Kerstin Ruckdeschel, Andreas Ette, Gert Hullen and Ingo Leven

Generations and Gender Survey

Documentation of the first wave in Germany

Supplement to Heft 121a ISSN 0178-918X



Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung 65180 Wiesbaden

Contact details of authors:

Kerstin Ruckdeschel Andreas Ette Federal Institute for Population Research Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 4 65185 Wiesbaden Germany

E-Mail: kerstin.ruckdeschel@destatis.de andreas.ette@destatis.de

http://www.bib-demographie.de

Ingo Leven TNS Infratest Sozialforschung Landsberger Str. 338 80687 München Germany E-Mail: ingo.leven@tns-infratest.com

http://www.tns-infratest.com

Translated by Neil Mussett

Preface

The Generations and Gender Survey (GGS) is an internationally comparative project coordinated by the Population Activity Unit of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) in Geneva. The GGS is a panel survey of a nationally representative sample of 18-79 year-old resident population in each participating country with at least three panel waves and an interval of three years between each wave.

In Germany, the first wave of the GGS has been conducted in 2005 by the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB). The publication provides the international scientific community with English-speaking information about the methodological approach of the German GGS. It is a translation of three parts of the documentation of the survey originally published in German only. For users of the harmonized German GGS data-file it includes additional information about the sampling, field work, weighting and data cleaning procedures. Questions concerning additional aspects of survey methodology and field work please contact the colleagues working in the German Federal Institute for Population Research.

1 Survey method

This method report refers to the representative survey carried out in Germany in 2005 by TNS Infratest Sozialforschung on the topic of "Generations and Gender" (Generations and Gender Survey "GGS"). It was commissioned by the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB) in Wiesbaden.

The report documents the fieldwork from methodical points of view, from sampling through to weighting.

The questionnaire (please refer to the original German documentation from BiB and the Core Questionaire from UNECE/PAU) was implemented in the form of an oral, person-to-person survey in accordance with the GGS call for tender. This was carried out with the aid of computers as a CAPI questionnaire (Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing). Computer support was used in order to have the complex filtering running in the background more or less "noiselessly" for the respondent and the interviewer. The computer-aided questionnaire program was subjected to detailed testing by the BiB and TNS Infratest Sozialforschung in the run-up to the main survey and scrutinised in a pretest with 115 respondents.

The questionnaire therefore covers a total of eleven areas between which it is possible to make a distinction, some of which had complex, difficult topics, such as:

- family relationships and social networks (household),
- partner biography,
- own children and partner's children in and outside own household, and
- attitudes towards partnership, family, desired fertility and society.

The survey was carried out in the shape of person-to-person, oral CAPI interviews in the period from the end of February to mid-May 2005 by experienced interviewers of the TNS Infratest interviewer staff. The interviewers were instructed using written training material encompassing both the nature of the selection procedure and the requirements for questioning the respective respondents.

For the implementation of the computer-aided question program, the interviewers had at their disposal books containing lists which the respondents were able to use as visual support for the respective scales or answers.

2 Sampling and field work

The population of the German GGS is formed by German-speaking persons aged between 18 and 79 living in private households in Germany. This included all persons of the residential population of Germany who were linguistically able to follow the interview, regardless of their nationality or ethnic origin.

The sample was taken on the basis of a random route survey according to the ADM design. The selection units of the first stage of sampling are the so-called sample points. Here, we take as a basis the update of the ADM selection basis (new ADM model), which became available very recently and

takes as a basis the current territorial state, as well as the population as per 31 December 2002, and hence replaces the master sample as per 1994/95.

In the first selection stage, all municipalities of the survey territory are divided into layers by regional criteria. The following are used as layering characteristics

- Federal *Länder*,
- administrative districts, and
- BIK municipality types.¹

The selection units of the first selection stage (sample points) are sub-divided proportionately to the number of households in the layers (cells) in such a manner that the respective outliers of the layering characteristics also optimally illustrate the household distributions of the corresponding margin categories. For the first selection stage, the Federal Republic of Germany is sub-divided using the local, statistical districts and with the aid of a geographical information system (GIS) to sub-divide streets into roughly 53,000 areas (new ADM model as per 31 December 2002). These areas or sample points form the selection units of the first selection stage, and hence constitute the new ADM master sample. With probabilities proportionate to the number of households in the sample points, the required number of points was sampled in each cell. An additional layering effect emerges from the sorting of the selection units by districts, municipalities and where appropriate by urban districts within each cell. The sample points defined by these means are exclusively at the disposal of the ADM member institutes in the form of the so-called ADM sample networks.

A total of 1,475 sample points were selected in this first step, 1,173 of which were in the old Federal *Länder* and 302 in the new Federal *Länder*.

