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In 2021, SOEP underwent several important organizational changes. First, and foremost, the survey is now implemented by infas, whose first field report is presented in this annual report. Second, the SOEP Survey Committee welcomed five new members. The DIW Executive Board appointed Conchita D’Ambrosio from the University of Luxembourg, Frank Kalter and Jutta Mata from the University of Mannheim, Anette Scherpenzeel from the Netherlands Institute for Health Services Research (Nivel), and Joachim Winter from Ludwig-Maximilian-University in Munich. Third, in September 2021 Monika Jungbauer-Gans was elected chair.

As we welcome these new members, we would also like to thank the previous chair, Uwe Sunde, along with the other SOEP Survey Committee members Melissa Hardy, Lucinda Platt, and Susann Rohwedder, who left the committee at the end of their appointment periods, for their valuable advice and support to the SOEP.

Both SOEP and the broader research environment are evolving quickly: This year’s SOEP Annual Report highlights how the SOEP contributes to understanding these changes and their societal impacts by providing national and international science with reliable and high-quality data. More importantly, it demonstrates that our SOEP colleagues are able to react quickly to social developments and to push the boundaries of current research. In 2021, the SOEP extended the special survey SOEP-CoV by adding a second survey on the development of the Corona pandemic and the consequences for individuals and society. Moreover, it added a further wave of interviews to its migration samples. This Annual Report presents outputs of both of these surveys as well as examples of some of the studies that have been conducted with the data.

The teamwork and commitment of the SOEP’s multidisciplinary expert team makes these quick reactions to global events possible. The DIW Executive Board would like to express its sincere thanks and gratitude to all of the members of the SOEP team for making these achievements possible. During times of uncertainty for policy makers and society as a whole, having reliable information as a basis for research and policy is especially important. The SOEP provides such reliability, supporting research and politics with its wealth of data that accurately reflect German society.

We wish the readers of this Annual Report an enjoyable and inspiring read.
Once again in 2021, the COVID-19 pandemic shaped not only the everyday activities of the SOEP team, but also our research. To investigate how the pandemic has affected people’s living situations, the special SOEP-CoV survey entered its second round at the beginning of the year. In the fall, the second wave of the study “Living in Germany—Corona Monitoring 2021” began, focusing not only on the spread of infection but also on the willingness to get vaccinated, particularly among migrants and refugees. The study is being carried out by researchers at the SOEP in close collaboration with experts from the Robert Koch Institute (RKI), the Institute for Employment Research (IAB), and the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF).

The year 2021 brought a major change in our fieldwork: Following a Europe-wide tendering process, we began working with a new survey institute: infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences. Fieldwork had previously been conducted by Kantar from 1984 to 2020. The year also brought changes to the SOEP Survey Committee, which advises the SOEP on the development of the survey and on the provision of services. The SOEP-SC consists of up to ten scholars who are appointed by the DIW Board of Trustees. The former chair, Uwe Sunde, left the committee at the end of his term, as did several other members. Once again, renowned researchers were recruited to join the committee (see Chapter 2). We welcome Monika Jungbauer-Gans as the new chair.

This SOEP Annual Report gives you a glimpse of our work in 2021. Chapter 1 of this SOEP Annual Report tells you about several new projects that were launched by the SOEP in 2021. Some of these are being carried out in partnership with other research institutions and universities and have outside funding. This chapter also presents the SOEP’s migration and refugee samples as well as our special surveys on the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting the research potential of these datasets.

Chapter 2 presents the structure and divisions of the SOEP at DIW Berlin, the members of our team in 2021, and our advisory bodies. To find out more about SOEP fieldwork in 2021, see the report by infas in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents the SOEP team’s work on the 36th wave of the data, which went out to SOEP data users in spring of 2021, and data preparation for the 37th wave of the study, along with the results of our SOEP User Survey. The increasing use of SOEP-IS data for high-quality scientific research is presented separately in the statistics on publications at the end of this report.

The SOEP Annual Report focuses on the data set we refer to as SOEP-Core. This consists of the original SOEP sample that was launched in 1984 and all of the subsamples and refresher samples that have been added to it over the years. When the SOEP survey first started, its aim was to provide a representative picture of private households in Germany from both a cross-sectional and a longitudinal perspective. This remains the objective of SOEP-Core to this day.

We thank you for your interest in the SOEP!
SOEP 2021: THE YEAR IN NUMBERS

- 35 research projects at the SOEP
- 35 dissertations by SOEP team members
- 18 doctoral students on the SOEP team
- 62 members of the SOEP team
- 12,775 registered SOEP data users from 52 countries
- 1,569 new SOEP data users
SOEP Annual Report 2021

SOEP 2021: The Year in Numbers

- ~10 million euros in outside project funding
- ~20,000 successfully interviewed households (incl. migrant and refugee samples)
- 140 papers by SOEP staff in DIW/SOEP publications
- 50 papers by SOEP staff in (S)SCI publications
- 444 papers published worldwide using SOEP data
- 45 guest researchers at the SOEP
- 38th wave of SOEP data in the field

SOEP Core
SOEP Users Around the World 2021
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SOEP 2021: The Year in Review
Second round of SOEP-CoV launched

The second round of the SOEP-CoV survey was launched in January to study the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on various life domains.

Markus M. Grabka provides expert testimony on Mini-Jobs to the German Bundestag

Appearing before the Bundestag Committee on Labor and Social Affairs in February, Markus M. Grabka provided expert testimony and answered questions on the topic of Mini-Jobs. He argued that the current minimum threshold of 450 euros per month for Mini-Jobs should be lowered in order to check the growth of Germany's low-wage sector. His statement can be found on the website of the German Bundestag.

Cornelia Kristen joins SOEP migration research area

The SOEP continues to build its research profile in the area of migration and integration. Cornelia Kristen, Professor of Sociology at the University of Bamberg, joined the SOEP team in January as a Senior Research Fellow. She studies issues related to the integration of immigrants and their descendants. She is also an expert on social inequality and educational sociology.
New research project launched on the opportunities and risks of digitization

Digitization opens up opportunities to improve working life and positively impact society as a whole, but it also bears considerable risks. How far has digital transformation progressed? How is digitization changing the quality of work? And what does it mean for employment relationships? These are the topics of the research project “Employment risks and quality of work in the digital transformation: Empirical analyses on AI, platform work, and digital workplaces with the SOEP” launched by SOEP in March with its partners, the Technical University of Berlin and the Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (BMAS). The project will collect data on digitization as part of the SOEP survey, analyze the data from an interdisciplinary perspective, and conduct methodological validation. For details, see the project page (in German).

2021 German Data Report published

The 2021 German Data Report addresses questions about the poverty risk in Germany, people’s success in building assets and wealth, and perceptions of income inequality in Germany and Europe. One fourth of the 52 reports in the 2021 Data Report are based on SOEP data. The report combines data from official statistical sources with social research data and provides a comprehensive picture of the living conditions and attitudes of people in Germany. It can be downloaded from the following websites: Berlin Social Science Center (WZB), Federal Statistical Office (Destatis), and Federal Agency for Civic Education (BpB).

SOEP researchers in Leopoldina working group study pandemic’s impacts on adolescents

SOEP researchers Jürgen Schupp and Gert G. Wagner, along with former DIW department head C. Katharina Spiess, participated in the ad hoc working group “Corona—Children, Adolescents, Young Adults” headed by Professor Jutta Mata (Health Psychology, University of Mannheim) and Professor Ralph Hertwig (MPI for Human Development) at the German National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina. The working group aimed to shed light on the psychological, physical, educational, social, and economic impacts of the pandemic on children, adolescents, and young adults. After concluding their work between March and June, the group released their findings.
Charlotte Bartels
Appointed John F. Kennedy Memorial Fellow & Visiting Scholar 2021–2022

Postdoctoral researcher Charlotte Bartels was appointed John F. Kennedy Memorial Fellow & Visiting Scholar 2021–2022 at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies (CES) at Harvard University. During her stay at Harvard, she will analyze the long-run relationship between inequality and voting behavior using her newly built German Regional Inequality Database.

Infas starts fieldwork for the SOEP

The infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences in Bonn started its first wave of fieldwork for the SOEP in April. Infas is one of the largest and most renowned private social research institutes in Germany, with extensive experience conducting fieldwork for surveys including the National Education Panel (NEPS) and the IAB Household Panel (PASS).

German government’s Sixth Poverty and Wealth Report published using SOEP data

The German government published its sixth Poverty and Wealth Report in May using indicators from SOEP data. The indicators were presented in the form of interactive graphics and can be downloaded from the Poverty and Wealth Report website.
RKI-SOEP Nationwide Corona Monitoring Study releases initial findings

First results from the RKI-SOEP study show a higher rate of SARS-CoV-2 infections among people with a lower level of education. The results also reveal that around two out of every 100 adults in Germany had been infected with SARS-CoV-2 as of November 2020—around twice as many as officially recorded for this time period. As part of this study, approximately 15,000 adults took a SARS-CoV-2 antibody and PCR test and answered a questionnaire. For further information, see the RKI factsheet (in German) and our project site.

SOEP’s Employer-Employee Survey enters second round

Changes in labor relations in the context of digitization are the focus of the second Linked Employer-Employee Study of the SOEP, which started in June. The survey also looks at how the pandemic has affected personnel and business management. Linking individual, household, and employer data adds not only additional variables but also a further data source to the SOEP. Project partners are Helmut Schmidt University and the University of the Federal Armed Forces in Hamburg.

Studying Regional Development Dynamics and their Political Consequences: Leibniz ScienceCampus SOEP RegioHub at Bielefeld University

The Leibniz ScienceCampus SOEP RegioHub at Bielefeld University started with eight PhD students in the disciplines of sociology, economics, public health, and data science. The doctoral students are based at Bielefeld University and also at the Socio-Economic Panel in Berlin. A separate graduate training program is designed to ensure that the doctoral students receive training in theory, methodology, and data infrastructure that is optimally suited to their research questions. For more information on the project, please see our website: https://lsc-soep-regiohub.com/
New study on social cohesion in Germany

The study “Living Together in Germany,” a project of the SOEP in partnership with the University of Bremen, was launched in September to study social cohesion in Germany. The survey includes questions about people’s personal attitudes toward society and politics, social relationships, family and leisure time, and housing and financial situations. For the study, the infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences is interviewing around 15,000 people aged 18 and over in more than 200 municipalities throughout Germany.

Second RKI-SOEP Nationwide Corona Monitoring Study launched

As part of RKI-SOEP-2, launched in September, respondents were asked to take a dry blood spot test and complete a short questionnaire. The results deliver insights into rates of infection and vaccination in the population, the prevalence of antibodies, and attitudes toward vaccination. The study is being carried out by the SOEP in partnership with the Robert Koch Institute. Other partners include the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) and the Research Centre of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF).

Joint Science Conference approves SOEP budget increase

In the fall of 2021, the Joint Science Conference (GWK) approved a permanent increase in the SOEP’s budget (Kleiner Sondertatbestand) in the amount of around 1 million euros. This will enable the SOEP to continue developing on various levels. First, it will go toward the surveys of migrants, high-net-worth individuals, and same-sex couples, which were previously financed through third-party funds. It will help to expand the range of SOEP data by linking SOEP with data from other institutions, such as the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) and the German Pension Insurance Association. It will also enable closer cooperation with international household panel studies such as the Cross-National Equivalent File (CNEF). Finally, the funding will go toward improving and expanding services for SOEP data users.
New research project studying the pandemic’s impacts on vulnerable groups

The project “Groups Put at Particular Risk by Covid-19” (GaPRisk) funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) was launched in November to answer questions such as how the pandemic is affecting vulnerable groups in Germany, and how successful government measures have been in containing the virus. In particular, researchers are investigating how people’s health and their economic situations have changed during the pandemic and what this means for inequality in society.

Five new members appointed to SOEP Survey Committee

At its meeting in early November 2021, the DIW Board of Trustees appointed five new members to the SOEP Survey Committee. In the coming years, they and the rest of the Survey Committee will advise the SOEP team on the content and methodology of the surveys, as well as on SOEP’s research and services. New members include economist Conchita D’Ambrosio, sociologist Frank Kalter, health psychologist Jutta Mata, survey methodologist Annette Scherpenzeel and empirical economist Joachim Winter.
FINDINGS FROM THE RESEARCH ON MIGRATION: Successes and Challenges of Integration

Germany has made significant progress in integration in recent years. Not only do more first- and second-generation immigrants consider themselves German, they are also improving their German skills, finding work, and spending more time with non-immigrants. These are just a few of the findings from studies based on data from the SOEP’s surveys of immigrants and refugees (IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees and IAB SOEP Migration Sample) conducted in cooperation with the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) and the Research Center of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF). More than 2,500 immigrants have participated in these surveys since 2013 and more than 4,000 refugees since 2016.

Below are some of the most important SOEP-based findings on migration and integration published in 2021:

Progress in integration among first- and second-generation immigrants

In 2018, half of all first-generation immigrants and three-quarters of all second-generation immigrants considered themselves German. In the same year, 56 percent of first-generation immigrants and 77 percent of second-generation immigrants had a primarily non-immigrant circle of friends. Second-generation immigrants from the new EU member states are now almost completely integrated into German society. These findings were the result of a study by the German Economic Institute published in March.

