has a much smaller effect on the overall number of migration events, reducing them from 188,706 to 156,094 or by 17.3% (for an overview of the sampling process see Figure 2-2).

Despite this restriction of the number of municipalities in the sampling frame, the distribution of emigrants and remigrants along the municipalities in Germany remains highly skewed, with a comparatively large portion originating from urban areas and a much smaller share from rural areas. In response, a stratified random sampling approach differentiating two sampling procedures was applied (Lohr 2010: p. 73 ff.). A first sampling procedure determined that the ten municipalities with the highest number of international migrants in 2015 (i.e. total number of 20 to 70-year-old emigrants and remigrants with German citizenship) are part of the sample of municipalities. Within those ten municipalities a fixed share of remigrants and emigrants are sampled based on simple random sampling (see Chapter 2.4.3). All ten municipalities provided the respective data.

Figure 2-2: Sampling process



Source: Authors' representation

A second sampling procedure consisted of the remaining municipalities of the sample frame, of which 60 municipalities were sampled in a first step. These municipalities were sampled randomly and proportional to the total number of international movements in 2015. Germany's federal states were used as strata to control for regionally proportional sampling. A balanced sampling algorithm was applied which approximates the weighted number of international movements in 2015 to the sampling frame (Tillé 2006). Additionally, for all 60 municipalities, statistical neighbours were determined for the case that individual municipalities were not able to deliver data. From a sample-theoretical point of view, statistical neighbours are similar to the actually sampled municipalities regarding the total number of international movements and their geographical location in the federal states. From the 60 municipalities, 36 population registration offices delivered complete data with information about emigrants, remigrants, and corresponding postal addresses. The other 24 municipalities that did not provide the required data were replaced with their statistical neighbour. From the list of remaining statistical neighbours, an additional sample of eleven municipalities was sampled to increase the original gross sample. Following this sampling process, the final sample contained 81 municipalities, which represent the basis for building the gross sample of German emigrants and remigrants.

2.4.2 Data cleaning procedures of register data

Register data from all 81 municipalities were consolidated into a single data set including both samples – emigrants and remigrants. Before the data were cleaned, all formats were harmonised, including a standard date format for all dates, differences between numerical and string formats, and translations of strings (spelling of countries, etc.). The subsequent data cleaning included the exclusion of ineligible cases. This included entries that were either outside the sampling frame, marked with a lock flag, died between the date of the event and the sampling date, or where basic information was missing completely.

A next data cleaning procedure included the identification and subsequent exclusion of duplets. This data cleaning procedure is specific to the sampling procedure of GERPS: In general, each person in the population register represents one unit of the target

population. Instead, the emigration and remigration samples concentrate on events during a particular time frame and the data received from the municipalities consequently describe populations of events (Groves et al. 2004: p. 82). The identification of duplets included in particular cases of multiple migration events, i.e. when the same person emigrated and remigrated during the sample period. These cases were identified through identical municipalities, names, and birth years. Although the incidence of several international movements within one year is comparatively low, the data was cleaned and, in case of several moves by the same individual, only the most recent event was retained.

A next data cleaning procedure included the identification and subsequent exclusion of duplets. This data cleaning procedure is specific to the sampling procedure of GERPS: In general, each person in the population register represents one unit of the target population. Instead, the emigration and remigration samples concentrate on events during a particular time frame and the data received from the municipalities consequently describe populations of events (Groves et al. 2004: p. 82). The identification of duplets included in particular cases of multiple migration events, i.e. when the same person emigrated and remigrated during the sample period. These cases were identified through identical municipalities, names, and birth years. Although the incidence of several international movements within one year is comparatively low, the data was cleaned and, in case of several moves by the same individual, only the most recent event was retained. Table 2 1 reports the number of cases lost at several stages of data cleaning and sampling. The 81 sampled municipalities provided us with data about 63,526 migration events. In total, we dropped 6,992 events for being ineligible cases or because of multiple migration events.

A final data cleaning procedure concerned the editing of postal addresses. The information about addresses in Germany was generally of high quality because this information is legally required and the population registers record them in a predefined format largely identical across all sampled municipalities. In the case of remigrants, the data cleaning procedure checked that all identified individuals are contacted at their *recent German addresses*. This procedure was necessary because of the sampled population of events discussed previously: Remigrants potentially moved between the date when they registered after returning from abroad and the sampling date. In the case of moves within the same municipality, the data provided by the population registers ensured that only the most recent postal address was specified. For subsequent movements into another municipality in Germany, however, municipalities tried to provide us with the current address of those individuals.

Table 2-1: Results of register data cleaning procedures and sampling of individuals

	Emigrants		Remigrants	Total
	Recent foreign address	Former German address	Recent German address	
Data on migration events provided by 81 municipalities	36,489		27,037	63,526
Cleaning				
Ineligible cases, multiple migration events	-737	-4,025	-2,230	-6,992
Sampling				
Multi-person households	-168	-1,289	-1,757	-3,214
Pretest sample	-144	-1,981	-489	-2,614
Simple random sampling in ten municipalities with most emigrants and remigrants in 2015	-	-1,872	-1,120	-2,992
Gross sample	9,446	16,827	21,441	47,714

Note: Based on data protection regulations, nine individuals requested the deletion of their data from the data set.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

In the case of emigrants, a more extensive data cleaning procedure was necessary because the indication of the address abroad is not obligatory and, in particular, because in many cases population registers did not comply with the predefined format to record international postal addresses. Consequently, a two-step procedure was developed: In a first step, an automated procedure – focusing in particular on the presence of numerical characters in the provided address information – identified 11,658 potential foreign addresses. In a second step, a manual procedure checked these potential foreign addresses and identified 1,900 foreign addresses as invalid or incomplete because they missed the indication of a street or a post-office box in combination with a municipality and a country. In case of doubt, foreign addresses were evaluated as potentially valid in order to avoid selectivity in the data cleaning procedure. Overall, 9,758 recent foreign addresses were identified that could be used for the subsequent sampling of individuals. In the case of missing or fragmentary foreign addresses, former German addresses were used as alternative contact options. This concerns the postal addresses where the individuals lived before they moved abroad. They were used with the expectation that a substantial number of emigrants had arranged some mechanism to receive postal items and correspondence either by established forwarding orders offered by the *Deutsche Post*, other courier companies, or by personal contacts with former household members or neighbours still living at the former address in Germany.

2.4.3 Clustered sampling of individuals

The final step of the sampling procedure concerns the sampling of individuals. The data cleaning procedure excluded not only ineligible cases but also all cases of multiple migration events resulting in a data set describing a population of individuals with every entry now defining one person instead of one event. Furthermore, all individuals only belong to one of the two samples – either emigrants or remigrants. Finally, the data cleaning procedure ensured that every individual would be contacted at the postal address providing the potentially highest chance of accessibility. For the remigrant sample, this implies that only the most recent postal addresses in Germany was used.

For the emigrant sample, the data cleaning procedure differentiates between two contact options: first, the recent foreign address and second, the former German address. The latter address is only used if the former is missing completely or is fragmentary.

The sampling of individuals includes three separate sampling steps (see Table 2-1). The first step concerns the selection of only one individual in each household. By definition, the register data provided by the municipalities potentially encompasses several household members if they satisfy the definition of the sample frame. In order to identify multi-person households, information about the kind of event (emigration or remigration), the event date, and all available address information were consulted. Through these criteria, 3,214 cases were dropped for living in multi-person households. Almost half of them lived in households with two individuals migrating simultaneously (48%), another half lived in households with three individuals migrating simultaneously (48%), and in the rest more than three individuals migrated together. In all cases of multi-person households, only one person was randomly sampled from each household. Although the population register in Germany principally includes information about the household structure, this information can only be used for sampling procedures executed by the municipalities themselves. Because of data protection issues, this additional household information was not available to us. As a consequence of these limitations, our procedure may have erroneously deleted observations that actually did not live in the same household but had identical addresses and identical migration event dates (false positives). In addition, we may have failed to identify moves from the same household or to the same household if the spelling of addresses differed between individuals with identical addresses and migration dates (false negatives). Other forms of false negatives include individuals who moved abroad from identical households (emigrants) or came back from abroad to identical households (remigrants) at varying dates. These forms of false positives or false negatives could be principally eliminated by a more advanced sampling procedure conducted by the municipalities. Some remaining forms of multi-person households would need register data of the country of destination: This includes emigrants who moved together in one household abroad but did not live together in one household before migration. Similarly, remigrants who lived together before migration but are now living in separate households in Germany could not be identified. Overall, however, hardly any indication exists that the applied procedure to identify multi-person households actually produced any significant sampling error.

A second sampling step concerned the pretest (see Chapter 4 for more information). In order to set up a pretest panel, random samples of overall 2,614 emigrants and remigrants were drawn. Finally, a third sampling step included drawing a simple random sample of individuals within the group of ten municipalities with the highest number of emigrants and remigrants in 2015 resulting in an additional 2,992 cases not included in the gross sample. Originally, a smaller sampling fraction was planned for those ten municipalities but was subsequently increased to raise the potential number of evaluable interviews in the study. In the remaining 71 municipalities, we applied cluster sampling, i.e. we sampled all individuals who remained after the data cleaning and sampling procedure to form the gross sample for the study. In total, the gross sample produced includes 47,714 individuals, which consist of 9,446 emigrants with recent foreign addresses, 16,827 emigrants with former German addresses and 21,441 remigrants. Data from the population register was used to calculate design weights controlling all aspects of the sampling process (see Chapter 12.1 for more information about the weighting procedure).

3 Questionnaire development

One central task of GERPS was to collect data from both emigrants and remigrants, allowing comparisons between the two groups. For this reason, the questionnaire was kept as identical as possible for both groups. This includes questions on various topics, including items on socio-structural characteristics as well as questions that explore the subjective attitudes, motives, and feelings of the respondents. This basic questionnaire was extended by specific questions focusing on the different situations of emigrants and remigrants either before or after the migration event. The overall strategy of operationalising questions was primarily based on current scientific studies and research questions as well as our pilot study (theory-driven approach). Still, as GERPS aims to allow analyses on the individual consequences of migration, our strategy was to generate a data set allowing valid comparisons with the German resident population based on comparable data of established surveys such as the SOEP (data-driven approach).

3.1 Structure of the questionnaires

The questionnaires of both surveys were divided into different thematic blocks (Table 3-1) and respondents were surveyed chronologically according to these blocks. Every interview started with a screening page (see Chapter 5.2.2) to determine whether respondents still have the migration status (emigrant or remigrant) that was deduced from information in the population register on which our survey sample was based (see Figure 5-10 in Chapter 5.2.2). The main reason for this approach was to verify and update the knowledge about the current migration status of the respondents. This was necessary because up to 20 months (between July 2017 – the earliest registered migration date in the population registers – and February 2019 – the end of the fieldwork of the survey in wave) could have elapsed between the last documented migration and the interview. Thus, respondents could have remigrated to Germany or onmigrated to another country in between. If that was the case, the respondents were automatically forwarded to the respective questionnaire.

After this status check, the initial survey started. It began with questions focusing on the arrival at their present place of residence and on their migration motives. Elucidating the personal situation and living conditions before the last international migration of our respondents was a central target of wave 1. Therefore, a number of retrospective questions were asked within the first thematic blocks of the survey. Here, the situation around three months before moving and the decision process to move abroad was reconstructed. This increases the analytical promise of wave 1 by adding the possibility of a longitudinal analysis (“Proxy” Wave 0 and Wave 1). After that, possible future onmigration intentions or return migration intentions, followed by questions about the current life situation, general standard demographic characteristics, as well as personality traits and life satisfaction of the respondents were surveyed. At the end of the survey, an open-ended question asking for remarks, comments, or suggestions concerning the project or the questionnaire was implemented.

Table 3-1: Thematic structure of the questionnaires

	Emigrant questionnaire	Remigrant questionnaire
1	Your move abroad	Your move to Germany
2	Your motives and reasons for leaving Germany	Your motives and reasons for your last move to Germany
3	Your life situation before leaving Germany	Your life situation before your move to Germany
4	The decision for your last emigration from Germany	The decision for your last move to Germany
5	Your housing situation before leaving Germany	Your housing situation before moving (back) to Germany
6		Your language skills
7	Your employment before leaving Germany	Your employment before moving to Germany
8	Your departure from Germany	
9	Planned duration of your stay abroad	Your previous and planned future stays abroad
10	Your previous long-term stays abroad	Your previous long-term stays abroad
11	Leaving your current country of residence or returning to Germany	Your future plans to go abroad
12	Your current life situation	Your current life situation
13	Your current housing situation	Your current housing situation
14	Your contacts to friends and relatives	Your contacts to friends and relatives
15	Your personal situation compared to the situation before you left Germany	Your personal situation compared to the situation before your move to Germany
16	Your current employment situation	Your current employment situation
17	Your current financial situation	Your current financial situation
18	General questions about your person	General questions about your person
19	Your language skills	
20	Information about your partner	Information about your partner
21	Some questions about your parents	Some questions about your parents
22	Some questions about your attitudes, personality and well-being	Some questions about your attitudes, personality and well-being
23	Feedback on the survey	Feedback on the survey

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

3.2 Comparing internationally mobile and non-mobile populations

As introduced above, a central task of GERPS is to create an opportunity to compare the group of international mobile Germans with the group of (non-mobile) German residents in as many fields as possible (e.g. socio-demographic structure, personality, life situation). For the approach of questionnaire development and question operationalisation, this means that in addition to a theory-driven approach the instrument development strategy was also data oriented. In that sense, questions in GERPS – wherever possible and important – were based on the operationalisation of existing established national and international surveys.

3.2.1 SOEP-related study: Enhancing the comparability with the non-mobile population

GERPS was realised as a so-called “SOEP-related study” in order to permit a comparison with the non-mobile population of Germany covered by the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). The SOEP is a wide-ranging representative longitudinal study of private households conducted by the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW). Every year since 1984, around 30,000 respondents in nearly 11,000 households are interviewed in Germany. Some of the many topics include household composition, occupational biographies, employment, earnings, health, and satisfaction indicators (Goebel et al. 2019; Wagner, Frick, Schupp 2007). Therefore, wherever possible and reasonable, questions from the SOEP were incorporated such that experiences, personal characteristics, and life situations of the international mobile group covered by GERPS could be compared with their non-mobile counterparts covered by the SOEP. In sum, 66 of the SOEP database are comparable to the remigration questionnaire and 63 questions are comparable to the emigration questionnaire, respectively. These questions cover various fields such as the personal situation of the respondents (e.g. partnership, marital status, (intergenerational) family situation and friendships, socioeconomic status, migration background), educational and occupational activity, and previous and further migration intention. Additional analysis potential results from the inclusion of questions on the subjective assessment of health status, life satisfaction, different attitudes and personality traits of the interviewees, which are regularly included in the SOEP (Beierlein et al. 2014; Dehne, Schupp 2007). In most cases, this allows us to compare the GERPS data of emigrants or remigrants with little to no coding efforts to the SOEP data. Finally, yet still important, due to generated variables on educational attainment (ISCED/CASMIN), professional activity (ISCO, KLDB), migration background, and other life circumstances (see Chapter 10 on generated variables in GERPS), comparisons to and matchings with other data sets are possible (see Chapter 3.2.2).

3.2.2 Additional surveys as frames for questions and bases for comparisons

Since the target group of international mobile Germans is a specific group possessing particular life situations and lifestyles that are different from non-mobile persons in various aspects, we additionally operationalised questions beyond the SOEP. In order to produce comparative data, we used other established surveys in addition to the SOEP as references, such as:

- German General Social Survey (ALLBUS)
- European Social Survey (ESS)
- GESIS Panel
- Transitions and Old Age Potentials (TOP)
- National Educational Panel Study (NEPS)

- Survey of the German Academic Exchange Service about course recognition after studying abroad (DAAD Studierendenbefragung 2017)
- The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)
- Working and Learning in a Changing World (ALWA)

However, as the group of international mobiles is a very specific and understudied group, it was not possible to cover all specific aspects relevant to this baseline survey based on established questions that have been used previously in other surveys. For these aspects, we had to ask specific questions without any direct possibility of comparison with established survey data sources. These were about 48 questions in both versions of the questionnaire. These 48 questions cover in particular the following topics:

- The country emigrants currently live or remigrants have lived in;
- the motives for international mobility;
- the living situation three months before the move (within the four different life domains, mainly employment and income, partnership and family);
- a self-rated evaluation of the development of the personal situation in these life domains compared to the situation three month before the move;
- respondent's migration history and migration intentions.

All of these questions were developed based on a strict theory-driven approach and therefore based on the state of research in these specific areas. Moreover, some of these questions had already been tested in the pilot study (Ette et al. 2015). Additionally, all questions had been tested within all different stages of the pretest (see Chapter 4).

3.3 Recording paradata, panel consent and address information

At the beginning of the technical implementation (i.e. the programming of the online questionnaires), we examined in which form additional paradata may be recorded. Furthermore, we checked which technical features and additional expenses would be necessary. Finally, we reviewed how additional expenses might be justified by the value or usability of the data. After (technical) examination and cost-benefit analysis, the following paradata were finally technically implemented and recorded:

- Duration and time of participation,
- number of times survey window is active,
- duration survey window is active,
- type of browser, browser name, language, and version,
- screen orientation and zoom,
- connection type,
- "referrer" URL, and
- IP address (anonymised after participation).

Complementary to the questions, JavaScripts were created to query paradata at the beginning and end of the questionnaire. Among other things, these scripts were used to determine which browser the respondent used to answer the online questionnaire and the device's screen resolution. In addition, three JavaScripts were inserted per question page to query paradata. For each block of questions, paradata was used to determine how often and for how long a respondent had temporarily left a questionnaire page and how long they had stayed on a questionnaire page.

After completing the survey, respondents were asked if they were willing to take part in a future survey wave within the scope of the project. The formal and legal requirements

of the data protection concept were followed. The willingness to take part in a future GERPS survey was inquired separately. All respondents who agreed to be contacted again were asked for a valid and up-to-date e-mail address through which they would like to be contacted. In addition, the respondents were given the opportunity to choose other channels of contact – such as postal or phone contact – and to provide those contact details.

Additionally, in order to motivate the respondents for survey participation and panel consent, an incentive strategy was developed based on the state of research (for details on this strategy see Chapter 5.2.4). In accordance with the formal and legal requirements of the data protection concept, a separate form was programmed to ask for the contact data to issue the incentives. All respondents who did not want to forgo or donate their incentive were asked for a valid and up-to-date e-mail address that could be used to send the incentive.

4 Pretest

All survey instruments and survey implementation aspects were tested intensively within a multi-stage pretest. This is a necessary and essential step in the development of the survey. The pretest helps to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the questionnaire concerning question format, wording, and order. Therefore, the focus is on the (technical) function on the one hand and on how people are answering our questions on the other hand.

4.1 Technical and cognitive pretests

The individual survey tools were first pretested technically. The primary objective was to test and control the filters. To conduct the technical pretest, project members reviewed and tested the layout, wording, and filters of the surveys as well as the structure, quality, and format of the collected data. All comments, questions, and suggestions were centrally documented and subsequently implemented. This procedure had to ensure that all filters were placed correctly and that respondents were taken through the questionnaire as intended.

After the technical pretest, a cognitive pretest was conducted. The aim of the cognitive pretest was to assess the relevance of the questionnaire and to get a better awareness of the thoughts of the specific target group of international mobile people. The approach of a multi-stage pretest combining technical, ordinary, and cognitive interviews has become very common in recent decades (cf. Presser et al. 2004). For this purpose, 35 people were recruited who are part of the target population (Germans who either currently live or have lived abroad and moved back to Germany) or experts in a field relevant to the project (e.g. survey methodologists or migration researchers). The selected people were invited to participate in the survey as part of the cognitive pretest and each respondent was sent a link and a personal password to access the survey. After each question, respondents were able to leave a comment on the questions as a whole, the wording of the question, and the response categories within a web probing field (Behr et al. 2017; Willis 2018). After the cognitive pretest, the questionnaire was revised and finalised according to the comments given by the testers.

4.2 Set-up of pretest panel

One aim of the realistic pretest was to quantify response behaviour and survey length based on a small but realistic sample. Another aim was to test the entire methodological procedure, particularly the technical infrastructure but also all survey implementation processes. To achieve these goals and against the background of the upcoming survey waves, it was necessary to establish a sufficient sample of pretest respondents. Accordingly, the methodological procedure was executed closely based on the procedure planned for the main study. After the realistic pretest, further changes to the questionnaire were introduced. This included adjusting and standardising individual scales, changing the question order and the wording of questions, but in particular deleting entire questions to reduce the length and burden of respondents.

4.2.1 Sampling and recruitment process

The sampling process for the pretest panel and the procedure for the invitation and reminder letters were largely in line with the main study of the baseline survey. The gross sample for the realistic pretest consisted of 2,614 people who were invited on 27 September 2018 to participate in the survey. The letter included a hyperlink to the landing page of the GERPS questionnaire, a personal password, a QR code, information on the incentives (a lottery of 500 euros), and data protection information largely in line with the information used in the final study (see Chapter 15.1). In addition to informing respondents about the study and inviting them to take part in the survey, information on data protection was enclosed. This information on data protection informed respondents about how addresses were selected, as well as about the legal basis of data protection, the structure and procedure of the study, and the voluntary nature of the survey.

4.2.2 Interview duration

For the 157 people who completely participated in the pretest of the remigrant questionnaire, the average completion time was 50.9 minutes and the median 29.7 minutes. For the 151 people who completely participated in the pretest of the emigrant questionnaire the average completion time was 48.4 minutes and the median 25.3 minutes.

4.2.3 Response rates

Table 4-1 provides an overview of the response rates in the pretest for both samples – emigrants and remigrants. Overall, 289 persons participated in the pretest, of which 253 completed the survey. Thus, the response rates of the pretest were below those of the main survey and the methodological adjustments (e.g. improved invitation letter, new “landing-page” for the respondents, shorter questionnaire) positively influenced response.

Table 4-1: Response rates by pretest sample

	Emigrants				Remigrants		Total	
	Recent foreign address		Former German address		Recent German address		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Gross sample	144	100.0	1,981	100.0	489	100.0	2,614	100.0
Complete interviews	30	20.8	114	5.8	109	22.3	253	9.7

Note: The definition of “complete interviews” differs from its meaning in the remainder of this report where it is based on AAPOR standards (cf. Chapter 7). In the pretest, “complete interview” refers to participants who retrieved the final page of the questionnaire irrespective of item nonresponse.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

4.2.4 Consent to pretest panel participation and the collection of address information

Table 4-2 and Table 4-3 provide an overview of the willingness to take part in a future survey and the type of contact details provided. Overall, 88.9%, i.e. 225 out of 253 people who participated completely in the survey declared their willingness to take part in a future survey. All 225 people provided an e-mail address, 27 provided a phone number, and 37 a postal mail address.

Table 4-2: Availability of panel consent by pretest sample

	Emigrants				Remigrants		Total	
	Recent foreign address		Former German address		Recent German address		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Complete interviews	30	100.0	114	100.0	109	100.0	253	100.0
Panel consent								
Yes	26	86.7	100	87.7	99	90.8	225	88.9
No	2	6.7	10	8.8	4	3.7	16	6.3
n.a.	2	6.7	4	3.5	6	5.5	12	4.7

Note: The definition of “complete interviews” differs from its meaning in the remainder of this report where it is based on AAPOR standards (cf. Chapter 7). In the pretest, “complete interview” refers to participants who retrieved the final page of the questionnaire irrespective of item nonresponse.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Table 4-3: Availability of address information by pretest sample

	Emigrants				Remigrants		Total	
	Recent foreign address		Former German address		Recent German address		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Panel consent	26	100.0	100	100.0	99	100.0	225	100.0
Address information								
E-mail address provided	26	100.0	100	100.0	99	100.0	225	100.0
Phone number provided	1	3.8	14	14.0	12	12.1	27	12.0
Mail address provided	5	19.2	17	17.0	15	15.2	37	16.4

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

4.2.5 Maintenance of the pretest panel

On 28 February 2019, an e-mail was sent to all 225 respondents who participated completely or partially in the realistic pretest, declared their consent to take part in future survey waves, and provided an e-mail address to maintain the pretest panel. The three winners of the lottery received a specific e-mail informing them about their prize and thanked for their participation. All others received an e-mail to also thank them for their participation. This intermediate contact of the pretest panel was also used to test the quality of the addresses submitted by our pretest participants, and existing problems of get identified by mail hosts as junk mail. E-mails including an unsubscribe option are generally regarded by mail hosts as more trustworthy (Schwarz 2017). E-mail messages were consequently adapted with half of them including a direct and easy option to unsubscribe from the study, whereas the other half received the message without an easy and direct option to unsubscribe. The aim was to test whether an easy and direct option to unsubscribe in the e-mail leads to an increase in the dropout rate. Table 4-4 shows an overview of the delivery protocol of this panel maintenance mailing showing an overall very high delivery rate of potential panel participants and no effect of the unsubscribe link. Of 225 people who provided an e-mail address, 220 could be reached, i.e. the e-mail could be delivered. Only five people could not be reached, i.e. in these cases the e-mails could not be delivered. Consequently, this link was applied in the main study as well.

Table 4-4: Delivery protocol of panel maintenance mailing

	No unsubscribe option		Unsubscribe option		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Delivery successful	109	98.2	108	97.3	220	97.8
Delivery unsuccessful	2	1.8	3	2.7	5	2.2
Failed connection to mail host	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	0.4
Address not accepted by mail host	2	1.8	0	0.0	2	0.9
Invalid line	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	0.4
Address has incorrect syntax	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	0.4
Total	111	100.0	111	100.0	225	100.0

Note: There is a (technical) possibility that individual e-mails that were not delivered directly because of a blocked e-mail address or a rejection by the receiving server (“soft bounce”) may have been delivered at a later point in time, e.g. if the “rejection” or the blocking was lifted. Unfortunately, these individual cases cannot (technically) be recorded, so that “non-deliverability” has to be assumed.

5 Survey mode and survey implementation

5.1 Survey modes and mixed-mode approaches

There are several modes for conducting standardised surveys. Usually, personal interviews (“face-to-face surveys”), postal surveys (“mail surveys”), telephone surveys, and web surveys are differentiated. All of these modes have several advantages and disadvantages (for an overview see Couper 2011; Jacob, Heinz, Décieux 2019; Schnell, Hill, Esser 2013). Within recent decades, we additionally encounter approaches that can be characterised as mixed-mode designs. In this context, two main approaches are distinguished. The first approach concerns a change of mode throughout the contact phase, for example, an advance notification letter announcing a subsequent personal face-to-face interview. The second approach concerns a mix of modes during the data collection phase, for example, offering respondents an option to choose between a telephone or a web interview (De Leeuw 2018; De Leeuw, Berzelak 2016). Nowadays, such mixed-mode designs are increasingly used (Dillman 2017). The main reasons to consider mixed-mode approaches are to enhance the coverage of the sample and reduce nonresponse errors, improve timeliness, and reduce costs. The decision to find the “right” mode for a study depends on several aspects such as topic, target group, availability of information, budget, field period, and time frame of the project.

5.1.1 Mixed-mode: Offline contact and online response

For GERPS, the choice of mode was made based on exactly these requirements. As already successfully tested in the pilot study (Ette et al. 2015), the main study of GERPS was realised applying a mixed-mode survey with differences between contact mode and survey response mode (De Leeuw 2018). Respondents were recruited via a postal invitation letter and two postal reminder letters, suggesting respondents to use a web survey. This design offers the possibility to combine advantages of offline mail recruitment (Sakshaug, Vicari, Couper 2019) with the benefits of an online survey (Cernat, Lynn 2017; Evans, Mathur 2018; Lee et al. 2018).

Concerning the recruitment of a representative sample, literature suggests that address-based register random sampling is usually the best strategy (Blom et al. 2017; Cornesse, Bosnjak 2018; Lynn et al. 2018; Sakshaug, Cernat, Raghunathan 2019; Sugie 2016). Thus, the sampling frame of GERPS aims to provide representative coverage of internationally mobile Germans. Regarding the advantages of an online survey, the web mode offers plenty of possibilities in programming (e.g. dependent interviewing), survey presentation, visual transmission and admission as well as lower costs, plus quicker and more valid responses (Décieux, Hoffmann 2014; Eggs, Jäckle 2015; Evans, Mathur 2018; Jacob, Heinz, Décieux 2019). For the group of emigrants, the lower costs and the quicker field process were particularly relevant, since sending questionnaires and a stamped return envelope, or conducting the interviews via telephone would have been very cost-intensive. Even more so, sending interviewers to all countries of the world to interview our respondents would have been unrealistic, cost-intensive, and time-consuming. Additionally, compared to interviewer-administered surveys, respondents of an online survey are assumed more honest in their responses, particularly to sensitive questions.

For respondents, the online mode brings the advantage that they can start and proceed with the survey at any time and place that is most convenient for them such as their home PC or directly on their mobile devices (Evans, Mathur 2018). Additionally, similar response rates can be expected for online surveys as for purely postal surveys and response rates for telephone survey are decreasing (Cernat, Lynn 2017; Couper, Coutts 2006; Weigold, Weigold, Natera 2018). Recent studies show that online surveys offering

the option of answering the survey via smartphones may have advantages compared to interviews or other survey methods if participants such as international mobiles are hard to reach (Sugie 2016). However, the online mode also possesses disadvantages (Jacob, Heinz, Décieux 2019). Due to societal differences in internet usage and access, internet surveys are generally associated with the risk of increased selectivity of the survey participants – related to a coverage error. Concerning GERPS, this is especially the case due to differences in infrastructure (internet availability and speed, mobile coverage, etc.) within the different countries and regions where the respondents of the emigrant sample live. On average, internet users are, for example, younger and better educated than the total population (Schlosser, Mays 2018; Schnell 2012).

This means that corresponding biases can also be expected among the participants of internet surveys. With respect to the total survey error, these biases can result in sampling errors or nonresponse errors (Jacob, Heinz, Décieux 2019; Schnell, Hill, Esser 2013). As we drew our sample based on Germany's population register, the specific sampling problems of online surveys do not play a central role in the research design. Nevertheless, biases due to lower response rates from less internet-affine subgroups cannot be ruled out. However, internet access is continuously increasing (Décieux, Heinen, Willems 2018) and increased internet affinity can generally be assumed in the case of internationally mobile individuals. Furthermore, internationally mobile Germans are also younger and better educated than the German population as a whole, which means that higher proportions of international migrants are likely to be able to use the internet and thus participate in an online survey (Ette, Sauer 2010). In addition, older or lesser-educated international migrants can also be expected to use the internet more frequently than non-mobile persons of the same age and educational level do. For example, online communication opportunities are frequently used to maintain contacts to home or former emigration countries (Mau, Mewes 2007).

5.1.2 Testing sequential and concurrent mixed-mode designs

Following response theory, the switch from offline invitation to online survey mode can be seen as a critical event, since the burden to participate is higher and, consequently, the risk of losing survey participants increases (Groves, Singer, Corning 2000). In the case of our main study, this critical event is when respondents receive the invitation letter offline via postal mail and are asked to participate in the survey by going online and answering the web survey (Dillman 2017). For example, this step is critical for subgroups that do not have devices to proceed with this questionnaire online or for respondents who experience this mode switch as complicated or burdensome as they additionally have to type the link of the survey and to log in with their code. In both cases, this would result in a higher risk of a systematic coverage error.

To reflect whether this step is actually critical – in terms of systematically losing respondents – and to check whether alternative approaches might advance data quality, particularly with respect to less internet oriented populations, we developed two methodological studies: The first approach uses a “concurrent mixed-mode design” and the second one is a mix of a “sequential” and a “concurrent mixed-mode design” (De Leeuw, Berzelak 2016), where respondents are offered two or more modes at the same time and thus are given a choice.

1. Concurrent mixed-mode design: A unified paper questionnaire was enclosed with 1,000 randomly selected letters of invitation to remigrants and the respondents could choose whether to participate in web or paper mode from the beginning of the recruitment period.
2. Sequential mixed-mode design: A group of 1,000 randomly selected remigrants got an invitation and a first reminder letter similar to the main study. Then, a paper questionnaire was attached to the second reminder letter. At this stage,

respondents could choose whether to participate online or use the paper questionnaire. Thus, this approach can be interpreted as a sequential design, as the first two contacts aimed at pushing the respondents to use our web survey. A concurrent design offering web and PAPI mode was used only in the last contact attempt.

To test the concurrent and sequential mixed-mode design, a PAPI version of the online questionnaire was created (see also Chapter 6.3.2). Based on the finalised online version, the questionnaire was adjusted and designed to fit the paper version. Even though the paper version should be identical to the online version in theory, in practice individual formulations, question types, and filters (which can be technically implemented within the framework of the online surveys) had to be adjusted for the written paper survey. In addition, it was decided that some questions, in particular the sections focusing on specific groups defined by their recent main activity (e.g. students, retired, etc.), were not included for methodological reasons. The PAPI questionnaire was designed by an external agency and internally tested (see Appendix 15.7).

5.2 Survey implementation

Dillman (1978) was one of the first scholars to develop a cost-benefit theory of participation behaviour in postal surveys. This approach known as the “tailored design method” can also be applied to other forms of survey modes (Dillman, Smyth, Melani 2011). In its practical implementation, the “tailored design method” primarily consists of the following aspects:

- **Invitation and reminder letters:** Personalisation of letters by using respondent’s names and addresses as well as a fixed chronological sequence of several contacts by using invitation and subsequent reminder letters are recommended.
- **Questionnaire design and technical infrastructure:** Respondent-specific attractive but not distracting layout of the questionnaire together with a meaningful arrangement of questions are recommended. This includes, for example, beginning with the questions that are easy to answer and interesting for the respondent but also an intuitive and comfortable technical infrastructure.
- **Data protection and respondent information:** The generation of trust by informing about the relevance of the project and providing additional information, highlighting data protection issues, and referring to credible institutions implementing the survey.
- **Incentives:** Incentives are another option to generate motivation and commitment, particularly through unconditional payments, and a potentially important strategy for push-to-web surveys without personal contact between interviewer and respondent.

These and other methodological considerations to increase participants’ willingness to participate in the survey (e.g. Mergener, Décieux 2018; Robinson, Leonard 2018; Rolstad, Adler, Rydén 2011; Sudman, Bradburn, Schwarz 1996) together with the experiences of the pilot study were followed to structure our survey implementation measures.

5.2.1 Invitation and reminder letters

Following the total design method, the invitation and reminder letters were developed with great care: The envelopes of all letters included the organisational logo of the Federal Institute of Population Research (BIB). Being part of Germany’s federal executive, the logo follows the corporate design of the Federal government and includes the federal eagle together with the federal flag representing a serious appearance.

Similarly, the letter paper included the logo of the project and the enclosed data protection leaflet included the logos of the four responsible institutions. The letter itself contained a basic description of the relevance and basic interests of the research project together with further information about the source of the used addresses. Furthermore, the letter contained a hyperlink to the landing page of the GERPS questionnaire and a personal password. Participants were asked to open the website and enter the personal password to start the questionnaire. In addition, all letters also contained individual QR codes particularly facilitating the participation of people using a smartphone or tablet. By scanning the QR code with a mobile device, the participants were able to access the online questionnaire immediately without separately typing the link and the password (see Chapter 15.1 in the appendix). The password also ensured that each person could participate only once and that if there were interruptions, they would re-enter the questionnaire where they left off.

In addition to the invitation letter, up to two reminder letters were sent. In the relevant literature there is great consensus that the repeated contact of participants has a positive impact on response rates (Basius, Reuband 1996; Lamnek, Trepl 1991; Petermann 2005). There is a discussion, however, about whether otherwise under-represented groups of persons can be reached by reminder letters. Some authors argue that reminders are an improvement for the heterogeneity of the social decomposition of the sample (Kunz 2010; Reuband 2001). Other authors argue that based on their analysis of the German General Social Survey (ALLBUS), using reminders neither mitigates nor eliminates the minor differences in social characteristics between the participants and the population. Only the number of cases increases (Koch 1998; Schneekloth, Leven 2003). Following Dillman's total design method, reminder letters were consequently sent two weeks after the invitation and then two weeks after the first reminder. The idea was to define a clear timing of the invitation and reminders. The first reminder letter only repeated the invitation and listed the URL and password without further detailed information. The second reminder letter also again contained the information leaflet about data protection regulations.

Table 5-1: Chronology of field work by sample and contact option

	Emigrants				Remigrants	
	Recent foreign address		Former German address		Recent German address	
	Date	N	Date	N	Date	N
Main mailing						
Invitation letter	07.11.2018	7,929	07.11.2018	16,827	08.11.2018	19,121
First reminder letter	21.11.2018	7,333	05.12.2018	8,313	22.11.2018	14,764
Second reminder letter	05.12.2018	6,346	-	-	06.12.2018	13,028
Delayed and additional mailings						
Invitation letter	21.11.2018	1,517	05.12.2018	209	22.11.2018	2,320
					06.12.2018	26
First reminder letter	05.12.2018	1,411	09.01.2019	109	06.12.2018	1,851
Second reminder letter	09.01.2019	1,186			10.01.2019	1,518
Total mailings		25,722		25,458		52,628

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Fieldwork of the survey started on 7 November 2018 for emigrants and on the 8 November 2018 for remigrants, aiming to contact potential participants with the invitation letter immediately before the weekend. An overview of the fieldwork is provided in Table 5-1 detailing the dates and volumes of letters sent. The second

reminder letters were sent on 5 and 6 December 2018 respectively. Because some municipalities provided the sampled addresses much later than originally planned, a delayed mailing started on 21 and 22 of November with the final reminder letter sent on 9 and 10 January 2019. An additional particularity concerned those individuals of the emigrant sample who were contacted at their former address in Germany. Because postal delivery times are significantly increased by forwarding orders, the interval between invitation letter and reminder letter was increased to four instead of two weeks. This allowed us to incorporate information provided by the postal service provider about the status of those addresses. All invitation letters that were not deliverable were withdrawn from the address list used for the reminder letter. Overall, 25,722 letters were sent to emigrants with recent foreign addresses, 25,458 letters to emigrants at their former address in Germany, and 52,628 letters to remigrants. All letters were either sent by the *Deutsche Post* service “*Standardpost*” or “*Dialogpost*” but always in combination with the service “*Premiumadress*” which allows the sender to receive more detailed information about the status of the letters sent. This includes, for example, information on whether a letter was successfully delivered or whether a letter was forwarded to a new address because of an existing forwarding order (in most cases even including information about the new address). This information was collected for unit nonresponse analyses (see Chapter 6). Finally, additional mailings took place for cases with failed delivery or new information provided by the service “*Premiumadress*” about new addresses including 235 letters that were sent on 5 and 6 December 2018.

5.2.2 Questionnaire design and technical infrastructure

After drawing the sample, all emigrants and remigrants included in the gross sample were contacted and asked to participate in our survey. In addition to a basic presentation of the project and an assurance of compliance with current data protection regulations, this letter also contained a reference to a welcome page set up for this purpose (see Figure 5-1). This welcome page was located under the following Internet address: www.international-mobil.de.

Figure 5-1: Survey landing page



Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1


On this welcome page the relevant survey version (Left: Emigrant or right: Remigrant) for the respective participant could be selected. Respondents living abroad at the time of the survey were directed to the emigrant survey, while respondents who had returned to Germany after a stay abroad were directed to the survey of returnees.

The technical implementation of the survey was carried out by the Institute for Social Research and Communication (SOKO). Before the survey began, respondents were asked to enter a password (personalised code) that was sent with the invitation and reminder letters. The use of these personalised codes and passwords ensured that only respondents from our sample were able to answer our questionnaire, that each respondent could participate only once, and that the respondent could pause and resume the survey at any time. Furthermore, it is possible to merge this code to an individual panel ID that enables combining the different survey waves for longitudinal analysis.

After successfully entering the individual access code manually or by scanning a QR code, some instructions were given on how to operate the system and how to proceed through the questionnaire. Then, after having chosen the target group, a brief text and short project description were offered followed by a page providing information on data protection, the project partners involved, and contact options. Since we expected many respondents to participate on smartphones, we developed a responsive survey design (see Figure 5-2). This should also ensure the highest possible practicability on the mobile device, for example by using drop-down menus or by splitting larger grid questions on screens with a small screen resolution (Andreadis 2015; Schnell, Hill, Esser 2013).

Figure 5-2: Example of the responsive questionnaire design

Desktop device



Ihr Umzug nach Deutschland

Sie sind vor einiger Zeit aus dem Ausland zurück nach Deutschland gezogen. Zunächst interessiert uns, wie Sie die Zeit seit Ihrer Ankunft in Deutschland erlebt haben.

Denken Sie nun bitte an die ersten Wochen und Monate in Deutschland: Wie leicht oder schwer ist es Ihnen gefallen, sich zurecht zu finden?


Antworten Sie bitte anhand der folgenden Skala, wobei der Wert 1 bedeutet "Sehr schwer" und der Wert 6 "Sehr leicht". Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstimmen.

Sehr schwer 1	2	3	4	5	Sehr leicht 6
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Zurück
Weiter

Wenn Sie Fragen haben oder Unterstützung beim Ausfüllen des Fragebogens benötigen, wenden Sie sich bitte unter der Telefonnummer +49 521 5242 200 an den Studienleiter im SOKO Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch bzw. seine Mitarbeiter/innen. Nutzen Sie bei Fragen auch unsere E-Mail-Adresse info@international-mobil.de.

Mobile device



Ihr Umzug nach Deutschland

Sie sind vor einiger Zeit aus dem Ausland zurück nach Deutschland gezogen. Zunächst interessiert uns, wie Sie die Zeit seit Ihrer Ankunft in Deutschland erlebt haben.

Denken Sie nun bitte an die ersten Wochen und Monate in Deutschland: Wie leicht oder schwer ist es Ihnen gefallen, sich zurecht zu finden?

Antworten Sie bitte anhand der folgenden Skala, wobei der Wert 1 bedeutet "Sehr schwer" und der Wert 6 "Sehr leicht". Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstimmen.

Sehr schwer
1

2

3

4

5

Sehr leicht
6

Zurück
Weiter

Wenn Sie Fragen haben oder Unterstützung beim Ausfüllen des Fragebogens benötigen, wenden Sie sich bitte unter der Telefonnummer +49 521 5242 200 an den Studienleiter im SOKO Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch bzw. seine Mitarbeiter/innen. Nutzen Sie bei Fragen auch unsere E-Mail-Adresse info@international-mobil.de.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Following the recommendations by Decieux et al. (2015) and Mergener, Sischka, and Decieux (2015), respondents were free to choose to answer a question or not. Thus, we implemented a 'continue' button to proceed to the next page of the questionnaire, regardless whether a valid answer was given to the previous question. In addition, it was possible to return to previous questions and change the answers using a 'back' button. Where appropriate, categories such as 'don't know' (e.g. proxy reports) 'prefer not to answer' (e.g. income) or 'does not apply' (e.g. certain motives for migration) were offered. Furthermore, to decrease effort for the participants, automatic filters were programmed to hide non-relevant questions based on previous given answers.

The title of the current topic of the block was centred at the top of every page (for example, see in Figure 5-2 the heading "Ihr Umzug nach Deutschland" ("Your move to Germany")) and used for the orientation of the respondents. In addition, short transitional texts between different subject areas or thematic blocks were applied as logical bridges and for better orientation (e.g., "*If you look back, how was your situation three months before you moved back to Germany? First of all, we are interested in your family and partnership.*" to introduce the third block "Your situation before your move to Germany" of the remigration survey).

The technical implementation of the online survey (i.e. the programming of the survey mask, hosting, access and field control) was based on LimeSurvey (version 3.14.8) survey software. LimeSurvey is the world's leading open source survey software, which runs as a self-hosted Community Edition on a SOKO web server. A German company hosted the entire technical infrastructure in high-performance data centres to ensure ideal connectivity, uninterruptible power supply, and access control. The web server and the mail server were located in Germany to conform to data protection standards (see Chapter 5.2.3).

5.2.3 Data protection and respondent information

The protection of individuals against unauthorised use of their data is a priority of good practice in social research (Häder 2009; RatSWD 2017). Furthermore, information about data protection procedures as well as additional information about the background and aim of the survey are expected to raise trust of potential respondents in the survey and are likely to increase participation (Kunz, Gummer 2019). Consequently, the invitation and reminder letters were complemented by a supplemental data protection sheet (see Appendix 15.2) and additional data protection information on the first pages of the online questionnaire. Background information about the survey was provided on a separate homepage linked to the online questionnaires.

For the purposes of GERPS, personal data is collected and processed at two stages: At the first stage, personal data is provided by the population registers of the 81 sampled municipalities. At the second stage, personal information is collected through questionnaires that are completed voluntarily by survey participants. A detailed data protection concept was developed together with the responsible data protection official and IT security official of the Federal Statistical Office (Destatis) who are both also responsible for the protection of information, communication, and data at the BIB.

The data protection concept discussed all legislative bases, flows of data, protection mechanisms, and dates for deletion of different categories of data in detail. The first stage of data collection is covered by Sections 34 and 46 of the Federal Act on Registration (BMG). These paragraphs regulate data transfers between public registers and official government bodies and between public registers and public research institutions. The BIB is a departmental research institution under the Federal Ministry of the Interior and therefore falls under the jurisdiction of Section 34. Since it is a hybrid institution between governmental department and public research institution, Section 46 is also involved in support of Section 34. Personal data transferred and processed at

this stage include first and last names, sex, doctoral degree, and current as well as former postal addresses. Further socio-demographic data linked to this personal information include date of migration, country of migration, birthdate, place of birth, country of birth, and citizenship(s). The data protection concept defined that all personal information from population registers that were not used for the survey would be deleted three months after the end of the first wave. The socio-demographic data of our sample was used for the purpose of nonresponse analyses (Chapter 6), the validation of our sample, and the generation of survey weights (Chapter 12). Finally, the data protection concept defined strict separation between population register data (stored at the BIB) and survey data collected at the second stage (see below) stored by the survey data collector (SOKO).

With respect to the second stage of data collection, the data protection concept defined that all survey data collected with online questionnaires relies on the voluntary informed consent of individuals. According to the principle of informational self-determination enshrined in the General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union (GDPR) and the Federal Data Protection Act (BDSG), participants are entitled to cancel the questionnaire, withdraw their informed consent, correct their information, enquire what personal data are saved by the project partners, and request the deletion of all personal data at any point in time. Such requests are granted to the extent that the retrieval of the relevant information is technically possible. A telephone number and e-mail address to that end were provided on the website and leaflet informing participants about measures and rights of data protection.

A separate project homepage was created with the aim to increase participants' trust in the project. The homepage is available to respondents of the survey as well as to interested parties as an additional source of information to complement and accompany the survey. In addition, the project homepage contains, for example, general information about the study, the methodological procedure, data protection, and announcements concerning the project through an integrated news system. Moreover, respondents have the possibility to leave a message or update their contact details for the survey through a contact form. The project homepage can be accessed at the internet address: <https://studie.international-mobil.de>.

5.2.4 Incentives

Response rates in social surveys are in historical decline (Groves 2006; Pforr et al. 2015; Stähli, Joye 2016). That is one reason why panel surveys aim to increase the personal commitment of respondents through face-to-face interviews (F2F). This may be particularly significant for online panels, which are rather anonymous. From the perspective of cost efficiency, computer-assisted web interviewing (CAWI) is an attractive alternative to F2F interviews. However, it is common practice to start online panel surveys with F2F interviews in the first wave (e.g. Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences (LISS), German Internet Panel (GIP), GESIS Panel). More recently, several studies started testing postal recruitment as a more cost-efficient alternative (e.g. GIP, European Value Study (EVS)). We took up this idea and used the CAWI mode starting from the first wave. We discussed the risks and opportunities of this strategy above. The most obvious risks include low response rates and low panel disposition. We aimed to attenuate these risks through incentives.

Since online panels have become an acceptable survey mode for probability-based samples rather recently, findings on incentives remain inconclusive. The implications of incentives hinge on the idiosyncrasies of online panels like sampling method (convenience vs probability), sample population (e.g. internet users, members of an organisation), and thematic focus (e.g. personally relevant, general survey). However, much of the evidence is in favour of cash incentives, which are most effective when

offered unconditionally (Becker, Möser, Glauser 2019; Gajic, Cameron, Hurley 2012; Jäckle, Lynn 2007; Pforr et al. 2015). This corroborates findings in the context of F2F survey modes (Becker, Mehlkop 2011; Stähli, Joye 2016). More recently, there have been attempts to increase cost-efficiency through combinations of unconditional with conditional incentives (Schumann et al. 2019). The rationale of the combination is to generate reciprocity through the unconditional payment and incentivise survey completion through conditional rewards.

Another incentive strategy often used is to offer a lottery. The main advantage of lotteries is their cost effectiveness. A study by Gajic, Cameron, and Hurley (2012) finds response rates to be highest in the unconditional incentive condition. However, cost-effectiveness measured by the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio is best in the high-paying lottery condition compared to no incentives, prepaid incentives, or a low-paying lottery. Another study by Göritz (2006) found no effect of lotteries on response rates and retention regardless of the kind of lottery. She tested a single large prize against multiple smaller prizes against the reference of no incentive in a continued non-profit opt-in online panel. In a similar study, Göritz and Luthé (2013) found no effect of various kinds of lotteries on response and retention. The inconclusiveness of lotteries is supported by Singer and Ye's (2012) review of several web survey experiments, a minority of which yield positive lottery effects on response rates. The majority of studies offers relatively low prizes ranging from approximately five to 50 euros (Pforr et al. 2015: p. 751; Singer, Ye 2012: p. 126). However, following the result of Gajic, Cameron and Hurley (2012), we offered comparatively high amounts within GERPS, drawing 20 prizes each including 500 euros in cash as a conditional incentive.

Aiming at low unit nonresponse, we opted for a high paying lottery that would potentially secure a high baseline response rate and was likely to be more cost efficient compared to other forms of incentives. In addition, sampled individuals were randomly assigned to different combinations of unconditional and conditional incentive conditions. The goal was to increase response and panel consent in all groups as well as to experiment with different variations of incentives for similar studies in the future. A total of 47,714 observations in the gross sample were randomly assigned to one of seven incentive schemes (INS) of predefined size with four schemes tested in the emigrant samples and six schemes tested in the remigrant sample (see Table 5-2).

Table 5-2: Gross sample size of incentive schemes by sample and contact option

Incentive scheme number (unconditional/conditional)	Emigrants		Remigrants	Total
	Recent foreign address	Former German address	Recent German address	
INS 1 (0/lottery)	2,948	4,830	10,444	18,222
INS 2 (0/10)	1,999	5,999	7,998	15,996
INS 3 (0/20)	3,999	5,998	750	10,747
INS 4 (non-cash/15)	500	-	-	500
INS 5 (5/5)	-	-	750	750
INS 6 (5/10)	-	-	750	750
INS 7 (5/15)	-	-	749	749
Total	9,446	16,827	21,441	47,714

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

The random assignment was clustered by the sample (emigrants and remigrants) and by the two different contact options in the emigrant sample (see Chapter 2.4). This clustered assignment resulted from practical considerations and certain limitations. Our primary goal of increasing response and panel disposition was particularly relevant for the emigrant sample. We had foreign addresses for a small proportion of emigrants. In addition, we had no experience with emigrant contact at former German addresses.

Given these uncertainties, we were keen to attain above average turnout among emigrants who provided valid foreign addresses. Unfortunately, the most promising strategy of unconditional cash incentives was not feasible for emigrants contacted at their recent foreign addresses and it was not cost-efficient for emigrants contacted at their former German addresses. There were two impediments to unconditional cash incentives for emigrants contacted at their recent foreign addresses. First, sending cash by mail is legal in some but not all countries. Second, euro notes are of practical relevance in just a small subset of countries where we contacted participants but almost useless in all other countries. The central drawback when contacting emigrants at their former German addresses was that we previously had little knowledge about the potential proportion of successful deliveries. They would only be successful where forwarding orders were installed or relatives or close neighbours were present. Therefore, the cost-benefit ratio of prepaid cash incentives seemed only acceptable in the remigrant sample. The proportion of non-deliveries was likely to be much smaller in this group and the practice of sending small notes is both legal and has actual benefits for recipients.

The unconditional cash incentive was a five-euro note in the invitation letter, which we combined with conditional cash incentives of varying amounts. We announced the additional payout of five euros (INS 5), ten euros (INS 6), or 15 euros (INS 7) respectively upon completion of the questionnaire. In addition, we used non-cash unconditional incentives in the group of the first contact option (INS 4). The non-cash unconditional incentive was a cover for webcams featuring the GERPS logo. To compensate for the lower value of the unconditional non-cash incentive, we combined it with high conditional incentives of 15 euros. This group is roughly comparable to INS 7. Furthermore, we offered medium conditional incentives of ten euros in both samples – emigrants and remigrants – as well as both contact options – recent foreign addresses and former German address (INS 2) as well as high conditional incentives of 20 euros in both samples and both contact options (INS 3). From a respondent perspective, these sums are comparable to the 5/5 and 5/15 incentive schemes. Finally, we offered a lottery including the drawing of 20 prizes each worth 500 euros in cash as a conditional incentive. The largest chunks of the sample were assigned to the three latter incentive schemes (INS 1, INS 2 and INS 3) whereas the other incentive schemes were included for methodological experiments. We did not include a control group receiving no incentive because we did not want to risk losing observations given a relatively small gross sample.

There are some additional practical issues regarding pay-outs for a highly mobile survey population that do not concern surveys at national level and below national level. We already discussed the non-feasibility of prepaid cash incentives for emigrants. Conditional incentives have the advantage that they give more leeway to respondents regarding their preferred mode of disbursement. One challenge is the multitude of currencies that could be required by respondents living in various countries. We offered three kinds of conditional incentive payouts: vouchers, money transfers, and charity donations. As opt out, we further included the option to forego the conditional incentive. Bank transfers have the disadvantage that respondents have to share personal and confidential information. The communication of these details is error prone and it would not serve the project to exhaust the willingness to provide private data in this question, because is not substantial for survey results. Potential fees for foreign bank transfers are an even more significant restriction, because they could reduce the incentive amount profoundly. We opted for PayPal money transfers, since they require e-mail addresses only and fees are comparatively small.

Vouchers would circumvent the problems related to bank transfers. However, they come with similar problems in terms of currency and redemption. Vouchers related to German companies would serve participants in the remigrant group but they would hardly serve

participants living abroad. Participants of this group might still use the voucher while on a visit in Germany or after a potential return, but these are merely hypothetical benefits for many emigrants. We therefore opted for Amazon vouchers, since they enable payouts in many countries (see Chapter 5.5). Participants were given the option to choose the Amazon country shop of their choice for the voucher (e.g. amazon.de, amazon.us).


Donations are the least problematic payout for our group. Donations can be made through the survey organiser regardless of the respondent's place of domicile. This is a key advantage when dealing with a highly mobile survey population. In order to increase respondents' sense of autonomy, we offered a selection of six charities. The list was compiled in a way that it would appeal to various ages and interests. It included the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, www.unicef.de), *Médecins sans Frontières* (MSF, www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.de), the Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU, www.nabu.de), the German Cancer Aid (*Deutsche Krebshilfe*, www.krebshilfe.de), the German Sport Aid Foundation (*Stiftung Deutsche Sporthilfe*, www.sporthilfe.de), and Viva con Agua as a non-profit organisation committed to ensure worldwide access to clean drinking water (www.vivaconagua.org).

5.3 Field process

Throughout the fieldwork lasting from 7 November 2018 to 11 February 2019, 4,997 persons of the gross sample of emigrants and 6,900 persons of the remigrant sample participated in one of the two surveys. Figure 5-3 and Figure 5-4 show an overview of the field process, showing both the number of interviews per day and the cumulated progress. They show a relatively continuous increase of responses over the whole period in particular with regard to the sample of emigrants. In comparison to other online surveys, this is rather unusual. Particularly when invitations and reminders are sent electronically, participants' response is usually concentrated on the first few days after receiving the invitation.