In the second selection stage, the household addresses needed for the sample were collected by random selection. The interviewers deployed are set a starting address which can be defined per sample point. Using a precisely-defined route, the interviewers are obliged to contact one target household in three and to carry out an interview if a respondent from the defined population has his/her first place of residence there. If several persons live in the household belonging to the population, the interviewer identifies the respondents who are to be asked on a strictly random basis in

3 = 100,000 up to 500,000 inhabitants (structural types 2,3,4)

- 5 = 50,000 up to 100,000 inhabitants (structural types 2,3,4)
- 6 = 20,000 up to 50,000 inhabitants
- 7 = 5,000 up to 20,000 inhabitants
- 8 = 2,000 up to 5,000 inhabitants
- 9 = under 2,000 inhabitants
- Structural type 1 core area of the BIK region
- Structural type 2 compression region of the BIK region
- Structural type 3 transitional area of the BIK region
- Structural type 4 peripheral area

Municipality type (corresponding to the BIK regions):

^{0 = 500,000} and more inhabitants (structural type 1)

^{1 = 500,000} and more inhabitants (structural types 2,3,4)

^{2 = 100,000} up to 500,000 inhabitants (structural type 1)

^{4 = 50,000} up to 100,000 inhabitants (structural type 1)

The attribution of the size relates to the number of inhabitants of the BIK region in question. When it comes to municipalities outside these regions, the attribution takes place according to the political municipality size class.

a third selection stage. This takes place with the aid of a systematic selection key (Kish selection grid) which guarantees to all persons of the population belonging to the household the same chance of getting into the sample, and clearly identifies the respondent. Any subjective influence on the part of the interviewer on the selection of the respondent is hence ruled out.

The field work was implemented in four waves (sample points were dispatched to interviewers at four different times). Table 1 below summarises the most important results in the implementation of the field work.

	Interviews carried out	No. of points	Interviews per point	No. of interviewers
Wave 1	2,728	400	6.8	384
Wave 2	2,756	400	6.9	369
Wave 3	2,685	400	6.7	375
Wave 4	1,848	275	6.7	269
Total	10,017	1,475	6.8	528

Tab. 1:Results per processing wave

The survey was carried out in the period from 22 February to 12 May 2005. A total of 528 interviewers were deployed. It was possible to carry out 10,017 useable interviews, of which 7,760 were in the old and 2,257 in the new Federal *Länder*.

	in minutes
Mean value	57
Median	53
Minimum	27
Maximum	164
25% percentile	42
75% percentile	66

Tab. 2: Duration of the interviews

Mean v	alue	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Household size				
1-person household	52	48	27	120
2-person household	57	53	30	148
Household with more than 2 persons	60	55	29	164
No. of previous partnerships				
No partnership	49	46	27	145
1 partnership	57	53	28	142
More than 2 partnerships	63	59	30	164

Tab. 3: Duration of the interviews by household size and number of partnerships

The duration of the interviews varied quite a lot in the GGS. The mean value was 57 minutes according to Table 2. By virtue of the fact that the median is below the mean value, this mean value is increased by individual interviews tending to take longer. Very few interviews took less than half an hour. Since all interviews which took fewer than 35 minutes were checked and are only accepted as valid interviews if the respondent confirmed that the interview had been carried out correctly, these rare short interviews are to be accepted as a fact.

Table 3 provides an approximate explanation of the variation of the length of the interviews. Short interviews took place above all in case of people with a short partner biography in small household units. Long interviews, by contrast, tend to signify large households in which the respondent had a longer partner biography.

It was not always possible to completely exhaust the prescribed points, meaning that an interview did not always take place in each household. Table 4 provides an overview of the exhaustion and the frequency of the individual reasons for failure. In order to be able to evaluate the relatively high degree of exhaustion of 55.3 %, it is vital to consider not only this absolute value, but above all to look at the interviews which took place in order to determine their sociodemographic structure in comparison with the target structures of the official statistics (cf. section 2.1).

Tab. 4: Exhaustion

Sample points	1,475	
Addresses per point	14	
Gross estimate	20,650	
No person in the target group	1,320	6.4%
Other sample-neutral failures	1,207	5.8 %
Remaining sample gross	18,123	100 %
No one found in the household	1,948	10.7 %
Respondent not at home	487	2.7 %
Respondent away / on holiday	69	0.4 %
Respondent ill / incapacitated	218	1.2 %
Respondent has no time	2,156	11.9 %
Respondent unwilling, other reason	2,829	15.6 %
Linguistic difficulties	223	1.2 %
Respondent does not answer on any social topics	149	0.8 %
Total failures	8,079	44.6 %
Interviews carried out	10,044	55.4 %
Arrived too late	6	0.0 %
Not useable	21	0.1 %
Evaluated interviews	10,017	55.3 %

