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**SOEP Annual Report 2022**
The 2022 SOEP Annual Report presents not only the diverse achievements of the excellent SOEP team in the field of data collection over the last year, but also discusses groundbreaking new developments at the national and international levels. Whether documenting the integration of newly arriving Ukrainian refugees, building our knowledge about employment and pensions, or continuing to survey respondents about the consequences of COVID-19 in Germany, SOEP data continue to be enhanced and refined to meet new and ongoing challenges. As in previous years, in 2022, the SOEP data provided numerous researchers with an indispensable tool for applied and methodological research, making SOEP one of the most important foundations for the description and analysis of socio-political and economic change. Yet again, SOEP can look back on a successful year of innovations in the provision of research data and the expansion of its research infrastructure.

Organizationally, SOEP underwent some changes in 2022. SOEP Director Stefan Liebig left on October 1, returning to the Institute of Sociology at Freie Universität Berlin. We thank Stefan Liebig for his contributions to SOEP and his project work over the last five years.

Maintaining reliable data collection and evaluation while expanding the range of data collected provides an indispensable basis for research: Independent analysis of the social, political, and economic present is only possible through the large-scale provision of survey data. In this context, the SOEP data represent an essential basis for research and evaluation that is accessible to researchers all over the world.

Together with SOEP team, the Executive Board of DIW Berlin looks back on a successful year of continuing this unique research-based data infrastructure. The DIW Berlin Executive Board thanks all SOEP employees for their outstanding and innovative contributions.

We wish the readers of this Annual Report an enjoyable and inspiring read.
From left to right: Markus M. Grabka, Sabine Zinn, Jan Goebel, and Carsten Schröder
The year 2022 at SOEP was marked by several significant advancements in the survey as well as new research projects that address key societal challenges.

A first major advancement was a new refresher sample of about 6,000 households that was added to counteract sample attrition and significantly increase case numbers of younger population groups and households in rural areas.

A second advancement was motivated by the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Because of the high number of refugees arriving in Germany, a new random sample of more than 10,000 Ukrainian refugees was drawn to understand more about this new population arriving in Germany. The survey of refugees from Ukraine is being carried out as a joint project of the SOEP, the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) of the Federal Employment Agency (BA), the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), and the Research Center of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF-FZ). Initial study results were presented at a federal press conference in December 2022.

A third advancement was the linkage of SOEP with administrative data from the German Pension Insurance. The resulting new data infrastructure significantly expands the analytical potential of the SOEP. The project is institutionalized in such a way that new SOEP samples can be linked with the pension data in the future as well.

New research projects were also launched in 2022. Two were started with funding from the German Research Foundation (DFG). The first deals with intergenerational reproduction of wealth inequality and its socio-demographic conditions in Germany, and the second will incorporate the survey of Ukrainian refugees, which was launched as a related study, into the regular SOEP-Core survey.

The year 2022 also brought important changes in the SOEP team. In September 2022, former SOEP Director Stefan Liebig left to take up a full professorship at Freie Universität Berlin. Since then, the four-member SOEP Directorate has managed the business of the SOEP. Sabine Zinn, head of the Survey Methodology and Management Division, has held the position of Deputy Director since December 2022.

This SOEP Annual Report gives you a glimpse of our wide-ranging activities in 2022. Chapter 1 presents several new projects that were launched in 2022, describes the SOEP’s migration and refugee samples, and highlights research potentials in the area of mental health.

Chapter 2 introduces the structure and divisions of the SOEP at DIW Berlin, the members of our team in 2022, and our advisory bodies. Chapter 3 gives an overview of fieldwork in 2022 by infas, the institute responsible for conducting the SOEP fieldwork. Chapter 4 presents the SOEP team’s work on the 37th wave of the SOEP data that was released in spring of 2022, describes data preparation for the 38th wave of the study, and summarizes the results of our 2022 SOEP User Survey.

The SOEP Annual Report focuses on the dataset 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 2022: THE YEAR IN NUMBERS

43 research projects at the SOEP

64 members of the SOEP team

14,116 registered SOEP data users from 52 countries

66 guest researchers at the SOEP

28 papers by SOEP staff in Web of Science™ Core Collection Publications

20,000 SOEP Core

1,803 SOEPs successfully interviewed households
17 doctoral students on the SOEP team

3 dissertations by SOEP team members

1,343 new SOEP data users

~10 million euros in outside project funding

407 papers published worldwide using SOEP data

>100,000 visits RDC website

300,000 visits DIW/SOEP website

39th wave of SOEP data in the field
New project on the intergenerational reproduction of wealth inequality

Many people today have around the same amount of wealth as their parents did at the same point in their lives. But to what extent is wealth passed on from one generation to the next? This question is investigated in the project “The intergenerational reproduction of wealth inequality and its socio-demographic conditions in Germany” (InterVerm), launched in February and funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

“Aging and Resilience” research network begins work

How do people manage to stay healthy and participate in social life into old age? This is the question that SOEP researchers led by psychologist Theresa Entringer are investigating, together with scientists from a total of 15 research institutes in the network “Aging and Resilience,” which will begin work in November. Up to now, research on aging in Germany has focused mainly on understanding and treating age-related diseases. Now researchers are taking a more health-oriented approach.
What makes millionaires tick? New SOEP data enable novel findings on the personality traits of the rich

A study by SOEP economist Johannes König and other researchers at the SOEP and the University of Münster (WWU) finds that millionaires are more willing to take risks, more emotionally stable, more open, more extraverted, and more conscientious than the general population. The data come from the SOEP’s new top wealth subsample. It appears in the April issue of Humanities & Social Sciences Communications.

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-022-01099-3 (open access)

Joint research project launched: IAB-BiB/FReDA-BAMF-SOEP survey of 6,000 refugees from Ukraine

The project “Refugees from Ukraine in Germany” is the first comprehensive, representative social science survey of this group. It is being conducted by the SOEP in partnership with the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) of the Federal Employment Agency (BA), the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), the Family Research and Demographic Analysis (FReDa) project, and the Research Center of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF-FZ). Launched in April, the study fills an important research gap by creating the first representative database on Ukrainian refugees in Germany, on the conditions that led them to flee, and on their integration into German society.

Article on pandemic depression among the self-employed published in top journal

How has the pandemic affected the mental health of self-employed people? SOEP researchers Daniel Graeber and Johannes Seebauer answer this question in their article “Pandemic Depression: COVID-19 and the Mental Health of the Self-Employed,” published in June in Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice (ETP). ETP is one of the leading scholarly journals in entrepreneurship, with a five-year impact factor of 14.1. The authors also received the DIW Berlin Best Publication Prize for their study.

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/10422587221102106 (open access)
SARS-CoV-2 antibody study shows most adults in Germany vaccinated

Results from the second wave of the nationwide antibody study “Corona Monitoring Nationwide” published in July show that about 90 percent of adults in Germany had been vaccinated at least once and had further antigen contact (through vaccination or infection) by December 2021. Also, about one third of the adult population had either received three vaccinations or been vaccinated and infected, which provide good protection against severe disease according to the Standing Committee on Vaccination (STIKO). The study was conducted by researchers at SOEP together with the Robert Koch Institute, the Institute for Employment Research (IAB), and the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF).

Link to a fact sheet on the study: https://www.rki.de/lid-studie (in German)

Refresher sample of 6,000 new households added to SOEP-Core

In July, a new refresher sample of 6,000 households is added based on a random sample of the population drawn from the records of Germany’s resident registration offices. The refresher significantly increases the total number of households in the SOEP. Sample R is kindly made possible by financial support from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

New pension records data released

Data from the Sample of the Insured Population’s Pension Fund Records (VSKT) are released to the international research community. The sample contains the pension records of around 14,494 SOEP respondents. In addition to socio-demographic information, it contains information on aspects of pension entitlements such as pension amounts, components, types, as well as points accrued in the pension point system. By linking the SOEP data with the register information of the German Pension Insurance, a variety of new analysis possibilities arise.
Viola Hilbert receives prize at the IARIW Conference

SOEP doctoral student Viola Hilbert is awarded the Best Poster Presentation Prize at the International Association for Research on Income and Wealth (IARIW) conference in August for her poster “Inequality of Opportunity in Wealth—Measurement from Germany”. She is also honored with the DIW Graduate Center Best Presentation Award 2022.

Aug

Laura Buchinger wins ECP poster award at EAPP Conference

In July, SOEP doctoral student Laura Buchinger receives the first poster prize at the European Conference of Personality in Madrid for her poster “Will we become what we aspire to? A longitudinal study on how life goals and personality are intertwined”. The study on which the poster is based was coauthored by Theresa M. Entringer, David Richter, Caroline Wehner, Gert G. Wagner, Denis Gerstorf, and Wiebke Bleidorn.

New IAB-SOEP Migration Sample launched

To adequately reflect changes in the structure of migration to Germany, a new sample of labor migrants from third countries has been launched. The target sample size is 1,500 households. The IAB-SOEP Migration Sample is a joint project of the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) and the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP).

Extension of funding for DFG projects on personality and social relationships

What are the main dynamics of social relationships? A research group led by SOEP psychologist Theresa Entringer is investigating interactions between personality traits and social relationships in two novel studies that are the first to use data collected with smartphones. These are being conducted as part of the SOEP Innovation Sample. The German Research Foundation approved funding for the next phase of the study.
Gert G. Wagner appointed to ASEP Scientific Advisory Board

Gert G. Wagner, former longtime director of SOEP, is appointed to the Scientific Advisory Board of the Austrian Socio-Economic Panel (ASEP) by the Austrian Minister of Science, Martin Polaschek. The ASEP is designed as a long-term household panel study for Austria that will consist of two parts: first, a purely register-based data infrastructure for the social and economic sciences, and second, annual longitudinal survey data.