The field process is an outcome of the GERPS research design: The push-to-web design based on postal invitation and reminder letters increases the response behaviour because contact with potential participants is less direct than electronic contacts. The postal delivery times are particularly relevant to understand the slower increase in interviews in the emigrant sample. Here, invitations were sent either to addresses all over the world or to former German addresses, so that forwarding orders additionally increased mail delivery times. This also explains why the increase in interviews was faster in the remigrant than the emigrant sample. Consequently, a comparatively long fieldwork period of several months obviously has a positive effect on response if an internationally mobile population is recruited.

Figure 5-3: Development of interviews in the emigrant sample



Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Figure 5-4: Development of interviews in the remigrant sample



Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

5.4 Interview duration

For the 6,465 people who participated in the full remigrant questionnaire, the average completion time was 38.7 minutes and the median 23.7 minutes. For the 4,545 people who participated in the full emigrant questionnaire, average completion time was 39.8 minutes and the median 24.3 minutes (see Table 5-3). Completion times include all parts of the survey; the panel consent query and the incentive query were also included in the calculation.

Table 5-3: Interview duration by questionnaire

	Number of respondents (N)	Median (in minutes)	Arith. mean (in minutes)	SD
Remigrant questionnaire	6,592	23.6	38.7	116.1
Complete	6,465	23.7	38.7	116.3
Partial	127	19.9	42.3	102.6
Emigrant questionnaire	4,667	24.3	39.8	116.5
Complete	4,545	24.2	39.2	110.0
Partial	122	31.0	62.4	261.5

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

5.5 Processing incentives in an international context

Processing incentives constituted a time-consuming obstacle with participants living in more than 100 countries all over the world. Aiming for high response rates and high panel consent, it had to be guaranteed that incentives would be delivered regardless of the present country of residence. Thus, irrespective of timing and amount of incentive, each person could choose the type of incentive they wanted to receive. The options included an Amazon voucher, a PayPal transfer, a donation to a charity or, if applicable, a bank transfer to a German account. Alternatively, respondents could also turn down their incentive.

Table 5-4: Type of contact details provided by respondents for receiving incentives

	Complete interview		thereof:				
	N	E-mail		Name		Phone number	
		N	N	%	N	%	N
Lottery	4,042	4,001	99.0	3,732	92.3	3,040	75.2
Amazon vouchers	2,395	2,371	99.0	2,198	91.8	1,640	68.5
Cash transfer (PayPal)	1,896	1,879	99.1	1,815	95.7	1,487	78.4
Cash transfer (bank account)	19	18	94.7	18	94.7	16	84.2
Total (asked for contact details)	8,352	8,269	99.0	7,763	93.0	6,183	74.0
Donation	2,144	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Renounced/unknown	514	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	11,010	8,269	75.1	7,763	70.5	6,183	56.2

Note: Incentives were issued to all respondents who “technically” submitted the questionnaire even if some answers were incomplete.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

For data protection reasons, respondents were asked to submit their contact details to receive the incentive separately from contact details collected for panel consent (see Chapter 8.3). Table 5-4 provides an overview of contact details collected as part of the incentive program. Overall, 99.0% of all respondents who were asked for detailed contact information provided an e-mail address to receive the incentive, 93.0% provided a name, and 74.0% a phone number. Respondents who donated to a charity, renounced

from their incentive, or did not choose which incentive they would like to receive were not asked for further contact details.

Lottery

The lottery drawing for the pretest as well as the main study took place in February 2019 under the supervision of a notary. A list including all respondents who completed the survey and agreed to participate in the lottery was created. It consisted of 241 respondents originating from the pretest as well as 4,074 respondents from the main study. Each respondent was only included once and was assigned a randomly generated number. The respondents with the smallest random number were selected as winners and were subsequently informed about their prize by e-mail. If they did not respond, they were additionally contacted by phone so that eventually all prizes could be delivered.

Amazon voucher

Once a respondent had chosen to receive their incentive in the form of an Amazon voucher, they were asked to select a nationally localised Amazon store and provide a valid e-mail address on which they wished to redeem the voucher. The e-mail address was used to send the voucher. After the system registered the completion of the survey, the amount indicated was sent as an Amazon voucher to the given e-mail address. Overall, 3,395 people chose an Amazon voucher as an incentive.

Table 5-5: Respondents selection of Amazon vouchers for nationally localised stores

	N	%
Germany (amazon.de)	2,038	85.1
Australia (amazon.au)	4	0.2
Brazil (amazon.com.br)*	1	0.0
China (amazon.cn)	2	0.1
France (amazon.fr)	53	2.2
Canada (amazon.ca)**	4	0.2
Italy (amazon.it)	17	0.7
Japan (amazon.co.jp)	9	0.4
Mexico (amazon.com.mx)*	1	0.0
The Netherlands (amazon.nl)	7	0.3
Austria (amazon.at)	56	2.4
Spain (amazon.es)	25	1.0
United Kingdom (amazon.co.uk)	101	4.2
United States of America (amazon.com)**	77	3.2
Total	3,395	100.0

Note: * Amazon in Brazil and Mexico do not offer digital vouchers and the option could not be used; ** Amazon in Canada and the USA could also not be used, as the purchase of vouchers was cancelled by Amazon's automatic security measures. All respondents who chose to receive their incentive as a voucher through one of these countries (Brazil, Mexico, Canada or USA) were contacted and offered an alternative. These included other Amazon platforms, PayPal, or bank transfers.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

At the beginning, there were several delays in transferring Amazon vouchers. After the first batch of vouchers was issued, Amazon blocked the credit card and suspended the Amazon account. To minimize fraud, Amazon's artificial intelligence suspends accounts that send too many vouchers at once. Consequently, a corporate account was set up with Amazon Incentive that was subsequently used for processing most Amazon

vouchers. Remaining problems concerned the North American marketplaces because of other technical problems. The orders were regularly cancelled by Amazon and the account was blocked. Opening an alternative account on the Amazon.com site was not possible from Germany. During the process, it became clear that it was not possible to purchase digital vouchers for Amazon Brazil and Mexico. Participants who chose vouchers from one of those two nationally localised stores were contacted offering an alternative type of incentive (another Amazon platform, PayPal, or a bank transfer). Finally, issuing vouchers to marketplaces in the Asia-Pacific region demanded the creation of separate Amazon accounts.

Cash transfer

All participants who opted for a PayPal transfer were asked to provide an e-mail address linked to a PayPal account. For practical reasons, transfers were not done instantly after the survey had been submitted but on a weekly basis only. Although PayPal principally offers standardised mass dispatches, this is only possible for 5,000 transfers onwards. After the money was sent via PayPal, respondents received a notification via the e-mail address provided offering them 30 days to retrieve the money. Overall, 1,896 respondents chose a PayPal transfer to receive the incentives.

Additionally, some individual transfers were rejected by the receiving account for unknown reasons. In all cases, those participants were contacted again to solve technical problems. If necessary, they were asked for an alternative e-mail address or to choose an alternative form of transmission, such as a bank transfer to a German account. A similar procedure was used in cases in which the amount was not accepted within the specified 30 days: A reminder was sent to the recipients and if necessary, the amount was transferred again.

Donation to a charity

Those who chose to donate their incentive to a charity had the opportunity to choose from six different organisations appealing to various ages and interests (see Chapter 5.2.4). As shown in Table 5-6, 43.4% out of the 2,144 people who wanted to donate their incentives to a charity chose Médecins sans Frontières, 16.1% the German Cancer Aid, 15.4% the Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU), 12.9% the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), 10.0% Viva con Agua and 2.2% the German Sports Aid Foundation. Finally, 404 people stated that they would like to renounce their incentive or did not wish to take part in the lottery, and 55 respondents did not provide any information on which type of incentives they would like although they completed and submitted the survey.

Table 5-6: Donations to charity organisations

	Respondents		Donation
	N	%	Euro
German Cancer Aid	346	16.1	4,685
United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)	276	12.9	3,655
Médecins sans Frontières (MSF)	930	43.4	12,005
Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU)	329	15.4	4,360
German Sports Aid Foundation	47	2.2	610
Viva con Agua	216	10.0	2,780
Total	2,144	100.0	28,095


Note: The total sum consists of all issued incentives also including incentives for participants who “technically” submitted the questionnaire even if some answers are incomplete.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

5.6 Participant requests

The initial letter of invitation as well as all reminder letters included a phone number and an e-mail address offering participants the option to discuss individual issues and remaining questions about the survey. In total, participants issued more than 640 requests by e-mail and approximately 1,000 by phone during the fieldwork. Figure 5-5 shows that the dispatch of the invitation letter resulted in few participant requests increasing only in the weeks following the first and the second reminder letter. Furthermore, the number of requests increased sharply after panel maintenance initiatives in March 2019 (see Chapter 8.4). In particular, this final increase was due to e-mails regarding pending incentives.

Figure 5-5: Development of participant requests



Note: For technical and organisational reasons, not all phone enquiries could be recorded and multiple enquiries from the same participant are counted multiple times in the Figure.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Participant requests included a wide range of topics. Compared to other surveys, a substantial number of requests provided positive feedback and people sent additional information about their own person and their living situation. Furthermore, a substantial number of respondents asked about when and in what form the results of the study would be published and whether and in what form the collected data could be accessed. Next to this positive feedback from the field, an initial issue that regularly caused requests mainly concerned technical problems while accessing and participating in the online survey. These types of requests were closely linked to the dispatch dates of the invitation and reminder letters. In cases where participants reported problems accessing the online questionnaire, the issues were usually associated with the participants themselves. Therefore, problems could be solved by suggesting that participants use a different internet browser or technical device. In addition, some requests concerned plausibility checks during the survey where participants could not continue because of implausible answers. Finally, some requests concerned participants without immediate internet access. In these cases, they were told that they could also participate later once they had internet access again.

A second issue included enquiries regarding data protection issues. Participants asked about the background and the aims of the survey as well as about the sampling process and the identification of the participants based on the population registers. Further enquiries ranged from general questions about data protection to specific questions on access to contact details and the storage of personal data. These questions could be answered based on the data protection concept, but direct contact to the responsible data protection official was established in a few cases.

A third issue concerned respondents who were erroneously identified as part of the sample population, or did not easily fit into the emigrant or remigrant sample. Some of the requests concerned the addresses of the emigrant respondents used. In many cases, the letters arrived at the address of their parents or other relatives. It turned out that the parents or relatives who opened the letter often did not know how to respond to the letter. In those cases, detailed information about the survey was provided and they were asked to forward the letter to the target respondent. Particularly in cases of older parents, the invitation and reminder letter were not specific enough. Further enquiries included cases that could not easily identify as emigrants or remigrants. This included, for example, border commuters who live in one country and work in another, or persons who were travelling around the world spending only a few weeks in each country. Respondents were regularly motivated to participate in the study and decide themselves whether they belong more to the emigrant or the remigrant sample. Furthermore, they were informed that some questions in both survey versions would not fit their specific situation and could be skipped.

Fourthly, participants requested information about the end of the fieldwork and deadline of the survey and provided feedback about the timing of the invitation and reminder letters. Those questions were received throughout the entire field process, presumably because neither the invitation nor the first reminder specified a concrete deadline. Only the last reminder specified a specific date. Even after the completion of the survey on 11 February 2019, approximately 45 enquiries were received by e-mail or phone as to whether participation was still possible. A reply was drafted to inform everybody who enquired about this topic that it was unfortunately no longer possible to participate. Furthermore, people asked multiple times whether it was possible to participate in the following waves of the survey but had to be informed that for organisational reasons participation in the second wave would not be possible without prior participation in the first wave. Concerning the number and the timing of the reminder letters, participants complained about the short period between the reminders as well as about reminders being sent although they had already submitted the survey. The single issue that caused the most participant requests concerned the processing of incentives. The majority of enquiries regarding incentives were related to the receipt or non-receipt of incentives, in particular of the Amazon vouchers. Especially at the beginning of the survey, enquiries were received because some respondents expected that Amazon vouchers or PayPal transfers would be issued instantly after the survey had been submitted. These enquiries were answered by pointing out that for organisational and technical reasons a waiting period of up to 14 days had to be expected and possibly even longer because of high numbers of participation. Some of the participants could not receive the incentives for technical reasons, for example, if the e-mail address provided was invalid. Other technical problems, especially with Amazon vouchers, also led to participants not receiving their incentive. Respondents to whom the selected incentive could not be issued for various reasons (see Chapter 5.5) were offered an alternative type of incentive.

After panel maintenance in March 2019, when the e-mail message sent mentioned the incentive again, participant requests concerned in particular the processing of incentives. Other requests concerned respondents who reported a change in address.

Finally, a last topic of participant requests concerned individuals who actively refused to participate in the survey or requested the deletion of their personal data. The feedback ranged from short e-mails from participants unsubscribing from participation in the survey, for example because of a lack of time to complete the survey, to longer messages with detailed, sometimes reproachful reasons. The predominant topics were concerns about data protection and annoyance about too many reminders. The number of refusals increased after the second reminder and the panel maintenance mailing in March 2019. Every person who actively refused to participate was sent a short, standardised, confirmation e-mail after their data was deleted and their deregistration was recorded in the database (see Chapter 6.2).

6 Response rates and unit nonresponse

Unit nonresponse refers to sample members initially invited for study participation who do not respond. Nonresponding sample members can be a major problem for panel surveys like GERPS. Unit nonresponse can harm data quality and lead to biased estimations if nonresponding sample members are distributed differently among specific population subgroups in systematic ways. In addition, unit nonresponse threatens surveys' longevity. If the former is the case, a survey suffers from nonresponse errors (see also Groves et al. 2004: p. 59). For example, if participants in GERPS felt on average less socially isolated compared to participation refusers, results on measured social isolation are affected by nonresponse bias. Analysing unit nonresponse in surveys is therefore instructive in various ways. This includes the assessment of data quality, corresponding weighting procedures, and taking appropriate actions towards proactively dealing with panel attrition.

In this chapter, we first describe the components of unit nonresponse. Second, we discuss different standards of response rates and apply them to GERPS. Third, we analyse potential covariates of unit nonresponse and the impact of methodological variations concerning different incentive schemes and survey modes.

6.1 Components of unit nonresponse

Three major components of unit nonresponse are distinguished in the literature: non-contact, refusal, and inability (e.g. Groves et al. 2004; Schnell 2012). "Noncontact" refers to sample members who could not be contacted and are thus not likely to know about the survey request. Noncontact occurs, for example, if survey invitations were not delivered by the post office. "Refusal" refers to sample members who know about the survey request, but refuse to participate. In GERPS, we distinguish explicit and implicit refusal. Explicit refusals refer to sample members who contacted us and withdrew from GERPS, whereas implicit refusals did not inform us about their withdrawal. This differentiation is similar for sample members who are not able to take part in the survey, which refers to "inability," the third component of unit nonresponse. For instance, inability occurs due to technical or physical obstacles that impair device use and online participation. Accordingly, explicit inability refers to sample members who contacted and informed us, while implicit inability refers to persons who on principle knew about the survey, but did not inform us of their inability.

Table 6-1 provides an overview of the various components of unit nonresponse in the first wave of GERPS. The initial gross sample contained 47,714 persons (see Chapter 2.4). Differentiated by the two samples, the gross sample included 21,441 remigrants and 26,273 emigrants. Among the emigrants, we invited 9,446 to participate in the

survey by contacting them at their recent foreign addresses in their destination country. The remaining 16,827 emigrants were invited via their former German address because information about their new address in their country of destination was missing (see Chapter 2.4.3). In the latter case, we expected that a substantial number of emigrants would have ensured the receipt of postal items and correspondence either through personal contacts (e.g. former household members or neighbours), or by establishing forwarding orders offered by the *Deutsche Post* or other courier companies. Forwarding orders are fee-based services offered by the post office, which forwards postal mails from outdated to current addresses (see Chapter 5.2.1).

Table 6-1: Components of unit nonresponse and response rates by sample and contact option

	Emigrants				Remigrants		Total	
	Recent foreign address		Former German address		Recent German address		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Gross sample	9,446	100.0	16,827	100.0	21,441	100.0	47,714	100.0
Noncontact	1,459	15.4	8,457	50.3	3,864	18.0	13,780	28.9
Explicit refusal	11	0.1	7	0.0	33	0.2	51	0.1
Explicit inability	2	0.0	2	0.0	3	0.0	7	0.0
Implicit refusal and inability	4,686	49.6	6,652	39.5	10,641	49.6	21,979	46.1
Interviews	3,287	34.8	1,710	10.2	6,900	32.2	11,897	25.0
Break-off	167	1.8	89	0.5	382	1.8	638	1.3
Partial interviews	94	1.0	31	0.2	124	0.6	249	0.5
Complete interviews	3,026	32.0	1,590	9.4	6,394	29.8	11,010	23.1
<i>Emigrant interviews</i>	<i>3,246</i>	<i>34.4</i>	<i>1,392</i>	<i>8.3</i>	<i>290</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>4,927</i>	<i>10.3</i>
<i>Break-off</i>	<i>165</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>261</i>	<i>0.5</i>
<i>Partial interviews</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>0.3</i>
<i>Complete interviews</i>	<i>2,987</i>	<i>31.6</i>	<i>1,300</i>	<i>7.7</i>	<i>258</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>4,545</i>	<i>9.5</i>
<i>Remigrant interviews</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>318</i>	<i>1.9</i>	<i>6,610</i>	<i>30.8</i>	<i>6,969</i>	<i>14.6</i>
<i>Break-off</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>357</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>377</i>	<i>0.8</i>
<i>Partial interviews</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>117</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>127</i>	<i>0.3</i>
<i>Complete interviews</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>290</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>6,136</i>	<i>28.6</i>	<i>6,465</i>	<i>13.5</i>

Note: Break-off = less than 50% of all applicable questions answered; partial = 50% to 80% answered; complete = over 80% answered (see also Chapter 7.2). In the case of 24 break-off interviews, no information about the used questionnaire exists because of early break-off. These cases are only included in the totals but not included in the differentiation between emigrant and remigrant interviews

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

GERPS has a relatively large proportion of noncontacts, which refers to sample members for whom we know that the invitation letter was not delivered. Noncontacts are thus not likely to know about the survey request. Since we study a highly mobile population, the large proportion of noncontacts was expected. The lowest percentage of noncontacts was recorded for emigrants contacted at their recent foreign addresses with 15.4% ($n=1,459$), whereas it was 18.0% ($n=3,864$) for remigrants and 50.3% ($n=8,457$) for emigrants contacted at their former German addresses. Two reasons might account for the particularly large share of noncontacts among emigrants who were contacted at their former German address. First, not all emigrants take care of postal correspondence at their former address. Second, established forwarding orders may have expired by the time the survey started. Accordingly, emigrants who left Germany at the end of the sampling period (e.g. in the first half of 2018) would be less likely to have an active

forwarding order compared to emigrants who moved in the second half of 2017. However, information on noncontact is less reliable for emigrants contacted at their recent foreign addresses because delivery information from international courier companies is less reliable than in a national context only. Net of noncontacts, 33,934 persons were contacted with invitation and reminder letters in total.

Only 0.1% ($n=51$) of the overall gross sample was recorded as explicit refusal, with a slightly higher share in the remigrant sample. Of those 51 individuals, 14 requested a complete deletion. Furthermore, seven persons informed us that they were technically or physically unable to fill out the online questionnaire. In postal surveys, differentiating implicit refusals from implicit inability is not possible, which is why both components are combined in Table 6-1. Accordingly, 49.6% ($n=4,686$) of emigrants contacted at their recent foreign addresses and 49.6% ($n=10,641$) of remigrants are assumed to have been informed about the survey request but did not participate in GERPS due to implicit refusal or inability. Among emigrants who were contacted at their former German addresses, the share of implicit refusal or inability was lowest (39.5%, $n=6,652$). Similar to the share of noncontacts, emigrants contacted at their recent foreign addresses were least likely to refuse implicitly or to be implicitly unable to participate in the study, while emigrants contacted at their former German addresses were most likely to be assigned to this category.

6.2 Response rates

One established indicator that provides a first glance at the data quality of a population survey is the response rate. Response rates in population studies have been in universal decline in recent decades (Beullens et al. 2018; Brick, Williams 2012; De Leeuw 2018; De Leeuw, Heer 2002). In Germany, for example, Schnell (2012: p. 164) demonstrated that response rates in many surveys are under 40%. Regarding web and postal surveys in particular, Shih and Fan (2008), report that the response rate of realised online interviews is on average 34% and 11 percentage points smaller compared to PAPI interviews (Manfreda et al. 2008; Tourangeau, Conrad, Couper 2013). This global trend is also expected to affect the response rate in GERPS. Moreover, GERPS focuses on a highly mobile population, which is generally much harder to reach than non-mobile populations, making a lower response rate compared to other population studies more likely (cf. Lynn et al. 2018).

There are different ways of calculating response rates. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR 2016: p. 61) differentiates six formulas. The strictest version divides the number of complete interviews by the respective gross sample size (including cases of unknown eligibility; “RR1” or “minimum response rate”). The most liberal version divides the number of partial and complete interviews by all sample members who are known to be eligible for survey participation and assumed to have received an invitation letter (“RR6”). AAPOR standards to calculate response rates are applied by population surveys in the US (e.g. Gallup Panel and American Life Panel). These standards are also increasingly applied internationally. Examples include large-scale longitudinal surveys like the Swedish Citizen Panel by the University of Gothenburg, the Norwegian Citizen Panel by the University of Bergen, the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) by the German Institute of Economic Research (DIW) and the German General Social Survey (ALLBUS), which is conducted by the German Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences (GESIS).

When looking for adequate benchmarks for response rates in GERPS, we must consider other probability-based online surveys. Examples of such surveys include the German Internet Panel (GIP), the German GESIS Panel, the Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences (LISS) in the Netherlands, or the Longitudinal (Pilot) Study *Étude*

Longitudinale par Internet Pour les Sciences Sociales (ELIPSS) in France. However, differences in design characteristics exacerbate direct comparisons between probability-based online surveys (Blom et al. 2016; Schaurer 2017: 20 ff.). Importantly, the aforementioned surveys differ in their recruitment strategies. In order to reduce coverage problems and increase response rates, the GIP and the GESIS Panel previously recruited potential candidates face-to-face, while the LISS Panel conducted telephone and face-to-face pre-recruitments using a multi-mode approach. The pilot study of ELIPSS followed a sequential recruitment design by initiating an offline recruitment phase by postal mail, then telephone, then face-to-face (Blom et al. 2016). In contrast, GERPS solely relied on invitations by postal mail and did not implement a pre-recruitment phase. Thus, the aforementioned probability-based online surveys with pre-recruitment strategies may be comparably more successful in maximising their number of respondents. However, Table 6-2 shows that the response rates of GERPS are quite satisfactory: We obtain an RR3 of 23.1% and an RR4 of 23.6% with 11,010 complete and 249 partial interviews in total (see Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 respectively). Note, however, that in GERPS, RR3 corresponds to RR1 and RR4 corresponds to RR2. Since sampling for GERPS was based on the population register, we were able to identify persons eligible for study participation before sending the invitation letters. Thus, noncontacts who did not receive our invitation are all expected to be eligible for study participation. Calculating an estimated proportion of eligible sample members among our noncontacts in order to compute RR3 and RR4 (see AAPOR 2016: p. 62) was therefore obsolete. Furthermore, GERPS yields a total RR5 of 33.1%. With reference to AAPOR (2016: 31), the calculation of this response rate excludes all noncontacts (see Table 6-1), since these survey members did not wilfully return a questionnaire, but due to undelivered invitations.

Table 6-2: Differentiated response rates in GERPS and overall response rates of other probability-based European online surveys

	GERPS				ELIPSS	LISS	GIP	GESIS-Panel
	E(f)	E(G)	R	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
RR3	32.0	9.4	29.8	23.1	27.3	48.3	-	-
RR4	33.0	9.6	30.4	23.6	-	-	18.1	-
RR5	37.9	19.0	36.4	33.1	-	-	-	25.1

Note: E(f) = Emigrants contacted at recent foreign addresses; E(G) = Emigrants contacted at former German addresses; R = Remigrants.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1; Blom et al. (2016)

Table 6-2 further shows that despite the pre-recruitment, the aforementioned probability-based online surveys in Europe – especially in Germany – are not more successful than GERPS in maximising the number of respondents in their main survey. The ELIPSS pilot study reported an overall response rate¹ of 27.3% (RR3). In LISS, the overall response rate (RR3) was 48.3% and comparatively high, however strongly positively influenced by the fact that the study is based on a household sample. The overall response rate (RR4) in GIP was 18.1% and 25.1% (RR5) in the GESIS Panel.

The satisfactory response rates in GERPS become particularly apparent once we concentrate on response rates for specific samples or contact options (see Chapter 2.4). For emigrants contacted at their recent foreign address, we obtain an RR3 of 32.0%. For the remigrant group, we obtained an RR3 of 29.8%. In contrast, the RR3 among emigrants contacted at their former German addresses was 9.4%.

¹ Overall, response rates are calculated by multiplying the survey recruitment rate with their profile rate (see AAPOR 2016: 48).

Emigrants who were contacted at their former German addresses were particularly hard to reach, as we had no or invalid information on their recent foreign address. Accordingly, for the recruitment in this particular group, we expected that emigrants would have ensured the receipt of postal items and correspondence either by personal contacts or by using forwarding orders provided by courier companies. Given the expected low quality of addresses in this subsample, the amount of additional interviews is decent. The RR3 of emigrants contacted at recent foreign addresses is 2.2 percentage points higher than in the remigrant sample. This finding is noteworthy given our expectation of higher address quality in the remigrant sample. Respondents living abroad seem relatively more inclined to answer the questionnaire compared to remigrants. Overall, the response rate of GERPS is at a similar level as response rates of other probability-based online surveys. Once we focus on individuals contacted at their current addresses, GERPS' response rate is substantially higher than in comparable surveys.

6.3 Correlates of unit nonresponse and available data sources

While response rates are a first indicator to assess nonresponse error in surveys (Groves et al. 2004: 59), they are not sufficient in determining data quality. The investigation of potential correlates of unit nonresponse is the second step. The available literature highlights various potential factors influencing unit nonresponse. Following Halbherr (2016), these factors can be assigned to personal characteristics of potential survey participants, to regional characteristics, and to specific characteristics of the survey.

1. **Personal characteristics:** Several personal characteristics of potential survey participants are regularly found to be related with unit nonresponse. These mainly include sex, age, migration experience, family status, education, employment status, and socio-economic status (cf. Brehm 1993; Darcovich et al. 1998; Demarest et al. 2012; Durrant, Steele 2009; Feskens et al. 2007; Groves, Couper 1998; Goyder 1987; Helmschrott, Martin 2014; Kleinert, Ruland, Trahms 2013; Koch 1998; Krause 1993; Lynn 2003; Smith 1983; Watson, Wooden 2009). The basic assumption behind the explanatory power of such socio-demographic and socio-economic factors is that potential survey participants who differ along those characteristics also differ with regard to their lifestyles and beliefs. Individual lifestyles therefore affect the risk of noncontact and survey refusal, which are often considered the main components of unit nonresponse (e.g. Peytchev 2013).
2. **Regional characteristics:** The social, political, and economic situation in a country or specific region might also influence response behaviour. Indicators can include national and regional unemployment rates, the degree of urbanisation, the building structure of the neighbourhood (e.g. single-family houses versus blocks of flats), and the degree of ethnic segregation in the residential area of potential survey participants (e.g. Foster, Bushnell 1994; Goyder 1987; Harris-Kojetin, Tucker 1999; Helmschrott, Martin 2014; Sinibaldi, Trappmann, Kreuter 2014). Assumptions guiding macro-level effects on unit nonresponse primarily refer to the refusal component of unit nonresponse. For instance, living in highly urbanised regions with high population density may foster the perceived anonymity and fear of crime, promoting a climate of mistrust and ultimately increasing the risk of refusal in survey participation (e.g. Helmschrott, Martin 2014; Schneekloth, Leven 2003). In the context of GERPS, regional characteristics are potentially relevant in three ways: in the country of sampling, the country of origin, and the country of destination. For example, nonresponse of emigrants might increase due to unreliable national postal services that restrict emigrants' reachability.

3. **Survey characteristics:** Several survey characteristics are likely to account for unit nonresponse. They include the mode of data collection as well as the type of incentives (Berlin et al. 1992; Juster, Suzman 1995; Martin, Helmschrott, Rammstedt 2014; Petrolia, Bhattacharjee 2009; Pforr et al. 2015; Singer, Kulka 2001; Singer et al. 1999; Singer, Ye 2013). Similar to personal characteristics, survey design effects on unit nonresponse are explained by reachability (with respect to different survey modes) and by motivational aspects (with respect to incentives). In GERPS, there are two additional survey design features potentially influencing unit nonresponse. The first feature concerns the contact option of emigrants by using recent postal addresses in the destination country or the former address in Germany before emigration. A second feature concerns the sampling procedure, which focused on migration events during a period of twelve months. Since residential mobility is relatively high in our sample, the time that passed between migration and survey invitation might also be related to reachability and motivation.

Although there are established and reasonably justified factors that influence potential survey participants' response behaviour, researchers who aim at assessing unit non-response error are often confronted with actually measuring explanatory factors because there is usually no or hardly any information available for the group of interest – i.e. the non-respondents (cf. Schnell 1997: 134). A particular advantage of the research design of GERPS is the availability of information on non-respondents (see in particular Chapter 2.4). Since the sampling for GERPS is based on Germany's population registers, we are provided with basic information about all sample members, irrespective of their survey participation. Throughout the fieldwork, additional meta data was collected including information about the survey process (cf. Lynn 2008). In the context of unit nonresponse, this includes information about date and time of attempted contact, contact option, and the survey mode (e.g. push-to-web mode or different variants of mixed-modes including paper questionnaires).

An additional way to deal with the challenge of lacking information about non-respondents is applying auxiliary information as a proxy for relevant factors that promote unit nonresponse (Kreuter 2013). We purchased proxy information for the gross sample from Microm, a German micro- and geo-marketing agency. Microm provides demographic, economic, and geographic information based on the address level for all of the approximately 40.9 million households in Germany. Microm data are compiled from various sources, including German governmental institutions, the *Deutsche Post*, telecommunication companies, and various providers of market data from the private sector. To meet requirements of data security, Microm defines so-called "micro cells," which consist of at least four households in a predefined geographical area. Accordingly, several micro cells can be part of one residential building, but a micro cell may also be represented by up to four residential buildings if each building contains only one household. Regarding GERPS, Microm information was matched to all available addresses in the overall gross sample. The information was mainly used on the micro-cell level to either account for personal or regional characteristics. It is important to note, however, that in the case of German emigrants, Microm does not provide auxiliary information on the current residential area abroad, but on the German place of residence from where they emigrated.

Basic descriptive statistics of our independent variables are displayed in Table 6-3 and assigns Microm data to the different characteristics discussed above. Note that case numbers between variables vary due to unavailable information from population registers and Microm. Considering personal characteristics, potential survey participants' sex is introduced as a dummy variable, with "0" referring to men and "1" referring to female. Individuals' age is categorised into five groups (0 = 20-30 years; ... 4 = 61-70 years). Whether participants in the study are born in Germany ("0") or born

abroad (“1”) is captured as well. We further use Microm information on the dominant family structure in the micro-cell of emigrating or remigrating Germans, differentiating between mainly family households (“0”), a mix of family and single households (“1”), and mainly single households (“2”). The family structure serves as a proxy for potential survey participants’ household size, assuming that persons living in single households are more difficult to contact and more likely to be socially isolated than persons living in larger households (e.g. Helmschrott, Martin 2014). Another Microm variable is the categorical variable “social status” (0 = lowest; ... 8 = highest), providing status information for the respective micro-cell based on a comparison with national averages of education and income. We expect a positive relationship between the socio-economic status and unit response because high-status participants are more likely to have cosmopolitan orientations and are more willing to disclose personal information for scientific purposes.

Table 6-3: Overview of independent variables in unit nonresponse analyses by sample

	Min.	Max.	Emigrants			Remigrants		
			n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Personal characteristics								
Female	0	1	26,226	0.47		21,004	0.45	
Age group								
20-30	0	1	26,261	0.38		21,402	0.34	
31-40	0	1	26,261	0.33		21,402	0.29	
41-50	0	1	26,261	0.13		21,402	0.16	
51-60	0	1	26,261	0.09		21,402	0.12	
61-70	0	1	26,261	0.04		21,402	0.05	
Born abroad	0	1	26,265	0.26		21,435	0.29	
Social status (M)	0	8	24,498	4.49	2.83	20,984	4.70	2.88
Family structure (M)								
Mainly family households	0	1	24,498	0.13		20,984	0.12	
Mix of family and single households	0	1	24,498	0.06		20,984	0.06	
Mainly single households	0	1	24,498	0.79		20,984	0.80	
Regional characteristics								
Country of (r)emigration								
EU-15	0	1	26,265	0.37		21,435	0.35	
Post-EU-15 Member	0	1	26,265	0.05		21,435	0.05	
Switzerland	0	1	26,265	0.16		21,435	0.00	
Other European country	0	1	26,265	0.05		21,435	0.06	
North America	0	1	26,265	0.08		21,435	0.08	
Latin America	0	1	26,265	0.05		21,435	0.08	
Asia	0	1	26,265	0.07		21,435	0.09	
Africa	0	1	26,265	0.02		21,435	0.04	
Australia, N. Zealand, Oceania	0	1	26,265	0.03		21,435	0.03	
Middle East, Arabic countries	0	1	26,265	0.02		21,435	0.04	
Missing country information	0	1	26,265	0.03		21,435	0.04	
Building structure (M)	0	6	24,498	2.98	1.51	20,984	3.03	1.56
Municipality size (M)	0	4	24,730	3.41	0.80	21,406	3.51	0.78

↓

Table 6-3: continued

	Min.	Max.	Emigrants			Remigrants		
			n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Survey characteristics								
Contacted at former German address	0	1	26,265	0.64				
Months since migration	4	18	26,174	10.97	3.59	21,429	10.56	3.64
Survey mode								
Push-to-web only	0	1				21,435	0.90	
PAPI option with invitation	0	1				21,435	0.04	
PAPI option with second reminder	0	1				21,435	0.04	
Incentive scheme number								
INS 1 (0/lottery)	0	1	26,265	0.30		21,435	0.49	
INS 2 (0/10)	0	1	26,265	0.30		21,435	0.37	
INS 3 (0/20)	0	1	26,265	0.38		21,435	0.03	
INS 4 (non-cash/15)	0	1	26,265	0.02				
INS 5 (5/5)	0	1				21,435	0.03	
INS 6 (5/10)	0	1				21,435	0.03	
INS 7 (5/15)	0	1				21,435	0.03	

Note: (M) = Microm data

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

With respect to regional characteristics, register information on emigrants' country of destination and remigrants' country of origin is used. Migration to or from EU-15 countries is coded "0," "1" refers to post-EU-15 accession countries, "2" to Switzerland, "3" to non-EU/non-Switzerland countries in Europe, "4" to North American countries, "5" to Latin American countries, "6" to Asian countries, "7" to African countries, "8" to countries in Australia, New Zealand and Oceania respectively, "9" to Arabic and Middle Eastern countries, and "10" to persons for whom no country information is available from the registers (i.e. 990 emigrants and 991 remigrants). We further account for the building structure (0 = 1-2 family homes in homogeneous street; 1 = 1-2 family homes in heterogeneous street; 2 = 3-5 family homes; 3 = 6-9 family homes; 4 = block of flats with 10-19 households; 5 = high-rise buildings with 20 and more households; 6 = mainly commercially-used houses) using Microm data. With reference to social isolation theories, this variable serves as a proxy for access to neighbours and the local community, assuming substandard access and, therefore, increased nonresponse for persons living in rather anonymous multiunit structures and areas with primarily commercially-used buildings (Groves, Couper 1998). The variable "municipality size" is derived from Microm information and measured at the municipality level. It is introduced as an ordinal variable (0 = below 20,000 inhabitants; 1 = 20,000 to below 50,000 inhabitants; 2 = 50,000 to below 100,000 inhabitants; 3 = 100,000 to below 500,000 inhabitants; 4 = 500,000 and more inhabitants). Municipality size provides information on the degree of urbanisation in the respective area, assuming that persons living in urban areas spend less time at home. In the context of GERPS, however, it could also be assumed that persons emigrating from or remigrating to rather remote areas feel less inclined to participate in a survey supported by the government, as persons from such areas often feel rather unnoticed by the government.

Regarding survey characteristics, four different variables are taken into account to understand nonresponse behaviour. First, a categorical variable accounts for the different contact options applied in the emigrant sample. It captures whether emigrants were contacted at their recent foreign addresses ("0") or at their former German addresses ("1"). The use of former German addresses indicated that there were either no or invalid foreign addresses registered at the register office (see Chapter 6.4 for more details on the survey mode and incentive experiments). Second, "months since migration" is a continuous variable and measures the time between the emigration or

remigration event and the first month of interviewing (November 2018). Choosing the first month of interviewing instead of interview dates avoids the problem of lacking interview dates and makes measurements between migrants comparable. Outliers are dealt with by restricting the variable range from four months (including one to three months since migration) to 18 months (including 19 to 234 months since migration). A third variable controls whether remigrants were part of the survey mode experiment or not. Potential survey participants in the experiment group were given the chance to participate by PAPI. The experiment group was divided into two groups: The first group received a paper questionnaire in combination with the invitation letter (coded “1”), while the second group received a paper questionnaire with the second reminder only (coded “2”; see Chapters 5.1.2 and 15.1). Finally, a fourth variable accounts for the different incentive schemes (INS) that we applied to test motivation of survey participation (see Chapter 5.2.4). Participants who were offered a lottery of twenty times 500 euros are coded “0,” while conditional cash incentives with 10 and 20 euros were coded “1” and “2” respectively. The other four categories account for incentive schemes with a combination of unconditional and conditional incentives: “3” refers to non-cash/15, “4” to 5/5, “5” to 5/10 and “6” to the 5/15 incentive scheme.

6.3.1 Effects of personal and regional factors on unit nonresponse

Table 6-4 depicts average marginal effects (AMEs) on unit nonresponse based on multiple logistic regression analyses with robust standard errors. The dependent variable measures response according to AAPOR standards, with nonresponse (including break-offs) coded “0” and response coded “1.” Accordingly, negative AMEs indicate a lower probability to respond, while positive AMEs indicate a higher probability to respond compared to the reference group. The analysis is conducted separately for emigrants and remigrants. Both estimations are based on the overall gross sample size but exclude cases with missing information resulting from failed matches between Microm data and GERPS data as well as from missing registry data.²

The pseudo-R² of the emigrant model is comparatively high, potentially indicating biased estimation outcomes. Stepwise logistic regressions, however, revealed that 9 percentage points are solely due to controlling for the availability of foreign address information and not due to socio-demographic characteristics of sample members. The personal indicators alone have an explanatory power of below 5% in both models. This finding is in line with evidence from other population surveys (e.g. Schneekloth, Leven 2003) and not surprising. According to Schnell (1997: 200) there never was a strong association between unit nonresponse and socio-demographic variables. The weak explanatory power indicated by the low pseudo-R² suggests that the relationship between almost all observed independent variables and unit nonresponse is rather small.

With respect to regional characteristics, the country of origin or destination affects unit nonresponse in both samples. Emigrants living in an EU-15 member state are most likely to respond, whereas emigrants in member states joining the EU after 2004 are 4.6% less likely to respond. Emigrants living in European non-EU-member states (excluding Switzerland) have low response probabilities as well (-5.8%). But also emigrants who live in North America (-2.9%), Africa (-5.2%), in Middle Eastern or in Arabic countries (-7.5%) are significantly less likely to respond compared to emigrants who live in one of the first 15 member states of the EU. Remigrants are least likely to respond when they returned from an EU-member state that joined the EU after 2004 (-12.7%) or another European country (-8.7%, excl. Switzerland). Lower response probabilities are also reported for migrants who returned from the Middle East or Arabic countries (-5.2%).

² Logistic regressions of missing information on unit nonresponse showed that sample members with missing information had no significantly different response probability than sample members with complete information.

Table 6-4: Average marginal effects (AMEs) on unit response (=1) based on separate multiple logistic regressions by sample

	Emigrants	Remigrants
Personal characteristics		
Female (ref.: male)	0.019*** (4.04)	0.054*** (8.51)
Age (ref.: 20-30 years)		
31-40 years	0.003 (0.47)	0.044*** (5.54)
41-50 years	-0.010 (-1.41)	0.021* (2.18)
51-60 years	-0.007 (-0.96)	-0.040*** (-4.00)
61-70 years	-0.020 (-1.82)	-0.045** (-3.27)
Place of birth abroad (ref.: Germany)	-0.082*** (-16.62)	-0.129*** (-18.73)
Social status	0.006*** (6.39)	0.011*** (9.96)
Family structure (ref.: mainly family households)		
mix of family and single households	-0.008 (-0.79)	0.001 (0.09)
mainly single households	-0.010 (1.29)	0.027* (2.56)
Regional characteristics		
Country of (r)emigration (ref.: EU-15)		
Post-EU-15 member	-0.046*** (-4.23)	-0.127*** (-9.10)
Switzerland	-0.014* (-2.13)	0.015 (1.32)
Other European country	-0.058*** (-5.49)	-0.087 (-6.42)
North America	-0.029** (-3.36)	-0.001 (-0.09)
Latin America	-0.021* (-1.97)	0.015 (1.20)
Asia	-0.016 (-1.62)	0.027* (2.22)
Africa	-0.052** (-3.43)	-0.001 (-0.05)
Australia, New Zealand, Oceania	-0.025 (-1.94)	0.014 (0.79)
Middle East, Arabic countries	-0.075*** (-5.07)	-0.052** (-3.29)
Missing country information	-0.057*** (-4.18)	-0.058*** (-3.92)
Building structure	-0.007*** (-4.12)	-0.009*** (-3.90)
Municipality size	0.010*** (3.58)	-0.002 (-0.41)
Survey characteristics		
Availability of foreign address (ref.: no)	-0.221*** (-35.17)	-
Months since migration	-0.004*** (-5.80)	0.002** (2.86)
Survey mode (ref.: push-to-web)		
PAPI option with invitation	-	0.017 (1.04)
PAPI option with second reminder	-	0.012 (0.78)
Incentive scheme (ref.: INS 1)		
INS 2 (0/10)	-0.001 (-0.20)	-0.004 (-0.56)
INS 3 (0/20)	0.027*** (4.57)	0.044* (2.47)
INS 4 (non-cash/15)	0.014 (1.04)	
INS 5 (5/5)	-	0.114*** (6.19)
INS 6 (5/10)	-	0.099*** (5.38)
INS 7 (5/15)	-	0.126*** (6.82)
Observations	24,368	20,527
McFadden's Pseudo-R ²	0.118	0.043

Note: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001; z statistics in parentheses. Estimated with robust standard errors.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

The remaining two regional characteristics are also associated with unit nonresponse. The building structure is negatively associated with unit response, indicating that a more heterogeneous building structure is related with a lower response probability (0.7% for

emigrants and 0.9% for remigrants for each unit change).³ Municipality size has an unexpected but rather small effect on unit nonresponse as unit response increases with municipality size in the emigration sample (1.0% per unit increase). Regarding remigrants, municipality size has no effect on their response behaviour.

6.3.2 Effects of survey-related factors on unit nonresponse

Similar to personal and regional characteristics, survey-related factors only marginally affect sample members' unit nonresponse. One exception is the contact option in the emigrant sample. The variable "Contacted at former German address" indicates whether emigrated persons were contacted at their recent foreign addresses or through their former addresses in Germany. The latter strategy was only followed in case of invalid or missing foreign addresses. It can be seen in the emigrant model that even when controlling for various personal, regional, and survey characteristics, emigrants with invalid or missing foreign addresses were 22.1% less likely to respond than emigrants whom we were able to contact at their recent foreign addresses. The higher nonresponse is, however, not related to emigrants' destination countries, as coefficients of contact option hardly differed before and after controlling for emigration country. Instead, the difference mainly results from the high noncontact rate of emigrants contacted at their former German addresses, because the response behaviour between all emigrants who received the invitation letters only differs marginally (cf. Table 6-1).

Regarding the survey design characteristic "months since migration," emigrants' response probability decreases with increasing time since emigration. This finding supports our assumption that emigrants' address quality decreases with increasing time since migration. Contrastingly, remigrants' response probability increases the longer the time since their remigration. A final survey design characteristic potentially affecting unit nonresponse in GERPS refers to the two methodological experiments. The first experiment tested alternative survey modes, assuming that push-to-web designs could impede unit response and increase social selectivity. Persons who were part of this survey mode experiment were provided with the opportunity to additionally participate by paper and pencil (PAPI). The experimental group consisted out of two sub-groups, with one sub-group receiving the paper questionnaire in combination with the invitation and reminder letter, and another sub-group receiving the paper questionnaire with the second reminder letter (see Chapter 5.1.2).

Table 6-5: Response rates by survey mode

	Sample	Interviews	RR1
	N	(complete only) N	%
Push-to-web	5,998	1,693	28.2
PAPI option with invitation and reminder letter	999	300	30.0
PAPI option only with second reminder letter	1,000	297	29.7
PAPI option total	1,999	597	29.9

Note: Analyses are restricted to the remigrant sample with a conditional 10€ incentive to reduce intervening survey design characteristics. Complete = over 80% of all applicable questions answered.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

³ We also employed multiple logistic regression analyses in which we used "building structure" as categorical variable. The results supported our related linear assumption as well.

Potential survey participants from the mixed-mode survey design showed a response rate (RR1) that was 1.9 percentage points higher in relation to comparable sample members who were exclusively pushed to web (see Table 6-5). According to a two-sided t-test, however, there is no statistically significant difference between the single- and mixed-mode survey group (95%-CI; $p(\text{Push-to-web} = \text{PAPI total}) = 0.160$, $df(7,996)$).

In the second methodological experiment, we tested various incentive schemes and their impact on unit response. The literature yields various answers to the question on how to maximise unit response through incentives. Research indicates that successful incentives depend on the survey population, survey modes, sampling methods, and the questionnaire's content and length (Becker, Möser, Glauser 2019; Blom, Gathmann, Krieger 2015; Edwards et al. 2005; Groves 2006; Singer, Ye 2013). Table 6-6 provides an overview of the response rates (RR1) for all seven incentive schemes by sample and contact option.

Table 6-6: Response rates (RR1) in percentage by incentive scheme, sample and contact option

	Emigrants	Remigrants	Total
INS 1 (0/lottery)	16.3	29.0	23.5
INS 2 (0/10)	14.1	28.0	21.0
INS 3 (0/20)	20.6	32.8	21.4
INS 4 (non-cash/15)	33.2		33.2
INS 5 (5/5)		39.8	39.8
INS 6 (5/10)		37.9	37.9
INS 7 (5/15)		40.1	40.1

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Incentive schemes 5, 6, and 7, which combine unconditional and conditional payments, yield the highest response rates ranging between 37.9% and 40.1%. This finding holds regardless of the amount of the conditional incentive, but the differences are not statistically significant according to two-sided t-tests (95%-CI; $p(\text{INS 5} = \text{INS 6}) = 0.459$, $df(1,498)$; $p(\text{INS 6} = \text{INS 7}) = 0.386$, $df(1,497)$; $p(\text{INS 5} = \text{INS 7}) = 0.899$, $df(1,497)$). The other incentive schemes in the remigrant sample yield significantly lower response rates with the lottery group even showing a higher response rate compared to the conditional 10-euro incentive scheme. Among INS 1 to 3, remigrants who were offered the conditional 20-euro incentive showed the highest response rate. The conditional 20-euro incentive and the mixed INS were also significant if controlled for other covariates (see Table 6-4).

In the emigrant sample, only small differences exist in response behaviour between the lottery incentive and the conditional 10-euro incentive scheme. High incentives of 20 euros have a particularly positive effect on response rates among the conditional incentive schemes. We report an RR1 of 20.6% in case of 20 euros offered after survey participation. However, combining unconditional non-cash and conditional 15-euro incentives resulted in the highest response rate among emigrants (33.2%). The response rate is markedly higher compared to the conditional 20-euro incentive scheme. This is in line with findings in the remigrant sample, where the combination of unconditional and conditional incentives yielded the highest response rates. Note that in contrast to INS 4, the results for INS 3 are likely influenced by the different contact options. INS 3 was selectively used in both contact options, while INS 4 was only used for a selected group of emigrants contacted at their recent foreign addresses.

Although there is still room for improvement regarding incentive schemes for surveying abroad, we can conclude that response rates in the emigrant sample benefit from relatively high conditional incentives of 20 euros. This holds true in the remigrant

sample as well. However, remigrants' response behaviour is even more promising in case of smaller incentives of five euros before and after their participation (see Table 6-6).

7 Survey completion and item nonresponse

Item nonresponse occurs when a respondent participates in the survey but does not provide answers to specific questions or items, or the answer provided by the respondent is not meaningful or substantive concerning the question asked. Item nonresponse usually results in missing data, which diminishes the validity and reliability of data (Dillman, Smyth, Melani 2011). Especially in self-administered modes such as web or postal surveys item nonresponse can be a major problem (Blumenberg et al. 2018; Bowling, Huang 2018; Couper 2000; Daikeler, Bošnjak, Lozar Manfreda 2019; Healy et al. 2018; Leeper 2019). Item nonresponse is usually caused by respondent refusal or the inability to provide usable answers to specific questions (Plutzer 2019). Nonresponse frequently found in a data set can have a negative influence on survey data quality. In some cases, it may be as severe as unit nonresponse (Tourangeau, Conrad, Couper 2013).

7.1 Missing data conventions

As in every survey, some answers or variables might be missing, for example those who are without a valid code or value. As GERPS is a SOEP-related study aiming to enable a direct comparison between the SOEP and GERPS, the conventions for defining missing data are based on those of SOEP (Liebig et al. 2019). As in the SOEP, negative values are not valid for any variable, but instead are used to code different reasons for missing information. There are two distinctions for missing values:

- Missing codes may originate in the respondent's answer as the respondent may refuse or not know an answer or may report invalid values.
- Missing codes may also be coded due to the survey design. For example, respondents with certain characteristics may be excluded from some questions due to filter questions, e.g. jobless respondents will never be asked about their weekly working hours. The following codes apply to data of GERPS as well as SOEP.

In the following, the missing categories used within GERPS as well as SOEP are presented:

Item nonresponse (-1)

Any situation in which a respondent actively skips a question is classified as item nonresponse. These are, for example, cases where a person might refuse to answer a question, which happens more often for sensitive questions (e.g. income-related questions), or he or she may just not know the answer to a question. In such a case where answers were skipped, the missing code is “-1” for no answer given to this question.

Does not apply (-2)

Information may be missing when a question is not asked because it is not relevant for a specific person, e.g. self-employed respondents were not asked about the duration of their working contract and will be filtered around the questions addressed specifically to employees. Also, there are specific rating questions in a grid question that are only relevant for specific groups. In those cases, a “does not apply to me” option was

included with the grid question. In both cases of “does not apply” to this person, the variable receives a code of “-2” for this respondent.

Not valid (-3)

Sometimes invalid answers are encountered, e.g. a person cannot work more than 168 hours a week. In such a case, multiple checks are carried out, and if the inconsistency remains, the variable is recoded “-3” for “implausible value.”

Not included in this version of the questionnaire (-5)

A master data set combining data of the emigrant and remigrant survey was generated. However, both surveys included several questions that are specific to either the group of emigrants or remigrants. In these specific emigrant questions, the remigrant cases were set to “-5” and vice versa within specific remigrant questions, the emigrant cases are coded with “-5,” characterising these as “Not included in this version of the questionnaire.” Moreover, as mentioned in Chapter 5.1.2, several experiments were carried out within GERPS. For one of these experiments, a reduced PAPI questionnaire was carried out. In this case, that means that some questions were left out completely, e.g. to shorten the questionnaire and ease the participation by omitting complicated filters for the self-administered PAPI version. Thus, the PAPI version only consisted of 81 questions and online-only questions variables’ values were also set to “-5.”

7.2 Prevalence of item nonresponse

In the context of GERPS, we did not find any overall incidence of excessive item nonresponse. On the contrary, our respondents answered most of the questions and as a result we had an average percentage of individual item nonresponse of 2% (SD=.05) in both samples. Compared to other studies that reported item nonresponse rates between 2% and 6% (Blumenberg et al. 2018; Bowyer, Rogowski 2017; Mavletova, Lynn 2019; Millar, Dillman 2012), GERPS performs very well and is located at the lowest end of this range. Moreover, in our emigrant sample, 30% did not leave any item blank and in our remigrant sample, this rate was raised to 59%.

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR 2016) advises that survey projects find a precise definition for interview status (especially for the status of completed questionnaires, partial cases and break-offs). Usually these decisions are based on individual nonresponse. In addition, they recommend that researchers exclude break-off cases from the analysis file as well as calculations of response and other outcome rates. Thus, when defining these statuses, researchers face a trade-off: First, they do not want to exclude too many cases from the analysis file due to a rigorous definition of break-off and by this to reach a high unit nonresponse rate. Second, they do not want to include too many cases in the analysis file because of a less strict definition of complete or partial cases, which will lead in higher item nonresponse rates in cases deemed complete or partial. Thus, the strategy of defining interview status for GERPS was based on widely-used standards of AAPOR (2016) and the work of Callegaro and DiSogra (Callegaro, DiSogra 2008; DiSogra, Callegaro 2015) on metrics for online panels. Therefore, we decided to define these three statuses based on the proportion of all applicable questions:

- **Break-off:** for respondents having answered less than 50% of all applicable questions
- **Partial interview:** for respondents having answered between 50% and 80% of all applicable questions
- **Completed interview:** with 80% and more of all applicable questions answered

Table 7-1: Survey completion rates by migration status

	Emigrants		Remigrants	
	N	%	N	%
Break-off	261	5.3	377	5.4
Partial interview	122	2.5	127	1.8
Completed Interviews	4,545	92.2	6,465	92.8
Total	4,928	100.0	6,969	100.0

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

7.3 Correlates of item nonresponse

As mentioned above, systematic nonresponse in particular can be a major threat to data quality. Thus, a central analysis of the sources of item nonresponse is crucial. Research on item nonresponse differences with regard to the impact of survey modes has produced mixed results: Some studies found lower rates for web surveys compared to postal surveys, some studies found similar rates, and others found higher rates for web surveys than for postal surveys (Couper, Antoun, Mavletova 2017; Kreuter, Presser, Tourangeau 2008; Lee et al. 2018; Lugtig, Toepoel 2016; Weigold, Weigold, Natera 2018). Moreover, other studies identified advantages of the online mode, decreasing item nonresponse to specific question types such as open-ended answers (Denscombe 2009), multiple response questions (Messer, Edwards, Dillman 2012; Millar, Dillman 2012), or questions covering sensitive topics (Décieux, Hoffmann 2014; Höglinger, Jann, Diekmann 2016; Sakshaug, Yan, Tourangeau 2010).

Besides survey modes, a number of other factors may affect item nonresponse rates. First, respondent-related characteristics such as age, sex, and education can influence nonresponse rates. Second, survey-related factors such as survey burden, mandatory questions, or incentives can affect respondents' willingness to answer certain questions. And third, question-related factors such as question format, types, or sensitivity can have an influence on the prevalence of item nonresponse (for an overview see, for example, Blumenberg et al. 2018; Healy et al. 2018; Tourangeau, Conrad, Couper 2013). In this chapter, we examine the determinants of item nonresponse within GERPS. Specifically, we focus on determinants of overall item nonresponse of respondents who completed the survey. As the main sample of GERPS was realised as a web survey, we have the possibility to analyse determinants of item nonresponse from different perspectives. Thus, the approach of our analyses is twofold. First, we analyse respondent-related factors affecting item nonresponse such as specific socio-demographic characteristics of participants that were mainly conducted at the end of the survey. Second, we examine survey-related variables provided by certain survey meta- and paradata (Brower 2018; Roßmann, Gummer 2016b; Vehre 2011).

