

**Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey
in Four European Countries
CILS4EU**

Technical Report

Wave 2 – 2011/2012

Version: 2.3.0

Year: 2016

Citation: CILS4EU. 2016. Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. Technical Report. Wave 2 – 2011/2012, v2.3.0. Mannheim: Mannheim University.

Content

1	Introduction	3
2	Sampling design	3
2.1	Target Population	3
2.2	Response rates, sample sizes and composition	5
2.2.1	Response rates	5
2.2.2	Sample sizes	8
2.2.3	Composition of the sample	10
3	Development of the instruments	12
3.1	Instruments for the student survey	12
3.1.1	Student main questionnaire	13
3.1.2	Sociometric instrument	14
3.1.3	Name generator	14
3.1.4	Newcomer questionnaire	15
3.2	Adaption and translation of the instruments	15
3.2.1	Adaptions and country specific questions	15
3.2.2	Translation of the instruments	17
4	Fieldwork	17
4.1	Students' survey	17
4.1.1	In-school	17
4.1.2	Outside the school context	19
	References	20

1 Introduction

The Technical Report deals with the sampling and fieldwork of the second wave of the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries CILS4EU. CILS4EU is a panel survey with three waves of data collection, starting with the first wave in 2010/2011 and ending with a third wave in 2012/2013. The present report describes the activities of the second wave, which was conducted in 2011/2012.

2 Sampling design

2.1 Target Population

The target population of the second wave of CILS4EU comprises all students being successfully interviewed in the first wave. Additionally, students being included on the class list in the first wave – and therefore being part of the first wave’s target population –, but being absent at the day of the school survey, are also part of the target population of the second wave.

Given the general school based sampling approach of CILS4EU described in the Technical Report for wave 1 (CILS4EU 2016c) and the advantages of such an approach with respect to response rates on the individual level, the aim of the data collection in the second wave was to repeat the general survey design and therefore conduct the data collection in schools. Besides these practical reasons, conducting the survey again in the school context offers the possibility to re-assess the classroom networks in order to capture possible changes in social ties within school classes between the first and the second wave (cf. section 3.1).

However, not the complete target population of the second wave could actually be surveyed in the school context. In Germany, the school tracks leading to the lowest qualification, the “Hauptschulen” and “Förderschulen”, last in most German Federal States only until the ninth grade and therefore the children regularly left school after the school year in

which the first wave was conducted. In order not to lose these cases, students were surveyed outside the school context using telephone, postal and web surveys. This holds also true for other countries where schools as the initial primary sampling units refused to take part in the survey of the second wave, making an in-school survey impossible. Also, students being part of the target population of wave 2, but being absent at the day of the in-school fieldwork of the second wave or having left school individually were also surveyed outside the school context.

Whenever in the following the term “students” is used, respondents falling in this definition of the CILS4EU-target population are meant, even if they are not attending schools anymore. However, the vast amount of respondents of the second wave is actually students.

In principle, and in contrast to the first wave where additional parental and teacher surveys were conducted, the second wave of CILS4EU targeted only at students of the relevant target population. However, Sweden and the Netherlands used the second wave to survey parents that were not successfully interviewed in the first wave in order to increase response rates. As these efforts are strongly connected to the fieldwork of the first wave, the instruments used and the respective outcomes of the survey (i.e. response rates, composition of the sample) are presented in the updated Technical Report of the first wave (CILS4EU 2016c).

Additionally, the Netherlands surveyed also a considerable number of “newcomers” being not part of the initial class lists from wave 1. This extension was due to the fact that some classes were restructured between grade 3 and grade 4 in secondary school and the newly created classes now contained additional students that were also surveyed. Additionally, in England, Germany and Sweden several new students were interviewed who entered the surveyed classes between wave 1 and wave 2. In order to differentiate between the randomly chosen students in the first wave sampling process and this at least to some degree convenient sample, all corresponding figures for this sample are displayed in the outside-sampling report (CILS4EU 2015b). The technical report at hand is restricted to the target population as defined above.

2.2 Response rates, sample sizes and composition

Given the repeated school based approach, non-response can again – in principle – occur on the school, class and students' level. The participation rates are presented in the following (2.2.1), together with the number of participating schools and students (2.2.2) and the composition of the overall student sample of the second wave (2.2.3).