Older refugees facing unique challenges

The majority of refugees who have come to Germany in recent years are relatively young. Only about 12 percent of all refugees living in Germany are 45 or older. These older individuals face particular challenges. They often have a harder time learning German, finding work, and making friends in Germany. These are some of the findings of a study by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) published in April.

Many older refugees are worried about their application for asylum (52%), about not being able to stay in Germany (66%), and about having to return to their country of origin (73%). They also worry about their financial situation and health. And yet, all in all, older refugees are approximately as satisfied with their lives as younger refugees are. The author of the study, Amrei Maddox, suspects that one reason for this is the older generation’s stronger family ties: Most older refugees live with family members.

» BAMF: “Older refugees in Germany”
» BAMF: “Living situations of older refugees in Germany”
Social integration and language skills improving among refugees

According to a study by researchers Wenke Niehues, Nina Roth er, and Manuel Siegert at the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF), there is steady improvement in German language skills among refugees who arrived in Germany between 2013 and 2016. As of 2019, five out of 10 refugees rated their German skills as “good” to “very good”. The results also show that refugees are spending increasing amounts of time with Germans, especially in work and educational settings.

However, older refugees, refugees with poorer German skills, and refugee women with small children need more time to build social relationships with Germans. They also run the risk of falling behind in the development of language skills and social contacts.

Study results also indicate that refugees’ social contacts decreased again during the pandemic, and that many refugees’ language skills may have plateaued or declined.

» BAMF: “Bessere Deutschkenntnisse und mehr soziale Kontakte bei Geflüchteten”

Pandemic job loss higher among refugees

Immigrants often hold temporary jobs in sectors like food service and hospitality, and many had only been working for a short time when the pandemic hit. As a result, immigrants were 2.5 times more likely than other workers to lose their jobs during COVID-19. Pandemic job loss was even higher among refugees.

The insights into the employment effects of the pandemic were among the findings of a study by the Institute for Employment Research (IAB).

“Refugees still often have shorter tenures with employers, work more for small businesses, and more often have fixed-term contracts and temporary jobs,” explains Herbert Brücker, Head of Migration, Integration, and International Labor Market Research at IAB. “Due to these factors, refugees had a higher risk of layoffs in the first lockdown but an above-average increase in employment thereafter.”

Another reason for the higher job loss among refugees lies in the different types of work that immigrants and non-immigrants do. Immigrants, and refugees in particular, often have jobs that cannot be done from home. According to study results, only three percent of refugees were able to work from home during the pandemic.

https://www.iab.de/de/informationsservice/presse/presseinformationen/kbo921.aspx
https://doku.iab.de/forschungsbericht/2021/fb0521.pdf

How has the pandemic affected household income?

According to a study based on SOEP-CoV data, the income gap between high- and low-income households has narrowed over the course of the pandemic. But unfortunately, this is bad news rather than good: It is due to a decline in income among self-employed people, who are otherwise among the better-off. “If the pandemic drags on and if measures to contain it are tightened further, this could bring about rising bankruptcy and unemployment,” said SOEP expert and study author Markus Grabka. His analysis shows that monthly net household incomes fell by an average of 16 percent, or 460 euros, among self-employed workers during the second lockdown, while incomes rose by 5 percent among salaried employees and civil servants. There was no change on average in other groups.

» DIW Berlin: “Corona pandemic reduces income inequality”

How does trust affect willingness to get vaccinated?

Social trust has been shown to foster cooperation, even during crisis situations. And according to results from the SOEP-CoV study, this mechanism has been at work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Social trust has been high during the pandemic and even increased between February 2020 and June 2021. The results show that trust has also played an important role in combatting the pandemic: People with higher trust in others were more likely to get vaccinated and to follow social distancing, hand hygiene, and mask rules.

» Corona-Pandemie: “Vertrauensvolle Menschen sind eher zur Impfung bereit und halten sich eher an AHA-Regeln”
How satisfied were people with their lives during the pandemic?

SOEP-CoV data show that life satisfaction has declined since the start of the pandemic, particularly in the areas of leisure-time activities and family life. But in some areas, satisfaction has increased. Many adults rate both their health and their sleep as significantly better than before. SOEP director Stefan Liebig commented, “When faced with the threat of the pandemic, you can more easily disregard smaller aches and pains.” As to the increased satisfaction with sleep, he noted: “Working from home eliminates the need for long commutes to work.”

» Berliner Zeitung: “Wie geht es uns in der Pandemie?”

» SOEP-CoV Spotlight: “Während der Corona-Pandemie sind die Menschen zunehmend unzufrieden mit der Freizeit, aber weiterhin zufrieden mit ihrem Schlaf”

Who has been affected most by pandemic restrictions?

Measures taken to contain the COVID-19 pandemic have meant that people in Germany have spent much more time at home than before. For many, this has led to psychological stress. Although one might assume that people living alone suffered the most from contact restrictions, data from the first months of the pandemic show that people living alone coped surprisingly well. Couples with children, in contrast, found the pandemic very stressful. They rated their well-being lower than in previous years and they were also less satisfied with their lives overall. For single parents, loneliness was the main problem during the pandemic.

» SOEP-CoV Spotlight: “Family life in lockdown”

» SOEP-CoV Spotlight: “Alleinlebende verkraften die Pandemie erstaunlich gut”
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Overview of the SOEP Research Infrastructure at DIW Berlin
The Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) is an independent research-driven infrastructure. Data from the SOEP survey are made available to researchers worldwide and are also used in research carried out by the SOEP team at DIW Berlin.

**Tasks and Structure**

Researchers on the SOEP team use the data to study processes of transformation and change in our society. A first key topic of research at the SOEP is the question of how equally or unequally societal resources such as income and wealth are distributed, and how differences in access to education and the labor market create risks and opportunities. A second topic of research is how living conditions affect health and well-being, and what role personality plays across the life course. A third research topic deals with the living situations of migrants. The fourth key research topic is how the SOEP study can be developed and improved from a survey methodology and data science perspective. In addition to these four key topics of research at the SOEP, the Junior Research Group “Social and Psychological Determinants of Mental Health in the Life Course” (SocPsych-MH) aims to strengthen SOEP research on mental health from an interdisciplinary perspective.

These topics of SOEP research correspond to the following four research areas:

1. Social Inequalities and Distribution
2. Subjective Well-Being, Personality, and Health
3. Migration and Integration
4. Survey Methodology and Data Science

A list of contacts who can provide more information on questions in each of these areas can be found on our website under SOEP Research.
SOEP staff also carry out a range of infrastructure tasks: conceptualizing studies and samples (Survey Methodology and Management), preparing SOEP data for user-friendly analysis and distributing the data to researchers (Data Operation and Research Data Center (RDC)), and analyzing the data (Applied Panel Analysis). They provide training in the use of the SOEP data and disseminate SOEP-based research findings throughout society—to both the policy community and the broader public (Knowledge Transfer).

The SOEP infrastructure is managed by a Board of Directors. These include the Director of the SOEP (who is also a member of the DIW Executive Board) and four division heads. The SOEP Survey Committee, which is comprised of up to ten researchers appointed by the DIW Board of Trustees, serves as a scientific advisory board to the SOEP.

The SOEP is one of Germany’s most important research data infrastructures in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences and is part of the National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI). As a member institute in the Leibniz Association, the SOEP receives funding from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and Germany’s state governments.
SOEP Administration and Management

In 2021, the SOEP Administration and Management team was responsible for around 60 staff members, as well as trainees, doctoral students, grant holders, and about 30 student assistants. The team provides a range of research and administrative support services as well as research and project management to the entire SOEP team. Administrative support activities include liaising with the SOEP Survey Committee and coordinating and facilitating administrative processes between the SOEP unit and DIW Berlin’s financial and human resources units.

The team also manages communications with SOEP study respondents, the research community, and the media. Media relations activities range from traditional media outreach to social media management and media training for researchers. As part of communications management, the project SOEP-Transfer aims to make SOEP data accessible to journalists.

The SOEP’s management team is comprised of the SOEP director and the heads of the four divisions: Survey Methodology and Management, Research Data Center, Applied Panel Analysis, and Knowledge Transfer. The members of this team set the direction for the diverse activities of the SOEP, ranging from independent research to infrastructure provision, and define strategic goals for the future development of the SOEP.

The Social Inequality and Justice Project Group (PIJE) was established in 2018 under the supervision of SOEP Director Stefan Liebig to intensify research on attitudes and perceptions related to social inequalities in the SOEP. The group was involved in the development of the module “Attitudes Toward Social Inequalities”, which was part of the survey in SOEP-Core 2021 and was developed together with a group of external experts.
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Survey Methodology and Management

**Prof. Dr. Sabine Zinn**
SOEP Board of Directors and Head of the Division of Survey Methodology and Management

**Luise Burkhardt**
Doctoral Student BGSS
Research Focus: Well-Being, Civic Engagement, and Quantitative Panel Data Analysis
Research Project: Evaluation of the Skilled Workers Immigration Act (M8)

**Dr. Adriana Cardozo Silva**
Research Focus: Labor and Employment, Migration, Inequality
Research Project: Refugee Families in Germany – GeFam2

**Dr. Carina Cornesse**
Coordinator Social Cohesion Panel – SOEP-related study ZHP-FGZ
Research Focus: Recruitment and maintenance of panel studies, the benefits and limitations of probability-based and non-probability samples, the application of mixed-mode data collection designs, and on linking survey data to data from other sources

**Miriam Gauer**
Doctoral Student
Research Focus: Gender, Migration, and Data Science

**Martin Gerike**
Specialist in Market and Social Research, Research Project: DDR-Psych

**Florian Griese**
Specialist in Market and Social Research, Survey Management

**Angelina Hammon**
Doctoral Student BAGGS
Research Focus: Handling of (Non-Ignorable) Missing Data, Multiple Imputation, Analytic Inference for Complex Survey Data, Bayesian Inference
Research Project: Web-Based, Non-Probability Surveys

**David Kasprowski**
Doctoral Student
Research Focus: Sexual Minorities and Gender Diversity, Inequality, Well-Being

**Michael D. Krämer**
Doctoral Student LIFE
Research Project: Personality and Social Relationship Dynamics: Short- and Medium-Term Processes in Daily Life

**Dr. Magdalena Krieger**
Research Focus: Migration
Research Project: MORE

**Prof. Dr. Cornelia Kristen**
Support for SOEP Research in the Area of Migration and Integration

**Dr. Elisabeth Liebau**
Survey Management
Research Focus: Migration
Research Project: GeFam

**Lisa Pagel**
Doctoral Student BGSS
Research Project: GeFam

**Prof. Dr. David Richter**
SOEP Innovation Sample (SOEP-IS)
Research Focus: Psychology

**Rainer Siegers**
Sampling and Weighting

**Hans Walter Steinhauer**
Sampling, Weighting, and Imputation, Research Focus: Item- and Unit-Nonresponse, Panel Attrition, Research Project: Evaluation of the Skilled Workers Immigration Act (M8)

The team of the Survey Methodology and Management division is responsible for all aspects of data collection, ranging from sampling designs and questionnaire development to research on selectiveness in the data. Experts from the team work closely with the other SOEP divisions, the SOEP Survey Committee and with the institute that conducts the fieldwork for the SOEP survey. The team is also responsible for the SOEP refugee sample and the Innovation Sample. The latter provides a framework for testing new and innovative concepts, questions, and survey instruments for potential inclusion in the main SOEP-Core study. A further area of the team's work is in weighting and data documentation.

The team's research focuses, on the one hand, on innovative topics in the field of survey statistics, such as new methods of sample selection, and the generation of appropriate weighting factors and imputation methods (with a focus on statistical learning methods). On the other hand, researchers on the team study current social issues ranging from immigration and refugee integration to the mental health and life satisfaction of people in Germany.
Experts from the Research Data Center of the SOEP (RDC) prepare the survey data for both longitudinal and cross-sectional scientific analysis. They generate numerous user-friendly variables and impute missing data—for instance, in cases where respondents failed to provide complete answers to income questions. They also provide access to small-scale regional codes through a variety of secure data channels.

The team provides SOEP data to researchers worldwide in the form of scientific use files, based on a data use contract. Researchers can analyze datasets that are subject to stricter data protection regulations either through remote data access or at a secure guest work station at the SOEP.

Comprehensive documentation on all of the SOEP data is published online either as downloadable PDF files or on paneldata.org, the open-source documentation system developed by the SOEP staff. An overview of the SOEP-Core data can be found in the SOEPcompanion.

Specialists in market and social research complete their vocational training in the RDC and support the experts on the team.

The RDC is accredited as a research data center by the German Data Forum and is active on the Standing Committee Research Data Infrastructure (FDI) in promoting exchange among the various research data centers.
Applied Panel Analysis

The Applied Panel Analysis division is made up of senior researchers as well as graduate students from a variety of doctoral programs. Key areas of the team’s empirical and methodological research include distributional analysis, policy evaluation, education and health, and integration and migration. Their research is based primarily on SOEP data but also on other international datasets such as the Cross-National Equivalent File (CNEF), to which the team contributes.

Their ongoing research with these datasets ensures that the quality of the data is being monitored regularly, systematically, and meticulously—from the questionnaire modules to the survey data. The team works closely with colleagues in different departments at DIW Berlin and is part of interdisciplinary networks worldwide.
The Knowledge Transfer division has two key tasks: First, the division provides diverse services to researchers. SOEPCampus workshops and SOEPTutorials offer young researchers an introduction to the SOEP data. A range of information and documentation materials that are published or made available online assist researchers in their work with SOEP data (e.g., SOEP Survey Papers, paneldata.org, SOEP website). And the SOEP-in-Residence guest program enables visiting researchers to analyze the SOEP data on site at DIW Berlin with support and advice from experts on the SOEP team.

