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1. Research Aims

The research project “Identity Development and Value Transmission among Veteran and Migrant Adolescents and their Families in Germany and Israel: Life Transitions and Contexts” aimed at exploring the impact of migration on the process of value formation and differentiation as well as on value transmission from parents to their children. Hereby it was aimed at disentangling the effects of migration and developmentally induced changes on value formation. The processes of value formation were examined regarding participants’ overall value schemes but also with regard to value priorities individuals’ show in specific social contexts (their family, their school, their nation). It was examined, to what degree individuals adapt their value priorities to the normative demands they are exposed to in particular life domains – termed value differentiation, and whether this context-specific value differentiation is especially evident among immigrants, who are forced to ‘juggle’ with both the cultural environment they are exposed to in their heritage community, and the cultural environment they are confronted with in the host society. A further aim was to explore whether context-specific value differentiation enhances or decreases individuals’ well-being.

1.1. Study design

The above described research aims were explored with a two-wave longitudinal survey design. The sample consisted of native Germans, native Israelis, Israeli Arabs, Turkish migrants to Germany, as well as Russian migrants to both Israel and Germany. In both first and second wave, the design aimed at sampling children and adolescents between 9 and 18 years but also at least one of their parents.

1.2. Method of Data Collection

Data were collected by use of a paper and pencil questionnaire.

1.3. Overview over Questionnaire Constructs

Table 1 documents the list of constructs that were incorporated in the questionnaires for adolescents and parents. For details on the constructs see the description of the questionnaires in a separate document.
Table 1.
*Constructs That Were Incorporated in the Questionnaires.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs That Were Incorporated in the Questionnaires</th>
<th>First-Wave Questionnaire</th>
<th>Second-Wave Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Adolescents</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Personal Values</td>
<td>General Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values in the Context: Family, Student, Nationality, Ethnic Group</td>
<td>Values in the Context: Family, Student, Nationality, Ethnic Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Cognitive Closure</td>
<td>Need for Cognitive Closure (extended)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with National Group and Ethnic Minority Group</td>
<td>Identification with National Group and Ethnic Minority Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup Attitudes</td>
<td>Intergroup Attitudes (extended)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup Contact</td>
<td>Intergroup Contact (shortended)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance</td>
<td>Ego Identity Questionnaire (only Germany)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Ability</td>
<td>Hierarchical Self-Interest (only Germany)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parents</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Personal Values</td>
<td>General Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values in the Context: Family, Work, Nationality, Ethnic Group</td>
<td>Values in the Context: Family, Work, Nationality, Ethnic Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Attitudes</td>
<td>Outgroup Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Style (Dyadic Adjustment)</td>
<td>Education Style (Dyadic Adjustment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Ego Identity Questionnaire (only Germany)</td>
<td>Hierarchical Self-Interest (only Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Sampling

2.1. Sampling Aim and Population

In Germany, it was aimed at collecting a longitudinal probability sample of Native Germans, Turkish, or Russian migrant adolescents and their parents in the Federal State of Bremen. Participants were supposed to be in mid respectively late adolescence. In Israel, the relevant sample groups were Israeli Jews, Israeli Arabs, as well as Russian immigrants in the same age range. In both countries, adolescents’ parents were also approached for participation in the study.

The time frame between the first and second wave of data collection was supposed to be 6 month. In both countries it was aimed to reach a final sample size of 150 families (child and at least one parent) in each ethnic and age group which had participated in both data collection waves.

In both countries all those children were considered to have a Russian or Turkish migrant background who themselves or at least one parent was born in either a country of the Former Soviet Union or in Turkey.

A fourth design element—in part confounded with age—was the one of a change of schools/school types in the course of the longitudinal study. At the first wave of data gathering adolescent participants should ideally be in a class that would see a change of schools/school types after the completion of that class, and at the second wave of measurement participants should ideally be in a new school environment. This conceptually derived design requirement could, however, not be fulfilled in the two countries in a way that allows to keep age constant across cultures. In many states of Germany the first major change of schools/school types occurs after Grade 4, and then a next one after Grade 10. In Israel, there is only one major change of schools/school types, which occurs after Grade 6. This situation forced us to take a decision whether we wanted to either give up the requirement of studying identical age groups in both countries, or the requirement of studying adolescents similarly affected by new horizons in their school biographies.

In addition, there was another complication, namely that the average student in a particular Israeli grade is three to six months younger than the average student of the same grade in Germany. In order to achieve maximum age-wise compatibility across
cultures and at the same time to retain the original plan of surveying adolescents across changes of school/school types, we came to the following decision: In Germany, we decided to survey 5\textsuperscript{th}- and 6\textsuperscript{th}-graders, expecting an average age of 11 ½ in that group, and 10\textsuperscript{th} grade, expecting an average age of 15 in that group. In Israel we planned to collect data of 6\textsuperscript{th}-graders in the younger group (expecting the same average age as in Germany, in that group), and data of pupils in grades 10 and 11 in the older group (once again expecting the same average age, in that group as well). This decision at the same time meant that only the younger Israeli group and the older German group expected a change of schools/school types between the first and second wave of measurement.

It was planned to collect data solely in schools. In Germany, it was originally attempted to have a probability sample of Bremen schools. The native German, Turkish, or Russian migrant pupils of these schools were supposed to form the data sample. However, because we expected a high rejection rate of the school administrations (urban German schools are quite overloaded with requests from scientific research projects), and participation rates of immigrant adolescents and their parents were also expected to lie below the participation rates of native Germans, two further decisions were taken in order to secure a core sample of 150 families per group encompassed in the longitudinal sample. Firstly, we decided to contact all public schools in Bremen that have students in the two age-groups included in the study, namely 11½-year-olds and 15-year-olds for possible participation in the study, instead of contacting a random sample of schools. Only by aiming for a complete study of all schools (and then, of course, finding that only a minority of them would actually agree to participate, see below), a sufficient number of non-German adolescents seemed to be approachable for participation in the study. Secondly, as one could anticipate early during sample acquisition in Bremen that even with this precaution it would be difficult to convince a sufficient number of immigrant parents to let their children participate in the study and at the same time participate themselves, we also approached schools of two regions of the state of Lower Saxony that surrounds Bremen, namely in the regions Hannover and Osnabrück.

In Israel, schools were randomly selected out of all schools in Israel (see below). The Jerusalem team decided to sample schools based on (1) age group, (2) sector – Jewish vs. Arab, and within the Jewish sector, the percentage of immigrants in the
community, based on data obtained from the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, (3) socioeconomic status, as reported to them by the Ministry of Education. The Jerusalem team, thus, came up with 18 clusters of schools, based on these characteristics, and sampled a school from each cluster randomly, from the list of schools in Israel.

Regarding the parent data collection it was planned that children should take home parent’s questionnaires. After the parents had filled them in, they were thought to return them to the school or send them to the researchers in a prepaid envelope. For the data collection of the second wave it was planned to send letters to children as well as their parents, containing the questionnaires as well as a prepaid envelope to send questionnaires back.

### 2.2. Sampling Realization

In Germany, as of October 2007, 63 schools with students in the selected grades were approached in the cities of Bremen and Bremerhaven for possible participation in the study. This was done through sending out a letter to the school principal, followed by a phone call. In most of the cases a face-to-face meeting with the school principal was arranged. Through this stepwise procedure, 22 out of 63 schools could be convinced to participate in the study (35%).

A similar process was started in January 2008 for the cities of Hannover, Osnabrück, Werle, and Cloppenburg (Lower Saxony). 22 schools were contacted of which 12 agreed to take part in the study (55%). The cities (respectively city districts) were selected based on demographic data from the statistical bureau of Lower Saxony that indicates a high number of Russian or Turkish immigrants there. Aside from the state of Bremen and Lower Saxony, three privately run Turkish schools in Köln, Paderborn and Mannheim were approached. They all agreed to participate.

In Israel, the 18 randomly chosen schools were approached using mail and phone. In each school contacted by phone, a research assistant conducted a meeting with a principal or a relevant teacher, to explain the study thoroughly. Of the 18 schools contacted 16 schools agreed to take part in the research. However, since there was still some shortage of Russian elementary pupils in the sample the Israeli team contacted
additional schools located in neighborhoods in which there is a substantial proportion of Russian immigrants.

2.3. Sampling Corrections

First Wave
Early during the data collection period it turned out to be clear that trying to collect parent data via schools is not effective enough to fulfill the sample size. In Germany, we therefore decided to additionally pursue a new strategy: Parents with children in the relevant age groups were approached directly. Parallel to the school survey and continuing beyond the deadline of July 2007, several different procedures were initiated.