2.2.1 Response rates

In contrast to the replacement strategy of the first wave with response rates being calculated before and after replacement, the participation rate on school level in the second wave (unconditional of the first wave's response rate) is simply the ratio of participating schools in the second wave and the number of participating schools (after replacement) in the first wave, which is the sum of all initially (in wave 1) sampled and participating schools ($n_{schoolsp}$) and of all participating replacement schools ($n_{schoolrp}$) (cf. CILS4EU 2016c).

$$PR_{schoolW2} = \frac{n_{schoolW2}}{n_{schoolW1}} = \frac{n_{schoolW2}}{n_{schoolsp} + n_{schoolrp}}$$

In contrast to the first wave, a calculation of the class participation rate is not feasible, as some schools restructured their classes (sometimes in general, sometimes only temporary for the survey in order to ease the survey process) prior to wave 2. However, specific non-response on class level seems not to be a major problem.

The overall student participation rate in wave 2 ($PR_{studentw2}$) as the ratio of all participating students in the second wave and all students representing the target population as described above consists of two parts: a student participation rate in the in-school survey ($PR_{studentISw2}$) and a student participation rate for those being surveyed outside the school context ($PR_{studentOSw2}$). The latter group comprises all students being absent during the in-school survey and those where the school refused to participate or where the students were not enrolled in schools anymore; thus, all students of the overall target population that were not surveyed in the in-school surveys in wave 2. The student participation rate in the in-school survey ($PR_{studentISw2}$) is calculated as the ratio of students taking part in the in-school survey ($n_{studentISw2}$) and those students being the target population for the second wave's in-

school survey ($n_{\text{studentISw2}}$; i.e. all students who attended a school in wave 1 that again takes part in the in-school survey in wave 2):

$$PR_{\text{studentISw2}} = \frac{n_{\text{studentpISw2}}}{n_{\text{studentISw2}}}$$

The student participation rate outside the school survey ($PR_{\text{studentOS}}$) is calculated as the ratio of students taking part in the outside-school survey ($n_{\text{studentpOSw2}}$) and those students being the target population for the outside-school survey ($n_{\text{studentOSw2}}$), that are those students meeting the requirements for the target population as described above and where the school refused to participate, who were not present during the survey date at their schools, or those being not enrolled in school anymore (e.g. students from “Hauptschulen” and “Förderschulen” in Germany):¹

$$PR_{\text{studentOSw2}} = \frac{n_{\text{studentpOSw2}}}{n_{\text{studentOSw2}}}$$

The overall participation rate ($PR_{\text{studentw2}}$) is the ratio of all participating students in wave 2 ($n_{\text{studentpw2}}$), regardless whether surveyed in-school and outside-school, and all students being the target population as described above ($n_{\text{studentw2}}$):

$$PR_{\text{studentw2}} = \frac{n_{\text{studentpw2}}}{n_{\text{studentw2}}}$$

¹ Unfortunately, not all research institutes provided information about refusing students in the in-school survey who were then not part of the target population for the out-school survey. Given this impossibility to exclude these refusals from the denominator of the formula for the out-school response rate results in an underestimation of the actual response rate in the outside-school survey.

Table 1: Response rates in the student survey: Schools and students

		School Participation Rate (in %)	Student Participation Rate		
			In-school (in %)	Outside school (in %)	Overall (in %)
England	Strata 1	73.7	63.2	7.2	50.9
	Strata 2	87.5	68.0	13.9	64.8
	Strata 3	79.2	72.8	16.7	64.8
	Strata 4	95.2	71.4	15.0	72.5
	Indep.	100.0	77.8	12.9	80.6
	Total	86.0	69.9	13.2	65.2
Germany*	Strata 1	89.5	75.3	56.1	86.5
	Strata 2	70.0	77.7	64.5	84.1
	Strata 3	77.8	70.2	51.7	81.0
	Strata 4	71.4	65.8	46.2	74.1
	Total	75.0	71.9	54.7	80.7
	Netherlands	Strata 1	100.0	69.8	31.1
Strata 2		100.0	70.3	20.8	76.5
Strata 3		100.0	76.6	19.2	81.1
Strata 4		90.5	66.1	14.8	64.6
Total		98.0	71.5	20.6	76.1
Sweden		Strata 1	100.0	82.5	-
	Strata 2	95.4	80.4	-	77.6
	Strata 3	100.0	80.1	-	80.1
	Strata 4	100.0	72.0	-	72.0
	Total	98.5	78.6	-	77.7

* The n=36 (25.0%) non-participating schools are composed of 10 (6.9%) refusing schools and 26 schools (18.1%) that do not enrol a 10th grade (cf. section 2.1).