Second, the Knowledge Transfer division disseminates findings from research based on SOEP data to policy makers and the broader public to provide a solid empirical basis for public debate and political decision making. Findings from SOEP research appear not only in international journals but also internal publication series such as the DIW Berlin Weekly Report as well as external publications such as the Data Report published jointly by the German Federal Statistical Office (Destatis), the Federal Agency for Political Education (bpb), the Berlin Social Science Center (WZB), and the SOEP. Every year, the SOEP also provides the indicators used by diverse government departments and agencies in their official reports. These publications form the basis for the public relations work of the Knowledge Transfer division, including social media and high-profile public events.
Junior Research Group
Social and Psychological Determinants of Mental Health in the Life Course (SocPsych-MH)

The aim of the Junior Research Group SocPsych-MH is to strengthen research on mental health at the SOEP from an interdisciplinary perspective. A particular focus is on the interplay between structural factors that can create vulnerabilities or resilience to mental health risks—from international, national, and regional contexts to family constellations, socio-economic life course trajectories, and individual psychological characteristics.

This focus is reflected in the three complementary themes of three research projects that Hannes Kröger is heading at the SOEP.

The first research project is “The legacy of the GDR and mental health: Risk and protective factors” (DDR-PSYCH, co-headed by David Richter), with its SOEP-based sub-project “Socio-economic trajectories after reunification in Germany—disruptions, continuity, and consequences for mental health”. It systematically compares how socio-economic trajectories and East-West migration can help to explain both individual mental health differences and differences in mental health outcomes at the population level between East and West Germany after reunification. The project makes a unique contribution to the research by integrating the life-course perspective from sociology and theories from psychology to predict vulnerability and resilience factors for mental health.

The second project, “Dynamics of Mental Health of Migrants—Analyzing dynamics of resilience and vulnerabilities using a synthesis of socio-structural and psychological approaches” (DMHM, co-headed by Ana Tibubos of the University Medical Center at the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz), follows a similar approach. It takes a longitudinal perspective on the mental health of migrants in four countries (the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, and the United States). These countries host migrant communities with very different histories and structural compositions. The goal is to test under what circumstances personality characteristics and family structure can become sources of resilience or vulnerability.

The third project, “Longitudinal aspects of the interaction between health and integration of refugees in Germany” (LARGE, co-headed by Jürgen Schupp), is part of a DFG research unit in the field of public health, “Refugee migration to Germany: A magnifying glass for broader public health challenges” (PH-LENS). PH-LENS considers refugees as a particularly relevant case for the analysis of “othering”. Within PH-LENS, LARGE investigates whether family constellations and regional deprivation can make refugees resilient or vulnerable to experiences of “othering”.

All three research projects share the approach of identifying sources of vulnerability and resilience with respect to mental health in important demographic groups, drawing on theories from sociology, psychology, and public health.
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PART 3
SOEP Data and Fieldwork
The Portfolio of SOEP Studies

SOEP-Core

The term SOEP-Core refers to the main Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), a wide-ranging representative longitudinal study of private households in Germany launched in 1984 as part of a collaborative research center of the German Research Foundation. In 1990, just before German reunification, the study was expanded from West Germany to include a representative East German sample, making it unique among household panel surveys worldwide in capturing a major system change. Since the study began in 1984, survey fieldwork has been conducted by Kantar Public Germany. Since 2021, ifas conducted the fieldwork for the SOEP which now surveys around 20,000 households and 30,000 individuals every year. The data provide information on every member of every household taking part in the survey. Respondents include Germans living in both the former East and West Germany, foreign nationals residing in Germany, recent immigrants, and refugees. Some of the many topics of SOEP-Core include household composition, education, occupational biographies, employment, earnings, health, and life satisfaction.

SOEP Innovation Sample (SOEP-IS)

The longitudinal SOEP Innovation Sample (SOEP-IS) was created in 2012 as a special sample for testing highly innovative research projects. It was designed primarily for the study of innovative methodologies and topics that involve too great a risk of non-response to be included over the long term in SOEP-Core, in some cases because the instruments are new and still undergoing scientific testing. SOEP-IS publishes a call every year inviting researchers at universities and research institutes worldwide to submit their own innovative proposals for questions or modules in SOEP-IS. Up to now, SOEP-IS has accepted and implemented numerous innovative proposals including economic behavioral experiments, implicit association tests (IAT), and complex procedures for measuring time use (day reconstruction method, DRM).

SOEP-Cross Country (SOEP-XC)

The SOEP team links and harmonizes SOEP survey data with household (panel) data from other countries. This enables use of the SOEP data in cross-national comparative analysis:

Cross-National Equivalent File (CNEF)

The Cross-National Equivalent File (CNEF) is an international panel dataset with harmonized information on education, employment, income, health, and life satisfaction. Along with SOEP data, the CNEF includes data from eight other countries in addition to Germany, including Australia, the UK, and the USA.

EU-SILC Clone

The European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) aims at collecting timely and comparable cross-sectional and longitudinal multidimensional microdata on income, poverty, social exclusion, and living conditions. EU-SILC previously only contained cross-sectional data on Germany. The EU-SILC Clone adds longitudinal information on private households in Germany based on the SOEP data.

Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) and the Luxembourg Wealth Study (LWS)

The Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) is a database of harmonized microdata from over 50 countries including income, employment, and demographic data. The LWS database contains comparable wealth data for nineteen countries.
The Organization of SOEP Fieldwork by infas
By Doris Hess and Jennifer Weitz

The infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences in Bonn is a private, independent social research institute that conducts research for and advises businesses, research institutes, and policy makers. It provides a range of services, including national and international empirical studies on diverse topics such as the labor market, education, and mobility. infas conducts panel surveys and evaluations for major scientific research projects on behalf of state and federal ministries, and also supports private companies by conducting international innovation research and reliable market analyses. Founded in 1959, infas currently employs more than 120 researchers and experts in various disciplines. infas is Germany’s largest commercial research institute with a social science focus.

The infas institute is integrated into the international social science research landscape through numerous partnerships and memberships in professional associations. It is a member of the ADM Arbeitskreis Deutscher Markt- und Sozialforschungsinstitute e.V., which represents the interests of private-sector market and social research agencies in Germany. In addition, it is actively involved in the development of “DIN SPEC 91368 Samples for scientific surveys in market, opinion and social research: Quality criteria and documentation requirements.” It is also a member of the European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research (ESOMAR), which represents around 5,000 market and social research institutes from over 120 countries.

infas has been commissioned to conduct the fieldwork for the SOEP survey—which is known to respondents under the name “Living in Germany”—since the survey’s 37th wave (2021). For this purpose, infas assembled a project-specific team to meet the study’s requirements. The SOEP team at infas consists of around 40 experts in the areas of project management, data preparation, graphic and communication design, data collection, statistics, and programming.

This team is made up entirely of experienced panel study experts who worked previously on studies such as the National Education Panel (NEPS), the Labor Market and Social Security Panel (PASS), and the Labor Force Survey Luxembourg (LFS). For surveys like the SOEP, infas uses a tried-and-tested quality and organizational manual with mandatory inspection points for every step of its processes. Since 2016, the institute has been certified to ISO 20252:2012, the international industry-specific quality standard for organizations conducting market, opinion, and social research. This standard sets out requirements for quality management, project management, and the entire research process, from data collection to data processing, analysis, and reporting. External audits are carried out regularly to monitor this certification. infas also adheres to the standards of the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) and works in cooperation with Westat, the largest professional services corporation engaged in social sciences research in the United States.

In all of the studies conducted by infas, it employs all available survey methodologies and uses only its own resources. The institute has several telephone studios in Bonn, Nuremberg, and Contern (LU) with around 200 stations, 1,000 interviewers for face-to-face fieldwork nationwide, and the infrastructure for online surveys. In addition, it has the resources to carry out mass mailings (up to 2 million per year).

infas has more than 300 interviewers who are trained and managed by infas specifically for the SOEP study. This ensures close coordination between project management and interviewers as well as comprehensive quality control during the fieldwork phase. The interviewers at infas have many years of experience with the special features of complex social science surveys and with the administration of panel studies.
For each wave of the survey, the SOEP Research Data Center makes the data available to researchers worldwide. The data files for each data release are provided to SOEP at DIW Berlin by infas and include gross and net survey data, methodological data, structured metadata as well as complete documentation. infas provided the data for the first time in 2021.

**Table 1** gives an overview of sample sizes in the different SOEP subsamples in 2021 (completed interviews).

### Survey Methodology in 2021

Through 2020, different methods of data collection were used in the SOEP with the different subsamples. The primary interview method was a computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI) and/or a pen-and-paper personal interview (PAPI) carried out by an interviewer in respondents’ homes—depending on the subsample and the assigned interviewer. In addition, a small percentage of respondents who had previously signaled their intention to stop participating in the study were offered the online version of the questionnaire. Respondents who indicated during fieldwork that they might drop out of the study in the future were offered the opportunity to switch to a computer-administered telephone interview (CATI) with an interviewer or to complete the survey on their own, either online (CAWI) or using a paper questionnaire (PAPI).

As of the 2021 survey wave, the survey design of the SOEP is standardized for subsamples A–L and N–Q in a mixed-mode design. The underlying strategy is sequential and is intended to reduce or avoid possible selectivity and design-related dropouts. The increased flexibility of the new design has also made it possible to overcome the survey-related challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. The sequential approach is depicted in Figure 1.
Figure 1

The mixed-mode design for subsamples A–L, N–Q

[Diagram of the mixed-mode design for subsamples A–L, N–Q]
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According to the design used for the first time in 2021, all households in all subsamples were initially processed in CAPI. In the individual households, the survey started by recording or updating the household composition. Once all household members had been listed or updated, it was clear which household members were to be surveyed and which questionnaires these individuals were to receive. All household members to be interviewed were offered CAPI but also had the option of completing the questionnaires independently on a tablet (CAWI), or of filling out the questionnaire in the absence of the interviewer, either online (CAWI) or on paper (PAPI). The same was true for the household questionnaire, which is always filled out by one household member on behalf of the entire household. This questionnaire could be completed in CAPI, online, or on paper. Respondents who could not be reached at home during the fieldwork period (“temporarily absent”) and respondents who declined to participate in the survey on the basis of “soft refusals” (no time, no desire, etc.) were automatically transferred to the PAPI field. PAPI questionnaires included a link to the online survey so that respondents could decide for themselves, even after receiving their paper questionnaires, whether they wanted to complete them on paper or online.

Households and respondents who had not yet been reached in the CAPI field were transferred to the CATI field after at least six unsuccessful contact attempts, provided that a telephone number was available for the household or person. As was the case with the CAPI field, respondents could switch to CAWI and PAPI if they wished. The switch to CAWI or PAPI for temporarily absent household members or for “soft refusers” was done automatically in the CATI field using the same procedure as in the CAPI field.

Questionnaires for subsamples A–L, N–Q

In 2021, a total of 13 different questionnaires were used in households for subsamples A–L, N–Q, most of which were implemented in CAPI-by-phone:

1. Household questionnaire: completed annually by the household member who is most familiar with household matters.
2. Individual questionnaire: completed annually by each household member born in 2003 or earlier.
3. Short individual questionnaire: completed by each household member born in 2003 or earlier who did not participate in the previous wave; it is used every year.
4. Biography questionnaire: completed by each household member born in 2003 or earlier and by anyone who has moved into a panel household; it is used every year but completed only once per person.
5. Youth questionnaire: completed by each household member who turns 17 years old in the survey year (in 2021: born in 2004); it is used every year but completed only once per person.
6. Early youth questionnaire: completed by every household member who turns 14 years old in the survey year (in 2021: born in 2007); it is used every year but completed only once per person.
7. Pre-teen questionnaire: completed by each household member who turns 12 years old in the survey year (in 2021: born in 2009); it is used every year but completed only once per person.
8. Mother & child questionnaire: completed by mothers of newborn children (born in 2020/2021); it is used every year but completed only once per child.
9. Mother & child questionnaire (age 2–3 years): completed by a parent of a child of the 2018 cohort; it is used every year but completed only once per child.
10. Mother & child questionnaire (age 5–6 years): completed by a parent of a child born in 2015; it is used every year but completed only once per child.
11. Mother & child questionnaire (age 7–8 years): completed by both parents of a child born in 2013; it is used every year but completed only once per child by each parent.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the CAPI-by-phone non-contact survey mode was also used at times during the 2021 survey wave, depending on the pandemic situation. In this mode, face-to-face interviewers conduct computer-assisted interviews by telephone.
12. Mother & child questionnaire (age 9–10 years): completed by a parent of a child born in 2011; it is used every year but completed only once per child.
13. Questionnaire “the deceased person”: completed by each household member born in 2003 or earlier who experienced a family loss in the previous year (2020); it is used every year but completed only once per person.

Table 2 gives an overview of response rates for each of the questionnaires.

The average duration of the two main questionnaires, households and individuals, in 2021 in the CAPI/CAPI-by-phone mode was 75.7 minutes (15.8 minutes for the household questionnaire and 59.9 minutes for the individual questionnaire). For a household consisting of two adults, this corresponds to 135.6 minutes plus the time needed for additional questionnaires such as the “gap” questionnaire.

