

Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries

**Germany
(CILS4EU-DE)**

Technical Report

Wave 6 (Short Version) – 2016/17

Version: 4.0.0

Year: 2019

Citation: CILS4EU-DE. 2019. Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries – Germany. Technical Report. Wave 6 (Short Version) – 2016/17, v4.0.0. Mannheim: Mannheim University.

Content

1	General Remarks	1
2	Fieldwork	2
2.1	Gross Sample of Wave 6 (Short Version) (Phone, Web/Post)	2
2.2	General Approach	2
2.3	Telephone Survey	3
2.4	Web/Postal Survey	4
3	Participation Rates.....	5
3.1	Overall Participation Rates	5
3.2	Telephone Survey Participation Rates	6
3.3	Web/Postal Survey Participation Rates.....	7
4	Response Times	8
5	Overall Sample Size Wave 6 (Long and Short Version)	9
6	Appendix.....	10

List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1: Fieldwork overview	3
Figure 2: Response times in web/postal survey (truncated at response=50 days)	8
Figure 3: Response times in web survey (truncated at response=50 days)	11
Figure 4: Response times in postal survey (truncated at response=50 days)	11
Table 1: Overall participation by immigrant status (% in brackets)	5
Table 2: Overall participation by stratum (% in brackets)	6
Table 3: Participation in telephone survey by immigrant status (% in brackets)	6
Table 4: Participation in telephone survey by stratum (% in brackets)	6
Table 5: Participation in web/postal survey by immigrant status (% in brackets)	7
Table 6: Participation in web/postal survey by stratum (% in brackets)	7
Table 7: Overall participation by immigrant status (weak definition) (% in brackets)	10
Table 8: Participation in telephone survey by immigrant status (weak definition) (% in brackets)	10
Table 9: Participation in web/postal survey by immigrant status (weak definition) (% in brackets)	10

1 General Remarks

The sixth wave of the “Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries” in Germany (CILS4EU-DE) included a refreshment sample for the first time, i.e. a random group of new respondents that was added to the initial sample in order to account for panel attrition across previous waves. To gain comparable information about the new respondents’ educational, labour market and partnership trajectories since 2011, we implemented a life history calendar (LHC) in this wave. Additionally, we decided to measure the respondents’ accent and/or dialect and to repeat the achievement tests that were conducted during the school interview in the first wave. To implement all these features, we conducted face-to-face interviews with the respondents at home, each taking around 60 minutes. More information and a description of the fieldwork can be found in the Technical Report (Long Version) by Schiel et al. (2016).

In the face-to-face interviews, a response rate of 51.62 per cent (N=1,561) of our gross sample of initial panelists was achieved. We decided to approach the persons who did not participate several months later with a short version of the main questionnaire in one of the usual interview modes from the third, fourth, and fifth wave.¹ This technical report focusses on the data collection of these short interviews. We started the fieldwork with a gross sample of 1,149 adolescents. By the end of the fieldwork period, overall 64.93 per cent (N=746) of the gross sample had participated (for further details, see section 3). Fieldwork was conducted in three different consecutive interview modes: by telephone, via web surveys and with postal questionnaires. All adolescents were first contacted by phone. This gave us the possibility to explain our reasons for approaching them a second time although they had not participated in the face-to-face interview. Persons who could not be reached by phone were subsequently approached via (e-)mail. Regardless of the interview mode the adolescents were approached with, we offered them 10 Euro cash as an incentive for their participation, which was sent to them via mail after having completed the interview.

¹ The only group we did not contact again were respondents who explicitly withdrew their panel consent when asking them to participate in the face-to-face interview of wave 6 (N=317).

This technical report entails information about the fieldwork process: First, we describe our general approach in the different stages of fieldwork (section 2). Second, response rates will be presented separately for each interview mode (section 3). Third, we provide information on the respondents' response times in the web/postal survey mode (section 4). In the last section, we give an overview of the total number of cases in the entire wave 6 taking the long and the short interviews together (section 5).

2 Fieldwork

2.1 Gross Sample of Wave 6 (Short Version) (Phone, Web/Post)


In the long version of wave 6 (face-to-face), we successfully conducted a total of 1,561 interviews. 578 persons did not answer, 539 persons were soft refusals (i.e., they declined to participate in the long version but did not disagree to be contacted again), and 32 persons did not participate for other reasons² (see Figure 1, first row). 317 people refused to participate in the interview by explicitly stating that they did not want to be contacted again in the future. Thus, a total of 1,149 participants remained for further investigation. This number constitutes the gross sample of the short version (Phone, Web/Post) of wave 6.