New project on capital accumulation in Germany

How great is the disparity in capital gains between rural and urban real estate owners? What are the drivers of wealth accumulation in Germany besides capital gains from real estate ownership? These are issues addressed by SOEP researchers Charlotte Bartels and Carsten Schröder in the project “Wealth Accumulation in Germany: Current Trends and Drivers,” which is being funded by the German Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (BMAS).

Study launched to analyze the wages and working hours of minimum wage workers during the pandemic

What impact did the Corona Pandemic and related short-time work in Germany have on earnings and working hours of dependent employees and on compliance with the minimum wage? These are core concerns of a new research project conducted by SOEP together with DIWecon on behalf of the Minimum Wage Commission. The project will run from September 2022 to April 2023 and was commissioned by the Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (BAuA):

https://www.baua.de/EN/Tasks/Coordination-offices/MLK.html
Findings from the study on Ukrainian refugees presented at federal press conference

In December, researchers from SOEP, the Institute for Employment Research (IAB), the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), and the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF-FZ) present the first representative findings from the study on Ukrainian refugees in Germany at a federal press conference. The study shows that Ukrainian refugees are actively participating in social life in Germany: 17 percent are already employed, half are attending language courses, and 60 percent live in their own apartment. Ukrainian refugee children are attending school and daycare. While most Ukrainian refugees plan to stay in Germany for a limited period, a quarter would like to live here permanently.

Sabine Zinn becomes Vice Director of SOEP

Sabine Zinn, Division Head for Survey Methodology and Management, takes over as Vice Director of the SOEP for the next 2 years on December 1, 2022. She will work with division heads Jan Goebel, Markus M. Grabka, and Carsten Schröder to ensure that the quality of all the SOEP’s data and research projects is maintained. The former SOEP director, Stefan Liebig, left DIW Berlin on September 30, 2022, and has since returned to a position as a university professor at Freie Universität Berlin.

Funding approved for research project on refugees in Germany

Funding for a new panel study on refugees from the Ukraine in Germany (SUARE) is approved in December by the German Research Foundation (DFG). SUARE will survey Ukrainian refugees longitudinally from 2023 to 2025 in the framework of the SOEP and investigate the institutional, economic, and social conditions of refugee migration from Ukraine to Germany.
After being postponed during the pandemic, the bi-annual SOEP Conference finally took place again at DIW Berlin from June 30 to July 1, 2022. Events like these are an important part of research life. Despite the still-ongoing pandemic and the many unknowns affecting travel and large events, the SOEP team was pleased to welcome many presenters and participants, who made the conference a great success.

The local organization team was led by Janina Britzke, Theresa Entringer, Philipp Lersch, and Carsten Schröder. The scientific committee included Marco Caliendo (University of Potsdam), Stefan Schmukle (University of Leipzig), Pia Schober (Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen), and Olaf Struck (University of Bamberg). They helped to choose around 65 of the approximately 80 submissions from eight different countries for presentation as a paper or a poster.

Two internationally renowned researchers offered keynote speeches: Arne L. Kalleberg (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC / USA) and Anja Abendroth (University of Bielefeld). Kalleberg’s presentation on “Technological Change and Job Quality” addressed the topic of work and technological change (digitalization) at the interface of sociology, economics, and psychology, and highlighted cross-national, comparative, and multi-level studies linking societal and organizational institutions and structures with individual outcomes. His presentation focused on three main themes: the fit between individuals and jobs, work structures and inequality, and employment relations. In the second keynote speech, Anja Abendroth presented her recent analyses on “Gender, Parenthood and Class Specific Patterns of Digital Work: A Comparative Perspective” and shared her findings on the interplay between digital forms of work and gender differences and its effects on parenthood. She also addressed differences between countries in the digitization of work, and emphasized the need to study algorithms that influence digital forms of work.

The conference ended with an awards ceremony. Three groups of researchers were awarded the 2022 Joachim R. Frick Memorial Prize for best presentation at the conference: One went to Laila Schmitt from University of Munich (LMU). A second went to Maximilian Blesch and his co-authors from the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Bonn University, Freie Universität Berlin, and DIW Berlin. A third Joachim R. Frick Memorial Prize went to Max Deter and Martin Lange from Bergische Universität Wuppertal and Leibniz Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW). The Felix Büchel Award went to C. Katharina Spieß, who herself worked at SOEP for many years and is now the director of the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB) in Wiesbaden.

For more information on prizes, conference presentations, and keynotes, see our website: [www.diw.de/soep2022](http://www.diw.de/soep2022)
Findings from the RESEARCH ON MIGRATION: Successes and Challenges of Integration

Immigration is one of the most significant social developments of the last two decades in Germany. The SOEP offers an invaluable data source for the analysis of issues surrounding migration. The SOEP has oversampled immigrants since the survey started in 1984. In addition, the IAB-SOEP Migration Sample and the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees, conducted in cooperation with the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) and the Research Centre of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF), complement the SOEP samples and provide a unique database for research on all aspects of immigration and refugee migration. More than 9,000 immigrants have participated in these surveys since 2013 and more than 8,000 refugees since 2016. Below are some of the most important findings on migration and integration published in 2022 based on these data:

Mentoring Programs Foster Integration

Mentoring programs bring refugees together with locals who assist them in navigating everyday life in Germany, in dealing with the authorities, and in finding jobs and childcare. A group of researchers at SOEP and IAB took a closer look at these programs. They found that refugees who are part of mentoring programs have more contact with Germans and participate more frequently in cultural and leisure activities. Those in mentoring programs are also more satisfied with their accommodations than other refugees, and their language skills also improve.


https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369183X.2022.2058918
Language Acquisition Depends Partly on Personality Traits

For refugees, proficiency in the language of their destination country is a crucial condition for integration. But how well and how quickly they learn this new language depends in part on their personality traits. According to a recent study conducted by Yuliya Kosyakova (IAB) and Marie-Christine Laible (BAMF), traits such as openness to new experiences, conscientiousness, risk appetite, locus of control, and resilience foster the ability to learn a new language. Agreeableness and neuroticism showed insignificant effects on language acquisition. Personality traits are especially important when it comes to communication skills, but less important when it comes to writing and reading.

Kosyakova, Yuliya, & Laible, Marie-Christine (2022): “Importance of Personality Traits for Destination-Language Acquisition: Evidence for Refugees in Germany,” International Migration Review 0(0).
https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183221132538

Refugees Experienced More Discrimination During the Pandemic than Before

Refugees who arrived in Germany between 2013 and 2016 reported experiencing more discrimination during the first year of the pandemic than before. This was especially the case among refugees who were looking for work or in education, as a study by SOEP researchers shows. Refugees living in eastern Germany, those younger than 40, those with poorer knowledge of the German language, as well as employed women reported experiencing discrimination most frequently.


Parents’ German Language Skills Play a Role in Their Children’s Educational Outcomes

In families that speak a different language than German, when the parents lack German language skills, the children face significant disadvantages in educational attainment. SOEP data show that only 15.5 percent of 13–15-year-olds whose parents lack good German language skills attended academic-track upper secondary school (Gymnasium) in 2019. In contrast, young people in the same age group whose parents do possess good German language skills had about the same probability of attending upper secondary school as young people without an immigrant background. These findings come from an analysis of SOEP data by Wido Geis-Thöne of IW Cologne. He recommends that children be introduced to the German language in early childhood and preschool. However, in 2019, only 65.3 percent of 3–4-year-old children of parents lacking German language skills were enrolled in daycare. The figure was 84.3 percent for children without an immigrant background.

First Results of the SURVEY OF UKRAINIAN REFUGEES

The Russian invasion of Ukraine has triggered the largest movement of refugees in Europe since World War II. More than one million people have fled from Ukraine to Germany since the start of the war. This makes Germany the third most important destination country for refugee migration from Ukraine after Russia and Poland.

In light of this, the Institute for Employment Research (IAB), the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), the Research Centre of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF-FZ), and the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) undertook the longitudinal survey “Ukrainian Refugees in Germany (IAB-BiB/FReDA-BAMF-SOEP survey)” to survey Ukrainian refugees who have fled to Germany since the start of the war. The study provides the first representative insights into the current living situation of these refugees and their plans for the future. In the first wave of the study, 11,225 Ukrainian nationals were surveyed between August and October 2022.

Key findings from this first wave are that most of the Ukrainian refugees in Germany are women (80%), and that many of them came to Germany with minor children (48%). The most important reason refugees mentioned for fleeing to

Educational and Occupational Qualifications of Ukrainian Refugees in Germany Compared to the Population of Ukraine and the Population of Germany (Share of 20-70-year-olds in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ukrainian Refugees in Germany</th>
<th>Population of Ukraine</th>
<th>Population of Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary / secondary education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Germany was that other Ukrainians—family members, friends, or acquaintances—were already living in Germany (60%). Regarding education, Ukrainian refugees in Germany are a selective group: 72 percent of adult Ukrainian refugees have tertiary (in most cases college or university) education. This is a much higher percentage of tertiary education than in the overall population of Ukraine. Regarding German language proficiency, only 4 percent of Ukrainian refugees rated their German as “good”, while 14 percent rated their German as “average” and 83 percent as “poor”. Despite the language challenges, 17 percent of refugees of working age were employed at the time of the survey. Of these, 80 percent were employed as skilled workers, specialists, or experts. When it comes to housing, most Ukrainian refugees (74%) moved into private housing immediately after arrival, another 17% into hotels or guest houses, and only 9% into shared accommodations. Refugees often experience psychological stress. It is therefore unsurprising that over a quarter (26%) of Ukrainian refugees report feeling lonely and lacking in social contact. This is especially true among older and single refugees, as well as refugees whose partners are not living in Germany. Almost half of the Ukrainian refugees surveyed would like to stay in Germany for the near future—the majority of them until the end of the war. Twenty-six percent see a long-term future in Germany and would like to stay forever, and 27 percent do not yet know whether and how long they want to stay.