Mail contact. The Bremen registration office kindly provided us with addresses of families with a Turkish passport or from a former Soviet Union country, with children in the target age groups, almost free of charge. In May 2008 we received 500 addresses from Russian families and 2500 addresses from Turkish families living in Bremen.

Mediator facilitation. Parallel to the school survey and the mail strategy, we contacted individual persons, institutions or private associations that have access to the Turkish and Russian community throughout Germany. Two Turkish student assistants established contacts to several Turkish sport/dance clubs as well as other Turkish associations in Bremen and Hamburg. One non-profit association, the Turkish Parent Union of Bremen, agreed to hand out 300 questionnaires to families that are part of this large Turkish network. They were able to receive questionnaires from around 40 families, however, not in every case with filled-in parent questionnaires. This association also agreed to establish a ‘joint-venture’ for the sending of the letters that were sent to the 2500 families described in the previous section. Writing a joint letter was assumed to lower the suspiciousness of the families increase their commitment towards the survey.

With regard to the Russian (and partly also the Turkish) sample, 55 institutions were approached as of early summer 2008. Contacts were established throughout Germany to individuals/institutions that actively work with Russian respectively Russian-German citizens in the corresponding communities. These institutions were Russian-German non-profit associations (basically run by Russian-German ‘private’ individuals),
Russian-Jewish communities, ministers of the Protestant (Lutheran) Church of Germany who work with Russian-Germans (‘Aussiedlerseelsorger’), German non-profit associations that work with migrants (Arbeiterwohlfahrt, Diakonie etc.) as well as Russian language teachers. Each individual/institution was initially contacted by sending a letter, followed by phone calls or face-to-face meetings. Of the 55 institutions approached around 30 agreed to actively seek for families with children in the corresponding age and ask them for participation in the study.

**Second Wave**
In Germany, families who had participated in wave 1 were sent the wave 2 questionnaires per mail. Besides the wave 2 questionnaires these letters contained a prepaid envelope to send questionnaires back to the Bremen research team. In Israel the Israeli Ministry of Education had not allowed to collect pupils addresses. Therefore, the research team visited the relevant schools again to collect wave 2 data. Since some children had undergone a school change the research team also visited these pupils new schools and assessed data there. As a consequence, in these schools some children and adolescents filled in the wave 2 questionnaire without having filled in the wave 1 questionnaire. To assess parents’ data the research team visited the relevant schools also on parents’ day to contact parents and ask them to fill in the questionnaire. As for the children, this procedure resulted in parents filling in the wave 2 questionnaire without necessarily having filled in the wave 1 questionnaire.

3. **Pretest**
In Israel piloting in schools proved to be a bit less problematic to organize. The Israeli pilot study was quantitative and took place in one school in the presence of the research associate. Thus, the setting was the same as in the later study. In this pilot study the instruments were tested regarding their usability. The Values in Context Questionnaire (VICQ) was administered twice in one high school, with administrations separated by three weeks. The mean level of differentiation remained stable (Time 1, M= 0.63, SD=0.27; Time 2, 0.66, SD=0.32.) The stability correlation across both administrations was r=0.49, p<.00.
In Bremen, pretesting had to be organized outside of schools, both because it had to commence already during the summer vacation, and secondly, because it is legally difficult to enter schools for piloting at a stage of a study where formal permission of the pertinent administration had not yet been obtained. Therefore, data were collected in youth clubs. In Bremen, the pilot study was qualitative. In the presence of a research associate adolescents filled in the questionnaire. Meanwhile they answered questions posed by the research associates exploring participants understanding of the questionnaire. Also adolescents were asked to verbalize any questionnaire-related thoughts they had while filling in the questionnaire. Regarding some items participants showed difficulties in understanding. These items were later simplified.

4. Questionnaire Translation

The original version of the questionnaire was developed in English language. In Israel, student questionnaires were translated into Hebrew, Russian and Arab, as were parent questionnaires. In Germany student questionnaires were developed only in German, while parent questionnaires were translated in German and Turkish, and the Russian version was taken from The Israeli team. Whenever a version of a scale in a particular language was not available from the literature or from its authors, a translation-backtranslation procedure was employed to obtain a valid version of the instrument in a new language.

5. Data Collection

Regarding the first wave, in Israel as well as in Germany adolescents’ data were collected in school in the presence of either a research associate or a student assistant.

Before data in schools could be collected, parental permission had to be obtained. Students were asked to take a form home, give it to their parents and, once the parents filled it in, return it to the class teacher. The longitudinal design of the study made it necessary to include the intention to take names and addresses from the students in the consent letter. In such a case, the university of the German research team (Jacobs University Bremen) requires the involvement of the University’s data protection officer,
represented by an external company. Unlike the often pursued procedure in many social survey studies, the data protection officer requested the use of an ‘active’ consent form, meaning that parents explicitly needed to sign that they allow their child to participate in the study. This latter fact in addition to the rather long ‘sequence’ of actions by the students (taking the letter home, bringing it back to school, handing it to the teacher, processing it to the headmaster) lead to a rather low response rate. Only among the parents of the younger German students a satisfying response rate could be achieved, followed (with a severe dropout) by parents of the older German cohort, the whole Turkish group and the Russian group. Again, of those who allowed their children to participate in the study, only a certain percentage agreed to participate themselves. In schools with a statistically very ‘promising’ percentage of migrants and at the same time an extremely low response rate the research associates visited each class a second time and tried to convince the students, yet, still the response rate remained quite low.

In Israel, consent forms were also given to the schools for the children to take home to the parents. This was done two weeks prior to the visit to the schools. The ministry of education approved of the use of "passive" consent forms, that is, the parents were asked to sign the forms just if they did not want their children to participate.

Once the permission was obtained, the actual data collection was organized and conducted.

In both countries, one to two school hours were scheduled for the survey. Questionnaires were filled in either in the classroom or in larger groups in the schools cafeteria or auditorium. The survey took place in the presence of one to four members of the research team (depending on the size of the student group), in some cases schools provided additional help from teachers or social workers. Two schools insisted on implementing the survey without the presence of a researcher.

Since in Germany - for ethical reasons - all students in a particular school were asked for participation (not just those with Russian or Turkish migration background), a large body of data was collected during that time.

In Germany, students whose parents agreed to take part in the study were given the parent questionnaires, together with the instruction to bring them back to the class teacher within one week. After all parent questionnaires were recollected in the schools,
they were picked up by a research team member. Alternatively, parents were offered the possibility to send the questionnaires directly back to the University. In Israel, administrative restrictions made it impossible to reach the parents via the schools. Therefore, telephone books that contain numbers of high school students were obtained. By calling the children we were able to receive their parents’ phone numbers to ask them to participate. Questionnaires were sent to them directly per mail.

Regarding the address list of Russian and Turkish families obtained from the registration office in Germany, letters were sent out to the families containing questionnaires for children and parents together with a bilingual letter that explained the study and asked for participation. The letters also contained a prepaid answer envelope for sending the filled in questionnaires back. Meanwhile, two bilingual Russian-German respectively Turkish-German student assistants were intensively trained by giving them information on the study and mutual role plays to enable them to call the families and convince them to participate. The registration office did not provide phone numbers, so only those families for which phone numbers were available via public phone books could be contacted by phone. After sending the letters followed by a reminder letter two weeks later, and after calling all available families twice, only 17 questionnaires of Russian families, and around 50 questionnaires from Turkish families were sent back.

Regarding the data collection by mediators (Germany), questionnaires and instructions were sent to them by mail, which they distributed to the potential participants. The mediators were contacted - roughly put - every 10 to 14 days to remind them and ask for advancements. Despite the large number of mediators that agreed to help (55%, note that they all did that on a voluntary basis along the way of their own job function), the backflow has been scarce.

In Israel, the second wave data collection eventually took place in school, and the procedure was the same as for wave 1. The Israel wave 2 parents filled in the second wave questionnaire at home by themselves. In Germany, both adolescents’ and parents’ questionnaires were sent to the families’ home where they filled them in by themselves. Reminder letters were sent to some of the participants (primarily those with migration background) two to three weeks after the questionnaires had been initially sent. Sending reminder letters to the full sample was not possible due to financial constraints.
6. **Error-, Consistency-, and Plausability Tests of the Raw Data**

All questionnaire data were typed into SPSS files by the research associates as well as student assistants. Questionnaires in Russian, Turkish, and Arab were typed in by bilingual student assistants. The data files of each single coder were continuously merged into an overall data set. Before merging, all raw data files were checked for data quality and possible errors were corrected (see below). Due to time constraints, the quality check as well as error corrections were conducted immediately with all newly incoming raw data files, while further questionnaires were still typed in by the research associates and student assistants. Hence, only the merged overall data file, which is already controlled for data quality, is available, but no overall raw data file.