Table 2: Response rates in the student survey: Schools and students (given participation wave 1)

		School Participation Rate (in %)	Student Participation Rate		
			In-school (in %)	Outside school (in %)	Overall (in %)
England	Strata 1	73.7	78.7	10.9	62.3
	Strata 2	87.5	80.3	23.2	77.3
	Strata 3	79.2	86.8	25.8	76.1
	Strata 4	95.2	82.8	25.3	83.6
	Indep.	100.0	82.9	18.0	86.0
	Total	86.0	82.3	21.0	76.6
Germany*	Strata 1	89.5	76.3	59.5	87.8
	Strata 2	70.0	78.7	67.8	85.8
	Strata 3	77.8	71.7	57.0	83.8
	Strata 4	71.4	66.4	49.4	75.9
	Total	75.0	73.0	58.5	82.7
	Netherlands	Strata 1	100.0	70.4	33.6
Strata 2		100.0	70.5	22.5	77.2
Strata 3		100.0	78.0	21.7	82.8
Strata 4		90.5	68.4	16.4	66.8
Total		98.0	72.5	22.7	77.5
Sweden		Strata 1	100.0	85.2	-
	Strata 2	95.4	84.1	-	81.3
	Strata 3	100.0	84.0	-	84.0
	Strata 4	100.0	77.6	-	77.6
	Total	98.5	82.7	-	81.8

* The 25.0% (n=36) non-participating schools are composed of 6.9% (n=10) refusing schools and 18.1% (n=26) schools that do not enrol a 10th grade (cf. section 2.1).

Both tables, Table 1 and Table 2, should be read as follows: The first column represents the school participation rate. The second column shows student participation rates in the in-school survey, while the third column represents the students' participation rate in the out-

side school survey, comprising all students being absent at the in-school survey, students having left school and students from schools refusing to participate or not enrolling the relevant target grade. The final column shows then the combined participation rate on students' level.

For example, according to Table 2 presenting response rates given participation in wave 1, 86.0% of the schools in England were willing to participate again in the survey. 82.3% of the students in these schools that already took part in wave 1 could be surveyed during the in-school survey in wave 2. The absent students as well as those students being enrolled in schools who refused to participate (i.e. the 14% of refusing schools) were then traced outside the school context, where interviews with 21.0% of the outside-school target population were conducted. Given the comparable high share of students in the outside-school sample (due to the non-response on school level), together with the less successful response rate in the outside-school survey results in an overall student participation rate of 76.6%².

2.2.2 *Sample sizes*

In the following, the sample sizes on school and students level are presented. Table 3 provides an overview over the number of cases on the different levels in all countries; differentiated by the stratum in which schools and students were located in wave 1. In total, almost 16,000 interviews were conducted, with the vast majority of students being surveyed in the in-school context. About 1,800 interviews were conducted outside the school context.

² The overall response rate can't be directly calculated out of the two response rates in the in-school and out-school survey, as the denominator for both response rates differ.

Table 3: Sample Sizes in wave 2

		Achieved sample sizes (% in brackets)			
		School level	Students level		
			In-school	Outside-school	Overall
England	Strata 1	14 (17.3)	422 (15.0)	34 (12.9)	456 (14.8)
	Strata 2	28 (34.6)	987 (35.0)	95 (36.0)	1,082 (35.1)
	Strata 3	19 (23.5)	670 (23.8)	82 (31.1)	752 (24.4)
	Strata 4	20 (24.7)	738 (26.2)	53 (20.1)	791 (25.7)
	Total (State)	81	2,817	264	3,081
	Indep.	11 (12.0)	297 (9.5)	11 (4.0)	308 (9.1)
	Total (All)	92	3,114	275	3,389
Germany	Strata 1	17 (15.7)	516 (17.0)	129 (10.5)	645 (15.2)
	Strata 2	28 (25.9)	943 (31.1)	492 (40.2)	1,435 (33.7)
	Strata 3	28 (25.9)	766 (25.3)	257 (21.0)	1,023 (24.0)
	Strata 4	35 (32.4)	807 (26.6)	346 (28.3)	1,153 (27.1)
	Total	108	3,032	1,224	4,256
Netherlands	Strata 1	16 (16.3)	553 (16.7)	74 (25.3)	627 (17.4)
	Strata 2	35 (35.7)	1,123 (33.8)	98 (33.6)	1,221 (33.8)
	Strata 3	28 (28.6)	1,118 (33.7)	65 (22.3)	1,183 (32.7)
	Strata 4	19 (19.4)	528 (15.9)	55 (18.8)	583 (16.1)
	Total	98	3,322	292	3,614
Sweden	Strata 1	19 (15.0)	740 (16.3)	-	740 (16.3)
	Strata 2	41 (32.3)	1,489 (32.9)	-	1,489 (32.9)
	Strata 3	33 (26.0)	1,274 (28.1)	-	1,274 (28.1)
	Strata 4	34 (26.8)	1,028 (22.7)	-	1,028 (22.7)
	Total	127	4,531	-	4,531
Total	Strata 1	66 (15.9)	2,231 (16.3)	237 (13.3)	2,468 (15.9)
	Strata 2	132 (31.9)	4,542 (33.2)	685 (38.5)	5,227 (33.8)
	Strata 3	108 (26.1)	3,828 (27.9)	404 (22.7)	4,232 (27.3)
	Strata 4	108 (26.1)	3,101 (22.6)	454 (25.5)	3,555 (23.0)
	Total (State)	414	13,702	1,780	15,482
	Indep.	11 (2.6)	297 (2.1)	11 (0.6)	308 (2.0)
	Total	425	13,999	1,791	15,790