The results of the IAB-BiB/FReDA-BAMF-SOEP survey provide a more nuanced picture of the Ukrainians who have fled to Germany since the beginning of the war. On the one hand, the relatively favorable conditions for coming to Germany as a Ukrainian refugee and for integration have led to initial positive developments in areas such as housing, language course participation, labor market participation, and childcare. On the other hand, refugees from Ukraine still face major challenges in a number of areas: in developing language skills, getting educational qualifications recognized and finding jobs that meet their qualifications, in social integration, in providing for their children’s well-being, and in dealing with family separation.
Findings from the SOEP RESEARCH ON MENTAL HEALTH

Mental health is not only the basis for a good quality of life—it is also a prerequisite for resilience, productivity, and social participation. This makes the rise in mental illnesses in Germany over the last few years all the more concerning. According to recent statistics, one in four people in Germany will suffer from a mental illness in his or her lifetime. Mental health is one of the most important research areas in the SOEP. Below, we present some of SOEP research findings on mental health that were published or presented in 2022.

COVID-19: How did the pandemic affect mental health?

People suffered psychologically during the COVID-19 pandemic—especially women and younger people. These and other findings from the SOEP-CoV study were presented by Stefan Liebig and Theresa Entringer at the WZB’s digital colloquium “Corona Sociology.”

Loneliness: Who does it affect the most?

How many people in Germany suffer from loneliness? Which population groups are affected most—and why? Theresa Entringer published an expert report on these questions for the Competence Network on Loneliness (Kompetenznetz Einsamkeit). It tells which risk factors contribute to loneliness and what people can do to protect themselves.
Religiosity: Does faith change people’s personality?

Religious people become more agreeable over time than non-religious people, and they also become more conscientious and conservative—assuming that the people around them are religious too. Theresa Entringer and colleagues proved for the first time that personality development depends not only on people’s individual learning experiences and behavior but also on their surroundings. The study was published in the *Journal of Personality*.

Women: How was their mental health impacted by the pandemic?

During the pandemic, women suffered psychologically: They became lonelier as well as more anxious. Theresa Entringer gave a lecture at the Heinrich Pesch Haus on the topic of women’s mental health during COVID-19 based on data from the SOEP-CoV study.

Depression: How did the pandemic affect people already suffering from depression?

People who already suffered from depression before the pandemic were at a higher risk of their illness worsening during the pandemic. This was not the case, however, for anxiety symptoms. These are among the results of a study by Theresa Entringer and colleagues published in the journal *European Psychiatry*. 
PART 2

Overview of the SOEP Research Infrastructure at DIW Berlin
Research at the SOEP

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 deals with 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 investigates the living situations of migrants (Migration and Social Transformation). For the fourth key research topic at the SOEP, experts in survey methodology and data science are working to develop and further improve the study.

These four key topics of research correspond to the following 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 under SOEP Research on our website.
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), 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 part of the National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI). As part of the Leibniz Association, the SOEP receives funding from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and Germany’s state governments.
SOEP Directorate

Prof. Dr. Sabine Zinn
Vice Director of SOEP and Head of the Division of Survey Methodology and Management

Dr. Jan Goebel
Board of Directors SOEP and SOEP Research Data Center Division Head

Prof. Dr. Carsten Schröder
Board of Directors SOEP and Head of the Division of Applied Panel Analysis

Dr. Markus M. Grabka
Board of Directors SOEP and Head of the Division of Knowledge Transfer

Patricia Axt
Team Assistance

Simon Kleineweber
Project Management

Maximilian Müller
Team Assistance

Monika Wimmer
SOEP Communications Management

In 2022, the SOEP directorate and its administration 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 directorate 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.
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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 SOEP 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.
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Experts from the Research Data Center of the SOEP (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 workstation 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.
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, theoretical, and methodological research include distributional analysis, policy evaluation, education, health, 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) or the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), 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.
Knowledge Transfer

The Division of Knowledge Transfer 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 are published or made available online to 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 in the DIW Berlin Weekly Report as well as in the Data Report that is published jointly by the German Federal Statistical Office (Destatis), the Federal Agency for Political Education (pbp), 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.
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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 SOEP began, it has repeatedly added new subsamples such as those with a special focus on migrants, refugees, families, and the wealthy. SOEP now surveys around 20,000 households and 30,000 individuals every year. 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 launched in 2011 for the study of innovative research questions as well as innovative survey methods. SOEP-IS publishes a call every year inviting researchers worldwide to propose their own questions or modules for inclusion 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 also links and harmonizes SOEP survey data with data from other countries. This enables use of the SOEP data in cross-national comparative analysis:

The Cross-National Equivalent File (CNEF) is an international panel dataset with harmonized information on education, employment, income, health, and life satisfaction. In addition to the German SOEP data, CNEF includes data from eight other countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Russia, South Korea, Switzerland, Japan, and Australia.

The EU-SILC Clone provides harmonized cross-sectional as well as longitudinal information on private households in Germany based on the SOEP data. It directly mimics the data structure of the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC).

The Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) is a database of harmonized microdata from over 50 countries including income, employment, and demographic data. The Luxembourg Wealth Study (LWS) database contains comparable wealth data for nineteen countries.

SOEP-Related Studies (SOEP-RS)

There are now a number of studies in Germany that have incorporated questions from the SOEP questionnaire to validate their results on a representative sample of the German population (SOEP as Reference Data). These SOEP-Related Studies (SOEP-RS) are designed and implemented in close cooperation with the SOEP team and structured similarly to the SOEP. Some examples of SOEP-RS include BASE-II (Berlin Aging Study II), FiD (Families in Germany), PIAAC-L (Programme for International Assessment of Adult Competencies-Longitudinal), SOEP-ECEC Quality (Early Childhood Education and Care Quality in the SOEP), SOEP-LEE 1&2 (SOEP Employer-Employee Survey), BIP (Bonn Intervention Panel), BRISE (Bremen Initiative to Foster Early Childhood Development), ZHP-FGZ (Cohesion Panel of the Research Institute for Social Cohesion), and IAB-BiB/FReDA-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees from Ukraine.
The infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences in Bonn is a private, independent social research institute founded in 1959 that conducts research for and advises businesses, research institutes, and policy makers. infas currently employs more than 150 researchers and experts in various disciplines who provide a range of services, including major national and international empirical studies on diverse topics such as the labor market, education, and mobility. infas is Germany’s largest commercial research institute with a social science focus. Since 2016, the institute has been certified to ISO 20252, 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.

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). 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). Fieldwork is carried out by over 500 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.
For each wave of the survey, the SOEP Research Data Center makes the most recent data available to researchers worldwide. The files for each data release are provided to the SOEP at DIW Berlin by infas and include gross and net survey data, methodological data, structured metadata, as well as complete documentation.

Table 1 gives an overview of the sample sizes in the different SOEP subsamples in 2022 (completed interviews).

How was the survey conducted in 2022?

SOEP-Core used a mixed-mode survey design. All households in all subsamples were initially contacted face-to-face in computer-assisted personal interviews (CAPI). The survey started with interviewers recording or updating the household composition. Once all household members had been listed or updated, it was clear which individuals should be given questionnaires and which questionnaires they should receive. All household members were primarily to be interviewed in CAPI but were also given the option of completing the questionnaires independently on a tablet (computer-assisted self-interview, CASI) or of filling out the questionnaire in the absence of the interviewer, either online (computer-assisted web interview, CAWI) or on paper (paper-and-pencil interview, PAPI). Respondents who could not be reached at home during the fieldwork period (classified as “temporarily absent”) and respondents who declined to participate in this wave due to a lack of time or other reasons (“soft refusals”) were automatically sent a PAPI questionnaire. PAPI questionnaires included a link to the online survey so that respondents could decide for themselves—even after starting out on paper—whether they preferred to complete the questionnaire.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Youths1</th>
<th>Children2</th>
<th>Total individual questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>3,261</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>4,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBa</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBb</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td>7,704</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>8,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,774</td>
<td>26,496</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>29,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Eleven to 17-year-olds who completed their respective questionnaire
2 Children (born between 2011 and 2022) for whom a child questionnaire was completed
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The mixed-mode design for subsamples A–Q
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online. Households and respondents who had not yet been reached by CAPI were switched to the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) survey mode after at least six attempts to reach them had failed, provided that a telephone number was available for the household or person. Analogous to CAPI, respondents in CATI could switch to CAWI and PAPI if they wished. Individuals who were temporarily absent and “soft refusers” were automatically switched to CAWI or PAPI during CATI fieldwork using the same procedure as in the CAPI fieldwork.

The sequential approach is depicted in Figure 1.

Who participated in the survey, and how long did it take?