In addition to the information from the questionnaires, the documentation of each household’s composition is central to the subsequent provision of data. This involves collecting basic information on each household member, including whether someone has moved out of a household since the last interview or whether someone new has moved into an existing household.

At the end of April, all adult members of all households in subsamples A–L, N–O, and Q received a letter announcing the upcoming survey (study participants in subsample P received these letters at the beginning of July, as this survey started in mid-July). Prior to this, all households were informed by postcard in February that this year’s survey (2021) would begin in May, unlike in previous years, and would be conducted for the first time by infas. In addition to the announcement of the upcoming survey, the letters sent out in late April / early July also contained the name of the interviewer responsible for the household as well as the incentive gift that would be provided for participation (10 euros for those born up to 2003, 5 euros for those born in 2004, 2007, and 2009) and a prize drawing for all participants. Furthermore, the letter contained information on data protection and the different interview procedures used due to the pandemic. In addition to the data protection flyer, the letter also included a flyer.
with information about the study, the survey procedure, pandemic hygiene measures, and much more, as well as a package of Haribo gummy candy as a small gift from the institute in Bonn.

To achieve the highest possible response rate, further mailings were sent out on a large scale during the course of fieldwork. Households that could not be reached after six attempts received a letter asking them to update their contact information in the infas online address database to minimize households being missed due to address changes. In accordance with the mixed-mode design, all respondents who had requested to switch to a different interview mode received letters with enclosed individually prepared PAPI forms or access data to the online survey at the start of fieldwork. Individuals who gave “soft reasons” for refusing to participate received letters at regular intervals with enclosed PAPI questionnaires and access data to the online survey to encourage them to participate in the survey on a self-administered basis.

All respondents who switched to PAPI or CAWI were sent a reminder letter six weeks after their switch, again inviting them to participate in the survey. Later, during fieldwork, this was reduced to two weeks after their switch. All reminder letters were accompanied by PAPI forms and access data to the online survey.

After participating, all respondents received a thank-you letter with the incentive gift. Adults who had not yet answered one or more of the additional questionnaires (gap, biography, “the deceased person”, or the parent-child questionnaires) received a special thank-you letter in which they were again invited to complete these questionnaires.

All cover letters included a study-specific e-mail address and a free study hotline number. Respondents could contact infas at any time with questions, and received answers from specially trained staff or, in the case of more specific questions, from project management. Letters also included the address of the website www.leben-in-deutschland.de, which was created for the 2021 survey wave. The website provided additional information on the study as well as recent study findings.

All survey materials, the study website, and the paper questionnaires utilized the corporate design of “Living in Germany,” which was developed for the 2021 survey wave. Figure 2 shows the PAPI questionnaires used for subsamples A–L and N–Q. Figure 3 shows an excerpt from the survey materials used. Figure 4 shows a screenshot of the study website on various devices.

---

2 A total of 348 prizes with a total value of over 25,000 euros were raffled. The prizes included high-tech products and various shopping vouchers. The top prize was an iPad Pro 12.9.
Of households that had dropped out in the previous wave, about 39 percent were brought back into the panel in this wave. Furthermore, about 37 percent of the “split” households that had been newly formed during the course of fieldwork were successfully surveyed. Response rates for these two groups differ more between the individual subsamples than the response rates for previous-wave respondents.

The vast majority of households could be convinced to participate after they had been reached during fieldwork based on the address data available. Thus, the cooperation rates across all subsamples are around 80%, which is even higher than the response rates. For those households that could not be reached, various tracking measures were used to obtain updated address data. In total, new address information was obtained for 1,320 households in subsamples A–L and N–Q after the household had moved.

Composition of gross sample A–L, N–Q and response rates in 2021

Table 3 shows the composition of the gross sample in 2021 as well as gross response and cooperation rates for the individual subsamples. Both the presentation of the gross sample and the response rates are differentiated into three types: 1. respondents in previous wave (86.7 percent of the gross sample), 2. dropouts in previous wave (9.4 percent of the gross sample), and 3. new households (splits; 3.9 percent of the gross sample).

A total of 15,302 households were contacted in subsamples A–L and N–Q, 10,891 of which were successfully interviewed. Of all interviews conducted, 9,316 (85.5%) were interviewer-administered and 1,575 (14.5%) were self-administered by the study participants in PAPI or CAWI. Among households that had already participated in a previous wave, a high response rate of about 76% was achieved. Across the subsamples, the response rate in this group is relatively constant, with a comparatively high rate of around 87% for subsample Q and a somewhat lower rate of just under 70% for subsample P.
### Table 3

**Composition of Gross Sample and Response Rates in Samples A–L, N–Q by Type of Fieldwork**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Samples A–H</th>
<th>Sample J</th>
<th>Sample K</th>
<th>Sample L</th>
<th>Sample N</th>
<th>Sample O</th>
<th>Sample P</th>
<th>Sample Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
<td>Number In %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(1) Gross sample composition by types of HH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,302</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>13,267</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2) Response rates by type of fieldwork</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,891</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>2,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>10,111</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>1,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-based</td>
<td>8,649</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally administered PAPI/CAWI</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-based</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally administered PAPI/CAWI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-based</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally administered PAPI/CAWI</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(3) Cooperation rate</strong></td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(4) Partial unit nonresponse</strong></td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Number of interviews divided by sum of interviews and refusals.
2 Share of households (number of household members >1) with at least one missing individual questionnaire (birth year up to 2003).
SOEP Migration Samples: M1, M2, M7, and M8a

By Jennifer Weitz and Michael Ruland

Table 4
Sample Sizes in the 2021 Migration Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total individual questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample M1</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample M2</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample M7</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample M8a</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Eleven to 16-year-olds who completed the respective questionnaire.
2 Children under the age of 11 whose parent completed a questionnaire about them.

The four SOEP migration samples M1, M2, M7, and M8a were generated as subsamples to better represent the migrant population in the SOEP. All four were drawn from the Integrated Employment Biographies Sample (IEBS) of the Federal Employment Agency (BA). Sample M1 started in 2013, sample M2 in 2015, and samples M7 and M8a in 2020. Table 4 provides an overview of the sizes of the four samples M1, M2, M7, and M8a in the 2021 survey.

Survey Methodology in 2021

Essentially the same survey design was used for migration samples M1, M2, M7, and M8a as for samples A–L and N–Q. In order to meet the language requirements of samples M7 (immigrants from Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria) and M8a (immigrants from non-EU countries with work permits for skilled workers), the questionnaires and other materials were provided in the corresponding foreign languages in addition to German. For sample M7, all survey materials including paper questionnaires were translated into Romanian, Bulgarian, and Polish and the preferred language of the respondent was used. For sample M8a, English translations were used in the field, and the computer-based instruments were also available in Bulgarian, Romanian, Polish, and English. In the computer-based survey modes, respondents and interviewers could switch between the available languages at any time at the question level. In addition, the interviewers who conducted the interviews using the foreign language survey materials were themselves native speakers of the respective languages.

The mixed-mode design introduced in samples A–L and N–Q in 2021 was also used for the migration samples. First, households were contacted in person and invited to participate. Respondents were also offered the options of completing their questionnaires independently on a tablet while the interviewer was present (CASI) or completing the questionnaires without the interviewer present either online (CAWI) or on paper (PAPI). At multiple points during the fieldwork, respondents were offered the option of switching methods and were sent reminders to prevent any interviewing issues and associated dropouts. For example, respondents who could not be reached or who had not participated for reasons classified as “soft refusals” were sent a separate letter with enclosed PAPI questionnaire and CAWI access data. Households that could not be reached and individuals for whom a telephone number was available were transferred to CATI fieldwork after at least six unsuccessful contact attempts.

For sample M8a, an additional letter was sent out towards the end of the regular fieldwork period to over 400 households in which questionnaires had not yet been completed. The letter was accompanied by an unconditional cash incentive of 5 euros. Furthermore, an additional, significantly higher incentive of 50 euros was offered condition- al on completing the questionnaires. Those contacted were asked to participate in the online survey using the access data in the letter and were also
offered the option of a telephone interview with a CATI interviewer. To be interviewed by telephone, respondents were asked to update their contact data in the infas online database. This led to the completion of more than 70 additional household questionnaires and just under 100 additional individual questionnaires for sample M8a.

Table 5 shows that in samples M2, M7, and M8a, the majority of interviews were conducted face-to-face in households (CAPI plus CASI), followed by telephone interviews (CAPI-by-phone). In sample M1, in contrast, the majority of interviews took place by telephone. Across all subsamples, 8 to 9 percent of interviews were self-administered CAWI or PAPI. PAPI was predominant in samples M1, M2, and M7, whereas CAWI was predominant at over 20 percent in M8a.

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Data Collection in Individual Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI-by-phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires Volumes and Response Rates¹ in Samples M1/M2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sample / reference value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth questionnaire: age 16 or 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early youth questionnaire: age 13 or 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-teen questionnaire: age 11 or 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother &amp; child questionnaire: newborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother &amp; child questionnaire: age 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother &amp; child questionnaire: age 5 or 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire for parents: age 7 or 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother &amp; child questionnaire: age 9 or 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biography questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire &quot;deceased individual&quot;²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The figures refer to the respective target population in participating households. For the child-related questionnaires, the reference value is the number of children in the respective age groups living in participating households. Therefore, the response rate for this questionnaire indicates the number of children for whom a questionnaire has been completed by one parent.

² The reference value for the questionnaire "deceased individual" refers to deceased members of participating households.

**Questionnaires**

Essentially the same survey instruments were used in the samples M1, M2, M7, and M8a as in samples A–L and N–Q. Table 6 gives an overview of the number of interviews carried out with each questionnaire in samples M1 and M2.

An extended individual questionnaire and an extended biography questionnaire were used for samples M7 and M8. Both contained additional questions aimed at gathering key information about the living situations of these population groups and their migration to Germany.
Table 8 shows the languages used in the individual interviews with adult respondents. The interviews with adolescents were conducted exclusively in German. Most of the interviews with adult household members were in German. In samples M1 and M2, a total of eight interviews were conducted in English, Polish, and Romanian. In samples M7 and M8a, the proportion of foreign-language interviews was higher (around 22 percent).
Composition of the gross sample M1, M2, M7, and M8 and response rates in 2021

Table 9 shows the composition of the gross sample in 2021 as well as the gross response and cooperation rates for the individual subsamples. Households are divided into three groups for both sample composition and response rates: 1. respondents in previous wave (89.3 percent of the gross sample), 2. dropouts in previous wave (8.6 percent of the gross sample) and 3. new households (splits; 2.1 percent of the gross sample).

A total of 3,533 households were contacted in the samples M1, M2, M7, and M8a, 1,680 of which were successfully interviewed. Just under 49 percent of households that had participated in the previous wave were interviewed successfully, but households in M7 and M8a, which were only surveyed for the second time, had a significantly lower response rate of 29 percent (M7) and 42 percent (M8a) than households in M1 (66 percent) and M2 (67 percent).

Of households that did not participate in the previous wave (in samples M1 and M2 only), about 39 percent were brought back in to the study in this wave. Furthermore, about 19 percent of the “split” that had been created during the course of fieldwork were successfully surveyed.

The cooperation rate across the four samples is 69 percent. In samples M1, M2, and M8a, the cooperation rate of 70 to 75 percent is significantly higher than in M7 (54.8 percent). This was likely due, on the one hand, to the stronger connection of respondents in M1 and M2 to the study. On the other hand, in the case of M8a, it was likely due to the additional incentivization at the end of the fieldwork period. In just under two thirds of the households, all planned individual interviews with adult target persons were conducted. In the remaining households, at least one of the planned interviews was not conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Gross sample composition by types of HH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M1</th>
<th>Sample M2</th>
<th>Sample M7</th>
<th>Sample M8a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,533</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2) Net sample composition by type of HH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M1</th>
<th>Sample M2</th>
<th>Sample M7</th>
<th>Sample M8a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) Response rates by type of HH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M1</th>
<th>Sample M2</th>
<th>Sample M7</th>
<th>Sample M8a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (4) Cooperation rate1 | 69.0 | 71.6 | 75.5 | 54.8 | 70.6 |
| (5) Partial unit non-response2 | 35.4 | 33.0 | 35.5 | 40.4 | 32.7 |

1 Number of interviews divided by sum of interviews and refusals.
2 Share of households (number of household members >1) with at least one missing individual questionnaire (birth year up to 2003).
The SOEP Refugee Samples M3–M6
By Michael Ruland and Theresa Müller

The SOEP, the Institute for Employment Research (IAB), and the Research Centre of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) launched the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees in Germany in 2016. The study now comprises a total of four household samples (M3, M4, M5, and M6). Samples M3 and M4 started in 2016, sample M5 in 2017, and M6 in 2020. These households in these samples were contacted and interviewed by infas for the first time in 2021.

Table 10 provides an overview of the sizes of the SOEP subsamples M3 to M6 for the 2021 survey in terms of completed interviews.

Survey Methodology in 2021

A computer-based mixed-mode design was used to survey samples M3 to M6 in 2021. This essentially mirrored the design used in the SOEP-Core samples, except that with samples M3 to M6, the traditional paper-based questionnaires (PAPI) were not used. The main method in these samples was face-to-face oral interviewing in the field (CAPI). In addition, due to the pandemic, telephone interviews by face-to-face interviewers were also possible throughout the fieldwork period (CAPI-by-phone). Respondents were also offered two self-administered survey methods that they could switch to if they wished: They could either complete questionnaire on a tablet computer while the interviewer was in the household (CASI) or complete the questionnaire on their own at a later point online (CAWI).