Table 7-2: Overview of independent variables in item nonresponse analyses by data source and migration status

	Min.	Max.	Emigrants			Remigrants		
			n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Survey data								
Age	19	78	4,531	34.45	11.08	6,408	36.78	11.41
Sex								
Male	0	1	2,221	0.49		3,155	0.48	
Female	0	1	2,294	0.51		3,234	0.50	
Missing	0	1	17	0.00		19	0.00	
School degree								
No	0	1	320	0.07		829	0.13	
Intermediate	0	1	741	0.16		1,133	0.18	
Upper	0	1	3,412	0.75		4,340	0.68	
Other	0	1	44	0.01		0	0.00	
Missing	0	1	14	0.00		106	0.02	
Connectedness with Germany								
Rather connected	0	1	1,466	0.32		2,244	0.35	
Rather unconnected	0	1	3,065	0.68		4,164	0.65	
Risk attitude	0	10	4,531	6.01	2.15	6,408	6.12	2.19
Life satisfaction	0	10	4,531	7.77	1.61	6,408	7.27	1.95
Meta- and paradata								
Panel consent								
No	0	1	305	0.07		453	0.07	
Yes	0	1	4,226	0.93		5,953	0.93	
Missing	0	1	0	0.00		2	0.00	
Incentive scheme								
0/10	0	1	1,084	0.24		2,273	0.36	
Pre-paid	0	1	200	0.04		833	0.13	
0/20	0	1	1,923	0.42		373	0.06	
Lottery	0	1	1,324	0.29		2,929	0.46	
Completion time								
Fast	0	1	99	0.02		180	0.03	
Normal	0	1	3,896	0.86		5,511	0.86	
Slow	0	1	536	0.11		717	0.11	
Device								
Desktop Device	0	1	3,158	0.70		4,377	0.68	
Mobile Device	0	1	1,351	0.30		1,814	0.28	
Missing	0	1	22	0.00		217	0.03	

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

7.3.1 Effects of respondent-related factors on item nonresponse

Previous research suggests that respondent-related factors, socio-demographic resources, and personality traits of individuals can have a substantial effect on the prevalence of item nonresponse. Therefore, we analysed the sample of all completed interviews with respect to specific patterns of item nonresponse. We investigated whether respondent's sex, age, education as well as their life satisfaction, their risk attitude, and their connectedness to Germany had a significant effect on the prevalence of item nonresponse. For connectedness to Germany, we used classified versions of

these variables, which aggregated the values of the original scales. Connectedness to Germany originally was conducted on a four-point scale (ranging from 1 = strongly connected to 4 = entirely unconnected) and was transformed to a two-point scale (original 1, 2: → 2 = rather connected and original 3, 4: → 1 = rather unconnected). Moreover, we used the life satisfaction and risk attitude variables, which were measured on an eleven-point Likert scale (0 = totally unsatisfied to 10 = totally satisfied, 0 = not willing to take risks to 10 = very risk-averse). Given that the adaptive filtering of our online survey meant that our respondents did not always have to answer the same number of questions, the cumulative number of nonresponse is a biased measure of data quality. For this reason, we calculated a relative measure as item nonresponse covering the individual percentage of overall item nonresponse (pinr).

Table 7-3: Respondent-related factors as determinants of overall item nonresponse in completed interviews (measured by the percentage of individual item non-response (Pinr)) by migration status (OLS regressions)

	Pinr Emigrants	Pinr Remigrants
Sex (ref. male)		
Female	0.033 (0.033)	0.065* (0.027)
Age	-0.235*** (0.011)	-0.019* (0.008)
Age	0.003*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)
School degree (ref.: no degree)		
Intermediate degree	-0.018 (0.076)	-0.022 (0.052)
Upper degree	-0.189** (0.067)	-0.184*** (0.046)
Connectedness with Germany (ref.: rather unconnected) (strongly) connected	-0.055 (0.035)	-0.033 (0.028)
Life satisfaction	-0.020 (0.013)	0.006 (0.008)
Risk attitude	-0.012 (0.008)	-0.015* (0.006)
Constant	7.745*** (0.275)	1.042*** (0.192)
Observations	4,512	6,369
R ²	0.395	0.052

Note: *t* statistics in parentheses; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

In the emigrant sample, different sociodemographic variables of respondents had an effect on item completion. Respondent's age and having an upper school degree had a significant negative effect on the prevalence of item nonresponse, meaning that these respondents showed stronger item completion behaviour. Concerning respondent-related factors, the results of the remigrants have a quite similar structure. Again, respondents' age and holding an upper school degree had a significant negative correlation with the prevalence of item nonresponse. However, sex of the respondent and having a positive risk attitude had an additional significant effect on the prevalence of item nonresponse in the remigrant sample, as female remigrants showed higher

levels of item non-response and remigrants with a higher risk attitude showed lower rates of item nonresponse.

7.3.2 Effects of survey-related factors on item nonresponse

Concerning survey-related factors, we tested the effect of four different variables as predictors for item nonresponse, while controlling for respondent-related factors (see Chapter 7.3.1): These survey-related factors are consent to panel participation, incentive mode, completion time, and the device used to proceed through the questionnaire.

Consent to panel participation was evaluated at the end of each survey and can be interpreted as a survey-related factor as it is an indicator of survey involvement, interest in the topic, or respondent motivation. The variable incentive mode refers to the different forms of incentives that our respondents received to motivate them for survey participation. As mentioned in Chapter 5.2.4, we tested the influence of different incentive schemes (INS; lottery, hybrid pre-post-paid strategies, and post-paid strategy), and different incentive values (5, 10, 15 and 20 euros). For the purpose of this chapter, these modes were categorised in a hybrid mode consisting of a pre-paid and a post-paid incentive, two categories of post-paid incentive: 10 euros, 20 euros and, as a reference, a lottery of 500 euros. Moreover, completion times were tested as an objective indicator for survey burden. Using the Stata module RSPEEDINDEX (Roßmann 2015) and based on the overall survey completion time, we computed a response speed index for every respondent. The index values can be interpreted as a measure of the mean response speed of survey respondents. An index value of “1” means that respondents’ response speed is equivalent to the mean response speed in the selected sample of respondents. Index values close to “0” indicate a very fast mean response speed, whereas values close to “2” indicate a very slow mean response speed of the individual respondent. Based on this index it was possible to flag response speed outliers in the lower (i.e., fast respondents) and the upper (i.e., slow respondents) based on absolute cut-off values of the response speed index. Respondents with a response-speed index value smaller than .5 were flagged as fast responders (speeder) and respondents with a value above 1.5 were flagged as slow respondents. Finally, the device type was used as an independent variable as survey participation on mobile devices is considered more burdensome and inconvenient than on traditional desktop computers. Using the Stata module PARSEUAS (Roßmann, Gummer 2016a), we extracted the information on which device our respondents used to participate in our survey from the User Agent String. For this chapter, we clustered these device types in two groups: mobile vs. desktop. This allows us to investigate whether the device used to take the survey had a significant effect on item nonresponse rates.

Table 7-4: Survey-related factors as determinants of item nonresponse in completed interviews (measured by the percentage of individual item non-response (Pinr)) by migration status (OLS regressions)

	Pinr Emigrants	Pinr Remigrants
Model 1		
Panel consent (ref.: no)		
Yes	-0.363 ⁻ (0.065)	-0.437 ⁻ (0.053)
Observations	4440	6329
R ²	0.271	0.053
Model 2		
Incentive (ref.: INS 1)		
0/10	-0.022 (0.044)	0.100 ⁻ (0.029)
pre-paid)	-0.033 (0.082)	-0.018 (0.041)
0/20	0.013 (0.039)	0.043 (0.058)
Observations	4440	6329
R ²	0.266	0.045
Model 3		
Completion time (ref.: normal time)		
Fast responders (speeding)	0.012 (0.111)	0.227 ⁻ (0.081)
Slow responders	0.067 (0.051)	0.085 ⁻ (0.042)
Observations	4440	6329
R ²	0.266	0.045
Model 4		
Device (ref.: desktop device)		
Mobile device	0.025 (0.036)	0.099 ⁻ (0.029)
Observations	4440	6329
R ²	0.266	0.045

Note: *t* statistics in parentheses; ⁻ $p < 0.05$, ⁻ $p < 0.01$, ⁻ $p < 0.001$, all models are controlled for respondent-related factors.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

For the emigrant sample, we only found a significant negative correlation between the willingness to participate in further waves of GERPS (Model 1) and the amount of item nonresponse in our survey. In the remigrant sample, we detected similar patterns concerning consent to panel participation (Model 1). Moreover, a post-paid incentive of 10 euros (Model 2), lower completion times (Model 3), and the use of a mobile device to complete the survey (Model 4) led to higher amounts of item nonresponse within the remigrant sample.

Even though the overall item nonresponse rate was rather low, a detailed analysis of the causes of item nonresponse was necessary. It turns out that in line with previous research, we detected some respondent-related factors as well as some survey-related factors influencing item nonresponse within both GERPS samples. In both samples, we found a significant correlation in the respondent's age, education, and consent to panel participation. Concerning the other factors, results were inconclusive between these groups. In particular, the difference concerning the effect of the device type is interesting. While using a mobile device had no significant effect on the frequency of

item nonresponse within the emigrant’s sample, the use of a mobile phone significantly increases item non-response. Here, future studies with a more precise view may find possible explanations for this difference. For example, a more differentiated view on the device type, quality of the internet connection etc. could be promising aspects worth investigating (Struminskaya, Weyandt, Bosnjak 2015).

8 Conditions for future panel participation

8.1 Consent to panel participation

Concerning the overall consent to panel participation, the willingness to participate in future waves of GERPS was high. In total, 93.1% of all respondents agreed and allowed us to invite them to take part in further interviews. Having a closer look at emigrant and remigrants, we find no significant differences concerning the willingness to participate in the next waves by migration status (see Table 8-1).

Table 8-1: Panel consent rates by migration status

Panel Consent	Emigrants	Remigrants	Total
No	0.07	0.07	0.07
Yes	0.93	0.93	0.93
N	4,619	6,531	11,150

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

8.2 Correlates of panel consent

Similar to item nonresponse, the panel consent rate can be affected by the survey itself (survey-related) or by the characteristics of the persons surveyed (respondent-related) (Groves, Singer, Corning 2000; Gummer, Daikeler 2018; Leeper 2019; De Leeuw, Lugtig 2015; Lugtig 2014; Sakshaug et al. 2019). Thus, the structure of the analysis and the choice of independent variables are very similar to the nonresponse analysis.

Table 8-2: Overview of independent variables in the analyses of panel consent by data source and migration status

	Min.	Max.	Emigrants			Remigrants		
			n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Survey data								
Age	19	78	4,531	34.45	11.08	6,406	36.78	11.41
Sex								
Male	0	1	2,221	0.49		3,154	0.49	
Female	0	1	2,294	0.51		3,233	0.50	
Missing	0	1	17	0.00		19	0.00	
School degree								
No	0	1	320	0.07		829	0.13	
Intermediate	0	1	741	0.16		1,133	0.18	
Upper	0	1	3,412	0.75		4,338	0.68	
Other	0	1	44	0.01		0	0.00	
Missing	0	1	14	0.00		106	0.02	
Connectedness with Germany								
Rather connected	0	1	1,466	0.32		2,243	0.35	
Rather unconnected	0	1	3,065	0.68		4,163	0.65	
Risk attitude	0	10	4,531	6.01	2.15	6,406	6.12	2.19
Life satisfaction	0	10	4,531	7.77	1.61	6,406	7.27	1.95
Meta- and para data								
Incentive scheme								
0/10	0	1	1,084	0.24		2,271	0.35	
Pre-paid	0	1	200	0.04		833	0.13	
0/20	0	1	1,923	0.42		373	0.05	
Lottery	0	1	1,324	0.29		2,929	0.46	
Completion time								
						21,356	0.09	0.28
Fast	0	1	99	0.02		180	0.03	
Normal	0	1	3,896	0.86		5,509	0.86	
Slow	0	1	536	0.11		717	0.11	
Device								
Desktop device	0	1	3,158	0.70		4,377	0.68	
Mobile device	0	1	1,351	0.30		1,814	0.28	
Missing	0	1	22	0.00		215	0.03	

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

8.2.1 Effects of respondent-related factors on consent to panel participation

As mentioned above, respondent-related factors, i.e. socio-demographic characteristics of individuals, can have a substantial effect on the willingness to participate in a survey. Thus, we investigated such respondent-related effects based on the variables that had also been used in Chapter 7.3.1 to represent respondent-related factors (more information on variable development there).

Table 8-3: Respondent-related factors as determinants of panel consent by migration status (multiple logistic regression, AMEs)

	Emigrants	Remigrants
Sex (ref.: male)		
Female	0.008 (1.09)	0.006 (0.94)
Age	0.002 (1.01)	0.000 (0.13)
Age	-0.000 (-1.37)	-0.000 (-0.84)
School degree (ref.: no degree)		
Intermediate degree	-0.015 (-0.79)	-0.008 (-0.53)
Upper degree	0.026 (1.57)	0.030* (2.41)
Other	0.042 (1.25)	
Connectedness with Germany (ref.: rather unconnected)		
Rather connected	0.021* (2.47)	0.022** (3.05)
Life satisfaction	-0.001 (-0.58)	-0.002 (-1.18)
Risk attitude	0.004* (2.32)	0.006*** (3.92)
Observations	4,531	6,406
McFadden's Pseudo-R ²	0.021	0.022

Note: *t* statistics in parentheses; $-p < 0.05$, $-p < 0.01$, $-p < 0.001$

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

However, probably due to the high overall willingness to participate in the future surveys, we found hardly any significant effects of socio-demographic characteristics on panel consent rates in both samples. Still, we found very similar patterns in both models focusing on the influence of respondent-related factors on consent to panel participation. Within both samples, significant positive effects on the willingness to participate in future waves of the survey could only be observed for participants who felt connected with Germany and respondents with a positive risk-averse attitude. In the remigrant sample, having an upper education degree had an additional positive effect on the willingness to participate in the panel survey.

8.2.2 Effect of survey-related factors on consent to panel participation

Survey-related factors can also affect respondents' attitudes towards a survey and thus the willingness to participate in surveys. In this context, we investigated the effect of three different survey-related factors on panel consent to participation. These are in analogy to Chapter 7.3.2: incentive mode, completion time, and device type (for more information on variable generation see there).

Table 8-4: Survey-related factors as determinants of panel consent by migration status (multiple logistic regression, AMEs)

	Emigrants	Remigrants
Model 1		
Incentive (ref.: INS 1)		
INS 2 (0/10)	-0.004 (-0.38)	-0.014 (-1.91)
INS 4 to 6 (pre- & post-paid)	-0.004 (-0.19)	-0.001 (-0.08)
INS 3 (0/20)	0.002 (0.20)	0.003 (0.20)
Observations	4,531	6,406
Pseudo McFadden's R ²	0.021	0.024
Model 2		
Completion time (ref.: normal time)		
Fast Responders (speeding)	-0.119** (-3.02)	-0.137*** (-4.55)
Slow Responders	0.016 (1.61)	0.016 (1.84)
Observations	4,531	6,406
Pseudo McFadden's R ²	0.029	0.034
Model 3		
Device (ref.: desktop device)		
Mobile device	-0.007 (-0.85)	-0.008 (-1.13)
Observations	4,531	6,406
McFadden's Pseudo-R ²	0.021	0.033

Note: *t* statistics in parentheses; · $p < 0.05$, · $p < 0.01$, · $p < 0.001$; all models are controlled for respondent-related factors.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Previous research and our incentive experiments for participation in this first wave (see Chapter 5.2.4) showed that incentives can have a positive effect on survey participation rates. Thus, it might also be interesting to investigate whether our different incentive modes had an effect on the willingness of the respondents to participate in future waves as this offers a first indication of the long-term effects of the different incentive modes. Here, it becomes obvious that respondents in the different treatment groups did not significantly differ concerning their willingness to participate in the next panel waves of GERPS (model 1) in both samples. Thus, based on the consent to panel participation rates, the value of an incentive does not seem to have a long-term effect on participation rates. Similar to the analysis of item nonresponse, we were able to detect influences of other context variables on the willingness to participate in future waves. While the device type⁴ (model 3) had no significant influence on the consent to panel participation rate, fast responders⁵ had a lesser tendency to participate in future waves in both samples (model 2).

8.3 Collecting address information

Table 8-5 provides an overview about the type of contact details provided by respondents at the end of the questionnaires. From 10,325 persons principally

⁴ Using the Stata module PARSEUAS (Roßmann, Gummer 2016a) we extracted information about the device type our respondents used to proceed through our questionnaire. Here we found no significant effect of device type.

⁵ Using the Stata module RSPEEDINDEX (Roßmann 2015) we computed a response speed index on the basis of our overall survey completion time, which can be interpreted as a measure response speed of survey respondents. Based on this index, it was possible to flag response speed outliers in the lower (i.e., fast respondents) and the upper (i.e., slow respondents), or both directions based on cutoff values absolute values of the response speed index.

providing their panel consent, 99.3% provided an e-mail address, 21.5% provided a phone number, and 26.9% provided a postal address. Hardly any differences exist between emigrants and remigrants.

Table 8-5: Availability of panel consent and address information by migration status

	Emigrants		Remigrants		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Willingness to take part in a future survey	4,282	100.0	6,043	100.0	10,325	100.0
E-mail address provided	4,252	99.3	6,000	99.3	10,250	99.3
Phone number provided	880	20.6	1,314	21.7	2,194	21.2
Postal address provided	1,149	26.8	1,625	26.9	2,774	26.9

Note: The e-mail addresses specified here are absolute values of the details provided, regardless of whether they are valid, i.e. whether people can be reached via this e-mail address. The quality of e-mail addresses was validated through plausibility checks and syntax specifications during programming as well as during the input of data by respondents.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

8.4 Panel maintenance

Panel maintenance measures following the baseline survey included an e-mail sent on 13 March 2019 thanking the participants for their time and support of the project. The e-mail was sent to all 10,250 respondents who participated completely or partially in the first wave, declared their willingness to take part in a future GERPS survey, and provided an e-mail address. The message was adapted for each incentive group so that each was specifically addressed (see Appendix 15.3 for an example of those mailings). Table 8-6 shows an overview of the delivery protocol of the panel maintenance mailing after wave 1.

Table 8-6: Delivery protocol of the panel maintenance mailing following the baseline survey

	N	%
Blocked e-mail address (duplicate)	4	0.0
Blocked e-mail address (Robinson-list)	59	0.6
Hard Bounce – failed connection to mail host	22	0.2
Hard Bounce – target address not accepted by mail host	67	0.7
Soft Bounce – connection rejected by mail host	5	0.0
Soft Bounce – disconnected by mail host during data transmission	8	0.1
Invalid line	1	0.0
Target address has incorrect syntax	12	0.1
Delivery successful	10,072	98.3
Total	10,250	100.0

Note: There is a (technical) possibility that individual e-mails that were not delivered directly because of a blocked e-mail address or a rejection by the receiving server (“soft bounce”) may have been delivered at a later point in time, e.g. if the “rejection” or the blocking was lifted. Unfortunately, these individual cases cannot (technically) be recorded, so that “non-deliverability” must first be assumed.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Of 10,250 people who provided an e-mail address, 10,072 could be reached, i.e. the e-mail could be delivered. Only 179 people could not be reached, i.e. in these cases the e-mails could not be delivered. Overall, 75 people who responded (complete or partial) and declared their willingness to take part in a future GERPS survey did not provide an e-mail address. Nine out of those 75 participants provided a phone number. In an effort to maintain the panel, these persons were contacted by phone and asked for an e-mail address. Only four people could be reached but none provided an e-mail address. One person refused explicitly during the phone call. Thus, the 75 respondents who did not provide an e-mail address could not be reached via e-mail or other channels and in the following were not contacted for further survey participation. Of the 10,072 successfully delivered e-mails, 29 refused to participate in GERPS in the future.

9 Data processing and variable generation

The data processing phase is the central part of the lifecycle model of research data production. This step logically follows the data collection (Jensen 2019). Here, processes such as data cleaning, data verification, and variable generation take place, which aim at making the collected data usable for internal or external research (Lück, Landrock 2019). Furthermore, the final data structure is defined, for example by systematic plausibility checks and verification approaches, variable re-codings, generations, or by supplementing content or administrative variables in order to make the data ready to be used by potential (secondary) researchers.

As these data processing steps often produce contextual information that is more or less necessary for understanding and working with the data, data managers are faced with the task of defining the individual work steps, assembling them into a workflow, and making them available for external researchers (Jensen 2012, 2019; Netscher, Eder 2018). Here, a systematic and transparent procedure from the beginning of the data processing phase helps to achieve these goals without wasting limited time and resources (Lemaire 2018). In addition, contextual data opens up further possibilities for data use, such as the replications of project results or subsequent use of the data by third parties. The demands on its preparation and documentation grow with the complexity of the data and the desire to make the process of its creation and processing transparent. The underlying measures and rules concerning data definition and cleaning are relevant information about the handling of data and necessary to secure data transparency and data quality. Possible modifications of the raw data have to be made inter-subjectively comprehensible for researchers outside the project and data problems have to be well documented. Such information has to be made available in codebooks, commented processing syntaxes, or method reports, as this is the only way to ensure that data quality can be evaluated for subsequent analyses and complex data files can be accessed even without internal project knowledge (Brislinger, Moschner 2019).

9.1 Plausibility checks during the survey

Plausibility checks were already added to the online survey. Such checks were reduced to a minimum but were used to prevent contradictory information or to point the respondents to obvious data confusion aiming at more reliable information. In this survey, for example, no date of birth prior to 1940 was considered acceptable because the sample frame was restricted to individuals who were not older than 70 years. Another example is the appearance of an indication when the net earnings reported are

above gross earnings. The following table provides an overview of all plausibility checks within the survey (see Table 9-1). Next to those documented checks no further checks were integrated in the online survey as these increase the risk of break-offs by participants who feel controlled or restricted in their response behaviour.

Table 9-1: Plausibility checks during the survey by emigrant and remigrant questionnaire

	Variable name in ...	
	Emigrant questionnaire	Remigrant questionnaire
Migration date between 1940 and 2018	a002*, a129	a002*, a129
Household size between 1 and 20	a014, a060	a014, a060
Year of birth of household members between 1900 and 2018	a015*, a061*	a015*, a061*
Maximum working hours per week not above 168	a030, a072, a115	a030, a072, a115
Net earnings not above gross earnings	a025a, a034a, a074a, a089a, a117a	a074a, a089a, a117a
Maximum number of semesters enrolled not above 50	a105	a105
Maximum number of study semesters not above number of semesters enrolled	a106	a106
Year of birth between 1940 and 2002	a126	a126

Note: The asterisk “*” behind variable names indicates that the respective variable is based on at least two items.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

9.2 Plausibility checks after the survey

Another important consideration concerns the number of cases affected by data inconsistency. If the proportion of affected cases in the dataset is large enough to substantially impact data analyses, the need to investigate, document, and potentially correct inconsistencies is naturally higher than if only a small proportion of cases is affected (Netscher, Eder 2018).

Based on the principles of good scientific practice, initial data processing focusing on data quality can be based on one of the following two approaches (Arbeitsgruppe Plausibilisierung 2018):

1. Liberal Approach: Data is processed in a way that is as “error-free” as possible. For example, possible errors or implausibilities within the answers of the panel respondents are checked and “corrected” top-down by the survey managers after the survey. Consequently, data on a first view draws a “plausible” and consistent picture for potential (secondary) users.
2. Conservative Approach: Data are checked for potential errors or implausibilities within the data. These are documented and, in most cases, flagged and thus made available for potential (secondary) researchers.

Following the recommendations of the Arbeitsgruppe Plausibilisierung (2018), a conservative strategy was followed for GERPS data management, especially concerning post-survey correction of responses. The latest discussions of this working group pointed out that data managers should “not place themselves above the respondents and their given answers” (Arbeitsgruppe Plausibilisierung 2018). In addition, the group

recommended that data managers should not deprive researchers of the opportunity to find the underlying cause of possible “implausibilities,” given that researchers, too, are experts in their research area. In this context, it should be emphasised that the research of such implausibilities (or better “noise in the data”) can lead to innovative research results with the background knowledge of an expert.

Inconsistencies in data can be caused by different survey factors (e.g. survey design, question operationalisation), response behaviour (e.g. satisficing, carelessness), or the presence of third parties (for more reasons or details see e.g. Lück and Landrock (2019)). Therefore, data managers should not decide that certain answers are right or wrong, or judge which of the contradictory answers might be the correct one. In nearly every case, a data manager cannot take such a decision without accepting a high residual uncertainty.

Such a conservative data processing strategy is also in line with the recommendations of Netscher and Eder (2018), who warn against correcting inconsistent values. From their point of view, corrections can only be made where the correct value could be inferred with highest levels certainty (e.g. from the documentations, or from open-ended answers). Following their advice, researchers otherwise should choose a more conservative intervention if there is no way of being sure about the correct value(s). One option would be to flag the specific variable or to set the inconsistent value(s) to missing(s). Even if the data manager is able to trace back the source of inconsistencies, it is not advisable to replace the original values. Instead, in such cases, a transparent and more recommendable approach is to leave the original variable in the dataset and additionally offer a corrected version. This way, each data user can decide which version to use.

During data processing of GERPS, we had such cases where it was not fully possible to understand how and why an inconsistency arose. In such cases, we followed the above-mentioned recommendations and documented all changes. In most cases, we decided not to change the original data but leave this “noise” within the data. For our users, this has the advantage that the decision of whether or not to include such cases in the data analyses is left up to them, so that researchers can make their own conclusions based on their assumptions and considerations with respect to their particular analysis. Thus, all responses were successively subjected to a plausibility examination. In most cases, possible implausible data was marked, documented, and afterwards discussed in the team. If no clear correction was possible, answers were flagged in the original data sets and marked as “invalid or implausible value” with the missing data code “-3” in the cleaned scientific use file.

9.3 Open-ended questions

While our questionnaire in wave 1 consisted mainly of closed questions such as single, multiple choice, or grid questions, in some parts of the questionnaire respondents also had the opportunity to specify, complement, or explain the given answers through open-answer response categories. In most self-administered survey modes these are included in order to improve the coverage of the questionnaire to the specific individual situation of an individual respondent (Singer, Couper 2017). Within GERPS, open answers were checked and, if possible, matched with existing categories. If no corresponding category existed but open answers were given sufficiently often and appeared valid, new categories were developed. Where permissible under the data protection regulations, the original version of the variable was additionally made available.

In addition, we included an open question at the end of the questionnaire to give respondents the opportunity for general feedback on the survey. Participants could both

make critical comments and point out anomalies in the questionnaire processing, which may be important for the interpretation of the data. For longitudinal panel studies, such participant feedback is of particular interest as it can be used to increase questionnaire quality in the next survey waves. In addition, reasons for dissatisfaction can be identified and eliminated at an early stage in order to reduce the number of participants leaving the panel (Decorte et al. 2019; McLauchlan, Schonlau 2016; Singer, Couper 2017; Wahlig et al. 2018). These studies show that, in general, respondents are willing to share their attitudes and advice. In case of GERPS, 23.1% of the emigrant sample and 24.9% of the remigrant sample made use of this option.

Existing literature on processing information from these final comments advises us to systematically analyse these data based on a predefined category scheme. However, especially due to the limited time between wave 1 and 2, such an approach was not possible. So far, we have only been able to screen these comments for substantial content that could help us to improve our wave 2 questionnaire. In future, however, we plan to deal more intensively with these questions and analyse them via team-based approaches in order to fully exploit their analytical potential (Cascio et al. 2019; McLauchlan, Schonlau 2016; Meitinger, Behr, Braun 2019; Schmidt, Gummer, Roßmann 2019).

10 Generated variables

As part of the Scientific Use File (SUF), the original data of the German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS) is complemented by generated variables. The aim of this procedure is threefold: First, generated variables simplify data usage because they provide combined information stemming from different variables from the original data set. Second, generated variables enhance data quality by providing information that has been checked for plausibility where possible and reasonable. And third, certain generated variables in GERPS directly reflect existing generated variables of the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), which makes comparative analyses between internationally mobile Germans (represented by GERPS) and the non-mobile German population (represented by SOEP) much easier.

In the following, the procedure for every single generated variable in GERPS is described. In addition, variables' names and value labels are provided. In cases of comparability between GERPS and SOEP, the variable names as well as the value labels used in both data sets are provided.

Unlike the general naming procedures in GERPS (see Chapter 9), generated variable names show comparability to generated variables in SOEP. Alternatively, if no SOEP variables exist, chosen variable names represent their content. All variables based on the first wave of GERPS are indicated by the letter "A" or "Z." This is because wave 1 contains information on the current situation of the migrant at the time of the interview. All referring generated variables were given the annex "A." The first wave contains retrospective information on the living conditions shortly before the last event of migration. Since this information functions as a "virtual" wave 0, all referring generated variables were given the annex "Z."

10.1 Design information

All GERPS participants can be identified by a unique central individual identifier variable ID. The ID is fixed across time and enables us to merge information for the same participant across waves.

The variable SAMPLE describes to which original sample a participant belongs. We distinguish between emigrants (contacted via their recent foreign addresses), emigrants (contacted via their former German addresses), and remigrants (contacted via their recent German addresses). This information was originally provided by the population register. It must be noted that some emigrants had already returned to Germany at the time of our interview and that some remigrants had already emigrated again at the time of our interview. Therefore, SAMPLE is not congruent with the original variable a000 that stores the actual migration status (emigrant vs. remigrant).

The month and the year of the interview are provided in the variables IWMONTHA and IWYEARA. If no such information is available, both variables are set to missing (“no answer”). If the information is improbable, both variables are also set to missing (“answer improbable”). The days that have been elapsed between the day of the interview in wave 1 and respondents’ self-reported date of migration is stored in ELAPDAY. Since the time of migration is only available on a monthly basis, we calculate ELAPDAY by using the first day in respondents’ self-reported month of migration. Given that the field process in wave 1 ended in February 2019, ELAPDAY should technically not include values above 608 days (counting from the first of July 2017 to the first of February 2019). However, ELAPDAY contains some cases above this threshold. Population registers are administrative data sources, which not always perfectly match with self-reported information of the registered population. Thus, GERPS also includes emigrants who report to have moved abroad before July 2017 and remigrants who report to have returned before July 2017. Depending on the research interest and questions, researchers have to make informed decisions about which cases above the threshold they retain for their analyses.

Weighting factors adjusting for selection probabilities and unit nonresponse are provided (see Chapter 12.1 for details). DWEIGHTA provides design weights correcting for selection probabilities of municipalities and individuals, whereas AWEIGHTA includes adjustment factor correcting for unit nonresponse. A combined weight resulting from the product of DWEIGHTA and AWEIGHTA is stored in the variable WEIGHTA.

The sex of the participants is stored in SEX.

10.2 Migration background

Born in Germany

The generated variable GERMBORN indicates whether the GERPS participant was born in Germany or not (see Table 10-1). It relies on information about the country of birth recorded in the original variable a128. GERMBORN in GERPS is congruent to the SOEP variable GERMBORN (SOEP Group 2018c: p. 16 ff.).

Table 10-1: Born in Germany

values	SOEP GERMBORN	GERPS GERMBORN
1	Born in Germany	Born in Germany
2	Not born in Germany	Not born in Germany
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Migration background

The generated variable MIGBACK indicates whether the GERPS participant has any migration background. It is congruent to the SOEP variable MIGBACK (SOEP Group 2018c: p. 22ff). GERMBORN relies on GERMBORN (see above) and information about the country of birth of the respondent's father and mother (a144*).

We assume that participants have no migration background if they were born in Germany and the father and the mother were both born in Germany. We assume a direct migration background if the participant was not born in Germany and, therefore, has obviously migrated to Germany him- or herself sometime in the past. We assume an indirect migration background if the participant was born in Germany but at least one of his or her parents was not born in Germany. If participants were not born in Germany but they report both parents were born in Germany, we define a not differentiable migration background. This is the same if information about the participant's country of birth is missing but they report that at least one parent was born outside Germany. If any information about the participant's country of birth or the country of birth of the participant's parents is missing, MIGBACK is set to missing (see Table 10-2).

Table 10-2: Migration background

values	SOEP MIGBACK	GERPS MIGBACK
1	No migration background	No migration background
2	Direct migration background	Direct migration background
3	Indirect migration background	Indirect migration background
4	Migration background, not differentiable	Migration background, not differentiable
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

10.3 Family status, partnership, and typology of household

Partner indicator

The two generated partner indicators in GERPS rely on the comparable generated variable PARTZ\$\$ in the SOEP (SOEP Group 2018b: p. 6). PARTZZ provides the partner indicator for the time three months before migration and PARTZA provides the partner indicator at the time of the interview in wave 1. The generation of PARTZZ and PARTZA relies on original information about the general status of partnership (a008, a057), about the marital status of partnership (a010, a059), and about the reported household composition (a014, a015*, a060, a061*).

Table 10-3: Partner indicator

values	SOEP PARTZ\$\$ Current indicator	GERPS PARTZZ Retrospective indicator	GERPS PARTZA Current indicator
0	No partner in household	No partner	No partner
1	Spouse, registered partner in household	Spouse, registered partner in household	Spouse, registered partner in household
2	Partner in household	Partner in household	Partner in household
3	Probably spouse, registered partner in household	-	-
4	Probably partner in household	-	-
5	-	Spouse, registered partner not in household	Spouse, registered partner not in household
6	-	Partner not in household	Partner not in household
-1	No answer	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	-	-
-5	Not included in questionnaire	-	-
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	-	-

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Due to the different methodological concepts – the SOEP is a household-survey and GERPS is an individual survey – it does not seem advisable to transfer the generation procedure of the SOEP directly into GERPS variables. The variable PARTZ\$\$ in the SOEP aims to identify partners in a shared household. It is not interested in any existing partnership with anybody outside of the household. In GERPS, it is possible to unequivocally identify whether a participant had or has a partners in and outside each current household. As a result, PARTZZ and PARTZA differ from PARTZ\$\$ in three ways:

1. GERPS generally indicates whether the participant had/has no partnership. It is not restricted to a missing partner in the current household like in the SOEP (see values “0” in Table 10-3).
2. GERPS unequivocally indicates whether there was/is a spouse or registered partner in or outside the household, or if there is a partner in or outside the household. Therefore, there is no need for the SOEP value categories “3” or “4.” In addition, GERPS includes the two new categories “5” and “6” (see Table 10-3).
3. Because of the methodological concept of the GERPS sample and questionnaires, only three of the six SOEP missing value categories are applicable in GERPS (see Table 10-3).

In addition, we set PARTZZ and PARTZA to missing (-3) if the age of the partner is reported as below 18 years.

Age of partner in household

The variable PAGEZ provides information about the age of the partner in the household of a GERPS respondent three months before migration. PAGEA provides information about the current age of the partner in the household of a GERPS respondent (see Table 10-4). Please note that in cases of partnership breakup and new partnership formation during the migration process, the information provided in PAGEZ and PAGEA could refer to different individuals. PAGEZ is calculated by subtracting the year of birth of the partner

living in respondent's household (stored in a015*_2) from the year of respondent's migration (stored in a0022). PAGEA is calculated by subtracting the year of birth of the partner living in respondent's household (stored in a061*_2) from the year of the interview (stored in IWYEARA).

Table 10-4: Age of partner

values	GERPS PAGEZ Retrospective indicator	GERPS PAGEA Current indicator
#	Age of partner in household	Age of partner in household
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Marital status

The two generated marital status indicators in GERPS rely on the comparable generated variable \$FAMSTD in the SOEP (SOEP Group 2018b: p. 7). ZFAMSTD provides the marital status indicator for the time three months before migration and AFAMSTD provides the marital status indicator at the time of the interview in wave 1. The generation of ZFAMSTD and AFAMSTD relies on original information about the marital status of the partnership (a009, a010, a058, a059). To add some information about the possible fact that a husband, wife, or a registered partner could live abroad, we use information about the spouse's place of residence before migration or at the time of the interview (a013).

All categories regarding the generated variables of marital status are completely comparable between SOEP and GERPS. However, only three of the six SOEP missing value categories are applicable in GERPS because of the methodological concept of the GERPS sample and questionnaires (see Table 10-5).

Table 10-5: Marital status

values	SOEP \$FAMSTD Current indicator	GERPS ZFAMSTD Retrospective indicator	GERPS AFAMSTD Current indicator
1	Married	Married	Married
2	Married, but separated	Married, but separated	Married, but separated
3	Single	Unmarried	Unmarried
4	Divorced	Divorced	Divorced
5	Widowed	Widowed	Widowed
6	Husband/wife abroad	Husband/wife abroad	Husband/wife abroad
7	Registered same-sex partnership, living together	Registered same-sex partnership, living together	Registered same-sex partnership, living together
8	Registered same-sex partnership, living apart	Registered same-sex partnership, living apart	Registered same-sex partnership, living apart
-1	No answer	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	-	-
-5	Not included in questionnaire	-	-
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	-	-

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Change in partner status

PARTNERA is a generated variable in GERPS only. It provides information about a change in partner status between the time before migration and the current survey date. It is based on a comparison between the information regarding the partner status before migration (a008), the current partner status after migration (a057), and the information provided by the participants about whether their past partnership before migration still exists (a011). It is possible not only to indicate whether a durable partnership has existed all along the migration process. In case of recent separations, it is also possible to provide information on whether this separation happened before or after the migration event. In addition, PARTNERA also provides information on whether the migrant formed a new partnership after arrival in their new destination (see Table 10-6). Additionally, three different missing categories exist.

Table 10-6: Change in partner status

values	GERPS PARTNERA
0	Permanently single
1	Separation in origin & single
2	Separation in destination & single
3	Separation in origin & new partnership in destination
4	Single in origin & new partnership in destination
5	Permanent partnership
-1	No answer
-2	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Typology of household (2 Digit)

The two generated variables that indicate the type of household in GERPS (2 digits) rely on the comparable generated variable TYP2HH\$\$ in the SOEP (SOEP Group 2018a: p. 31). TYP2HHZ provides information about the type of household for the time three months before migration and TYP2HHA provides information about the type of household at the time of the interview in wave 1. The generation of TYP2HHZ and TYP2HHA relies on original information about the age at migration and the age at the time of the interview (generated Variable AGEZ & AGEA), the sex (a125), and the household composition (a008, a009, a010, a014, a015*, a057, a058, a059, a060, a061*).

Unlike the generated SOEP variable, a distinction between multiple-generation households and other household types is not possible in GERPS. Therefore, multiple-generation households are subsumed in the two categories describing “other combination” (values ‘81’ and ‘82’, see Table 10-7).

Table 10-7: Household typology (2 digits)

values	SOEP	GERPS	GERPS
	TYP2HH\$\$ Current indicator	TYP2HHZ Retrospective indicator	TYP2HHA Current indicator
11	1- person HH male LE35	1- person HH male LE35	1- person HH male LE35
12	1- person HH male 35- LT60	1- person HH male 35- LT60	1- person HH male 35- LT60
13	1- person HH male GE60	1- person HH male GE60	1- person HH male GE60
14	1- person HH female LE35	1- person HH female LE35	1- person HH female LE35
15	1- person HH female 35- LT60	1- person HH female 35- LT60	1- person HH female 35- LT60
16	1- person HH female GE60	1- person HH female GE60	1- person HH female GE60
21	Couple without children	Couple without children	Couple without children
31	Single parent, 1 child, LE16	Single parent, 1 child, LE16	Single parent, 1 child, LE16
32	Single parent, 2 or more children, LE16	Single parent, 2 or more children, LE16	Single parent, 2 or more children, LE16
33	Single parent, 1 child, GT16	Single parent, 1 child, GT16	Single parent, 1 child, GT16
34	Single parent, 2 or more children, GT16	Single parent, 2 or more children, GT16	Single parent, 2 or more children, GT16
35	Single parent, 2 children, LE and GT16	Single parent, 2 children, LE and GT16	Single parent, 2 children, LE and GT16
36	Single parent, 3 or more children, LE and GT16	Single parent, 3 or more children, LE and GT16	Single parent, 3 or more children, LE and GT16
41	Couple, 1 child, LE16	Couple, 1 child, LE16	Couple, 1 child, LE16
42	Couple, 2 children, LE16	Couple, 2 children, LE16	Couple, 2 children, LE16
43	Couple, 3 or more children, LE16	Couple, 3 or more children, LE16	Couple, 3 or more children, LE16
51	Couple, 1 child, GT16	Couple, 1 child, GT16	Couple, 1 child, GT16
52	Couple, 2 children, GT16	Couple, 2 children, GT16	Couple, 2 children, GT16
53	Couple, 3 or more children, GT16	Couple, 3 or more children, GT16	Couple, 3 or more children, GT16
61	Couple, 2 children, LE and GT16	Couple, 2 children, LE and GT16	Couple, 2 children, LE and GT16
62	Couple, 3 or more children, LE and GT16	Couple, 3 or more children, LE and GT16	Couple, 3 or more children, LE and GT16
71	3-generation HH	-	-
72	4-generation HH	-	-
73	Grandparents- grandchildren HH	-	-
81	Other combination without children LE16	Other combination without children LE16	Other combination without children LE16
82	Other combination with children LE16	Other combination with children LE16	Other combination with children LE16
-1	No answer	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	-	-
-5	Not included in questionnaire	-	-
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	-	-

Note: LE = lower than or equal, GT = greater than.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Typology of household (1 Digit)

The two generated variables that indicate the type of household in GERPS (1 digit) rely on the comparable generated variable TYP1HH\$\$ in the SOEP (SOEP Group 2018a: p. 31). TYP1HHZ provides information about the type of household for the time three months before migration and TYP1HHA provides information about the type of household at the time of the interview in wave 1. The generation of TYP1HHZ and TYP1HHA relies on the generated variables TYP2HHZ and TYP2HHA (see above).

Unlike the generated SOEP variable, a distinction between multiple-generation households and other household types is not possible in GERPS. Therefore, multiple-generation households are subsumed in the two categories describing “other combination” (value ‘8,’ see Table 10-8).

Table 10-8: Household typology (1 digit)

values	SOEP	GERPS	GERPS
	TYP1HH\$\$	TYP1HHZ	TYP1HHA
	Current indicator	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
1	1-person household	1-person household	1-person household
2	Couple without children	Couple without children	Couple without children
3	Single parent	Single parent	Single parent
4	Couple with children LE 16	Couple with children LE 16	Couple with children LE 16
5	Couple with children GT 16	Couple with children GT 16	Couple with children GT 16
6	Couple with children LE and GT 16	Couple with children LE and GT 16	Couple with children LE and GT 16
7	Multiple generation household	Multiple generation household	Multiple generation household
8	Other combinations	Other combinations	Other combinations
-1	No answer	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	-	-
-5	Not included in questionnaire	-	-
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	-	-

Note: LE = lower than or equal, GT = greater than.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

GERPS typology of household (1 digit)

The SOEP-related variables that indicate the type of household (TYP1HH# and TYP2HH#) require a great deal of information, which leads to a relatively large amount of missing data. In addition, the specific focus on internationally mobile individuals leads to an increased importance of households where adult respondents live with their parents (e.g. students). The variables TYP3HHZ and TYP3HHA are provided for these reasons (see Table 10-9). TYP3HHZ provides information about the type of household for the time three months before migration and TYP3HHA provides information about the type of household at the time of the interview in wave 1. The generation of TYP3HHZ and TYP3HHA relies on original information about the household composition (a014, a015*, a060, a061*).

Table 10-9: GERPS household typology (1 digit)

	GERPS TYP3HHZ	GERPS TYP3HHA
values	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
1	1-person household	1-person household
2	Couple without children	Couple without children
3	Single parent	Single parent
4	Couple with children LE 16	Couple with children LE 16
5	Parents and adult children (GT 16)	Parents and adult children (GT 16)
6	Adults with parents	Adults with parents
7	Multiple generation household	Multiple generation household
8	Other combinations	Other combinations
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Note: LE = lower than or equal, GT = greater than.

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Children in household (by age class)

The variables ZC_AGE# and AC_AGE# (GERPS only) provide information on whether children belonging to certain age groups live in the household before and after migration (see Table 10-10). We distinguish between children below the age of six (group 1), children at the age of six to eleven years (group 2), and finally children at the age of 12 to 16 years (group 3). Unlike TYP1HHZ and TYP1HHA, the kind of family relationship is not pertinent. Therefore, these age-group variables also cover stepchildren and blended families. The variables ZC_AGE# and AC_AGE# rely on information stored in the original variables a014, a015*, a060, a061*. It is important to note that the value ‘-2’ (“does not apply”) means that no children below the age of 17 are living in the household. However, if the variable AC_AGE1, for example, has the value ‘0’ this indicates that there is at least one child in the household but none of these children is below the age of six.

Table 10-10: Number of children in household (by age group)

	GERPS ZC_AGE#	GERPS AC_AGE#
values	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
0	At least one child in household, but not in the related age group	At least one child in household, but not in the related age group
1	At least one child in household belonging to the related age group	At least one child in household belonging to the related age group
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Age of the youngest child in household

CH_MINAGEZ stores the age of the youngest child below the age of 17 years in the household before migration. CH_MINAGEA stores the current age of the youngest child below the age of 17 years in the household (see Table 10-11). Every child is included irrespective of whether the GERPS respondent claims the child as his or her son or daughter. That means that CH_MINAGEZ and CH_MINAGEA also cover stepchildren and blended families. The variables ZC_AGE# and AC_AGE# rely on information stored in the original variables a014, a015*, a060, a061*.

Table 10-11: Age of youngest child in household

	GERPS CH_MINAGEZ	GERPS CH_MINAGEA
values	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
#	Age of youngest child in HH (< 17 years old)	Age of youngest child in HH (< 17 years old)
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Change in household composition

HHCHANGEA is a generated variable in GERPS only. It provides information about a change in the household composition between the time before migration and the current survey date. It is based on a comparison between the information on the household composition before migration (a014, a015*), and the current household composition after migration (a060, a061*). The aim of HHCHANGEA is to determine whether certain members of the household at the origin place are still members of the household at the place of destination. It also provides information on whether certain members of the household at the destination have newly joined the household after migration (see Table 10-12).

Table 10-12: Change in household composition

values	GERPS HHCHANGEA
1	Identical household composition before/after migration
2	New individual(s) in household after migration
3	Former household members missing after migration
4	New individual / former household members missing after migration
-1	Missing
-2	Incomplete information

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

10.4 Wages and salary

In the following, we describe how original information about wages and salaries have been prepared for further analyses. However, external GERPS users should be aware of the fact that the Scientific Use File (SUF) only provides condensed information on salaries and wages due to anonymisation (see Chapter 11 for detailed information).

Gross labour income

The variable LABGROZ contains information about the gross labour income before migration and LABGROA contains information about the current gross labour income reported by the GERPS participants. LABGROZ includes the gross labour income of workers, civil servants, and the self-employed and is based on information about the main employment status (a019) and information on wages and salaries (a024, a024a, a033, a033). LABGROA includes the gross labour income of workers, civil servants, apprentices, and the self-employed and is based on information about the main employment status (a068) and information on wages and salaries (a073, a073a, a088, a088a, a116, a116a).

LABGROZ and LABGROA are congruent to the SOEP variable LABGRO\$\$ except for imputed and missing values. In GERPS, missing values on gross labour income are recorded in LABGROZ and LABGROA while missing values on gross labour income in the SOEP are recorded in the additional variable IMPGOR\$\$\$. In addition, there are no income imputations regarding gross labour income in GERPS (see Table 10-13).

Table 10-13: Gross labour income (in euros)

	SOEP LABGRO\$\$	GERPS LABGROZ	GERPS LABGROA
values	Current indicator	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
#	Current gross labour income in euros	Gross labour income before migration in euros	Current gross labour income in euros
-1	-	No answer	No answer
-2	-	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	-	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Net labour income

The variable LABNETZ contains information about the net labour income before migration and LABNETA contains information about the current net labour income reported by the GERPS participants (see Table 10-14). LABNETZ includes the net labour income of workers, civil servants, and the self-employed and is based on information about the main employment status (a019) and information on wages and salaries (a025, a025a, a034, a034a). LABNETA includes the gross labour income of workers, civil servants, apprentices, and the self-employed and is based on information about the main employment status (a068) and information on wages and salaries (a074, a074a, a089, a089a, a117, a117a).

LABNETZ und LABNETA are congruent to the SOEP variable LABNET\$\$ except for imputed and missing values. In GERPS, imputed income information is included in IMP1NETZ and IMP1NETA (see below). In addition, missing values on net labour income are recorded in LABNETZ and LABNETA while missing values on net labour income in the SOEP are recorded in the additional variable IMPNET\$\$\$.

Table 10-14: Net labour income (in euros)

	SOEP LABNET\$\$	GERPS LABNETZ	GERPS LABNETA
values	Current indicator	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
#	Current net labour income in euros	Net labour income before migration in euros	Current net labour income in euros
-1	-	No answer	No answer
-2	-	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	-	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Current net labour income 2 (in euros) (incl. income imputation)

The variables IMP1NETZ and IMP1NETA contain the same information as LABNETZ and respectively LABNETA (see Table 10-15). The difference between these variables is that IMP1NETZ and IMP1NETA also contain imputed income information. These imputed values are derived from the original variables a026, a035, a075 and a090. These variables contain grouped income information for employed workers and civil servants as well as the self-employed who did not report their exact net income in LABNETZ or LABNETA. To transform this grouped information into pseudo-exact information, we first calculate the median of

each income group (separately for the employed and self-employed) based on the exact observations in LABNETA for these groups. After that, we assign these group medians to all participants who did not report exact but grouped net labour income information. In addition, we create additional variables IMPFLAGZ and IMPFLAGA that indicate whether the income information in IMP1NETZ or IMP1NETA refer to exact reporting or to imputed group median values (see Table 10-16). Missing values are the same for IMP1NETZ, IMP1NETA, IMPFLAGZ and IMPFLAGA).

Table 10-15: Current net labour income 2 (in euros) (incl. income imputation)

	SOEP LABNET\$\$	GERPS IMP1NETZ	GERPS IMP1NETA
values	Current indicator	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
#	Current net labour income in euros	Net labour income before migration in euros	Current net labour income in euros
-1	-	No answer	No answer
-2	-	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	-	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Table 10-16: Flag for imputation of current net labour income 2

	SOEP IMPNET\$\$	GERPS IMPFLAGZ	GERPS IMPFLAGA
values	Current indicator	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
0	No imputation	No imputation	No imputation
1	Imputation	Imputation	Imputation
-1	No answer	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	-	-
-5	Not included in questionnaire	-	-
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	-	-

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

10.5 Employment status

Main activity

In GERPS, the participants were asked for their main activity three months before migration and during the last week before the interview. This information is stored in the variables a019, a068. Based on this information, the variables MAINACTZ and MAINACTA were generated (see Table 10-17). The first variable refers to the main activity before migration and the second variable refers to the current main activity. Due to anonymisation, we subsumed the category “civil servant” under the category “employed” in the SUF. MAINACT# does not directly correspond to any SOEP variable. However, the SOEP variable STIB\$\$ can easily be transformed for comparison with MAINACT#.

Table 10-17: Main activity

values	GERPS MAINACTZ	GERPS MAINACTA
	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
1	Employed	Employed
2	Self-employed	Self-employed
3	Civil servant	Civil servant*
4	Unemployed	Unemployed
5	Retired	Retired
6	Education & training	Education & training
7	Not employed	Not employed
8	Other	Other
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Note: * in the SUF, the category “civil servant” is subsumed under the category “employed”

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

MAINACT# counts all employees regardless of their working hours as employed. All students, trainees and apprentices were subsumed in the category “Education & Training.” Respondents who report to be on parental leave and homemakers are covered by the category “not employed.” If respondents do any kind of voluntary service, work as an au pair, or do some kind of “work and travel,” or chose the original category “other activity,” they are subsumed in the category “other.” All other categories fit one to one to the originally recorded.

Main activity of current partner

In GERPS, the participants were asked about the current main activity of their partner during the last week before the interview. This information is stored in the variable a143. Based on this information the variable MAINACTPA was generated (see Table 10-18).

MAINACTPA provides information on whether the partner was full or part-time employed (including marginal or sporadic employment). All students, trainees, and apprentices were subsumed in the category “Education & Training.” Respondents who report to be on parental leave, and homemakers are covered by the category “not employed.” All other categories fit one to one to the originally recorded categories in a143.

Table 10-18: Partner’s current main activity

values	GERPS MAINACTPA
	Current indicator
1	Full-time employed
2	Part-time employed
3	Self-employed
4	Unemployed
5	Retired
6	Education & training
7	Not employed
8	Other
-1	No answer
-2	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Current working hours

In GERPS, information on employees' current contractually agreed as well as actual weekly working hours is included and provided by the generated variables WTCA and WTAA (see Table 10-19). In addition, the two generated variables WTCCLASA and WTACLASA gives information on the current working hours as arranged. The variables summarise whether the respondent's contractually agreed or actual weekly working hours can be categorised as "full time" (>30 hours/week), "long part-time" (20<30 hours/week) or "short part-time" (<20 hours/week) (see Table 10-20). These cut-offs correspond to established thresholds in labour market research (cf. van Bastelaer, Lemaître, Marianna 1997). All these working hour-related variables rely on the original information stored in a071, a071a, a072.

Table 10-19: Current working hours/week

	GERPS WTCA	GERPS WTAA
values	Contractually agreed	Actual
#	Current working hours/week	Current working hours/week
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Table 10-20: Current working hour arrangements

	GERPS WTCCLASA	GERPS WTACLASA
values	Contractually agreed	Actual
1	No defined working hours	No defined working hours
2	Full time	Full time
3	Long part time	Long part time
4	Short part time	Short part time
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

10.6 Occupational classification

Forming occupational classifications is a complex enterprise and its quality heavily depends not only on data quality but on extensive practical experience in occupational coding. Therefore, all occupational coding was externalised to the *Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft* (INFAS) as a service provider with extensive experience in occupational coding. In its coding strategy, INFAS followed coding procedures recommended by GESIS documented in Geis (2011). Based on original GERPS data, INFAS provides information relying on two different common classification typologies, namely the "International Standard Classification of Occupations" (ISCO08) provided by the International Labour Office (ILO) (2012) and the German "Classification of Occupations 2010" (KIDB2010) provided by the German Federal Labour Office (BA) (Paulus, Schweitzer, Wiemer 2010) (see Table 10-21 and Table 10-22). Information on respondents' occupational classification is only provided for the first digit level to

reduce the identification risk (see Chapter 11). The corresponding variables in the SUF are ISCO08A_SUF and KLDB2010A_SUF

Relying on ISCO08, INFAS also formed two variables that measure occupational prestige, namely the “International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status” (ISEI88) (Ganzeboom, Graaf, Treiman 1992) and the “Standard Index of Occupational Prestige Scala” (SIOPS88) (Ganzeboom, Treiman Donald J. 1996; Treiman 1977) (see Table 10-23 and Table 10-24). Occupational classification information in GERPS is only available for participants who indicated that they were (marginally) employed, civil servants, or self-employed three months before migration or at the time of the interview.