In 2022, a total of nine different questionnaires were used for subsamples A–R. In 2022, only one child questionnaire was administered: a questionnaire about children born in 2011 or later. In the previous waves, interviewers administered as many as five different child questionnaires per household, each referring to a specific child birth cohort, that had to be completed by one of the parents. This meant that prior to 2022, five birth cohorts could not be taken into account each survey year. The change in 2022 provides data on all the birth cohorts of interest (2011 to 2022) but limits the average amount of time it takes to complete the child questionnaires to about 10 minutes per child.

Table 2 gives an overview of response rates for each of the questionnaires and shows the high response rates achieved among adult respondents in the participating households. Around 73 percent of adult respondents completed the individual questionnaires, and around 25 percent of respondents who had not completed an individual questionnaire in the previous wave completed a gap questionnaire in the present wave, filling in key missing data. Importantly, almost complete response (98.5 percent) to the household questionnaire was achieved in the participating households.

In 2022, the total average time to complete the two main questionnaires—household and individual—in CAPI was 55 minutes (13 minutes for the household questionnaire and 42 minutes for the individual questionnaire). For a household consisting of two adults, this added up to 97 minutes in the household plus the time needed for additional questionnaires such as the gap questionnaire.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires Volumes and Response Rates¹</th>
<th>Gross sample size</th>
<th>Completed interviews</th>
<th>Response rate in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household questionnaire</td>
<td>19,774</td>
<td>19,477</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual questionnaire</td>
<td>36,377</td>
<td>26,496</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth questionnaire: birth year 2005</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early youth questionnaire: birth year 2008</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-teen questionnaire: birth year 2010</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child questionnaire: birth year 2011 to 2022</td>
<td>5,425</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical questionnaire</td>
<td>19,768</td>
<td>9,104</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap questionnaire</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire “The deceased individual”²</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The figures refer to the target population of participating households. For the child questionnaire, the reference value is the number of children in the respective age group living in the participating households. The response rate for this questionnaire therefore indicates the number of children for whom one parent completed a questionnaire.

² The reference value for the questionnaire “The deceased individual” refers to deceased persons in participating households.
What were response rates in samples A–Q?

Table 3 shows the composition of the gross sample in 2022 as well as gross response and cooperation rates for the individual subsamples. Both rates are differentiated into: 1. previous-wave respondents (66.8 percent of the gross sample), 2. previous-wave dropouts (29.4 percent of the gross sample), and 3. new households (splits; 3.8 percent of the gross sample).

A total of 17,241 panel households were contacted in 2022, 14,029 of which were in samples A–Q. Of the total completed interviews, 7,600 (70.9 percent) were interviewer-administered and 3,116 (29.1 percent) were self-administered in PAPI or CAWI. Response rates were high among households that had participated in the previous wave, at about 80.3 percent.

Of households that had not participated in the previous wave, about 26.1 percent did participate in the 2022 wave. Furthermore, about 21.6 percent of the new households that split off existing households during the 2022 fieldwork were surveyed. There was a greater difference in response rates between subsamples in these two groups than among previous-wave respondents. The cooperation rate across all subsamples was 79.0 percent. A look at the individual samples shows that the older panel samples A–Q have a significantly higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>In %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sample composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>17,241</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14,029</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>11,520</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>10,057</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>5,064</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Response rates by type of fieldwork | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 10,716 | 62.2 | 9,594 | 68.4 | 685 | 45.7 | 142 | 20.4 | 295 | 29.0 |
| Respondents in previous wave | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 9,253 | 80.3 | 8,427 | 83.8 | 568 | 64.8 | 75 | 41.4 | 183 | 45.2 |
| Interviewer-based | 6,831 | 73.8 | 6,203 | 73.6 | 476 | 83.8 | 44 | 58.7 | 108 | 59.0 |
| Self-administered PAPI/CAWI | 2,422 | 26.2 | 2,224 | 26.4 | 92 | 16.2 | 31 | 41.3 | 75 | 41.0 |
| Dropouts in previous wave | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 1,321 | 26.1 | 1,036 | 30.7 | 106 | 18.7 | 67 | 13.1 | 112 | 18.4 |
| Interviewer-based | 673 | 51.0 | 511 | 49.3 | 74 | 69.8 | 33 | 49.3 | 55 | 49.1 |
| Self-administered PAPI/CAWI | 648 | 49.1 | 525 | 50.7 | 32 | 30.2 | 34 | 50.8 | 57 | 50.9 |
| New households (split-off HHs) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 142 | 21.6 | 131 | 22.1 | 11 | 20.0 | - | - | - | - |
| Interviewer-based | 96 | 67.6 | 86 | 65.7 | 10 | 90.9 | - | - | - | - |
| Self-administered PAPI/CAWI | 46 | 32.4 | 45 | 34.4 | 1 | 9.1 | - | - | - | - |

| Cooperation rate1 | 79.0 | 80.8 | 69.6 | 52.4 | 68.8 |

1 Number of interviews divided by sum of interviews and refusals.
response rate (83.8 percent) than the younger migration samples. Also, 30.7 percent of previous-wave dropouts completed interviews in the 2022 wave. For the migration samples except M7, this was between 18 and 19 percent. The cooperation rate was also highest in samples A–Q at around 81 percent.

Who was the target population for boost samples R and M8b?

In 2020, two boost samples (R and M8b) were added to the SOEP. Sample R was a refresher sample created by randomly sampling addresses from residents’ registration offices. It was designed to provide higher proportions of respondents from lignite coal regions as well as younger respondents. The aim was to recruit 6,000 households, 1,000 of them from four lignite coal regions. There were different selection probabilities for this sample due to the disproportionality by lignite areas and age groups. The age group of 18-to-45-year-olds was to be disproportionately represented compared to 46-to-70-year-olds by a factor of 2. Sample R was surveyed in 300 German municipalities.

Sample M8b was designed to provide data for evaluation of the skilled immigration act (Fachkräfteeinwanderungsgesetz), which went into effect on March 1, 2020. The target population was migrants who came to Germany between 2019 and 2020. The Institute for Employment Research (IAB) provided the random sample.

Both samples were first surveyed in July 2022 with the same study design as the other SOEP-Core samples. The only exception was that there was no PAPI mode in the boost samples. Starting in October 2022, after fieldwork for this wave had already started, the study design for M8b was modified so that households that had not yet been surveyed could complete the entire survey, including the questionnaire on household composition, in the self-administered CAWI mode.

Table 4 shows the fieldwork results for the two boost samples. In both samples, the targeted household realizations in 2022 were achieved. When processing the addresses, however, it became apparent that there were difficulties with the address-es provided, especially in the migration sample M8b. Around 40 percent of the households were untraceable, and another 14 percent could not be reached during fieldwork. Around 25 percent of contacted households declined to participate in the study.
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The proportion of households that declined to participate was even higher in boost sample R, at almost half of the households (12.9 percent permanent refusals, 35.1 percent “soft” or current-wave refusals). The quality of the addresses in this sample was significantly better. Fewer than 10 percent of the households were untraceable, and around 13 percent could not be reached during fieldwork.

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. Table 5 gives an overview of the sample sizes in the four SOEP subsamples in 2022 (completed interviews).

### How was the survey conducted in 2022?

To survey samples M3–M6, the mixed-mode design used in the previous year was continued. First, interviewers contacted the households personally and recorded or updated the household composition. They then conducted face-to-face interviews with the household members. To increase the motivation to participate, respondents were given the option of completing their questionnaire self-administered on a tablet computer (CASI) or online (CAWI).

During the field phase, various additional interventions were implemented to increase the motivation to participate and to reach more respondents. First, a reminder was sent by mail to all respondents who had not yet been reached. A personalized QR code on the card led respondents to a short online questionnaire where they could enter preferred interview times and update contact information. To increase motivation, the postpaid incentive was raised from 10 to 20 euros.

The questionnaires and documents were provided in German, English, Arabic, and Farsi. Of the 182 interviewers who worked on the 2022 survey, 95 were native speakers of the respective language. Interviewers with the appropriate language skills were assigned to households based on the language used in the last interview. If an interviewer was unable to communicate with a household in a given language, another interviewer with the appropriate language skills attempted to make contact.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Total household questionnaires</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Youths(^1)</th>
<th>Children(^2)</th>
<th>Total individual questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>3,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Adolescents (birth years 2005, 2008, and 2010) who completed their respective questionnaire.

\(^2\) Children (birth years 2011 to 2022) for whom a child questionnaire has been completed.
Who participated in the survey, and how long did it take?

In 2022, a total of eight questionnaires were used. Several major changes and revisions were made to integrate instruments from other SOEP samples. For example, only one integrated individual questionnaire was used in this survey for both first-time respondents and repeat respondents. The individual questionnaire took an average of about 45 minutes to complete. First-time respondents also received the biographical questionnaire, which added an average of 35 minutes to the interview time. Respondents who had not participated in the survey last year received the gap questionnaire, which took almost 3 minutes, in addition to the individual questionnaire. In addition, adult respondents in the household without a migration background and respondents who had moved to Germany before the age of 16 received the individual questionnaire (about 53 minutes) and biographical questionnaire (for first-time respondents only) from SOEP-Core.

Corresponding to the other SOEP samples, the integrated child questionnaire was given to one parent of all children born in 2011 or later and not just to children in certain birth cohorts. The birth-year-specific questions were filtered within the questionnaire. The average additional interview time per child (born between 2011 and 2022) was 13 minutes.