The questionnaires were provided in German, English, Arabic, and Farsi. In addition, all interviewers in the 2021 survey were native speakers of the respective languages. The combination of a flexible mixed-mode design, translated questionnaires and documents, and the use of native-speaker interviewers was intended to reduce potential selectivity and design-related dropouts.

All adult respondents received a cover letter at the beginning of fieldwork announcing the upcoming survey as well as an incentive (10 euros for respondents born up to 2003, 5 euros for respondents born in 2004, 2007, 2009) and a prize drawing for all participants. In addition, the letter contained a flyer about data protection, a flyer with brief information about the study, and a package of vegan fruit gummies as a small gift from Bonn. The letter and data protection flyer were translated into Arabic, English, and Farsi and sent to respondents in the language used in the previous wave. The flyer about the study was available in German and English. After the interview, all respondents received a thank-you letter by mail with the cash incentive. Those who expressed the desire to do all or part of their interview online received a letter with the access data. Respondents who had not participated online two weeks after receiving the access data were sent another reminder. After the letters were sent out, households were contacted by the native-speaker interviewers in the face-to-face fieldwork phase starting in September 2021. Assignments of native-speaker interviewers were based on the language used in the most recent interview. All interviewers were able

Table 10

Sample Sizes in the 2021 Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th>Children²</th>
<th>Total individual questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample M3</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample M4</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample M5</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample M6</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>5,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Eleven to 16-year-olds who completed the respective questionnaire.
² Children under the age of 11 whose parent completed a questionnaire about them.
to conduct the interview in either the respective foreign language or in German. If the interviewer determined that another target language was spoken in the household and that communication was not possible, the households were contacted again in a subsequent step by other interviewers with the corresponding language skills. In households with several respondents, the new mixed-method survey design also made it possible for several interviewees to complete their questionnaires simultaneously, with some using a tablet computer (CASI). This had the advantage of enabling respondents in a given household to switch languages even if the interviewer did not have the corresponding language skills, as respondents could set the language themselves on the tablet.

The increased flexibility of the new mixed-mode design also made it possible to meet the survey-related challenges of the pandemic, especially when the decision was made at the end of November to make contact in person but not to carry out any face-to-face interviews with the households. Households were offered the options of either a telephone (CAPI-by-phone or CATI) survey or self-administered online survey (CAWI).

In addition to this challenge, it also became apparent during the course of the fieldwork that many households were difficult to reach and that a high level of effort was necessary to make contact, arrange to meet the individuals, and motivate them to participate. For this reason, various measures were undertaken to increase response rates and reduce the number of dropouts. These included special letters sent to households that had not yet been reached that were intended to motivate them to participate and that asked individuals to provide a current telephone number for further contact. This letter was accompanied by an additional unconditional incentive of 5 euros.

In addition, German-speaking interviewers from the SOEP-Core samples were used during the course of fieldwork to contact respondents at home, update or request contact information, and identify the desired language. Respondents were then contacted and interviewed by interviewers with appropriate language skills. Parallel to the processing during the face-to-face fieldwork phase, households or respondents that had not yet been reached but whose telephone numbers were on file were transferred to the multilingual CATI fieldwork phase starting in December. Respondents could change methods in either direction throughout the entire fieldwork phase.

Table 11 below shows the interviews conducted, differentiated by survey mode. In general, it can be observed that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, significantly more interviews (approx. 58 percent) were conducted by telephone than face-to-face in the households (CAPI plus CASI). The new CASI option was used frequently by adult household members (about 17 percent of the interviews conducted in households). The percentage of CAWI was higher among young respondents, at 13.2 percent, than among the adults, which indicates that the online mode appeals to adolescents.

---

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Data Collection for the Individual Interviews</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M3</th>
<th>Sample M4</th>
<th>Sample M5</th>
<th>Sample M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI by phone</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATI</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASI</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWI</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI by phone</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A total of 132 prizes with a total value of over 5,000 euros were raffled. The prizes included high-tech products and various shopping vouchers. The top prize was an iPad.
Questionnaires for subsamples M3 to M6

In 2021, a total of seven different questionnaires were used with samples M3 to M6. The household member most knowledgeable about household matters was given the (1) household questionnaire. In addition, each adult respondent (born in 2003 or later) was given either the (2) repeat respondent questionnaire or the (3) first-time household respondent questionnaire. These questionnaires were translated into all designated foreign languages. For adult respondents without a migration background and respondents who moved to Germany before the age of 16, the two SOEP-Core questionnaires (4) individual questionnaire and (5) biography questionnaire (for first-time respondents only) were used. These were the only questionnaires that were provided solely in German. For adolescents born in 2004, 2007, and 2009, an (6) integrated youth questionnaire was used, which was also translated into all languages. Likewise, an (7) integrated children’s questionnaire was used for children born in 2021/2020, 2018, 2015, 2013 and 2011, which a parent completed in addition to the respective individual questionnaire.

Table 12 gives an overview of the number of interviews carried out, differentiated according to the individual questionnaires. In the 2021 survey, the aim was that respondents would be interviewed by an interviewer who spoke the language of the respondent. In addition, the language of the questionnaire could also be changed for each question, so even if an interview started in German, it was always possible to switch to another language in the course of the interview if the respondent had difficulties understanding something. This was particularly important for the self-administered interviews (CASI and CAWI), as the respondents could decide themselves which language they wanted to use for each question.

Table 13 shows the languages used in the individual interviews by both adults and youths. Most interviews with adults were conducted in Arabic (approximately 73 percent), and just under 19 percent were in German. A significantly smaller proportion were in Farsi and English, at 6.5 percent and 1.6 percent, respectively.

As expected, the figures for young respondents are different: Approximately half of all interviews were conducted in German. The proportion was lower only in sample M6, at 39.1 percent, which may be due to the fact that these young people had only been living in Germany for a short time. Young people used Farsi and English little or not at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Volumes and Response Rates</th>
<th>Gross sample / reference value</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Response rate / coverage rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household questionnaire</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual questionnaire (repeat respondents)</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual questionnaire (first-time respondents)</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth questionnaire</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child questionnaire</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual questionnaire (CORE)</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biography questionnaire</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The numbers refer to the respective target population in participating households. For the child-related questionnaires, the reference value is the number of children in the respective age groups living in participating households. Therefore, the response rate for this questionnaire indicates the number of children for whom a questionnaire was completed by one parent.
The cooperation rate across the four samples is 71 percent and is thus significantly higher than the response rate. The cooperation rate of 74 to 77 percent for samples M3 to M5 is significantly higher than that for sample M6 (59.7 percent). This suggests that the households that have been participating in the study for a longer period of time have stronger ties to the study. This shows that overall, households could be convinced to participate if they were reached in the field with the help of the available address data. For those households that could not be reached, attempts were made to obtain updated address data through various tracking measures. In total, new address and contact information was obtained from 1,228 households in samples M3 to M6.

In about 70 percent of the households, all planned individual interviews with adult respondents could be conducted; in the remaining households, at least one of the planned interviews was missing. The proportion of missing interviews, termed partial unit non-response, is somewhat higher in the older samples, M3 and M4, than in M5 and especially M6, which has the lowest rate of partial unit non-response at 23.9 percent.

Table 13 shows the composition of the gross sample in 2021, as well as the gross response and cooperation rates for the individual subsamples. Households are divided into three groups for both sample composition and response rates: 1. respondents in the previous wave (91.0 percent of the gross sample), 2. dropouts in the previous wave (6.3 percent of the gross sample), and 3. new households (splits; 2.7 percent of the gross sample).

A total of 3,891 households were contacted in samples M3 to M6, 1,915 of which were interviewed successfully. In the case of households that had participated in the previous wave, almost 52 percent were interviewed successfully. The households in M6, which were only surveyed for the second time, had a significantly lower response rate of 39 percent than the households in samples M3 to M5.

Of households that did not participate in the previous wave (only in the samples M3 to M5), about 21 percent could be won back for the panel. Furthermore, about 25 percent of the “split” that had been newly formed during the course of fieldwork were successfully surveyed.
Table 14
Composition of Gross Sample, Net Sample, and Response Rates in Samples M3–M6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M3</th>
<th>Sample M4</th>
<th>Sample M5</th>
<th>Sample M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (splitoff HHs)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Net sample composition by type of HH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M3</th>
<th>Sample M4</th>
<th>Sample M5</th>
<th>Sample M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (splitoff HHs)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In %</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Response rates by type of HH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M3</th>
<th>Sample M4</th>
<th>Sample M5</th>
<th>Sample M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (splitoff HHs)</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Cooperation rate¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M3</th>
<th>Sample M4</th>
<th>Sample M5</th>
<th>Sample M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Partial unit nonresponse²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample M3</th>
<th>Sample M4</th>
<th>Sample M5</th>
<th>Sample M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Number of interviews divided by sum of interviews and refusals.
² Share of households (number of household members >1) with at least one missing individual questionnaire (birth year up to 2003).
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SOEP Data Service
The SOEP’s 36th data release, with additional datasets and user resources

Version 36 of the SOEP-Core data (1984–2019, 10.5684/soep-core.v36) was released in the first quarter of 2021 with numerous additional datasets and resources for data users. Along with our “classic” SOEP-Core data, it included data from the SOEP Innovation Sample (10.5684/soep.is.2019).

With v36, we introduced our new SOEP Data Editions and a new missing value to manage restricted-access information more transparently. Due to changes in data protection and privacy law, variables containing information on Germany’s federal states (Bundesländer) may not be transmitted to recipients outside the European Union. We therefore developed a new concept with different editions for the different data access procedures resulting from the change in law (listed in ascending order by the amount of information contained in each edition):

- Teaching Edition (50% sample | doi:10.5684/soep-core.v36t)
- International Edition (95% sample | doi:10.5684/soep-core.v36i)
- EU Edition (100% sample | doi:10.5684/soep-core.v36eu)
- Area Types (add-on for EU Edition: classification of areas, 100% sample | doi:10.5684/soep-core.v36at)
- Planning Regions (add-on for EU edition: 96 planning regions | doi:10.5684/soep-core.v36pr)
- Remote Edition (available through remote execution including counties | doi:10.5684/soep-core.v36r)
- On-Site Edition (available only on site including municipalities, zip codes, and geo-coordinates | doi:10.5684/soep-core.v36o)

The default edition that we transmit to European users by sending them a personalized download link is the EU Edition. Some datasets may not be available in more restricted editions. If variables are not available in a more restricted edition, they are recoded to -7, a new missing value labeled “only available in less restricted edition.” A major advantage of integrating the more sensitive variables and data sets into the normal data release as empty data sets is that it is now much easier for our users to identify which additional data are available through other channels.

Over the remainder of the year, data were prepared for the next release of the SOEP data, version SOEPv37, in the first quarter of 2022. Three new migration samples (M6 to M8) and two studies related to the COVID-19 pandemic were integrated.

The 2020 boost sample M6 supplements the samples of the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees by adding an additional 1,141 households. To recruit these households, a random sample was drawn from the Central Register of Foreigners. The 2020 boost sample M7 supplements the samples of the IAB-SOEP Migration Survey by adding 783 households. Similar to the M1 and M2 samples, M7 used register data from the Federal Employment Agency as a sampling frame. The survey of this sample collects information on households of people who immigrated from Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria between January 2016 and December 2018. The 2020 boost sample M8 supplements the samples of the IAB-SOEP Migration Survey by adding 1,096 households. Register data of the Federal Employment Agency were used to identify the population of third-country nationals who applied to work in Germany as professionals (Fachkräfte) under the Residence Act (Zuwanderungsgesetz) and were granted permission in the period from January 2019 until January 2020.
Number of data users

The SOEP Research Data Center (RDC SOEP), which is accredited by the German Data Forum (RatSWD), provides the international research community with access to anonymous microdata. Figure 5 presents an overview of the number of data distribution contracts signed each year since 2012. In 2021, 392 external users signed each year data distribution contracts.

It should be kept in mind that a single data use contract usually covers a number of researchers and often an entire research team. The breakdown for 2020 in Table 15 shows that more than 1,500 individual researchers were given access to the SOEP data that year.
According to the results of the SOEP User Survey from mid-November 2021 to early January 2022, increasing numbers of data users were working with the longitudinal SOEP data, and many had used the complete SOEP time series (1984–2019) at least once. The survey went out to 944 users, 768 of whom completed the survey in full. This is the highest number of participants since the user survey began in 2011.

A growing number of users valued the advantages of this data format: Longitudinal data are delivered as a compressed data package that makes it easier to work with the data.

A more detailed report on the other topics covered in the survey, including the use of statistical programs, the analysis of the data, and the use of specific data sets can be found on our website: https://www.diw.de/en/diw_01.c.603784.en/soep_user_survey.html.
Record Linkage with Administrative Pension Data (SOEP-RV)

By Jan Goebel, Markus M. Grabka, and Carsten Schroeder

The project “A Combined Dataset for Life Course Research SOEP Record Linkage with Administrative Pension Data (SOEP-RV)” links SOEP data with high-quality social security data from administrative pension records.