International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO08)

Table 10-21: International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO08)

values	SOEP	GERPS	GERPS
	ISCO08_\$\$ Current indicator	ISCO08Z Retrospective indicator	ISCO08A Current indicator
-1	Answer improbable	No answer	No answer
-2	No answer/ Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	-	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-8	Not available in year of interview	-	-
100	Soldiers	-	-
110	-	Commissioned armed forces officers	Commissioned armed forces officers
210	-	Non-commissioned armed forces officers	Non-commissioned armed forces officers
310	-	Armed forces occupations, other ranks	Armed forces occupations, other ranks
410	-	Soldier (without further specification) (GESIS special code)	Soldier (without further specification) (GESIS special code)
...			
9622		Odd job persons	Odd job persons
9623		Meter readers and vending- machine collectors	Meter readers and vending- machine collectors
9624		Water and firewood collectors	Water and firewood collectors
9629		Elementary workers not elsewhere classified	Elementary workers not elsewhere classified

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Classification of Occupations (KIDB2010)

Table 10-22: Classification of Occupations (KIDB2010)

values	SOEP	GERPS	GERPS
	KLDB2010_\$\$ Current indicator	KLDB2010Z Retrospective indicator	KLDB2010A Current indicator
-1	Answer improbable	No answer	No answer
-2	No answer/ Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	-	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-8	Not available in year of interview	-	-
1104	Officer	Officer	Officer
1203	Senior non-commissioned officers and higher	Senior non-commissioned officers and higher	Senior non-commissioned officers and higher
1302	Junior non-commissioned officers	Junior non-commissioned officers	Junior non-commissioned officers
1402	Armed forces personnel in other ranks	Armed forces personnel in other ranks	Armed forces personnel in other ranks
11101	Occupations in farming (without specialisation)-unskilled/semiskilled tasks	Occupations in farming (without specialisation)-unskilled/semiskilled tasks	Occupations in farming (without specialisation)-unskilled/semiskilled tasks
11102	Occupations in farming (without specialisation)-skilled tasks	Occupations in farming (without specialisation)-skilled tasks	Occupations in farming (without specialisation)-skilled tasks
...			
94713	Technical occupations in museums and exhibitions-complex tasks	Technical occupations in museums and exhibitions-complex tasks	Technical occupations in museums and exhibitions-complex tasks
94714	Technical occupations in museums and exhibitions-highly complex tasks	Technical occupations in museums and exhibitions-highly complex tasks	Technical occupations in museums and exhibitions-highly complex tasks
94724	Art experts-highly complex tasks	Art experts-highly complex tasks	Art experts-highly complex tasks
94794	Managers in museum	Managers in museum	Managers in museum

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (ISEI08)

Table 10-23: International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (ISEI08)

values	SOEP	GERPS	GERPS
	ISEI88_\$\$ Current indicator	ISEI08Z Retrospective indicator	ISEI08A Current indicator
#	Current ISEI value	ISEI value before migration	Current ISEI value
-1	-	No answer	No answer
-2	-	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	-	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Note: SOEP still refers to the older version (ISEI88)

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Standard Index of Occupational Prestige Scala

Table 10-24: Standard Index of Occupational Prestige Scala (SIOPS88)

	SOEP SIOPS88_\$\$	GERPS SIOPS88Z	GERPS SIOPS88A
values	Current indicator	Retrospective indicator	Current indicator
#	Current SIOPS value	SIOPS value before migration	Current SIOPS value
-1	-	No answer	No answer
-2	-	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	-	Answer improbable	Answer improbable

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

10.7 Education

ISCED 2011 classification

The variable ISCED11_A represents the internationally comparable educational degree of the respondents according to the “International Standard Classification of Education” (ISCED) provided by the OECD in its 2011 version (OECD, Eurostat, UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2015). This variable is congruent with the variable ISCED11_\$\$ in the SOEP (see Table 10-25). The generated GERPS variable ISCED11_A is based on information on current school attendance, the highest attained school degree and the highest attained vocational and university degree (a068, a132, a136).

Table 10-25: ISCED 2011 classification

	SOEP ISCED11_\$\$	GERPS ISCED11_A
0	In school	In school
1	Primary education	Primary education
2	Lower secondary education	Lower secondary education
3	Upper secondary education	Upper secondary education
4	Post-secondary education	Post-secondary education
5	Short-cycle tertiary education	Short-cycle tertiary education
6	Bachelors or equivalent level	Bachelors or equivalent level
7	Masters or equivalent level	Masters or equivalent level
8	Doctoral or equivalent level	Doctoral or equivalent level
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	Inadmissible multiple response
-5	Not included in questionnaire	Not included in questionnaire
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

CASMIN classification

The variable CASMINA represents the internationally comparable educational degree of the respondents according to the scheme “Comparative Analysis of Social Mobility in Industrial Nations” (CASMIN) (Schroedter, Lechert, Lüttinger 2006). This variable is congruent with the variable CASMIN\$\$ in the SOEP (see Table 10-26). The generated GERPS variable CASMINA is based on information on current school attendance, the highest attained school degree and the highest attained vocational and university degree (a068, a132, a136).

Table 10-26: CASMIN classification

values	SOEP CASMIN\$\$	GERPS CASMINA
0	0 In school	0 In school
1	(1a) Inadequately completed	(1a) Inadequately completed
2	(1b) General Elementary School	(1b) General Elementary School
3	(1c) Basic Vocational Qualification	(1c) Basic Vocational Qualification
4	(2b) Intermediate general Qualification	(2b) Intermediate general Qualification
5	(2a) Intermediate Vocational	(2a) Intermediate Vocational
6	(2c_gen) General Maturity Certificate	(2c_gen) General Maturity Certificate
7	(2c_voc) Vocational Maturity Certificate	(2c_voc) Vocational Maturity Certificate
8	(3a) Lower Tertiary Education	(3a) Lower Tertiary Education
9	(3b) Higher Tertiary Education	(3b) Higher Tertiary Education
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	Inadmissible multiple response
-5	Not included in questionnaire	Not included in questionnaire
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

School-leaving degree

The generated variable APSBIL contains information about the highest attained school degree. It corresponds to the SOEP variable \$PSBIL. However, both variables are not fully congruent because it is not possible to identify the SOEP category “Technical School Degree” in the GERPS data (see Table 10-27). The generated GERPS variable APSBIL is based on information on current school attendance and the highest attained school degree (a068, a132).

Table 10-27: School-leaving degree

values	SOEP \$PSBIL	GERPS APSBIL
1	Secondary school degree	Secondary school degree
2	Intermediate school degree	Intermediate school degree
3	Technical school degree	-
4	Upper secondary degree	Upper secondary degree
5	Other degree	Other degree
6	Dropout, no school degree	Dropout, no school degree
7	No school degree	No school degree
-1	No answer	No answer
-2	Does not apply	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response	Inadmissible multiple response
-5	Not included in questionnaire	Not included in questionnaire
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Vocational and university degree

AEDU is a generated variable in GERPS only (see Table 10-28). It provides information about the highest attained vocational or university degree. It is based on information if any vocational or university education has been completed and the highest attained vocational and university degree (a135, a136).

Table 10-28: Highest attained vocational or university degree

values	GERPS AEDU
1	No degree
2	Intermediate degree
3	Upper degree
-1	No answer
-2	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response
-5	Not included in questionnaire
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

Vocational and university degree of current partner

AEDUP is a generated variable in GERPS only (see Table 10-29). It provides information about the highest attained vocational or university degree of the respondent's current partner. It is based on information about any vocational or university education completed and the highest attained vocational and university degree of the respondent's current partner (a141, a142).

Table 10-29: Highest received vocational or university degree of current partner

Values	GERPS AEDUP
1	No degree
2	Intermediate degree
3	Upper degree
-1	No answer
-2	Does not apply
-3	Answer improbable
-4	Inadmissible multiple response
-5	Not included in questionnaire
-6	Version of questionnaire with modified filtering

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1

11 Preparation of a scientific use file

According to Art. 4 (1) of the General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union (GDPR), the German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS) collects, stores, and processes personal data. The GERPS data protection concept (see Chapter 5.2.3) defines how this personal data is handled and ensures that this procedure is totally in line with the GDPR as well as with the national data protection rules in Germany (Federal Data Protection Act, BDSG). The data protection concept also allows that GERPS be provided to other researchers outside the project for the purpose of secondary analysis by providing a Scientific Use File (SUF) as recommended by the Alliance of German Science Organisations in its “Principles for the Handling of Research Data” (Alliance of German Science Organisations 2010). According to the data protection concept, to provide such an SUF requires appropriate measures of statistical disclosure control. In case of GERPS, this means that the data has to be “virtually anonymised,” meaning that even by combining different information it would only be possible to identify a single survey participant under extreme and disproportional efforts for any data offender. This definition of “virtual anonymisation” precisely corresponded to Section 16 of the BDSG until it was amended to fit the GDPR in 2018. Today, however, neither the current BDSG nor the GDPR includes the concept of virtual anonymisation. However, Section 26 of the GDPR allows the provision of sufficient anonymised data to authorised third parties in principal, whereas this procedure de facto corresponds to the concept of virtual anonymisation as described in the former BDSG until 2018.

It is clear that any anonymisation procedure results in a reduction of analytical potential. Therefore, the anonymisation of personal data with the aim to provide an SUF has to account for a risk minimisation of identification and at the same time has to strive for a maximisation of analytical potency for the sake of needs and interests of researchers (Hundepool et al. 2012; Wirth 2016). In some cases, it is possible that certain information cannot be disseminated in the SUF to meet the data protection rules of the GDPR. External researchers may however heavily rely on this information to conduct specific analyses. If this should be the case, external researchers who are, for example, interested in differentiated spatial information should contact the GERPS team to discuss alternative data access strategies. In this regard, external researchers should also consult Chapter 15.4 in the Appendix. It provides an overview of original variables not included in the SUF due to anonymisation.

11.1 Basic concepts and principles

In the following, we describe the measures of statistical disclosure control that have been taken to build up an anonymised scientific use file. These measures draw upon broad experience and recommendations gained over the last 30 years (Müller, Wirth 1991; Wirth 1992, 2006; Hundepool et al. 2012). The overarching goal of anonymisation is to effectively rule out any identification risk. Identification in this sense means that “an intruder trying to link [a protected data set] V with an external non-anonymous data source will find at least k records in V that match any value of the quasi-identifier the intruder uses for record linkage. Thus re-identification, i.e. mapping a record in V to a non-anonymous record in the external data source, is not possible; the best the intruder can hope for is to map groups of k records in V to each non-anonymous external record” (Hundepool et al. 2012: 6; see also Wirth 2006: p. 1). Additionally, any anonymisation strategy has to consider technological conditions that shape the possibilities to identify single individuals within survey data and that these conditions have changed and will further develop as a consequence of progress, particularly in information technologies (Karg 2015). Wirth (1992: pp. 10–11) points out that the actual identification risk can be estimated along three criteria – content of overlapping information, sample characteristics, data mismatch between micro data file and complementary knowledge – as described below.

Content of overlapping information

Regarding the content of overlapping information, it seems particularly risky if strongly differentiated objective and spatial items coincide. In GERPS, this is particularly the case with regard to information on employment and occupational status, information on household and family constellations, as well as spatial information.

Sample characteristics

Due to the sample characteristics, there is protection against identification of single GERPS survey participants because a potential intruder cannot be sure whether a particular person really took part in GERPS. However, this protection is limited because being a member of the GERPS sample is not entirely random as it is in standard population surveys. Instead the GERPS sample includes only individuals with German nationality who officially indicated to their local registration office in Germany that they have moved abroad or have moved back to Germany between July 2017 and June 2018 (see also Chapter 2.4). Because these sample criteria have to be published for methodological reasons, this restriction implies a limitation to the potential to re-identify a group of people particularly for a probable intruder. Moreover, we note that GERPS is a survey of a “rare population” (Kalton, Anderson 1986; Lynn et al. 2018). The restrictions of the sampling criteria to a concrete and timed event (here: emigration or remigration) combined with the rarity of such events increases the risk of identification in GERPS by definition. Moreover, we have to take into account that this risk of identification is further increased due to the panel characteristic and the crucial information about further on-migration or return-migration of sample members between the single survey waves. The risk of identification could also be affected by the increasing use of social media tools (e.g. Facebook, Twitter) because some survey participants could voluntarily disclose sensitive additional information about the countries they have moved to or even study participation to the public and, thus, potential offenders.

Because of these possible risks, GERPS has undergone partial information suppression and detail reduction for the sake of building an SUF. This is particularly the case with regard to all information that would allow references to any spatial context to be created. This includes information on (former) host countries of emigrants and remigrants but also information on spatial characteristics of the former or current place of residence

(e.g. community size). This strategy is also a protection for identification if a potential intruder has additional knowledge about a particular individual, for example, whether this person moved to a certain country (e.g. Papua New Guinea) during the past year.

Data mismatch between micro data file and complementary knowledge

A potential risk of identification exists if probable intruders link two or more different micro data files with the aim to find data “twins” with unique combinations of characteristics that could be used for identification of certain individuals. However, this risk is ipso facto limited because all surveys constantly have to face deviations in survey participants’ answer behaviour as well as data errors due to subsequent data preparation and adjustment. In this respect, intruders could not be sure whether they can really identify the same individual by data linkage (Wirth 1992, 2006). In the case of GERPS, we also have to recognise that there is no single micro data file or survey in Germany that contains information about recent emigrations out of Germany or remigrations to Germany with reasonable accuracy. Therefore, identification of GERPS participants via data linkage is impossible.

11.2 General processes of anonymisation

Following the recommendations of Wirth (2006: 8), the precise GERPS sampling strategy is kept confidential to reduce the risk of identification. Moreover, external users of the SUF have to sign a contract of use that determines the terms of use including the obligation to observe the valid data protection regulations as well as to delete all GERPS data after a certain period of usage. The use of GERPS data is strictly restricted to non-profit research purposes. Data dissemination is carried out by the GESIS data archive in Cologne, Germany on the behalf of the GERPS team. Of course, the SUF does not explicitly include any data that allows the direct identification of participants like names, dates of birth or addresses. In addition, there is no information regarding the exact month of survey participation. As mentioned above, original detailed information on (former) host countries of emigrants and remigrants as well as information on spatial characteristics of the former or current place of residence (e.g. community size) are not included in the SUF.

11.3 Non-perturbative masking of information

To preclude an identification of survey participants by intruders, the original data has undergone further preparation by appropriate non-perturbative masking measures. This procedure anticipates that GERPS is a panel study and therefore has to account for possible identification risks that appear due to repeated interviews of the same individuals over the course of time. In the following, we describe all concrete non-perturbative masking procedures of GERPS to produce a genuinely anonymised SUF.

Countries of destination

In GERPS, emigrants and remigrants were asked about the country they currently live in (emigrants) or that they lived in before they recently returned to Germany (remigrants). Since internationally mobile individuals are a rare and specific population, this information regarding destination countries bears an increased risk of identification. This is particularly the case with regard to countries to which only a small number of Germans emigrate or from which only a small number of Germans returned. However, we also have to keep in mind that for migration research, information about the destination of German emigration is of decisive importance to answer certain research

questions. Obviously there has to be a compromise between the need to avoid identification of single survey participants and the need of researchers for spatial information. As a result, the GERPS SUF contains information regarding the destination country of emigrants and returning remigrants only in the form of the following categories that summarise appropriate geographical, geo-political, cultural and/or legal entities (stored in REGION).

- -1 “no valid information”
- 1 “German speaking neighbours (LUX, AUT, CHE, LIE)”
- 2 “Non-German speaking neighbours (DNK, POL, CZE, FRA, BEL, NLD)”
- 3 “other EU or EFTA + GBR, Ex-Yugoslavia, ALB”
- 4 “Near and Middle East (incl. TUR)”⁶
- 5 “Asia (incl. RUS, UKR, BLR)”
- 6 “Africa”
- 7 “North America (CAN + USA)”
- 8 “Latin America”
- 9 “Oceania”

Residential Status

In wave 1, GERPS asks participants about their residential status at the time of the interview. Due to anonymisation, the seven categories in the raw data are condensed to three categories in the SUF as shown in Table 11-1.

Table 11-1 Recoding of categories of residential status

Categories in raw data	Categories in SUF (RESTATA)
Tourist Temporary visa	Temporary visa /tourist
Permanent visa National citizen	Permanent visa / national citizen
No visa required Diplomat	No visa required / diplomat
Other	Subsumed under “answer improbable”

Source: GERPS 2019, wave 1.

Classification of occupations

In GERPS, the participants provide information about their exact occupation by answering an open-ended question. Relying on this information, and in combination with other data, it is possible to assign emigrants and remigrants to two well-established classifications of occupations, namely the “International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO08)” and the German “*Klassifikation der Berufe 2010*” (KIDB 2010). Within the GERPS SUF, this information is provided only on the upper one-digit level to diminish the identification risk (stored in ISCO08A_SUF, KLDB2010A_SUF).

Household status

GERPS collects detailed information about the household composition of emigrants and remigrants. Respondents report about the number of housemates, their relationship status with respect to these individuals, housemates’ sex, and their year of birth. In combination with other information, particularly with regard of changes in household composition between the single waves, identification risk is potentially increased. Therefore, the GERPS SUF contains only three generated variables representing the

⁶ Category 4 includes TUR, YEM, ARM, BHR, IRQ, IRN, ISR, JOR, QAT, AZE, GEO, KAZ, KWT, KGZ, LBN, OMN, ARE, TJK, TKM, SAU, SYR, UZB and PSE.

household composition (see Chapter 10.3 for details). All variables are deleted and are not part of the SUF in which the detailed information about each single housemate is originally stored.

Year of birth

To avoid identification by combining participants' age with other available information, the GERPS SUF provides not the exact age but only classified data on participants' year of birth. In addition, we carry out bottom coding and subsume all individuals born before 1969 in one single category. This is necessary because emigration and remigration is a domain of younger people and therefore the number of cases aged 50 and above is quite small and has to be subsumed. This leads to the following six year-of-birth-categories: (1) 1968 and earlier, (2) 1969 – 1978, (3) 1979 – 1984, (4) 1985 – 1989, (5) 1990 – 1994 and (6) 1995 – 2001. The information is stored in the variable GEBJHR_SUF.

Wages

GERPS records participants' monthly wages. To avoid identification, all wage information was rounded (hundreds digit). In addition, all wages below 500 euros and above 7,500 euros were subsumed in two classes (bottom and top coding). Wage information are stored in LABNETZ_SUF, LABGROZ_SUF, LABNETA_SUF and LABGROA_SUF.

Parents' origins

GERPS asks participants to provide information about their parents' countries of origin. The SUF condenses these data and provides only information about whether father or mother were born (1) in Germany, (2) in the emigrant's or remigrant's (former) destination country or (3) in another country. This information is stored in CBIRTHF and CBIRTHM.

Additional adjustments

GERPS ask its participants about their migration motives. In this context, all emigrants who migrated to the United Kingdom and all remigrants who recently left the United Kingdom were asked about the importance of United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union ("Brexit") for their migration decision (remigrants) or their intention to stay in the UK (emigrants). This information is deleted from the SUF.

12 Generation of weights and data quality

Concluding the previous analyses about the data quality of GERPS from a survey lifecycle perspective, this final chapter provides information about the generation of design and nonresponse weights to correct for the specific sampling strategy as well as to reduce potential nonresponse error. Finally, comparative analyses between the distributions of key demographic variables in the sample with official reference statistics are presented to have an intuitive crosscheck about the respective data quality of GERPS.

12.1 Weighting to adjust selection probabilities and unit nonresponse

The sampling procedure of GERPS results in unequal probabilities of selection for both municipalities and individuals (see Chapter 2.4). Furthermore, the variation in response rates between different subgroups of the internationally mobile population varied (see Chapter 6.3). In complex sample surveys it is common to generate weights to compensate these features (Groves et al. 2004: 321f.). In the multistage stratified

sampling procedure of GERPS, overall 81 municipalities were selected. Since the inclusion of the ten municipalities with the highest number of international migrants in 2015 (i.e. total number of 20 to 70-year-old emigrants and remigrants with German citizenship) was set, their probability of inclusion was equal to 1. The other 71 municipalities were sampled proportional to the size of emigrants and remigrants in the year 2015. Due to the stepwise sampling procedure (see Chapter 2.4), the sampling design led to variation in inclusion probabilities on the individual level. In such cases, design weights enable an unbiased estimation by considering the sampling design and its different inclusion probabilities for particular individuals.

The resulting design weights of all 11,010 complete interviews showed a mean of 3.3 and a median of 1.5 but also included some outliers with values up to 463.4. This is due to internationally mobile persons originating from particularly small municipalities as well as relatively large households. In order to reduce the impact of the design weights on standard errors of survey estimates, they were trimmed for selected municipalities. Overall, 123 individuals from 23 municipalities with comparatively high design weights were identified as outliers. For those cases, the 99th percentile of the design weight's distribution in the net sample was chosen and replaced by the mean of the design weights in these municipalities (48.4). This fundamentally reduces design weights for the 123 individuals identified as outliers without reducing the proportion of those 23 municipalities in the final sample of complete interviews.

Next to the design weight, adjusting for unequal selection probabilities of municipalities and individuals, existing information from the population registers as a sample frame were used to adjust for unit nonresponse. The aim of nonresponse weights is to account for nonresponse that occurs due to particular socio-demographic characteristics. The detailed unit nonresponse analyses in Chapter 6 showed that some personal, regional as well as survey design factors are correlates of nonresponse of the internationally mobile population. The information from population registers as well as about survey design features are generally of high quality and are available for almost all individuals included in the gross sample. Instead, the socio-economic data originating from Microm, a German micro- and geo-marketing agency, is proxy information used to assess data quality but is neither available for all individuals of the gross sample nor of the necessary quality to be used for nonresponse adjustments. The nonresponse weighting procedure was conducted separately for both samples – emigrants and remigrants – and included the following aspects: sex, municipality size, age, country of (r)emigration, and survey mode (paper and pencil interviews).

Nonresponse adjustments must be limited to information available for every person in the gross sample. Whereas this is principally the case for the variables listed above, the gross sample included a few cases with missing information. In those cases, missing values were replaced following the “multiple imputation with chained equations” approach (cf. Royston 2009). This approach is also applied in the SOEP (see Kroh et al. 2017) and replaces all missing values ten times. The remaining uncertainty of each imputation procedure is considered in subsequent nonresponse modelling and enables the estimation of corrected standard errors.

In line with the procedure in Chapter 6, logistic regression models are used to model the probability of participation. The participation probabilities for each person are estimated based on several independent variables (Kim, Kim 2007). Persons with characteristics that are often associated with participation receive a high assigned probability of participation. These varying probabilities of participation are balanced by forming the inverse ($1/p$), representing each participant's individual nonresponse weight (“propensity weight”). Persons with a low probability of participation thus receive a high weight and vice versa. In line with the results in Chapter 6, the explanatory power of the models are at a low level of 2 percent, demonstrating again that the decision for participation or non-participation is mainly unsystematic.

In line with the procedure on design weights, the resulting adjustment weights are trimmed because weighting factors with high variance increase standard errors of subsequent analyses of the data. No generally accepted procedure regarding the trimming of weights exists (Elliott, Little 2000) but most procedures take the empirical distribution of the adjustment factors as their basis. Because the distribution of weighting factors is in most cases extremely right-skewed, weights are usually trimmed at the upper end of the distribution, for example at the 95 percent percentile (see Lee, Lessler, Stuart 2011). In the case of GERPS, a factor of two times the mean was set as the upper limit for the nonresponse weights. Instead of replacing all weights above that limit with the value of the limit itself, the trimmed weights spread around the limit to reflect the variation of the original weighting factors. Overall, however, the trimming affected fewer than 200 individuals in both samples but reduced the standard deviation of the weights by more than 30 percent. After trimming, the nonresponse weights were modified by linear transformation to reach the gross sample size of 47,714 individuals. The scientific use file includes the design weight as well as the adjustment weight separately but also a combined weight for thematic analyses resulting as the product of both individual weights.

12.2 Comparing the GERPS sample to data from official statistics

Germany's official migration statistics provided by the Federal Statistical Office certainly constitute the most important reference to crosscheck data quality of both GERPS samples. They offer the opportunity to compare the composition of GERPS with the distribution of the official statistics along key socio-demographic variables like sex and age as well as along regions of destination/origin and time of migration. The assessment of survey data quality and the effect of weighting procedures based on reference data is well established practice in survey methodology and also guides this chapter (e.g. Hartmann, Schimpl-Neimanns 1992; Kalter, Kogan, Dollmann 2019).

The information from the official statistics in all following tables refers to average results of Germany's migration statistic for the years 2017 and 2018 because the sampling period of GERPS occurred between July 2017 and June 2018. The analyses are restricted to 20 to 70-year-old German citizens to match the sampling frame of GERPS as closely as possible. Moreover, the analysis of the official statistic excludes cases deregistered "ex officio" (see also Chapter 2.3) but additional analyses (not shown here) indicate that differences between the distributions of German migrants with and without deregistration "ex officio" are marginal. All analyses in this chapter show the distribution of the official statistic, the gross sample of GERPS as well as the unweighted and weighted results for all complete interviews of GERPS. Whereas the information on the distribution in the gross sample has to rely on register information, the data on complete interviews refers to the information provided by the respondents themselves. Table 12-1 presents the distribution of male and female emigrants and remigrants in official statistics compared with the respective distribution in the gross sample of GERPS and the final sample of all complete interviews. The results show that the gross sample of GERPS matches the distribution share of emigrants and remigrants to a very high degree. Official statistics record that 52.6% of emigration events were undertaken by males, whereas the respective share in the gross sample of GERPS is 52.1%. For remigrants, the difference is even lower and differs only by 0.1 percentage points demonstrating that with respect to sex, sampling errors were marginal. With respect to the unweighted distribution in the sample of the interviews, however, the table shows a higher probability of females to respond to the GERPS questionnaire. This results in an overrepresentation of female respondents in the emigrant sample by 3.8 percentage points compared to official statistics and – even more pronounced – by almost 5.0

percentage points in the remigrant sample (for more detailed analyses about nonresponse see Chapter 6). Applying the weights, in both samples the distribution is now closer to the known distribution from the official statistics. Males are overrepresented in both samples, closely mirroring the gender distribution of German migrants.

Table 12-1: Distribution of sex in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent

	Emigrants				Remigrants			
	Official statistics	Gross sample	<u>Complete interviews</u> unweighted	weighted	Official statistics	Gross sample	<u>Complete interviews</u> unweighted	weighted
Male	52.6	52.1	48.9	52.9	54.5	54.4	49.5	51.4
Female	47.4	47.9	51.1	47.1	45.5	45.6	50.5	48.6
N	91,399	26,226	4,509	4,509	79,174	21,004	6,401	6,401

Source: Authors' calculations based on GERPS 2019, wave 1 and official statistics provided by the Federal Statistical Office

With regard to age (see Table 12-2), differences in the distribution between official statistics and the gross sample of GERPS are more pronounced. This is mainly caused by the official migration statistics recording migration events with no reference to specific individuals or households. The sampling procedure of GERPS, instead, concentrates on only one randomly chosen individual per household. Because international migration in the household context is more likely in older age groups, the sampling procedure results at an overrepresentation of younger age groups (20-29 years and 30-39 years) in the gross sample. Regarding the unweighted results, especially the 30 to 39-year-old respondents in both samples are overrepresented by 8.7 percentage points for the emigrants sample and 7.6 percentage points for the remigrant sample. This higher probability of response of the 30 to 39-year-olds consequently results at an underrepresentation of the older age groups of both samples. Applying weights, the overrepresentation of the 30 to 39-year-old respondents decreases. For the emigrant sample, this group is now overrepresented by 5.0 percentage points and 2.3 percentage points for the remigrant sample. Moreover, the share of the older age groups (50 to 59 and 60 to 70) increases in both samples, resulting in a lower degree of underrepresentation for the older respondents.

Table 12-2: Distribution of age in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent

	Emigrants				Remigrants			
	Official statistics	Gross sample	<u>Complete interviews</u> unweighted	weighted	Official statistics	Gross sample	<u>Complete interviews</u> unweighted	weighted
20-29	33.3	33.6	32.0	33.0	28.2	31.0	30.1	33.1
30-39	30.6	35.9	39.3	35.6	29.0	31.1	36.6	31.3
40-49	15.8	14.8	14.6	14.6	18.3	17.5	17.6	16.5
50-59	12.8	10.3	10.4	11.4	15.8	13.9	11.0	12.4
60-70	7.5	5.3	3.7	5.4	8.7	6.4	4.7	6.7
N	91,399	26,261	4,501	4,501	79,174	21,402	6,393	6,393

Source: Authors' calculations based on GERPS 2019, wave 1 and official statistics provided by the Federal Statistical Office

Germany's migration statistics also provide information about the geography of migration. The distribution of the region of destination of emigrants in the gross sample largely matches the corresponding distribution in official statistics with a 1.6 percentage

point overrepresentation of Switzerland in the gross sample marking the most obvious discrepancy (see Table 12-3).

Table 12-3: Distribution of the region of destination of emigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent

	Emigrants			
	Official statistics	Gross sample	Complete interviews unweighted	Complete interviews weighted
EU-28	45.5	45.3	50.3	45.2
Other European	6.8	5.7	3.5	4.7
Switzerland	15.1	16.7	22.1	19.4
North America	10.3	10.4	10.1	12.1
Latin America	4.4	4.3	2.9	3.6
Asia	8.1	7.8	5.7	7.3
Africa	3.0	2.8	1.7	2.5
Oceania	4.2	4.0	2.6	3.2
Near and Middle East	2.5	3.1	1.2	2.0
N	91,399	25,239	4,527	4,527

Source: Authors' calculations based on GERPS 2019, wave 1 and official statistics provided by the Federal Statistical Office

Table 12-4: Distribution of the region of origin of remigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent

	Remigrants			
	Official statistics	Gross sample	Complete interviews unweighted	Complete interviews weighted
EU-28	39.8	42.8	42.1	40.5
Other European	10.1	6.3	3.8	5.8
Switzerland	11.0	10.6	11.7	10.2
North America	10.3	10.6	11.4	11.0
Latin America	6.2	7.7	8.0	8.4
Asia	11.0	9.5	10.7	10.7
Africa	3.9	4.3	4.1	3.9
Oceania	4.0	3.6	4.6	5.1
Near and Middle East	3.7	4.7	3.6	4.5
N	79,174	20,379	6,426	6,426

Source: Authors' calculations based on GERPS 2019, wave 1 and official statistics provided by the Federal Statistical Office

Interestingly, the pattern of divergences between the official statistics and the gross sample is more marked with respect to remigrants. Potential sampling errors in the divergent distribution between official statistics and the gross sample are the most pronounced. For example, 39.8% of remigrants return from an EU-28 country whereas their respective share is 42.8% in the gross sample. This is most likely caused by the regional stratification of the GERPS sampling strategy (see Table 12-5). Based on this particular distribution, additional nonresponse bias has only marginal consequences for the remigrant sample (with the exception of European countries outside of the EU) but is more relevant for the emigrant sample. These divergences between the gross sample and the complete interviews in the unweighted emigrant sample are mostly

explained by more serious noncontact problems in non-European countries whereas emigrants within most European countries are more easily recruited by using origin-based sampling with a destination-based interviewing approach. Regarding the weighted results, the divergence between the complete interviews and the official statistics as well as the gross sample is reduced. The share of emigrants living in regions outside Europe increases whereas the share of emigrants in Switzerland decreases. Finally, the weighted distribution partly compensates for the noncontact problems of emigrants living in countries outside Europe. With regard to the remigrant sample, the share of remigrants returning from EU-28 countries decreases and the share from non-European countries increases. Although this results in a better match with the official statistics, the remigrants from European countries outside the EU are still underrepresented.

The temporal dimension of migration is a major strength of GERPS. It enables the analysis of the consequences of migration across the life course, it will provide longitudinal data about the ongoing migration process within a panel design, and it focuses on the experiences of migration immediately related to the migration event. GERPS sampled persons who migrated during a twelve-month period immediately ahead of the actual fieldwork. The nonresponse analyses show hardly any effect of the timing of migration on the final response behaviour. The distribution of official statistics and the information provided by the respondent, however, clearly show some striking differences well known from other migration samples based on administrative registers (e.g. Brücker et al. 2014; Kühne, Jacobsen, Kroh 2019). Table 12-5 and Table 12-6 show that for a substantial number of 29.3% (emigrants) and 17.2% (remigrants) the actual date of the migration event took place before or after the sampling period, which lasted from July 2017 until June 2018. This difference even increases when weights are applied.

Table 12-5: Distribution of the timing of the migration event of emigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent

	Emigrants			
	Official statistics	Gross sample	Complete interviews unweighted	Complete interviews weighted
Before July 2017	-	-	23.6	25.1
July 2017	9.1	10.4	5.7	5.3
August 2017	10.1	11.6	8.4	9.0
September 2017	9.3	10.4	7.4	6.5
October 2017	8.9	8.1	5.5	5.1
November 2017	8.7	6.3	4.1	3.5
December 2017	8.5	8.2	5.2	5.1
January 2018	8.1	8.7	7.3	6.9
February 2018	7.5	6.9	5.6	5.5
March 2018	7.6	7.5	5.4	4.7
April 2018	7.3	7.2	6.4	6.5
May 2018	7.1	6.4	4.9	5.2
June 2018	7.8	8.3	4.9	5.3
After June 2018	-	-	5.7	6.4
N	266,968	26,174	4,509	4,509

Note: In contrast to Tables 12-1 to 12-4, data from official statistics are not restricted to 20 to 70-year-olds and contain cases with deregistration “ex officio.” These additional analyses were not available from the Federal Statistical Office.

Source: Authors’ calculations based on GERPS 2019, wave 1 and official statistics provided by the Federal Statistical Office

In the cases where actual migration took place after the date registered in official migration statistics, the registration took place in advance of the actual migration whereas – and this is the empirically much more common finding – in cases with migration taking place before July 2017, individuals had deregistered several months after the actual migration. Although substantial delays in the registration behaviour obviously exist, the predominate number of respondents actually migrated within the sampling framework and the respondents who migrated earlier did so – in most cases – one or two years before the date in the official data source, hardly diminishing the overall high data quality.

Table 12-6: Distribution of the timing of the migration event of remigrants in GERPS data and official statistics, in percent

	Remigrants			
	Official statistics	Gross sample	Complete interviews unweighted	Complete interviews weighted
Before July 2017	-	-	8.1	8.7
July 2017	10.3	9.4	8.7	7.7
August 2017	9.6	9.7	9.3	8.1
September 2017	8.2	9.2	8.1	7.4
October 2017	7.6	8.5	7.4	7.1
November 2017	6.6	6.5	4.7	4.4
December 2017	7.8	6.6	5.8	6.4
January 2018	8.4	8.8	7.7	7.8
February 2018	7.6	6.8	6.1	5.6
March 2018	7.9	7.8	5.9	5.5
April 2018	8.3	8.7	7.1	5.8
May 2018	8.2	8.0	6.1	6.0
June 2018	9.6	9.9	6.0	5.9
After June 2018	-	-	9.1	13.7
N	180,328	21,429	6,374	6,374

Note: In contrast to tables 12-1 to 12-4, data from official statistics are not restricted to 20 to 70-year-olds and contain cases with deregistration “ex officio.” These additional analyses were not available from the Federal Statistical Office.

Source: Authors’ calculations based on GERPS 2019, wave 1 and official statistics provided by the Federal Statistical Office

13 Summary

International migration between economically highly developed countries and the consequences for the regions of origin as well as the individual consequences for the migrants themselves are regularly neglected research areas in migration studies. Despite the increasing importance of these international migration processes and their potential consequences for countries with ageing populations and decreasing labour forces, there is scant empirical research about this group. The main cause for this unsatisfactory state is a lack of appropriate data to study this form of international migration. The aim of the German Emigration and Remigration Panel Study (GERPS) is to contribute to the necessary geographical and theoretical broadening of migration studies by collecting new data that enable the analysis of the individual consequences of international migration. The report aimed to provide a detailed documentation of the

methodological concept, its practical implementation, and the outcomes of the baseline survey (wave 1) of this new study. It supports external researchers who are interested in working with the survey data. Furthermore, it provides detailed first-hand information for third parties interested in setting up similar research designs.

Given the difficulty of surveying this rare and hard-to-reach population, GERPS aimed to study internationally migrating German citizens based on an original research design characterised by five major characteristics:

1. GERPS applies an **origin-based sampling design** and uses Germany's population register to set up a probability sample of the internationally mobile German population. In contrast to traditional destination-based migrant samples, this provides the opportunity for analyses of the individual causes and consequences of migration by comparison with existing data on non-migrants in the country of origin.
2. GERPS uses a **both-ways migration design** and provides data on both recently emigrated and recently remigrated German citizens. Less biased migration samples are the key methodological advantage of this design, which accounts for selective return migration. Additionally, this design provides the opportunity to study the individual consequences of migration during the time abroad as well as after returning to the country of origin.
3. GERPS is based on a **push-to-web design** combining offline, postal invitation letters with online web interviewing to recruit this hard-to-reach population. Whereas emigrants are surveyed during their time abroad in a large and diverse number of countries of destination, remigrants are surveyed after their return to Germany. In contrast to traditional migrant samples, this provides the opportunity for comparative analyses of the consequences of migration between multiple destination countries.
4. GERPS applies a **multi-sited design** studying migration in both origin and destination countries. Analyses of the causes and consequences of international migration have to be interpreted with reference to the internationally non-mobile population in the country of origin. GERPS does not sample this non-mobile population but its data has been collected so that it can be easily harmonised with SOEP data to provide unlinked multi-sited data.
5. GERPS implements a **longitudinal design** combining the collection of retrospective data with panel data to study consequences of migration along the life course. In contrast to cross-sectional studies, multiple measurements of central target variables within a comparatively short time interval provides insights into the dynamics of international migration processes and their consequences. Within the following waves of GERPS, the longitudinal design will furthermore provide the opportunity to study multiple migrations of emigrants deciding to migrate onwards or to return to Germany and remigrants deciding to emigrate again.

The provided information and analyses of this report document that the research design of GERPS is a promising approach. The four basic characteristics proved successful overall, including the set up of a probability sample based on the country of origin as well as the push-to-web design resulting in overall competitive response rates. The final data set of this baseline study of GERPS includes more than 11,000 interviews and overall high data quality with respect to low levels of item nonresponse. It provides a probability sample of the internationally mobile German population. It provides data about emigrants including information about their recent life situation and about their life before migration including the migration process itself. It provides detailed information about remigrants and their recent life situation and about their life before return migration including the migration process itself. Finally, GERPS data are easy to harmonise with SOEP data, which contain information about the non-mobile population in the country of origin, and with additional data sources, which provide information about the countries of destination.

There are several possibilities to improve GERPS' research design in the future. One is the use of Germany's population register as a sampling frame. GERPS is the first study to use the newly available information about emigration in Germany's population registers for a scientific study. Existing data protection considerations of individual municipalities and rudimentarily developed software tools to exploit this newly available information posed practical difficulties during the sampling process. In the future, even closer cooperation with the municipalities in the preparation of the sampling process could increase data quality. Another is the coverage error between the population register as a sampling frame and the internationally migrating German target population. Progress could include analyses about the match between the target population and the sampling frame based on large-scale national household surveys in the country of origin and destination to better assess potential coverage errors. In addition, potential enhancements of the sampling process should be exploited in the future. This includes, for example, the application of multiple-frame sampling designs complementing the existing probability sample based on Germany's population register with a nonprobability sample. More recent advances in social network sampling, even in the context of migration studies (Schneider, Harknett 2019; Pötzschke, Braun 2016), could further increase the quality of the sample. A final aspect is the push-to-web design, which provided a cost-efficient and comprehensive strategy for recruiting this mobile population. In future, studies should improve on our lessons learned with regard to the difficulties of processing incentives across borders. Besides those procedural improvements, several methodological experiments within this baseline GERPS survey showed that unconditional incentive schemes bring about the best sampling outcomes. Additional analyses of these incentive experiments and the development of new incentive mechanisms for surveying across borders could potentially increase the quality of the resulting data.

This documentation exhibits an innovative sampling design and its application in the context of a rare population. It shows how the approach can be realised successfully and provides ideas for improving probability samples of internationally mobile populations in future. Thus, GERPS makes a significant contribution to the geographical broadening of migration studies by improving the data situation about international migration in Germany and between economically highly developed countries more generally. Furthermore, GERPS contributes to a theoretical broadening of migration studies by providing opportunities for comparative analyses of the internationally migrating population with the non-migrating population of its country of origin. Alongside the existing endeavours to construct new immigrant samples in major destination countries, the research design of GERPS offers a promising new strategy to set up complementing migrant samples from the perspective of origin countries.

14 Bibliography

- AAPOR 2016: Standard Definitions. Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 9th edition.
- ADM 2014: Stichproben-Verfahren in der Umfrageforschung. Eine Darstellung für die Praxis. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Albers, Ines 1997: Einwohnermelderegister-Stichproben in der Praxis. In: *Gabler, Siegfried; Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, Jürgen H. P.* (ed.): *Stichproben in der Umfragepraxis*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: 117–126.
- Alliance of German Science Organisations 2010: Principles for the Handling of Research Data: Alliance of German Science Organisations.
- Amelina, Anna; Faist, Thomas 2012: De-naturalizing the national in research methodologies: Key concepts of transnational studies in migration. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35;10: 1707–1724.
- Andreadis, Ioannis 2015: Web Surveys Optimized for Smartphones. Are there Differences Between Computer and Smartphone Users? In: *methods, data, analyses* 9;2: 213–228.
- Arbeitsgruppe Plausibilisierung 2018: Austauschtreffen zum Thema Plausibilisierungspraktiken. Ergebnissicherung. Hannover.
- Basius, Jörg; Reuband, Karl-Heinz 1996: Postalische Befragungen in der empirischen Sozialforschung. Ausschöpfungsquoten und Antwortqualität. In: *Planung & Analyse* 96;1: 35–41.
- Beauchemin, Cris; González-Ferrer, Amparo 2011: Sampling international migrants with origin-based snowballing method: New evidence on biases and limitations. In: *Demographic Research* 25;3: 103–134.
- Becker, Rolf; Mehlkop, Guido 2011: Effects of Prepaid Monetary Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates and on Self-reporting about Delinquency - Empirical findings. In: *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique* 111;1: 5–25.
- Becker, Rolf; Möser, Sara; Glauser, David 2019: Cash vs. vouchers vs. gifts in web surveys of a mature panel study - Main effects in a long-term incentives experiment across three panel waves. In: *Social Science Research* 81: 221–234.
- Behr, Dorothee; Meitinger, Katharina; Braun, Michael; Kaczmirek, Lars 2017: Web probing - implementing probing techniques from cognitive interviewing in web surveys with the goal to assess the validity of survey questions (Version 1.0). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Beierlein, Constanze; Kovaleva, Anastasiya; László, Zsuzsa; Kemper, Christoph J.; Rammstedt, Beatrice 2014: Eine Single-Item-Skala zur Erfassung von Risikobereitschaft. Die Kurzskaala Risikobereitschaft-1 (R-1). GESIS-Working Papers. Mannheim.
- Beine, Michel; Docquier, Frédéric; Rapoport, Hillel 2006: Measuring International Skilled Migration: New Estimates Controlling for Age of Entry, Policy Research Discussion Paper. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Berlin, Martha; Mohadjer, Leyla; Waksberg, Joseph; Kolstad, Andrew; Kirsch, Irwin S.; Rock, Donald A.; Yamamoto, Kentaro 1992: An experiment in monetary incentives. In: *American Statistical Association* (ed.): *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section*: 393–398.
- Beullens, Koen; Loosveldt, Geert; Vandenplas, Caroline; Stoop, Ineke 2018: Response Rates in the European Social Survey. Increasing, Decreasing, or a Matter of Fieldwork Efforts? In: *Survey Insights: Methods from the Field*.

- Bilsborrow, Richard E.; Hugo, Graeme; Oberai, A. S.; Zlotnik, Hania* 1997: International Migration Statistics. Guidelines for Improving Data Collection Systems. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Blom, Annelies G.; Bosnjak, Michael; Cornilleau, Anne; Cousteaux, Anne-Sophie; Das, Marcel; Douhoum, Salima; Krieger, Ulrich* 2016: A Comparison of Four Probability-Based Online and Mixed-Mode Panels in Europe. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 34;1: 8–25.
- Blom, Annelies G.; Gathmann, Christina; Krieger, Ulrich* 2015: Setting Up an Online Panel Representative of the General Population: The German Internet Panel. In: *Field Methods* 27;2: 391–408.
- Blom, Annelies G.; Herzing, Jessica M. E.; Cornesse, Carina; Sakshaug, Joseph; Krieger, Ulrich; Bossert, Dayana* 2017: Does the Recruitment of Offline Households Increase the Sample Representativeness of Probability-Based Online Panels? Evidence From the German Internet Panel. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 35;4: 498–520.
- Blumenberg, Cauane; Zugna, Daniela; Popovic, Maja; Pizzi, Costanza; Barros, Aluisio J. D.; Richiardi, Lorenzo* 2018: Questionnaire Breakoff and Item Nonresponse in Web-Based Questionnaires. Multilevel Analysis of Person-Level and Item Design Factors in a Birth Cohort. In: *Journal of medical Internet research* 20;12: 1-11.
- Bowling, Nathan A.; Huang, Jason L.* 2018: Your Attention Please! Toward a Better Understanding of Research Participant Carelessness. In: *Applied Psychology* 67;2: 227–230.
- Bowyer, Benjamin T.; Rogowski, Jon C.* 2017: Mode Matters. Evaluating Response Comparability in a Mixed-Mode Survey. In: *Political Science Research and Methods* 5;2: 295–313.
- Brehm, John* 1993: The phantom respondents: Opinion surveys and political representations. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Brick, J. Michael; Williams, Douglas* 2012: Explaining Rising Nonresponse Rates in Cross-Sectional Surveys. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645: 36–59.
- Brislinger, Evelyn; Moschner, Meinhard* 2019: Datenaufbereitung und Dokumentation. In: *Jensen, Uwe; Netscher, Sebastian; Weller, Katrin* (ed.): *Forschungsdatenmanagement sozialwissenschaftlicher Umfragedaten: Grundlagen und praktische Lösungen für den Umgang mit quantitativen Forschungsdaten*. Leverkusen: Verlag Barbara Budrich: 97–114.
- Brower, Cheyna Katherine* 2018: Too long and too boring. The effects of survey length and interest on careless responding. Master thesis.
- Brücker, Herbert; Kroh, Martin; Bartsch, Simone; Goebel, Jan; Kühne, Simon; Liebau, Elisabeth; Trübswetter, Parvati; Tucci, Ingrid; Schupp, Jürgen* 2014: The new IAB-SOEP migration sample: An introduction into the methodology and the contents. SOEP Survey Papers 216. Berlin.
- Cai, Ruohong; Esipova, Neli; Oppenheimer, Michael; Feng, Shuaizhang* 2014: International migration desires related to subjective well-being. In: *IZA Journal of Migration* 3;8.
- Callegaro, Mario; DiSogra, Charles* 2008: Computing response metrics for online panels. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72;5: 1008–1032.
- Careja, Romana; Bevelander, Pieter* 2018: Using population registers for migration and integration research: examples from Denmark and Sweden. In: *Comparative Migration Studies* 6: 19.
- Carow, Annelen; Mundil-Schwarz, Rabea; Vigneau, Elsa* 2019: Bevölkerung am üblichen Aufenthaltsort und Weiterentwicklung des Schätzverfahrens zur Langzeitmigration. In: *Wirtschaft und Statistik*: 65–81.

- Cascio, M. Ariel; Lee, Eunlye; Vaudrin, Nicole; Freedman, Darcy A.* 2019: A Team-based Approach to Open Coding. Considerations for Creating Intercoder Consensus. In: *Field Methods* 31;2: 116-130.
- Cernat, Alexandru; Lynn, Peter* 2017: The Role of E-mail Communications in Determining Response Rates and Mode of Participation in a Mixed-mode Design. In: *Field Methods* 30;1: 70–87.
- Cornesse, Carina; Bosnjak, Michael* 2018: Is there an association between survey characteristics and representativeness? A meta-analysis. In: *Survey Research Methods* 12;1: 1–13.
- Couper, Mick P.* 2000: Usability evaluation of computer-assisted survey instruments. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 18;4: 384–396.
- Couper, Mick P.* 2011: The future of modes of data collection. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75;5: 889–908.
- Couper, Mick P.; Antoun, Christopher; Mavletova, Aigul* 2017: Mobile Web Surveys. A Total Survey Error Perspective. In: *Biemer, Paul P.; De Leeuw, Edith; Eckman, Stephanie; Edwards, Brad; Kreuter, Frauke; Lyberg, Lars E.; Tucker, Clyde; West, Brady T.* (ed.): *Total Survey Error in Practice*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: 133–154.
- Couper, Mick P.; Coutts, Elisabeth* 2006: Online-Befragung. Probleme und Chancen verschiedener Arten von Online-Erhebungen. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 44: 217–243.
- Daikeler, Jessica; Bošnjak, Michael; Lozar Manfreda, Katja* 2019: Web Versus Other Survey Modes. An Updated and Extended Meta-Analysis Comparing Response Rates. In: *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*.
- Darcovich, Nancy; Binkley, Marilyn; Cohen, Jon; Myrberg, Mats; Persson, Stefan* 1998: Non-response bias. In: *Murray, T. Scott; Kirsch, Irwin S.; Jenkins, Lynn B.* (ed.): *Adult literacy in OECD countries: Technical report on the first International Adult Literacy Survey*. NCES 98-053. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education: 55–71.
- De Leeuw, Edith* 2018: Mixed-Mode: Past, Present, and Future. In: *Survey Research Methods* 12;2: 75–89.
- De Leeuw, Edith; Berzelak, Necj* 2016: Survey mode or survey modes? In: *Wolf, Christof; Joye, Dominique; Smith, Tom W.; Fu, Yang-chih* (ed.): *The Sage Handbook of Survey Methodology*. London: SAGE Publications: 142–156.
- De Leeuw, Edith; Heer, Wim de* 2002: Trends in Household Survey Nonresponse: A Longitudinal and International Comparison. In: *Groves, Robert M.; Dillman, Don A.; Eltinge, John L.; Little, Roderick J. A.* (ed.): *Survey Nonresponse*. New York: John Wiley & Sons: 41–54.
- De Leeuw, Edith; Lugtig, Peter* 2015: Dropouts in Longitudinal Surveys. In: *Balakrishnan, N.; Colton, Theodore; Everitt, Brian; Piegorsch, Walter; Ruggeri, Fabrizio; Teugels, Jef. L.* (ed.): *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online*: 1–6.
- Décieux, Jean Philippe; Heinen, Andreas; Willems, Helmut* 2018: Social Media and Its Role in Friendship-driven Interactions among Young People. A Mixed Methods Study. In: *Young* 27;1: 18–31.
- Décieux, Jean Philippe Pierre; Hoffmann, Matthias* 2014: Antwortdifferenzen im Junk & Crime Survey. Ein Methodenvergleich mit goffmanscher Interpretation. In: *Löw, Martina* (ed.): *Vielfalt und Zusammenhalt. Verhandlungen des 36. Kongresses der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Bochum und Dortmund 2012*. Frankfurt am Main, New York: Campus.
- Décieux, Jean Philippe Pierre; Mergener, Alexandra; Sischka, Philipp; Neufang, Kristina* 2015: Implementation of the forced answering option within online surveys. Do higher item response rates come at the expense of participation and answer quality? In: *Psihologija* 48;4: 311–326.

- Decorte, Tom; Malm, Aili; Sznitman, Sharon R.; Hakkarainen, Pekka; Barratt, Monica J.; Potter, Gary R.; Werse, Bernd; Kamphausen, Gerrit; Lenton, Simon; Asmussen Frank, Vibeke* 2019: The challenges and benefits of analyzing feedback comments in surveys. Lessons from a cross-national online survey of small-scale cannabis growers. In: *Methodological Innovations* 12;1: 1-16.
- Dehne, Max; Schupp, Jürgen* 2007: Persönlichkeitsmerkmale im Sozio-oekonomischen Panel (SOEP)-Konzept, Umsetzung und empirische Eigenschaften. Research Note. Berlin.
- Demarest, Stefan; van der Heyden, Johan; Charafeddine, Rana; Tafforeau, Jean; van Oyen, Herman; van Hal, Guido* 2012: Socio-economic differences in participation of households in a Belgian National Health Survey. In: *European Journal of Population* 23;6: 981–985.
- Denscombe, Martyn* 2009: Item non-response rates. A comparison of online and paper questionnaires. In: *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 12;4: 281–291.
- Destatis* 2019: Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit: Wanderungen 2017. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.
- Diehl, Claudia* 2007: Materialband und Endbericht zur Neuzuwandererbefragung - Pilotstudie. 1. und 2. Welle. Materialien zur Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Heft 122. Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung.
- Diehl, Claudia; Lubbers, Marcel; Mühlau, Peter; Platt, Lucinda* 2015: Starting out. New migrants' socio-cultural integration trajectories in four European destinations. In: *Ethnicities* 16;2: 157–179.
- Dillman, Don A.* 1978: Mail and telephone surveys. The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dillman, Don A.* 2017: The promise and challenge of pushing respondents to the Web in mixed-mode surveys. In: *Survey Methodology* 43;1: 3–30.
- Dillman, Don A.; Smyth, Jolene D.; Melani, Leah* 2011: Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys. The tailored design method: Wiley & Sons Toronto.
- DiSogra, Charles; Callegaro, Mario* 2015: Metrics and Design Tool for Building and Evaluating Probability-Based Online Panels. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 34;1: 26–40.
- Durrant, G. B.; Steele, Fiona* 2009: Multilevel modelling of refusal and noncontact in household surveys: Evidence from six UK government surveys. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A* 172;2: 361–381.
- Edwards, Phil; Cooper, Rachel; Roberts, Ian; Frost, Chris* 2005: Meta-analysis of randomised trials of monetary incentives and response to mailed questionnaires. In: *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 59;11: 987–999.
- Eggs, Johannes; Jäckle, Annette* 2015: Dependent Interviewing and Sub-Optimal Responding. In: *Survey Research Methods* 9;1: 15–29.
- Elliott, Michael R.; Little, Roderick J. A.* 2000: Model-Based Alternatives to Trimming Survey Weights. In: *Journal of Official Statistics* 16;3: 191–209.
- Erlinghagen, Marcel* 2012: Nowhere Better Than Here? The Subjective Well-Being of German Emigrants and Remigrants. In: *Comparative Population Studies* 36;4: 899–926.
- Ette, Andreas; Sauer, Lenore* 2010: Auswanderung aus Deutschland. Daten und Analysen zur internationalen Migration deutscher Staatsbürger. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Ette, Andreas; Sauer, Lenore; Scheller, Friedrich; Bekalarczyk, Dawid; Erlinghagen, Marcel; Engler, Marcus; Schneider, Jan; Schultz, Caroline* 2015: International Mobil. Dokumentation der Befragung von Auswanderern und Rückwanderern aus

- Deutschland. BiB Daten- und Methodenbericht 1/2015. Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung.
- Ette, Andreas; Unger, Rainer; Graze, Philip; Sauer, Lenore* 2008: Measuring spatial mobility with the German Microcensus: The case of German return migrants. In: *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft* 33;3: 409–431.
- Evans, Joel R.; Mathur, Anil* 2018: The value of online surveys. A look back and a look ahead. In: *Internet Research* 28;4: 854–887.
- Fawcett, James T.; Arnold, Fred* 1987: The Role of Surveys in the Study of International Migration: An Appraisal. In: *International Migration Review* 21;4: 1523–1540.
- Feskens, Rem; Hox, J. J.; Lensvelt-Mulders, Gerty; Schmeets, Hans* 2007: Nonresponse among ethnic minorities: A multivariate analysis. In: *Journal of Official Statistics* 23;3: 387–408.
- Font, Joan; Méndez, Mónica* (ed.) 2013: *Surveying Ethnic Minorities and Immigrant Populations. Methodological Challenges and Research Strategies*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Forgasz, Helen; Tan, Hazel; Leder, Gilah; McLeod, Amber* 2017: Enhancing survey participation. Facebook advertisements for recruitment in educational research. In: *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* 41;3: 257–270.
- Foster, Kate; Bushnell, D.* 1994: Non-response bias on government surveys in Great Britain. 5th International Workshop on Household Survey Nonresponse, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Gajic, Aleksandra; Cameron, David; Hurley, Jeremiah* 2012: The cost-effectiveness of cash versus lottery incentives for a web-based, stated-preference community survey. In: *The European Journal of Health Economics* 13;6: 789–799.
- Ganzeboom, Harry B. G.; Graaf, Paul M.; Treiman, Donald J.* 1992: A standard international socio-economic index of occupational status. In: *Social Science Research* 21;1: 1–56.
- Ganzeboom, Harry B.G.; Treiman Donald J.* 1996: Internationally Comparable Measures of Occupational Status for the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupations. In: *Social Science Research* 25;3: 201–239.
- Geis, Alfons* 2011: *Handbuch für die Berufsvercodung*. Mannheim.
- Gerhards, Jürgen; Hans, Silke* 2013: Transnational Human Capital, Education, and Social Inequality. Analyses of International Student Exchange. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 42;2: 99–117.
- Ghimire, Dirgha J.; Williams, Nathalie E.; Thornton, Arland; Young-DeMarco, Linda; Bhandari, Prem* 2019: Strategies for origin-based surveying of international migrants. In: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45;7: 1185–1206.
- Giesselmann, Marco; Bohmann, Sandra; Goebel, Jan; Krause, Peter; Liebau, Elisabeth; Richter, David; Schacht, Diana; Schröder, Carsten; Schupp, Jürgen; Liebig, Stefan* 2019: The Individual in Context(s). Research Potentials of the Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) in Sociology. In: *European Sociological Review* 35;5: 738–755. [doi: 10.1093/esr/jcz029].
- Glowsky, David* 2013: Stichprobenziehung von Ehepaaren: ein Praxisbericht zur Erhebung von seltenen Paarkombinationen. In: *methods, data, analyses* 7;1: 35–58.
- Goebel, Jan; Grabka, Markus M.; Liebig, Stefan; Kroh, Martin; Richter, David; Schröder, Carsten; Schupp, Jürgen* 2019: The German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). In: *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 239;2: 345–360.
- Göritz, Anja S.* 2006: Cash Lotteries as Incentives in Online Panels. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 24;4: 445–459.
- Göritz, Anja S.; Luthe, Susanne C.* 2013: Effects of Lotteries on Response Behavior in Online Panels. In: *Field Methods* 25;3: 219–237.