2.1 Validation of the net sample using official statistics

Validation entails a comparison of the characteristic distribution in the sample with reference statistics of which it is presumed that they correctly portray the population. Such a comparison should take account of whether effects exerted by different question and measurement concepts on the distribution of the characteristics can be largely ruled out with the characteristics in both data sources. As far as the results of the official statistics are consulted as a reference, this condition is only met as a rule for a small number of characteristics of the social structure. Taking account of previous publications regarding the topic of the net validation of population samples,² the following sociodemographic characteristics form the subject of the assessment:

- sex and age,
- schooling,
- household size, and
- municipality size class.

The comparison with the official statistics takes place for this method report with the data of the microcensus 2004. Tables 5 to 7 show that the sample in the sociodemographic marginal distributions corresponds in a very good measure to the marginal distributions of the official statistics.

The greatest deviation exists in the old Federal *Länder* in relation to the respondents' educational level. Whilst in the unweighted sample only slightly more than 40% of respondents stated that they had received a low level of schooling, this share in the total population in this age group is somewhat more than 50%. This shows that above all respondents with a higher level of schooling tended to be more willing to participate in the GGS.

A similar picture also emerges when it comes to the household size. In this case, it is largely respondents from one-person households which occur less frequently in the actual sample of the GGS in comparison to the overall population³. There are only minor differences between the old and the new Federal *Länder* in this respect. 27.5% of the sample in the new Federal *Länder* live in one-person households, whilst it is 36.5% according to the official statistics (old Federal *Länder*: 24.5% as against 37.1%). This shortfall could easily be corrected by weighting (cf. section 2.4), so that the weighted data here are also representative of the population.

Related to the age distribution and the municipality size class, it can be ascertained that large parts of the sample already portray the structures from the official statistics very accurately prior to the weighting.

 ² Schneekloth, Ulrich; Leven, Ingo (2003): Woran bemisst sich eine "gute" allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage? In: ZUMA-Nachrichten, 53, pp. 16-57

³ The question of the causes of this general under-coverage is certainly unresolved. Our experience points to a not insignificant reason lying in the diverging definition of "household". For instance, shared accommodation was frequently subdivided by definition in the microcensus into individual one-person households, whilst interviewers working for survey institutes do not make this sub-division, and regard these as multiple-person households.

		Sample St	tructure by weighting	Target structure (population extrapolation 2003)
West / male				<u>,</u>
18 to 2	4 years	5.1 %	5.3 %	5.1 %
25 to 3	4 years	6.3 %	8.4 %	8.4 %
35 to 4	4 years	10.0 %	11.4 %	11.4 %
45 to 5	4 years	8.2 %	8.9 %	8.9 %
55 to 6	4 years	8.0 %	7.7 %	7.7 %
65 to 7	9 years	9.0 %	7.8 %	7.9 %
Total		46.7 %	49.4 %	49.4 %
West / female				
18 to 2	4 years	4.9 %	5.1 %	5.1 %
25 to 3	4 years	8.8 %	8.2 %	8.2 %
35 to 4	4 years	13.2 %	10.9 %	10.9 %
45 to 5	4 years	10.1 %	8.9 %	8.9 %
55 to 6	4 years	7.2 %	7.8 %	7.8 %
65 to 7	9 years	9.1 %	9.7 %	9.8 %
Total		53.3 %	50.6 %	50.6 %
East / male				
18 to 2	4 years	5.3 %	6.4 %	6.2 %
25 to 3	4 years	5.5 %	7.7 %	7.8 %
35 to 4	4 years	8.1 %	10.9 %	10.7 %
45 to 5	4 years	8.0 %	9.4 %	9.6 %
55 to 6	4 years	7.9 %	7.6 %	7.6 %
65 to 7	9 years	8.8 %	7.8 %	7.9 %
Total		43.5 %	49.8 %	49.8 %
East / female				
18 to 2	4 years	5.8 %	5.5 %	5.5 %
25 to 3	4 years	7.9 %	6.8 %	6.8 %
35 to 4	4 years	11.3 %	10.0 %	10.0 %
45 to 5	4 years	11.6 %	9.4 %	9.3 %
55 to 6	4 years	9.1 %	8.0 %	8.0 %
65 to 7	9 years	10.8 %	10.4 %	10.6 %
Total		56.5 %	50.2 %	50.2 %

Tab. 5: Comparison of the net sample with official statistics: sex and age separated by Western and Eastern Germany