The project is being carried out by the SOEP in partnership with the Research Data Centre of the German Pension Insurance (FDZ-RV). Every time a person participates in the German social security system starting at the age of 14, the German Pension Insurance records data on their employment biographies, pensions, pension prospects, social security earnings, and other topics. Linking SOEP data with these high-quality, long-term monthly data on people’s entire work histories offers an invaluable enhancement to the SOEP study.

The long time frame of the social security data provides unique possibilities for research combining administrative and survey information, such as studies addressing new questions of long-term inequality or policy reform effects. In particular, SOEP-RV offers significant potential for research on pensions and old age, and for research on methodological questions such as the consistency of self-reported versus administrative information.

A crucial condition for inclusion of SOEP data in SOEP-RV is that record linkage is only carried out with the expressed written consent of the SOEP respondents. After providing consent, the respondents give their social security number or allow the German pension insurance to provide this information from their pension records.

Up to now, about 15,000 SOEP respondents have consented to record linkage. In 2021, SOEP-RV will add remaining subsamples such as recent migration samples and further enhance the number of observations. In the SOEPv37 data release, there will be an identifier for the first time (rv_id) that supports the linkage of information on respondents from the SOEP survey with the register data of the German Pension Insurance (FDZ-RV). Initially, on the register data side, only information from the pension stock (RTBN) will be available. In the future, following a revision, information from the sample of insured accounts (VSKT) will also be linkable. More information can be found online at: http://www.diw.de/soep-rv_en
What is the EU-SILC-like panel? (EU-SILC Clone)
By Charlotte Bartels

The EU-SILC-like panel is based on the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) and includes all EU-SILC panel variables for which the required information is recorded in the SOEP. Only a few EU-SILC variables cannot be replicated by the SOEP data due to a lack of information. The personal and household IDs of SOEP respondents remain the same in the EU-SILC-like panel, allowing users to merge the data with additional information from SOEP that is not part of the official EU-SILC data. You can find detailed information in our EU-SILC-like panel codebook.

What is EU-SILC?
The European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) contains data from across Europe on individual and household income, household living conditions, individual health, aspects of child care, employment, and self-assessed financial situation. EU-SILC offers both cross-sectional and longitudinal data. Up to now, the official German EU-SILC is provided only as a cross-sectional dataset by the German Federal Statistical Office. As a consequence, Germany has been excluded from cross-country studies exploiting the longitudinal dimension of EU-SILC. Even though an official German EU-SILC panel dataset started in the survey year 2020, this panel dataset will only include panel information since 2020 and will not go back to the EU-SILC starting year.

What can data users do with the EU-SILC-like panel?
• Users can add the EU-SILC-like panel to other countries’ EU-SILC longitudinal data and conduct research requiring individual and household longitudinal information. Note that Germany still does not offer a longitudinal EU-SILC version. Filling this gap in the European panel data landscape is the main goal of the EU-SILC-like panel.
• Users can compare trends for specific variables and groups using the EU-SILC-like panel and the German EU-SILC cross-sectional data. In our EU-SILC-like panel codebook, we do this comparison for the full population for all EU-SILC-like panel variables and the German EU-SILC cross-sectional data. Below we show the comparison for imputed rent and capital income, which both reveal differences between the two data sets (note that SOEP indicates EU-SILC-like panel variables based on SOEP and EU-SILC is official cross-sectional EU-SILC data). How do trends compare for poverty, inequality, and other measures?
The comparison of EU-SILC-like panel variables based on SOEP with EU-SILC cross-sectional may lead to the decision to use the EU-SILC-like panel variables instead of the German cross-sectional EU-SILC for European cross-country analysis. Particularly if the aim is to analyze trends since 2005, data users might prefer to use the EU-SILC-like panel because the new survey design of the official German EU-SILC since 2020 inhibits comparison with results from the preceding years, as noted by the German Federal Statistical Office.

More cross-country dataset information can be found on the SOEP website at: www.diw.de/soep_silc-clone
PART 5
SOEP-Based Publications in 2021
The Richest 10 Percent of All Heirs Receive Half of All Inheritances

By Kira Baresel, Heike Eulitz, Uwe Fachinger, Markus M. Grabka, Christoph Halbmeier, Harald Künemund, Alberto Lozano Alcántara, and Claudia Vogel

Abstract

Around 10 percent of all adults in Germany have received at least one inheritance or major gift in the past 15 years. The total value of inheritances averages just over 85,000 euros per person in real terms, and the value of gifts is 89,000 euros, according to SOEP data. Inheritances and gifts increased between 2001 and 2017 by an average of around 20 percent in real terms. Intergenerational transfers are unevenly distributed: For example, half of all inheritances and gifts go to the richest 10 percent of heirs. Inheritances and gifts thus increase absolute inequality. This suggests that the “ten-year limit” rule that allows heirs to claim a tax exemption every ten years should be abolished so that exemptions can be claimed only once in a lifetime. At the same time, small and medium-sized inheritances and gifts reduce wealth concentration—that is, relative inequality. Exemptions to the inheritance tax should therefore be distributed more evenly across the different groups of heirs and degrees of kinship, especially in light of the increasing number of patchwork families.

From the Authors

“The wave of inheritances is exacerbating wealth inequality. Policymakers should work to counteract this, for instance, by preventing use of the ten-year limit to split up large inheritances.”

Markus M. Grabka

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_wb:2021-5-1
LGBTQI* People in Germany Face Staggering Health Disparities

By David Kasprowski, Mirjam Fischer, Xiao Chen, Lisa de Vries, Martin Kroh, Simon Kühne, David Richter, and Zaza Zindel

Share of LGBTQI* people with poor mental and physical health is much higher than in the rest of the population

- 26% of LGBTQI* people have experienced depression at one point, two and a half times as many as in the rest of the population.
- 15% of LGBTQI* people feel lonely very often, twice as many as in the rest of the population.
- 17% of LGBTQI* people suffer from chronic back pain, significantly more than the rest of the population.

Sources: Socio-Economic Panel v36.beta; Bielefeld; authors' own calculations.

The number of safe spaces should be increased; stronger laws to combat homophobia and transphobia are needed.

Abstract

Discrimination and rejection experienced by LGBTQI* people affect their mental health and, in the long term, their physical health as well. Survey data from the SOEP and Bielefeld University show that LGBTQI* people in Germany are affected by negative mental health outcomes three to four times more often than the rest of the population. Poor physical health outcomes that may be stress-related, such as heart disease, migraines, asthma, and chronic back pain, are also far more common. A person’s general well-being depends in part on their social environment. LGBTQI* people, and trans* people in particular, often feel lonely, which is cause for concern in view of increasing loneliness among most people during the coronavirus pandemic. The findings point to a marked health gradient, which should be addressed by measures including expanding queer safe spaces and by explicitly naming LGBTQI* hate crimes in the criminal code.

From the Authors

“Regarding equal opportunities of LGBTQI* people to lead healthy lives, there is still a long way to go. Societal and institutional discrimination go hand in hand with these staggering mental and physical health disparities.”

Mirjam Fischer

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_dwr.2021-5-1
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Refugees’ Mental Health During the Coronavirus Pandemic: Psychological Distress and Continued Loneliness

By Theresa Entringer, Jannes Jacobsen, Hannes Kröger, and Maria Metzing

In 2017, refugees were as lonely as people without a migration background at the beginning of the coronavirus pandemic. Index from 0 (not lonely/no distress) to 12 (very lonely/high distress)

Loneliness

Psychological distress

People with no migration background
Refugees

Sources: SOEP; IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees in Germany, v.36, SOEP-CoV supplementary surveys, weighted.

© DIW Berlin 2021

Abstract

Many people have suffered from impacts of the coronavirus pandemic. Refugees, however, constitute an underprivileged group in many respects. They are therefore more likely than average to live in overcrowded living quarters such as community housing and are thus exposed to a higher risk of infection. At the same time, even before the pandemic, they had an above-average likelihood of experiencing severe psychological distress and thus more acute psychological outcomes. This Weekly Report analyzes how the first months of the coronavirus pandemic impacted the mental health of refugees and shows that their psychological distress was still high in 2020. In addition, refugees continued to feel very lonely during this time. Refugees’ mental health should therefore be monitored closely to be able to both combat increasing psychological distress and reduce existing loneliness, two factors important to successful integration.

From the Authors

“Mental health must not be ignored when discussing integration, as psychological distress can present additional hurdles that refugees must overcome in an already difficult situation on the path to social participation.”

Hannes Kröger

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_dwr:2021-12-1
Why Self-Employed Women Are Among the Pandemic’s Biggest Losers

By Johannes Seebauer, Alexander S. Kritikos, and Daniel Graeber

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has had negative effects on many people’s lives. An analysis of data from a special survey of the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP-CoV) shows that the roughly 4.2 million self-employed people in Germany have been hit harder by the pandemic than salaried employees. The findings reveal a clear gender gap: 47 percent of self-employed men but 63 percent of self-employed women have experienced a drop in income. A key reason for this is that self-employed women are more likely to work in sectors that have been impacted most severely by the pandemic and are therefore more likely to have been directly affected by pandemic containment measures such as restrictions on business hours. In addition, self-employed women’s mental health has suffered more than self-employed men’s. The gendered impact of pandemic containment measures should be taken into account by policy makers in designing future measures.

From the Authors

“The impact of COVID-19 is not gender-neutral. Among the self-employed, women are significantly more likely than men to have experienced income losses due to the pandemic. It therefore comes as no surprise that self-employed women have also suffered more psychologically.”

Johannes Seebauer

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_wb:2021-15-3
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Income Inequality in Germany Stagnating over the Long Term, but Decreasing Slightly During the Coronavirus Pandemic

By Markus M. Grabka

Abstract

Both wages and needs-adjusted household income increased by ten percent between 2013 and 2018, benefiting all income groups. Wage inequality has been declining for many years and has now again reached the level of the early 2000s. At the same time, the low-wage sector shrank by two percentage points. Household income inequality, in contrast, has hardly changed for many years and the low-income rate is stagnating. However, the share of people in Germany who are affected by severe material deprivation sank to a low level in a European comparison. Income inequality in Germany has declined slightly since the beginning of the coronavirus pandemic, but this is likely primarily due to incomes decreasing among the self-employed. However, the pandemic poses the risk that an increasing number of insolvencies and unemployed people will cause incomes to fall again across the board. Financial assistance for the self-employed and business owners should not be ended too early and its targeting should be readjusted.

From the Authors

“The financial crisis showed that income inequality decreases during times of crisis because incomes in the upper deciles fall more than incomes in the lower deciles. During the coronavirus pandemic, the declines in income experienced by the self-employed have had a particular impact on the distribution.”

Markus M. Grabka

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_dwr:2021-17-1
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The Social Home-Buying Subsidy: A Proposed Addition to German Homeownership Assistance Programs

By Reiner Braun and Markus M. Grabka

The social home-buying subsidy would provide viable financing to low-equity households buying social housing or the home they are currently renting

Example of financing for a model household

Social home-buying subsidy: the subsidy would reduce the monthly financial burden on the model household into a viable range (below 40 percent).

Model household: couple with child, gross household income 4,000 euros per month

Model property: purchase price incl. ancillary costs 303,800 euros

Subsidized debt capital (principal bank) 25,000
Subsidized equity capital (Wohn-Riester housing subsidy, home-building subsidy) 25,000
Subsidized debt capital (KfW) 100,000
Subsidized debt capital (Landesförderbank) 53,800

From the Authors

“The social home-buying subsidy would target low-equity households while also creating additional incentives to save by taking advantage of existing subsidy programs.”

Markus M. Grabka

Abstract

About one in four people in Germany are immigrants or have at least one parent who immigrated to the country. An indicator of their inclusion in political life is their reported party identification. SOEP survey data show that first- and second-generation immigrants report a party identification less often than the rest of the population. Among first-generation immigrants, party identification increases over time: Up to five years after immigrating, about a quarter of respondents report an initial party identification; after 15 years, the proportion is about half. Party identification differs greatly by country of origin. People from Turkey tend to lean toward the SPD, while people from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union and its successor states lean toward the CDU/CSU. The fact that half of all first- and second-generation immigrants in Germany do not yet identify with a German political party indicates high potential for political mobilization. Parties should reach out to this growing group of voters more actively and take their diverse political interests more fully into account.

From the Authors

“Parties have the potential to garner long-term support from first- and second-generation immigrants. To do so, they should work systematically to integrate the diverse political interests of immigrants and their children into their party platforms and translate these ideas into concrete policies.”

Jannes Jacobsen

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_wb:2021-28-1
Daycare and School Closures Have Changed West German Fathers’ Attitudes Toward Mothers’ Employment

By Natalia Danzer, Mathias Huebener, Astrid Pape, C. Katharina Spieß, and Gert G. Wagner

Abstract

Government measures to combat the COVID-19 pandemic created significant challenges for families, especially the temporary closure of schools and daycare centers. While many previous studies focused on how mothers and fathers distributed the additional childcare responsibilities between them during this time, the present study examined how the pandemic affected parents’ views about gender roles. By comparing representative data from spring 2021 to data from 2008 to 2016, we examined whether parents’ attitudes toward working mothers changed. The results show that fathers with younger children—who had become more egalitarian in their attitudes toward mothers’ employment over the preceding decade—changed their attitudes during the pandemic: Whereas around 60 percent of fathers held very egalitarian gender role attitudes in 2016, this percentage fell to around 54 percent during the pandemic, a reduction of around ten percent. We found no such changes in attitudes among either mothers or fathers in eastern Germany. This suggests that the pandemic, in addition to changing the distribution of responsibilities within families, has slowed the trend toward more egalitarian gender role attitudes, and has even partially reversed this trend in western Germany.