In the single raw data files of the coders, typing errors were checked using the frequency function in SPSS. Data entries were seen as a typing error when the value was beyond the range of a particular scale (e.g. a value of seven in a scale that ranged from one to six). Emerging errors were corrected by checking back with the participant’s original questionnaire. This was done for the children as well as the parents questionnaires.

In some cases, participants filled in items they were not supposed to fill in according to previous filter items. For example, when participants had answered ‘don’t agree at all’ to the three context-specific identification items (e.g. ‘Being a German is an important part of who I am’), they were asked in the instruction to skip the corresponding 12 value items. In case the participants had filled in these value items anyways, the data were kept in the file.

Possible double entries of complete person entries were checked using the variable ‘codenumber’. In cases where double entries were found, one of the entries was deleted.

In addition, a number of plausibility and consistency tests were conducted. In the children’s questionnaires, contradictions in the demographics part of the questionnaire were checked and corrected by the research team. Specifically, contradictions regarding the item ‘Who do you live with’ and regarding the items ‘When did your father/mother immigrate?’ and ‘Did your father/mother immigrate before or after you were born?’ were
checked for and corrected. Regarding the item ‘Who do you live with’, children had – among others – the option to tick the box ‘both my parents’. Alternatively, they could also tick either the box ‘my mother’ or ‘my father’. Sometimes children had ticked all three boxes. In these cases the entry in the ‘my father’ and ‘my mother’ box were set to 1 (indicating ‘no’).

With regard to the two immigration items children had sometimes chosen the option ‘as a child’ to the question ‘When did your mother/father immigrate?’. However, in the next question they had ticked the answer ‘after I was born’ to the question ‘Did your father/mother immigrate before or after you were born?’. To find out if children had made a mistake in the first or the second answer, we checked childrens’ answers back with the parents’ questionnaires, if these were available (i.e. with parents’ answers to the item ‘At which age did you immigrate?’). Additionally, and in cases were parents had not filled in a questionnaire, we compared children’s answers regarding the two questions with their answer to the question ‘In which country were you born?’. If children had answered that they had been born outside Germany/Israel than it was most probable that they had made a mistake when ticking the answer ‘as a child’ to the question ‘When did your mother/father immigrate?’, and that the correct answer would have been ‘as an adult’. Consequently, this answer was changed accordingly. In cases were children had answered that they were born in Germany/Israel it seemed most probably that they had made a mistake when ticking the box ‘after I was born’ to the question ‘When did your mother/father immigrate?’, and that the correct answer would have been that parents migrated before the child had been born. In this case the answer to the question ‘Did your father/mother immigrate before or after you were born?’ was also changed accordingly.

In both the children and the parent questionnaires of both waves, a consistency check was conducted regarding the question asking for (a) the languages spoken by the person, and (b) the languages most often spoken at home (only children questionnaire). Language was coded in two numeric variables (one for first and one for a possible second language). The languages Hebrew, Russian, Arab, German, and Turkish were given the codes one to five, and in case the participant had named a language other than the ones above, the code six was given. In those cases the particular other language was coded in a third (string-) variable in which the name of the particular language was entered. The
consistency check tested whether in all cases where the numeric language variables had the value six there was an entry in the string variable specifying the particular language.

7. Anonymization
The anonymity of participants was guaranteed by giving each participant a codenumber. This codenumber was also assigned to the same person in the second wave. Also fathers, mothers, and children of the same family received the same codenumber. Only the original (paper) questionnaires contained participants’ full names together with the codenumber. The data file itself contains only participants’ codenumber and not participants’ name or addresses, neither participants’ birthdays. Thus, the data file completely ensures participants anonymity. With regard to the questionnaires, only the first (in some questionnaire versions the last) sheet of the questionnaire asked participants name and address (to send the second wave questionnaire). This first (respectively last) sheet was cut off from the rest of the questionnaire directly after the data collection and was kept separately from the questionnaires with a data protection officer – a person not involved in the project in any way. For the second wave the project team gave the second wave questionnaires with the codenumbers on them to the data protection officer who than wrote the corresponding address on the envelope and sent it out to participants.
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1. Introduction

The questionnaires used for this survey were constructed jointly by the Israeli and the German research team. The master versions of the questionnaires were constructed in English language. There is one version for children, one for fathers, and one for mothers, for wave 1 and wave 2, respectively.

The English master versions were translated into the necessary languages (Russian, Turkish, Hebrew, German, Arab). In order to ensure high comparability of the questionnaires, a strict translation-back-translation procedure was implemented in both countries. The various language versions used in Germany and Israel sometimes differed in certain aspects. For details on these differences see the documentation of deviations and problems in a separate document.

2. Children Questionnaire First Wave

2.1. Portrait Value Questionnaire

The Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ) was used to measure general value priorities. The measure is based on the value theory by the Israeli psychologist Shalom Schwartz (1992). According to the theory, values can be seen as abstract concepts or beliefs concerning a person’s goals that serve as guiding standards in his or her live. In other words, values describe what is fundamentally important to the person. Values form a main part of the individual’s identity. Schwartz proposed and empirically confirmed 10 universal values which can be measured among individuals around the world. The ten values and the corresponding meanings are listed below:

- **Power**: Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources (authority, social power, wealth, preserving my public image)
- **Achievement**: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards (ambitious, successful, capable, influential)
- **Hedonism**: Pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself (pleasure, enjoying life, self-indulgent)
- **Stimulation**: Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life (daring, a varied life, an exciting life)
- **Self-direction**: Independent thought and action—choosing, creating, exploring (creativity, freedom, independent, choosing own goals, curious)
- **Universalism**: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature (equality, social justice, wisdom, broadminded, protecting the environment, unity with nature, a world of beauty)
- **Benevolence**: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact (helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible)
- **Tradition**: Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide (devout, respect for tradition, humble, moderate)
- **Conformity**: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms (self-discipline, politeness, honoring parents and elders, obedience)
- **Security**: Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self (family security, national)

These 10 values are ordered along two broad dimensions, one ranging from openness to change at one end of the continuum to conservatism at the other end. The other dimension ranges from self-transcendence at one pole to self-enhancement at the other.

Figure 1. Theoretical Model of 10 universal human values (Figure taken from Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004)
Schwartz’s first measure to assess his 10 value types was the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992). However, this measure was cognitively very demanding, which led to the development of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz et al., 2001; Schwartz & Rubel, 2005). The PVQ has meanwhile been tested with over 50 samples and has been shown to be suitable for use with children and adolescents (Bubeck & Bilsky, 2004; Knafo & Schwartz, 2003; Boehnke & Welzel, 2006). The questionnaire comprises descriptions of a particular person’s goals, aspirations, or wishes (e.g. “She/He thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally.”). For each item, participants are asked to indicate how similar the portrayed person is to them. The response scale ranged from one (‘very much like me’) to six (‘not like me at all’).

The PVQ was included to assess participants overall or context-independent value preferences. Some of the item wordings were slightly changed in order to ensure that the children would understand them. Furthermore, the original PVQ scale comprises more items. In the current study, a shorted 25-item version was used, to avoid cognitive overload among the young participants. We used the 21-item version which has been implemented in the European Social Survey (see Bilsky, Janik, & Schwartz, 2011) and added four more items, resulting in a 25-item scale.

2.2. Values in Context Questionnaire

The most central instrument of the survey was the Values in Context Questionnaire (VICQ). It was developed by the Israeli research associate Ella Daniels specifically for this project to assess value differentiation. The VICQ is based on the idea that peoples value priorities differ depending on the context they find themselves in. For example, adolescents might value achievement in the school context, however, in the family context benevolence might be highly valued and achievement might be less important.

The VICQ was developed based on Schwartz’s original instrument, the Schwartz Value Survey (see Schwartz, 1992). It focuses on questions regarding the broad values of benevolence, achievement, conformity, and self-direction. These four were chosen because they are important in particular life contexts (e.g., achievement is important in
the school context, and conformity and self-direction, respectively, are important aspects for adolescents in the family context).

Each of the four values was measured by three items. Participants were presented these 12 items repeatedly, each time referring to a particular life context: *Family, school, national group, ethnic minority group*. Table 1 exemplarily documents the items for the value achievement.