Table 4 displays the sample sizes given the participation wave 1; meaning that in this table only those cases are presented where an additional wave 1 interview exists. Comparing Table 3 and Table 4, it becomes evident that 851 students were surveyed in the second wave where no first wave interview exists ($15,790 - 14,939 = 851$). These cases were mainly interviewed in the in-school context and are students who were included on the class list of the first wave (and therefore part of the first waves' target population), but being absent at the day of the survey.

Table 4: Sample Sizes in wave 2 (given participation in wave 1)

		Achieved sample sizes (% in brackets)			
		School level	Students level		
			In-school	Outside-school	Overall
England	Strata 1	14 (17.3)	413 (15.1)	33 (12.8)	446 (14.9)
	Strata 2	28 (34.6)	942 (34.4)	92 (35.7)	1,034 (34.5)
	Strata 3	19 (23.5)	668 (24.4)	82 (31.8)	750 (25.0)
	Strata 4	20 (24.7)	716 (26.1)	51 (19.8)	767 (25.6)
	Total (State)	81	2,739	258	2,997
	Indep.	11 (12.0)	296 (9.8)	11 (4.1)	307 (9.3)
	Total (All)	92	3,035	269	3,304
Germany	Strata 1	17 (15.7)	500 (17.1)	128 (10.5)	628 (15.2)
	Strata 2	28 (25.9)	917 (31.4)	492 (40.3)	1,409 (34.0)
	Strata 3	28 (25.9)	740 (25.3)	256 (21.0)	996 (24.0)
	Strata 4	35 (32.4)	768 (26.3)	345 (28.3)	1,113 (26.9)
	Total	108	2,925	1,221	4,146
Netherlands	Strata 1	16 (16.3)	524 (16.9)	74 (25.7)	598 (17.7)
	Strata 2	35 (35.7)	1,032 (33.4)	97 (33.7)	1,129 (33.4)
	Strata 3	28 (28.6)	1,046 (33.8)	64 (22.2)	1,110 (32.8)
	Strata 4	19 (19.4)	491 (15.9)	53 (18.4)	544 (16.1)
	Total	98	3,093	288	3,381
Sweden	Strata 1	19 (15.0)	655 (15.9)	-	655 (15.9)
	Strata 2	41 (32.3)	1,355 (33.0)	-	1,355 (33.0)
	Strata 3	33 (26.0)	1,160 (28.2)	-	1,160 (28.2)
	Strata 4	34 (26.8)	938 (22.8)	-	938 (22.8)
	Total	127	4,108	-	4,108
Total	Strata 1	66 (15.9)	2,092 (16.3)	235 (13.3)	2,327 (15.9)
	Strata 2	132 (31.9)	4,246 (33.0)	681 (38.5)	4,927 (33.7)
	Strata 3	108 (26.1)	3,614 (28.1)	402 (22.8)	4,016 (27.5)
	Strata 4	108 (26.1)	2,913 (22.6)	449 (25.4)	3,362 (23.0)
	Total (State)	414	12,865	1,767	14,632
	Indep.	11 (2.6)	296 (2.3)	11 (0.6)	307 (2.1)
	Total	425	13,161	1,778	14,939

2.2.3 Composition of the sample

In this section, the focus is on the composition of the student sample with respect to the immigrant status of the respondents. Table 5 provides an overview over the composition of the student sample in terms of immigrant proportion (Dollmann et al. 2014). As can be seen, and compared to the distribution in the first wave, the share of immigrants remained quite stable (overall, and also within the different countries) with an overall very slight reduction of 1% between both waves (45.7% in wave 1 versus 44.7% in wave 2). At least given these overall figures, selective non-response on individual level due to the immigrant background of students should not be a problem for the survey's second wave.