- Goyder, J. 1987: *The silent minority: Nonrespondents on sample surveys*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Groenewold, George; Bilborrow, Richard 2008: Design of samples for international migration surveys: Methodological considerations and lessons learned from a multi-country study in Africa and Europe. In: *Bonifazi, Corrado; Okólski, Marek; Schoorl, Jeannette; Simon, Patrick* (ed.): *International migration in Europe: new trends and new methods of analysis*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press: 293–312.
- Groves, Robert M. 2006: Nonresponse Rates and Nonresponse Bias in Household Surveys. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70;5: 646–675.
- Groves, Robert M.; Couper, Mick P. 1998: *Nonresponse in household interview surveys*. New York: Wiley.
- Groves, Robert M.; Fowler, Floyd J., JR; Couper, Mick P.; Lepkowski, James M.; Singer, Eleanor; Tourangeau, Roger 2004: *Survey Methodology*. Wiley series in survey methodology. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Groves, Robert M.; Singer, Eleanor; Corning, Amy 2000: Leverage-Saliency Theory of Survey Participation. Description and an Illustration. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64;3: 299–308.
- Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo; Portes, Alejandro; Haller, William 2003: Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 108;6: 1211–1248.
- Gummer, Tobias; Daikeler, Jessica 2018: A Note on How Prior Survey Experience With Self-Administered Panel Surveys Affects Attrition in Different Modes. In: *Social Science Computer Review*.
- Guveli, Ayse; Ganzeboom, Harry B. G.; Platt, Lucinda; Nauck, Bernhard; Baykara-Krumme, Helen; Eroğlu, Şebnem; Bayraktar, Sait; Sözeri, Efe K.; Spierings; Niels 2016: *Intergenerational consequences of migration. Socio-economic, Family and Cultural Patterns of Stability and Change in Turkey and Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Häder, Michael 2009: *Der Datenschutz in den Sozialwissenschaften. Anmerkungen zur Praxis sozialwissenschaftlicher Erhebungen und Datenverarbeitung in Deutschland*. RatSWD Working Papers 90. Berlin.
- Häder, Sabine 2015: *Stichproben in der Praxis*. Mannheim: GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Halbherr, Verena Roswitha 2016: *Data Quality in Cross-National Surveys. A Longitudinal and Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Quality Indicators Response Rate, Fieldwork Efforts, and Nonresponse Bias*. Mannheim.
- Harris-Kojetin, Brian; Tucker, Clyde 1999: Exploring the Relation of Economic and Political Conditions with Refusal Rates to a Government Survey. In: *Journal of Official Statistics* 15;2: 167–184.
- Hartmann, Peter H.; Schimpl-Neimanns, Bernhard 1992: Sind Sozialstrukturanalysen mit Umfragedaten möglich? Analysen zur Repräsentativität einer Sozialforschungsumfrage. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 44;2: 315–340.
- Healy, Patricia; Edwards, Philip James; Smith, Valerie; Murphy, Edel; Newell, John; Burke, Eimear; Meskell, Pauline; Galvin, Sandra; Lynn, Peter; Stovold, Elizabeth; McCarthy, Bernard; Biesty, Linda M.; Devane, Declan 2018: Design-based methods to influence the completeness of response to self-administered questionnaires. In: *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*; 7: 1–11.
- Helmschrott, Susanne; Martin, Silke 2014: Nonresponse in PIAAC Germany. In: *methods, data, analyses* 8;2: 243–266.

- Höglinger, Marc; Jann, Ben; Diekmann, Andreas* 2016: Sensitive Questions in Online Surveys. An Experimental Evaluation of Different Implementations of the Randomized Response Technique and the Crosswise Model. In: *Survey Research Methods* 10;3: 171–187.
- Hugo, Graeme* 2014: A Multi Sited Approach to Analysis of Destination Immigration Data: An Asian Example. In: *International Migration Review* 48;4: 998–1027.
- Hundepool, Anco; Giessing, Sarah; Nordholt, Eric Schulte; Spicer, Keith; Domingo-Ferrer, Josep; Franconi, Luisa; Wolf, Peter-Paul de* 2012: *Statistical Disclosure Control*. Wiley series in survey methodology. 1st ed.: Wiley.
- International Labour Organisation* 2012: *International Standard Classification of Occupations*. Volume 1: Structure, group definitions and correspondence tables. Geneva.
- Jäckle, Annette; Lynn, Peter* 2007: Respondent incentives in a multimode panel survey: cumulative effects on nonresponse and bias. ISER Working Paper Series 2007-01.
- Jacob, Rüdiger; Heinz, Andreas; Décieux, Jean Philippe* 2019: *Umfrage. Einführung in die Methoden der Umfrageforschung*. Oldenburg: Walter de Gruyter.
- Jasso, Guillermina; Massey, Douglas S.; Rosenzweig, Mark R.; Smith, James P.* 2000: The New Immigrant Survey Pilot (NIS-P): Overview and New Findings about U. S. Legal Immigrants at Admission. In: *Demography* 37;1: 127–138.
- Jensen, Uwe* 2012: *Leitlinien zum Management von Forschungsdaten. Sozialwissenschaftliche Umfragedaten*. Technical Reports. Mannheim.
- Jensen, Uwe* 2019: *Forschungsdaten und Forschungsdatenmanagement in den Sozialwissenschaften*. In: *Jensen, Uwe; Netscher, Sebastian; Weller, Katrin* (ed.): *Forschungsdatenmanagement sozialwissenschaftlicher Umfragedaten: Grundlagen und praktische Lösungen für den Umgang mit quantitativen Forschungsdaten*. Leverkusen: Verlag Barbara Budrich: 13–37.
- Juster, F. Thomas; Suzman, Richard* 1995: An overview of the health and retirement study. In: *Journal of Human Resources* 30;5: 7–56.
- Kalter, Frank* 1997: *Wohnortwechsel in Deutschland. Ein Beitrag zur Migrationstheorie und zur empirischen Anwendung von Rational-Choice-Modellen*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Kalter, Frank; Kogan, Irena; Dollmann, Jörg* 2019: Studying Integration from Adolescence to Early Adulthood. Design, Content, and Research Potential of the CILS4EU-DE Data. In: *European Sociological Review* 35;2: 280–297.
- Kalton, Graham; Anderson, Dallas W.* 1986: Sampling Rare Populations. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)* 149;1: 65–82.
- Karg, Moritz* 2015: Anonymität, Pseudonyme und Personenbezug revisited? In: *Datenschutz und Datensicherheit* 39;8: 520–526.
- Kim, Jae Kwang; Kim, Jay J.* 2007: Nonresponse weighting adjustment using estimated response probability. In: *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 35: 501–514.
- Kleinert, Corinna; Ruland, Michael; Trahms, Annette* 2013: *Bias in einem komplexen Surveydesign: Ausfallprozesse und Selektivität in der IAB-Befragung ALWA*. FDZ-Methodenreport. Nürnberg.
- Koch, Achim* 1998: Wenn „mehr“ nicht gleichbedeutend mit „besser“ ist: Ausschöpfungsquoten und Stichprobenverzerrungen in allgemeinen Bevölkerungsumfragen. In: *ZUMA-Nachrichten* 22;42: 66–93.
- Kratz, Fabian; Netz, Nicolai* 2018: Which mechanisms explain monetary returns to international student mobility? In: *Studies in Higher Education* 43;2: 375–400. [doi: 10.1080/03075079.2016.1172307].
- Krause, Neal* 1993: Neighborhood deterioration and social isolation in later life. In: *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 36;1: 9–38.

- Kreuter, Frauke* 2013: Facing the Nonresponse Challenge. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645: 23–35.
- Kreuter, Frauke; Presser, Stanley; Tourangeau, Roger* 2008: Social Desirability Bias in CATI, IVR, and Web Surveys: The Effects of Mode and Question Sensitivity. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72;5: 847–865.
- Kroh, Martin; Kühne, Simon; Jacobsen, Jannes; Siegert, Manuel; Siegers, Rainer; (Keine Angabe)* 2017: Sampling, Nonresponse, and Integrated Weighting of the 2016 IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees (M3/M4) - Revised Version. SOEP Survey Papers 477: Series C - Data Documentations. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW).
- Kühne, Simon; Jacobsen, Jannes; Kroh, Martin* 2019: Sampling in Times of High Immigration: The Survey Process of the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees. In: *Survey Methods: Insights from the Field*.
- Kunz, Franziska* 2010: Mahnaktionen in postalischen Befragungen. Empirische Befunde zu Auswirkungen auf den Rücklauf, das Antwortverhalten und die Stichprobenezusammensetzung. In: *Methoden - Daten - Analysen* 4;2: 127–155.
- Kunz, Tanja; Gummer, Tobias* 2019: Understanding Respondents' Attitudes Toward Web Paradata Use. In: *Social Science Computer Review OnlineFirst*. [doi: 10.1177/0894439319826904].
- Lamnek, Siegfried; Trepl, Ralph* 1991: Die Nichtteilnahme an sozialwissenschaftlichen Befragungen. In: *Planung & Analyse* 6: 205–211.
- Lavrakas, Paul* 2008: *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Lederer, Harald* 2004: Indikatoren der Migration: Zur Messung des Umfangs und der Arten von Migration in Deutschland unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Ehegatten- und Familiennachzugs sowie der illegalen Migration. Bamberg: europäisches forum für migrationsstudien.
- Lee, Brian K.; Lessler, Justin; Stuart, Elizabeth A.* 2011: Weight Trimming and Propensity Score Weighting. In: *PLoS ONE* 6;3: e18174.
- Lee, Hana; Kim, Sunwoong; Couper, Mick P.; Woo, Youngje* 2018: Experimental Comparison of PC Web, Smartphone Web, and Telephone Surveys in the New Technology Era. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 37;2: 234–247.
- Leeper, Thomas J.* 2019: Where have the Respondents Gone? Perhaps we ate them all. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 83;1: 280–288.
- Lemaire, Marina* 2018: Vereinbarkeit von Forschungsprozess und Datenmanagement in den Geisteswissenschaften. In: *o-bib. Das offene Bibliotheksjournal/Herausgeber VDB* 5;4: 237–247.
- Liebig, Stefan; Goebel, Jan; Richter, David; Schröder, Carsten; Schupp, Jürgen; Bartels, Charlotte; Fedorets, Alexandra; Franken, Andreas; Giesselmann, Marco; Grabka, Markus; Jacobsen, Jannes; Kara, Selin; Krause, Peter; Kroh, Martin; Kröger, Hannes; Metzing, Maria; Nebelin, Jana; Schacht, Diana; Schmelzer, Paul; Schmitt, Christian; Schnitzlein, Daniel; Siegers, Rainer; Wenzig, Knut; Zimmermann, Stefan* 2019: SOEP-Core.
- Lohr, Sharon L.* 2010: *Sampling: Design and Analysis*. Brooks: Cengage.
- Lück, Detlev; Landrock, Uta* 2019: Datenaufbereitung und Datenbereinigung in der quantitativen Sozialforschung. In: *Baur, Nina; Blasius, Jörg* (ed.): *Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden: 457–471.
- Lugtig, Peter* 2014: Panel Attrition: Separating Stayers, Fast Attriters, Gradual Attriters, and Lurkers. In: *Sociological Methods and Research* 43;4: 699–723.

- Lugtig, Peter; Glasner, Tina; Boevé, Anja J.* 2016: Reducing Underreports of Behaviors in Retrospective Surveys: The Effects of Three Different Strategies. In: *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 28;4: 583–595.
- Lugtig, Peter; Toepoel, Vera* 2016: The Use of PCs, Smartphones, and Tablets in a Probability-Based Panel Survey: Effects on Survey Measurement Error. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 34;1: 78–94.
- Lynn, Peter* 2003: PEDAKSI: Methodology for collecting data about survey non-respondents. In: *Quality and Quantity* 37;3: 239–261.
- Lynn, Peter* 2008: The problem of nonresponse. In: *De Leeuw, Edith; Hox, Joop J.; Dillman, Don A.* (ed.): *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*. London, New York: Psychology Press: 35–55.
- Lynn, Peter; Nandi, Alita; Parutis, Violetta; Platt, Lucinda* 2018: Design and implementation of a high-quality probability sample of immigrants and ethnic minorities. Lessons learnt. In: *Demographic Research* 38: 513–548.
- Manfreda, Katja Lozar; Bosnjak, Michael; Berzelak, Jernej; Haas, Iris; Vehovar, Vasja* 2008: Web surveys versus other survey modes: a meta-analysis comparing response rates. In: *International Journal of Market Research* 50;1: 79–104.
- Martí, Mónica; Ródenas, Carmen* 2007: Migration Estimation Based on the Labour Force Survey: An EU-15 Perspective. In: *International Migration Review* 41;1: 101–126.
- Martin, Silke; Helmschrott, Susanne; Rammstedt, Beatrice* 2014: The use of respondent incentives in PIAAC: The field test experiment in Germany. In: *methods, data, analyses* 8;2: 223–242.
- Massey, Douglas S.* 1987: Understanding Mexican Migration to the United States. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 92: 1372–1403.
- Massey, Douglas S.; Espinosa, Kristin* 1997: What's driving Mexican-U.S. Migration? A Theoretical, Empirical and Policy Analysis. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 102: 939–999.
- Mau, Steffen; Mewes, Jan* 2007: Transnationale soziale Beziehungen. Eine Kartographie der deutschen Bevölkerung. In: *Soziale Welt* 58;2: 203–222.
- Mavletova, Aigul; Lynn, Peter* 2019: Item Nonresponse Rates and Panel Conditioning in a Longitudinal Survey among Youth. In: *Field Methods* 31;2: 95–115.
- Mazzucato, Valentina* 2008: Simultaneity and Networks in Transnational Migration: Lessons Learned from a Simultaneous Matched-Sample Methodology. In: *DeWind, Josh; Holdaway, Jennifer* (ed.): *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration: 69–100.
- McLauchlan, Cynthia; Schonlau, Matthias* 2016: Are Final Comments in Web Survey Panels Associated with Next-Wave Attrition? In: *Survey Research Methods* 10;3: 211–224.
- Meitinger, Katharina; Behr, Dorothee; Braun, Michael* 2019: Using Apples and Oranges to Judge Quality? Selection of Appropriate Cross-National Indicators of Response Quality in Open-Ended Questions. In: *Social Science Computer Review*: 1-22.
- Mergener, Alexandra; Décieux, Jean Philippe Pierre* 2018: Die „Kunst“ des Fragenstellens. In: *Keller, Bernhard; Klein, Hans-Werner; Wirth, Thomas* (ed.): *Qualität und Data Science in der Marktforschung: Prozesse, Daten und Modelle der Zukunft*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden: 81–97.
- Mergener, Alexandra; Sischa, Philipp; Decieux, Jean Philippe Pierre* 2015: „To force or not to force. That is the question!“. Die Auswirkungen des Einsatzes von Forced-Response-Fragen auf die Qualität der Befragungsergebnisse. In: *Lessenich, Stephan* (ed.): *Routinen der Krise - Krise der Routinen*. Verhandlungen des 37. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Trier 2014.

- Messer, Benjamin L.; Edwards, Michelle L.; Dillman, Don A.* 2012: Determinants of item nonresponse to web and mail respondents in three address-based mixed-mode surveys of the general public. In: *Survey Practice* 5;2: 1–8.
- Millar, Morgan; Dillman, Don* 2012: Do Mail and Internet Surveys Produce Different Item Nonresponse Rates? An Experiment Using Random Mode Assignmentmode assignment. In: *Survey Practice* 5;2.
- Müller, Walter; Wirth, Heike* 1991: Die faktische Anonymität von Mikrodaten : Abschlußbericht zum Projekt Entwicklung eines anonymisierten Mikrodatenfiles für wissenschaftliche Zwecke. Mannheim: Lehrstuhl für Methoden der Empirischen Sozialforschung and Angewandte Soziologie.
- Netscher, Sebastian; Eder, Christina* 2018: Data Processing and Documentation. Generating High Quality Research Data in Quantitative Social Science Research. In: *Netscher, Sebastian; Eder, Christina* (ed.): *Data Processing and Documentation. Generating High Quality Research Data in Quantitative Social Science Research.* GESIS PAPERS 22|2018. Mannheim: 5.
- OECD* 2015: *Connecting with Emigrants. A Global Profile of Diasporas 2015.* Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD; Eurostat; UNESCO Institute for Statistics* 2015: *ISCED 2011 Operational Manual: Guidelines for Classifying National Education Programmes and Related Qualifications.* Paris.
- Parrado, Emilio A.; McQuiston, Chris; Flippen, Chenoa A.* 2005: Participatory Survey Research. In: *Sociological Methods & Research* 34;2: 204–239.
- Paulus, Wiebke; Schweitzer, Ruth; Wiemer, Silke* 2010: *Klassifikation der Berufe 2010. Entwicklung und Ergebnis. Methodenbericht der Statistik der BA.* Nürnberg.
- Petermann, Sören* 2005: Rücklauf und systematische Verzerrungen bei postalischen Befragungen. Eine Analyse der Bürgerumfrage Halle 2003. In: *ZUMA-Nachrichten* 29: 56–78.
- Petrolia, Daniel R.; Bhattacharjee, Sanjoy* 2009: Revisiting incentive effects: Evidence from a random sample mail survey on consumer preferences for fuel ethanol. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73;3: 537–550.
- Peytchev, Andy* 2013: Consequences of Survey Nonresponse. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645: 88–111.
- Pffor, Klaus; Blohm, Michael; Blom, Annelies G.; Erdel, Barbara; Felderer, Barbara; Fräßdorf, Mathis; Hajek, Kristin; Helmschrott, Susanne; Kleinert, Corinna; Koch, Achim; Krieger, Ulrich; Kroh, Martin; Martin, Silke; Saßenroth, Denise; Schmiedeberg, Claudia; Trüdinger, Eva-Maria; Rammstedt, Beatrice* 2015: Are Incentive Effects on Response Rates and Nonresponse Bias in Large-scale, Face-to-face Surveys Generalizable to Germany? Evidence from Ten Experiments. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79;3: 740–768.
- Plutzer, Eric* 2019: Privacy, Sensitive Questions, and Informed Consent. Their Impacts on Total Survey Error, and the Future of Survey Research. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 83;1: 169–184.
- Pötzschke, Steffen; Braun, Michael* 2016: Migrant Sampling Using Facebook Advertisements. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 35;5: 633–653.
- Poulain, Michel; Perrin, Nicolas; Singleton, Ann* (ed.) 2006: *THESIM. Towards Harmonised European Statistics on International Migration.* Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.
- Poutvaara, Panu; Munk, Martin D.; Junge, Martin* 2009: Self-Selection and Earnings of Emigrants from a Welfare State, IZA DP No. 4144. Bonn: IZA.

- Prandner, Dimitri; Weichbold, Martin* 2019: Building a Sampling Frame for Migrant Populations via an Onomastic Approach – Lesson learned from the Austrian Immigrant Survey 2016. In: *Survey Methods: Insights from the Field*.
- Presser, Stanley; Couper, Mick P.; Lessler, Judith T.; Martin, Elizabeth; Martin, Jean; Rothgeb, Jennifer M.; Singer, Eleanor* 2004: Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questions. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68;1: 109–130.
- Rallu, Jean Louis* 2008: One-way or both-ways migration surveys. In: *Bonifazi, Corrado; Okólski, Marek; Schoorl, Jeannette; Simon, Patrick* (ed.): *International migration in Europe: new trends and new methods of analysis*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press: 273–292.
- RatSWD* 2017: *Forschungsethische Grundsätze und Prüfverfahren in den Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften*. RatSWD Output 9. Berlin.
- Raymer, James; Wiśniowski, Arkadiusz; Forster, Jonathan J.; Smith, Peter W. F.; Bijak, Jakub* 2013: Integrated Modeling of European Migration. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 108;503: 801–819.
- Recchi, Ettore; Favell, Adrian* (ed.) 2009: *Pioneers of European Integration: Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*: Edward Elgar Publishing, Incorporated.
- Reher, David; Requena, Miguel* 2009: The National Immigrant Survey of Spain: A new data source for migration studies in Europe. In: *Demographic Research* 20: 253–278.
- Reuband, Karl-Heinz* 2001: Möglichkeiten und Probleme des Einsatzes postalischer Befragungen. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 53;2: 307–333.
- Robinson, Sheila B.; Leonard, Kimberly Firth* 2018: *Designing Quality Survey Questions*: SAGE Publications.
- Rolstad, Sindre; Adler, John; Rydén, Anna* 2011: Response burden and questionnaire length. Is shorter better? A review and meta-analysis. In: *Value in Health* 14;8: 1101–1108.
- Roßmann, Joss* 2015: RSPEEDINDEX. Stata module to compute a response speed index and perform outlier identification. *Statistical Software Components* S458007.
- Roßmann, Joss; Gummer, Tobias* 2016a: PARSEUAS. Stata module to extract detailed information from user agent strings. *Statistical Software Components*.
- Roßmann, Joss; Gummer, Tobias* 2016b: Using Paradata to Predict and Correct for Panel Attrition. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 34;3: 312–332.
- Royston, Patrick* 2009: Multiple imputation of missing values. Further update of ice, with an emphasis on categorical variables. In: *The Stata Journal* 9;3: 466–477.
- Sakshaug, Joseph; Cernat, Alexandru; Raghunathan, Trivellore E.* 2019: Do Sequential Mixed-Mode Surveys Decrease Nonresponse Bias, Measurement Error Bias, and Total Bias? An Experimental Study. In: *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 7;4: 545–571.
- Sakshaug, Joseph; Hülle, Sebastian; Schmucker, Alexandra; Liebig, Stefan* 2019: Panel Survey Recruitment With or Without Interviewers? Implications for Nonresponse, Panel Consent, and Total Recruitment Bias. In: *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*.
- Sakshaug, Joseph; Vicari, Basha; Couper, Mick P.* 2019: Paper, E-mail, or Both? Effects of Contact Mode on Participation in a Web Survey of Establishments. In: *Social Science Computer Review* 37;6: 750-765.
- Sakshaug, Joseph; Yan, Ting; Tourangeau, Roger* 2010: Nonresponse error, measurement error, and mode of data collection. Tradeoffs in a multi-mode survey of sensitive and non-sensitive items. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74;5: 907–933.
- Schaurer, Ines* 2017: *Recruitment strategies for a probability-based online panel: Effects of interview length, question sensitivity, incentives and interviewers*. Mannheim.

- Schlosser, Stephan; Mays, Anja* 2018: Mobile and Dirty: Does Using Mobile Devices Affect the Data Quality and the Response Process of Online Surveys? In: *Social Science Computer Review* 36;2: 212–230.
- Schmidt, Katharina; Gummer, Tobias; Roßmann, Joss* 2019: Effects of Respondent and Survey Characteristics on the Response Quality of an Open-Ended Attitude Question in Web Surveys. In: *methods, data, analyses*: 1–32.
- Schneekloth, Ulrich; Leven, Ingo* 2003: Woran bemisst sich eine ‚gute‘ allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage? Analysen zu Ausmaß, Bedeutung und zu den Hintergründen von Nonresponse in zufallsbasierten Stichprobenerhebungen am Beispiel des ALLBUS. In: *ZUMA-Nachrichten* 27;53: 16–57.
- Schneider, Daniel; Harknett, Kristen* 2019: What’s to Like? Facebook as a Tool for Survey Data Collection. In: *Sociological Methods and Research*.
- Schnell, Rainer* 1997: Nonresponse in Bevölkerungsumfragen. Ausmaß, Entwicklung und Ursachen. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Schnell, Rainer* 2012: *Survey-Interviews. Methoden standardisierter Befragungen*: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Schnell, Rainer; Hill, Paul B.; Esser, Elke* 2013: *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*. München: Oldenbourg.
- Schroedter, Julia H.; Lechert, Yvonne; Lüttinger, Paul* 2006: Die Umsetzung der Bildungsskala ISCED-1997 für die Volkszählung 1970, die Mikrozensus-Zusatzerhebung 1971 und die Mikrozensus 1976-2004. ZUMA-Methodenbericht 2006/08. Mannheim: ZUMA - Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen.
- Schumann, Almut; Lück, Detlev; Bujard, Martin; Schneider, Norbert F.* 2019: Which Incentive Works Best? Findings from a Push-to-Web Experiment in the GGP Context in Germany. ESRA 2019. Zagreb.
- Schupp, Jürgen; Siegel, Nico A.; Erlinghagen, Marcel; Stegmann, Tim; Wagner, Gert G.* 2008: Leben außerhalb Deutschlands - Eine Machbarkeitsstudie zur Realisierung von Auslandsbefragungen auf Basis des Sozio-oekonomischen Panels (SOEP). In: *SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research* 120;August 2008.
- Schwarz, Torsten* 2017: *Erfolgreiches E-Mail-Marketing inkl. Arbeitshilfen online: Adressgewinnung, Newsletter-Gestaltung, Software, Monitoring*. Freiburg: Haufe.
- Shih, Tse-Hua; Fan, Xitao* 2008: Comparing Response Rates from Web and Mail Surveys: A Meta-Analysis. In: *Field Methods* 20;3: 249–271.
- Singer, Eleanor; Couper, Mick P.* 2017: Some Methodological Uses of Responses to Open Questions and Other Verbatim Comments in Quantitative Surveys. In: *methods, data, analyses* 11;2: 115–134.
- Singer, Eleanor; Kulka, Richard A.* 2001: Paying respondents for survey participation. In: *Ploeg, Michele ver; Moffitt, Robert A.; Citro, Constance F.* (ed.): *Studies of welfare populations: Data collection and research issues*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press: 105–128.
- Singer, Eleanor; van Hoewyk, John; Gebler, Nancy; Raghunathan, Trivellore E.; Mcgonagle, Katherine A.* 1999: The effect of incentives on response rates in interviewer-mediated surveys. In: *Journal of Official Statistics* 15;2: 217–230.
- Singer, Eleanor; Ye, Cong* 2012: The Use and Effects of Incentives in Surveys. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645;1: 112–141. [doi: 10.1177/0002716212458082].
- Singer, Eleanor; Ye, Cong* 2013: The Use and Effects of Incentives in Surveys. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645;1: 112–141.
- Sinibaldi, Jennifer; Trappmann, Mark; Kreuter, Frauke* 2014: Which Is the Better Investment for Nonresponse Adjustment: Purchasing Commercial Auxiliary Data or Collecting Interviewer Observations? In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78;2: 440–473.

- Smith, James P.; Thomas, Duncan* 2003: Remembrances of things past. Test-retest reliability of retrospective migration histories. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 166;1: 23–49.
- Smith, Tom W.* 1983: The Hidden 25 Percent: An analysis of nonresponse on the 1980 general social survey. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 47;3: 386–404.
- SOEP Group* 2018a: SOEP-Core v33.1 – Documentation of Household-related Status and Generated Variables in \$HGEN. SOEP Survey Papers 482: Series D – Variable Descriptions and Coding. Berlin.
- SOEP Group* 2018b: SOEP-Core v33.1 – Documentation of Person-related Status and Generated Variables in \$PGEN. SOEP Survey Papers 483: Series D – Variable Descriptions and Coding. Berlin.
- SOEP Group* 2018c: SOEP-Core v33.1 – PPFAD. SOEP Survey Papers 487: Series D – Variable Descriptions and Coding. Berlin.
- Stähli, Michèle; Joye, Dominique* 2016: Incentives as a possible measure to increase response rates. In: *Wolf, Christof; Joye, Dominique; Smith, Tom W.; Fu, Yang-chih* (ed.): *The Sage Handbook of Survey Methodology*. London: SAGE Publications: 425–440.
- Statistisches Bundesamt* 2006: Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Natürliche Bevölkerungsbewegung 2004. Fachserie 1, Reihe 1.1. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.
- Statistisches Bundesamt* 2019: Qualitätsbericht Wanderungen 2016. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.
- Struminskaya, Bella; Weyandt, Kai; Bosnjak, Michael* 2015: The effects of questionnaire completion using mobile devices on data quality. Evidence from a probability-based general population panel. In: *methods, data, analyses* 9;2: 261–292.
- Sudman, Seymour; Bradburn, Norman M.; Schwarz, Norbert* 1996: Thinking about answers. The application of cognitive processes to survey methodology. *Research Methods for the Social Sciences* 39: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sugie, Naomi F.* 2016: Utilizing Smartphones to Study Disadvantaged and Hard-to-Reach Groups. In: *Sociological Methods & Research* 47;3: 458–491.
- Süßmuth, Werner* 2016: Bundesmeldegesetz. Kommentar. Rechtswissenschaften und Verwaltung Kommentare. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Teruel, Graciela; Rubalcava, Luis; Arenas, Erika* 2012: Migration in the Mexican Family Life Survey. In: *Cuecuecha, Alfredo; Pederzini, Carla* (ed.): *Migration and remittances from Mexico: Trends, impacts, and new challenges*: Lexington: 15–35.
- Thornton, Louise; Batterhamb, Philip J.; Fassnacht, Daniel B.; Kay-Lambkin, Frances; Calear, Alison L.; Hunt, Sally* 2016: Recruiting for health, medical or psychosocial research using Facebook: Systematic review. In: *Internet Interventions* 4: 72–81.
- Tillé, Yves* 2006: *Sampling Algorithms*. New York: Springer.
- Tourangeau, Roger; Conrad, Frederick G.; Couper, Mick P.* 2013: *The science of web surveys*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Treiman, Donald J.* 1977: *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- van Bastelaer, Alois; Lemaître, Georges; Marianna, Pascal* 1997: The Definition of Part-Time Work for the Purpose of International Comparisons. In: *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers* 22.
- van Dalen, Hendrik P.; Henkens, Kène* 2007: Longing for the Good Life: Understanding Emigration from a High-Income Country. In: *Population and Development Review* 33;1: 37–65.

- van Mol, Christof* 2014: Erasmus Student Mobility as a Gateway to the International Labour Market? In: *Gerhards, Jürgen; Hans, Silke; Carlson, Sören* (ed.): Globalisierung, Bildung und grenzüberschreitende Mobilität. Wiesbaden: Springer VS: 295–314.
- Vehre, Helen* 2011: Sie wollen mir doch was verkaufen! Analyse der Umfrageteilnahme in einem offline rekrutierten Access Panel. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Wagner, Gert; Frick, Joachim; Schupp, Jürgen* 2007: The German Socio-Economic Panel study (SOEP)-evolution, scope and enhancements. SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research.
- Wahlig, Gabriele; Dannwolf, Tanja; Züll, Cornelia; Tanner, Angela* 2018: Panelmanagement. Probleme, Anmerkungen und Kommentare der Befragten; Kategorienschema für die Codierung von Befragtenrückmeldungen im GESIS Panel. GESIS PAPERS. Köln.
- Watson, Nicole; Wooden, Mark* 2009: Identifying factors affecting longitudinal survey response. In: *Lynn, Peter* (ed.): Methodology of longitudinal surveys. Chichester: Wiley: 157–181.
- Weigold, Arne; Weigold, Ingrid K.; Natera, Sara N.* 2018: Response Rates for Surveys Completed With Paper-and-Pencil and Computers. Response Rates for Surveys Completed With Paper-and-Pencil and Computers. In: Social Science Computer Review 37;5.
- Willis, Gordon* 2018: Cognitive Interviewing in Survey Design: State of the Science and Future Directions. In: *Vannette, D.; Krosnick, J.* (ed.): The Palgrave Handbook of Survey Research. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan: 103–107.
- Wirth, Heike* 1992: Die faktische Anonymität von Mikrodaten. In: ZUMA Nachrichten 16;30: 7–65.
- Wirth, Heike* 2006: Anonymisierung des Mikrozensuspanels im Kontext der Bereitstellung als Scientific-Use-File. Mannheim: Methodenverbund Aufbereitung und Bereitstellung des Mikrozensus als Panelstichprobe.
- Wirth, Heike* 2016: Analytical Potential Versus Data Confidentiality – Finding the Optimal Balance. In: *Wolf, Christof; Joye, Dominique; Smith, Tom W.; Fu, Yang-chih* (ed.): The Sage Handbook of Survey Methodology. London: SAGE Publications: 488–501.
- Zabal, Anouk* 2014: The challenge of meeting international data collection standards within national constraints: Some examples from the fieldwork for PIAAC in Germany. In: methods, data, analyses 8;2: 175–198.

15 Appendix

15.1 Invitation and reminder letters

Invitation letter of the emigrant sample



Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung · Postfach 5528 · 65180 Wiesbaden · Germany

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

EINLADUNG ZUR BEFRAGUNG

international mobil

7. November 2018

Sehr geehrte [REDACTED]

wir laden Sie ganz herzlich ein, sich an unserer Studie „international mobil“ mit Ihren Erfahrungen zum Leben im Ausland zu beteiligen. Das Projekt wird von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft finanziert und vom Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung und der Universität Duisburg-Essen in Zusammenarbeit mit dem SOKO Institut durchgeführt.

Warum ist Ihre Teilnahme so wichtig?

Immer mehr Menschen verbringen einen Teil Ihres Lebens im Ausland. Mit dieser Studie wollen wir herausfinden, warum Menschen ins Ausland umziehen und wie sich diese Erfahrungen auf das weitere Leben auswirken. Wir möchten Ihnen Fragen zu Ihrem persönlichen Werdegang in verschiedenen Lebensbereichen stellen. Dadurch wollen wir mehr über die Gründe für Ihren Wegzug aus Deutschland und über Ihr Leben im Ausland erfahren. Hierfür benötigen wir Ihre Unterstützung.

Unser Dankeschön an Sie

Mit Ihrer Teilnahme werden Sie Teil eines bisher einmaligen Projekts, bei dem Menschen während ihres Aufenthalts im Ausland oder auch danach zu ihrer Lebenssituation befragt werden. **Als kleines Dankeschön erhalten Sie 10 Euro, die wir Ihnen nach der Teilnahme als Einkaufsgutschein oder in Form einer Überweisung zuschicken werden.**

Wie können Sie teilnehmen?

Die Befragung wird mit Hilfe eines Online-Fragebogens durchgeführt. Diesen können Sie unter Verwendung der beigefügten Internetadresse und Ihres individuellen Zugangscodes auf jedem internetfähigen Gerät aufrufen. Auf dem Smartphone und Tablet können Sie alternativ auch den QR-Code verwenden, der Ihnen ebenfalls direkten Zugriff auf den Fragebogen ermöglicht (siehe Rückseite). Das Beantworten des Online-Fragebogens wird ca. 25 Minuten in Anspruch nehmen. Sie können während des Ausfüllens Ihre Teilnahme unterbrechen und zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt unter erneuter Eingabe des Zugangscodes die Befragung fortsetzen.

Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung · Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4 · 65185 Wiesbaden · www.bib.bund.de

Um zur Befragung zu gelangen, öffnen Sie bitte folgende Internetadresse, wählen Sie den Fragebogen ‚Leben im Ausland‘ aus und geben Sie anschließend Ihren individuellen Zugangscode ein.

Internetadresse: www.international-mobil.de

Individueller Zugangscode:

Wie wurden Sie für diese Befragung ausgewählt?

Die Adressen für unsere Befragung – darunter auch Ihre – wurden durch ein statistisches Zufallsverfahren aus dem Einwohnermelderegister Ihres letzten Wohnortes in Deutschland ausgewählt. Ihre Teilnahme an der Befragung ist freiwillig. Die Ergebnisse der Untersuchung sind aber nur dann aussagekräftig, wenn möglichst viele der ausgewählten Menschen an der Befragung teilnehmen. Deshalb bitten wir Sie, den Online-Fragebogen zu beantworten. Der individuelle Zugangscode dient einzig Ihrem persönlichen Zugang zum Fragebogen und zur Erfassung Ihrer Teilnahme an der Befragung. Die Zuordnung der Antworten aus dem Fragebogen zu den teilnehmenden Personen ist technisch und organisatorisch ausgeschlossen. Die Befragung dient ausschließlich wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und hält alle Regeln des strengen deutschen Datenschutzes ein. Weitere Informationen können Sie auch der beiliegenden „Erklärung zum Datenschutz und zur Vertraulichkeit Ihrer Angaben“ entnehmen.




An wen können Sie sich bei Fragen wenden?

Wenn Sie Fragen haben oder Unterstützung beim Ausfüllen des Fragebogens benötigen, wenden Sie sich bitte unter der Telefonnummer +49 521 5242 200 an den Projektleiter im SOKO Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch und sein Team. Nutzen Sie bei Fragen auch unsere E-Mail-Adresse info@international-mobil.de. Wir werden Ihnen kurzfristig unsere Antwort senden. Weitere Informationen zum Forschungsprojekt und den beteiligten Institutionen finden Sie auch auf der Homepage unter www.studie.international-mobil.de.

Wir würden uns sehr freuen, wenn Sie sich beteiligen und somit zum Gelingen unseres Forschungsvorhabens beitragen würden.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

		
Prof. Dr. Norbert Schneider Direktor des Bundesinstituts für Bevölkerungsforschung	Prof. Dr. Markel Eppinghagen Lehrstuhl für empirische Sozialstrukturanalyse Universität Duisburg-Essen	Dr. Henry Puhe Geschäftsführer des SOKO Instituts für Sozialforschung und Kommunikation



Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung - Postfach 5528 - 65180 Wiesbaden - Germany

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

EINLADUNG ZUR BEFRAGUNG
international mobil

5. Dezember 2018

Sehr geehrte [REDACTED]

vor zwei Wochen haben wir Ihnen ein kurzes Erinnerungsschreiben zukommen lassen mit der Bitte, sich an unserer Studie ‚international mobil‘ zu beteiligen.

Um zur Befragung zu gelangen, öffnen Sie bitte auf Ihrem PC, Notebook, Tablet oder Smartphone die folgende Internetadresse, wählen Sie den Fragebogen ‚Leben im Ausland‘ aus und geben Sie anschließend Ihren individuellen Zugangscodes ein. Alternativ können Sie auf dem Smartphone oder Tablet auch den QR-Code verwenden, der Ihnen ebenfalls direkten Zugriff auf den Fragebogen ermöglicht.

Internetadresse: www.international-mobil.de

Individueller Zugangscodes: [REDACTED]



Warum ist Ihre Teilnahme so wichtig?

Immer mehr Menschen verbringen einen Teil Ihres Lebens im Ausland. Mit dieser Studie wollen wir herausfinden, warum Menschen ins Ausland umziehen und wie sich diese Erfahrungen auf das weitere Leben auswirken. Wir möchten Ihnen Fragen zu Ihrem persönlichen Werdegang in verschiedenen Lebensbereichen stellen. Dadurch wollen wir mehr über die Gründe für Ihren Wegzug aus Deutschland und über Ihr Leben im Ausland erfahren. Hierfür benötigen wir Ihre Unterstützung.

Ihre Teilnahme an der Befragung ist selbstverständlich freiwillig. Die Ergebnisse der Studie sind aber nur dann aussagekräftig, wenn möglichst viele der ausgewählten Personen an der Befragung teilnehmen. Ihre Angaben unterliegen allen Regeln des strengen deutschen Datenschutzes und werden anonym ausschließlich zu wissenschaftlichen Zwecken ausgewertet.

Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung - Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4 - 65185 Wiesbaden - www.bib.bund.de

Unser Dankeschön an Sie

Als kleines Dankeschön für Ihre Unterstützung erhalten Sie **10 Euro**, die wir Ihnen nach der Teilnahme als Einkaufsgutschein oder in Form einer Überweisung zuschicken werden. Mit Ihrer Teilnahme werden Sie Teil eines bisher einmaligen Projekts, bei dem 6.000 Menschen während oder nach ihrem Aufenthalt im Ausland zu ihrer Lebenssituation befragt werden.


An wen können Sie sich bei Fragen wenden?

Wenn Sie Fragen haben oder Unterstützung beim Ausfüllen des Fragebogens benötigen, wenden Sie sich bitte unter der Telefonnummer +49 521 5242 200 an den Projektleiter im SOKO Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch und sein Team. Nutzen Sie bei Fragen gerne auch unsere E-Mail-Adresse info@international-mobil.de. Wir werden Ihnen kurzfristig unsere Antwort senden. Weitere Informationen zum Forschungsprojekt, den beteiligten Institutionen oder dem Datenschutz finden Sie auch auf unserer Homepage unter www.studie.international-mobil.de.

Wir würden uns sehr freuen, wenn Sie sich beteiligen und somit zum Gelingen unseres Forschungsvorhabens beitragen würden. Sollten Sie inzwischen schon teilgenommen haben, so ist dieses Schreiben selbstverständlich hinfällig geworden.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen


Prof. Dr. Norbert Schneider Prof. Dr. Marcel Eriqghagen Dr. Henry Puhe
Direktor des Lehrstuhl für empirische Geschäftsführer des
Bundesinstituts für Sozialstrukturanalyse SOKO Instituts für
Bevölkerungsforschung Universität Duisburg-Essen Sozialforschung



Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung · Postfach 5528 · 65180 Wiesbaden



— **EINLADUNG ZUR BEFRAGUNG**
international mobil

8. November 2018

Sehr geehrter [REDACTED]

wir laden Sie ganz herzlich ein, sich an unserer Studie „international mobil“ mit Ihren Erfahrungen zum Leben im Ausland und Ihren Erfahrungen nach Ihrem Umzug zurück nach Deutschland zu beteiligen. Das Projekt wird von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft finanziert und vom Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung und der Universität Duisburg-Essen in Zusammenarbeit mit dem SOKO Institut durchgeführt.

Warum ist Ihre Teilnahme so wichtig?

Immer mehr Menschen verbringen einen Teil Ihres Lebens im Ausland. Mit dieser Studie wollen wir herausfinden, warum Menschen ins Ausland umziehen und wie sich diese Erfahrungen auf das weitere Leben auswirken. Wir möchten Ihnen Fragen zu Ihrem persönlichen Werdegang in verschiedenen Lebensbereichen stellen. Dadurch wollen wir mehr über Ihre bisherige Erfahrung im Ausland und die Gründe für Ihren Umzug nach Deutschland erfahren. Hierfür benötigen wir Ihre Unterstützung.

— **Unser Dankeschön an Sie**

Mit Ihrer Teilnahme werden Sie Teil eines bisher einmaligen Projekts, bei dem Menschen zu ihren Aufenthalten im Ausland und zu ihrer aktuellen Lebenssituation befragt werden. Für Ihre Teilnahme an der Befragung möchten wir uns gerne erkenntlich zeigen. **Deshalb haben wir diesem Anschreiben 5 Euro beigelegt, die Sie auf jeden Fall behalten dürfen. Zusätzlich erhalten Sie 5 Euro, die wir Ihnen nach der Teilnahme als Einkaufsgutschein oder in Form einer Überweisung zuschicken werden.**

Wie können Sie teilnehmen?


Die Befragung wird mit Hilfe eines Online-Fragebogens durchgeführt. Diesen können Sie unter Verwendung der beigelegten Internetadresse und Ihres individuellen Zugangscodes auf jedem internetfähigen Gerät aufrufen. Auf dem Smartphone und Tablet können Sie alternativ auch den QR-Code verwenden, der Ihnen ebenfalls direkten Zugriff auf den Fragebogen ermöglicht (siehe Rückseite). Das Beantworten des Online-Fragebogens wird

Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung · Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4 · 65185 Wiesbaden · www.bib.bund.de

ca. 25 Minuten in Anspruch nehmen. Sie können während des Ausfüllens Ihre Teilnahme unterbrechen und zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt unter erneuter Eingabe des Zugangscode die Befragung fortsetzen.

Um zur Befragung zu gelangen, öffnen Sie bitte folgende Internetadresse, wählen Sie den Fragebogen ‚Leben in Deutschland‘ aus und geben Sie anschließend Ihren individuellen Zugangscode ein.

Internetadresse: www.international-mobil.de

Individueller Zugangscode: 

Wie wurden Sie für diese Befragung ausgewählt?

Die Adressen für unsere Befragung – darunter auch Ihre – wurden durch ein statistisches Zufallsverfahren aus dem Einwohnermelderegister Ihres letzten Wohnortes in Deutschland ausgewählt. Ihre Teilnahme an der Befragung ist freiwillig. Die Ergebnisse der Untersuchung sind aber nur dann aussagekräftig, wenn möglichst viele der ausgewählten Menschen an der Befragung teilnehmen. Deshalb bitten wir Sie, den Online-Fragebogen zu beantworten. Der individuelle Zugangscode dient einzig Ihrem persönlichen Zugang zum Fragebogen und zur Erfassung Ihrer Teilnahme an der Befragung. Die Zuordnung der Antworten aus dem Fragebogen zu den teilnehmenden Personen ist technisch und organisatorisch ausgeschlossen. Die Befragung dient ausschließlich wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und hält alle Regeln des strengen deutschen Datenschutzes ein. Weitere Informationen können Sie auch der beiliegenden „Erklärung zum Datenschutz und zur Vertraulichkeit Ihrer Angaben“ entnehmen.



An wen können Sie sich bei Fragen wenden?

Wenn Sie Fragen haben oder Unterstützung beim Ausfüllen des Fragebogens benötigen, wenden Sie sich bitte unter der Telefonnummer 0521 5242 200 an den Projektleiter im SOKO Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch und sein Team. Nutzen Sie bei Fragen auch unsere E-Mail-Adresse info@international-mobil.de. Wir werden Ihnen kurzfristig unsere Antwort senden. Weitere Informationen zum Forschungsprojekt und den beteiligten Institutionen finden Sie auch auf der Homepage unter www.studie.international-mobil.de.

Wir würden uns sehr freuen, wenn Sie sich beteiligen und somit zum Gelingen unseres Forschungsvorhabens beitragen würden.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

		
Prof. Dr. Norbert Schneider Direktor des Bundesinstituts für Bevölkerungsforschung	Prof. Dr. Marcel Erdinghagen Lehrstuhl für empirische Sozialstrukturanalyse Universität Duisburg-Essen	Dr. Henry Puhe Geschäftsführer des SOKO Instituts für Sozialforschung und Kommunikation

Second reminder letter of the remigrant sample



international mobil

Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung · Postfach 5528 · 65180 Wiesbaden



EINLADUNG ZUR BEFRAGUNG
international mobil

6. Dezember 2018

Sehr geehrter 

vor zwei Wochen haben wir Ihnen ein kurzes Erinnerungsschreiben zukommen lassen mit der Bitte, sich an unserer Studie ‚international mobil‘ zu beteiligen.

Um zur Befragung zu gelangen, öffnen Sie bitte auf Ihrem PC, Notebook, Tablet oder Smartphone die folgende Internetadresse, wählen Sie den Fragebogen ‚Leben in Deutschland‘ aus und geben Sie anschließend Ihren individuellen Zugangscode ein. Alternativ können Sie auf dem Smartphone oder Tablet auch den QR-Code verwenden, der Ihnen ebenfalls direkten Zugriff auf den Fragebogen ermöglicht.

Internetadresse: www.international-mobil.de

Individueller Zugangscode: 

Warum ist Ihre Teilnahme so wichtig?

Immer mehr Menschen verbringen einen Teil ihres Lebens im Ausland. Mit dieser Studie wollen wir herausfinden, warum Menschen ins Ausland umziehen und wie sich diese Erfahrungen auf das weitere Leben auswirken. Wir möchten Ihnen Fragen zu Ihrem persönlichen Werdegang in verschiedenen Lebensbereichen stellen. Dadurch wollen wir mehr über Ihre bisherige Erfahrung im Ausland und die Gründe für Ihren Umzug nach Deutschland erfahren. Hierfür benötigen wir Ihre Unterstützung.

Ihre Teilnahme an der Befragung ist selbstverständlich freiwillig. Die Ergebnisse der Studie sind aber nur dann aussagekräftig, wenn möglichst viele der ausgewählten Personen an der Befragung teilnehmen. Ihre Angaben unterliegen allen Regeln des strengen Datenschutzes und werden anonym ausschließlich zu wissenschaftlichen Zwecken ausgewertet.

Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung · Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4 · 65185 Wiesbaden · www.bib.bund.de

Unser Dankeschön an Sie

Als kleines Dankeschön für Ihre Unterstützung erhalten Sie **5 Euro**, die wir Ihnen nach der Teilnahme als Einkaufsgutschein oder in Form einer Überweisung zuschicken werden. Mit Ihrer Teilnahme werden Sie Teil eines bisher einmaligen Projekts, bei dem 6.000 Menschen nach oder während ihrem Aufenthalt im Ausland zu ihrer Lebenssituation befragt werden.



An wen können Sie sich bei Fragen wenden?

Wenn Sie Fragen haben oder Unterstützung beim Ausfüllen des Fragebogens benötigen, wenden Sie sich bitte unter der Telefonnummer 0521 5242 200 an den Projektleiter im SOKO Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch und sein Team. Nutzen Sie bei Fragen gerne auch unsere E-Mail-Adresse info@international-mobil.de. Wir werden Ihnen kurzfristig unsere Antwort senden. Weitere Informationen zum Forschungsprojekt, zu den beteiligten Institutionen und zum Datenschutz finden Sie auch auf unserer Homepage unter www.studie.international-mobil.de.

Wir würden uns sehr freuen, wenn Sie sich beteiligen und somit zum Gelingen unseres Forschungsvorhabens beitragen würden. Sollten Sie inzwischen schon teilgenommen haben, so ist dieses Schreiben selbstverständlich hinfällig geworden.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

		
Prof. Dr. Norbert Schneider Direktor des Bundesinstituts für Bevölkerungsforschung	Prof. Dr. Marcel Erichhagen Lehrstuhl für empirische Sozialstrukturanalyse Universität Duisburg-Essen	Dr. Henry Puhe Geschäftsführer des SOKO Instituts für Sozialforschung



ERKLÄRUNG ZUM DATENSCHUTZ UND ZUR VERTRAULICHKEIT IHRER ANGABEN

Das Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung und die Universität Duisburg-Essen führen in Zusammenarbeit mit dem SOKO Institut die Befragung 'international mobil' durch. Alle Beteiligten arbeiten nach den gesetzlichen Bestimmungen des Datenschutzes und sind an die Datenschutzgrundverordnung (DS-GVO) sowie alle weiteren datenschutzrechtlichen Vorschriften gebunden.

Mit dieser Erklärung zum Datenschutz kommen wir unseren Informationspflichten nach Art. 13 und 14 DS-GVO nach. Das Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung (BiB) in Wiesbaden hat die öffentliche Aufgabe, Bevölkerungsbefragungen durchzuführen und hat zu diesem Zweck Ihre Adresse – ausschließlich zur Durchführung dieser Studie – auf Grundlage von § 34 Bundesmeldegesetz von ausgewählten Einwohnermeldeämtern in Deutschland erhalten. Das BiB als verantwortliche Institution hat technische und organisatorische Maßnahmen getroffen, die sicherstellen, dass die Vorschriften über den Datenschutz sowohl im BiB als auch von externen Kooperationspartnern beachtet werden. Die Vorhaltung Ihrer Daten im Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung gewährleistet das Informationstechnikzentrum Bund in Bonn als zentraler IT-Dienstleister für die Bundesverwaltung. Mit der Vorhaltung der Daten beim SOKO Institut ist die domainfactory GmbH in Ismaning beauftragt.

Sie wurden zufällig für die Teilnahme ausgewählt. Ihre Teilnahme an der Befragung ist freiwillig. Es steht Ihnen frei, die Beantwortung einzelner Fragen abzulehnen. Die Ergebnisse der Befragung werden ausschließlich in anonymisierter Form, d.h. ohne Namen und Anschrift, dargestellt. Persönliche Angaben wie Name und Anschrift werden getrennt gespeichert und dienen ausschließlich der Organisation der Befragung. Es erfolgt keine Weitergabe von Daten an Dritte, die Ihre Person erkennen lassen.

Gemäß den Artikeln 15 ff. DS-GVO stehen Ihnen hinsichtlich der Sie betreffenden Daten und bei Vorliegen der dort genannten Voraussetzungen gegenüber uns die folgenden Rechte auf Auskunft, Berichtigung, Löschung, Einschränkung der Verarbeitung sowie Datenübertragbarkeit zu. Liegt aus Ihrer Sicht ein Verstoß gegen die datenschutzrechtlichen Bestimmungen vor, haben Sie zudem das Recht, sich bei der Bundesbeauftragten für den Datenschutz und die Informationsfreiheit als Datenschutzaufsichtsbehörde über die Verarbeitung ihrer personenbezogenen Daten zu melden und eine Beschwerde vorzubringen.

Für die Einhaltung der Datenschutzbestimmungen sind die Leiter der beteiligten Einrichtungen verantwortlich. Sollten Sie darüber hinaus Fragen zum Datenschutz haben, zögern Sie nicht, nachzufragen. Es stehen Ihnen der Projektleiter im Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung, Herr Dr. Andreas Ette und sein Team unter der Telefonnummer +49 611 75 2235 gerne zur Verfügung. Darüber hinaus haben Sie auch die Möglichkeit, mit den Datenschutzbeauftragten direkt in Kontakt zu treten. Die behördliche Datenschutzbeauftragte des Statistischen Bundesamtes und des Bundesinstituts für Bevölkerungsforschung erreichen Sie unter datschutzbeauftragter@destatis.de, die Datenschutzbeauftragte des SOKO Instituts für Sozialforschung und Kommunikation unter datschutz@soko-institut.de.




WAS GESCHIEHT MIT MEINEN ANGABEN?