Table 1.
*Value ‘Achievement’ in different life contexts.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>family member</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be capable (good at many things).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>family member</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be ambitious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>family member</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be successful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>student</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be capable (good at many things).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>student</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be ambitious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>student</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be successful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Group Context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>German/Israeli</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be capable (good at many things).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>German/Israeli</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be ambitious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>German/Israeli</em></td>
<td>it is important for me to be successful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Minority Context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>Turk/Russian</em></td>
<td>[or someone from the former Soviet Union] it is important for me to be capable (good at many things).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>Turk/Russian</em></td>
<td>[or someone from the former Soviet Union] it is important for me to be ambitious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a <em>Turk/Russian</em></td>
<td>[or someone from the former Soviet Union] it is important for me to be successful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All items ranged on a 6-point scale from ‘very important to me’ to ‘not important to me at all’. The scores for same values in different context were used to estimate the
The individual’s value differentiation: The degree to which the individual adapts his or her values to the particular context. Low value complexity is indicated by strong relationships between different assessments of the same value across context, whereas high value complexity is characterized by contextualization of the values.

2.3. Ingroup Identification

Before children and adolescents filled in the VICQ section that assessed their value preferences in the different life domains, their identification with the particular domain was assessed with three items:

1. “Being _____ is an important part of who I am.”
2. “It is important to me to see myself as ______.”
3. “It is important to me that others view me as ____.”

The three items were presented to the participants before the corresponding 12 value items, each time referring to the particular life domain (being a family member, a student, a member of the national group (German/Israeli) or a member of an ethnic minority group (Turkish/Russian [or someone from the former Soviet Union]/Arab). Identification with the particular life context was measured because it was assumed to relate to the degree of value adaptation. The items had a 6-point response format, ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. They were taken from a 16-item scale by Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, Halevy, and Eidelson (2008) measuring group identification.

2.4. Cognitive Complexity Task

Cognitive complexity was measured with the ‘Latin Square Task’ developed by Birney, Halford, & Andrews (2006). This measure is similar to a Sudoku task, with the difference that numbers are replaced by geometrical figure. Originally the Latin Square Task was developed to measure the influence of relational complexity on reasoning. It was included in the questionnaire because it was assumed that value differentiation is related to cognitive reasoning abilities.
2.5. Well-Being

Well-Being was measured by two different constructs: Self-esteem and life satisfaction. To assess self-esteem we used the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). However we used only the five positively worded items of the original scale. Items ranged from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ on a 7-point scale.

Life satisfaction was assessed with a 5-item scale developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin (1985). Again, items ranged from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ on a 7-point scale.

Both scales were included to explore whether or not value complexity is related to well-being.

2.6. Need for Cognitive Closure

The Need for Cognitive Closure construct was introduced by Kruglanski et al. (Kruglanski, 1989; Kruglanski and Webster, 1996, Webster & Kruglanski, 1994). According to the authors, need for cognitive closure (NFCC) is a motivationally driven way of perception and information processing, defined as “a desire for giving an answer to a given topic, any answer, as compared to confusion and ambiguity” (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994, p. 1049, italics in original). Persons high in NFCC are described as striving to find immediate and permanent answers on any given issue, they constantly seek order and predictability in life, they feel uncomfortable with ambiguous situations and prefer quick, single solutions on any problem they encounter. It was decided to include NFCC in the survey, because it was assumed that the relationship between value differentiation and well-being would be moderated by this construct. It was assumed that among individuals with a high NFCC, higher value differentiation would impact well-being more negatively than among individuals with a low NFCC.

The majority of previous empirical studies on NFCC has used the Need for Cognitive Closure Scale presented by Webster and Kruglanski (1994). The scale consists of 42 items representing five sub-dimensions, namely preference for order, preference for predictability, decisiveness, discomfort with ambiguity, and closed-mindedness. In this study only three of the five facets of NFCC were assessed, namely discomfort with ambiguity, decisiveness, and closed mindedness. These subscales were chosen since it
was assumed that they will show the most promising findings regarding the proposed research questions. However, in order to avoid cognitive overload among the younger participants not all of the items of these subscales were used but only three per scale (originally the scales contain eight to nine items per sub-scale). The choice of the items was made using factor loadings of each item as a criterion for item property.

2.7. Ingroup and Outgroup Attitudes

It was attempted to measure in-group and out-group attitudes among both individuals without and with migration background. However, usual scales of out-group attitudes have been administered to the view of the host society members towards ‘the strangers’ or ‘the foreigners’. Items like “Foreigners take away our jobs.” are widely used to assess out-group hostility, but they cannot be used with migrant individuals, since they are the ‘strangers’ themselves. Therefore, a set of three items was gathered that was assumed to measure in-group and out-group attitudes among all these groups in a comparable way. Participants were be presented these three items and were asked to estimate their agreement with regard to four different reference groups (Germany: Germans, Turks, Russians and Blacks; Israel: Israeli Jews, Arabs, Russian Jews and Ethiopians). Subjects were asked to rate their agreement on a 6-point scale from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’.

The three items were adapted from previously developed scales. Table 2 presents the original items from the scales as well as the here used adaptations. The items were partly reworded to accomplish a better comprehensibility by the younger age group. Each of the three items accentuates a certain aspect of attitudes. The first item is more cognitive whereas the second has a more affective, the third one a more behavioral connotation. Furthermore, their psychometric properties have been proven in previous studies.
Table 2.

*Original and Adapted Items on Ingroup and Outgroup Attitudes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Item (author)</th>
<th>Adapted Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Allowing more immigrants into this country will enrich our culture.&quot; (Lederer, 1983)</td>
<td>“These people can enrich this country with their culture (e.g. their way of living).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;When I shake hands with a Jew, I experience personal revulsion.&quot; (Lederer, 1995)</td>
<td>“When I shake hands with these people, I feel uncomfortable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is not good to have too many foreigners in the country, because they are unpleasant and disagreeable.” (German original from Liebhart &amp; Liebhart, 1971).</td>
<td>“It is better not to have too much to do with these people because they are unpleasant to interact with.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8. Social Distance

The Social Distance Scale used in this study refers to the work of Bogardus (1925) and a more recent publication of Steinbach (2004). Again, regarding the four reference groups in each country, participants were presented a selection of items which they were asked to agree or disagree with. They were asked whether they would accept a member of this group (a) as a *family member*, (b) as a *close friend* and (c) as a *classmate*. The items have a dichotomous answer format, participants choose between yes and no. As Steinbach (2004) has proven, the items represent different degrees of social distance, with the family item representing the smallest distance and a higher distance represented by friend and classmate. The here used item ‘accept as a classmate’ is a modification of the original item ‘accept as a colleague at work’ (Steinbach, 2004) to adapt it to the context of the age group.

2.9. Demographics

Here participants age, gender, living situation, family size, migration background, socio-economic status, religiosity, as well as their number of intra- and interethnic friends was assessed.
2.10. **Wish to Have Children Scale**

The questionnaire contained an item asking participants whether or not they would like to have children themselves (as adults). Children could choose between the answers yes / no / don’t know. In a second question participants were asked how many children they would like to have. Children could choose between the categories 1, 2, 3, 4, or more than 4.

3. **Children Questionnaire Second Wave**

The VICQ and PVQ were also used in the second wave and in exactly the same format. Also, **Well-Being** was measured in exactly the same way as in wave one.

With regard to the other scales the following changes were made:

1. The **cognitive complexity task** was taken out of the questionnaire.
2. We added three items to the short **Need For Closure Scale** (taken from the original scale by Webster and Kruglanski, 1994), in order to improve reliability of the measure. The additional three items are part of the original sub-scale **preference for order**.
3. An additional scale measuring various aspects of an individual’s **Value-Related Behavior** was included (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). This was done to collect additional insights on the interplay of values (both general and context specific), well-being and behavior. The scale assessed the frequency with which participants showed certain value related behaviors with 16 items ranging on a 5-point scale from ‘always’ to ‘never’.
4. A Scale measuring **Identity Status** was included, to test whether value differentiation is related to identity development. The scale contained 12 items ranging on a 6-point scale from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. The scale was based on the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire by Balistreri, Busch-Roßnagel, and Geisinger (1995). The original questionnaire contains 32 items measuring identity status as conceptualized by Marcia (1966) in the domains of occupation, religion, politics, values, family, friendships, dating, and sex roles. For the second wave questionnaire
of this study we used some of the items by Balistreri et al. (1995) in the original wording, for other items the wordings were slightly changed so that they pertained only to the domains of values and the self.