The figures may have also changed due to different information available for the generation of the immigrant status variable as compared to the first wave. Given the routine described in Dollmann et al. (2014), missing values on the variables indicating the country

of birth of the respondent, of his or her mother and father, or of his or her grandparents were replaced following different logical rules. However, whenever information on one or more of these variables was available in the second wave, these were used in order to generate the immigrant status, the generational status as well as the country of origin of the child. These changes are documented in more detail in Dollmann and Jacob (2015).

Table 5: Composition of the student sample

		Students			Total
		with immigrant background (% of total)	without immigrant background (% of total)	immigrant background unclear (% of total)	
England	Strata 1	59 (12.9)	392 (86.0)	5 (1.1)	456
	Strata 2	349 (32.3)	714 (66.0)	19 (1.8)	1,082
	Strata 3	437 (58.1)	306 (40.7)	9 (1.2)	752
	Strata 4	662 (83.7)	117 (14.8)	12 (1.5)	791
	Indep.	141 (45.8)	166 (53.9)	1 (0.3)	308
	Total	1,648 (48.6)	1,695 (50.0)	46 (1.4)	3,389
Germany	Strata 1	135 (20.9)	493 (76.4)	17 (2.6)	645
	Strata 2	509 (35.5)	910 (63.4)	16 (1.1)	1,435
	Strata 3	568 (55.5)	439 (42.9)	16 (1.6)	1,023
	Strata 4	915 (79.4)	225 (19.5)	13 (1.1)	1,153
	Total	2,127 (50.0)	2,067 (48.6)	62 (1.5)	4,256
Netherlands	Strata 1	98 (15.6)	529 (84.4)	0 (0.0)	627
	Strata 2	271 (22.2)	948 (77.6)	2 (0.2)	1,221
	Strata 3	410 (34.7)	773 (65.3)	0 (0.0)	1,183
	Strata 4	368 (63.1)	212 (36.4)	3 (0.5)	583
	Total	1,147 (31.7)	2,462 (68.1)	15 (0.1)	3,614
Sweden	Strata 1	147 (19.9)	591 (79.9)	2 (0.3)	740
	Strata 2	440 (29.6)	1,036 (69.6)	13 (0.9)	1,489
	Strata 3	645 (50.6)	624 (49.0)	5 (0.4)	1,274
	Strata 4	899 (87.5)	127 (12.4)	2 (0.2)	1,028
	Total	2,131 (47.0)	2,378 (52.5)	22 (0.5)	4,531
Total	Strata 1	439 (17.8)	2,005 (81.2)	24 (1.0)	2,468
	Strata 2	1,569 (30.0)	3,608 (69.0)	50 (1.0)	5,227
	Strata 3	2,060 (48.7)	2,142 (50.6)	30 (0.7)	4,232
	Strata 4	2,844 (80.0)	681 (19.2)	30 (0.8)	3,555
	Indep.(EN)	141 (45.8)	166 (53.9)	1 (0.3)	308
	Total	7,053 (44.7)	8,602 (54.5)	135 (0.9)	15,790

Table 6: Composition of the student sample (given participation in wave 1)

		Students			Total
		with immigrant background (% of total)	without immigrant background (% of total)	immigrant background unclear (% of total)	
England	Strata 1	59 (13.2)	383 (85.9)	4 (0.9)	446
	Strata 2	342 (33.1)	678 (65.6)	14 (1.4)	1,034
	Strata 3	437 (58.3)	305 (40.7)	8 (1.1)	750
	Strata 4	648 (84.5)	110 (14.3)	9 (1.2)	767
	Indep.	140 (45.6)	166 (54.1)	1 (0.3)	307
	Total	1,626 (49.2)	1,642 (49.7)	36 (1.1)	3,304
Germany	Strata 1	134 (21.3)	492 (78.3)	2 (0.3)	628
	Strata 2	499 (35.4)	909 (64.5)	1 (0.1)	1,409
	Strata 3	556 (55.8)	436 (43.8)	4 (0.4)	996
	Strata 4	885 (79.5)	224 (20.1)	4 (0.4)	1,113
	Total	2,074 (50.0)	2,061 (49.7)	11 (0.3)	4,146
	Netherlands	Strata 1	94 (15.7)	504 (84.3)	0 (0.0)
Strata 2		250 (22.1)	878 (77.8)	1 (0.1)	1,129
Strata 3		386 (34.8)	724 (65.2)	0 (0.0)	1,110
Strata 4		339 (62.3)	204 (37.5)	1 (0.1)	544
Total		1,069 (31.6)	2,310 (68.3)	2 (0.1)	3,381
Sweden		Strata 1	129 (19.7)	525 (80.2)	1 (0.2)
	Strata 2	403 (29.7)	944 (69.7)	8 (0.6)	1,355
	Strata 3	583 (50.3)	576 (49.7)	1 (0.1)	1,160
	Strata 4	824 (87.9)	113 (12.1)	1 (0.1)	938
	Total	1,939 (47.2)	2,158 (52.5)	11 (0.3)	4,108
	Total	Strata 1	416 (17.9)	1,904 (81.8)	7 (0.3)
Strata 2		1,494 (30.3)	3,409 (69.2)	24 (0.5)	4,927
Strata 3		1,962 (48.9)	2,041 (50.8)	13 (0.3)	4,016
Strata 4		2,696 (80.2)	651 (19.4)	15 (0.5)	3,362
Indep.(EN)		140 (45.6)	166 (54.1)	1 (0.3)	307
Total		6,708 (44.9)	8,171 (54.7)	60 (0.4)	14,939