Adolescent household members born in 2005, 2008, and 2010 received the integrated youth instrument with filtering of age-specific questions. The survey took an average of 43 minutes for an adolescent to complete. It is important to note that the biographical and gap questionnaires were completed after the personal questionnaire. Fifty-seven percent of the first-time respondents who completed an individual questionnaire also completed the biographical questionnaire (21.6 percent of all first-time respondents in a household) and 71 percent (45.9 percent of all household members who did not participate in the previous year) completed the gap questionnaire.

What were the response rates?

Table 7 shows the composition of the gross sample in 2022 as well as gross response and cooperation rates for the individual subsamples. If we look at the composition of the gross sample and the different subsamples, we see that in sample M6 in particular, there was a high proportion of dropouts in the previous wave (61 percent). In the other samples, M3–M5, the proportion was somewhat lower at around 45 percent.

These differences between the subsamples are also reflected in the response rates. The overall response rate in 2022 was 37.8 percent; in samples M3 and M4, it was about 42 percent; in M5, nearly 38 percent; and in M6, nearly 33 percent. One reason for these differences between the samples may be the lower study retention in sample M6 (first survey in 2020).

If we look at the willingness of respondents to participate in the last year, we see that a response rate of 60 percent was achieved in samples M3 and M4. In sample M5, this was 51 percent and in M6 47 percent.

When it comes to response rates among households that did not participate in the previous year, the differences were smaller, and about 23 percent of these households were interviewed in 2022.

The overall low response rate is explained by the relatively low cooperation rate, which was 60 percent overall and only 50 percent in sample M6.
### Table 7
Composition of Gross Sample and Response Rates in Samples M3–M6 by Type of Fieldwork

<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></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>In %</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Gross sample composition by types of HH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Response rates by type of fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-based</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered PAPI/CAWI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-based</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered PAPI/CAWI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-based</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered PAPI/CAWI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Cooperation rate¹</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Number of interviews divided by sum of interviews and refusals.
The study Living in Germany conducted its first tests and experiments at an early stage, e.g., in 1998 with Sample E, which was aimed, among other things, at examining how panel participants react to the CAPI interview mode in comparison to PAPI. These tests marked the beginning of what later became known as the SOEP Innovation Sample (SOEP-IS). What makes this sample unique is not its target group, but its content and implementation. In its first wave, SOEP-IS contained several short-term experiments, and both the sample and its content have evolved further over time.

In 2011, SOEP-IS became an independent sub-study of the SOEP. As an annual household panel survey, SOEP-IS corresponds closely to SOEP-Core in its design, questionnaires, and fieldwork procedures. It also provides a framework for testing innovative survey content and modules for potential inclusion in SOEP-Core.

In 2012, SOEP-IS was opened up to international researchers from a variety of disciplines to propose their own survey modules. The innovative modules that they have contributed to SOEP-IS cover diverse topics and research objectives and include in-depth questions on personal opinions and attitudes, questions about the effects of major life events, and even short behavioral experiments. SOEP-IS can be used for both short-term experiments and long-term survey questions that cannot be included SOEP-Core due to the specificity of the research questions or the new and not yet established methodologies. In SOEP-IS, in contrast to SOEP-Core, all interviews are conducted in German only.

As the 2021 SOEP-IS wave had to be cancelled for pandemic-related reasons, the 2022 wave was the first one to be conducted by infas. SOEP-IS fieldwork was shifted to take place at the same time as fieldwork for SOEP-Core: Whereas SOEP-IS fieldwork used to take place from fall to spring, now it takes place from spring to fall. Participants were informed about these changes by mail in September 2021.

Figure 2 provides an overview of the development of the SOEP-IS over time.
How was the survey conducted in 2022?

The 2022 wave of SOEP-IS had a mixed-mode design. This meant that all households were contacted by telephone for an initial CATI interview if a telephone number was available. If not, an interviewer visited the household in person for a CAPI interview. In the first step, the interviewer recorded or updated the household composition to determine who should be surveyed and which questionnaires they should receive.

In SOEP-IS, in contrast to SOEP-Core, only adult household members are surveyed. For the individual surveys in the 2022 wave of SOEP-IS, all adult household members contacted by telephone were first offered CAWI but could also choose to continue via CATI as a second option. This approach aimed at encouraging respondents to use CAWI ("push to web"). This was a different approach than with household members who were visited by an interviewer, meaning there was no "push to web", the interviewer attempted to do the interview via CAPI and offered CAWI only after a person’s refusal.

Respondents who could not be reached during the fieldwork period (“temporarily absent”) and those who declined to participate due to a lack of time or other reasons (“soft refusals”) were automatically switched to the group of respondents interviewed in CAWI in future waves. Households and respondents that could not be reached in CATI after six attempts were switched to CAPI. Respondents were also given the option of switching to CAWI if they preferred.

Who participated in the survey, and how long did it take?

To capture the overall situation of the household and to cover household members of different ages, SOEP-IS uses various questionnaires. One questionnaire, the household questionnaire, deals with the situation of the household as a whole and is completed by the person most familiar with household matters (head of household). Ideally, this should be the same person every wave, but the head of household can be changed if necessary.

In 2022, every household member born in 2004 or earlier was asked to complete an individual questionnaire. New household members also completed a biographical questionnaire covering their life before joining the survey. One parent was asked to complete a child questionnaire about all children in the household born in 2011 or later.

Table 8 gives an overview of the number of expected and completed interviews.

The 24 innovative modules are not separate questionnaires but are integrated into the individual questionnaire at appropriate points. One innovative module was included in the child questionnaire. Not every participant received all of the innovative modules. For each of the eight samples in SOEP-IS, a different subset of these modules was defined in order to keep the duration of the interview within reasonable limits (see Table 9). All members of a household, including new household members, received the same subset of innovative modules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Gross sample size</th>
<th>Completed interviews</th>
<th>Response rate in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household questionnaire</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual questionnaire</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child questionnaire</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biography questionnaire</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27.5</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 group living in participating households. Therefore, the response rate for these questionnaires indicates the number of children for whom a questionnaire has been completed by one parent.
How long it takes for a household to complete the survey depends on the number of people in the household. The household questionnaire took about 13.7 minutes on average. The individual questionnaire excluding the innovative modules took about 23.3 minutes on average. If a person was interviewed for the first time as part of the study, the interview took somewhat longer due to the biographical questionnaire, which took an average of 19.6 minutes to complete. For interviews with questions about a child born in 2011 or later, the survey took about 7.5 minutes for each child.

Table 9 shows the composition of the gross sample in 2022 as well as gross response and cooperation rates for the individual subsamples. Both the gross sample and response rates are differentiated into three groups:

1. **previous-wave respondents**
   - (88.6 percent of the gross sample)
2. **previous-wave dropouts**
   - (7.7 percent of the gross sample)
3. **new households**
   - (splits: 3.7 percent of the gross sample)
A total of 3,635 households were contacted, 1,854 (51 percent) of which were successfully interviewed. One indicator of the success of the fieldwork on an individual level is partial unit non-response (PUNR). In 2021, the highest PUNR was 29.9 percent in sample I6 and the lowest, 11.3 percent, in sample I1. Overall, the PUNR was 17.6 percent. The high PUNR for sample I6 is likely due to the fact that this sample was first surveyed in 2020 and the survey failed in 2021. In all other subsamples, the PUNR was below or at 16.4 percent. The overall cooperation rate was 72.1 percent.

Among households that had already participated in a previous wave, a response rate of about 54.9 percent was achieved. Across the subsamples, the response rate in this group was similar, with a comparatively high rate of around 64.1 percent for subsample I4 and a somewhat lower rate of just 45.1 percent for subsample I1.

Of households that had dropped out in the previous wave, about 21.1 percent were brought back into the panel in this wave. Furthermore, about 18.8 percent of the “split” households that had been newly formed during the fieldwork were successfully surveyed. Response rates for these two groups differ more between the individual subsamples than the response rates for previous-wave respondents.

Table 11 gives an overview of sample sizes in the different SOEP-IS subsamples in 2022 on the individual level (completed interviews). In total, data was collected on 2,747 individuals in the households surveyed. Of these, 2,507 were adults born in 2004 or earlier and 240 were children born in 2011 or later.

With regard to the push-to-web strategy, 24.8 percent of all household interviews were conducted online (CAWI). Table 12 shows the survey mode of the household interview differentiated by household type.

It turns out that the online mode is particularly well suited for previous-wave respondents. In the case of split households, 32 percent were surveyed online, although these figures should be interpreted with caution due to the small number of cases. In the case of dropouts in previous wave, the interviewer-assisted mode seems to be more suitable for winning these cases back. At the individual level, an even larger proportion of interviews (33.1 percent) were conducted online. Compared to previous SOEP-IS waves, there was a substantial increase in self-administered interviews in CAWI in 2022.