5. A scale measuring **Hierarchical Self-Interest (HSI)** was added. HSI represents an attitude of striving after materialistic achievements and wanting to be better than everyone else, even if this means harm to others (Hadjar, 2004; Boehnke, Hadjar, & Baier, 2007). It is a construct that is assumed to be especially evident in modern industrial societies, whose market orientation enforces competitive relationships among its individuals. The construct is composed of four underlying dimensions: *Machiavellism, competitiveness, achievement orientation, and individualism*. Machiavellism describes a personality disposition which comprises low commitment to the conventional moral conceptions and ethics, a high adaption to reality, relatively little commitment to certain ideologies, and relatively little affective involvement regarding social relations (Hadjar, 2004). Competitiveness describes the need to be better than others. It refers to the hierarchic composition of society, as well as to perceived differences in achievement, status, and wealth (Hadjar, 2004). Achievement orientation describes as a strong fixation on rationality with regard to work and learning, with the only aim of producing (mainly material) goods (Hadjar, 2004). Individualism describes the tendency to value one’s own personal interests and goals over those of the group the individual is a member of.

The HSI construct was measured with an 8-item short scale, containing two items for each dimension. The items had a 6-point answering format ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’.

6. The first-wave data showed that a large number of the students were not able to name their parents’ occupations in a way that could be used for statistical analyses of socio-economic status (SES). To still be able to assess SES we added the **Family Affluence Scale** developed by Currie, Molcho, Boyce, Holstein, Torsheim, and Richter (2008), a short scale developed especially for children and adolescents to assess their families’ SES.
4. Parent Questionnaire First Wave

4.1. PVQ

As for the children, the parent questionnaire comprised the Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ). Whereas for the children some of the item wordings had been changed slightly to increase understandability, the original version (Schwartz, et al., 2001; Schwartz & Rubel, 2005) was used for the parents. However, as for the children, we used only a shorted version (25 items).

4.2. VICQ

Also the VICQ was implemented in the first wave parent questionnaire. The instrument was exactly the same as for the children with the only difference being that the context school was replaced by the context workplace.

4.3. Life Satisfaction

As a measure for well-being the parent questionnaire contained the life satisfaction scale also used in the children questionnaire: The 5-item scale developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin (1985). Items ranged from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ on a 7-point scale.

4.4. Outgroup Derogation

Derogatory attitudes towards other ethnic or national groups were measured with a 6-item scale. All items had a 6-point answering format ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’:
1) “When I shake hands with these people, I feel uncomfortable.”
2) “It is better not to have too much to do with these people because they are unpleasant to interact with.”
3) “In all areas of life, people of their origin or nationality should have the same rights like anyone else.”
4) „People of other origin or nationality should choose to marry people of their own origin or nationality. “
5) „I think it would be better if people of different origin or nationality did not try to mix together.“
6) „I can understand people having a negative attitude to people of other origin or nationality.“

The items come from different scales that had been used in previous research. The first two items were taken from the children questionnaire wave 1 (see the description and references above). The third and the fourth item stem from the German Centre for Survey, Methods, and Analyses (Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen - ZUMA), and were used in a German survey – the ALLBUS (Zentralarchiv für empirische Sozialforschung (ZA), & Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen (ZUMA) e.V., 1982-1996). The fifth item was developed by the research group based on different scales on outgroup attitudes and ethnocentrism, which were also available via the ZUMA archive. The sixth item was taken from a scale by Duckitt, Callaghan, Wagner (2005) measuring intergroup attitudes.

4.5. Dyadic Adjustment

A scale measuring education style (dyadic adjustment) was included in the parent questionnaire to explore whether or not dyadic adjustment influences value transmission from parents to their children. Several items of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale by Spanier (1976) were used. In the original version the scale consists of four sub-scales measuring dyadic consensus, satisfaction, cohesion, as well as affectional expression. We used four items of the dyadic consensus subscale (the original subscale consists of 13 items) as well as 3 items from the cohesion subscale (the original subscale consists of 4 items). Due to a coding error the cohesion sub-scale had a 7-point answering format ranging from ‘always agree’ to ‘always disagree’ in the German and Turkish version of the questionnaire. In the other languages this scale had a 6-point answering format (for details see the documentation of deviations between the language versions in a separate document). The consensus scale had a six-point answering format in all language versions. Originally, all subscales have a six-point answering format.
4.6. Demographics

In the demographics section parents were asked about their age, their marital status, their number and age of children, their migration background, their religiosity, their educational background, and their profession. Also, their socio-economic status was assessed (income).

5. Parent Questionnaire Second Wave

The second wave parent questionnaire was basically the same as the first wave questionnaire. The only difference was that two additional scales were added. These additional scales were the 12-item identity status scale that was also used in the second wave children questionnaire, as well as the 8-item scale measuring Hierarchical Self-Interest that was also used in the second wave children questionnaire.
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1. Introduction

In both countries, Germany and Israel, a total number of 22 different questionnaire versions were created. Firstly, in each wave one English master questionnaire was used for children as well as for fathers and mothers (both differed only in gender-related words like “he/she”). Secondly, these English master questionnaires for children and parents were translated into German, Russian, Turkish (only parent questionnaire), Hebrew, and Arab. Finally, the first-wave and second-wave questionnaires for children and parents partly differed in content. The present documentation describes all differences between the versions that are necessary to know when using the data. The deviations are explained and exemplary illustrations are given. In case the deviations require certain working steps before being able to conduct the actual data analyses, these requirements are explained (the corresponding paragraphs are framed and shaded in grey).

2. First-Wave Questionnaires

2.1. Masterfiles and Translation Procedure – Children and Parent Questionnaire

The original versions of the first-wave questionnaires were constructed jointly by the Israeli and the German team. These master versions were constructed in English language. There is one version for children, one for fathers, and one for mothers (father and mother questionnaires differed only in gender-related words like “he/she”).

The English master versions were then translated into the necessary languages. In order to ensure high comparability of the questionnaires, a strict translation-back-translation procedure was implemented in both countries. Student assistants who were fluent in English and spoke one of the necessary languages as their mother tongue translated the English master questionnaires into the respective languages. These translated versions were then back-translated into English by a second translator. Both
the original and the back-translated version of the questionnaires were then jointly compared by the project supervisors and the two translators. Deviations from the English master version were discussed and corrected.

In Israel, the children as well as the parent questionnaires were translated into Hebrew, Arab, and Russian. In Germany, the children questionnaire was translated only into German, because it was expected that all students with a Turkish respectively Former Soviet Union (FSU) migration background would be sufficiently fluent in German. The parent questionnaires were translated into Turkish. For the Russian speaking parents in Germany the Russian version of the parent questionnaires from the Israeli team was used.

Particular items and scales were only used either in Germany or in Israel. Furthermore, particular demographic information was assessed in different ways in the various language versions, e.g. education level or migration background. The English master questionnaire comprises all scales and items, and all ways of assessing demographic information, regardless whether they have been used in all or only in one particular language version respectively one of the two countries. The translated questionnaires comprise only the items, scales and demographic measures that were necessary for respectively tailored to this specific language version.

---

1 The majority of Turkish children and adolescents are second- and third-generation immigrants, hence, they learn German as a second mother tongue. Among children and adolescents with a FSU background the percentage of first-generation immigrants was higher, but since most of them have been living in Germany for at least a number of years and have visited a German school since their arrival, an acceptable command of German was expected.
2.2. Deviations of the Different Language Versions

2.2.1. Children

a) Values in Context Questionnaire

In all versions, participants were asked to estimate their degree of identification with and their values as a member of their ethnic heritage group (Russian, Turkish, Arab, see Section 2.2 of the questionnaire description). In addition, prior to the items asking for Turkish respectively Russian identification and values the participants were asked to state whether they, respectively their parents, were born in the country of heritage (Former Soviet Union, Turkey). Here the questionnaires in Germany and Israel differed slightly: The wording of the question asking for the parents’ country of birth was “Did any of your parents immigrate to Germany/Israel from the former Soviet Union?” in Germany, but „Did any of your parents immigrate to Germany/Israel from the former Soviet Union ten years or less before you were born?“ in Israel (see the English master version for children, page 6 and 7). This different criterion was applied due to the fact that the immigration history of the Israeli society is rather different compared to Germany. Since the establishment of the comparably young country is to large parts based on the return of Jewish communities from all over the world, and the Former Soviet Union in particular, the percentage of individuals who were born in foreign countries is much higher (see Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, 2008).

Illustration 1. Immigration Status of Parents From the FSU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germany:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you immigrated to Israel from the former Soviet Union (Russia, the Ukraine, the Caucasian states etc.)? 1. Yes □ 2. No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any of your parents immigrate to Israel from the former Soviet Union? 1. Yes □ 2. No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered &quot;yes&quot; to any of the questions above, please answer the questions on this page as well. Otherwise, please skip this page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Israel:
Have you immigrated to Israel from the former Soviet Union (Russia, the Ukraine, the Caucasian states etc.)?  1.Yes ☐  2. No ☐
Did any of your parents immigrate to Israel from the former Soviet Union ten years or less before you were born?  1.Yes ☐  2. No ☐
If you answered "yes" to any of the questions above, please answer the questions on this page as well. Otherwise, please skip this page.