3 Development of the instruments

3.1 Instruments for the student survey

The aim of the student survey of the second wave was a well-balanced mix between questions being already asked in the first wave and new questions, especially in order to capture possible changes in the situation of the students. The student questionnaire of the second wave focusses on three core dimensions of integration: structural, social and cultural integration. Furthermore, this instrument is also designed to measure possible changes in key demographic and migration-specific characteristics of the students, e.g. like possible visits of the sending country of immigrant children etc. Overall, the final student questionnaire consisted in all but one country of two parts (ordered as appeared during the survey): the main student questionnaire (3.1.1) and a sociometric measure to capture the relations in the class context (3.1.2). The Dutch team also repeated the ego-centered network measure of

wave 1 in the second wave, which is described in section (3.1.3), as well as a questionnaire for newcomers distributed to students who did not participate in wave 1 (3.1.4). Students interviewed outside the school context, however, did not answer the classmates questionnaire (except for Dutch students who participated in the long version of the out-school questionnaire).

In order to account for specificities of the circumstances of the interviews as well as the current situation of the students, we used different modes as well as different questionnaire versions (long and short; cf. Table 7), which are described in the following sections.

Table 7: Modes and questionnaire versions

	England	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden
Self-completion in school	X	X	X	X
Telephone long version	X	X		
Telephone short version		X		
Self-completion at home (post)		X	X	
Online long version		X	X	
Online short version		X	X	

3.1.1 Student main questionnaire

The main student questionnaire focusses on several constructs measuring structural, social, and cultural integration, and on the key explanatory and intervening variables. With respect to structural integration, the instrument measures again school characteristics like school grades, tracks, transitions in the educational career, drop-outs, and truancy, but also the financial situation of the students in terms of their economic resources. The social integration inside, but primarily outside the school context, like romantic relations, weak ties, family relations, and participation in clubs etc. are included in the main questionnaire. In addition, some topics regarding cultural integration cover the endowment with cultural capital, the use of cultural practices related to the country of origin as well as to the country of destination, religion and religious activities, language usage, and ethnic identity. A wide range of explanatory and intervening variables are also included in the main questionnaire and partly repeat the measures of the first waves, for example socio-demographic background, return orientations, in-group identification and out-group rejection, general values, normative attitudes, and information about the migration history of the family, to name only a few. For

interviews outside the school context, questions about the respondents' current situation were added in the German and Dutch questionnaires.

Again, as in wave 1, the questionnaire includes many immigrant- and minority-specific topics. In order to avoid sophisticated filter instructions in the self-completion interview simple and sometimes quite general questions were used in the survey that can be answered irrespective of the ethnic and immigration background of the students. Furthermore, whenever filters weren't avoidable, a very simple filter structure with only short and straightforward skips were used, complemented by eye-catching instructions. For telephone and web-survey interviews, respective filters were programmed.

3.1.2 Sociometric instrument

The school and class context is one of the most important contexts for building up friendships and social contacts for adolescents. In order to assess possible changes in the friendship patterns, a shortened version of the sociometric instrument from the first wave was repeated in the second wave for all students being surveyed inside the school-context and therefore complements the social integration measures in the main instrument. The administration of the sociometric instrument was comparable to the procedure of the first wave: Prior to completion of this instrument, a class list with all students and a corresponding and unique ID was disseminated to each student in the class. During the completion of the interview the students simply named the number of the student or students to whom the question applied.