1. Die Namen und Adressen aus den Einwohnermelderegistern erhält ausschließlich das Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung. Diese Informationen werden noch vor Abschluss der Studie gelöscht.
2. Ihre Antworten aus dem Online-Fragebogen werden computergestützt verarbeitet und durch das SOKO Institut gespeichert. Die Speicherung Ihrer Angaben erfolgt grundsätzlich ohne Ihren Namen und ohne Ihre Adresse (also in anonymisierter Form).
3. Anschließend werden alle Online-Fragebögen (ohne Namen und Adressen) ausgewertet. Der Computer zählt z.B. alle Antworten zur Erwerbssituation (siehe Beispiel) und errechnet daraus Prozentergebnisse.
4. Das Gesamtergebnis und die Ergebnisse für Teilgruppen (z.B. für Frauen und Männer) werden als Tabellen oder in Form von Abbildungen berichtet. Angaben einzelner Personen sind nicht erkennbar.
5. Sollten Sie uns darüber hinaus Kontaktdaten im Online-Fragebogen zur Verfügung stellen, werden diese nur für die dort genannten Zwecke genutzt.

Beispiel

In welcher Situation befinden Sie sich derzeit?
Sind Sie ...

Erwerbstätig
 Arbeitslos
 Freigestellt
 In Ausbildung/Studium
 Hausfrau/Hausmann
 Wehr-/Zivildienstleistender
 Sonstiges




Sie können absolut sicher sein, dass wir ...

- ⇒ Ihren Namen und Ihre Adresse nicht mit Ihren Angaben aus dem Online-Fragebogen zusammenführen, so dass niemand erfährt, welche Antworten Sie persönlich gegeben haben;
- ⇒ Ihren Namen und Ihre Anschrift nicht an Dritte weitergeben;
- ⇒ keine Einzeldaten, die einen Rückschluss auf Ihre Person zulassen, an Dritte weitergeben;
- ⇒ die Daten ausschließlich zu Forschungszwecken nutzen werden.

Wir danken Ihnen herzlich für Ihr Mitwirken und für Ihr Vertrauen in unsere Arbeit!

15.3 Panel maintenance mailings



Sehr geehrte Teilnehmerin, sehr geehrter Teilnehmer der Studie „international mobil“,

Ende letzten Jahres haben Sie an unserer Studie „international mobil“ teilgenommen und uns freundlicher Weise eine Reihe von Fragen beantwortet. Damit sind Sie Teil eines weltweit einmaligen Projekts geworden, an dem Personen in beinahe allen Ländern der Erde teilnehmen.

Dafür möchten wir uns im Namen des gesamten Projektteams nochmals ganz herzlich bei Ihnen bedanken! Nur durch Ihre Unterstützung werden wir in Zukunft in der Lage sein, bislang offene Fragen zum Thema internationale Mobilität gestützt auf eine breite Datengrundlage erstmalig zu beantworten.

Als kleines Dankeschön für Ihre Teilnahme haben Sie an einer Verlosung von 500 Euro teilgenommen. Die Verlosung hat am 21.02.2019 unter notarieller Aufsicht in Bielefeld stattgefunden. Leider waren Sie nicht unter den Gewinnern. Wir hoffen dennoch, dass die Befragung interessant für Sie war.

Wir möchten mit dieser E-Mail auch schon einmal darauf hinweisen, dass wir die Teilnehmerinnen und Teilnehmer im Rahmen der Studie gerne mehrfach befragen möchten. Vielleicht fragen Sie sich, warum wir Sie mehr als einmal befragen wollen? Der Grund ist, dass wir nur durch eine solche Mehrfachbefragung verlässliche Informationen über Veränderungen in unterschiedlichen Lebensbereichen der international mobilen Bevölkerung erhalten, z. B. wenn sich die familiäre oder die berufliche Situation im Laufe der Zeit verändert. Solche Erkenntnisse sind für uns als Wissenschaftler von enormer Wichtigkeit.

Derzeit bereiten wir die zweite Befragung vor, die dann voraussichtlich im Mai 2019 stattfinden wird. **Wir möchten Sie dann gerne dazu einladen, sich auch am zweiten Teil der Umfrage zu beteiligen.** Für die wissenschaftliche Auswertung ist es besonders wichtig, dass sich wieder möglichst viele Menschen an der Studie beteiligen. Daher hoffen wir weiter auf Ihre Unterstützung im Rahmen der Wiederholungsbefragung.

Sollten Sie in der Zwischenzeit Rückfragen haben oder uns vielleicht Änderungen Ihrer Kontaktdaten mitteilen wollen, können Sie sich gerne an den Studienleiter im SOKO-Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch, wenden (per Mail: info@international-mobil.de; per Telefon: +49 (0)521 5242 200).

Neues aus dem Projekt erfahren Sie bei Interesse auch regelmäßig unter:
<https://studie.international-mobil.de>

Bis dahin verbleiben wir mit herzlichen Grüßen

Prof. Dr. Norbert Schneider (Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung)
Prof. Dr. Marcel Erlinghagen (Universität Duisburg-Essen)
Dr. Henry Puhe (SOKO Institut Bielefeld)

Impressum

Prof. Dr. Marcel Erlinghagen

Institut für Soziologie
Universität Duisburg-Essen
Fakultät für Gesellschaftswissenschaften
Lotharstr. 63
D-47057 Duisburg

Über datenschutzrelevante Aspekte können Sie sich gerne wie gewohnt auch auf unserer
Homepage informieren:
<https://studie.international-mobil.de/datenschutz-studie.html>

ABMELDEN:

Und wenn Sie im Rahmen der Studie nicht weiter von uns kontaktiert werden möchten,
schreiben Sie uns bitte eine entsprechende Mail an info@international-mobil.de

15.4 Original variables not included in the SUF due to anonymisation

<i>a0011</i>	<i>a01516_2</i>	<i>a05610</i>	<i>a06119_2</i>	<i>a1115</i>
<i>a0011s</i>	<i>a01517_1</i>	<i>a058</i>	<i>a06120_1</i>	<i>a1116</i>
<i>a0012</i>	<i>a01517_2</i>	<i>a059</i>	<i>a06120_2</i>	<i>a112</i>
<i>a0012s</i>	<i>a01518_1</i>	<i>a0611_1</i>	<i>a062</i>	<i>a113</i>
<i>a0021</i>	<i>a01518_2</i>	<i>a0611_2</i>	<i>a068</i>	<i>a113s</i>
<i>a0022</i>	<i>a01519_1</i>	<i>a0612_1</i>	<i>a068s</i>	<i>a114a</i>
<i>a00511</i>	<i>a01519_2</i>	<i>a0612_2</i>	<i>a069</i>	<i>a114</i>
<i>a009</i>	<i>a01520_1</i>	<i>a0613_1</i>	<i>a070s</i>	<i>a115</i>
<i>a010</i>	<i>a01520_2</i>	<i>a0613_2</i>	<i>a071</i>	<i>a116a</i>
<i>a0151_1</i>	<i>a016</i>	<i>a0614_1</i>	<i>a073a</i>	<i>a116</i>
<i>a0151_2</i>	<i>a019</i>	<i>a0614_2</i>	<i>a073</i>	<i>a117a</i>
<i>a0152_1</i>	<i>a019s</i>	<i>a0615_1</i>	<i>a074a</i>	<i>a117</i>
<i>a0152_2</i>	<i>a020</i>	<i>a0615_2</i>	<i>a074</i>	<i>a118</i>
<i>a0153_1</i>	<i>a021</i>	<i>a0616_1</i>	<i>a075</i>	<i>a119</i>
<i>a0153_2</i>	<i>a022s</i>	<i>a0616_2</i>	<i>a084</i>	<i>a120</i>
<i>a0154_1</i>	<i>a024a</i>	<i>a0617_1</i>	<i>a085s</i>	<i>a121</i>
<i>a0154_2</i>	<i>a024</i>	<i>a0617_2</i>	<i>a088a</i>	<i>a1221</i>
<i>a0155_1</i>	<i>a025a</i>	<i>a0618_1</i>	<i>a088</i>	<i>a1222</i>
<i>a0155_2</i>	<i>a025</i>	<i>a0618_2</i>	<i>a089a</i>	<i>a1223</i>
<i>a0156_1</i>	<i>a026</i>	<i>a0619_1</i>	<i>a089</i>	<i>a1224</i>
<i>a0156_2</i>	<i>a027</i>	<i>a0619_2</i>	<i>a090</i>	<i>a1225</i>
<i>a0157_1</i>	<i>a028s</i>	<i>a06110_1</i>	<i>a09888s</i>	<i>a126</i>
<i>a0157_2</i>	<i>a029</i>	<i>a06110_2</i>	<i>a103</i>	<i>a127</i>
<i>a0158_1</i>	<i>a033a</i>	<i>a06111_1</i>	<i>a104</i>	<i>a132s</i>
<i>a0158_2</i>	<i>a033</i>	<i>a06111_2</i>	<i>a105</i>	<i>a1441</i>
<i>a0159_1</i>	<i>a034a</i>	<i>a06112_1</i>	<i>a106</i>	<i>a1442</i>
<i>a0159_2</i>	<i>a034</i>	<i>a06112_2</i>	<i>a107</i>	<i>a1441s</i>
<i>a01510_1</i>	<i>a035</i>	<i>a06113_1</i>	<i>a108</i>	<i>a1442s</i>
<i>a01510_2</i>	<i>a036</i>	<i>a06113_2</i>	<i>a109</i>	
<i>a01511_1</i>	<i>a037</i>	<i>a06114_1</i>	<i>a1101</i>	
<i>a01511_2</i>	<i>a038</i>	<i>a06114_2</i>	<i>a1102</i>	
<i>a01512_1</i>	<i>a039</i>	<i>a06115_1</i>	<i>a1103</i>	
<i>a01512_2</i>	<i>a040</i>	<i>a06115_2</i>	<i>a1104</i>	
<i>a01513_1</i>	<i>a0411</i>	<i>a06116_1</i>	<i>a1105</i>	
<i>a01513_2</i>	<i>a0412</i>	<i>a06116_2</i>	<i>a11088</i>	
<i>ar01514_1</i>	<i>a0413</i>	<i>a06117_1</i>	<i>a11098</i>	
<i>a01514_2</i>	<i>a0414</i>	<i>a06117_2</i>	<i>a1111</i>	
<i>a01515_1</i>	<i>a0415</i>	<i>a06118_1</i>	<i>a1112</i>	
<i>a01515_2</i>	<i>a04188</i>	<i>a06118_2</i>	<i>a1113</i>	
<i>a01516_1</i>	<i>a05388s</i>	<i>a06119_1</i>	<i>a1114</i>	

15.5 Emigrant questionnaire and codebook

*Reader information: The SUF variable can be found to the right of the corresponding question or item in the second row

Page 2: **Your move abroad**

[Screening Questions for Paneltransition]

According to the registration office ("Einwohnermeldeamt"), you moved your residence abroad some time ago. Just to be sure:

0. Are you currently living abroad?	<u>ae000</u>
	<u>a000</u>
Yes (Continue with question 1.1)	1
No (Continue with question with "Switch side")	2

Page 3: Your move abroad

[Switch Side]

You have indicated that you do not (any longer) live abroad.

We therefore assume that you have recently lived abroad but are now living permanently in Germany again.

[If this is the case, please click here.](#) [*→ Forwarding to Remigrant Questionnaire*]

If you are currently living abroad, please click on the button in the bottom right corner.

Thank you very much!

We are interested in which country you have moved to.

1.1 In which country do you currently live in?	<u>ae0011</u> <u>a0011</u>
Drop-down list (with the option of other open specification as the last answer option)	

If selected "other country"

1.1s. [Open] In which country do you currently live in?	<u>ae0011s</u> <u>a0011s</u>

No selection: Soft-Reminder pop-up window→→

The question of the country to which you moved some time ago is of particular interest for us. We would therefore be very pleased if you could give us this information.

We are interested in which country you have moved to.

1.2 In which country do you currently live in?	<u>ae0012</u> <u>a0012</u>
Drop-down list (with the option of other open specification as the last answer option)	

If selected "other country"

1.2s [Open] In which country do you currently live in?	<u>ae0012s</u> <u>a0012s</u>

2. When did you leave Germany?

Please specify the month and year.

Drop-down menu Month	Drop-down menu Year (2018-1940)
<u>ae0021</u>	<u>ae0022</u>
<u>a0021</u>	<u>a0022</u>

3. Before you moved to the country where you currently live, did you already know people in that country?

Please tick everything that is true. (Multiple nominations possible)

Yes, close relatives (e.g. partners, parents, children, siblings, grandchildren, grandparents)	0/1	<u>ae0031</u> <u>a0041</u>
Yes, other relatives (e.g. aunts/uncles, cousins, nieces/nephews)	0/1	<u>ae0032</u> <u>a0042</u>
Yes, work colleagues	0/1	<u>ae0033</u> <u>a0043</u>
Yes, other friends and acquaintances	0/1	<u>ae0034</u> <u>a0044</u>
No	0/1	<u>ae0035</u> <u>a0045</u>

4. There are many possible reasons to move out of Germany. The following are different motives for leaving Germany. Please tell us how important these reasons were for your decision to move out of Germany

Please answer on the following scale, where a value of 1 means "Not at all important" and the value 6 "Very important". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment. For reasons that do not apply to you, please select "Not applicable".

	Not at all important					Very important	Not applicable	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	
Own professional reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0041</u> <u>a0051</u>
Professional reasons of my partner	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0042</u> <u>a0052</u>
Other reasons regarding the partnership	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0043</u> <u>a0053</u>
Family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0044</u> <u>a0054</u>
Financial reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0045</u> <u>a0055</u>
Dissatisfaction with life in Germany	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0046</u> <u>a0056</u>
Educational or training-related reasons / studies	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0047</u> <u>a0057</u>
For reasons of my personal lifestyle (e.g. better climate, different way of life, gaining new experiences)	1	2	3	4	5	6	-2	<u>ae0048</u> <u>a0058</u>

Based on SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 25 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 F25

5. Now, please think about the first weeks and months in the country where you live: How easy or difficult did you set foot?

[ae005](#)
[a007](#)

Please answer using the following scale, where a value of 1 means "Very difficult" and the value 7 means "Very easy". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment.

Very difficult						Very easy
1	2	3	4	5	6	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 8: Your personal situation before leaving Germany

And now we have some questions about your personal situation before leaving Germany. If you look back, what was your situation like **three months before you went abroad?**

First, we are interested in your family and partnership.

6. Were you in a serious partnership before you left Germany?		<u>ae006</u>
		<u>a008</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.		
Yes (Continue with question 8)		1
No		0

SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 F85

7. If you were Single, what was your marital status back then?		<u>ae007</u>
		<u>a009</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.		
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.		
Married, separated		3
Registered partnership, separated		4
Single		5
Divorced		6
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased		8

(Continue with question 12)

8. What was your marital status back then?		<u>ae008</u>
		<u>a010</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.		
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.		
Married		1
Registered partnership		2
Married, separated		3
Registered partnership, separated		4
Single		5
Divorced		6
Registered partnership annulled		7
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased		8

Based on SOEP I 2017 F187 and Allbus 2016 F082

9. Did your partnership extend beyond your move abroad?		<u>ae009</u>
		<u>a011</u>
Yes		1
No (Continue with question 12)		0

SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 F86

Page 9: **Your decision to leave Germany**

A partnership, whether it is a marriage or a relationship, can sometimes have more, sometimes less influence on our decisions. Therefore, we ask you to remember the time before you left Germany, specifically the time of the decision-making process.

10. When you think of your decision to leave Germany, who was the driving force? You or your partner?	<u>ae010</u> <u>a012</u>
My Partner	1
Myself	2
Both equally	3
I don't know	-2

SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 87

11. What was it like after you moved to the country you are currently living in: Which of you both moved first, or did you move together?	<u>ae011</u> <u>a013</u>
My partner was already living in the country when we met	1
My partner moved before me to the country	2
My partner moved after me to the country	3
We moved to the country at the same time	4
My partner still lives in Germany	5
My partner lives in another country	6

SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

Page 10: Your living situation before leaving Germany

Your living situation at that time - **three months before you left for the country in which you live** - is also interesting for us.

12. How many people lived in your household permanently at the time, including yourself?

[ae012](#)

[a014](#)

Please refer to your situation **three months before you have gone abroad.**

If you lived in a shared flat, please select "1" .

Please also think of all children living in the household.

[Drop Down Menu \(1-20\)](#)

13. Now we would like to know more: Who lived in your household permanently, except you?

How do you relate to these people (e.g. Your father, your daughter, your partner, your mother)?

Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.

	Relationship	Birth
First person	List	Drop
Second person	List	2018-1900
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
Twentieth person	List	List
	<u>ae0131 1 to ae01320 1</u> <u>a0151 1 to a01520 1</u>	<u>ae0131 2 to ae01320 2</u> <u>a0151 2 to a01520 2</u>

Based on ESS 2016 F0_HH_1 -F0_HH_12

Items from the Drop Down list:

- Partner
- Daughter
- Son
- Father
- Mother
- Father
- Mother
- Grandson
- Other relatives
- Other unrelated persons

Page 12: Your living situation before leaving Germany

14. How many citizens lived in your town in Germany before you left?		<u>ae014</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.		<u>a016</u>
More than 1,000,000 inhabitants		1
100,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants		2
10,000 to 100,000 inhabitants		3
Less than 10,000 inhabitants		4

Based on ALLBUS 2016 F119 and ESS2016 DOMICIL F14

Page 13: Your employment situation before leaving Germany

Now we are interested in your main activity **three months before you left Germany**.

15. What was your main activity? What describes your situation the best at the time? I was...		<u>ae015</u> <u>a019</u>
If you have been in several activities, please indicate the activity for which you have spent the most time.		
Blue- or white-collar worker (Continue with question 23)		1
Civil servants (including judges and professional soldiers) (Continue with question 23)		2
Self-employed or freelancer (Continue with question 17)		3
Marginal part-time employed ("Mini-Job" up to 450 €) (Continue with question 23)		4
In first-time in-service training/apprenticeship (Continue with question 32)		5
In further training, retraining or further occupational training (Continue with question 32)		6
Registered unemployed (Continue with question 32)		7
In retirement/early retirement (Continue with question 16)		8
On maternity leave/parental leave (Continue with question 32)		9
Attending school/university/vocational school (Continue with question 32)		10
Voluntary military service, Federal volunteer service or similar (Continue with question 32)		11
Work and Travel, Au Pair or similar (Continue with question 32)		12
Housemaker (Continue with question 32)		13
Other [Please specify]		88

15s What other activity were you doing at the time?	<u>ae015s</u> <u>a019s</u>
(Open indication)	

(Continue with question 32)

Page 14: Your employment situation before leaving Germany

[Block: Retirement before moving]

16. What was your main activity at the time before your retirement?	<u>ae016</u> <u>a020</u>
Blue- or white-collar worker (Continue with question 23)	1
Civil servant (including judges and professional soldiers) (Continue with question 23)	2
Self-employed or freelancer (Continue with question 17)	3
Jobseeker/registered unemployed (Continue with question 32)	4
Early retirement/pension (persons with a pension due to disability) (Continue with question 32)	5
In the exemption phase of part-time retirement (Continue with question 32)	6
Housemaker (Continue with question 32)	7
In further education/retraining (Continue with question 32)	8

Transitions and Old Age Potentials (TOP), Wave 1 | X100

Page 15: **Your employment situation before leaving Germany**

[Block: Self-employed or freelancer before moving]

17. What was your position/occupation at the time?	<u>ae017</u> <u>a021</u>
Please state the exact job title, i.e. not "entrepreneur", but: "head of a metalworking company", not "freelancer", but: "lawyer". Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.	
.....	

18. Which industry did your company belong to?	<u>ae018</u>
Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>a022</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic service activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

18s. Which industry did your company belong to?	<u>ae018s</u> <u>a022s</u>
Short free text	

19. How many employees did you have at that time?	<u>ae019</u> <u>a023</u>
None	1
1-9	2
10 or more	3

20. What was your average monthly gross profit back then?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae020a</u> <u>a024a</u>
Gross profit (in euros) was	2 <u>ae020</u> <u>a024</u>

SOEP bhp9701

21. What was your average monthly net profit back then?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae021a</u> <u>a025a</u>
Net profit (in euros) was (Continue with question 23)	2 <u>ae021</u> <u>a025</u>

SOEP bhp9702

Page 17: Your employment situation before leaving Germany

22. Would you tell us, if any, which category your average monthly net profit was in?	<u>ae022</u> <u>a026</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

→(Continue with question 32)

[Block: Blue- and white-collar and civil servants before moving]

<p>23. What was your position/occupation at the time? <u>ae023</u> <u>a027</u></p> <p><i>[If civil servants]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not 'civil servants in the higher service', but 'financial officials in the higher service'.</p> <p><i>[If blue/white collar worker]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not "clerk", but: "shipping clerk", not "blue-collar worker", but: "machine metalworker".</p> <p><i>[To both]</i> Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.</p>

SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First survey 2015 91 or current activity SOEP 2017 I 52

24. Which industry did your company belong to?	<u>ae024</u>
Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>a028</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic service activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

24s. Which industry did your company belong to?

ae024s

a028s

Short free text

Page 19: Your employment situation before leaving Germany

25. How many hours per week were stipulated in your contract (excluding overtime)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No fixed working time	1 <u>ae025a</u> a029a
Hours per week.....	2 <u>ae025</u> a029

SOEP 2017 | 79

26. And how many hours did you generally work, including any overtime?	
Hours per week.....	<u>ae026</u> <u>a030</u>

SOEP 2017 | 80

Page 20: Your employment situation before leaving Germany

27. In your position at work at the time, did you supervise others? In other words, did people work under your direction?	<u>ae027</u> <u>a031</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 29)	2

SOEP 2017 | 63

[Opens if 27=1]

28. How many people worked under your direction?	<u>ae028</u> <u>a032</u>

SOEP 2017 | 64

29. What were your average monthly gross earnings back then?	
If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.	
Gross earnings mean income before deduction of taxes and social security.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae029a</u> <u>a033a</u>
Gross earnings (in euros)	2 <u>ae029</u> <u>a033</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

30. What were your average monthly net earnings back then?	
If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.	
Net earnings mean income after deduction of taxes, social security, and unemployment and health insurance.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae030a</u> <u>a034a</u>
Net earnings (in euro) (Continue with question 32)	2 <u>ae030</u> <u>a034</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

Page 22: Your employment situation before leaving Germany

31. Would you tell us, if any, what category your average monthly net earnings were in?	<u>ae031</u> <u>a035</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

SOEP 2017 | 97

Now to another topic:

32. How much time do you plan to spend in Germany within the next 12 months?	<u>ae032</u>
	<u>a043</u>
I'm not going to be there at all	1
Less than 1 month	2
1 to 3 months	3
4 to 6 months	4
More than 6 months	5
I don't know yet	-2

Page 24: Planned duration of your stay abroad

33. And how long do you want to stay in the country where you currently live in ae001.shown?		<u>ae033</u>
		<u>a044</u>
A maximum of one more year (Continue with question 35)		1
A few more years		2
Forever (Continue with question 35)		3
Don't know yet (Continue with question 35)		-2

[Opens if 33=2]

34. How many years do you plan to stay in the country where you currently live in?		<u>ae034</u>
		<u>a045</u>
.....		

<p>35. Many people settle in several countries over the course of their lives. What about you? Did you always live in Germany before you left, or did you live elsewhere at times?</p>		<p><u>ae035</u> <u>a046</u></p>
<p>This refers to a continuous stay in another country of more than 3 months. Shorter stays, e.g. vacations or visits to relatives, are not meant here.</p>		
I have always lived in Germany (Continue with question 38)		1
I lived elsewhere once		2
I lived elsewhere twice		3
I lived elsewhere three times or more		4

Based on SOEP 2015 Migration Sample F 6 (first respondent), SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 F 5

Page 26: Your previous long-term stays abroad

36. For how long have you lived abroad?		<u>ae036</u>
If you have lived abroad several times, please refer to the entire duration (including your current stay abroad).		<u>a047</u>
Less than a year		1
1 to under 2 years		2
2 to under 5 years		3
5 and more years		4

Based on Allbus 2016 F055L (also based on SOEP 2015 Migration Sample F 6 (first respondent), SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 5)

37. Where did you live during your last extended stay abroad (at least three months)?		<u>ae037</u>
Also, in the country where I live now ae001.shown		1
In another country		2

Page 27: Leaving your current country of residence or returning to Germany

38. Have you seriously been thinking of moving back to Germany or another country lately?	<u>ae038</u>
Yes	<u>a054</u> 1
No (Continue with question 41)	2

Based on SOEP 2014 F 145

Page 28: **Leaving your current country of residence or returning to Germany**

39. Which country do you intend to move to?		<u>ae039</u>
		<u>a055</u>
Back to Germany		1
To another country		2
Don't know yet		3

Based on SOEP 2014 F 147

40. And why do you want to leave the country in which you currently live?		
Please tick everything that is true. (Multiple nominations possible)		
Stay was planned for a limited period of time	0/1	<u>ae0401</u> <u>a0561</u>
Own professional reasons	0/1	<u>ae0402</u> <u>a0562</u>
Professional reasons of my partner	0/1	<u>ae0403</u> <u>a0563</u>
Other reasons regarding the partnership	0/1	<u>ae0404</u> <u>a0564</u>
Family reasons (e.g. proximity to relatives)	0/1	<u>ae0405</u> <u>a0565</u>
Financial reasons	0/1	<u>ae0406</u> <u>a0566</u>
Dissatisfaction with life in the country where I live .ae001.shown	0/1	<u>ae0407</u> <u>a0567</u>
Educational or training-related reasons / studies	0/1	<u>ae0408</u> <u>a0568</u>
For reasons of my personal lifestyle (e.g. better climate, other way of life)	0/1	<u>ae0409</u> <u>a0569</u>
[When 'ae001.shown' = United Kingdom]	0/1	<u>ae04010</u>
The UK's exit from the EU (Brexit)		<u>a05610</u>
Other reasons:	0/1	<u>ae04088</u> <u>a05688</u>

Page 29: Your current life situation

Now we are interested in your current living situation in the country in which you live. We start with your family situation.

41. Do you currently have a serious partnership?	<u>ae041</u> <u>a057</u>
Yes (Continue with question 43)	1
No	2

42. If you are not in a serious partnership, what is your current marital status?	<u>ae042</u> <u>a058</u>
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.	
Married, separated	3
Registered partnership, separated	4
Single	5
Divorced	6
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased	8

(Continue with question 44)

43. What is your current marital status?	<u>ae043</u> <u>a059</u>
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.	
Married	1
Registered partnership	2
Married, separated	3
Registered partnership, in separation	4
Single	5
Divorced	6
Registered partnership annulled	7
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased	8

SOEP I 2017 F187

<p>44. How many people live in your household permanently including yourself?</p> <p>If you live in a shared flat, please enter "1". Please also think of all children living in the household.</p>	<p><u>ae044</u> <u>a060</u></p>
<p>Drop Down Menu (1-20)</p>	

Page 31: Your current housing situation

45. Now we would like to know more: who lives in your household permanently except you?		
How do you relate to these people (e.g. Your father, your daughter, your partner, your mother)?		
	Relationship	Birth
First person	List	Drop
Second person	List	1900-2018
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
Twentieth person	List	List
	<u>ae0451 1 to ae04520 1</u> <u>a0611 1 to a06120 1</u>	<u>ae0451 2 to ae04520 2</u> <u>a0611 2 to a06120 2</u>

Based on ESS 2016 F0_HH_1 -F0_HH_12

Items from the Drop-Down list:

- Partner
- Daughter
- Son
- Father
- Mother
- Father
- Mother
- Grandson
- Other relatives
- Other unrelated person

Page 32: Your current housing situation

46. How many citizens live in your town where you currently live?		<u>ae046</u>
		<u>a062</u>
More than 1,000,000 inhabitants		1
100,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants		2
10,000 to 100,000 inhabitants		3
Less than 10,000 inhabitants		4

Page 33: Your contacts with friends and relatives

Now we are interested in your group of friends

47. How many close friends would you say that you have?		<u>ae047</u>
		<u>a064</u>
friends		

Based on SOEP 2017 I F6

[Opens if 47 > 0]

48. How many of these close friends live ...		
_____ in Germany	1	<u>ae0481</u>
		<u>a0651</u>
_____ in the country where you lived	2	<u>ae0482</u>
		<u>a0652</u>
_____ in another country	3	<u>ae0483</u>
		<u>a0653</u>

Page 34: Your contacts with friends and relatives

We are also interested in how regularly you are in contact with your relatives and close friends in Germany

49. How often do you have contact with the following people in Germany?						
All possible types of contact count here, such as phone calls, messages via messenger or internet, letters/packages or personal visits. If you have contact with, for example, several siblings, children or friends, please think only of the person with which you are most often in contact. Please select the category "Not applicable" if you don't have any people in a category or if the person is not living in Germany.						
	Daily	At least once a week	At least once a month	Rare	Not applicable	
(Marriage) Partner	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae0491</u> <u>a0661</u>
Parents/in-laws	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae0492</u> <u>a0662</u>
Siblings	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae0493</u> <u>a0663</u>
Children	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae0494</u> <u>a0664</u>
Grandchildren	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae0495</u> <u>a0665</u>
Grandparents	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae0496</u> <u>a0666</u>
Other relatives (e.g. aunts, uncles, cousins)	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae0497</u> <u>a0667</u>
Close friends	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ae04988</u> <u>a06688</u>

Oriented to Allbus 2016 F 55

Page 35: Your personal situation compared to the situation before you left from Germany

50. If you compare your current personal situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas of life?						
	Much better than in Germany	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in Germany	
Your family life	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae0501</u> <u>a0671</u>
Your group of friends and acquaintances	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae0502</u> <u>a0672</u>
Your health	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae0503</u> <u>a0673</u>
Your residential area	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae0504</u> <u>a0674</u>
Your contacts with the neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae0505</u> <u>a0675</u>

Page 36: Your current employment situation

Here are some questions about your current employment in the country where you live.

51. What is your current occupational status? What describes your current situation the best? I was...		<u>ae051</u> <u>a068</u>
If you are in several activities, please indicate the activity for which you spent the most time.		
Blue- or white-collar worker (Continue with question 52)		1
Civil servants (including judges and professional soldiers) (Continue with question 52)		2
Self-employed or freelancer (Continue with question 67)		3
In first-time in-service/apprenticeship (Continue with question 95)		4
In further training, retraining or further occupational training (Continue with question 95)		5
Registered unemployed (Continue with question 75)		6
In retirement/early retirement (Continue with question 80)		7
On maternity leave/parental leave (Continue with question 75)		8
Attending school/university/vocational school (Continue with question 86)		9
Voluntary military service, federal volunteer Service or similar (Continue with question 106)		10
Work and Travel, Au Pair or similar (Continue with question 106)		11
Housemaker (Continue with question 75)		12
Other [Please specify]		88

Based on SOEP 2017 I 122

51s What other activity are you currently doing?	<u>ae051s</u> <u>a068s</u>
Short free text	

(Continue with question 106)

Page 37: Your current employment situation

[Block: Blue- and white-collar workers and civil servants]

52. What is your current position/occupation?	<u>ae052</u> <u>a069</u>
<p><i>[If civil servants]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not 'civil servants in the higher service', but 'financial officials in the higher service'.</p> <p><i>[If blue/white collar worker]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not "clerk", but: "shipping clerk", not "blue-collar worker", but: "machine metalworker".</p> <p><i>[To both]</i> If you do not know the German name, please try to describe your profession.</p>	

SOEP 2017 | 52 SOEP or previously IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

53. Which industry does your company belong to? Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>ae053</u> <u>a070</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic service activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

53s. Which industry does your company belong to?	<u>ae053s</u> <u>a070s</u>
Short free text <input style="float: right;" type="checkbox"/>	

54. How many hours per week are stipulated in your contract (excluding overtime)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No fixed working time	1 ae054a a071a
Hours per week.....	1 ae054 a071

SOEP 2017 | 79

55. And how many hours do you generally work, including any overtime?	
Hours per week.....	ae055 a072

SOEP 2017 | 80

56. What was your average monthly gross earnings last month?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Gross earnings mean income before deduction of taxes and social security

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae056a</u> <u>a073a</u>
Gross earnings (in euros)	2 <u>ae056</u> <u>a073</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

57. What was your average monthly net earnings last month?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Net earnings mean income after deduction of taxes, social security, and unemployment and health insurance.

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae057a</u> <u>a074a</u>
Net earnings (in euro)(Continue with question 59)	2 <u>ae057</u> <u>a074</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

Page 40: Your current employment situation

58. Would you tell us, if any, what category your monthly net earnings are in?	<u>ae058</u> <u>a075</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

SOEP 2017 | 97

Page 41: Your current employment situation

59. Does this job correspond to the occupation for which you were trained?	<u>ae059</u>
Yes	1
No	2
Still in education or training	3
I have not been trained for a particular occupation	4

SOEP 2017 | 53

Page 42: Your current employment situation

60. What has changed in relation to your employer as a way of moving abroad? Your current employer is...	<u>ae060</u>
	<u>a077</u>
... the same employer as in Germany	1
... a subsidiary of the last employer in Germany	2
... a completely different employer than in Germany (Continue with question 62).	3
	4
<i>Not applicable</i> (Continue with question 62).	-2

61. Have you been sent by your employer?	<u>ae061</u>
	<u>a078</u>
Yes	1
No	2

62. Do you have a fixed-term or permanent employment contract?	<u>ae062</u>
	<u>a079</u>
Permanent contract	1
Fixed-term contract	2
Not applicable/Do not have an employment contract	3

SOEP 2017 | 60

Page 43: Your current employment situation

63. In your position at work, do you supervise others? In other words, do people work under your direction?		<u>ae063</u>
		<u>a080</u>
Yes		1
No (Continue with question 65)		2

SOEP 2017 | 63

[Opens if 63=1]

64. How many people work under your direction?		<u>ae064</u>
		<u>a081</u>

SOEP 2017 | 64

65. Approximately how many people does the company employ as a whole?		<u>ae065</u>
		<u>a082</u>
This does not refer to a local unit of the company, but to the entire company.		
Less than 5 employees		1
From 5 up to, but less than 10 employees		2
From 10 up to, but less than 20 employees		3
From 20 up to, but less than 100 employees		4
From 100 up to, but less than 200 employees		5
From 200 up to but less than 2000 employees		6
2000 or more employees		7

SOEP 2017 | 62

66. If you compare your professional situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in Germany	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in Germany	Not applicable	
Your wage	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0661</u> <u>a0831</u>
Your career opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0662</u> <u>a0832</u>
The safety of your workplace	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0663</u> <u>a0833</u>
Your decision-making skills	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0664</u> <u>a0834</u>

(Continue with question 106)

[Block Self-employed/freelancers]

67. What is your current position/occupation?

ae067

a084

Please state the exact job title, i.e. not "entrepreneur", but: "head of a metalworking company", not "freelancer", but: "lawyer".

If you do not know the German name, please try to rewrite the profession.

SOEP 2017 | 52 SOEP or previously IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

68. Which industry does your company belong to?		<u>ae068</u>
Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>		<u>a085</u>
Construction		1
Mining, quarrying		2
Energy and water supply		3
Provision of financial and insurance services		4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services		5
Provision of other service activities		6
Provision of other economic service activities (administrative and support service activities)		7
Education (and childcare)		8
Accommodation and food service activities		9
Human health and social work activities		10
Real estate activities		11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods		12
Information and communication		13
Arts, entertainment and recreation		14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing		15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security		16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods		17
Transportation and storage		18
Other		88

68s. Which industry does your company belong to?		<u>ae068s</u>
		<u>a085a</u>
Short free text		<input type="checkbox"/>

69. How many employees do you have?		<u>ae069</u>
If you have more than one professional activity, please answer the following questions only for your current main occupation.		<u>a086</u>
None		1
1-9		2
10 or more		3

Page 46: Your current employment situation

70. Does this job correspond to the occupation you were trained?		<u>ae070</u>
		<u>a087</u>
Yes		1
No		2
Still in education or training		3
I have not been trained for a particular occupation		4

SOEP 2017 | 53

71. What is your average monthly gross profit?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae071a</u> <u>a088a</u>
Gross profit (in euros)	2 <u>ae071</u> <u>a088</u>

72. What is your average monthly net profit?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae072a</u> <u>a089a</u>
Net profit (in euros) (Continue with question 73)	2 <u>ae072</u> <u>a089</u>

73. Would you tell us, if any, which category your average monthly net profit is in?	<u>ae073</u> <u>a090</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

74. If you compare your professional situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in Germany	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in Germany	Not applicable	
Your earning opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0741</u> <u>a0911</u>
Support from public authorities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0742</u> <u>a0912</u>
Entrepreneurial framework conditions	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0743</u> <u>a0913</u>

(Continue with question 106)

Page 50: Your current employment situation

[Block not employed]

75. Have you been working since your arrival in the country where you currently live?	<u>ae075</u> <u>a092</u>
Yes	1
No	2

76. Do you intend to obtain (or resume) employment in the future?	<u>ae076</u> <u>a093</u>
No, definitely not (Continue with question 78)	1
Probably not	2
Probably	3
Yes, definitely	4
Don't know (Continued with question 78)	-2

SOEP 2017 F34

[Opens if 76=2, 3 or 4]

77. When, approximately, would you like to start working?	<u>ae077</u> <u>a094</u>
As soon as possible	1
Within the coming year	2
In the next 2 to 5 years	3
In more than 5 years	4

SOEP 2017 F35

Page 51: Your current employment situation

78. If you were currently looking for a new job: Is it or would it be easy, difficult or almost impossible to find an appropriate position?		<u>ae078</u> <u>a095</u>
Easy		1
Difficult		2
Almost impossible		3
I don't know		4

SOEP 2017 F37

[back to all]

79. If you compare your current professional situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in Germany	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in Germany	Not applicable	
Your chances of finding a job	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0791</u> <u>a0961</u>
Your chances of finding a job that suits your education	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0792</u> <u>a0962</u>
Your protection as an unemployed	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0793</u> <u>a0963</u>

(Continue with question 106)

[Block to pensioners]

80. Are you currently receiving retirement benefits such as a statutory old-age pension or state pension, a widow's pension or an incapacity pension?		<u>ae080</u> <u>a097</u>
Yes		1
No		0

NEPS SC6 Wave 8: 301

81. Why did you retire?		
Please tick everything that is true. (Multiple nominations possible)		
Reaching the legal age limit	0/1	<u>ae0811</u> <u>a0981</u>
Fulfillment of the eligibility requirements for an old-age pension	0/1	<u>ae0812</u> <u>a0982</u>
Fulfillment of the eligibility requirements for an occupational pension	0/1	<u>ae0813</u> <u>a0983</u>
Received offer for an early retirement scheme	0/1	<u>ae0814</u> <u>a0984</u>
Has been terminated (e.g. early retirement benefits, unemployment benefit, etc.)	0/1	<u>ae0815</u> <u>a0985</u>
Due to my poor health	0/1	<u>ae0816</u> <u>a0986</u>
Due to the poor health of family members or friends	0/1	<u>ae0817</u> <u>a0987</u>
To retire at the same time as spouse or partner	0/1	<u>ae0818</u> <u>a0988</u>
To spend more time with my family	0/1	<u>ae0819</u> <u>a0989</u>
To enjoy life	0/1	<u>ae08110</u> <u>a09810</u>
Other reason	0/1	<u>ae08188</u> <u>a09888</u>

SHARE EP064

81s. Why did you retire?	<u>ae08188s</u> <u>a09888s</u>
Long free text	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 53: Your current employment situation

82. Many people are also employed during retirement, often in form of a secondary employment. What about you?	<u>ae082</u> <u>a099</u>
I am currently working	1
I intend to start working (Continue with question 84)	2
I am not interested in working (Continue with question 85)	3

Based on NEPS SC6 wave 8: 306

Filter: currently in employment

83. There are several reasons why people are working during their retirement. To what extent are the following reasons true for you?					
One reason is ...					
	Does not apply at all	Does rather not apply	Does rather apply	Does apply completely	
... to continue to earn money.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0831</u> <u>a1001</u>
... to feel needed	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0832</u> <u>a1002</u>
... to socialize with other people.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0833</u> <u>a1003</u>
... recognition and appreciation.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0834</u> <u>a1004</u>
... sharing knowledge and experience.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0835</u> <u>a1005</u>
... that I enjoy working.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0836</u> <u>a1006</u>
... to have a regular daily routine.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0837</u> <u>a1007</u>
... further development and further education.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0838</u> <u>a1008</u>
... to stay mentally fit.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0839</u> <u>a1009</u>

Based on TOP, Welle1, X304

(Continue with question 106)

Filter: employment intended

84. There are several reasons why people want to work during their retirement. To what extent are the following reasons true for you?					
One reason is ...					
	Does not apply at all	Does rather not apply	Does rather apply	Does apply completely	
... to continue to earn money.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0841</u> <u>a1011</u>
... to feel needed.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0842</u> <u>a1012</u>
... to socialize with other people.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0843</u> <u>a1013</u>
... recognition and appreciation.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0844</u> <u>a1014</u>
... sharing knowledge and experience.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0845</u> <u>a1015</u>
... that I enjoy working.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0846</u> <u>a1016</u>
... to have a regular daily routine.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0847</u> <u>a1017</u>
... further development and further education.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0848</u> <u>a1018</u>
... to stay mentally fit.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0849</u> <u>a1019</u>

Based on TOP, Welle1, X304
(Continue with question 106)

Filter: not currently interested in gainful employment

85. To what extent are the following reasons true for you?					
During my retirement, I don't want to work anymore because...					
	Does not apply at all	Does rather not apply	Does rather apply	Does apply completely	
... I don't enjoy working.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0851</u> <u>a1021</u>
... I have no opportunities in the labor market.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0852</u> <u>a1022</u>
... I have health problems.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0853</u> <u>a1023</u>
... I have to look after a sick or dependent person.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0854</u> <u>a1024</u>
... I want to spend more time with my family.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0855</u> <u>a1025</u>
... I want more time for myself.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0856</u> <u>a1026</u>
... it is not financially necessary.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0857</u> <u>a1027</u>
... I have worked enough.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0858</u> <u>a1028</u>
... I would not get a work permit, because I am here as pensioner with a corresponding residence permit.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae0859</u> <u>a1029</u>
... It would be very disadvantageous from a tax or social law point of view, since the transfer of pensions is not so easily possible if you receive additional foreign pension or income.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae08510</u> <u>a10210</u>

Based on TOP, Welle1, X309, X310
(Continue with question 106)

Page 54: Your current employment situation

[Block to students]

86. Are you currently attending university or school?	<u>ae086</u>
I am attending university	<u>a103</u> 1
I am attending school (Continue with question 106)	2

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, Wave 8, F2

Page 55: Your current employment situation

87. What degree does your current study lead to?		<u>ae087</u>
		<u>a104</u>
Bachelor		1
Master		2
State examination		3
Doctorate/Ph.D.		4
Other university degree		5

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 5.

88. How many semesters (including the current semester) have you been enrolled in a university?		<u>ae088</u>
		<u>a105</u>
<p>This refers to the semesters in your current studies plus, if true, semesters completed in another study, as well as semesters on leave and practical semesters.</p> <p>If you are studying in a different study structure (e.g. with trimesters), try to convert this according to the semester logic (2 semesters per year).</p> <p>.....</p>		

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 7.

89. And how many semesters (including the current semester) have you been enrolled in your current studies?		<u>ae089</u>
		<u>a106</u>
<p>If you are studying in a different study structure (e.g. with trimesters), try to convert this according to the semester logic (2 semesters per year).</p> <p>.....</p>		

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 7.

90. Are your current studies in [country_v1] a stay abroad while studying at a German university or are you mainly studying at the current university?		<u>ae090</u>
		<u>a107</u>
Stay abroad while studying at a German university		1
Studies are mainly carried out at the current university in "ae001.shown" (Continue with question 93)		2
The study took mainly place abroad (Continue with question 93)		3

Page 56: Your current employment situation

91. Is your current stay abroad in the country where you live in mandatory in your curriculum?	<u>ae091</u> <u>a108</u>
Yes	1
No, it was not mandatory, but it was supported by the course structure (e.g. a mobility or practical semester)	2
No, it was not mandatory and was not supported by the course structure	3

Based on DAAD Student Survey 2017, B4

92. Is your current stay abroad part of one of the following organized mobility programs?	<u>ae092</u> <u>a109</u>
TEMPUS	1
ERASMUS (MUNDUS)	2
LINGUA	3
Other mobility program	4
No	5

Page 57: Your current employment situation

[Back to all students!]

93. How do you finance your studies?		
(Multiple nominations possible)		
Parental support	0/1	<u>ae0931</u> <u>a1101</u>
BAföG/student grant	0/1	<u>ae0932</u> <u>a1102</u>
Educational credit/student loan	0/1	<u>ae0933</u> <u>a1103</u>
Scholarship (e.g. study foundation, party-affiliated foundation, church foundation, etc.)	0/1	<u>ae0934</u> <u>a1104</u>
Employment before/during studies	0/1	<u>ae0935</u> <u>a1105</u>
Other	0/1	<u>ae09388</u> <u>a11088</u>

Based on SOEP 2014 F 147

94. If you compare your current personal situation with that before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in Germany	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in Germany	Not applicable	
The quality of classes in general	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0941</u> <u>a1111</u>
The teaching of practical vocational skills	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0942</u> <u>a1112</u>
The teaching of skills to work independently	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0943</u> <u>a1113</u>
The costs to study/Tuition	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0944</u> <u>a1114</u>
The reputation of universities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0945</u> <u>a1115</u>
The Mentoring of students	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae0946</u> <u>a1116</u>

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 369.

(Continue with question 106)

Page 58: Your current employment situation

[Block of people in apprenticeship, vocational training/continuing education, further training]

95. In which professional field do you complete your training?	<u>ae095</u> <u>a112</u>
<p>Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not "commercial employee", but: "forwarding clerk", not "worker", but: "machine metalworker".</p> <p>If you do not know the German name, please try to describe your profession.</p>	

SOEP 2017 | 52 SOEP or previously IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

96. Which industry does your company belong to? Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>ae096</u> <u>a113</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic service activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

53s. Which industry does your company belong to?	<u>ae096s</u> <u>a113s</u>
Short free text	<input type="checkbox"/>

97. How many hours per week are stipulated in your contract (excluding overtime)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No fixed working time	1 ae097a a114a
Hours per week:	2 ae097 a144

SOEP 2017 | 79

98. And how many hours do you generally work, including any overtime?	
Hours per week:	ae098 a115

SOEP 2017 | 80

99. What was your average monthly gross earnings last month?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Gross earnings mean income before deduction of taxes and social security

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae099a</u> <u>a116a</u>
Gross earnings (in euros)	2 <u>ae099</u> <u>a116</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

100. What was your average monthly net earnings last month?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Net earnings mean income after deduction of taxes, social security, and unemployment and health insurance.

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ae100a</u> <u>a117a</u>
Net earnings (in euro)	2 <u>ae100</u> <u>a117</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

Page 61: Your current employment situation

101. What has changed in relation to your employer as a way of moving abroad? Your current employer is ...		<u>ae101</u> <u>a118</u>
... the same employer as in Germany		1
... a subsidiary of the last employer in Germany		2
... a completely different employer than in Germany		3
It's not applicable for me.		-2

102. Have you been sent by your employer?		<u>ae102</u> <u>a119</u>
Yes		1
No		2

103. Approximately how many people does the company employ as a whole?		<u>ae103</u> <u>a120</u>
This does not refer to a local unit of the company, but to the entire company.		
Less than 5 employees,		1
From 5 up to, but less than 10 employees		2
From 10 up to, but less than 20 employees		3
From 20 up to less, but than 100 employees		4
From 100 up to less than, but 200 employees		5
From 200 up to, but less than 2000 employees		6
2000 or more employees		7

SOEP 2017 | 62

Page 62: Your current employment situation

104. Is your current stay abroad part of one of the following organized mobility programs?		<u>ae104</u> <u>a121</u>
TEMPUS		1
ERASMUS (MUNDUS)		2
LINGUA		3
Other mobility program		4
No		5

105. If you compare your current professional situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in Germany	Bes- ser	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in Germany	Not applicable	
The quality of your training or further education in general	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1051</u> <u>a1221</u>
The costs of your training or further education	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1052</u> <u>a1222</u>
Your wage	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1053</u> <u>a1223</u>
Your career opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1054</u> <u>a1224</u>
The safety of your workplace	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1055</u> <u>a1225</u>

(Continue with question 106)

Page 63: Your current financial situation

Now we are interested in the financial situation of your budget as a whole.

106. Which of the descriptions on this card comes closest to how you feel about your household's income nowadays?		<u>ae106</u>
		<u>a123</u>
Living comfortably on present income		1
Coping on present income		2
Finding it difficult on present income		3
Finding it very difficult on present income		4

ESS 2016 HINCFEL F42

107. If you compare your current financial situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in Germany	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in Germany	Not applicable	
Your standard of living	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1071</u> <u>a1241</u>
Your personal income	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1072</u> <u>a1242</u>
Your household income	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ae1073</u> <u>a1243</u>

Page 64: **General questions about your personality**

Now we have a few general questions about you.

108.	Please indicate your gender:	<u>ae108</u>
		<u>a125</u>
	Male	1
	Female	2

109.	Please indicate your year of birth:	<u>ae109</u>
		<u>a126</u>
	Drop - Down (1940-2002)	

110.	What is your current status of residence?	<u>ae110</u>
		<u>a127</u>
	I entered as a tourist	1
	I have a temporary residence permit/ visa	2
	I have an open-ended residence permit/ visa	3
	I have the nationality of the country which I currently live in	4
	As a German citizen, I do not need a residence permit / visa	5
	I have a diplomatic status	6
	Other	88

Page 65: **General questions about your personality**

111.	Were you born in Germany?	<u>ae111</u>
		<u>a128</u>
	Yes (Continue with question 113)	1
	No	2

[Opens if 111=2]

112.	When did you first move to Germany?	<u>ae112</u>
		<u>a129</u>
	Drop - Down [2018-1940]	

113.	Do you have the German citizenship?	<u>ae113</u>
		<u>a130</u>
	Yes	1
	No (Continue with question 115)	0

[Opens if 113=1]

114.	How did you acquire the German citizenship?	<u>ae114</u>
		<u>a131</u>
	By birth	1
	By the status as a (late) emigrant (in his own person or as a family member of late emigrants)	2
	Through naturalization	3
	Adoption by German parents / a German parent	4

115. What type of degree/certificate/diploma did you obtain? (for foreign degrees please indicate German equivalent)?		<u>ae115</u> <u>a132</u>
Please specify only the highest school degree achieved!		
I do not have a school degree (Continue with question 118)		1
Secondary school degree		2
Intermediate school degree		3
Technical college entrance qualification (completion of a technical secondary school)		4
Abitur (university entrance qualification)		5
Other school degree, namely		88

SOEP 2017 | F22

115s What other type of degree/certificate/diploma did you obtain?	<u>ae115s</u> <u>a132s</u>
Short free text	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 67: General questions about your personality

[Opens if 115 is nonzero 1]

116. Did you obtain this school degree/certificate/diploma in Germany?	<u>ae116</u> <u>a133</u>
Yes	1
No, in the country where I currently live {ae001.shown} (Continue with question 118)	0
No, in another country (Continue with question 118)	2

Based on ALWA (asinaus)

[Opens if 116=1]

117. Did you attend school in any country other than Germany for at least one month during your time of school?	<u>ae117</u> <u>a134</u>
Yes	1
No	0

Based on ALWA (asat)

Page 68: **General questions about your personality**

118. Did you finish vocational training or university/higher education?	<u>ae118</u> <u>a135</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 122)	0

SOEP migrant sample F151 with focus on in Germany; SOEP 2017 F17 with focus on 31.12.2015.

[Opens if 118=1]

119. What kind of training or degree was this (please indicate the German equivalent for foreign degrees)?	<u>ae119</u> <u>a136</u>
Please indicate only the highest level of education or study attained!	
Doctrine	1
Vocational school, commercial school, school of health care	2
Technical School	3
Civil servant training	4
University of Applied Sciences, Vocational Academy	5
University	6
Other university degree	7
Doctorate, Ph.D.	8
Other degree	88

120. Did you obtain this degree in Germany?	<u>ae120</u> <u>a137</u>
Yes	1
No, in the country where I currently live (Continue with question 122)	0
No, in another country (Continue with question 122)	2

[Opens if 120 =1]

121. Did you complete at least one month of your training or study abroad?	<u>ae121</u> <u>a138</u>
Yes	1
No	0

Based on ALWA (abat)

<p>122. Is any language other than German spoken in the country where you currently live?</p> <p>This is the language that is predominantly spoken in the region in which you currently live.</p>	<p><u>ae122</u></p> <p><u>a139</u></p>
Yes	1
No	0

[Opens if 122=1]

<p>123. How well do you assess your knowledge of the language of the country in which you currently live?</p> <p>This is the language that is predominantly spoken in the region where you now live.</p>	<p><u>ae123</u></p> <p><u>a140</u></p>
Native language	1
Very good	2
Rather good	3
Medium	4
Rather bad	5
Very bad	6

Page 70: Some questions about your partner

[Block: Information about your partner (If question 41 = yes)]

124. Did you partner finish vocational training or university/higher education?	<u>ae124</u> <u>a141</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 126)	0
I don't know	98

[Opens if 124=1]

125. What kind of training or degree was this (please indicate the German equivalent for foreign degrees)?	<u>ae125</u> <u>a142</u>
Please indicate only the highest level of education or study attained!	
Doctrine	1
Vocational school, commercial school, school of health care	2
Technical School	3
Civil servant training	4
University of Applied Sciences, Vocational Academy	5
University	6
Other university degree	7
Doctorate, Ph D	8
Other degree	88
I don't know	98

126.	Is your partner currently in employment? What describes his or her situation best (in the last seven days)?	<u>ae126</u> <u>a143</u>
<p>Please specify only the activity that best describes the situation of your partner. If they are pursuing more than one activity, please indicate the activity for which they spend the most time.</p>		
Working full-time		1
In part-time employment		2
Self-employed / freelance		3
Low or irregular employed		4
On maternity leave / parental leave		5
Retired / Pension / Early retirement		6
Housemaker		7
In vocational training / continuing education		8
unemployed		9
Student (School or University)		10
Other		88
I don't know		-2

[Back to everyone!]

127. In which country were your parents born?					
	Germany	In the country where I currently live (ae001.shown)	Other country [Please specify]	I don't know	
Father	1	2	3	-2	<u>ae1271</u> <u>a1441</u>
Mother	1	2	3	-2	<u>ae1272</u> <u>a1442</u>

[Opens if 127.1= 3]

1271s. Please tell us the country of birth of your father:	<u>ae1271s</u> <u>a1441s</u>
.....	

[Opens if 127.2= 3]

1272s. Please tell us the country of birth of your mother:	<u>ae1272s</u> <u>a1442s</u>
.....	

Here are some questions about your attitudes towards different topics, your personality and your well-being. These individual perspectives and experiences can be naturally quite different in humans. It is of particular interest to our project to learn more about this diversity.