Furthermore, the following additional text was included in the instructions of the section that asked for identification with being Turkish: “In this questionnaire we use the term “Turk” for all persons who migrated from Turkey to Germany. If you or your parents are from Turkey but you do not consider yourself a Turk, we ask you to nevertheless answer the following table.” This text was included to avoid confusion among the participants with regard to their ethnic group membership.

b) Latin Square Task
The English master version for children comprises the Latin Square Tasks which consists of four by four squares containing figures and a question mark (for a description of the task see Section 2.4 of the questionnaire description as well as the master questionnaire for children, page 10/11). These tasks are presented in two blocks. The first block contains tasks 1 to 6, the second block tasks 7 to 11. In the Hebrew, Russian, and Arab versions, the order of the tasks is different due to the different writing styles from left to right (English, Russian) respectively right to left (Hebrew, Arab). In this regard, some inconsistencies need to be explained:

- In the Hebrew and Arab versions, the tasks were chronologically ordered from right to left: The first task appeared in the upper right corner of the page, the second task in the upper left corner, and so on. That way the correct chronological order of the tasks (ordered by increasing task difficulty) was kept when working on the task from right to left. However, regarding the tasks 7 and 8, only the numbering was
changed, but the actual square task accidentally remained in the same position like in the English master versions (task 7 on the left side, task 8 on the right side).

- In the Russian questionnaire, the order of the square tasks 7 and 8 also deviated: The numbering was correct, but the actual square tasks were ordered from right to left. Furthermore, in each square task of the Russian questionnaire, the figures were mirrored. For example, a figure that in the English version would appear in the upper left corner of a particular square task would appear in the upper right corner of the Russian version (see the illustration below).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Version</th>
<th>Russian Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="" alt="Illustration" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the participants were thought to solve the items with increasing task difficulty, the deviation of task 7 and 8 from the correct order might have impacted the resulting scores (item 8 was solved before item 7 although it was more difficult). Also the mirrored presentation of the tasks comprises the possibility of an effect on the performance of the participants. However, the Russian version of the questionnaire was only given to a comparably small number of participants (n = 27).

c) **Need for Closure Scale**

The Need for Closure Scale was presented in the questionnaires below the scales assessing self-esteem and life satisfaction (see section 2.6 of the questionnaire description; see also the master questionnaire for children, page 14). In the English master version as
well as the Hebrew, Russian, and Arab version of the questionnaire, the Need for Closure items were presented in a separate table. In the German version of the questionnaire, these items were presented in one table together with the previous items assessing self-esteem and life satisfaction.

Furthermore, in the German version the Need for Closure items was presented with a scale range from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”), whereas in all other language versions, these items had only a scale range from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 6 (“strongly agree”).

Finally, the Need for Closure items were taken from three sub-scales of the Need for Cognitive Closure Scale presented by Webster and Kruglanski (1994, see the document Description of the the Questionnaire). Items nfc1, nfc2, and nfc8 were taken from the sub-scale discomfort with ambiguity, items nfc3, nfc4, and nfc5 were taken from the sub-scale decisiveness, and items nfc6, nfc7, and nfc9 were taken from the sub-scale closed-mindedness. However, confirmatory factor analyses of the data showed that the items cannot be used to measure the three sub-scales. It is recommended to only use them as single items.

---

Due to the different scale range, the items need to be standardized when comparing the German and Israeli data. Furthermore, it is recommended not to use the items to measure the three sub-scales of the original Need for Closure Scale by Webster and Kruglanski (1994) but rather use them as single items.

---

d) Social Distance Scale

The Social Distance Scale asked participants, whether they would accept a member of a particular ethnic group as a family member, a friend or a class mate (see section 2.8 of the questionnaire description). The corresponding table, as it was presented in the questionnaire, is seen below. Participants were asked to tick the corresponding box of the table, if they would accept this ethnic group member (e.g., if they would accept a German as a family member). It was also possible to tick more than one box (e.g. accept a German as a family member and as a friend).
However, only after the completion of the questionnaire construction it was realized that in case the box was not ticked it is not clear whether this meant that the participant would not accept, for example, a German as family member (which would have had to be coded as “no acceptance” in the data file), or whether the person actually omitted the complete item (which would have had to be coded as “missing” in the data file).

To account for this problem, the design was subsequently changed. However, since in Israel the printing of the questionnaire had already started, it was only possible to make this subsequent change in the German version of the questionnaire. In the new table design in the German version, the children were now able to choose between „yes“ and „no“, instead of having only one option per cell that would indicate acceptance of the particular ethnic group member. The German translation of the questionnaire contained the new design of the Social Distance Scale, all other versions including the English master version contained the original design.
Illustration 4. Social Distance Scale - Revised Version Used in Germany.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Germans</th>
<th>Former Soviet Union Immigrants</th>
<th>Turks</th>
<th>People with black skin color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would accept as members of my family (e.g. through marriage).</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would have as close friends.</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would accept as class mate.</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The user of the data needs to take this deviation into consideration when interpreting results of analyses. In the Israeli data, the value “1” that stands for “not accepting this ethnic group member as …” can actually also refer to a missing value, and vice versa.

e) Ingroup and Outgroup Attitude and Contact Scale

All questionnaire versions contained three items measuring attitudes towards and contact with the ingroup as well as three different outgroups. For example, the agreement to the item "These people can enrich this country with their culture." was answered by the participants with regard to the four different groups. The presented reference groups were in Israel "Veteran Israeli Jew (Sabra)“, "Russian and other people from the Former Soviet Union“, "Israeli Arabs“ and "Ethiopian Immigrants“. The German equivalent was "Germans“, "Russians and other people from the Former Soviet Union“, "Turks“, and "People with black skin color“. However, in the Hebrew, Russian, and Arab language versions of the questionnaire the order of the reference groups was slightly different: The second reference group was "Israeli Arab“ (instead of "Russian“), and the third was "Russians and other people from the Former Soviet Union“ (instead of "Israeli Arab“).
Illustration 5. *Ingroup and Outgroup Attitudes and Intergroup Contact Scale.*

Hebrew, Arab, and Russian language version in Israel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These people can enrich this country with their culture (e.g. their way of living).

Veteran Israeli Jews (Sabra)

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Israeli Arabs

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Russians and other people from the former Soviet Union

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Ethiopian immigrants

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

German language version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These people can enrich this country with their culture (e.g. their way of living).

Germans

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Former Soviet Union Immigrants

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Turks

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

People with black skin color

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

In the data file the interchanged entries were correctly ascribed to the corresponding variables. Hence, no variable transformations are necessary prior to data analyses.

f) **Demographics Section**

- **Birth Order**

  In all language versions of the children questionnaire, the item “*How many brothers and sisters do you have?*” was included. In the German language version of the questionnaire, an additional item was included asking for the childrens’ birth order („*Als wievieltes Kind wurdest Du geboren?*“).
- Parents’ Age of Immigration

The children were asked about their parents’ age of immigration. It was assessed, whether the parents had immigrated as children or as adults, and whether they had immigrated before or after the child was born.

Both aspects were coded in the variables m_immigrate1 (respectively f_immigrate1 for fathers) and m_immigrate2 (respectively f_immigrate2 for fathers). The variable f/m_immigrate1 was coded with “1” if the mother/father had immigrated as a child, and with “2” if mother/father had immigrated as an adult. The variable f/m_immigrate2 was coded with “1” if the mother/father had immigrated before the child was born, and with “2” if mother/father had immigrated after the child was born.

However, the way the corresponding items were presented in the questionnaire differed between the language versions. The original item of the master questionnaire, which remained included in the Hebrew, Arab, and Russian translation, had the following response options:

If born outside Israel, when did your mother/father immigrate?

 a. As a child    b. as an adult    c. after I was born

Response options a. and b. were coded in the variable f/m_immigrate1. If the individual marked option a. the variable was coded with “1” (immigrated as a child), and if the individual marked option b. the variable was coded with “2” (as an adult). Result option c. was used to code the variable f/m_immigrate2. If the participant marked this option c., the code “2” (after I was born) was given to this variable. When the participant did not mark the option c., the code “1” (before I was born) was given.

However, like in the case of the Social Distance Scale (see above) it was realized later after the construction of the questionnaire that having not chosen response option c. can indicate that the participant’s parents had immigrated before the child was born, but also that the participant had omitted this option. Therefore, this item was subsequently changed. However, since in Israel the printing of the
questionnaire had already started, it was only possible to make this subsequent change in the German version of the questionnaire.

