Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey
in Four European Countries
CILS4EU

A short note on the CILS4EU outside-sample cases
Wave 3 – 2012/2013

Version: 3.3.0
Year: 2017

Contents

Introduction

This report aims at providing information on students that were interviewed in the wave 3 of the "Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries" (CILS4EU) that were not part of the target population as defined in the Technical Report of the third wave (CILS4EU 2017; for the data see: Kalter et al. 2017a; Kalter et al. 2017b). These non-sampled respondents stem from three sources:

(1) Students who visited a school that participated in the first wave although the school was not sampled in the first wave (in the Netherlands only; cf. Smith et al. 2013).

(2) Students who are not part of the sample themselves but who are classmates of a sampled student in wave 2 (because they entered a sampled class after wave 1 was conducted (applies to all countries) or because a sampled student changed to their classroom (in the Netherlands only)).

(3) Students who are not part of the sample themselves but who are classmates of a sampled student in wave 3 (because they entered a sampled class after wave 2 was conducted or because a sampled student changed to their classroom (in the in-school surveys in the Netherlands only)).

Two variables in the data sets give information on why the respondent is defined as an outside-sample case. The variable y3_sampledw1 is coded (1) if the respondent was already part of the class in the first wave, but visited a school that was not sampled and (0) otherwise. The second variable outside informs whether the school was sampled in the first wave (0) or not (1). Note that for some students both exclusion criteria apply, thus, these students enter classes in schools that were not sampled during the first wave.

Composition of the sample

Table 1 shows the number of outside-sample cases in each country, separately for the different strata.

As can be seen, most of the outside-sample cases are Dutch cases (1,605 out of 1,898). This is due to a pronounced restructuring of the class composition between the first and second wave, as well as between the second and third wave, in which the whole class was surveyed with at least one student of the wave 1 sample. In England and Sweden, only individual newcomers in sampled classes were surveyed who entered the class context in between the first and the second wave. In total, 1,898 students were interviewed that are not sampled (15%).

Table 1: Sample sizes in wave 2 (regular and outside sample)

		Achieved sample sizes (% in brackets)		
		Regular sample	Outside sample	Total
England	Strata 1	309 (15.3)	28 (17.3)	337 (15.5)
	Strata 2	708 (35.1)	46 (28.4)	754 (34.6)
	Strata 3	523 (25.9)	56 (34.6)	579 (26.5)
	Strata 4	479 (23.7)	32 (19.8)	511 (23.4)
	Total (State)	2,019	162	2,181
	Indep.	208 (9.3)	5 (3.0)	213 (8.9)
	Total (All)	2,227	167	2,394
Germany	Strata 1	562 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	562 (16.7)
	Strata 2	1,191 (35.4)	0 (0.0)	1,191 (35.4)
	Strata 3	769 (22.9)	0 (0.0)	769 (22.9)
	Strata 4	844 (25.1)	0 (0.0)	844 (25.1)
	Total	3,366	0 (0.0)	3,366
Netherlands	Strata 1	515 (20.3)	465 (30.3)	980 (24.0)
	Strata 2	903 (35.5)	590 (38.5)	1,493 (36.6)
	Strata 3	796 (31.3)	288 (18.8)	1,084 (26.6)
	Strata 4	329 (12.9)	190 (12.4)	519 (12.7)
	Total (Known)	2,543	1,533	4,076
	Unknown	0 (0.0)	72 (4.5)	72 (1.7)
	Total (All)	2,543	1,605	4,148
Sweden	Strata 1	403 (15.5)	11 (8.7)	414 (15.2)
	Strata 2	833 (32.0)	20 (15.9)	853 (31.3)
	Strata 3	738 (28.4)	31 (24.6)	769 (28.2)
	Strata 4	628 (24.1)	64 (50.8)	692 (25.4)
	Total	2,602	126	2,728
Total	Strata 1	1,789 (17.0)	504 (27.7)	2,293 (18.6)
	Strata 2	3,635 (34.5)	656 (36.0)	4,291 (34.7)
	Strata 3	2,826 (26.8)	375 (20.6)	3,201 (25.9)
	Strata 4	2,280 (21.7)	286 (15.7)	2,566 (20.8)
	Total (State/Known)	10,530	1,821	12,351
	Indep. (EN)	208 (1.9)	5 (0.3)	213 (1.7)
	Unknown (NL)	0 (0.0)	72 (3.8)	72 (0.6)
	Total	10,738	1,898	12,636

Table 2 shows the composition of the outside sample with respect to immigrant status (Dollmann et al. 2014). Germany is excluded from the table because no outside-sample cases were interviewed. In general, the number of immigrants is slightly lower in the outside sample compared to the regular sample (see Table 5 in the Technical Report) with 9.5 per cent less immigrants (43.1% vs. 33.6%).