3.1.3 Name generator

An extension of the social integration measures described so far, which focusses on students' social ties in- and outside the school context, is the name generator already used in wave 1. However, this – compared to the first wave: slightly reduced – instrument was only used in the Netherlands in order to assess characteristics of ego-centred networks, where the five best in- and out-school friends could be named (the number of friends was reduced in

the out-school version to four). The other countries had to desist from the repetition of this instrument due to time constraints in the in-school survey.

3.1.4 Newcomer questionnaire

In the Netherlands, a large number of students were expected to participate in wave 2 for the first time due to extensive restructuring of the class composition within schools between after the third grade of secondary school. Therefore, a short instrument was designed for these students in order to gather information about important background information such as household composition and parental social status.

3.2 Adaption and translation of the instruments

As in the first wave of data collection, the student instruments described above were initially developed as English master instruments. Therefore, some questions in the questionnaire again had to be adapted to fit to each country's specificity, e.g. question about the educational system, but also questions dealing with monetary resources where the currency had to be adapted. Furthermore, some country teams included country specific questions that were not asked in all four countries. Together with these adjustments and additional questions, the questionnaires had to be translated into Dutch, German, and Swedish before they were used in the different countries. In order to increase comparability between the waves, the question phrasing of repeated questions were used again in the survey's second wave, despite possible minor changes in cases where it turned out that the old phrasing was problematic. In the following sections, an overview over the country specific questions and adjustments (3.2.1) as well as a description of the translation approach (3.2.2), is provided.

3.2.1 Adaptions and country specific questions

The major adaptations of the international master instrument refer to two topics. On the one hand, some country teams included country specific questions that were only asked in one – or more, but not in all – countries. On the other hand, questions that were designed to be

asked in all – or at least more than one – countries, needed adaptation due to the country specific context the questions referred to.

Country-specific questions that were not asked in all four countries due to national specificities, but also due to specific interest of the national research teams were restricted to the bare minimum in order to achieve an as comprehensive instrument as possible. The Codebook of the second wave (CILS4EU 2016a) documents these country specific questions.

Adaptions that were necessary due to country specificities again mainly deal with the educational system of a country. Here, questions as well as answer categories had to be adapted to suit the specific characteristics of a national educational system (cf. questions about the setting system, educational aspirations, and parental education in the main student questionnaire). Similar adaptations were necessary for answer categories referring to immigrant groups. Here, the largest immigrant groups in each country had to be included in the answer categories. Furthermore, for some questions dealing with economic resources, the currency had to be adapted (cf. questions about money earned from jobs and pocket money in the main student questionnaire).

However, adaptations were not only necessary between different countries, but also within a country. In Germany, some Federal States expressed their concerns regarding specific items to be asked in the in-school surveys. Therefore, it was not possible to ask about third persons in the survey in one Federal State (e.g. no questions about parents in the students' survey). In order to get comparable information, some questions were reformulated. Furthermore, one Federal State objected to questions asking about deviant behaviour, like questions about smoking, drinking, stealing etc. Two batteries dealing with these issues were excluded in the state-specific instruments. In some Federal States, the question on exact birth date was forbidden, and in one Federal State, we were not allowed to ask a question about tutoring outside school.

3.2.2 *Translation of the instruments*

The translation process for new question in the second wave followed again the TRAPD approach in order to increase comparability between the countries, but also between the waves. The acronym captures the five steps Translation, Review, Adjudication, Pre-testing and Documentation (Harkness, 2007). The whole process is based on teamwork between translators, reviewers and an adjudicator for one language from the beginning on.

To ensure a high degree of cross-country comparability of the translated instruments, all countries were provided with detailed guidelines, which had to be followed during the whole translation process. These guidelines were based on previous research indicating typical problems and sources of errors that can occur during the translation process of questionnaires. As recommended by the European Social Survey (ESS) coordinators, TRAPD was preferred as a method to translate the instruments, including again several cognitive interviews. The fundamental ideas behind TRAPD and its implementation in CILS4EU are described in more detail in the Technical Report of the first wave (CILS4EU 2016c).

4 **Fieldwork**

4.1 **Students' survey**

4.1.1 *In-school*

The in-school fieldwork followed again the guidelines from the first wave's survey manual, after its adjustment to meet the new requirements with respect to reduced survey time and after the adjustment from four to one (in the Netherlands: two) student instruments.