The new version in the German questionnaire is documented below:

If born outside Israel, when did your father immigrate?

As a Child: 
As an Adult: 
-after I was born: 
-before I was born: 

As can be seen, the option „before I was born“ was added to the questionnaire, and the code “1” was given to the variable f/m_immigrate2 when a participant had choosen this option.

The user of the data needs to take this deviation into consideration when interpreting results of analyses. In the Israeli data, the value “1” that stands for “before I was born” in the variable f/m_immigrate2 might also actually be a missing value.

- Number of Friends Speaking Particular Languages

The questionnaire contained the item “How man of your five best friends speak …?”. This item assessed interethnic friendships, hence, the particular reference group varied according to the participants’ group membership. Accordingly, the particular reference group was adapted in the different language versions of the questionnaire.

The German language version contained the same item twice with two different reference groups: “How man of your five best friends speak Russian?” and “How many of your five best friends speak Turkish?”. The Hebrew and the Russian language version contained the item “How man of your five best friends speak Russian?”, whereas the Arab language version contained the item “How man of your five best friends speak Hebrew?”.
- Education of Parents
The English master version as well as the Hebrew, Russian, and Arabic version of the children questionnaire contained the items “Which schools did your father finish?” respectively “Which schools did your mother finish?”, with the response options “elementary school”, “high school” and ”university or higher education”. The German translation of these response options was adapted to the German school system. Four options were presented: “elementary school“ (“Grundschule“), “secondary school 10th grade“ (“Abschluss 10. Klasse“), “secondary school 12th grade with degree certificate“ (“Abitur/Hochschulreife“), and “university degree“ (“Universitätsabschluss“). In the data from Israel, the response “high school“ matches the response “secondary school 12th grade with degree certificate“ of the German version of the questionnaire (coded with “3”). Furthermore, in the Arab version of the questionnaire, an additional option was presented, namely the option “no school degree“. This option was coded with 0.

The variable fat_edu and mot_edu of the data set need to be used having these country specific differences in the questionnaires in mind. In Germany, participants received one of the codes “1” to “4”, whereas in Israel only the codes “1”, “3” and “4” were given. It is recommended to classify participants with the codes “2” and “3” in one group. In addition, the code “0” was only given to Arab participants of which the father respectively the mother did not finish any school.

The variable fat_edu and mot_edu of the data set need to be used having these country specific differences in the questionnaires in mind. In Germany, participants received one of the codes “1” to “4”, whereas in Israel only the codes “1”, “3” and “4” were given. It is recommended to classify participants with the codes “2” and “3” in one group. In addition, the code “0” was only given to Arab participants of which the father respectively the mother did not finish any school.

g) Wish to Have Children Scale
The German version of the children questionnaire contained the items “Would you like to have children in the future?” and “If yes, how many children would you like to have?“. These items were only presented to the participants in Germany and were thus not part of the Hebrew, Arab, and Russian versions.

h) Reduction of the Questionnaire Length
There were two situations which forced us to let the participants fill in only a limited number of items and scales:
• Students filled in the questionnaire very slowly, so that the time limit which was agreed upon with the school administration (one to two school hours) was not enough. In such cases, the particular student was told to skip certain scales.
• In Germany part of the data collection did not take place in schools but was organized in cooperation with a number of private associations that had contact to individuals with Russian or Turkish migration background. Some of these associations asked for a reduction of questionnaire length.

In case the questionnaire had to be shortened, this reduction pertained primarily to the Latin Square Task, as well as the Intergroup Attitude and Intergroup Contact Scale. In the case that students in schools did not manage to finish the questionnaire within the time limit, they were additionally told to answer only a small part of the demographics section (age, gender, migration background) and skip the rest.

Due to this reduction of the questionnaire length a number of entries of individuals in the data file have missing values of complete scales and/or large parts of the demographics section.

2.2.2. Parents

a) Values in Context Questionnaire

As described in section 2.2 of the questionnaire description, the Value in Context Questionnaire consists of 12 items assessing value preferences, which each had to be responded to with regard to a number of life domains. In the parent questionnaire, the items had to be answered referring to oneself “as a family member”, “as a worker in my job”, “as a German/Israeli”, and “as a Russian/Turk/Arab”. The presentation of the scale in the questionnaire slightly differed in the versions used in Germany and Israel. The difference regards to the life domain that refers to the participants’ migration background. In Israel, only one option was given to the participants: Questionnaires in Hebrew and Russian language only included the option “as an immigrant from the Former Soviet
Union“, whereas questionnaires in Arab included the option „as an Arab“. In the German versions (German, Russian, and Turkish language) both the option ”as an immigrant from the Former Soviet Union“, and ”as a Turk“ were given in one table. Depending on their migration background, participants chose the respective option.

Furthermore, in all questionnaires used in Germany the following paragraph was added to the instructions of the Values in Context Questionnaire:

”But note: even if you do not feel you are a German, please try to fill in that column as well. Also, we use the term “Turk” for everyone who comes from Turkey. If you come from Turkey but you do not consider yourself a Turk, please try to fill in that column as well.”

b) Parental Style Questionnaire

The German and Turkish versions deviated from the other language version with regard to the scaling of the Parental Style Questionnaire (see section 4.5 of the questionnaire description). This scale was presented in the questionnaire in two tables:

Illustration 6. Parental Style Questionnaire.

In most relationships there are disagreements with regard to certain issues. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always............</th>
<th>Sometimes........</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Philosophy of life</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aims, goals, and things believed important</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amount of time spent together</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child education</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More than once a day</th>
<th>Once a day</th>
<th>1-2 times a week</th>
<th>1-2 months</th>
<th>Less than 1-2 times a month</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Calmly discuss something together</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work together on a project</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Hebrew, Russian and Arab language versions, the four items of the first table had a scale range from 1 (“always disagree“) to 6 (“always agree“), whereas in the German and Turkish version, these four items accidentally had a scale range from 1 (“always disagree“) to 7 (“always agree“).

Due to the different scale range, the items need to be standardized when comparing the German and Israeli data.

c) Demographics Section

- Income
The different language versions of the parent questionnaires were kept identical with two minor deviations in the demographics section. The first regarded to the item assessing participants’ income level. The English question was “The Statistic bureau indicates that the income of an average family is about ____. Accordingly, your family’s income is (a) much below average, (b) a little below average, (c) average, (d) a little above average, (e) much above average“. What differed in the questionnaires used in Germany (German, Russian, and Turkish versions) compared to those used in Israel (Hebrew, Russian and Arab versions) was the amount of money presented as the reference level. In Germany it was 2766 Euro, whereas in Israel it was 7900 New Israeli Schekel (NIS, about 1600 Euro). Both amounts represented the average income in these countries at that time. Hence,
the responses given by the participants represent the individual’s family’s level of income relative to the particular country’s average (based on data from the German resp. Israeli Statistical Bureau).

This different reference level needs to be considered when using income as a socioeconomic variable in analyses.

- **Level of Education**

The English master questionnaire for parents contained the item “*How many years of education did you graduate?*** in the demographics section. This was an open question, participants were asked to write down the number of years they went to school. However, exemplary response options were given in parentheses. In all except one language versions these were ”6 = elementary school“, ”12 = high school“ and ”15 = university degree“. One exception was made: In Germany, the Russian translation for parents gave participants two options: (a) ”In Germany: 6 = elementary school, 12 = high school, 15 = university degree“, (b) “In the Former Soviet Union: 9 = not completed secondary school, 11 = completed secondary school, 16 = university degree“. These presented exemplary response options obviously caused some confusion among the participants. Instead of writing down the exact years they went to school, many participants wrote down the presented exemplary response option that best matched the number of years they went to school. For example, if a person went to school for 10 years, he or she sometimes wrote down the number 12, indicating a “high school degree”. Due to this confusion, the codes “6”, “12”, “15”, as well as “9”, “11”, “16” of the variables years_school_m an years_school_p are more frequent than others.

When using the variables years-school_m/years_school_p of the data file, one needs to keep in mind, that the codes “6”, “12”, “15”, as well as “9”, “11”, “16” occur more often, because these codes refer to exemplary response options
presented in the questionnaires which were often used by the participants instead of writing down the exact number of years they went to school.

- **Religiosity**

Additional to the question “What is your religion?” a second item was included in all questionnaires used in Israel. This question asked for religious subgroups: “How would you define yourself in terms of religious belonging?”. Response options were “ultra-orthodox“, “religious“, “traditional“, “secular”, and “others“. The item was not used in Germany.