Table 2: Composition of the outside sample

		Students			
		with immigrant background (% of total)	without immigrant background (% of total)	immigrant background unclear (% of total)	Total
England	Strata 1	3 (10.7)	23 (82.1)	2 (7.1)	28
	Strata 2	13 (28.3)	31 (67.4)	2 (4.4)	46
	Strata 3	20 (35.7)	32 (57.1)	4 (7.1)	56
	Strata 4	22 (68.8)	8 (25.0)	2 (6.3)	32
	Indep.	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	5
	Total	61 (36.5)	96 (57.5)	10 (6.0)	167
Netherlands	Strata 1	66 (14.2)	362 (77.9)	37 (8.0)	465
	Strata 2	147 (24.9)	357 (60.5)	86 (14.6)	590
	Strata 3	115 (39.9)	148 (51.4)	25 (8.7)	288
	Strata 4	111 (58.4)	66 (34.7)	13 (6.8)	190
	Unknown	47 (65.3)	25 (34.7)	0 (0.0)	72
	Total	486 (30.3)	958 (59.7)	161 (10.0)	1,605
Sweden	Strata 1	5 (45.5)	6 (54.6)	0 (0.0)	11
	Strata 2	12 (60.0)	8 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	20
	Strata 3	20 (64.5)	11 (35.5)	0 (0.0)	31
	Strata 4	54 (84.4)	9 (14.1)	1 (1.6)	64
	Total	91 (72.2)	34 (27.0)	1 (0.8)	126
Total	Strata 1	74 (14.7)	391 (77.6)	39 (7.7)	504
	Strata 2	172 (26.2)	396 (60.4)	88 (13.4)	656
	Strata 3	155 (41.3)	191 (50.9)	29 (7.7)	375
	Strata 4	187 (65.4)	83 (29.0)	16 (5.6)	286
	Indep.(EN)	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	5
	Unknown (NL)	47 (65.3)	25 (34.7)	0 (0.0)	72
	Total	638 (33.6)	1,088 (57.3)	172 (9.1)	1,898

Data access

The outside sample cases are stored separately from the regular sample and are only available in the Secure Data Center of GESIS in Cologne. In contrast to the inside sample cases, they are stored as data sets combining all four CILS4EU countries for the different questionnaire parts (youth main and youth friends; youth classmates only for the Netherlands).

Advice on using the data

As the outside sample cases of wave 3 are not a random sample and respondents may be likely to differ from respondents of the regular sample, the advice from Smith et al. (2013) about the problems and possible pitfalls when using the outside sample cases of wave 1 still holds also when using the outside sample cases of wave 3 – even more than in the previous waves (CILS4EU 2016). We strongly recommend not using the outside sample when the aim is to make generalizable statements. If the outside sample is used in order to increase the power of non-generalizable analyses, we strongly recommend to run separate analyses with the inside sample as well as with the combined inside and outside sample and to compare the results carefully. In any case, whenever the outside sample cases are used for analyses, the researcher should report that the outside sample is used and how this sample is a non-random convenience sample. Furthermore, we strongly recommend reporting descriptive as well as multivariate results of the analyses for the inside sample cases and the combined (inside and outside) sample cases separately in order to make possible differences between the subsamples clear.

Besides increasing statistical power due to larger sample sizes, the outside sample may be of another use. As the outside sample captures newcomers in participating schools and classes, panel participants of wave 3 (the ones stored in the regular data versions; Kalter et al. 2017a; Kalter et al. 2017b) may have nominated some of the outside sample cases in the sociometric instrument. Therefore, the outside sample data may be of use to merge additional information when analyzing the sociometric data of CILS4EU (cf. also Kruse et al. 2016).

References

CILS4EU (2017). Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. Technical Report. Wave 3 – 2012/2013, v3.3.0. Mannheim: Mannheim University.

CILS4EU (2016). 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.

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.

Kalter, F., Heath, A. F., Hewstone, M., Jonsson, J. O., Kalmijn, M., Kogan, I. and Tubergen, F. v. (2017a). Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries (CILS4EU) – Full Version. Data file for on-site use. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne, ZA5353 Data file Version 3.3.0, doi:10.4232/cils4eu.5353.3.3.0.

Kalter, F., Heath, A. F., Hewstone, M., Jonsson, J. O., Kalmijn, M., Kogan, I. and Tubergen, F. v. (2017b). Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries (CILS4EU) – Reduced version. Reduced data file for download and off-site use. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne, ZA5656 Data file Version 3.3.0, doi:10.4232/cils4eu.5656.3.3.0.

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.

Smith, S., Jaspers, E., Van Zantvliet, P. and Geven, S. (2013). Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. Technical Report Dutch Non-Sampled Students. Wave 1 – 2010/2011, v1.0.0. Utrecht: Utrecht University.