2.2 General Approach

Our general approach was to contact the adolescents first by phone (given that we knew their phone number). This gave us the possibility to explain our reasons for approaching them again. Where the telephone calls were not successful, we tried to contact the persons by (regular) mail and e-mail two months later.

² Most of them were living abroad (N=24) and thus could not be contacted by the interviewers.

Figure 1: Fieldwork overview



2.3 Telephone Survey

From all eligible respondents, a total of 1,059 adolescents had provided us with at least one phone number. As can be seen in Figure 1 (third row), only a small number of persons had

not provided their phone number (N=83). Another seven adolescents were not approached, as they explicitly stated in previous waves not wanting to be contacted by phone.

The telephone questionnaire was programmed using the CATI software “Voxco”. We carefully checked for mistakes, and only minor adaptations were necessary. The average duration of an interview was approximately 8 minutes³. The telephone interviews took place in the telephone laboratory of the Mannheim Centre for European Social Research (MZES) at Mannheim University. The interviews were carried out between November 10th, 2016 and December 21st, 2016. Overall, we employed 26 student research assistants as interviewers, calling respondents from Mondays to Thursdays between 5.15 p.m. and 8.30 p.m., on Fridays between 5.15 p.m. and 6.45 p.m., and on Saturdays between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. All interviewers were undergraduates and were paid an hourly wage.

By the end of the telephone fieldwork period, 490 interviews had been conducted. The main reason for not realizing more telephone interviews in this wave was the high number of people who could not be reached (N=238, see Figure 1 (fourth row) or Table 6 for more details).

2.4 Web/Postal Survey

On January 20th, 2017 we sent out a cover letter together with a short self-completion questionnaire (4 pages), a contact sheet, two stamped return envelopes, and a pencil to all remaining 531 adolescents. The cover letter also included a link to the web survey, which was programmed using the provider and software “Unipark”. Simultaneously, all adolescents who had provided us with an e-mail address were contacted also by e-mail and were asked to participate in the web survey. Another day later, a second attempt was made to contact adolescents using a corrected or alternative e-mail address if the first e-mail turned out to be undeliverable.

³ Please note that approximately three minutes were needed at the end of the interview to collect the respondent’s contact information. Thus, the regular questionnaire took 5 minutes on average.

Altogether, the postal/web survey resulted in 256 interviews: 127 respondents participated online and 129 completed a mail questionnaire (see Figure 1, sixth row). Up to this point, one person actively refused participation. We had no answers from 267 persons and did not reach another seven persons, whose e-mail addresses turned out to be invalid and/or to whom paper questionnaires could not be delivered. During the whole survey phase, additional efforts were made for adolescents whose questionnaires could not be delivered by regular mail: we contacted the respective register of residents in order to obtain new addresses, which proved to be quite successful.

3 Participation Rates

3.1 Overall Participation Rates

Table 1 represents the participation results of the short version of wave 6 (Phone, Web/Post) for the gross sample of 1,149 people. We obtained an overall participation rate of 64.93 per cent (N=746). The participation rate is lower for immigrants⁴ (61.67 per cent vs. 67.56 per cent), which is mainly due to the fact that many could not be reached or did not answer (cf. row “not reached/no answer”: 29.57 per cent vs. 19.21 per cent).

Table 1: Overall participation by immigrant status (% in brackets)

	Natives	Immigrants	Total
Participated total	429 (67.56)	317 (61.67)	746 (64.93)
Participated telephone	276 (43.46)	214 (41.63)	490 (42.65)
Participated post	78 (12.28)	51 (9.92)	129 (11.23)
Participated web	75 (11.81)	52 (10.12)	127 (11.05)
Refusal total	84 (13.23)	45 (8.75)	129 (11.23)
Refusal telephone	84 (13.23)	44 (8.56)	128 (11.14)
Refusal web/post	(0.00)	1 (0.19)	1 (0.09)
Not reached/no answer	122 (19.21)	152 (29.57)	274 (23.85)
Total	635	514	1,149

⁴ Immigrants are defined as persons with a migration background up to the 2.75th generation. For better comparability with previous reports, in which we use a broader definition of immigrants (up to the 3.5th generation), see Tables 8-10 in the appendix.