128.	How would you describe your current health?	<u>ae128</u> <u>a145</u>
	Very good	1
	Well	2
	Satisfactory	3
	Less good	4
	Bad	5

SOEP 2017 | F 158

129. The following statements apply to different attitudes towards life and the future. To what degree to you personally agree with the following statements?								
Please answer according to the following scale: 1 means disagree completely, and 7 means agree completely.								
	Disagree completely						Agree completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
How my life goes depends on me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ae1291</u> <u>a1471</u>
One has to work hard in order to succeed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ae1292</u> <u>a1472</u>
I frequently have the experience that other people have a controlling influence over my life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ae1293</u> <u>a1473</u>
What a person achieves in life is above all a question of fate or luck	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ae1294</u> <u>a1474</u>

SOEP I 2015 5; Selection of four items based on the "Internal-Externale-Control-Conviction-4 (IE-4)" instrument; cf. Kovaleva, Beierlein, Kemper, & Rammstedt of GESIS

130. How often do you...						
	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
... miss the company of others?	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae1301</u> <u>a1481</u>
... feel left out?	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae1302</u> <u>a1482</u>
... feel socially isolated?	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ae1303</u> <u>a1483</u>

SOEP 2017 | F7

131. And now we want to know how strongly you feel connected to certain places or regions and their citizens. How strongly do you feel connected to...					
	Strongly identifying	Rather identifying	Rather not identifying	Not identifying at all	
... your municipality (city) in the country in which you currently live. ae001.shown and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae1311</u> <u>a1491</u>
... the country in which you currently live, ae001.shown as a whole and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae1312</u> <u>a1492</u>
... your community of origin (city) in Germany and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae1313</u> <u>a1493</u>
... Germany as a whole and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae1314</u> <u>a1497</u>
... of the European Union and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ae1315</u> <u>a1498</u>


Based on Allbus 2016 F121

<p>132. Are you generally a person who is willing to take risks or do you try to avoid taking risks? <u>ae131</u> <u>a150</u></p> <p>Please answer on the following scale, where the value is 0 "not at all willing to take risks" and the value 10 "very willing to take risks". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment.</p>											
not at all willing to take risks											very willing to take risks
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SOEP-I 2017 F5

<p>133. In conclusion, we would like to ask you about your satisfaction with your life in general. <u>ae132</u> <u>a151</u></p> <p>How satisfied are you with your life, all things considered?</p> <p>Please answer again on the following scale, where 0 means "completely dissatisfied" and 10 means "Completely satisfied". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment.</p>											
completely dissatisfied											completely satisfied
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SOEP I 2017 205 for question part 1.

<p>134. If you have any comments about the survey, please use the following box. You can tell us here what you noticed or went through your mind during the survey. This can be suggestions, hints, additional information, concerns or simply your opinion. We will try to use these hints and include them in the following waves of interviews.</p>	<p><u>ae133</u> <u>a152</u></p>
	

Page 77: Re-contact

We want to get a better understanding of how the lives of people who go abroad or move to Germany from abroad develop. Therefore, we would like to ask you again about your life situation. Next time we would contact you in about half a year.

1 Do you agree that we may contact you again as part of our project?	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 78: Re-contact

We want to get a better understanding of how the lives of people who go abroad or move to Germany from abroad develop. Therefore, we would like to ask you again about your life situation. Next time we would contact you in about half a year.

2 Do you agree that we may contact you again as part of our project?	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

3 In order to reach you as easily and easily as possible, we would like to contact you via e-mail in the future.

Please provide an e-mail address that will best reach you:

Your e-mail address will be used by us only to contact you as part of our project. It will be kept strictly confidential and will not be passed on to third parties. It will not be merged with your information from the online questionnaire.

Short free text



4 In order to reach you as easily and easily as possible, we would be happy to contact you by e-mail in the future.

Please provide an e-mail address that will best reach you:

Your e-mail address will be used by us only to contact you as part of our project. It will be kept strictly confidential and will not be passed on to third parties. It will not be merged with your information from the online questionnaire.

Short free text



5 Even if contacting via e-mail is particularly straightforward and easy, this connection may not work.

Would you be willing to provide additional contact information in such cases?

Your contact information will be used by us only to contact you as part of our project. It will be kept strictly confidential and will not be passed on to third parties. It will not be merged with your information from the online questionnaire.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No, I don't want to provide any more contact information. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

6 Please enter the contact information here: .

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Your landline number | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Your mobile phone number | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| an alternative mobile phone number (if available) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Your alternate e-mail address (if available) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

7 We would be pleased if you would also provide us with your postal address, where we can contact you. In order for us to have complete information, we ask you to not only give us your address, but also your first and last name:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Surname | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Address addition (if necessary) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Street and house number | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Postal code | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| City | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Country | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8 You did not provide an e-mail address. Alternatively, we would like to contact you by phone if necessary. Please provide the relevant information here:	
Your landline number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your mobile phone number	<input type="checkbox"/>
An alternative mobile phone number (if available)	<input type="checkbox"/>

9 You did not provide an e-mail address. Alternatively, we would like to contact you by phone if necessary. Please provide the relevant information here:	
Your landline number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your mobile phone number	<input type="checkbox"/>
An alternative mobile phone number (if available)	<input type="checkbox"/>

10 We would be pleased if you would also provide us with your postal address, where we can contact you. In order for us to have complete information, we ask you to not only give us your address, but also your first and last name:

Name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Surname	<input type="checkbox"/>
Address addition (if necessary)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Street and house number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Postal code	<input type="checkbox"/>
City	<input type="checkbox"/>
Country	<input type="checkbox"/>

11 It is a pity that we are not allowed to contact you again. There may be many reasons for this. If you like, here is the opportunity to give us a brief hint as to why you have made your decision. Such information is particularly valuable to us in terms of future studies. Thank you very much.

Long free text



12 Thank you for taking the time to answer our questions.

As a small "thank you" for your support, we will give away a total of 20 x 500 € among all participants in February 2019! Would you like to take part in the raffle?

The winners will be notified after the draw scheduled for February 2019. You will then be able to decide whether your prize should be transferred to you as a winner (via PayPal*), whether you want an Amazon voucher, or whether you want to donate your prize to a non-profit organization.

The transfers are planned as PayPal money transfers for data protection and cost reasons. If you would like to transfer money to a bank account, please let us know when you announce your profit.

Legal redress is excluded. Participation is only possible once per person, participants in the study are excluded. The winners will be drawn by a notary. Further information can also be found on the homepage www.studie.international-mobil.de in February 2019.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Yes, I would like to take part in the raffle | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No, I don't want to take part in the raffle | <input type="checkbox"/> |

13 In order for us to inform you in the event of a profit, we need appropriate contact information from you. For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which we can contact you, and if necessary, also provide us with your name and telephone number for any queries:

The provision of your contact details will be treated strictly confidentially and will not be passed on to third parties.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

14 In order for us to inform you in the event of a profit, we need appropriate contact information from you. For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which we can contact you, and if necessary, also provide us with your name and telephone number for any queries:

The provision of your contact details will be treated strictly confidentially and will not be passed on to third parties.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

15 Thank you for taking the time to answer our questions. You can choose between the following options:

Amazon Voucher	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer via PayPal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Donation for a charitable purpose (an organization can be chosen by you from a preselection)	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would like to do without the 'thank you'	<input type="checkbox"/>

16 In which country or amazon platform would you like to redeem the voucher?

Please note: Unfortunately, the Amazon voucher is not available in all countries. Please also note that the actual voucher value in countries outside the European currency area also depends on the respective exchange rates and additional fees, and therefore there may be discrepancies.

Germany (amazon.de)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Australia (amazon.au)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Brazil (amazon.com.br)	<input type="checkbox"/>
China (amazon.cn)	<input type="checkbox"/>
France (amazon.fr)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Canada (amazon.ca)	<input type="checkbox"/>
India (amazon.in)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Italy (amazon.it)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Japan (amazon.co.jp)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mexico (amazon.com.mx)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Netherlands (amazon.nl)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Austria (amazon.at)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spain (amazon.es)	<input type="checkbox"/>
United Kingdom (amazon.co.uk)	<input type="checkbox"/>
United States (amazon.com)	<input type="checkbox"/>

17 In order to send you the voucher, we need your contact information.

For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which we can contact you, and if necessary, also provide us with your name and telephone number for any queries:

The provision of your contact details will be treated strictly confidentially and will not be passed on to third parties.

The voucher will be sent to you within the next 14 days. Please understand that shipping may be delayed in the event of a large volume.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

18 In order to send you the voucher, we need your contact information.

For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which we can contact you, and if necessary, also provide us with your name and telephone number for any queries:

The provision of your contact details will be treated strictly confidentially and will not be passed on to third parties.

The voucher will be sent to you within the next 14 days. Please understand that shipping may be delayed in the event of a large volume.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

19 In order to send you our "Thank you" in the amount of 10 Euro via PayPal, we need your contact information. For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which the money transfer can be processed via PayPal. Please also give us your name and phone number for any queries:

PayPal will contact you using the e-mail address provided. By providing your e-mail address, you agree that we will forward it to PayPal for the purpose of transferring funds.

The information provided to your contact details will be kept strictly confidential and will not be associated with your answers in the survey.

Please also note: In order to receive our "Thank you", it may be necessary to set up a PayPal account (if not already available). For more information on bank transfers via PayPal, please call www.paypal.com.

The transfer to your PayPal account will be made within the next 14 days. Please understand that the transfer may be delayed in the event of a large amount of money.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

20 In order to send you our "Thank you" in the amount of 10 Euro via PayPal, we need your contact information. For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which the money transfer can be processed via PayPal. Please also give us your name and phone number for any queries:

PayPal will contact you using the e-mail address provided. By providing your e-mail address, you agree that we will forward it to PayPal for the purpose of transferring funds.

The information provided to your contact details will be kept strictly confidential and will not be associated with your answers in the survey.

Please also note: In order to receive our "Thank you", it may be necessary to set up a PayPal account (if not already available). For more information on bank transfers via PayPal, please call www.paypal.com.

The transfer to your PayPal account will be made within the next 14 days. Please understand that the transfer may be delayed in the event of a large amount of money.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

21 Please select one of the following organizations/initiatives to which we should submit your donation of 10 euros:

From February 2019, you can find out about the total amount of donations we have transferred to the respective organizations on our homepage (www.studie.international-mobil.de)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| UNICEF (www.unicef.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Doctors Without Borders (www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| German Nature Conservation Association (www.nabu.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| German Cancer Aid (www.krebshilfe.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Stiftung Deutsche Sporthilfe (www.sporthilfe.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Viva con Agua (www.vivaconagua.org) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

22 Please select one of the following organizations/initiatives to which we should submit your donation of 10 euros:

From February 2019, you can find out about the total amount of donations we have transferred to the respective organizations on our homepage (www.studie.international-mobil.de)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| UNICEF (www.unicef.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Doctors Without Borders (www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| German Nature Conservation Association (www.nabu.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| German Cancer Aid (www.krebshilfe.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Stiftung Deutsche Sporthilfe (www.sporthilfe.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Viva con Agua (www.vivaconagua.org) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

15.6 Remigrant questionnaire and codebook

*Reader information: The SUF variable can be found to the right of the corresponding question or item in the second row

Page 2: **Your move to Germany**

[Screening questions for Paneltransition]

According to the registration office ("Einwohnermeldeamt"), you moved your residence from abroad to Germany some time ago. Just to be sure:

0. Are you currently living in Germany?	<u>ar000</u> <u>a000</u>
Yes (Continue with question 1.1)	1
No (Continue with question "change side")	2

Page 3: Your move to Germany

[Switch Side]

You have indicated that you do not (any longer) live in Germany.

We therefore assume that you have recently lived in Germany but are now living abroad again.

[If this is the case, please click here.](#) [*→ Forwarding to Emigrant Questionnaire*]

If you are currently living in Germany, please click on the button in the bottom right corner.

Thank you very much!

We are interested in which country you lived before.

1.1 In which country did you last live in?	<u>ar0011</u> <u>a0011</u>
Drop-down list (with the option of other open specification as the last answer option)	

If selected "other country"

1.1s [Open] In which country did you last live in?	<u>ar0011s</u> <u>a0011s</u>

No selection: Soft-Reminder pop-up window→→

The question of the country in which you lived before moving to Germany is of particular interest for us. We would therefore be very pleased if you could give us this information.

1.2 In which country did you last live in?	<u>ar0012</u>
This only refers to your last stay abroad.	<u>a0012</u>
Drop-down list (with the option of other open specification as the last answer option)	

If selected "other country"

1.2s [Open] In which country did you last live in?	<u>ar0012s</u>
	<u>a0012s</u>

2 When did you move to Germany?	
Please specify the month and year.	
Drop-down menu Month	Drop-down menu Year (2018-1940)
<u>ar0021</u>	<u>ar0022</u>
<u>a0021</u>	<u>a0022</u>

3 How long did you live abroad?		<u>ar003</u>
This only refers to <u>your last</u> stay abroad.		<u>a003</u>
Less than a year		1
1 to under 2 years		2
2 to under 5 years		3
5 and longer		4

Page 7: Your motives and reasons for your last move to Germany

4 There are many possible reasons to move back to Germany. The following are different motives for moving to Germany. Please tell us how important these reasons were for your decision to move to Germany.

Please answer on the following scale, where a value of 1 means "Not at all important" and the value 6 "Very important". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment. For reasons that do not apply to you, please select "Not applicable".

	Not at all important	1	2	3	4	5	Very important	6	Not applicable	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		
Own professional reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0041</u> <u>a0051</u>
Professional reasons of my partner	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0042</u> <u>a0052</u>
Other reasons regarding the partnership	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0043</u> <u>a0053</u>
Family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0044</u> <u>a0054</u>
Financial reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0045</u> <u>a0055</u>
Dissatisfaction with life in the country in which I lived	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0046</u> <u>a0056</u>
Educational or training-related reasons / studies	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0047</u> <u>a0057</u>
For reasons of my personal lifestyle (e.g. better climate, different way of life, gaining new experiences)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0048</u> <u>a0058</u>
Recent political developments in the country where I lived "cr001.shown"	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar0049</u> <u>a0059</u>
Social security/support (e.g. health/care, welfare, childcare)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar00410</u> <u>a00510</u>
[If the 'cr 001.shown' = United Kingdom]	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		<u>ar00411</u> <u>a00511</u>
The UK's exit from the EU (Brexit)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	-2		

Based on SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 25 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 F25

5 Was your stay abroad in the country you lived in planned for a limited time only?

ar005
a006

Yes	1
No	2

Some time ago, you moved back to Germany from abroad. First, we are interested in how you have experienced the time since your arrival in Germany.

6 Now please think about the first weeks and months in Germany: How easy or difficult did u set foot?						<u>ar006</u> <u>a007</u>
Please answer using the following scale, where a value of 1 means "Very difficult" and the value 7 means "Very easy". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment.						
Very difficult 1	2	3	4	5	6	Very easy
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 9: Your personal situation before your moved to Germany

And now we have some questions about your personal situation before you moved to Germany. If you look back, what was your situation like **three months before you moved back to Germany?**

First, we are interested in your family and partnership.

7 Were you in serious partnership before moving to Germany?	<u>ar007</u>
	<u>a008</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you moved back to Germany.	
Yes (Continue with question 9)	1
No	0

SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 F85

8 If you were Single, what was your marital status back then?	<u>ar008</u>
	<u>a009</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you moved back to Germany.	
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.	
Married, separated	3
Registered partnership, separated	4
Single	5
Divorced	6
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased	8

(Continue with question 12)

SOEP I 2017 F187

9 What was your marital status back then?	<u>ar009</u>
	<u>a010</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you moved back to Germany.	
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.	
Married	1
Registered partnership	2
Married, separated	3
Registered partnership, separated	4
Single	5
Divorced	6
Registered partnership annulled	7
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased	8

Based on SOEP I 2017 F187

10 Did your partnership extend beyond your move to Germany?	<u>ar010</u>
	<u>a011</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 12)	0

SOEP Migranten First Survey 2015 F86

Page 10: Your decision to move to Germany

A partnership, whether it is a marriage or a relationship, can sometimes have more, sometimes less influence on our decisions. Therefore, we ask you to remember the time before you left the country in which you lived, specifically the time of the decision-making process.

11 When you think of your decision to move back to Germany, who was the driving force? You or your partner?	<u>ar011</u> <u>a012</u>
My Partner	1
Myself	2
Both equally	3
I don't know	-2

SOEP Migrants First survey 2015 87

12 What was it like after you moved to Germany: Which of you both moved first or did you move together?	<u>ar012</u> <u>a013</u>
My partner was already living in Germany when we met	1
My partner moved before me to Germany	2
My partner moved after me to Germany	3
We moved to Germany at the same time	4
My partner still lives in the country where I lived	5
My partner lives in another country	6

SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

Page 11: Your living situation before moving to Germany

Your living situation at that time - **three months before you moved back to** Germany – is also interesting for us.

<p>13 How many people lived in your household permanently at the time, including yourself?</p> <p>Please refer to your situation three months before you have moved back to Germany. If you lived in a shared flat, please select "1". Please also think of all children living in the household.</p>	<p><u>ar013</u> <u>a014</u></p>
<p><u>Drop Down Menu (1-20)</u></p>	

Page 12: Your living situation before moving to Germany

14 Now we would like to know more: Who lived in your household permanently, except you?

How do you relate to these people (e.g. Your father, your daughter, your partner, your mother)?

Please refer to your situation three months before you moved back to Germany.

	Relationship	Birth
First person	List	Drop
Second person	List	1900-2018
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
Twentieth person	List	List
	<u>ar0141 1 to ar01420 1</u> <u>a0151 1 to a01520 1</u>	<u>ar0141 2 to ar01420 2</u> <u>a0151 2 to a01520 2</u>

Based on ESS 2016 F0_HH_1-F0_HH_12

Items from the Drop-Down list:

- Partner
- Daughter
- Son
- Father
- Mother
- Father
- Mother
- Grandson
- Other relatives
- Other unrelated person

15 How many citizens lived in your town in the country where you lived in?	<u>ar015</u> <u>a016</u>
Please refer to your situation three months before you have moved back to Germany.	
More than 1,000,000 inhabitants	1
100,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants	2
10,000 to 100,000 inhabitants	3
Less than 10,000 inhabitants	4

Based on ALLBUS 2016 F119 and ESS2016 DOMICIL F14

Page 14: Your language skills

And now we are interested in the language you spoke during your time abroad.

16 Was a language other than German spoken in the country where you last lived abroad?	<u>ar016</u> <u>a017</u>
This is the language that is predominantly spoken in the region where you lived at that time.	
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 18)	2

17 How well do you rate your knowledge of the language in the country you last lived in?	<u>ar017</u> <u>a018</u>
This is the language that is predominantly spoken in the region where you lived in at that time.	
Native language	1
Very good	2
Rather good	3
Mediocre	4
Rather bad	5
Very bad	6

Page 15: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

Now we are interested in your professional situation **three months before you moved back to Germany.**

18 What was your main activity? What describes your situation the best at the time? I was...		<u>ar018</u> <u>a019</u>
If you have done several activities, please indicate the activity for which you have spent the most time.		
Blue- or white-collar worker (Continue with question 26)		1
Civil servants (including judges and professional soldiers) (Continue with question 26)		2
Self-employed or freelancer (Continue with question 20)		3
In first-time in-service training/apprenticeship (Continue with question 41)		4
In further training, retraining or further occupational training (Continue with question 41)		5
Registered unemployed (Continue with question 41)		6
In retirement/early retirement (Continue with question 19)		7
On maternity leave/parental leave (Continue with question 41)		8
Attending school/university/vocational school (Continue with question 35)		9
Voluntary military service, Federal volunteer service or similar (Continue with question 41)		10
Work and Travel, Au Pair or similar (Continue with question 41)		11
Housemaker (Continue with question 41)		12
Other [Please specify]		88

Based on SOEP 2017 I 122

18s. What other activity have you done?	<u>ar018s</u> <u>a019s</u>
(Open indication)	<input type="checkbox"/>

(Continue with question 41)

[Block: Retirement before moving]

19 What was your main activity like just before retirement?	<u>ar019</u> <u>a020</u>
Blue- or white-collar worker (Continue with question 26)	1
Civil servant (including judges and professional soldiers) (Continue with question 26)	2
Self-employed or freelancer (Continue with question 20)	3
Jobseeker/registered unemployed (Continue with question 41)	4
Early retirement/pension (persons with a pension due to disability) (Continue with question 41)	5
In the exemption phase of part-time retirement (Continue with question 41)	6
Housemaker (Continue with question 41)	7
In further education/retraining (Continue with question 41)	8

Transitions and Old Age Potentials (TOP), Wave 1 | X100

Page 17: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

[Block: Self-employed or freelancer before moving]

20 What was your position/occupation at that time?	<u>ar020</u> <u>a021</u>
Please state the exact job title, i.e. not "entrepreneur", but: "head of a metalworking company", not "freelancer", but: "lawyer". Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.	

21 Which industry did your company belong to?	<u>ar021</u>
Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>a022</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic service activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

21s. Which industry did your company belong to?	<u>ar021s</u>
Short free text	<u>a022</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	

Page 18: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

22 How many employees did you have at that time?		<u>ar022</u>
		<u>a023</u>
None		1
1-9		2
10 or more		3

SOEP-2017-I | 57

23 What was your average monthly gross profit back then?		
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given		1 <u>ar023a</u>
		<u>a024a</u>
Gross profit (in euros) was		2 <u>ar023</u>
		<u>a024</u>

24 What was your average monthly net profit back then?		
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given		1 <u>ar024a</u>
		<u>a025a</u>
Net profit (in euros) was (Continue with question 26)		2 <u>ar024</u>
		<u>a025</u>

Page 19: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

25 Would you tell us, if any, which category your average monthly net profit was in?	<u>ar025</u> <u>a026</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

→(Continue with question 41)

[Block: Blue- and white-collar and civil servants before moving]

26 What was your position/occupation at the time?	<u>ar026</u> <u>a027</u>
<p><i>[If civil servants]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not 'civil servants in the higher service', but 'financial officials in the higher service'.</p> <p><i>[If blue/white collar worker]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not "clerk", but: "shipping clerk", not "blue-collar worker", but: "machine metalworker".</p> <p><i>[To both]</i> Please refer to your situation three months before you have gone abroad.</p>	

SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First survey 2015 91 or current activity SOEP 2017 I 52

27 Which industry did your company belong to? Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>ar027</u> <u>a028</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic services activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

27s. Which industry did your company belong to?

ar027s

a028s

Short free text

Page 21: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

28 How many hours per week were stipulated in your contract (excluding overtime)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No fixed working time	1 <u>ar028a</u> <u>a029a</u>
Hours per week.....	2 <u>ar028</u> <u>a029</u>

SOEP 2017 | 79

29 And how many hours did u generally work, including any overtime?	
	<u>ar029</u> <u>a030</u>
Hours per week.....	

SOEP 2017 | 80

30 In your position at work at the time, did you supervise others? In other words, did people work under your direction?	
	<u>ar030</u> <u>a031</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 32)	2

SOEP 2017 | 63

31 How many people worked under your direction?	
	<u>ar031</u> <u>a032</u>

SOEP 2017 | 64

32 What were your average monthly gross earnings back then?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Gross earnings mean income before deduction of taxes and social security.

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1	<u>ar032a</u> <u>a033a</u>
Gross earnings (in euros)	2	<u>ar032</u> <u>a033</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

33 What was your average monthly net earnings in the year before you moved?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Net earnings mean income after deduction of taxes, social security, and unemployment and health insurance.

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1	<u>ar033a</u> <u>a034a</u>
Net earnings (in euro) (Continue with question 41)	2	<u>ar033</u> <u>a034</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

Page 23: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

34 Would you tell us, if any, what category your average monthly net earnings were in?	<u>ar034</u> <u>a035</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

(Continue with question 41)

Page 24: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

[Block: Students before moving]

35 Did you attend university or school?	<u>ar035</u>
	<u>a036</u>
I attended university	1
I attended school (Continue with question 41)	2

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, Wave 8, F2

Page 25: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

36 What degree did the study lead to?	ar036
Bachelor	1
Master	2
State examination	3
Doctorate/Ph.D.	4
Other university degree	88

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 5.

37 Was your studies at that time in the country in which you lived in a stay abroad during your study at a German university or did you study mainly at the university abroad?	ar037
Stay abroad while studying at a German university	1
Studies were mainly carried out at the university in the country in which I lived (Continue with question 40)	2
The study took mainly place abroad (Continue with question 40)	3

[Opens if 37=1]

38 Was your stay in the country where you lived in mandatory in your curriculum?	ar038
Yes	1
No, it was not mandatory, but was supported by the course structure (e.g. a mobility or practical semester)	2
No, it was not mandatory and was not supported by the course structure	3

Based on DAAD Student Survey 2017, B4

39 Was your stay abroad in the country where you lived in part of one of the following organized mobility programs?	ar039
Tempus	1
ERASMUS (MUNDUS)	2
LINGUA	3
Other mobility program	4
No	5

Page 26: Your employment situation before moving to Germany

[Back to all students!]

40 How did you finance your studies in the country you lived in?		
(Multiple nominations possible)		
Parental support	0/1	<u>ar0401</u> <u>a0411</u>
Foreign BAföG/student grant	0/1	<u>ar0402</u> <u>a0412</u>
Educational credit/student loan	0/1	<u>ar0403</u> <u>a0413</u>
Scholarship (e.g. study foundation, party-affiliated foundation, church foundation, etc.)	0/1	<u>ar0404</u> <u>a0414</u>
Employment before/during studies	0/1	<u>ar0405</u> <u>a0415</u>
Other	0/1	<u>ar0408</u> <u>a04188</u>

Based on SOEP 2014 F 147

Page 27: Your previous and future planned stays abroad

Now to another topic: We are interested in your planned stays abroad, both so far and in the future.

41 How much time do you plan to spend in the country where you lived within the next 12 months?	<u>ar041</u> <u>a042</u>
I'm not going to be there at all	1
Less than 1 month	2
1 to 3 months	3
4 to 6 months	4
More than 6 months	5

<p>42 Many people settle in several countries over the course of their lives. What about you? Before you moved to the country where you lived, did you always live in Germany or did you live elsewhere at times?</p>		<p><u>ar042</u> <u>a046</u></p>
<p>This refers to a continuous stay in another country of more than 3 months. Shorter stays, e.g. vacations or visits to relatives, are not meant here.</p>		
I have always lived in Germany before (Continue with question 44)		1
I lived elsewhere once before		2
I lived elsewhere twice before		3
I lived elsewhere three times or more before		4

Based on SOEP 2015 Migration Sample F 6 (first respondent), SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 F 5

43 For how long have you lived abroad?		<u>ar043</u>
If you have lived abroad several times, please refer to the entire duration (including your current stay abroad).		<u>a047</u>
Less than a year		1
1 to under 2 years		2
2 to under5 years		3
5 years and longer		4

Based on Allbus 2016 F055L (also based on SOEP 2015 Migration Sample F 6 (first respondent), SOEP IAB BAMF 2016 5)

Page 30: Your future plans to go abroad

44 Have you seriously been thinking of going abroad again for a long time or for ever?	<u>ar044</u> <u>a049</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 49)	2

Based on SOEP 2014 F 145

Page 31: Your future plans to go abroad

45 How long would you like to stay abroad?		<u>ar045</u>
		<u>a050</u>
A few months		1
A few years		2
Forever		3
<i>I don't know yet</i>		-2

Based on SOEP 2014 F 146

46 Which country do you intend to move to?		<u>ar046</u>
		<u>a051</u>
Back to the country where I lived		1
To another country		2
<i>I don't know yet</i>		-2

Based on SOEP 2014 F 147

Page 32: Your future plans to go abroad

47 Do you intend to move abroad or emigrate within the next 12 months?	<u>ar047</u>
	<u>a052</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 49)	2

Based on SOEP 2014 F 148

[Opens if 47=1]

48 And why do you want to leave Germany (again)?		
Please tick everything that is true. (Multiple nominations possible)		
Own professional reasons	0/1	<u>ar0481</u> <u>a0531</u>
Professional reasons of my partner	0/1	<u>ar0482</u> <u>a0532</u>
Other reasons regarding the partnership	0/1	<u>ar0483</u> <u>a0533</u>
Family reasons (e.g. parental care, childcare assistance)	0/1	<u>ar0484</u> <u>a0534</u>
Financial reasons	0/1	<u>ar0485</u> <u>a0535</u>
Dissatisfaction with life in Germany	0/1	<u>ar0486</u> <u>a0536</u>
Educational or training-related reasons / studies	0/1	<u>ar0487</u> <u>a0537</u>
For reasons of my personal lifestyle (e.g. better climate, other way of life)	0/1	<u>ar0488</u> <u>a0538</u>
Other reasons:	0/1	<u>ar04888</u> <u>a05388</u>

48s. For what other reasons do you want to leave Germany (again)?	
Long free text	<u>ar0489s</u> <u>a05388s</u>

Page 33: Your current life situation

Now we are interested in your current living conditions in Germany. We start with your family situation.

49 Do you currently have a serious partnership?		<u>ar049</u>
		<u>a057</u>
Yes (Continue with question 51)		1
No		2

SOEP I 2017 F188

50 If you are not in a serious partnership, what is your current marital status?		<u>ar050</u>
		<u>a058</u>
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.		
Married, separated		3
Registered partnership, separated		4
Single		5
Divorced		6
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased		8

(Continue with question 52)

51 What is your current marital status?		<u>ar051</u>
		<u>a059</u>
This is only about the official marital status, regardless of the relationship status.		
Married		1
Registered partnership		2
Married, separated		3
Registered partnership, in separation		4
Single		5
Divorced		6
Registered partnership annulled		7
Widowed / life partner from registered partnership deceased		8

SOEP I 2017 F187

52 How many people live in your household permanently, including yourself?

ar052
a060

If you live in a shared flat, please enter "1".
Please also think of all children living in the household.

Drop Down Menu (1-20)

53 Now we would like to know more: who lives in your household permanently except you?		
How do you relate to these people (e.g. Your father, your daughter, your partner, your mother)?		
	Relationship	Birth
First person	List	Drop
Second person	List	1900-2018
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
.....	1	2
Twentieth person	List	List
	<u>ar0531_1 to ar05320_1</u> <u>a0611_1 to a06120_1</u>	<u>ar0531_2 to ar05320_2</u> <u>a0611_2 to a06120_2</u>

Based on ESS 2016 F0_HH_1-F0_HH_12

Items from the Drop-Down list:

- Partner
- Daughter
- Son
- Father
- Mother
- Father
- Mother
- Grandson
- Other relatives
- Other unrelated person

54 How many inhabitants does the place where you currently live have?		<u>ar054</u>
		<u>a062</u>
More than 1,000,000 inhabitants		1
100,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants		2
10,000 to 100,000 inhabitants		3
Less than 10,000 inhabitants		4

55 Where do you live at the moment?		<u>ar055</u>
		<u>a063</u>
In same house / same apartment as before my departure from Germany		1
In the same place or city, but in another apartment		2
In another place / city, but in the same state		3
In a different state than before I left		4

Page 37: Your contacts with friends and relatives

Now we are interested in your group of friends

56 How many close friends would you say that you have?		<u>ar056</u>
		<u>a064</u>
_____	friends	

Based on SOEP 2017 I F6

[Opens if 56>0]

57 How many of these close friends live ...	
_____ in Germany	1 <u>ar0571</u> <u>a0654</u>
_____ in the country where you lived	2 <u>ar0572</u> <u>a0655</u>
_____ in another country	3 <u>ar0573</u> <u>a0656</u>

We are also interested in how regularly you are in contact with your relatives and close friends in Germany

58 How often do you have contact with the following people?

All possible types of contact count here, such as phone calls, messages via messenger or internet, letters/packages or personal visits.

If you have contact with, for example, several siblings, children or friends, please think only of the person with which you are most often in contact.

Please select the category "Not applicable" if you don't have any people in a category.

	Daily	At least ein times a week	At least once per month	Rare	Not appli cable	
(Marriage) Partner	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0581</u> <u>a0661</u>
Parents/in-laws	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0582</u> <u>a0662</u>
Siblings	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0583</u> <u>a0663</u>
Children	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0584</u> <u>a0664</u>
Grandchildren	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0585</u> <u>a0665</u>
Grandparents	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0586</u> <u>a0666</u>
Other relatives (e.g. aunts, uncles, cousins)	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0587</u> <u>a0667</u>
Close friends	1	2	3	4	-2	<u>ar0588</u> <u>a06688</u>

Oriented to Allbus 2016 F 55

Page 40: Your personal situation compared to the situation before you moved back to Germany

59 If you compare your current personal situation with the one before you left the country where you lived, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas of life?						
	Much better than in the Country "cr001.shown"	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in the Country "cr001.shown"	
Your family life	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar0591</u> <u>a0671</u>
Your group of friends and acquaintances	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar0592</u> <u>a0672</u>
Your health	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar0593</u> <u>a0673</u>
Your residential area	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar0594</u> <u>a0674</u>
Your contacts with the neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar0595</u> <u>a0675</u>

Page 41: Your current employment situation

Here are some questions about your current employment in the country where you live.

60 What is your current occupational status? What describes your current situation the best? I was...		<u>ar060</u> <u>a068</u>
If you are in several activities, please indicate the activity for which you spent the most time.		
Blue- or white-collar worker (Continue with question 61)		1
Civil servants (incl. judges and professional soldiers) (Continue with question 61)		2
Self-employed or freelancer (Continue with question 76)		3
Marginal part-time employed ("Mini-Job" up to 450 €) (Continue with question 61)		4
In first-time in-service/apprenticeship (Continue with question 104)		5
In further training, retraining or further occupational training (Continue with question 104)		6
Registered unemployed (Continue with question 84)		7
In retirement/early retirement (Continue with question 89)		8
On maternity leave/parental leave (Continue with question 84)		9
Attending school/university/vocational school (Continue with question 95)		10
Voluntary military service, federal volunteer Service or similar (Continue with question 113)		11
Work and Travel, Au Pair or similar (Continue with question 113)		12
Housemaker (Continue with question 84)		13
Other [Please specify]		88

Based on SOEP 2017 I 122

60s. What other activity are you currently doing?	<u>ar060s</u> <u>a068s</u>
Short free text	

(Continue with question 113)

Page 42: Your current employment situation

[Block: Blue- and white-collar workers and civil servants]

61 Welche berufliche Tätigkeit üben Sie derzeit aus?	<u>ar061</u> <u>a069</u>
<p><i>[If civil servants]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not 'civil servants in the higher service', but 'financial officials in the higher service'.</p> <p><i>[If blue/white collar worker]</i> Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not "clerk", but: "shipping clerk", not "blue-collar worker", but: "machine metalworker".</p> <p><i>[To both]</i> If you do not know the German name, please try to describe your profession.</p>	

SOEP 2017 | 52 SOEP or previously IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

62 Which industry does your company belong to? Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>ar062</u> <u>a070</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic services activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

62s. Which industry does your company belong to?	<u>ar062s</u> <u>a070s</u>
Short free text	

63 How many hours per week are stipulated in your contract (excluding overtime)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No fixed working time	1 <u>ar063a</u> <u>a071a</u>
Hours per week	2 <u>ar063</u> <u>a071</u>

SOEP 2017 | 79

64 And how many hours do you generally work, including any overtime?	
Hours per week	<u>ar064</u> <u>a072</u>

SOEP 2017 | 80

Page 44: Your current employment situation

65 What was your average monthly gross earnings last month?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Gross earnings mean income before deduction of taxes and social security

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1	<u>ar065a</u> <u>a073a</u>
Gross earnings (in euros)	2	<u>ar065</u> <u>a073</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

66 What was your average monthly net earnings last month?

If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.

Net earnings mean income after deduction of taxes, social security, and unemployment and health insurance.

<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1	<u>ar066a</u> <u>a074a</u>
Net earnings (in euro) (Continue with question 68)	2	<u>ar066</u> <u>a074</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

Page 45: Your current employment situation

67 Would you tell us, if any, what category your monthly net earnings are in?	<u>ar067</u> <u>a075</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

SOEP 2017 | 97

Page 46: Your current employment situation

68 Does this job correspond to the occupation for which you were trained?	<u>ar068</u> <u>a076</u>
Yes	1
No	2
Still in education or training	3
I have not been trained for a particular occupation	4

SOEP 2017 | 53

Page 47: Your current employment situation

69 What has changed in relation to your employer as a way of moving to Germany? Your current employer is...	<u>ar069</u> <u>a077</u>
... the same employer as in the country in which you lived	1
... a subsidiary of the last employer in the country in which you lived	2
... a completely different employer than in the country in which you lived (Continue with question 71)	3
Not applicable (Continue with question 71)	-2

70 Have you been sent by your employer?	<u>ar070</u> <u>a078</u>
Yes	1
No	2

71 Do you have a fixed-term or permanent employment contract	<u>ar071</u> <u>a079</u>
Permanent contract	1
Fixed-term contract	2
Not applicable/Do not have an employment contract	-2

SOEP 2017 | 60

Page 48: Your current employment situation

72 In your position at work, do you supervise others? In other words, do people work under your direction?	<u>ar072</u> <u>a080</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 74)	2

SOEP 2017 | 63

[Opens if 72=1]

73 How many people work under your direction?	<u>ar073</u> <u>a081</u>

SOEP 2017 | 64

74 Approximately how many people does the company employ as a whole?	<u>ar074</u> <u>a082</u>
This does not include, if necessary, the local permanent establishment.	
Less than 5 employees	1
From 5 up to, but less than 10 employees	2
From 10 up to, but less than 20 employees	3
From 20 up to, but less than 100 employees	4
From 100 up to, but less than 200 employees	5
From 200 up to, but less than 2000 employees	6
2000 or more employees	7

SOEP 2017 | 62

75 If you compare your professional situation with the one before you left the country where you lived, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in .cr001.shown	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in the "cr001.shown"	Not applicable	
Your wages	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar0751</u> <u>a0831</u>
Your career opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar0752</u> <u>a0832</u>
The safety of your workplace	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar0753</u> <u>a0833</u>
Your decision-making skills	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar0754</u> <u>a0834</u>

(Continue with question 113)

[Block Self-employed/freelancers]

76 What is your current position/occupation? <u>ar076</u> <u>a084</u>
<p>Please state the exact job title, i.e. not "entrepreneur", but: "head of a metalworking company", not "freelancer", but: "lawyer".</p> <p>If you do not know the German name, please try to rewrite the profession.</p>

SOEP 2017 | 52 SOEP or previously IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

77 Which industry does your company belong to? Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>	<u>ar077</u> <u>a085</u>
Construction	1
Mining, quarrying	2
Energy and water supply	3
Provision of financial and insurance services	4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services	5
Provision of other service activities	6
Provision of other economic services activities (administrative and support service activities)	7
Education (and childcare)	8
Accommodation and food service activities	9
Human health and social work activities	10
Real estate activities	11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods	12
Information and communication	13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security	16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods	17
Transportation and storage	18
Other	88

77s. Which industry does your company belong to? <u>ar077s</u> <u>a085s</u>
Short free text <input style="float: right;" type="checkbox"/>

Page 50: Your current employment situation

78 How many employees do you have?		<u>ar078</u>
If you have more than one professional activity, please answer the following questions only for your current main occupation.		<u>a086</u>
None		1
1-9		2
10 or more		3

SOEP-2017-I | 57

79 Does this job correspond to the occupation you were trained?		<u>ar079</u>
Yes		1
No		2
Still in education or training		3
I have not been trained for a particular occupation		4

SOEP 2017 | 53

80 What is your average monthly gross profit?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ar080a</u> <u>a088a</u>
Gross profit (in euros) was	2 <u>ar080</u> <u>a088</u>

81 What is your average monthly net profit?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ar081a</u> <u>a089a</u>
Net profit (in euros) was (Continue with question 83)	2 <u>ar081</u> <u>a089</u>

Page 52: Your current employment situation

82 Would you tell us, if any, what category your average monthly net profit is in?	<u>ar082</u> <u>a090</u>
Less than 500 euros	1
500 to less than 1000 euros	2
1000 to less than 1500 euros	3
1500 to less than 2000 euros	4
2000 to less than 2500 euros	5
2500 to less than 3000 euros	6
3000 to less than 4000 euros	7
4000 to less than 5000 euros	8
5000 to less than 7500 euros	9
7500 Euro and more	10

83 If you compare your professional situation with the one before you left the country where you lived, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in the country .cr001.shown	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in the country	Not applicable	
Your earning opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar0831</u> <u>a0911</u>
Support from public authorities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar0832</u> <u>a0912</u>
Entrepreneurial framework conditions	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar0833</u> <u>a0913</u>

(Continue with question 113)

Page 54: Your current employment situation

[Block to not employed]

84 Have you been working since your arrival in Germany?		<u>ar084</u>
		<u>a092</u>
Yes		1
No		2

85 Do you intend to obtain (or resume) employment in the future?		<u>ar085</u>
		<u>a093</u>
No, definitely not (Continue with question 87)		1
Probably not		2
Probably		3
Yes, definitely		4
Don't know (Continue with question 87)		-2

SOEP 2017 F34

Page 55: Your current employment situation

86 When, approximately, would you like to start working?	ar086
As soon as possible	1
Within the coming year	2
In the next 2 to 5 years	3
In more than 5 years	4

SOEP 2017 F35

Page 56: Your current employment situation

87 If you were currently looking for a new job: Is it or would it be easy, difficult or almost impossible to find an appropriate position?		<u>ar087</u>
		<u>a095</u>
Easy		1
Difficult		2
Almost impossible		3
I don't know		-2

SOEP 2017 F37

88 If you compare your current personal situation with the one before you left the country where you lived, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?						
	Much better than in the country "cr001.shown"	Better	About the same	Worse	Much better than in the country "cr001.shown"	Not applicable
Your chances of finding a job	1	2	3	4	5	-2
						<u>ar0881</u>
						<u>a0961</u>
Your chances of finding a job that suits your education	1	2	3	4	5	-2
						<u>ar0882</u>
						<u>a0962</u>
Your protection as an unemployed	1	2	3	4	5	-2
						<u>ar0883</u>
						<u>a0963</u>

(Continue with question 113)

Page 57: Your current employment situation

[Block to pensioners]

89 Are you currently receiving retirement benefits such as a statutory old-age pension or state pension, a widow's pension or an incapacity pension??	<u>ar089</u> <u>a097</u>
Yes	1
No	0

NEPS SC6 Wave 8: 301

90 Why did you retire?	
Please tick everything that is true. (Multiple nominations possible)	
Reaching the legal age limit	0/1 <u>ar0901</u> <u>a0981</u>
Fulfillment of the eligibility requirements for an old-age pension	0/1 <u>ar0902</u> <u>a0982</u>
Fulfillment of the eligibility requirements for an occupational pension	0/1 <u>ar0903</u> <u>a0983</u>
Received offer for an early retirement scheme	0/1 <u>ar0904</u> <u>a0984</u>
Has been terminated (e.g. early retirement benefits, unemployment benefit, etc.)	0/1 <u>ar0905</u> <u>a0985</u>
Due to my poor health	0/1 <u>ar0906</u> <u>a0986</u>
Due to the poor health of family members or friends	0/1 <u>ar0907</u> <u>a0987</u>
To retire at the same time as spouse or partner	0/1 <u>ar0908</u> <u>a0988</u>
To spend more time with the family	0/1 <u>ar0909</u> <u>a0989</u>
To enjoy life	0/1 <u>ar09010</u> <u>a09810</u>
Other reason	0/1 <u>ar09011</u> <u>a09888</u>

SHARE EP064

91s. Why did you retire?	<u>ar0901s</u> <u>a09888s</u>
Long free text	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 58: Your current employment situation

91 Many people are also employed during retirement, often in form of a secondary employment. What about you?	<u>ar091</u> <u>a099</u>
I am currently working.	1
I intend to start working (Continue with question 93)	2
I am not interested in working (Continue with question 94)	3

Based on NEPS SC6 wave 8: 306

Filter: currently in employment

92 There are several reasons why people are working during their retirement. To what extent are the following reasons true for you? One reason is ...					
	Does not apply at all	Does rather not apply	Does rather apply	Does apply completely	
... to continue to earn money.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0921</u> <u>a1001</u>
... to feel needed	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0922</u> <u>a1002</u>
... to socialize with other people.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0923</u> <u>a1003</u>
... recognition and appreciation.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0924</u> <u>a1004</u>
... sharing knowledge and experience.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0925</u> <u>a1005</u>
... that I enjoy working.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0926</u> <u>a1006</u>
... to have a regular daily routine.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0927</u> <u>a1007</u>
... further development and further education.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0928</u> <u>a1008</u>
... to stay mentally fit.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0929</u> <u>a1009</u>

Based on TOP, Welle1, X304
(Continue with question 113)

Filter: employment intended

93 There are several reasons why people want to work during their retirement. To what extent are the following reasons true for you? One reason is ...					
	Does not apply at all	Does rather not apply	Does rather apply	Does apply completely	
... to continue to earn money.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0931</u> <u>a1011</u>
... to feel needed.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0932</u> <u>a1012</u>
... to socialize with other people.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0933</u> <u>a1013</u>
... recognition and appreciation.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0934</u> <u>a1014</u>
... sharing knowledge and experience.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0935</u> <u>a1015</u>
... that I enjoy working.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0936</u> <u>a1016</u>
... to have a regular daily routine.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0937</u> <u>a1017</u>
... further development and further education.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0938</u> <u>a1018</u>
... to stay mentally fit.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0939</u> <u>a1019</u>

Based on TOP, Welle1, X304
(Continue with question 113)

Filter: not currently interested in gainful employment

94 To what extent are the following reasons true for you? During my retirement, I don't want to work anymore because...					
	Does not apply at all	Does rather not apply	Does rather apply	Does apply completely	
... I don't enjoy working.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0941</u> <u>a1021</u>
... I have no opportunities in the labor market.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0942</u> <u>a1022</u>
... I have health problems.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0943</u> <u>a1023</u>
... I have to look after a sick or dependent person.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0944</u> <u>a1024</u>
... I want to spend more time with my family.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0945</u> <u>a1025</u>
... I want more time for myself.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0946</u> <u>a1026</u>
... it is not financially necessary.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0947</u> <u>a1027</u>
... I have worked enough.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar0948</u> <u>a1028</u>

Based on TOP, Welle1, X309, X310
(Continue with question 113)

[Block to students]

95 Are you currently attending university or school?	<u>ar095</u>
	<u>a103</u>
I am attending university	1
I am attending school (Continue with question 113)	2

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, Wave 8, F2

Page 60: Your current employment situation

96 What degree does your current study lead to?	<u>ar096</u> <u>a104</u>
Bachelor	1
Master	2
State examination	3
Doctorate/Ph.D.	4
Other university degree	5

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 5.

97 How many semesters (including the current semester) have you been enrolled in a university?	<u>ar097</u> <u>a105</u>
<p>This refers to the semesters in your current studies plus, if true, semesters completed in another study, as well as semesters on leave and practical semesters.</p> <p>If you are studying in a different study structure (e.g. with trimesters), try to convert this according to the semester logic (2 semesters per year).</p> <p>.....</p>	

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 7.

98 And how many semesters (including the current semester) have you been enrolled in your current studies?	<u>ar098</u> <u>a106</u>
<p>If you are studying in a different study structure (e.g. with trimesters), try to convert this according to the semester logic (2 semesters per year).</p> <p>.....</p>	

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 7.

99 Are your current studies in Germany a stay abroad while studying at a foreign university or are you mainly studying at the current university?	<u>ar099</u> <u>a107</u>
Stay in Germany while studying at a foreign university	1
Studies are mainly carried out at the current university in Germany (Continue with question 102)	2

Page 61: Your current employment situation

100	Is your current stay abroad in the country where you live in mandatory in your curriculum?	<u>ar100</u> <u>a108</u>
	Yes	1
	No, it was not mandatory, but it was supported by the course structure (e.g. a mobility or practical semester)	2
	No, it was not mandatory and was not supported by the course structure	3
	I don't know	-2

Based on DAAD Student Survey 2017, B4

101	Is your current stay in Germany part of one of the following organized mobility programs?	<u>ar101</u> <u>a109</u>
	Tempus	1
	ERASMUS (MUNDUS)	2
	LINGUA	3
	Other mobility program	4
	No	5
	I don't know	-2

Page 62: Your current employment situation

[Back to all students!]

102 How do you finance your studies?		
(Multiple nominations possible)		
Parental support	0/1	<u>ar1021</u> <u>a1101</u>
BaföG/student grant	0/1	<u>ar1022</u> <u>a1102</u>
Educational credit/student loan	0/1	<u>ar1023</u> <u>a1103</u>
Scholarship (e.g. study foundation, party-affiliated foundation, religious foundation, etc.)	0/1	<u>ar1024</u> <u>a1104</u>
Employment before/during studies	0/1	<u>ar1025</u> <u>a1105</u>
Other	0/1	<u>ar10288</u> <u>a11088</u>
I don't know	0/1	<u>ar10298</u> <u>a11098</u>

Based on SOEP 2014 F 147

103 If you compare your current personal situation with the one before you left the country where you lived, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in the country "cr001.shown"	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in the country "cr001.shown"	Not applicable	
The quality of classes in general	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1031</u> <u>a1111</u>
The teaching of practical vocational skills	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1032</u> <u>a1112</u>
The teaching of skills to work independently	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1033</u> <u>a1113</u>
The costs to study/Tuition	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1034</u> <u>a1114</u>
The reputation of universities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1035</u> <u>a1115</u>
The Mentoring of students	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1036</u> <u>a1116</u>

Based on NEPS Starting Cohort 5, page 369.

(Continue with question 113)

Page 63: Your current employment situation

[Block of people in apprenticeship, vocational training/continuing education, further training]

104	In which professional field do you complete your training?	<u>ar104</u> <u>a112</u>
Please indicate the exact job title, i.e. not "commercial employee", but: "forwarding clerk", not "worker", but: "machine metalworker".		
If you do not know the German name, please try to describe your profession.		

SOEP 2017 | 52 SOEP or previously IAB BAMF 2016 146 or SOEP Migrants First Survey 2015 91

105	Which industry does your company belong to?	<u>ar105</u>
Please select <u>only one answer option.</u>		<u>a113</u>
Construction		1
Mining, quarrying		2
Energy and water supply		3
Provision of financial and insurance services		4
Provision of professional, scientific and technical services		5
Provision of other service activities		6
Provision of other economic services activities (administrative and support service activities)		7
Education (and childcare)		8
Accommodation and food service activities		9
Human health and social work activities		10
Real estate activities		11
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and consumer goods		12
Information and communication		13
Arts, entertainment and recreation		14
Agriculture, forestry and fishing		15
Public administration, defense, compulsory social security		16
Manufacturing, manufacture of goods		17
Transportation and storage		18
Other		88

105s.	Which industry does your company belong to?	<u>ar105s</u>
Short free text		<u>a113s</u>
		<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 64: Your current employment situation

106 How many hours per week are stipulated in your contract (Excluding overtime)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No fixed working time	1 <u>ar106a</u> <u>a114a</u>
Hours per week:	2 <u>ar106</u> <u>a114</u>

SOEP 2017 | 79

107 And how many hours do you generally work, including any overtime?	
Hours per week:	<u>ar107</u> <u>a115</u>

SOEP 2017 | 80

108 What was your average monthly gross earnings last month?	
If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.	
Gross earnings mean income before deduction of taxes and social security	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ar108a</u> <u>a116a</u>
Gross earnings (in euros)	2 <u>ar108</u> <u>a116</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

109 What was your average monthly net earnings last month?	
If you received extra income such as vacation pay or back pay, please do not include this.	
Net earnings mean income after deduction of taxes, social security, and unemployment and health insurance.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No information given	1 <u>ar109a</u> <u>a117a</u>
Net earnings (in euro)	2 <u>ar109</u> <u>a117</u>

SOEP 2017 | 97

110 What has changed in relation to your employer as a way of moving to Germany?		<u>ar110</u>
Your current employer is ...		<u>a118</u>
... the same employer as in the country in which you lived		1
... a subsidiary of the last employer in the country in which you lived		2
... a completely different employer than in the country in which you lived		3
It's not applicable for me.		-2

111 Approximately how many employees does the company employ as a whole?		<u>ar111</u>
This does not refer to a local unit of the company, but to the entire company.		<u>a120</u>
Less than 5 employees		1
From 5 up to, but less than 10 employees		2
From 10 up to, but less than 20 employees		3
From 20 up to less, but than 100 employees		4
From 100 up to less than, but 200 employees		5
From 200 up to, but less than 2000 employees		6
2000 or more employees		7

SOEP 2017 | 62

112 If you compare your current professional situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?							
	Much better than in the country "cr001.shown"	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in the country "cr001.shown"	Not applicable	
The quality of your training or further education in general	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1121</u> <u>a1221</u>
The cost of your training or further education	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1122</u> <u>a1222</u>
Your wage	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1123</u> <u>a1223</u>
Your career opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1124</u> <u>a1224</u>
The safety of your workplace	1	2	3	4	5	-2	<u>ar1125</u> <u>a1225</u>

Now we are interested in the financial situation of your budget as a whole.

113 Which of the descriptions on this card comes closest to how you feel about your household's income nowadays?		ar113
		a123
Living comfortably on present income	1	
Coping on present income	2	
Finding it difficult on present income	3	
Finding it very difficult on present income	4	

ESS 2016 HINCFEL F42

114 If you compare your current financial situation with the one before you left Germany, how do you generally assess the situation in the following areas?						
	Much better than in the country "cr001.shown"	Better	About the same	Worse	Much worse than in the country "cr001.shown"	Not applicable
Your standard of living	1	2	3	4	5	-2
Your personal income	1	2	3	4	5	-2
Your household income	1	2	3	4	5	-2

Now we have a few general questions about you.

115 Please indicate your gender:	<u>ar115</u>
	<u>a125</u>
Male	1
Female	2

116 Please indicate your year of birth:	<u>ar116</u>
	<u>a126</u>
Drop - Down (1940-2002)	

117 Were you born in Germany?	<u>ar117</u>
	<u>a128</u>
Yes (Continue with question 119)	1
No	2

[Open if 117=2]

118 When did you first move to Germany?	<u>ar118</u>
	<u>a129</u>
Drop Down [2018-1940]	

Page 70: **General questions about your personality**

119	Do you have the German citizenship?	<u>ar119</u>
		<u>a130</u>
	Yes	1
	No (Continue with question 121)	0

[Opens if 119=1]

120	How did you acquire the German citizenship?	<u>ar120</u>
		<u>a131</u>
	By birth	1
	By the status as a (late) emigrant (in his own person or as a family member of late emigrants)	2
	Through naturalization	3
	Adoption by German parents / a German parent	4

Page 71: **General questions about your personality**

121 Which type of degree/certificate/diploma did you obtain? (for foreign degrees please indicate German equivalent)?	<u>ar121</u> <u>a132</u>
Please specify only the highest school degree achieved!	
I do not have a school degree (Continue with question 124)	1
Secondary school degree	2
Intermediate school degree	3
Technical college entrance qualification (completion of a technical secondary school)	4
Abitur (university entrance qualification)	5
Other school degree, namely	88

SOEP 2017 | F22

121s. What other type of degree/certificate/diploma did you obtain?	<u>ar121s</u> <u>a132s</u>
Short free text	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOEP 2017 | F22

[Opens if 121 is nonzero 1]

122 Did you obtain this school degree/certificate/diploma in Germany?	<u>ar122</u> <u>a133</u>
Yes	1
No, in the country in which I lived , 'cr001.shown' (Continue with question 124)	0
No, in another country (Continue with question 124)	2

Based on ALWA (asinaus)

[Opens if 122=1]

123 Did you attend a school in any country other than Germany for at least one month during your school?	<u>ar123</u> <u>a134</u>
Yes	1
No	0

Based on ALWA (asat)

Page 72: General questions about your personality

124	Did you finish vocational training or university/higher education?	<u>ar124</u> <u>a135</u>
	Yes	1
	No (Continue with question 128)	0

SOEP migrant sample F151 with focus on in Germany; SOEP 2017 F17 with focus on 31.12.2015.