### Table 10

Composition of Gross Sample and Response Rates on the Household Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>I3</th>
<th>I4</th>
<th>I5</th>
<th>I6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>3,635</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2) Response rates by type 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>1,854</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (split-off HHs)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial unit non-response (PUNR)i</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation ratei</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Share of households (number of household members >1) with at least one missing individual questionnaire (birth year up to 2004).
2. Number of interviews divided by sum of interviews and refusals.
Table 11
Sample Sizes in the 2022 Subsamples on the Individual Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>I3</th>
<th>I4</th>
<th>I5</th>
<th>I6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
Net Sample and Survey Mode on the Household Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>I3</th>
<th>I4</th>
<th>I5</th>
<th>I6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-administered (CATI/CAPI)</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered (CAWI)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in previous wave</td>
<td></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>1,770</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-administered (CATI/CAPI)</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered (CAWI)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts in previous wave</td>
<td></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>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-administered (CATI/CAPI)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered (CAWI)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households (splitoff HHs)</td>
<td></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>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer-administered (CATI/CAPI)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered (CAWI)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Additional PhoneStudy

DIW Berlin (German Institute for Economic Research), in cooperation with the University of Heidelberg and the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, commissioned an additional study on social interactions to be conducted in 2022. Social relationships between people are a cornerstone of our society. Everyone has a need for social relationships, but people differ in the strength of this need and in how they organize their everyday social relationships. The results of the study will help to better identify and reduce the risk of social isolation. To conduct the study, the smartphone app PhoneStudy for Android was developed. It recorded various aspects of smartphone use in the background (number and duration of calls, etc.) in a pseudonymized form to preserve respondents’ privacy. The app also recorded certain information about the participants’ environment.

At the end of the SOEP-IS questionnaire, respondents were asked a few questions about the smartphone they mainly use and their basic willingness to participate in this additional study. Those who consented to participate and had an Android 6.1 or higher smartphone received further information, including access data and an explanatory flyer. From the day the app was installed, the study was conducted for 14 consecutive days, and participants were given 40 euros as an incentive.

Of the 2,468 participants in the SOEP-IS who were asked to take part in this study, 1,260 (51 percent) expressed their willingness to participate. Of these, 786 (62 percent) fulfilled the technical requirements for participation. Ultimately, 338 (44 percent) of the participants who fulfilled the technical requirements and declared their willingness to participate installed the app and took part in the additional study for 14 days.
SOEP Users Around the World 2022

SOEP Annual Report 2022
Number of users per country:

- 1 – 9: 5 countries
- 10 – 99: 6 countries
- 100 – 1,000: 10 countries
- 1,000+: 5 countries

Countries with the highest number of users:

- Russia: 30
- China: 52
- South Korea: 51
- Japan: 41
- Australia: 100

Countries with the lowest number of users:

- Georgia: 1
- Iran: 1
- Nepal: 1
- Sri Lanka: 1
- Singapore: 16
- Indonesia: 3

Other countries with users:

- United Arab Emirates: 7
- Cyprus: 5
- Kazakhstan: 6
- India: 2
- Singapore: 16
- Taiwan: 7
- South Africa: 4
- New Zealand: 11
The SOEP’s 37th data release, with additional datasets and user resources

Version 37 of the SOEP-Core data (1984–2020, 10.5684/soep-core.v37) was released in the first quarter of 2022 with numerous additional datasets and resources for data users. Along with our “classic” SOEP-Core data, it also included data from the SOEP Innovation Sample (10.5684/soep.is.2020; see p. 55 ff. for more on the SOEP-IS).

SOEP v37 includes three new migration samples (M6 to M8) and two studies related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The 2020 boost sample M6 supplements the samples of the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees by adding an additional 1,141 households that were recruited based on a random sample 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 of people who immigrated from Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria between January 2016 and December 2018, and used register data from the Federal Employment Agency as a sampling frame (as did samples M1 and M2). The 2020 boost sample M8 supplements the samples of the IAB-SOEP Migration Survey by adding 1,096 households. For M8, register data from the Federal Employment Agency were used to identify the population of third-country nationals who applied to work in Germany as skilled workers (Fachkräfte) under the Immigration Act (Zuwanderungsgesetz) and were granted residency in the period from January 2019 to January 2020.


The second study on the COVID-19 pandemic comes from our partnership with RKI and contains information about the number of people already infected with the coronavirus as well as the number of infections that have gone undetected. More information about the project can be found online at https://www.diw.de/nationwide_antibody_study. The data are included in the new dataset bkbiorki, but the results of the PCR and DBS tests are only available on site at the SOEP Research Data Center.
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 3 presents an overview of the number of data distribution contracts signed each year since 2012. In 2021, 392 external users signed 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 2022 in Table 13 shows that more than 1,343 individual researchers were given access to the SOEP data last year.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Contracts</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU/EEA (not incl. Germany)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From November 2022 to early January 2023, SOEP data users had the opportunity to participate in our annual SOEP User Survey. The online survey allows users to give us their opinions, requests, and critiques and to tell us about their experiences and any problems they may be having with the data. This year’s questionnaire was shortened to 35 questions.

The focus of the 2022 User Survey was on how and when users get the data. Since we need our users’ continuous input and suggestions to improve, we are very grateful to the 974 data users who participated!

Survey respondents

This was the first SOEP User Survey for around 63% of our respondents. More than half of all respondents were male. Sixty-two percent were between 21 and 40 years old, and the average age was 40. About 70% are using Stata as a statistical program to analyze SOEP data.

Aspects of data quality

This year, respondents were asked about their satisfaction with various aspects of SOEP data quality. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is “completely dissatisfied” and 10 is “completely satisfied,” respondents were asked to rate various aspects of data quality. Figure 4 shows the mean values for the various aspects. The results show that SOEP scores high with data users on its trustworthiness as a data source. Users are also satisfied with the comparability of the data, the composition of the samples, the relevance of the study, and the accessibility of the datasets. Due to the complexity of the data and long period of time covered by the survey, users starting out with the SOEP are somewhat less satisfied when it comes to the user-friendliness and documentation of SOEP-Core data. The SOEP’s Getting Started initiative was launched to address these issues, and solutions to these problems are underway. The data documentation platform paneldata.org is continually being expanded to include additional information and features. And for new users, the SOEPtutorials video series and the SOEPcompanion digital manual have made it easier to get started working with SOEP data. Online and in-person SOEPcampus workshops are also very popular and provide an excellent hands-on introduction to the data. We hope that these resources will be utilized by users in the future and that they will increase satisfaction with the documentation and user-friendliness of the SOEP data.
Another topic of this year’s survey was how quickly and in what form users want to receive the SOEP data. The preparation and merging of SOEP data from the different samples as well as the creation of additional generated variables and the weighting and imputation of missing values are time-consuming processes. For this reason, six to 12 months elapse between the completion of fieldwork and the release of the data to our users.

Because of this relatively long wait, we were especially interested in finding out how users would feel about getting the data sooner. Overall, the results show that our users are not completely in agreement: 46% would like to get the data earlier (Figure 5). Of these, 11% would find it helpful to get the data along with weighting variables and additional generated data, 9% would like the data with weighting variables only, and 26% would like just the checked data. More than half of data users are not interested in receiving the data earlier and are quite willing to wait.

Thank you again to everyone who took part in our 2022 User Survey! For more results of the survey, please check our website.
SOEP is constantly striving to improve the analytical potential of the data. This is done by making changes and additions to the questionnaires, but also by linking the SOEP data with data from high-quality external sources such as administrative registers. Currently, the SOEP data are linked with data from the Research Data Center of the German Pension Insurance (SOEP-RV).

SOEP-RV is a joint project of SOEP and the Research Data Centre of the German Pension Insurance (FDZ-RV). The German Pension Insurance contains comprehensive information on individual employment and pension histories starting at the age of 14. As information is added every time a person participates in the pension system, the pension insurance information contains data on pension contributions, social security system pensions, pension prospects, social security earnings, and other topics. Linking SOEP data with these high-quality, long-term monthly data 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 data to answer questions about long-term inequality or the effects of policy reforms. SOEP-RV offers significant potential for research on pensions and old age, and on methodological questions such as the consistency of self-reported versus administrative information. SOEP data are only included in SOEP-RV if the SOEP respondent has provided express written consent to data linkage.

Up to now, around 15,000 SOEP respondents have consented to record linkage. In 2022, SOEP-RV will add further respondents who had not provided consent until now. Since the SOEPv37 data release, there is an identifier (rv_id) that supports the linkage of information on respondents from the SOEP survey with the register data from the German Pension Insurance (FDZ-RV). More information can be found online at: www.diw.de/soep-rv

In 2022, work also began to link SOEP data with additional register data from the Integrated Employment Biographies of the IAB, which contain merged and processed entries from employment histories, benefit receipt histories, basic income support benefit histories, job-seeker histories, and measure participation histories. Some of this information goes back as far as 1975. The linked data (SOEP-CMI-ADIAB) will be particularly useful for research questions that require very precise income data spanning the life course. The linked data set will be published in the course of 2023. Researchers will be able to use the data in the framework of a guest visit to the IAB’s Research Data Center and thereafter through remote data processing.
What is the EU-SILC-like panel? (EU-SILC Clone)

By Charlotte Bartels

The European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) contain data from across Europe on individual and household income, household living conditions, individual health, childcare, employment, and self-assessed financial situation. EU-SILC offers both cross-sectional and longitudinal data. Longitudinal EU-SILC data for Germany have only been available since 2020. The other EU-SILC countries began providing longitudinal data together with the cross-sectional data in the mid 2000s, which meant that German households could not be compared to other European households in the longitudinal dimension.

The EU-SILC-like panel is based on the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) and includes all EU-SILC panel variables for which the respective information is available in the SOEP. Detailed information is provided in our EU-SILC-like panel codebook and on the SOEP website at: www.diw.de/soep_silc-clone

What can data users do with the EU-SILC-like panel?