Interestingly, response rates still differ systematically with respect to sampling school strata from the first wave. Adolescents who attended a low-strata school in wave 1, i.e. a school with a lower number of immigrants, six years later had a higher participation rate and a lower non-contact rate than adolescents from a high-strata school (see Table 2).

Table 2: Overall participation by stratum (% in brackets)

	0-10%	10-30%	30-60%	60-100%	Total
Participated total	140 (77.78)	267 (66.09)	164 (58.99)	175 (60.98)	746 (64.93)
Participated telephone	95 (52.78)	186 (46.04)	105 (37.77)	104 (36.24)	490 (42.65)
Participated post	18 (10.00)	41 (10.15)	29 (10.43)	41 (14.29)	129 (11.23)
Participated web	27 (15.00)	40 (9.90)	30 (10.79)	30 (10.45)	127 (11.05)
Refusal total	14 (7.78)	56 (13.86)	33 (11.87)	26 (9.06)	129 (11.23)
Refusal telephone	14 (7.78)	56 (13.86)	32 (11.51)	26 (9.06)	128 (11.14)
Refusal web/post	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.36)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.09)
Not reached/no answer	26 (14.44)	81 (20.05)	81 (29.14)	86 (29.97)	274 (23.85)
Total	180	404	278	287	1,149

3.2 Telephone Survey Participation Rates

Table 3 shows that the participation rates in the telephone survey do not differ between natives and immigrants. However, the telephone sample comprises more natives than immigrants. Natives were more likely to refuse participation in the telephone survey than immigrants (14.24 per cent vs. 9.38 per cent).

Table 3: Participation in telephone survey by immigrant status (% in brackets)

	Natives	Immigrants	Total
Participated	276 (46.78)	214 (45.63)	490 (46.27)
Refusal	84 (14.24)	44 (9.38)	128 (12.09)
Not reached/no answer ⁵	230 (38.98)	211 (44.99)	441 (41.64)
Total	590	469	1,059

Table 4: Participation in telephone survey by stratum (% in brackets)

	0-10%	10-30%	30-60%	60-100%	Total
Participated	95 (57.23)	186 (49.08)	105 (41.18)	104 (40.15)	490 (46.27)
Refusal	14 (8.43)	56 (14.78)	32 (12.55)	26 (10.04)	128 (12.09)
Not reached/no answer ⁵	57 (34.34)	137 (36.15)	118 (46.27)	129 (49.81)	441 (41.64)
Total	166	379	255	259	1,059

⁵ “No answer” in this context means that the person was reached, but it was not possible to conduct an interview with him/her during the field period.

Again, response and refusal rates seem to be affected by the school strata (see Table 4). The reason for the lower participation rates of adolescents from high-strata schools is that almost half of them (49.81 per cent) could not be reached or did not answer.

3.3 Web/Postal Survey Participation Rates

Similarly to the overall figures, Table 5 shows that the response rate in the web/postal survey is lower for immigrants than for natives (post: 28.36 per cent vs. 19.92 per cent, web: 27.27 per cent vs. 20.31 per cent). Overall, the participation rates in the online and postal survey are almost identical. Immigrants were less likely to participate via mail questionnaire or web survey, because it was more difficult to reach them or because they did not answer.

Table 5: Participation in web/postal survey by immigrant status (% in brackets)

	Natives	Immigrants	Total
Participated post	78 (28.36)	51 (19.92)	129 (24.29)
Participated web	75 (27.27)	52 (20.31)	127 (23.92)
Refusal web/post	0 (0.00)	1 (0.39)	1 (0.19)
Not reached/no answer	122 (44.36)	152 (59.38)	274 (51.60)
Total	275	256	531

Table 6: Participation in web/postal survey by stratum (% in brackets)


	0-10%	10-30%	30-60%	60-100%	Total
Participated post	18 (25.35)	41 (25.31)	29 (20.57)	41 (26.11)	129 (24.29)
Participated web	27 (38.03)	40 (24.69)	30 (21.28)	30 (19.11)	127 (23.92)
Refusal web/post	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.71)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.19)
Not reached/no answer	26 (36.62)	81 (50.00)	81 (57.45)	86 (54.78)	274 (51.60)
Total	71	162	141	157	531

Again, participation rates in the web survey differ according to school strata, but not much in the postal survey (see Table 6). Whereas 38.03 per cent of the respondents from a low-strata school in wave 1 participated via web survey, only 19.11 per cent from a high-strata school did. The percentage of respondents who could not be reached or who did not answer (36.62) is also lowest in the 0-10% strata.