[Opens if 124=1]

125	What kind of training or degree was this (please indicate the German equivalent for foreign degrees)?	<u>ar125</u> <u>a136</u>
Please indicate only the highest level of education or study attained!		
	Doctrine	1
	Vocational school, commercial school, school of health care	2
	Technical School	3
	Civil servant training	4
	University of Applied Sciences, Vocational Academy	5
	University	6
	Other university degree	7
	Doctorate, Ph.D.	8
	Other degree	88

Page 73: General questions about personality

126	Did you obtain this degree in Germany?	<u>ar126</u> <u>a137</u>
	Yes	1
	No, in the country in which I lived, 'cr001.shown' (Continue with question 128)	0
	No, in another country (Continue with question 128)	2

[Opens if 126=1]

127	Did you complete at least one month of your training or study abroad?	<u>ar127</u> <u>a138</u>
	Yes	1
	No	0

Based on ALWA (abat)

Page 74: Information about your partner

[Block: Information about your partner (If question 49 = yes)]

128 Did you partner finish vocational training or university/higher education?	<u>ar128</u> <u>a141</u>
Yes	1
No (Continue with question 130)	0
I don't know	98

[Opens if 128=1]

129 What kind of training or degree was this (please indicate the German equivalent for foreign degrees)?	<u>ar129</u> <u>a142</u>
Please indicate only the highest level of education or study attained!	
Doctrine	1
Vocational school, commercial school, school of health care	2
Technical School	3
Civil servant training	4
University of Applied Sciences, Vocational Academy	5
University	6
Other university degree	7
Doctorate, Ph D	8
Other degree	88
I don't know	98

130 Is your partner currently in employment? What describes his or her situation best (in the last seven days)?		<u>ar130</u> <u>a143</u>
Please specify only the activity that best describes the situation of your partner. If they are pursuing more than one activity, please indicate the activity for which they spend the most time.		
Working full-time	1	
In part-time employment	2	
Self-employed / freelance	3	
Low or irregular employed	4	
On maternity leave / parental leave	5	
Retired / Pension / Early retirement	6	
Housemaker	7	
In vocational training / continuing education	8	
unemployed	9	
Student (School or University)	10	
Other	88	
I don't know	98	

[Back to everyone!]

131 In which country were your parents born?					
	Germany	In the country where I lived "cr001.shown"	Other country [Please specify]	I don't know	
Father	1	2	3	-2	<u>ar1311</u> <u>a1441</u>
Mother	1	2	3	-2	<u>ar1312</u> <u>a1442</u>

[Opens if 131.1= 3]

1311s. Please tell us the country of birth of your father:	<u>ar1311s</u> <u>a1441s</u>
.....	

[Opens if 131.2= 3]

1312s. Please tell us the country of birth of your mother:	<u>ar1312s</u> <u>a1442s</u>
.....	

Here are some questions about your attitudes towards different topics, your personality and your well-being. These individual perspectives and experiences can be naturally quite different in humans. It is of particular interest to our project to learn more about this diversity.

132	How would you describe your current health?	<u>ar132</u> <u>a145</u>
	Very good	1
	Well	2
	Satisfactory	3
	Less good	4
	Bad	5

SOEP 2017 | F 158

133 The following statements apply to different attitudes towards life and the future. To what degree do you personally agree with the following statements?								
Please answer according to the following scale: 1 means disagree completely, and 7 means agree completely.								
	Disagree completely						Agree completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
How my life goes depends on me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ar1331</u> <u>a1471</u>
One has to work hard in order to succeed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ar1332</u> <u>a1472</u>
I frequently have the experience that other people have a controlling influence over my life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ar1333</u> <u>a1473</u>
What a person achieves in life is above all a question of fate or luck	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>ar1334</u> <u>a1474</u>

SOEP I 2015 5; Selection of four items based on the "Internal-Externale-Control-Conviction-4 (IE-4)" instrument; cf. Kovaleva, Beierlein, Kemper, & Rammstedt of GESIS

134 How often do you ...						
	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
... miss the company of others?	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar1341</u> <u>a1481</u>
... feel left out?	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar1342</u> <u>a1482</u>
... feel socially isolated?	1	2	3	4	5	<u>ar1343</u> <u>a1483</u>

SOEP 2017 | F7

135 And now we want to know how strongly you feel connected to certain places or regions and their citizens. How strongly do you feel connected to...					
	Strongly identifying	Rather identifying	Rather not identifying	Not identifying at all	
... your municipality (city) in Germany and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar3151</u> <u>a1494</u>
... Germany as a whole and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar1352</u> <u>a1497</u>
... your former municipality (city) in the country where you lived have 'cr001.shown' and their citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar1353</u> <u>a1495</u>
... the country in which you have lived, 'cr001.shown' as a whole and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar1354</u> <u>a1496</u>
... of the European Union and its citizens.	1	2	3	4	<u>ar1355</u> <u>a1498</u>

Based on Allbus 2016 F121

136 Are you generally a person who is willing to take risks or do you try to avoid taking risks? [ar136](#)
[a150](#)

Please answer on the following scale, where the value is 0 "not at all willing to take risks" and the value 10 "very willing to take risks". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment.

not at all willing to take risks	Very willing to take risks									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOEP-I 2017 F5

137 In conclusion, we would like to ask you about your satisfaction with life in general. [ar137](#)
[a151](#)

How satisfied are you with your life, all things considered?

Please answer again on the following scale, where 0 means "completely dissatisfied" and 10 means "Completely satisfied". You can use the values in between to downgrade your assessment.

completely dissatisfied	completely satisfied									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOEPI 2017 205 for question part 1.

Page 81: Re-contact

We want to get a better understanding of how the lives of people who go abroad or move to Germany from abroad develop. Therefore, we would like to ask you again about your life situation. Next time we would contact you in about half a year.

1 Do you agree that we may contact you again as part of our project?	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 82: Re-contact

We want to get a better understanding of how the lives of people who go abroad or move to Germany from abroad develop. Therefore, we would like to ask you again about your life situation. Next time we would contact you in about half a year.

2 Do you agree that we may contact you again as part of our project?	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

3 In order to reach you as easily and easily as possible, we would like to contact you via e-mail in the future.

Please provide an e-mail address that will best reach you:

Your e-mail address will be used by us only to contact you as part of our project. It will be kept strictly confidential and will not be passed on to third parties. It will not be merged with your information from the online questionnaire.

Short free text



4 Even if contacting via e-mail is particularly straightforward and easy, this connection may not work.

Would you be willing to provide additional contact information in such cases?

Your contact information will be used by us only to contact you as part of our project. It will be kept strictly confidential and will not be passed on to third parties. It will not be merged with your information from the online questionnaire.

- Yes
- No, I don't want to provide any more contact information.

5 Please enter the contact information here:	
Your landline number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your mobile phone number	<input type="checkbox"/>
an alternative mobile phone number (if available)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your alternate e-mail address (if available)	<input type="checkbox"/>

6 We would be pleased if you would also provide us with your postal address, where we can contact you. In order for us to have complete information, we ask you to not only give us your address, but also your first and last name:	
Name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Surname	<input type="checkbox"/>
Address addition (if necessary)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Street and house number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Postal code	<input type="checkbox"/>
City	<input type="checkbox"/>
Country	<input type="checkbox"/>

7 You did not provide an e-mail address. Alternatively, we would like to contact you by phone if necessary. Please provide the relevant information here:	
Your landline number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your mobile phone number	<input type="checkbox"/>
An alternative mobile phone number (if available)	<input type="checkbox"/>

8 You did not provide an e-mail address. Alternatively, we would like to contact you by phone if necessary. Please provide the relevant information here:	
Your landline number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your mobile phone number	<input type="checkbox"/>
An alternative mobile phone number (if available)	<input type="checkbox"/>

9 We would be pleased if you would also provide us with your postal address, where we can contact you. In order for us to have complete information, we ask you to not only give us your address, but also your first and last name:

Name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Surname	<input type="checkbox"/>
if necessary, address addition	<input type="checkbox"/>
Street & House Number	<input type="checkbox"/>
Postcode/ Postcode	<input type="checkbox"/>
City	<input type="checkbox"/>
Country	<input type="checkbox"/>

10 It is a pity that we are not allowed to contact you again. There may be many reasons for this. If you like, here is the opportunity to give us a brief hint as to why you have made your decision. Such information is particularly valuable to us in terms of future studies. Thank you very much.

Long free text



11 Thank you for taking the time to answer our questions.

As a small "thank you" for your support, we will give away a total of 20 x 500 € among all participants in February 2019! Would you like to take part in the raffle?

The winners will be notified after the draw scheduled for February 2019. You will then be able to decide whether your prize should be transferred to you as a winner (via PayPal*), whether you want an Amazon voucher, or whether you want to donate your prize to a non-profit organization.

The transfers are planned as PayPal money transfers for data protection and cost reasons. If you would like to transfer money to a bank account, please let us know when you announce your profit.

Legal redress is excluded. Participation is only possible once per person, participants in the study are excluded. The winners will be drawn by a notary. Further information can also be found on the homepage www.studie.international-mobil.de in February 2019.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Yes, I would like to take part in the raffle | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No, I don't want to take part in the raffle | <input type="checkbox"/> |

12 In order for us to inform you in the event of a profit, we need appropriate contact information from you. For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which we can contact you, and if necessary, also provide us with your name and telephone number for any queries:

The provision of your contact details will be treated strictly confidentially and will not be passed on to third parties.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

13 Thank you for taking the time to answer our questions. You can choose between the following options:	
Amazon Voucher	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer via PayPal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Donation for a charitable purpose (an organization can be chosen by you from a preselection)	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would like to do without the 'thank you'	<input type="checkbox"/>

14 In which country or amazon platform would you like to redeem the voucher?

Please note: Unfortunately, the Amazon voucher is not available in all countries. Please also note that the actual voucher value in countries outside the European currency area also depends on the respective exchange rates and additional fees, and therefore there may be discrepancies.

Germany (amazon.de)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Australia (amazon.au)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Brazil (amazon.com.br)	<input type="checkbox"/>
China (amazon.cn)	<input type="checkbox"/>
France (amazon.fr)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Canada (amazon.ca)	<input type="checkbox"/>
India (amazon.in)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Italy (amazon.it)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Japan (amazon.co.jp)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mexico (amazon.com.mx)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Netherlands (amazon.nl)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Austria (amazon.at)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spain (amazon.es)	<input type="checkbox"/>
United Kingdom (amazon.co.uk)	<input type="checkbox"/>
United States (amazon.com)	<input type="checkbox"/>

15 In order to send you the voucher, we need your contact information.

For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which we can contact you, and if necessary, also provide us with your name and telephone number for any queries:

The provision of your contact details will be treated strictly confidentially and will not be passed on to third parties.

The voucher will be sent to you within the next 14 days. Please understand that shipping may be delayed in the event of a large volume.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

16 In order to send you the voucher, we need your contact information.

For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which we can contact you, and if necessary, also provide us with your name and telephone number for any queries:

The provision of your contact details will be treated strictly confidentially and will not be passed on to third parties.

The voucher will be sent to you within the next 14 days. Please understand that shipping may be delayed in the event of a large volume.

E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

17 In order to send you our "Thank you" in the amount of 10 Euro via PayPal, we need your contact information. For this purpose, please provide us with a valid and up-to-date e-mail address, through which the money transfer can be processed via PayPal. Please also give us your name and phone number for any queries:

PayPal will contact you using the e-mail address provided. By providing your e-mail address, you agree that we will forward it to PayPal for the purpose of transferring funds.

The information provided to your contact details will be kept strictly confidential and will not be associated with your answers in the survey.

Please also note: In order to receive our "Thank you", it may be necessary to set up a PayPal account (if not already available). For more information on bank transfers via PayPal, please call www.paypal.com.

The transfer to your PayPal account will be made within the next 14 days. Please understand that the transfer may be delayed in the event of a large amount of money.


E-mail address	<input type="checkbox"/>
First and last name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone number	<input type="checkbox"/>

18 Please select one of the following organizations/initiatives to which we should submit your donation of 10 euros:

From February 2019, you can find out about the total amount of donations we have transferred to the respective organizations on our homepage (www.studie.international-mobil.de)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| UNICEF (www.unicef.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Doctors Without Borders (www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| German Nature Conservation Association (www.nabu.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| German Cancer Aid (www.krebshilfe.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Stiftung Deutsche Sporthilfe (www.sporthilfe.de) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Viva con Agua (www.vivaconagua.org) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

15.7 PAPI questionnaire



Sehr geehrte Teilnehmerinnen und Teilnehmer,

vielen Dank für Ihr Interesse an unserer Studie „international mobil“.

Mit dieser Studie wollen wir mehr über Ihre bisherige Erfahrung im Ausland und die Gründe für Ihren Umzug nach Deutschland erfahren. Mit Ihrer Teilnahme werden Sie Teil eines bisher einmaligen Forschungsprojekts, bei dem Menschen während oder auch nach ihrem Aufenthalt im Ausland zu ihrer Lebenssituation befragt werden. Das Projekt wird von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) finanziert und vom Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung und der Universität Duisburg-Essen in Zusammenarbeit mit dem SOKO Institut (Bielefeld) durchgeführt.

Das Ausfüllen des folgenden Fragebogens nimmt ca. 25 Minuten in Anspruch. Die Befragung dient ausschließlich wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und hält alle Regeln des strengen deutschen Datenschutzes ein.

Als kleines Dankeschön erhalten Sie 10 Euro, die wir Ihnen nach der Teilnahme als Einkaufsgutschein oder in Form einer Überweisung zuschicken werden.

WIR BEDANKEN UNS HERZLICH FÜR IHRE ZEIT UND UNTERSTÜTZUNG!

Ihr Team von „international mobil“



Ihr Umzug nach Deutschland | Teil A

➤ Laut Auskunft des Einwohnermeldeamtes haben Sie vor einiger Zeit Ihren Wohnsitz aus dem Ausland nach Deutschland verlagert.

1 In welchem Land haben Sie zuletzt gelebt?

Name des Landes: _____

2 Wann sind Sie nach Deutschland umgezogen?

➤ Bitte geben Sie den Monat und das Jahr an.

Monat: _____ Jahr: _____

3 Wie lange haben Sie insgesamt im Ausland gelebt?

➤ Gemeint ist hier lediglich Ihr **letzter** Auslandsaufenthalt.

- Weniger als ein Jahr
- 1 bis unter 2 Jahre
- 2 bis unter 5 Jahre
- 5 Jahre und länger



 Teil A | Ihr Umzug nach Deutschland

4 Es gibt viele mögliche Gründe dafür, zurück nach Deutschland zu ziehen. Im Folgenden werden unterschiedliche Motive für einen Umzug nach Deutschland genannt. Bitte geben Sie an, wie wichtig diese Gründe für Ihre Entscheidung nach Deutschland zu ziehen waren.

Antworten Sie bitte anhand der folgenden Skala, wobei der Wert 1 bedeutet „Ganz und gar nicht wichtig“ und der Wert 6 „Sehr wichtig“. Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstimmen. Bei Gründen, die für Sie nicht zutreffen, wählen Sie bitte „Trifft auf mich nicht zu“.

	Ganz und gar nicht wichtig						Sehr wichtig	Trifft auf mich nicht zu
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Eigene berufliche Gründe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Berufliche Gründe meines Partners / meiner Partnerin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Andere partnerschaftliche Gründe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Familiäre Gründe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Finanzielle Gründe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unzufriedenheit mit dem Leben im Ausland	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bildungs- oder ausbildungsbezogene Gründe / Studium	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aus Gründen meines persönlichen Lebensstils (z. B. besseres Klima, andere Lebensart)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Neuere politische Entwicklungen im Ausland	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Soziale Absicherung / Unterstützung (z. B. bei Gesundheit / Pflege, Arbeitslosigkeit, Kinderbetreuung)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5 War Ihr Auslandsaufenthalt von vornherein nur für eine begrenzte Zeit geplant?

- Ja
 Nein

Ihr Umzug nach Deutschland | Teil A

6 Nun interessiert uns, wie Sie die Zeit seit Ihrer Ankunft in Deutschland erlebt haben. Denken Sie bitte an die ersten Wochen und Monate in Deutschland: Wie leicht oder schwer ist es Ihnen gefallen, sich zurecht zu finden?

➤ Antworten Sie bitte anhand der folgenden Skala, wobei der Wert 1 bedeutet „Sehr schwer“ und der Wert 6 „Sehr leicht“. Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstimmen.

Sehr schwer			Sehr leicht		
1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Lebenssituation vor Ihrem Umzug nach Deutschland | Teil B

➤ Und nun haben wir einige Fragen zu Ihrer Lebenssituation vor Ihrem Umzug nach Deutschland. Wenn Sie einmal zurückblicken, wie war Ihre Situation drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind? Zuerst interessieren wir uns für den Bereich Familie und Partnerschaft.

7 Waren Sie vor Ihrem Umzug nach Deutschland in einer festen Partnerschaft?

➤ Beziehen Sie sich bitte auf Ihre Situation drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind.

- Ja → Direkt weiter mit Frage 9 auf Seite 6
 Nein

8 Wenn Sie nicht in einer festen Partnerschaft waren, wie war dann ihr Familienstand?

➤ Beziehen Sie sich bitte auf Ihre Situation drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind. Hier geht es nur um den offiziellen Familienstand, unabhängig vom Beziehungsstatus.

- Verheiratet, in Trennung
 In eingetragener Partnerschaft, in Trennung
 Ledig
 Geschieden
 Verwitwet / Lebenspartner/-in aus eingetragener Partnerschaft verstorben
- Direkt weiter mit Frage 13 auf Seite 7



Teil B | Lebenssituation vor Ihrem Umzug nach Deutschland



Diese Seite bitte nur ausfüllen, wenn Sie drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind in einer festen Partnerschaft waren.

9

Wie war damals Ihr Familienstand?



Beziehen Sie sich bitte auf Ihre Situation drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind. Hier geht es nur um den offiziellen Familienstand.

- Verheiratet
- Eingetragene Partnerschaft
- Verheiratet, in Trennung
- ledig
- In eingetragener Partnerschaft, in Trennung
- Geschieden
- Eingetragene Partnerschaft aufgehoben
- Verwitwet / Lebenspartner/-in aus eingetragener Partnerschaft verstorben

10

Bestand Ihre Partnerschaft auch noch über Ihren Umzug nach Deutschland hinaus?

- Ja
- Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 13, Seite 7



Nun geht es um Ihre Entscheidung für Ihren letzten Umzug nach Deutschland.

Eine partnerschaftliche Beziehung, egal ob es sich um eine Ehe oder eine feste Beziehung handelt, kann mal mehr, mal weniger Einfluss auf unsere Entscheidungen haben. Daher bitten wir Sie, sich nochmal an die Zeit vor Ihrem Wegzug aus dem Ausland, also an die Zeit der Entscheidungsphase, zu erinnern.

11

Wer war bei der Entscheidung nach Deutschland zu ziehen die treibende Kraft?

- Mein Partner/Meine Partnerin
- Ich selbst
- Beide zu gleichen Teilen
- Weiß ich nicht.

12

Wer von Ihnen beiden ist zuerst nach Deutschland umgezogen oder sind Sie gemeinsam umgezogen?

- Mein Partner /meine Partnerin wohnte bereits in Deutschland als wir uns kennenlernten
- Mein Partner /meine Partnerin ist vor mir nach Deutschland umgezogen
- Mein Partner /meine Partnerin ist nach mir nach Deutschland umgezogen
- Wir sind gleichzeitig nach Deutschland umgezogen
- Mein Partner /meine Partnerin wohnt noch in dem Land, in dem ich im Ausland gelebt habe
- Mein Partner /meine Partnerin lebt in einem anderen Land

Ihre Wohnsituation vor dem Umzug nach Deutschland | Teil C

i Ab hier bitte wieder alle Befragten die Fragen beantworten!

➤ Auch Ihre damalige Wohnsituation – drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind – ist für uns interessant.

13 Wie viele Personen lebten damals in dem Land, in dem Sie im Ausland gelebt haben, ständig in Ihrem Haushalt, Sie selbst eingeschlossen?

➤ Beziehen Sie sich bitte auf Ihre Situation drei Monate, bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind. Sollten Sie in einer Wohngemeinschaft gelebt haben, tragen Sie bitte „1“ ein. Denken Sie dabei bitte auch an alle im Haushalt lebenden Kinder.

Es lebten damals _____ Personen in meinem Haushalt

Davon waren _____ Kinder unter 18 Jahren

14 Wie viele Einwohner hatte der Ort, in dem Sie im Ausland gelebt haben?

➤ Beziehen Sie sich bitte auf Ihre Situation drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind.

- Mehr als 1.000.000 Einwohner
- 100.000 bis 1.000.000 Einwohner
- 10.000 bis 100.000 Einwohner
- Weniger als 10.000 Einwohner

Ihre Sprachkenntnisse | Teil D

➤ Wir interessieren uns auch für die Sprache, die Sie während Ihrer Zeit im Ausland gesprochen haben.

15 Wurde in dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben, eine andere Sprache als Deutsch gesprochen?

- Ja
- Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 17 auf Seite 8

Teil D | Ihre Sprachkenntnisse

16 Wie gut schätzen Sie Ihre Kenntnisse der Sprache des Landes, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben, ein?

➤ Gemeint ist die Sprache, die in der Region, in der Sie damals lebten, überwiegend gesprochen wird.

- Muttersprache
- Sehr gut
- Eher gut
- Mittelmäßig
- Eher schlecht
- Sehr schlecht

Teil E | Ihre berufliche Situation vor dem Umzug nach Deutschland

➤ Nun interessieren wir uns für Ihre berufliche Situation drei Monate, bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind.

17 Was war damals Ihre Haupttätigkeit? Was trifft am besten auf Ihre damalige Situation zu?

➤ Falls Sie mehreren Tätigkeiten nachgegangen sind, geben Sie bitte die Tätigkeit an, für die Sie am meisten Zeit aufgewendet haben.

Ich war ...

- ... Arbeiter/-in oder Angestellter/-e.
 - ... Beamter/-in (einschl. Richter/-in und Berufssoldat/-in).
 - ... Selbständiger/-e oder Freiberufler/-in.
 - ... in betrieblicher Erstausbildung / Lehre.
 - ... in Fortbildung, Umschulung oder beruflicher Weiterbildung.
 - ... arbeitssuchend / arbeitslos gemeldet.
 - ... in Rente / Pension oder Vorruhestand.
 - ... im Mutterschutz / Elternzeit.
 - ... Schüler/-in oder Student/-in.
 - ... Person im freiwilligen Wehrdienst, Bundesfreiwilligendienst o.ä.
 - ... Work and Travel, Au Pair o.ä.
 - ... Hausfrau / Hausmann.
 - ... Sonstiges, und zwar: _____
- Weiter mit Frage 26 auf Seite 11

i Diese Seite bitte nur ausfüllen, wenn Sie bei Frage 17 Arbeiter/-in, Angestellter/-e und Beamter/-in angegeben haben! Ansonsten weiter mit Frage 26 auf Seite 11.

18 Welche berufliche Tätigkeit haben Sie damals ausgeübt?

> Bitte geben Sie die genaue Tätigkeitsbezeichnung an, also z.B. nicht „kaufmännische Angestellte“, sondern: „Speditionskauffrau“, nicht „Arbeiter“, sondern: „Maschinenschlosser“, nicht „Beamter im höheren Dienst“, sondern: „Finanzbeamter im höheren Dienst“. Beziehen Sie sich bitte auf Ihre Situation **drei Monate bevor Sie zurück nach Deutschland gezogen sind**. Wenn Sie die deutsche Bezeichnung nicht kennen, dann versuchen Sie bitte kurz, den Beruf zu umschreiben.

19 Welcher Branche war der Betrieb, in dem Sie damals arbeiteten, zuzuordnen?

> Bitte wählen Sie nur eine Antwortoption aus.

- Baugewerbe / Bau
- Bergbau, Gewinnung von Steinen und Erden
- Energie- und Wasserversorgung
- Erbringung von Finanz- und Versicherungsdienstleistungen
- Erbringung von freiberuflichen, wissenschaftlichen und technischen Dienstleistungen
- Erbringung von sonstigen wirtschaftlichen Dienstleistungen
- Erbringung von sonstigen Dienstleistungen
- Erziehung und Unterricht
- Gastgewerbe, Beherbergung und Gastronomie
- Gesundheits- und Sozialwesen
- Grundstücks- und Wohnungswesen
- Handel, Instandhaltung und Reparatur von Kfz und Gebrauchsgütern
- Information und Kommunikation
- Kunst, Unterhaltung und Erholung
- Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Fischerei und Fischzucht
- Öffentliche Verwaltung, Verteidigung, Sozialversicherung
- Verarbeitendes Gewerbe, Herstellung von Waren
- Verkehr und Lagerei
- Weiß ich nicht.



Teil E | Ihre berufliche Situation vor dem Umzug nach Deutschland



Diese Seite bitte nur ausfüllen, wenn Sie bei Frage 17 Arbeiter/-in, Angestellter/-e und Beamter/-in angegeben haben! Ansonsten weiter mit Frage 26 auf Seite 11.

20

Wie viele Wochenstunden betrug damals Ihre vereinbarte Arbeitszeit ohne Überstunden?

Stunden pro Woche: _____

Keine festgelegte Arbeitszeit

21

Und wie viel betrug damals im Durchschnitt Ihre tatsächliche Arbeitszeit pro Woche einschließlich eventueller Überstunden?

Stunden pro Woche: _____

22

Waren Sie Anderen bei der Arbeit leitend vorgesetzt, d.h. dass Personen nach Ihren Anweisungen gearbeitet haben?

Ja

Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 24

23

Wie viele Personen arbeiteten nach Ihren Anweisungen?

Anzahl der Personen: _____

24

Wie hoch war Ihr durchschnittlicher monatlicher Brutto-Arbeitsverdienst im Jahr vor Ihrem Umzug?

➤ Bruttoverdienst heißt Lohn oder Gehalt **vor Abzug** der Steuern und Abgaben.

Der Arbeitsverdienst betrug **brutto** (in Euro): _____

Keine Angabe

25

Wie hoch war Ihr durchschnittlicher monatlicher Netto-Arbeitsverdienst im Jahr vor Ihrem Umzug?

➤ Nettoverdienst heißt den Betrag **nach Abzug** von Steuern und Abgaben.

Der Arbeitsverdienst betrug **netto** (in Euro): _____

Keine Angabe

Ihre bisherigen und zukünftig geplanten Auslandsaufenthalte | Teil F

i Ab hier bitte wieder alle Befragten die Fragen beantworten!

> Nun zu einem anderen Thema: Uns interessieren Ihre bisherigen und zukünftig geplanten Auslandsaufenthalte.

26 Wie viel Zeit planen Sie innerhalb der nächsten 12 Monate in dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben, zu verbringen?

- Ich werde überhaupt nicht dort sein.
- Weniger als 1 Monat
- 1 bis 3 Monate
- 4 bis 6 Monate
- Mehr als 6 Monate

27 Viele Menschen lassen sich im Laufe Ihres Lebens in mehreren Ländern nieder. Wie ist das bei Ihnen? Haben Sie vor Ihrem letzten Wegzug ins Ausland immer in Deutschland gelebt oder haben Sie zeitweise auch woanders gelebt?

> Gemeint ist hier eine **durchgehende Aufenthaltsdauer in einem anderen Land von mehr als 3 Monaten**. Kürzere Aufenthalte, z. B. Urlaubsreisen oder Besuche bei Verwandten, sind hier nicht gemeint.

- Ich habe zuvor **immer** in Deutschland gelebt. → Direkt weiter mit Frage 29 auf Seite 12
- Ich habe zuvor bereits **einmal** woanders gelebt.
- Ich habe zuvor bereits **zweimal** woanders gelebt.
- Ich habe zuvor bereits **dreimal oder häufiger** in anderen Ländern gelebt.

28 Wie lange haben Sie insgesamt im Ausland gelebt?

> Falls Sie mehrfach im Ausland gelebt haben, beziehen Sie sich bitte auf die gesamte Dauer (inklusive Ihres letzten Auslandsaufenthaltes).

- Weniger als ein Jahr
- 1 bis unter 2 Jahre
- 2 bis unter 5 Jahre
- 5 Jahr und länger



Teil G | Ihre zukünftigen Pläne ins Ausland zu gehen

29 Haben Sie in letzter Zeit ernsthaft mit dem Gedanken gespielt, nochmals für längere Zeit oder auch für immer ins Ausland zu gehen?

- Ja
 Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 34 auf Seite 13

30 Wie lange würden Sie dann gerne im Ausland bleiben?

- Einige Monate
 Einige Jahre
 Für immer
 Weiß ich noch nicht.

31 In welches Land würden Sie dann umziehen bzw. auswandern?

- Wieder in das Land, in dem ich zuletzt im Ausland gelebt habe
 In ein anderes Land
 Weiß ich noch nicht.

32 Beabsichtigen Sie, innerhalb der nächsten 12 Monate wieder ins Ausland umzuziehen?

- Ja
 Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 34 auf Seite 13

33 Und warum haben Sie vor, Deutschland (wieder) zu verlassen?

➤ Kreuzen Sie bitte alles Zutreffende an (Mehrfachnennungen sind möglich).

- Eigene berufliche Gründe
 Berufliche Gründe meines Partners / meiner Partnerin
 Andere partnerschaftliche Gründe
 Familiäre Gründe (z.B. Pflege der Eltern, Hilfe bei der Kinderbetreuung)
 Aus finanziellen Gründen
 Unzufriedenheit mit dem Leben in Deutschland
 Bildungs- oder ausbildungsbezogene Gründe / Studium
 Aus Gründen meines persönlichen Lebensstils (z.B. besseres Klima, andere Lebensart)
 Sonstige Gründe: _____

➤ Nun interessieren uns Ihre aktuellen Lebensumstände in Deutschland.
Wir beginnen zunächst mit Ihrer familiären Situation.

34 Haben Sie derzeit eine feste Partnerschaft?

- Ja
- Nein

35 Wie ist Ihr aktueller Familienstand?

➤ Hier geht es nur um den offiziellen Familienstand, unabhängig vom Beziehungsstatus.

- Verheiratet
- Eingetragene Partnerschaft
- Verheiratet, in Trennung
- In eingetragener Partnerschaft, in Trennung
- Ledig
- Geschieden
- Eingetragene Partnerschaft aufgehoben
- Verwitwet/Lebenspartner/-in aus eingetragener Partnerschaft verstorben



Teil I | Ihre aktuelle Wohnsituation

36 Wie viele Personen leben ständig in Ihrem Haushalt, Sie selbst eingeschlossen?

▶ Sollten Sie in einer Wohngemeinschaft leben, tragen Sie bitte „1“ ein.
Denken Sie dabei bitte auch an alle im Haushalt lebenden Kinder.

Es leben aktuell _____ Personen in meinem Haushalt

Davon sind _____ Kinder unter 18 Jahren

37 Wie viele Einwohner hat der Ort, in dem Sie derzeit wohnen?

- Mehr als 1.000.000 Einwohner
- 100.000 bis 1.000.000 Einwohner
- 10.000 bis 100.000 Einwohner
- Weniger als 10.000 Einwohner

38 Wo leben Sie momentan?

- In demselben Haus / derselben Wohnung wie vor meinem Wegzug aus Deutschland
- In dem gleichen Ort bzw. der gleichen Stadt, aber in einer anderen Wohnung
- In einem anderen Ort / einer anderen Stadt, aber im gleichen Bundesland
- In einem anderen Bundesland als vor meinem Wegzug

Teil J | Ihre Kontakte zu Freunden und Verwandten

39 Was würden Sie sagen: Wie viele enge Freunde haben Sie?

Enge Freunde insgesamt: _____

↳ Davon leben ...

... _____ in Deutschland.

... _____ in dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben.

... _____ in einem anderen Land.

Ihre Kontakte zu Freunden und Verwandten | Teil J

➤ Wir sind auch daran interessiert, wie regelmäßig Sie mit Ihren Verwandten und engen Freunden in Deutschland in Kontakt stehen.

40 Wie häufig haben Sie ungefähr Kontakt mit den folgenden Personen in Deutschland?

➤ Sollten Sie Kontakt z. B. zu mehreren Geschwistern, Kindern oder Freunden haben, denken Sie hierbei bitte nur an die Person, mit der Sie am häufigsten in Kontakt stehen.

	Täglich	Mindestens einmal wöchentlich	Mindestens einmal im Monat	Seltener	Trifft auf mich nicht zu
(Ehe-) Partner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eltern / Schwiegereltern	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Geschwister	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kinder	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enkel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Großeltern	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sonstige Verwandte (z. B. Tanten, Onkel, Cousins / Cousinen)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enge Freunde	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ihre persönliche Situation | Teil K

41 Wenn Sie Ihre jetzige persönliche Situation mit der vor Ihrem Wegzug aus dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben, vergleichen, wie beurteilen Sie allgemein die Situation in folgenden Lebensbereichen?

	Viel besser als im Ausland	Besser	Etwa gleich	Schlechter	Viel schlechter als im Ausland
Ihr Familienleben	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihr Freundes- und Bekanntenkreis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihre Gesundheit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihre Wohngegend	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihre Kontakte zur Nachbarschaft	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

 Teil I | Ihre aktuelle Erwerbssituation

➤ Es folgen Fragen zu Ihrer aktuellen Erwerbstätigkeit in Deutschland.

42 Was ist derzeit Ihre Haupttätigkeit?
Was trifft am besten auf Ihre Situation (in den letzten sieben Tagen) zu?

➤ Bitte geben Sie hier nur die Tätigkeit an, die Ihre Situation am besten beschreibt (falls Sie mehreren Tätigkeiten nachgehen, geben Sie die Tätigkeit an, für die Sie am meisten Zeit aufwenden).

Ich bin ...

- ... Arbeiter/-in oder Angestellter/-e .
 - ... Beamter/-in (einschl. Richter/-in und Berufssoldat/-in).

 - ... Selbständiger/-e oder Freiberufler/-in.
 - ... in einem Mini-Job (bis 450 Euro).
 - ... in betrieblicher Erstausbildung / Lehre.
 - ... in Fortbildung, Umschulung oder beruflicher Weiterbildung.
 - ... arbeitssuchend / arbeitslos gemeldet.
 - ... in Rente / Pension oder Vorruhestand.
 - ... im Mutterschutz / Elternzeit.
 - ... Schüler/-in oder Student/-in.
 - ... Person im freiwilligen Wehrdienst, Bundesfreiwilligendienst o.ä.
 - ... Work and Travel, Au Pair o.ä.
 - ... Hausfrau / Hausmann.
 - ... Sonstiges, und zwar: _____
- Weiter mit Frage 57 auf Seite 20

! Diese Frage bitte nur beantworten, wenn Sie bei Frage 42 Arbeiter/-in, Angestellter/-e und Beamter/-in angegeben haben! Ansonsten weiter mit Frage 57 auf Seite 20.

43 Welche berufliche Tätigkeit üben Sie derzeit aus?

➤ Bitte geben Sie die genaue Tätigkeitsbezeichnung an, also z.B. nicht „kaufmännische Angestellte“, sondern: „Speditionskauffrau“, nicht „Arbeiter“, sondern: „Maschinenschlosser“, nicht „Beamter im höheren Dienst“, sondern: „Finanzbeamter im höheren Dienst“.

i Diese Seite bitte nur ausfüllen, wenn Sie bei Frage 42 Arbeiter/-in, Angestellter/-e und Beamter/-in angegeben haben! Ansonsten weiter mit Frage 57 auf Seite 20.

44 Welcher Branche ist der Betrieb, in dem Sie arbeiten, zuzuordnen?

> Bitte wählen Sie nur eine Antwortoption aus.

- Baugewerbe / Bau
- Bergbau, Gewinnung von Steinen und Erden
- Energie- und Wasserversorgung
- Erbringung von Finanz- und Versicherungsdienstleistungen
- Erbringung von freiberuflichen, wissenschaftlichen und technischen Dienstleistungen
- Erbringung von sonstigen wirtschaftlichen Dienstleistungen
- Erbringung von sonstigen Dienstleistungen
- Erziehung und Unterricht
- Gastgewerbe, Beherbergung und Gastronomie
- Gesundheits- und Sozialwesen
- Grundstücks- und Wohnungswesen
- Handel; Instandhaltung und Reparatur von Kfz und Gebrauchsgütern
- Information und Kommunikation
- Kunst, Unterhaltung und Erholung
- Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Fischerei und Fischzucht
- Öffentliche Verwaltung, Verteidigung, Sozialversicherung
- Verarbeitendes Gewerbe, Herstellung von Waren
- Verkehr und Lagerei
- Weiß ich nicht.

45 Wie viele Wochenstunden beträgt Ihre vereinbarte Arbeitszeit ohne Überstunden?

Stunden pro Woche: _____

- Keine festgelegte Arbeitszeit

46 Und wie viel beträgt im Durchschnitt Ihre tatsächliche Arbeitszeit pro Woche einschließlich eventueller Überstunden?

Stunden pro Woche: _____

 Teil I | Ihre aktuelle Erwerbssituation

i Diese Seite bitte nur ausfüllen, wenn Sie bei Frage 42 Arbeiter/-in, Angestellter/-e und Beamter/-in angegeben haben! Ansonsten weiter mit Frage 57 auf Seite 20.

47 Wie hoch war Ihr monatlicher Brutto-Arbeitsverdienst im letzten Monat?

> Bruttoverdienst heißt Lohn oder Gehalt vor Abzug der Steuern und Abgaben.

Der Arbeitsverdienst betrug **brutto** (in Euro): _____

Keine Angabe

48 Wie hoch war Ihr monatlicher Netto-Arbeitsverdienst im letzten Monat?

> Nettoverdienst heißt den Betrag nach Abzug von Steuern und Abgaben.

Der Arbeitsverdienst betrug **netto** (in Euro): _____

Keine Angabe

49 Entspricht Ihre jetzige Tätigkeit Ihrem erlernten Beruf?

- Ja
- Nein
- Ich bin noch in Ausbildung
- Ich habe keinen Beruf erlernt

50 Was hat sich durch Ihren Umzug nach Deutschland in Bezug auf Ihren Arbeitgeber verändert?

Ihr aktueller Arbeitgeber ist ...

- ... der gleiche Arbeitgeber wie in dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben.
- ... eine Tochterfirma des letzten Arbeitgebers in dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben.
- ... ein ganz anderer Arbeitgeber als in dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben. → Weiter mit Frage 52 auf Seite 19
- Trifft auf mich nicht zu. → Weiter mit Frage 52 auf Seite 19

51 Sind Sie von Ihrem Arbeitgeber entsendet worden?

- Ja
- Nein

i Diese Seite bitte nur ausfüllen, wenn Sie bei Frage 42 Arbeiter/-in, Angestellter/-e und Beamter/-in angegeben haben! Ansonsten weiter mit Frage 57 auf Seite 20.

52 Haben Sie einen unbefristeten Arbeitsvertrag oder ein befristetes Arbeitsverhältnis?

- Unbefristeter Arbeitsvertrag
- Befristetes Arbeitsverhältnis
- Trifft nicht zu / ich habe keinen Arbeitsvertrag

53 Sind Sie Anderen bei der Arbeit leitend vorgesetzt, d.h. dass Personen nach Ihren Anweisungen arbeiten?

- Ja
- Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 55

54 Wie viele Personen arbeiten nach Ihren Anweisungen?

Anzahl der Personen: _____

55 Wie viele Beschäftigte hat das Gesamtunternehmen etwa?

➤ Nicht gemeint ist hierbei gegebenenfalls die lokale Betriebsstätte.


- Unter 5 Beschäftigte
- 5 bis unter 10 Beschäftigte
- 10 bis unter 20 Beschäftigte
- 20 bis unter 100 Beschäftigte
- 100 bis unter 200 Beschäftigte
- 200 bis unter 2.000 Beschäftigte
- Mehr als 2.000 Beschäftigte

56 Wenn Sie Ihre berufliche Situation einmal mit derjenigen vor Ihrem Wegzug aus dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben, vergleichen, wie beurteilen Sie allgemein die Situation in den folgenden Bereichen?

	Viel besser als im Ausland	Besser	Etwa gleich	Schlechter	Viel schlechter als im Ausland	Trifft auf mich nicht zu
Ihr Arbeitslohn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihre Aufstiegsmöglichkeiten	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Sicherheit Ihres Arbeitsplatzes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihre Entscheidungskompetenzen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

 **Teil M | Die finanzielle Situation Ihres Haushaltes**

 Ab hier bitte wieder alle Befragten die Fragen beantworten!

 Jetzt interessieren wir uns für die finanzielle Situation Ihres Haushaltes insgesamt.

57 Welche der folgenden Antwortmöglichkeiten beschreibt am besten, wie Sie Ihr gegenwärtiges Haushaltseinkommen beurteilen?

Mit dem gegenwärtigen Einkommen kann ich /können wir ...

- ... bequem leben.
- ... zurechtkommen.
- ... nur schwer zurechtkommen.
- ... nur sehr schwer zurechtkommen.

58 Wenn Sie Ihre jetzige persönliche Situation einmal mit derjenigen vor Ihrem Wegzug aus dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben vergleichen, wie beurteilen Sie allgemein die Situation in den folgenden Bereichen?

	Viel besser als im Ausland	Besser	Etwa gleich	Schlechter	Viel schlechter als im Ausland	Trifft auf mich nicht zu
Ihr Lebensstandard	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihr persönliches Einkommen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ihr Haushaltseinkommen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

 **Teil N | Allgemeine Fragen zu Ihrer Person**

 Nun haben wir ein paar allgemeine Fragen zu Ihrer Person.

59 Bitte nennen Sie Ihr Geschlecht.

- Männlich
- Weiblich

60 Bitte nennen Sie Ihr Geburtsjahr.

61 Sind Sie in Deutschland geboren?

- Ja → Direkt weiter mit Frage 63
 Nein

62 Wann sind Sie das erste Mal nach Deutschland gezogen?

Im Jahr: _____

63 Haben Sie die deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit?

- Ja
 Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 65

64 Wie haben Sie die deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit erworben?

- Durch Geburt
 Durch den Status als (Spät-)Aussiedler/-in (in eigener Person / als Familienangehöriger von (Spät-)Aussiedler/-in)
 Durch Einbürgerung
 Adoption durch deutsche Eltern / einen deutschen Elternteil

65 In welchem Land ist Ihr Vater und in welchem Land ist Ihre Mutter geboren?

Geburtsland des Vaters: _____

Geburtsland der Mutter: _____

66 Welchen Schulabschluss haben Sie gemacht (bei ausländischen Abschlüssen bitte deutsche Entsprechung angeben)?

➤ Bitte geben Sie nur den höchsten erreichten Schulabschluss an!

- Ich habe keinen Schulabschluss → Direkt weiter mit Frage 69 auf Seite 22
 Hauptschulabschluss
 Mittlerer Schulabschluss (z.B. Realschulabschluss)
 Fachhochschulreife (Abschluss einer Fachoberschule)
 Abitur (Hochschulreife)
 Sonstiger Schulabschluss, und zwar: _____

 Teil N | Allgemeine Fragen zur Person

67 Haben Sie diesen Schulabschluss in Deutschland erworben?

- Ja
- Nein, in dem Land, in dem ich zuletzt im Ausland gelebt habe → Direkt weiter mit Frage 69
- Nein, in einem anderen Land → Direkt weiter mit Frage 69

68 Haben Sie während Ihrer Schulzeit für mindestens einen Monat eine Schule in einem anderen Land als in Deutschland besucht?

- Ja
- Nein

69 Haben Sie eine Berufsausbildung oder ein Studium abgeschlossen?

- Ja
- Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 73 auf Seite 23

70 Was für ein Ausbildungs- oder Studienabschluss war das (bei ausländischen Abschlüssen bitte die deutsche Entsprechung angeben)?

▶ Bitte geben Sie nur den höchsten erreichten Ausbildungs- bzw. Studienabschluss an!

- Lehre
- Berufsfachschule, Handelsschule, Schule des Gesundheitswesens
- Fachschule, z. B. Meister-, Technikerabschluss
- Beamtenausbildung
- Fachhochschule, Berufsakademie
- Universitätsabschluss
- Sonstiger Hochschulabschluss
- Promotion
- Sonstiger Abschluss

71 Haben Sie diesen Ausbildungs- oder Studienabschluss in Deutschland erworben?

- Ja
- Nein, in dem Land, in dem ich zuletzt im Ausland gelebt habe → Direkt weiter mit Frage 73 auf Seite 23
- Nein, in einem anderen Land → Direkt weiter mit Frage 73 auf Seite 23

72 Haben Sie mindestens einen Monat Ihrer Ausbildung bzw. Ihres Studiums im Ausland absolviert?

- Ja
- Nein

i Diese Seite bitte nur ausfüllen, wenn Sie aktuell in einer festen Partnerschaft sind!
Ansonsten weiter mit Frage 76, Seite 24.

73 Hat Ihr/e Partner/-in eine Berufsausbildung oder ein Studium abgeschlossen?

- Ja
- Nein → Direkt weiter mit Frage 75
- Weiß ich nicht.

74 Was für ein Ausbildungs- oder Studienabschluss war das?

> Bitte geben Sie nur den höchsten erreichten Ausbildungs- bzw. Studienabschluss an!

- Lehre
- Berufsfachschule, Handelsschule, Schule des Gesundheitswesens
- Fachschule, z.B. Meister-, Technikerabschluss
- Beamtenausbildung
- Fachhochschule, Berufsakademie
- Universitätsabschluss
- Sonstiger Hochschulabschluss
- Promotion
- Sonstiger Abschluss
- Weiß ich nicht.

75 Übt Ihr/e Partner/in derzeit eine Erwerbstätigkeit aus?
Was trifft am besten auf ihre / seine Situation (in den letzten sieben Tagen) zu?

> Bitte geben Sie hier nur die Tätigkeit an, die die Situation Ihres Partners /Ihrer Partnerin am besten beschreibt (falls er / sie mehreren Tätigkeiten nachgeht, nennen Sie die Tätigkeit, für die am meisten Zeit aufgewendet wird).

- In Vollzeit erwerbstätig
- In Teilzeitbeschäftigung
- Selbstständig / freiberuflich tätig
- Geringfügig oder unregelmäßig erwerbstätig
- Im Mutterschutz / in Elternzeit
- In Rente / Pension / Vorruhestand
- Hausfrau / Hausmann
- In beruflicher Ausbildung / Weiterbildung
- Arbeitslos / arbeitsuchend
- Schüler/-in oder Student/-in
- Sonstiges
- Weiß ich nicht.

 Teil P | Ihre Einstellungen, Persönlichkeit und Ihr Wohlbefinden

i Ab hier bitte wieder alle Befragten die Fragen beantworten!

s Es folgen nun einige Fragen zu Ihren Einstellungen zu unterschiedlichen Bereichen, zu Ihrer Persönlichkeit und Ihrem Wohlbefinden. Diese individuellen Sichtweisen und Erfahrungen können bei Menschen naturgemäß ganz unterschiedlich sein. Für unser Projekt ist es von besonderem Interesse, mehr über diese Vielfalt zu erfahren.

76 Wie würden Sie Ihren gegenwärtigen Gesundheitszustand beschreiben?

- Sehr gut
- Gut
- Zufriedenstellend
- Weniger gut
- Schlecht

77 Die folgenden Aussagen kennzeichnen verschiedene Einstellungen zum Leben und zur Zukunft. In welchem Maße stimmen Sie persönlich den einzelnen Aussagen zu?

s Antworten Sie bitte wieder anhand einer Skala. Der Wert 1 bedeutet „Stimme überhaupt nicht zu“, der Wert 7 bedeutet „Stimme voll zu“. Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstimmen.

	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu						Stimme voll zu
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Wie mein Leben verläuft, hängt von mir selbst ab.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Erfolg muss man sich hart erarbeiten.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ich mache häufig die Erfahrung, dass andere über mein Leben bestimmen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Was man im Leben erreicht, ist in erster Linie eine Frage von Schicksal oder Glück.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

78 Wie oft haben Sie das Gefühl, ...

	Sehr oft	Oft	Manchmal	Selten	Nie
... dass Ihnen die Gesellschaft anderer fehlt?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... außen vor zu sein?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... dass Sie sozial isoliert sind?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

79 Und jetzt möchten wir wissen, wie stark Sie sich mit bestimmten Orten oder Regionen und den Bürger/-innen dort verbunden fühlen.

	Stark verbunden	Ziemlich verbunden	Wenig verbunden	Gar nicht verbunden
Wie stark fühlen Sie sich verbunden mit ...				
... Ihrer Gemeinde (Stadt) in Deutschland und ihren Bürger/-innen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... Deutschland als Ganzem und seinen Bürger/-innen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... Ihrer ehemaligen Gemeinde (Stadt) in dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben und ihren Bürger/-innen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... dem Land, in dem Sie zuletzt im Ausland gelebt haben als Ganzem und seinen Bürger/-innen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... der Europäischen Union und ihren Bürger/-innen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

80 Wie schätzen Sie sich persönlich ein: Sind Sie im Allgemeinen ein risikobereiter Mensch oder versuchen Sie, Risiken zu vermeiden?

➤ Antworten Sie bitte anhand der folgenden Skala, wobei der Wert 0 bedeutet „Gar nicht risikobereit“ und der Wert 10 „Sehr risikobereit“. Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstimmen.


Gar nicht risikobereit											Sehr risikobereit
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

➤ Zum Schluss möchten wir Sie noch nach Ihrer Zufriedenheit mit Ihrem Leben insgesamt fragen.

81 Wie zufrieden sind Sie gegenwärtig, alles in allem, mit Ihrem Leben?

➤ Antworten Sie bitte wieder anhand der folgenden Skala, wobei der Wert 0 bedeutet „Ganz und gar unzufrieden“ und der Wert 10 „Ganz und gar zufrieden“. Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstimmen.

Ganz und gar unzufrieden											Ganz und gar zufrieden
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**Wir bedanken uns nochmals herzlich
für Ihre Zeit und Unterstützung!**

Wenn Sie Fragen haben, wenden Sie sich bitte unter
der Telefonnummer +49 (521) 5242 200 an den
Studienleiter im SOKO Institut, Herrn Frederik Knirsch
bzw. seine Mitarbeiter/-innen.

Nutzen Sie bei Fragen auch unsere E-Mail-Adresse
info@international-mobil.de.



Impressum

SOKO Institut
Ritterstraße 19
33602 Bielefeld

Ansprechpartner
Frederik Knirsch


Kontakt
Fon: +49 (0)521 5242 200
Fax: +49 (0)521 5242 199
info@international-mobil.de
www.studie.international-mobil.de

- Wie angekündigt möchten wir Ihnen gerne ein kleines Dankeschön zukommen lassen. Unabhängig davon würden wir uns auch freuen, wenn wir Sie im Rahmen unseres Projektes erneut kontaktieren dürfen. Die Aussagekraft unserer Forschungsergebnisse ist ganz entscheidend von Ihrer weiteren Unterstützung abhängig.

Bitte füllen Sie deshalb dieses Kontaktdatenblatt (Vorder- und Rückseite) aus und senden es zusammen mit dem Fragebogen über den beiliegenden Freiumschlag kostenlos an das von uns beauftragte SOKO Institut zurück. Vielen Dank!


Erneuter Kontakt

- Wir möchten ein besseres Verständnis davon bekommen, wie sich das Leben der Menschen entwickelt, die ins Ausland gehen oder aus dem Ausland nach Deutschland ziehen. Daher würden wir Sie gerne erneut zu Ihrer Lebenssituation befragen. Das nächste Mal würden wir Sie in ca. einem halben Jahr kontaktieren.

 Wenn Sie damit einverstanden sind, dass wir Sie zukünftig im Rahmen des Projektes international mobil kontaktieren, dann würden wir dies zukünftig gerne möglichst einfach und unkompliziert per E-Mail tun. Bitte geben Sie nachfolgend eine E-Mail-Adresse an, über die wir Sie am besten erreichen können.

- Ihre E-Mail-Adresse wird von uns einzig dafür verwendet, Sie im Rahmen unseres Projektes zu kontaktieren. Sie wird streng vertraulich behandelt und nicht an Dritte weitergegeben. Sie wird nicht mit den Befragungsdaten in Verbindung gebracht.

E-Mail: _____ @ _____

 Auch wenn der Kontakt per E-Mail besonders unkompliziert und einfach ist, kann es sein, dass diese Verbindung einmal nicht funktioniert. Wären Sie bereit, für solche Fälle weitere Kontaktinformationen anzugeben?

- Ihre Kontaktinformationen werden von uns einzige dafür verwendet, Sie im Rahmen unseres Projektes zu kontaktieren. Sie werden streng vertraulich behandelt und nicht an Dritte weitergegeben.

Ihre Festnetznummer:

Ihre Mobilfunknummer:

eine alternative Mobilfunknummer:
(falls vorhanden)

eine alternative E-Mail-Adresse:
(falls vorhanden)

Vorname:

Nachname:

ggf. Adresszusatz:

Straße & Hausnummer:

Postleitzahl / Postcode:

Stadt:

Land:


Bitte wenden ➡

➤ **Wie angekündigt möchten wir Ihnen gerne ein kleines Dankeschön zukommen lassen. Unabhängig davon würden wir uns auch freuen, wenn wir Sie im Rahmen unseres Projektes erneut kontaktieren dürfen. Die Aussagekraft unserer Forschungsergebnisse ist ganz entscheidend von Ihrer weiteren Unterstützung abhängig.**

Bitte füllen Sie deshalb dieses Kontaktdatenblatt (Vorder- und Rückseite) aus und senden es zusammen mit dem Fragebogen über den beiliegenden Freiumschlag kostenlos an das von uns beauftragte SOKO Institut zurück. Vielen Dank!


Unser kleines Dankeschön an Sie!

➤ **Vielen Dank, dass Sie sich die Zeit genommen haben, unsere Fragen zu beantworten. Als kleines „Dankeschön“ für Ihre Unterstützung möchten wir Ihnen gerne 10 Euro zukommen lassen**

 Bitte wählen Sie eine der folgenden Möglichkeiten.

- Amazon-Gutschein in Höhe von 10 Euro (amazon.de).
- Überweisung von 10 Euro (via PayPal).
- Spende in Höhe von 10 Euro für einen gemeinnützigen Zweck an eine der folgenden Organisationen:
 - ↳ UNICEF (www.unicef.de)
 - ↳ Ärzte ohne Grenzen (www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.de)
 - ↳ Naturschutzbund Deutschland (www.nabu.de)
 - ↳ Deutsche Krebshilfe (www.krebshilfe.de)
 - ↳ Stiftung Deutsche Sporthilfe (www.sporthilfe.de)
 - ↳ Viva con Agua (www.vivaconagua.org)
- Ich möchte auf das „Dankeschön“ verzichten.



 Sollten Sie als Dankeschön einen Amazon Gutschein oder eine Überweisung via PayPal gewählt haben, benötigen wir noch einmal Kontaktinformationen von Ihnen, um die Weitergabe des Dankeschöns zu organisieren. Bitte geben Sie uns zu diesem Zweck eine gültige und aktuelle E-Mail-Adresse bzw. die E-Mail-Adresse mit der Ihr PayPal-Konto verknüpft ist und über die der Geldtransfer via PayPal abgewickelt werden kann. Bitte nennen Sie uns ggf. auch Ihren Namen und Ihre Telefonnummer für evtl. Rückfragen.

➤ **Bitte beachten Sie:** PayPal wird mit Ihnen über die angegebenen Mailadresse Kontakt aufnehmen. Mit der Angabe Ihrer E-Mail-Adresse erklären Sie sich einverstanden, dass wir diese zum Zweck des Geldtransfers an PayPal weiterleiten. **Die Angabe Ihrer weiteren Kontaktdaten werden streng vertraulich behandelt und nicht an Dritte (auch nicht an PayPal) weitergegeben.**

E-Mail-Adresse:

Vorname und Nachname:

Telefonnummer:

Bitte wenden ➡