- The EU-SILC-like panel based on the SOEP allows researchers to conduct longitudinal analyses that include Germany along with other EU-SILC countries.
- Users can compare trends for specific variables and groups using the EU-SILC-like panel and the German EU-SILC cross-sectional data. Below we present a comparison of imputed rent and capital income, which both reveal differences between the two data sets. One could also compare, for instance, trends for the duration in poverty or other dynamic measures.
- Data users may also decide to use the EU-SILC-like panel based on SOEP instead of the EU-SILC cross-sectional data. If the aim is to analyze trends from 2005 up to the latest survey year, users might prefer the EU-SILC-like panel because the new survey design of the official German EU-SILC since 2020 has hindered comparison with results from preceding years, as noted by the German Federal Statistical Office.
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Similar Trajectories of German Language Skill Development Among Refugees and Other Recent Immigrants—Language Courses Play Crucial Role
By Cornelia Kristen, Yuliya Kosyakova, and Christoph Spörlein

When it comes to learning German, refugees do not differ much from other recent immigrants. Ability to speak, read, and write German, rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 12 (very well).

Abstract
For recent immigrants to Germany, language learning is vital for integration. This paper investigates the acquisition of German as a second language during the first few years following immigration, comparing refugees to other new immigrants who came to Germany within the last decade. Results suggest similar processes of second language acquisition in the two groups. The most important factors in language acquisition are learning opportunities that arise, on the one hand, in everyday life through personal interactions, and on the other, in structured learning situations such as language courses. The results show that language courses lead to significant gains in German language skill development within a fairly short period of time. Language courses play an important role, especially for refugees, whereas everyday social contact is also very beneficial for other immigrants. Language courses therefore appear to be an effective tool that policymakers can use to provide newly arrived immigrants with targeted support in language acquisition.

From the Authors
“The results show that language courses are an effective tool for for all immigrants, but especially refugees, to learn German. They are a key prerequisite for successful integration. Efforts in this direction should be intensified.”
Cornelia Kristen

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_wb:2022-5-1
Refugees in Germany perceived higher discrimination in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic
By Adriana Cardozo Silva, Christopher Prömel, and Sabine Zinn

Refugees in Germany perceived discrimination in all observed dimensions much more during the coronavirus pandemic than previously
Refugees’ perceived discrimination due to their country of origin in 2019 and 2020, shares in percent

Source: Authors’ own calculations based on the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees, weighted (longitudinal data, 2019).

Abstract
Refugees in Germany perceive discrimination due to their country of origin in various life dimensions, which can negatively affect their integration into society. Using IAB-BAMF-SOEP survey data, this report analyzes to what extent refugees perceive discrimination on the labor market, at educational institutions, on the housing market, with public authorities, and in daily life. The results show that perceived discrimination increased in all observed dimensions between 2019 and 2020, especially on the labor market and at educational institutions. In 2019, refugees living in eastern Germany, refugees below 40 years old, refugees with poorer German language skills, and employed refugee women felt more discriminated against than other groups of refugees. This increase is most likely related to the abrupt changes to the labor market and to the discontinuation of important integration measures due to the coronavirus pandemic. Thus, it is essential to resume these integration measures, such as language and integration courses, as soon as possible to mitigate refugees’ exclusion and marginalization.

From the Authors
“It is important to continue investing in state measures to improve refugees’ integration into German society, including in-depth measures such as language courses and counseling to help refugees compensate for a lack of social networks and experience in the German labor market.”
Adriana Cardozo Silva

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_dwr:2022-17-1
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Wages, Pensions, and Household Incomes Have Increased in Real Terms over the Past 25 Years

By Markus M. Grabka

Net household incomes have risen in all income groups since 1995
Changes in disposable household income by decile^1 (1995 = 100)

Abstract

Both gross wages and needs-adjusted net household incomes have increased significantly in Germany since 1995 after adjusting for inflation. Real wage growth has been especially strong among full-time employees, with an increase of more than 20 percent. At the same time, inequality in hourly wages has been decreasing and is now close to the same level as in the early 2000s, and the low-wage sector in Germany is shrinking. Net household incomes rose by an average of 26 percent in real terms between 1995 and 2019. There was growth across all income deciles, but especially in the top decile. The share of low-income earners has remained stable since 2015 at around 16.5 percent. However, with inflation now rising sharply, there is a risk that real wages and net household incomes will fall. Policymakers should work to counteract this through measures targeting the lower income groups in particular. The lump sum energy subsidy (Energiepreispauschale) is essentially a step in the right direction, but additional financial support programs should be created for groups such as retired people and students, who do not benefit from this.

From the Authors

“It’s good news that wages and incomes have been rising for a few years and that inequality at least is not increasing. But the current high inflation is hitting low-income households particularly hard and could reverse that trend.”

Markus M. Grabka

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_wb:2022-23-1

Sources: SOEPv37; author’s calculations.

Notes: Real incomes (measured in 2015 prices); individuals living in private households; needs-adjusted annual income recorded in the following year; needs-adjusted using the modified OECD equivalence scale.

^1 The population is sorted by income levels and divided into 10 equally sized groups (deciles). The lowest (highest) decile indicates the income situation of the poorest (richest) 10 percent of the population.
Changes in working hours are driving earnings inequality

By Mattis Beckmannshagen and Carsten Schröder

Abstract

According to Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) data, inequality in gross monthly earnings in Germany increased significantly between 1993 and 2003 and has been stagnating at a high level since 2008. As this Weekly Report shows, the increase is not being driven by higher hourly wage inequality, but rather by working hours: In recent years, employees with a high hourly wage work more than previously compared to employees with a low hourly wage. In particular, this applies to two groups whose share of the workforce has increased significantly in recent years: employed women and service sector employees. Had employees been able to work their desired number of hours, the rise in inequality would have been more moderate. A better work-life balance and more opportunities to increase working hours in the low-wage sector could counteract this trend.

From the Authors

“The fact that changes in working hours are not aligned with employees’ preferences is problematic from a social policy perspective. For example, mothers often work fewer hours than they would like. Clearly, there is still a lack of a sufficient work-life balance.”

Carsten Schröder

https://doi.org/10.18723/diw_dwr:2022-32-1
Nearly 1.1 million people in Germany use food banks, single and separated parents in particular at an above-average frequency

By Markus M. Grabka and Jürgen Schupp

Abstract

Food banks are returning to the spotlight as their use increases due to the coronavirus pandemic and the influx of Ukrainian refugees to Germany. The current discussion is focused on whether the food banks can handle the increasing number of users as well as the financial and organizational challenges that come with them. Until now, however, no robust, empirical data on food bank use has been available. Using Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) data, this Weekly Report presents new findings and analyses on the number of food bank users and their socio-demographic distribution. According to the SOEP data, about 1.1 million people used food banks in the first half of 2020. A large share of users are women, people with a migration background, divorced or separated people, and the unemployed; additionally, one fourth of those who benefit from food banks are children. Food bank users also tend to be in poor health. As expected, they also have a below average net household income and accordingly, over two thirds of them are at risk of poverty. The structural causes of poverty must be addressed to ensure that food banks do not reach their limit...

From the Authors

“Food banks can provide a short-term solution during personal or social crises. However, to combat poverty effectively, welfare reforms must be initiated quickly.”

Markus M. Grabka
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Charitable giving and income: Households with high income donate less than poorer households relative to their disposable income

By Karsten Schulz-Sandhof and Jürgen Schupp

**Abstract**

For the first time in 2020, the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), an annual survey of private households, surveyed the donation behavior of a random sample of high net worth individuals that had been added in 2019. As a result of this sample, the volume of private donations increased from 9.7 to 10.3 billion euros in 2019, despite the fact that fewer individuals donated and the donation rate was lower (46.8 percent vs. 43.3 percent) than in 2017. The donation volume for 2021 will increase to 12.9 billion euros, its development extrapolated using the DZI Donation Index (DZI Spenden-Index). Socio-economic analyses of SOEP data show that income has a clear influence on donation behavior. Although the richest ten percent of households contribute 37 percent of total donations, they donate less than the poorer income groups relative to their disposable income. Despite this, the tax benefit from charitable giving is greater for richer households than for poorer because it is based on the marginal tax rate. Equal tax treatment for donors regardless of income could increase the willingness to donate.

**From the Authors**

“Although poorer households in Germany donate a larger share of their disposable income than rich households, they are disadvantaged in tax terms. A uniform deduction could counteract this unequal tax treatment.”