4 Response Times

Figure 2 shows the response times in the web/postal mode, which vary greatly. “Day 0” is defined as the day of the first successful contact. For most of the respondents, this corresponds to the day we sent out the e-mails.⁶ The majority of participants responded within the first week, with a minimum response time in the web survey of replying the same day we sent out the e-mail. The paper questionnaires were sent out via regular mail on the same day as the e-mail, but they needed on average two days more to be delivered to the adolescent and then two more days to be returned to us. Consequently, Figure 2 shows that many respondents participated one week after the day we sent out the mail questionnaire (for separate plots of the web and postal survey, see Figures 3 and 4 in the appendix).

Figure 2: Response times in web/postal survey (truncated at response=50 days)



⁶ An attempt is counted as successful if the e-mail (or the paper questionnaire) was not sent back as undeliverable. Therefore, “Day 0” can also refer to the date we sent out a second e-mail after a failed first attempt or the date we sent out the invitations via regular mail to those without e-mail addresses. For more information, see section 3.

5 Overall Sample Size Wave 6 (Long and Short Version)

In the last section, we give an overview of the final sample sizes of both parts of wave 6, i.e. the long and short version of the interview (see Table 7). In total, the refreshment sample constitutes approximately 60 per cent of the entire wave 6. Overall, the differences between natives and immigrants are rather negligible.

Table 7: Overall sample sizes by immigrant status (% in brackets)

	Natives	Immigrants	Total
Panel			
Face-to-face	909 (27.45)	652 (26.00)	1,561 (26.82)
Telephone	276 (8.33)	214 (8.53)	490 (8.42)
Post	78 (2.36)	51 (2.03)	129 (2.22)
Web	75 (2.26)	52 (2.07)	127 (2.18)
Total	1,338 (40.40)	969 (38.64)	2,307 (39.64)
Refreshment			
Face-to-face	1,974 (59.60)	1,539 (61.36)	3,513 (60.36)
Total	3,312	2,508	5,820

Please note that the total number of 5,820 cases in Table 7 deviates from the total number of 5,814 cases reported in Tables A2 and A3 in Schiel et al. (2016), representing the weight calibration, as six panel cases from the short version interview have not been included in the generation of the weights. For these persons, weights were replaced with those of respondents from the same class in wave 1. See the wave 6 Codebook (CILS4EU-DE 2018) for more information on this issue.

6 Appendix

Table 8: Overall participation by immigrant status (weak definition) (% in brackets)

	Natives	Immigrants	Total
Participated total	402 (67.56)	344 (62.09)	746 (64.93)
Participated telephone	258 (43.36)	232 (41.88)	490 (42.65)
Participated post	73 (12.27)	56 (10.11)	129 (11.23)
Participated web	71 (11.93)	56 (10.11)	127 (11.05)
Refusal total	78 (13.11)	51 (9.21)	129 (11.23)
Refusal telephone	78 (13.11)	50 (9.03)	128 (11.14)
Refusal web/post	0 (0.00)	1 (0.18)	1 (0.09)
Not reached/no answer	115 (19.33)	159 (28.70)	274 (23.85)
Total	595	554	1,149

Table 9: Participation in telephone survey by immigrant status (weak definition) (% in brackets)

	Natives	Immigrants	Total
Participated	258 (46.65)	232 (45.85)	490 (46.27)
Refusal	78 (14.10)	50 (9.88)	128 (12.09)
Not reached/no answer ⁷	217 (39.24)	224 (44.27)	441 (41.64)
Total	553	506	1,059

Table 10: Participation in web/postal survey by immigrant status (weak definition) (% in brackets)

	Natives	Immigrants	Total
Participated post	73 (28.19)	56 (20.59)	129 (24.29)
Participated web	71 (27.41)	56 (20.59)	127 (23.92)
Refusal web/post	0 (0.00)	1 (0.37)	1 (0.19)
Not reached/no answer	115 (44.40)	159 (58.46)	274 (51.60)
Total	259	272	531

⁷ “No answer” in this context means that the person could be reached, but it was not possible to conduct an interview with him/her during the field period.

Figure 3: Response times in web survey (truncated at response=50 days)




Figure 4: Response times in postal survey (truncated at response=50 days)