The in-school fieldwork was conducted by Statistics Sweden in Sweden between February 2012 and June 2012, by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) in England during October 2011 and July 2012 and by the IEA Data Processing Center in Germany during October and December 2011. Again, and comparable to wave 1, the Dutch team conducted the survey on their own between October 2011 and April 2012, using student

assistants to administer the survey. Regardless who conducted the survey, the test administrators that were responsible for the administration of the survey were trained extensively in order to ensure a smooth procedure. The test administrator was responsible for disseminating the materials to the students, leading them through the questionnaires and finally collecting the completed survey parts and sending them back to the national research centers. In order to ensure that the different instruments were completed by the respective students and to allow linking information of wave 1 and 2, all instruments were identified with a unique ID, which was linked to the specific student on a class list.

The whole survey was planned to maximally last 40 minutes (plus 5 additional minutes for the name generator in the Netherlands). Table 8 provides an overview over the time allowed for the different modules. Not shown here are additional times needed to disseminate, control and collect the material before and after the test session.

Table 8: Time frame for different CILS4EU student instruments

Instrument (in the order the instruments were administered)	Length
Student questionnaire	25+ minutes
Sociometric questionnaire	10+ minutes
Name generator (NL only)	5+ minutes

For the administration of the sociometric instrument, there were some differences between but also within the countries with respect to the inclusion of names of absent students on the class list. In some countries, all students were included on the class list, irrespective of whether they were absent or not, while in other countries this procedure was more ambiguous. The sociometric fieldwork report of the second wave provides information on how the sociometric survey was implemented in all countries (cf. Kruse et al. 2015).

As the incentives in the first wave in Germany were mainly used to overcome possible problems of the active consent needed by the parents, the country team desisted from using incentives in the second wave in-school survey.

4.1.2 *Outside the school context*

In England, students not attending the schools from the first wave any more or being absent at the day of the class session were contacted by phone to invite them to participate in the survey. Also, students from five schools refusing to participate in the second wave were contacted via phone to complete the survey. These five schools were selected according to their immigrant proportion, i.e. students from schools with middle to high immigrant proportions were primarily selected. The reason for only contacting students from five schools was financial restrictions. The out-school survey took place from February to July 2012.

In Germany, students enrolled in schools refusing to participate or students having left school or being absent at the day of the survey were contacted outside the school context via telephone, postal and web surveys. The telephone surveys were conducted at the telephone laboratory of the Mannheim Centre for European Social Research (MZES) at the University of Mannheim between January and June 2012 with the help of student assistants. Students which could not be reached by telephone or students without a valid telephone number, but with a valid email and/or home address were invited to take part in a postal/web survey combination. The invitations were sent out from Mid May 2012 onwards, followed by two reminders at intervals of two to three weeks if necessary.

In the Netherlands, two schools did no longer wish to participate in the second wave and their students were approached individually by email and post from April to May 2012, with three reminders being set out in a three week interval. Due to financial constraints, students from this subpopulation received no incentive. Students being absent at the school survey received a questionnaire via their school. In addition to approaching students from refusing schools, (former) students from participating schools who dropped out of the classes under study were individually approached by email from June to September 2012. These students were offered a 5 euro incentive and were reminded twice. The sociometric part of the questionnaire was excluded for dropped out students, as they were no longer in the classes under study and their current class composition was unknown.

References

- CILS4EU 2016a. **Children of immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. Codebook. Wave 2 – 2011/2012**, v.2.3.0. Mannheim: Mannheim University.
- CILS4EU 2016b. **Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. A short note on the CILS4EU outside-sample cases. Wave 2 – 2011/2012**, v2.3.0. Mannheim: Mannheim University.
- CILS4EU 2016c. **Children of immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. Technical Report. Wave 1 – 2010/2011**. v.1.2.0, Mannheim, University of Mannheim.
- Dollmann, J., Jacob, K., and Kalter, F. 2014. **Examining the Diversity of Youth in Europe. A Classification of Generations and Ethnic Origins Using CILS4EU Data (Technical Report)**. MZES Working Paper 156. Mannheim: University of Mannheim. <http://www.mzes.uni-mannheim.de/publications/wp/wp-156.pdf>
- Dollmann, J. and Jacob, K. 2015. **Examining the Diversity of Youth in Europe. A Classification of Generations and Ethnic Origins Using CILS4EU Data. A Wave 2-Update**, v2.0.0. Mannheim: University of Mannheim. Available at <http://cils4.eu>
- Harkness, J. 2007. **ESS: Round 3 Translation Guidelines**, ESS Docs. <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org>.
- Kruse, H., Weißmann, M., and Jacob, K. 2016. **Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. Sociometric Fieldwork Report. Wave 2 – 2011/2012**, v2.3.0. Mannheim: Mannheim University.