### 3. Second Wave

#### 3.1. Masterfiles and Translations

The second-wave questionnaires were adapted versions of the first-wave questionnaires.

Based on the experiences in the first-wave data collection as well as data analyses, a number of scales and items were excluded, and a number of new scales and items were included. Some of these new items and scales were included only in Germany. The English master version of the second-wave questionnaires contained all new items and scales, but the particular translations contained only the parts that were actually used in the corresponding countries. The original versions of all new scales and single items were in English language and were translated in all necessary languages following the same translation-back-translation procedure already used for the first-wave questionnaires. After translating the new scales and items into the different languages they were included in the corresponding language versions of the over-all questionnaire. The changes are described in detail below.

#### 3.2. Deviations from the Wave 1 Questionnaire – Children

Three scales were excluded from the questionnaire: The Latin Square Task, the Social Distance Scale, as well as the scale assessing contact to authorities from different
ethnic groups. These scales were excluded because they appeared to be difficult to comprehend for participants (especially the younger one’s), and taking them out was expected to increase the response rate. Additionally, two items that were only part of the first-wave questionnaires in Germany were no longer needed: the item asking for the number of children, as well as the item asking participants’ birth order.

Instead, three new scales as well as a number of further items belonging to already included first-wave scales were added. In both Germany and Israel a Value-Related Behaviors Scale was included (see Section 3 of the questionnaire description). In addition, three items were added to the Need for Closure Scale, and two items were added to the Intergroup Attitude Scale. Finally, a new scale assessing socioeconomic status (Family Affluence Scale, see Section 3 of the questionnaire description) was added to the demographics section.

A number of further changes were made only in Germany: Firstly, the Identity Diffusion Scale and the Hierarchic Self-Interest Scale (see Section 3 of the questionnaire description) were newly added. Furthermore, the item “What kind of school do you go to?” was included, with the response options “Sekundarschule (secondary school)”, “Gymnasium (grammar school)”, “Realschule”, “Hauptschule”, and “Gesamtschule” (the latter three special types of secondary schools in Germany). Instead, three items were excluded from the German questionnaire: (1) The question “How many rooms are there in your home?”, (2) the question “What is your father’s/mother’s profession?”, as well as (3) the question “Which school did your father/mother finish?”. In the questionnaires used in Israel these items remained included. The decision to leave out the three mentioned items in Germany was made due to concerns regarding the length of the over-all questionnaire and the expected higher attrition rates associated with that. Due to the above mentioned additional scales (Identity Diffusion, Hierarchical Self-Interest) as well as the additional item asking for the type of school the questionnaire used in Germany was quite longer and thus needed to be shortened.
3.3. Deviations from the Wave 1 Questionnaire – Parents

In the Israeli part of the study, the second-wave questionnaires for parents were identical to the first wave questionnaires, with regard to both the included scales and the demographics section. In Germany, two additional scales were included: The Identity Diffusion Scale and the Hierarchic Self-Interest Scale, which were also included in the second-wave children questionnaire in Germany (see above).

3.4. Deviations of the Different Language Versions

3.4.1. Children Questionnaire

a) Deviations Identical to the First-Wave Questionnaires

A number of differences between the language versions were identical to those in the first-wave questionnaires. For this reason, these differences will not be explained here in detail, but the reader is referred to the corresponding sections above. These differences regard to the following scales and items:

1. Deviations in the introduction text of the VICQ were the same in the second-wave questionnaire (see Section 2.2.1.a).
2. The Need for Closure Scale was now presented in a separate table in all language versions, however, the response options still differed (Germany: 1-7, Israel: 1-6; see Section 2.2.1.c).
3. The order of the reference groups “Russian” and “Turk/Israeli Arab” of the Ingroup and Outgroup Attitude Scale still differed between the German and the Israeli questionnaire versions. (see Section 2.2.1.e).
4. The items asking when parents immigrated to Germany/Israel had different response options in Germany and Israel (see Section 2.2.1.f).
5. The number of friends speaking particular languages differed in Germany and Israel. (see Section 2.2.1.f).
6. Response option for the item “Which school did your father/mother finish?” differed in the Arab version: Additional option “no school degree” (see Section 2.2.1.f).
3.4.2. Parent Questionnaire

a) Deviations Identical to the First-Wave Questionnaires

Like in the second-wave children questionnaire, a number of differences between the language versions of the parent questionnaire were identical to those in the first wave. These referred to the following scales and items:

1. The presentation of the Values in Context Questionnaire (See Section 2.2.2.a)
2. The question asking participants’ monthly income (different reference numbers in Germany and Israel) (See Section 2.2.2.c).
3. The question “How would you define yourself in terms of religious belonging?” which was only included in the Israeli questionnaires (See Section 2.2.2.c).

b) Demographics Section: Level of Education

Like in the first-wave questionnaire, the item asking for the education level differed between the language versions. However, in the second-wave questionnaire the item and corresponding response options were even more specifically adapted to the different school systems in the participants’ countries of origin. All different versions can be found in the English master questionnaire.

In all language versions used in Israel, the question “How many years of education did you graduate?” remained unchanged. Like in the first-wave questionnaire, this was an open question, and participants were asked to write down the number of years they went to school. Also like in the first-wave questionnaire, exemplary response options were given in parentheses. These were ”6 = elementary school“, ”12 = high school“ and ”15 = university degree“. Additionally, the Russian version gave participants two options: (a) ”In Israel: 6 = elementary school, 12 = high school, 15 = university degree“, (b) “In the Former Soviet Union: 9 = not completed secondary school, 11 = completed secondary school, 16 = university degree“. The responses were coded in the variables years_school_m2 and years_school_p2. Like in the first-wave questionnaire, the presented exemplary response options obviously caused some confusion among the participants. Instead of writing down the exact years they went to school, many
participants wrote down the presented exemplary response option that best matched the number of years they went to school. For example, if a person went to school for 10 years, he or she sometimes wrote down the number 12, indicating a “high school degree”. Due to this confusion, the codes “6”, “12”, “15”, as well as “9”, “11”, “16” of the variables years_school_m2 and years_school_p2 are more frequent than others.

In all language versions used in Germany, the item was reworded into “What is your highest education degree?”. This item had no open response format but presented fixed categories from which participants were asked to choose the one that applied best to them. These response options were adapted to the particular school systems in Germany as well as Turkey and the FSU. All language versions used in Germany presented the response options that applied to the German school system, and the Turkish and Russian language versions additionally presented response options that applied to the school system of Turkey respectively the FSU. For details see Table 1. The responses were coded in the variables education_degree_m2 and education_degree_p2. For details which response category received which code see the codebook.

Level of education is coded in different variables in the data set. The variables that apply to Israel are years_school_m2 and years_school_p2, the ones that apply to Germany are education_degree_m2 and education_degree_p2.

When using the variables years-school_m2/years_school_p2 of the data file, one needs to keep in mind, that the codes “6”, “12”, “15”, as well as “9”, “11”, “16” occur more often, because these codes refer to exemplary response options presented in the questionnaires which were often used by the participants instead of writing down the exact number of years they went to school.

Generally, when using education as a variable for analyses, one need to consider the different ways it was assessed and coded in the two countries as well as the different language version of each country. The comparability of the data between the different questionnaire versions is reduced.
Table 1.

*Different Assessment of Education Level in the Different Questionnaire Translations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Version</th>
<th>Response Options Given in the Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Arab</td>
<td>6=elementary school, 12=high school, 15=BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian (Israel)</td>
<td>In Israel: 6=elementary school, 12=high school, 15=BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Former Soviet Union: 9 = not completed secondary school, 11 = completed secondary school, 16 = university degree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>elementary school □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school type 1 (Mittlere Reife) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school type 2 (Hauptschule) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school type 3 (Realschule) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school with degree certificate, vocational focus (Fachabitur) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school with degree certificate, general (Abitur) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university degree □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>In Germany:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary school □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school (Mittlere Reife) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school (Hauptschule) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school (Realschule) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school with degree certificate, vocational focus (Fachabitur) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school with degree certificate, general (Abitur) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university degree □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Turkey:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary school □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school (Ortaokul) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school (Lise) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school with degree certificate, vocational focus (Meslek Lisesi) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advanced college degree (Yüksek Okul) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university degree □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian (Germany)</td>
<td>In Germany:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary school □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school type 1 (Mittlere Reife) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school type 2 (Hauptschule) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school type 3 (Realschule) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school with degree certificate, vocational focus (Fachabitur) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school with degree certificate, general (Abitur) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university degree □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Former Soviet Union:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not completed secondary school □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completed secondary school □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university degree □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>