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_wb:2021-34-2
Volunteerism Varies Between Different Social Groups, Especially in Very Rural Areas
By Tuuli-Marja Kleiner and Luise Burkhardt

Abstract
Politicians and some researchers see volunteer work as playing an important role in social cohesion, support for democracy, and the provision of public services, especially in rural areas. However, little is known about volunteerism in the different types of rural areas. For this report, the typology of rural areas developed at the Thünen Institute of Rural Studies was merged with survey data from the SOEP, and volunteering in the different types of rural areas was evaluated with regard to gender, employment status, and frequency of participation in religious events. The results show that volunteerism is highest in very rural regions with a good socio-economic situation. Men in very rural regions are significantly more likely to volunteer than women. Employment also plays a stronger role in volunteerism in very rural regions. Participation in religious events is a reliable predictor of volunteering across all regions. The results suggest that volunteering should be promoted further, especially in very rural areas, and made more accessible to groups that have not been involved as much up to now.

From the Authors
“In order for volunteerism to help strengthen social cohesion and democracy, especially in structurally weak rural areas, policymakers should create better conditions for volunteering by providing the infrastructure and ensuring the provision of public services.”

Tuuli-Marja Kleiner

Volunteering is highest in prosperous, very rural areas
In percent, by degree of rurality and socio-economic situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Rurality</th>
<th>Better Socio-Economic Situation</th>
<th>Worse Socio-Economic Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very rural areas</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-rural areas</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-rural areas</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Germany as a whole

Sources: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP v.35); authors’ calculations (weighted). Figures in percent based on valid 2017 data.

© DIW Berlin 2021
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20 Years of the Riester Pensions—Personal Retirement Provision Requires Reform
By Johannes Geyer, Markus M. Grabka, and Peter Haan

Abstract

Introduced 20 years ago as a part of the 2001 pension reform, the Riester pension is meant to function as a core component of the German pension system with the aim of compensating for decreasing public pensions. However, data collected by the SOEP show that this objective has not yet been achieved. For ten years, use of the Riester pension plan has been stagnating at around 25 percent of the working-age population, meaning the majority of households do not have a Riester contract. From a sociopolitical standpoint, the growing significant inequality in the use of the Riester pension is especially problematic. In 2020, only around 13 percent of individuals in the lowest income quintile had a Riester contract compared to almost 32 percent in the top quintile. Among pension recipients, the Riester pension has so far only played a minor role in securing their standard of living, accounting for just around five percent of their total retirement income. If the Riester pension is to function as a core component of the German pension system, it must be fundamentally reformed. One possibility would be to organize personal pension provision through a mandatory pension fund, similar to the Swedish model of a standardized pension scheme product with low administrative costs. However, it must be guaranteed that low-income earners and the unemployed are able to pay the mandatory basic contributions.

From the Authors

“The Riester pension is struggling to reach important target groups. Those who need Riester pensions the most because they are threatened with old-age poverty rarely have Riester pension contracts. If the Riester pension is to be a significant component of old-age provision in Germany, comprehensive reform is necessary.”

Peter Haan

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_dwr:2021-40-1
DIW Weekly Report 44/45

Need for Long-Term Care Depends on Social Standing

By Johannes Geyer, Peter Haan, Hannes Kröger, and Maximilian Schaller

Abstract

The poor have significantly lower life expectancy than the wealthy. Using data from the Socio-Economic Panel, this Weekly Report shows that poorer people more often are in need of care, and begin to require care at a younger age. In addition, blue-collar workers have a higher risk of requiring care than civil servants, as do people with high job strain compared to people with low job strain. The risk of dependence on care is determined by society, income, and work. Therefore, socio-political reforms are needed to reduce this inequality, which existing social security systems only compensate for in part. To reduce the risk preventatively, a sustainable policy to reduce strain must begin during the employment phase. To reduce the inequality in the short term, private co-payments should be decreased and made more dependent on disposable income. Abolishing the private system in favor of a single-payer health care system covering all residents would be effective as well, as those with private care insurance have a considerably lower risk of dependence on care.

From the Authors

“Not only is income unequally distributed throughout society in Germany, but life expectancy and risk of care dependence are as well. We need socio-political measures, such as a single-payer health care system, to combat this inequality.”

Peter Haan

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_dwr:2021-44-1

People at risk of poverty become in need of care much earlier than wealthy people

Source: SOEP-Core v35.

© DIW Berlin 2021
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Artificial Intelligence in Germany: Employees Often Unaware They Are Working with AI-Based Systems

By Oliver Giering, Alexandra Fedorets, Jule Adriaans, and Stefan Kirchner

Abstract

Using a new SOEP-IS data module on digitalization including information on the prevalence of AI use in the workplace, this report shows that for many employed people, the term “artificial intelligence” often appears to have little relation to their own everyday work. When asked directly about the use of digital systems with the term “artificial intelligence,” around 20 percent of the working respondents in the sample answered that they use such systems. When asked indirectly—without using the term AI—almost double the share of respondents answered that they use at least one of these digital systems on a daily basis. Thus, many employees are already working with AI-based systems without knowing it. This suggests that the current debate about job displacement due to AI (substitution) needs to be expanded to include perspectives on collaboration between humans and machines. As of 2021, many employees still complete certain tasks themselves but also receive assistance from AI-based systems. Training should be offered for the workforce to gain knowledge about AI and strengthen their AI-related skills. With these measures, as many people as possible can shape technological progress in Germany and thus benefit from it.

From the Authors

“The phrase ‘artificial intelligence’ often makes people think of futuristic robots. Many people are not aware that AI-based systems are already an everyday part of their work. With a realistic view of AI, many employees could benefit from improved collaboration with digital systems.”

Oliver Giering

© DIW Berlin 2021
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DIW aktuell 58
February 12, 2021

Proposed Hartz IV reform: Neither social policy milestone nor gradual introduction of an unconditional basic income
By Fabian Beckmann, Rolf G. Heinze, Dominik Schad and Jürgen Schupp

During the first COVID-19 lockdown, access to Hartz IV unemployment benefits was eased to cushion the impact of virus containment measures. The means-testing of housing costs and assets was eliminated or significantly simplified and sanctions were waived. These changes were initially effective until the end of March but were extended again to December 31, 2021, in a recent meeting of the grand coalition government. This suggests that Federal Labor Minister Hubertus Heil’s legislative proposal, which is intended to permanently facilitate access to Hartz IV benefits, has been postponed until the upcoming Bundestag election. To provide a sound basis for political debate, we empirically analyze how sensible it is to keep the temporary changes in place after the end of the special COVID-19 rules. The analysis of three basic points for the reform of the benefit system shows that a permanent simplification of the rules on housing costs would only cause a minor increase in expenditures. The abolition of sanctions, on the other hand, would be met with low public support, especially among recipients of Hartz IV benefits.

DIW aktuell 59
February 17, 2021

Not an “either-or” situation: Parents worry about their children’s education and health during lockdown
By Mathias Huebener, Nico A. Siegel, C. Katharina Spieß, Christian Spinner, Gert G. Wagner

Now in its second month, the second strict lockdown has left an impact on many families in Germany, according to data from infratest dimap on parents’ worries and life satisfaction. Satisfaction with childcare, satisfaction with family life, and satisfaction with life in general have all fallen relatively to the so-called “lockdown light” in November. In the current lockdown, mothers report lower levels of well-being than fathers, just as they did in the first strict lockdown last spring. Factors such as parental education and household income also play a role. Parents who are very concerned about their children’s education also worry about their children’s health. While parents tend to take a positive view of daycare and school closures for health reasons, they are less satisfied in terms of their children’s education. This makes it all the more urgent to develop concepts that do justice to both education and health and thus take parents’ concerns as well as children’s needs into account.
DIW aktuell 61
April 26, 2021

It’s not just the minimum wage level that matters
By Alexandra Fedorets and Mattis Beckmannshagen

Six years after the introduction of the minimum wage in Germany, the political debate is still focused mainly on the level of the minimum wage and on the introduction of minimum wages across Europe. Too little attention is paid to other structural weaknesses that came to light with the introduction of a minimum wage in Germany: First, hourly wage increases still do not translate one-to-one into increases in monthly income. Second, there is too little monitoring of compliance with minimum wage law. Third, workers who are affected by noncompliance are inadequately protected under labor law. It will be important for the next federal government to address these three weaknesses to improve wages in the low-wage sector and ensure fair competition between companies. The minimum wage debate should be expanded to take into account innovative, cost-effective, and efficient control mechanisms; stronger incentives for compliance; and strategies to achieve better occupational health and safety.

DIW aktuell 63
May 11, 2021

Pandemic schooling: Parental education plays a role in how much time children spend on schoolwork
By Sabine Zinn and Michael Bayer

School closures during the pandemic have raised fears that with homeschooling, children with learning disabilities and children of less educated parents will be left behind. A recent analysis of SOEP-CoV data shows that when schools were closed completely, parental education had little effect on the amount of time children spent on their schoolwork. That changed in the period immediately after the first lockdown, when schools were partially reopened: Children of less educated parents spent much less time on schoolwork at home than their peers. A similar trend is likely to emerge in the near future as schools resume in-person instruction. The Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) is planning large-scale support programs to compensate for students’ learning deficits. For these programs to succeed, schools across Germany should measure student progress simultaneously using identical instruments.
DIW aktuell 66
June 24, 2021

People who trust others are more likely to get vaccinated and follow social distancing rules
By Jule Adriaans, Philipp Eisnecker, Martin Kroh and Simon Kühne

Trust is an important social resource, especially in uncertain times: Crises like the COVID-19 pandemic can only be overcome through broad social cooperation. According to results from the SOEP-CoV study, social trust has been high during the pandemic and even increased between February 2020 and June 2021. The results show that trust has also played an important role in combatting the pandemic: People with higher trust in others were more likely to get vaccinated and to follow social distancing, hand hygiene, and mask rules.

DIW aktuell 67
July 1, 2021

Continuing loneliness and lower satisfaction with life: Second COVID-19 lockdown has had a greater impact on well-being
By Theresa Entringer and Hannes Kröger

The pandemic was expected to have a psychological impact on Germany’s population, even during the first lockdown. During the second, much longer lockdown, these fears increased. Many believed that the mental health of the population was in jeopardy. Results of the SOEP-CoV study show that these concerns were at least partially justified. During the second lockdown, loneliness remained high and life satisfaction declined. If economic insecurity increases or if the crisis continues to affect people’s everyday lives—for instance, in another lockdown—it can be assumed that mental health and well-being will deteriorate further. Efforts should therefore be undertaken now to develop concepts for providing easy access to psychotherapy and other support services for those who need them. These should be targeted especially at women, younger people, and immigrants—the groups whose mental health suffered most during the second lockdown.
**DIW aktuell 69**

July 7, 2021

**COVID-19 increasingly forcing self-employed people out of business—women hit especially hard**

By Alexander S. Kritikos, Daniel Graeber, and Johannes Seebauer

The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in a negative income shock for many self-employed workers in 2020. How has the pandemic affected self-employed people’s willingness to continue in self-employment? In 2019, around 85 percent of those who had been self-employed in the previous year were still self-employed, whereas at the start of the pandemic in spring 2020, this was only true of around 75 percent. The percentage of previously self-employed individuals who gave up self-employment but did not switch to a job that is subject to social insurance contributions also increased from 9 to 13 percent. In the first two months of 2021, the probability of remaining self-employed plateaued for men but continued to fall for women.