Jürgen Schupp
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### Survey Instruments (Erhebungsinstrumente)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 1988: Personenfragebogen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 1988: Vermögensbilanz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 1989: Haushaltsfragebogen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 1989: Personenfragebogen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 1989: Biografiefragebogen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Corona (mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Corona Tranche 2 (mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Corona Tranche 4 (mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Corona Tranche 5 (mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Corona Tranche 7 (mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Corona Tranche 9 (mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1118</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Corona (M3–M6, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Mutter und Kind (Neugeborene, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Mutter und Kind (2–3 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Mutter und Kind (5–6 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Eltern und Kind (7–8 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Mutter und Kind (9–10 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Haushalt (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Haushalt (M7/M8, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Haushalt (M3–M6, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Jugend (16–17 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1128</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Jugend (11–17 Jahre, M3–M5, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seite</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Kindheit (0–10 Jahre, M–M5, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Nachbefragung Person (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Biografie (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Biografie (M7–M8a, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Person und Biografie (M3–M6, Erstbefragte, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Person (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Person (M7/M8a, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Pre-Teen (11–12 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Frühe Jugend (13–14 Jahre, CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Verstorbene Person (CAPI, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2020: Person (M3–M5, Wiederbefragte, mit Verweis auf Variablen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2019 – Fragebogen für die SOEP-Innovations-Stichprobe (Update Release 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2019 – Questionnaire for the SOEP Innovation Sample (Update Release 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Fragebogen für die SOEP-Innovations-Stichprobe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1144</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Questionnaire for the SOEP Innovation Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Fragebogen für die SOEP-Innovations-Stichprobe (Stichprobe FGZ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Questionnaire for the SOEP Innovation Sample (FGZ Sample)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Fragebogen für die SOEP-Innovations-Stichprobe (Eltern, Stichprobe BIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>SOEP-IS 2020 – Fragebogen für die SOEP-Innovations-Stichprobe (Schüler*innen, Stichprobe BIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1193</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Nachbefragung Person, Altstichproben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Haushaltsfragebogen, Stichproben A–L3, M1–M2 + N–Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1195</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Personenfragebogen, Stichproben A–L3, M1–M2 + N–Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Biografie, Stichproben A–L3, M1–M2 + N–Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1197</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Die verstorbene Person, Altstichproben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1198</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Mutter und Kind (Neugeborene), Altstichproben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Mutter und Kind (2–3 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Mutter und Kind (5–6 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td>SOEP-Core – 2021: Eltern und Kind (7–8 Jahre), Altstichproben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1202
SOEP-Core – 2021: Mutter und Kind (9–10 Jahre), Alttichproben

1203
SOEP-Core – 2021: Pre-Teen (11-12 Jahre), Alttichproben

1204
SOEP-Core – 2021: Frühe Jugend (13–14 Jahre), Alttichproben

1205
SOEP-Core – 2021: Jugend (16–17 Jahre), Stichproben A-L3, M1-M2 + N-Q

1206

1207

1208
SOEP-Core – 2021: Biography (A-L3, M1-M2 + N-Q)

1209
SOEP-Core – 2021: Catch-up Individual

1210
SOEP-Core – 2021: Deceased Individual

1211
SOEP-Core – 2021: Mother and Child (Newborns)

1212
SOEP-Core – 2021: Mother and Child (2–3-year-olds)

1213
SOEP-Core – 2021: Mother and Child (5–6-year-olds)

1214
SOEP-Core – 2021: Parents and Child (7-8-year-olds)

1215
SOEP-Core – 2021: Mother and Child (9–10-year-olds)

1216
SOEP-Core – 2021: Pre-teen (11-12-year-olds)

Series C
Data Documentations (Datendokumentationen)

1104
Sampling, Nonresponse, and Weighting of the 2020 Refreshment Sample (M6) of the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Refugee Panel

1105
SOEP-Core – 2020: Sampling, Nonresponse, and Weighting in the IAB-SOEP Migration Studies M7 and M8

1106
SOEP-Core v37 – Documentation of Sample Sizes and Panel Attrition in the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) (1984 until 2020)

1133
SOEP-CoV: Project and Data Documentation

1175
SOEP-Core – 2021: Sampling, Nonresponse, and Weighting in Wave 2 of Living in Germany – Nationwide Corona-Monitoring (RKI-SOEP2)

1188
SOEP-Core v35 – Sampling and Path Files: Documentation of Files and Variables

1190
Gewichtung der CoV-Studie der IAB-BAMF-SOEP-Befragung von Geflüchteten

1217
SOEP Scales Manual (updated for SOEP-Core v37)
Series D
Variable Descriptions and Coding

1081
SOEP-Core v36: Codebook for the EU-SILC-like panel for Germany based on the SOEP

1082
SOEP-Core v37 – Codebook for the $PEQUIV File 1984-2020: CNEF Variables with Extended Income Information for the SOEP

1083
SOEP-Core v36 – The Couple History Files BIOCOUPLM and BIOCOUPLY, and Marital History Files BIOMARSM and BIOMARSY

1149
SOEP-IS 2020 – BIO: Variables from the Life Course Question Module

1150
SOEP-IS 2020 – BIOAGE: Variables from the Modules of Questions on Children

1151
SOEP-IS 2020 – BIOBIRTH: Birth Biography of Female and Male Respondents

1152
SOEP-IS 2020 – BIOPAREN: Biography Information on the Parents

1153
SOEP-IS 2020 – COGNIT: Cognitive Achievement Potentials

1154
SOEP-IS 2020 – H: Variables from the Household Question Module

1155
SOEP-IS 2020 – HBRUTTO: Household-Related Gross File

1156
SOEP-IS 2020 – HGEN: Household-Related Status and Generated Variables

1157
SOEP-IS 2020 – HRF: Weights for Households

1158
SOEP-IS 2020 – IBIP_PARENT: Variables from Bonn Intervention Panel (Parents)

1159
SOEP-IS 2020 – IBIP_PUPIL: Variables from Bonn Intervention Panel (Children)

1160
SOEP-IS 2020 – IDRM: Person-Related Data from Innovative DRM Module

1161
SOEP-IS 2020 – IDRM_ESM: Person-Related DRM Data from Innovative ESM Module

1162
SOEP-IS 2020 – IESM: Person-Related ESM Data from Innovative ESM Module

1163
SOEP-IS 2020 – ILANGUAGE: Variables from Innovative Language Modules

1164
SOEP-IS 2020 – ILOTTERY: Variables from an Innovative Lottery Experiment in 2016

1165
SOEP-IS 2020 – INNO: Variables from the Innovation Modules

1166
SOEP-IS 2020 – INNO_H: Household-Variables from the Innovation Modules

1167
SOEP-IS 2020 – INTV: Variables about the Interviewers

1168
SOEP-IS 2020 – IRISK: Decision from Description vs. Decision from Experience

1169
SOEP-IS 2020 – KID: Pooled Dataset on Children

1170
SOEP-IS 2020 – P: Variables from the Individual Question Module

1171
SOEP-IS 2020 – PBRUTTO: Person-Related Gross File

1172
SOEP-IS 2020 – PGEN: Person-Related Status and Generated Variables

1173
SOEP-IS 2020 – PHRF: Weights for Persons
1174
SOEP-IS 2020 – PPFAD: Person-Related Meta-Dataset

1176
SOEP-Core v37 – BIOIMMIG: Generated Information on Immigration History

1177
SOEP-Core v37 – BIOPAREN

1178
SOEP-Core v37 – BIOSIB

1179
SOEP-Core v37 – COGDJ

1180
SOEP-Core v37 – HBRUTTO: Household-Related Gross File

1181
SOEP-Core v37 – HEALTH

1182
SOEP-Core v37 – HGEN: Household-Related Status and Generated Variables

1183
SOEP-Core v37 – HPATHL: Household-Related Meta-Dataset

1184
SOEP-Core v37 – INTERVIEWER

1185
SOEP-Core v37 – PBRUTTO: Person-Related Gross File

1186
SOEP-Core v37 – PGEN: Person-Related Status and Generated Variables

1187
SOEP-Core v37 – PPATHL: Person-Related Meta-Dataset

1189
SOEP-Core v35 – Asylum Seekers and Refugees: Documentation of AREFBACK and AREFINFO

1191
SOEP-Core v37 – BIOBIRTH
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April 25, 2022
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Entlastungspakete der Bundesregierung für hohe Energiepreise: Es profitieren die Falschen

Süddeutsche Zeitung
July 21, 2022
Hanno Charisius

Fast 90 Prozent der Menschen in Deutschland haben Antikörper gegen Sars-CoV-2
Eine höhere Vermögenssteuer wäre der falsche Ansatz
Wissenschaftler Dr. Markus M. Grabka vom Deutschen Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung über die Wechselwirkung von Einkommen, Vermögen und Demokratie in Deutschland.

Macht der Hauskauf wirklich glücklich?
Die eigene Immobilie ist der große Traum vieler Menschen. Doch eine Studie zeigt: Das Eigenheim macht nicht so glücklich wie erhofft.

Wie sich Einsamkeit auf unser Herz auswirkt
Besonders zur Weihnachtszeit fühlen sich viele Menschen einsam. Doch dieses Gefühl hat nicht nur Auswirkungen auf die seelische Verfassung, sondern wirkt sich auch auf das Herz aus.

Mein Haus, meine Firma, mein schlechtes Gewissen
DIE ZEIT
January 1, 2022

Tina Groll

Bausparer leben auf dem Land, Sammler in der Stadt

Frankfurter Rundschau
July 22, 2022

Pamela Dörhöfer

Corona-Pandemie in Deutschland: Großteil der Menschen hatte Kontakt mit Sars-CoV-2
Das RKI veröffentlicht die Ergebnisse einer Antikörperstudie. Die ergibt, dass rund 90 Prozent der Erwachsenen vor 2022 mit Corona in Kontakt gekommen sind.

Frankfurter Allgemeine
July 31, 2022

Moritz Schularick, Thilo Albers, Charlotte Bartels

Der Reichtum der Deutschen
Einem Prozent der deutschen Haushalte gehören heute rund 27 Prozent des gesamten Vermögens aller Deutschen. Wie aber war das früher? Über die Geschichte der Vermögensverteilung in Deutschland.
Ein Atlas der Einsamkeit: In welchen Regionen Deutschlands sich Menschen am meisten alleingelassen fühlen


Coronavirus-Studie: Neun von zehn Menschen in Deutschland haben Antikörper

Über 90 Prozent der Menschen in Deutschland hatten Ende 2021 Antikörper gegen das Coronavirus. Doch nur rund ein Drittel war gut vor einer schweren Erkrankung geschützt.
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