**DIW aktuell 76**

November 23, 2021

**At the start of the fourth pandemic wave: Parents more satisfied and less worried when schools and daycare centers are open**

By Mathias Huebener, Astrid Pape, Nico A. Siegel, C. Katharina Spieß, and Gert G. Wagner

Parents reported significantly higher satisfaction with family life, childcare, and life in general in October at the start of the fourth wave of COVID-19 than during the lockdowns of the previous winter and spring. They also reported worrying significantly less than in April about their children’s education and economic future, for example. Despite the relatively high incidence of infection in young people when schools and daycare centers were open and when school was mostly in-person, parents’ worries about their children’s health declined significantly. This may indicate that parents were concerned about children’s other health outcomes besides COVID-19 when schools and daycare centers were closed or partially closed. Keeping schools and daycare centers open is important for parents and children alike. Regular testing, high vaccination rates among staff, and appropriate hygiene measures appear to be key in preventing renewed closures and minimizing potentially wide-ranging long-term impacts of the pandemic on children and families.
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This graph shows the development of the number of publications separately for SOEP Core and SOEP-IS. It should be noted that the starting year for SOEP-Core is 1984, while SOEP-IS refers to 2011 with a time lag. It can be seen that after ten years, the number of publications for both data products has developed in a comparable manner. Both data products are thus comparably successful in terms of output.
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Pavlova, Maria K. 2021. Do workers accumulate resources during continuous employment and lose them during unemployment, and what does that mean for their subjective well-being? *PloS one*, 16 (12), e0261794. (https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261794)
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Mutter und Kind (9–10 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Mutter und Kind (9–10 Jahre, CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Mutter und Kind (9–10 Jahre, Q, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Haushalt (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Haushalt (Q, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Haushalt (M3–M5, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Haushalt (CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Haushalt (P, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Jugend (16–17 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Jugend (16–17 Jahre, Q, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Jugend (11–17 Jahre, M3–M5, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Jugend (16–17 Jahre, CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Kindheit (0–10 Jahre, M3–M5, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Nachbefragung Person (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Nachbefragung Person (CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Biografie (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Biografie (CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Biografie (Q, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Person und Biografie (M3–M5, Wiederbefragte, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1022</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Person und Biografie (M3–M5, Erstbefragte, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Person (Q, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Person (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Person (CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Pre-Teen (11–12 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1027</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Pre-Teen (11–12 Jahre, CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Pre-Teen (11–12 Jahre, Q, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Frühe Jugend (13–14 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Frühe Jugend (13–14 Jahre, CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Frühe Jugend (13–14 Jahre, Q, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Verstorbene Person (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Verstorbene Person (CAWI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 1988: Haushaltsfragebogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Haushaltsfragebogen, Stichproben A–L3, M1–M2 + N-Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Personenfragebogen, Stichproben A–L3, M1–M2 + N-Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Biografie, Stichproben A–L3, M1–M2 + N-Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Nachbefragung Person, Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Die verstorbenen Personen, Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Mutter und Kind (2–3 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Mutter und Kind (5–6 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Eltern und Kind (7–8 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Mutter und Kind (9–10 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Pre-Teen (11–12 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Frühe Jugend (13–14 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Jugend (16–17 Jahre), Stichproben A–L3, M1–M2 + N-Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Biografie (A–L3, M1–M2 + N–Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Haushaltsfragebogen, Stichproben M7–M8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Personenfragebogen, Stichproben M7–M8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Biografie, Stichproben M7–M8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Auswahlfragebogen Ankerperson, Stichproben M7–M8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series B</td>
<td>Survey Reports (Methodenberichte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>Methodenbericht zur Studie Corona-Monitoring bundesweit (RKI-SOEP-Studie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Survey Report on the 2020 SOEP Innovation Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Methodenbericht zum Befragungsjahr 2020 des Bonn Intervention Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2017: Report of Survey Methodology and Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2016: Report of Survey Methodology and Fieldwork for M3 and M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Report of Survey Methodology and Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series C</th>
<th>Data Documentation (Datendokumentationen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Design, Nonresponse, and Weighting in the Sample Q (Queue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>SOEP-IS modules 2011-2018 – Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – Documentation of Sample Sizes and Panel Attrition in the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) (1984 until 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>Weighting the SOEP-CoV study 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Sampling, Nonresponse, and Weighting in Living in Germany – Nationwide Corona Monitoring (RKI-SOEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2019: Sampling, Nonresponse, and Weighting in the Sample P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Series D
Variable Descriptions and Coding

941 Documentation of ISCED generation based on the CAMCES tool in the IAB-SOEP Migration Samples M1/M2 and IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees M3/M4/M5 until 2019

957 SOEP-IS 2019–BIO: Variables from the Life Course Question Module

961 SOEP-IS 2019 – BIOAGE: Variables from the Modules of Questions on Children

962 SOEP-IS 2019 – BIOBIRTH: Birth Biography of Female and Male Respondents

963 SOEP-IS 2019 – BIOPAREN: Biography Information on the Parents

964 SOEP-IS 2019 – COGNIT: Cognitive Achievement Potentials

965 SOEP-IS 2019 – H: Variables from the Household Question Module

966 SOEP-IS 2019 – HBRUTTO: Household-related Gross File

967 SOEP-IS 2019 – HGEN: Household-related Status and Generated Variables

968 SOEP-IS 2019 – HHRF: Weights for Households

969 SOEP-IS 2019 – IBIP_PARENT: Variables from Bonn Intervention Panel (parents)

970 SOEP-IS 2019 – IBIP_PUPIL: Variables from Bonn Intervention Panel (children)

971 SOEP-IS 2019 – IDRM: Person-related Data from Innovative DRM Module

972 SOEP-IS 2019 – IDRM_ESM: Person-related DRM Data from Innovative ESM Module

973 SOEP-IS 2019 – IESM: Person-related ESM Data from Innovative ESM Module

974 SOEP-IS 2019 – ILANGUAGE: Variables from Innovative Language Modules

975 SOEP-IS 2019 – ILOTTERY: Variables from an Innovative Lottery Experiment in 2016

976 SOEP-IS 2019 – INNO: Variables from the Innovation Modules

977 SOEP-IS 2019 – INNO_H: Household Variables from the Innovation Modules

978 SOEP-IS 2019 – INTV: Variables about the interviewers

979 SOEP-IS 2019 – IRISK: Decision from Description vs. Decision from Experience

980 SOEP-IS 2019 – KID: Pooled Dataset on Children

981 SOEP-IS 2019 – P: Variables from the Individual Question Module

982 SOEP-IS 2019 – PBRUTTO: Person-related Gross File

983 SOEP-Core v36 – Biographical Information in the Meta File PPFAD (Month of Birth, Immigration Variables, Living in East or West Germany in 1989)

1034 SOEP-IS 2019 – PGEN: Person-Related Status and Generated Variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2019 – PHRF: Weights for Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2019 – PPFAD: Person-Related Meta-Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – BIOIMMIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – BIOPAREN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1039</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – BIOSIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – COGDJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – HBRUTTO: Household-Related Gross File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – HEALTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – HGEN: Household-Related Status and Generated Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1044</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – HPATHL: Household-Related Meta-Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – HPATHL: Household-Related Meta-Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – PBRUTTO: Person-Related Gross File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – PGEN: Person-Related Status and Generated Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – PPATHL: Person-Related Meta-Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1078</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – LIFESPELL: Information on the Pre- and Post-Survey History of SOEP-Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>SOEP-Core v36 – BIOAGEL &amp; BIOPUPIL: Generated Variables from the “Mother &amp; Child”, “Parent”, “Pre-Teen”, and “Early Youth” Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOEP in the Media
Selected Articles about the SOEP

http://www.diw.de/soep-in-den-medien

Zeit online – December 31, 2021
Altersvorsorge: Wer sorgt wie fürs Alter vor?

Zeit online – December 30, 2021
Privater Immobilienbesitz: Wer sind die Immobilienbesitzer in Deutschland?

Frankfurter Rundschau – December 23, 2021
Unterschätzte Hilfe

Spiegel online – December 7, 2021
ZEW-Studie: Studienabbrücher kosten den Staat viel Geld

Junge Welt online – December 4, 2021
Vulnerable Gruppen: Vom Wohlstand abgekoppelt

FAZ online – November 29, 2021
Soziologie der Impfunwilligen: Manchmal begrüßen selbst Corona-Skeptiker eine Impfpflicht

Tagesspiegel online – November 17, 2021
Nachhaltiger Wohlstand lässt sich mit BIP nicht erfassen

Handelsblatt online – November 10, 2021
WSI-Verteilungsbericht: "Erwerbsarbeit keine Garantie für Sicherheit" – Mittelschicht hat trotz steigender Einkommen Abstiegsangst

FAZ online – November 9, 2021
Wie Studenten über Einwanderung denken

Ärzteblatt.de – November 8, 2021
Infektionsrisiko mit SARS-CoV-2 von Beschäftigten in Gesundheitsberufen während der Pandemie

Handelsblatt online – October 28, 2021
Frauen, Einzelhandel, Gastronomie: Wer besonders von der Anhebung des Mindestlohns profitieren würde

Versicherungsbote online – October 6, 2021
DIW Berlin: Nur ein Viertel der Bürger riestert

Junge Welt online – September 25, 2021
Prekär angestellt: Tarifreue nur auf dem Papier

Zeit online – September 13, 2021
IW-Studie: Viele Rentner arbeiten nicht aus finanzieller Not

rbb24 online; Radioeins radio show – September 9, 2021, 3 p.m.
Psychische Gesundheit in der Pandemie: "Frauen leiden mehr unter Ängsten und Depressionen als Männer" (Interview with Theresa Entringer)

Versicherungsbote online – September 8, 2021
Deutsche Aktuare: Pflegebürgerversicherung ist keine Lösung

FAZ online – August 30, 2021
Der Volkswirt: Die Politiker und das Risiko

Stern online – August 22, 2021
Generationen im Einkommensvergleich: Verdienen Söhne mehr als ihre Väter?

FAZ online – August 19, 2021
Sozialforschung zu Immigration: Die Ressourcen der Toleranz
PART 5: SOEP-Based Publications in 2021

AssCompact – Fachmagazin für Risiko- und Kapitalmanagement online – August 17, 2021
VdK fordert Rente mit 63 für anstrengende Berufe

Tagesspiegel online – August 17, 2021
Arbeiter sterben früher als Beamte Stress frisst Rentenjahre

ÄrzteZeitung online – August 12, 2021
Bürgerversicherung: Eine solidarische Alternative?

NDR Info – Redezzeit radio show – August 11, 2021
Vierte Welle im Herbst – sind wir gerüstet?

Süddeutsche Zeitung online – August 11, 2021
Arbeitsmarkt: Warum viele Mütter nicht arbeiten – obwohl sie wollen

Neue Zürcher Zeitung online – August 7, 2021
Interaktiv: Arbeiter und Migranten wählen links, Spitzenverdiener rechts? Von wegen

Focus online – July 22, 2021
Armut- und Reichheitsbericht: Wie arm sind die Deutschen? Bei den Vermögen fällt die Antwort eindeutig aus

Versicherungsbote.de – July 20, 2021
Bürgerversicherung würde nur kurzzeitig Krankenkassen-Beiträge entlasten

FAZ online – July 14, 2021
Viele Selbständige schmeißen hin

Zeit online – July 10, 2021
Dunkelziffer: Infiziert, ohne es zu wissen

nd-aktuell – July 10, 2021
Echte Gegensätze und erwünschte Polarisierung

FAZ online – July 9, 2021
Corona-Pandemie: Deutsche zufrieden wie vor der Krise

Zeit online – July 1, 2021
Corona und psychische Erkrankungen: Corona-Pandemie schlägt vor allem Ärmeren auf die Psyche

KOMMUNAL.de – June 19, 2021
Studie: Sport fördern – mehr einkommensstarke Bürger!

Zeit Campus online – June 15, 2021
Rentensystem: Jung, wild und bereit für die Rente

Capital online – June 9, 2021
Corona-Pandemie: eine Krise der Gleichberechtigung?

DAB Deutsches Architektenblatt online – June 7, 2021
Gehaltsunterschied 26 Prozent: Skandal oder statistisches Artefakt?

Tagesspiegel online – June 2, 2021
Immer mehr Fälle von Überschuldung: Finanzielle Bildung könnte viele vor der Schuldenfalle retten

Business Insider online – June 1, 2021
Kinder, deren Eltern länger in Elternzeit waren, sind als Erwachsene glücklicher – zeigt eine Langzeitstudie

Focus online – May 14, 2021
Multimilliardär vs. Hartz-IV-Empfänger: Regierung verschleiert ein deutliches Problem

Junge Welt online – May 18, 2021
Stress im Arbeitsalltag: Erzieherinnen unzufrieden

WiWo online – May 18, 2021
Paare mit dem gleichen Beruf sind erfolgreicher

Eichsfelder Nachrichten online – May 13, 2021
Schule in der Pandemie: Lernzeit der Kinder hängt auch vom Bildungsgrad der Eltern ab

FAZ am Sonntag online – May 2, 2021
Hanks Welt: Müssen alle Menschen Akademiker werden?

Berliner Zeitung online – April 19, 2021
Gesellschaftliche Entwicklung: Studie zu Lebenszufriedenheit: Wie geht es uns in der Pandemie?

Sueddeutsche Zeitung online – April 13, 2021
Corona-Pandemie: Selbständige Frauen leiden besonders unter der Krise
migazin online – March 26, 2021
Geflüchtete sind in der Pandemie psychisch stark belastet

Welt online – March 5, 2021
Jetzt rächt sich die deutsche Kita-Ignoranz

FAZ online – February 26, 2021
Namensgebung bei Migranten: Mahmuds Schwester heißt Jasmin

Spiegel online – February 22, 2021
Interaktive Grafik: Wohnen Sie großzügig – oder beengt?

Zeit online – February 15, 2021
Soziale Ungleichheit: Wie wohlabend sind Sie?

Zeit online – February 10, 2021
LGBTQ: Queere Menschen leiden häufiger an stressbedingten Erkrankungen

Berliner Morgenpost – February 10, 2021
Studie: Homosexuelle Menschen erkranken häufiger an Depressionen

Business Insider – February 5, 2021
Wie gebildet eure Eltern sind, beeinflusst eure Gesundheit – noch Jahrzehnte, nachdem ihr ausgezogen seid

der Freitag – Die Wochenzeitung – January 22, 2021
Der Apologet der Großvermögen
(Guest comment: Helmut Däuble)

elektronik.net online – January 19, 2021
Bertelsmann-Stiftung: Unternehmen sollen mehr im Ausland rekrutieren

FAZ online – January 17, 2021
Pflegefall in der Familie: Viele Angehörige geben den Beruf auf

Neues Deutschland online – January 16, 2021
Homeoffice: Das andere Risiko

Welt online – January 15, 2021
Einmalige Abgabe oder Steuer? Die Vermögenden im Visier der Linken

Zeit online – January 5, 2021
Bevölkerungsentwicklung: Mehrheit der Bayern bleibt in Bayern
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