	Sample	Structure by weighting	Target structure (population extrapolation 2003)
Education / West			
Still pupils	1.5 %	1.7 %	1.5 %
Low	40.2 %	51.9 %	51.9 %
Medium	30.3 %	22.6 %	23.2 %
High	28.0 %	23.8 %	23.3 %
Education / East			
Still pupils	0.7 %	1.1 %	1.9 %
Low	28.4 %	31.1 %	30.7 %
Medium	48.4 %	47.1 %	47.7 %
High	22.5 %	20.8 %	19.7 %
Household size / West		Here: household weighting	
1-person household	24.5 %	37.1 %	37.2 %
2-person household	33.7 %	33.5 %	33.5 %
Household with more than two persons	41.5 %	29.4 %	29.4 %
Household size / East		Here: household weighting	
1-person household	27.5 %	36.5 %	36.5 %
2-person household	38.9 %	35.3 %	35.3 %
Household with more than two persons	33.6 %	28.2 %	28.2 %

Tab. 6: Comparison of the net sample with official statistics: Education and household size separated by Western and Eastern Germany

	Sample	Structure by weighting	Target structure (population extrapolation 2003)
BIK / West (No. of inhabitants)			
Core area 500,000+	28.9 %	26.1 %	24.2 %
Margin area 500,000+	8.2 %	8.6 %	9.1 %
Core area 100,000 - 499,999	18.0 %	17.0 %	16.3 %
Margin area 100,000 - 499,999	15.7 %	16.7 %	17.5 %
Core area 50,000 - 99,999	1.9 %	1.8 %	1.8 %
Margin area 50,000 - 99,999	6.8 %	6.9 %	7.3 %
20,000 - 49,999	9.6 %	10.8 %	11.1 %
5,000 - 9,999	7.4 %	7.9 %	8.3 %
2,000 - 4,999	1.9 %	2.4 %	2.5 %
to 1,999	1.7 %	1.6 %	1.8 %
BIK / East (No. of inhabitants)			
Core area 500,000+	16.9 %	16.9 %	16.6 %
Margin area 500,000+	6.6 %	7.0 %	6.8 %
Core area 100,000 - 499,999	15.7 %	14.1 %	14.0 %
Margin area 100,000 - 499,999	11.0 %	11.0 %	10.7 %
Core area 50,000 - 99,999	5.0 %	4.5 %	4.7 %
Margin area 50,000 - 99,999	12.0 %	11.8 %	13.0 %
20,000 - 49,999	16.5 %	15.8 %	15.3 %
5,000 - 9,999	8.6 %	9.0 %	9.0 %
2,000 - 4,999	4.1 %	5.4 %	5.4 %
to 1,999	3.5 %	4.3 %	4.4 %

 Tab. 7:
 Comparison of the net sample with official statistics: municipality size class (BIK) separated by Western and Eastern Germany

Compared with other surveys in Germany⁴, the deviations with the GGS are within the under-coverage of specific parts of the population observable elsewhere.

⁴ The publication by Achim Koch should be explicitly indicated at this point as pioneering work in Germany: Koch, Achim (1998): Wenn "mehr" nicht gleichbedeutend mit "besser" ist: Ausschöpfungsquoten und Stichprobenverzerrungen in Allgemeinen Bevölkerungsumfragen. In: ZUMA-Nachrichten 42, pp. 66-90

2.2 Deployment of interviewers and results of interviewer monitoring

A total of 528 interviewers were deployed. Table 8 reflects the sociodemographic distribution of these interviewers and the number of interviews per interviewer.

It is noticeable that the average of roughly 19 interviews per interviewer varies greatly from one interviewer to another. Nine interviewers tried in vain to complete any interviews, whilst one interviewer carried out the maximum of 180 interviews.

It is noticeable with regard to the sociodemographic information that the share of male interviewers, at 53%, is slightly increased. The age distribution makes it clear that the interviewers are older as a rule; for instance almost two-thirds of the interviewers deployed are 50 and older. As to the level of schooling attained, the interviewers have better schooling in comparison to the population of the same age. All in all, it must be stated in looking at these distributions that the deviations are not marked in comparison with the overall population.

Interviewer monitoring is standard in the projects of TNS Infratest. 2,931 GGS interviews from 587 sample points were subjected to basic written checks, having been carried out by 353 interviewers. There were 1,616 responses (55%) to this written quality control process. 1,322 interviews were confirmed here as having been carried out correctly. 244 interviews showed shortcomings in returns at first sight; 171 control cards came back as undeliverable. It was possible to clarify 160 cases; 21 interviews were removed from the evaluation as "not useable", and both the interviewers concerned were dismissed. With the cases that had been clarified as positive, the address database was updated. 66 interviews were reported "as not having been implemented with a laptop". In all cases, clarification carried out by central interviewer monitoring at TNS Infratest by enquiring of the respondent revealed that the interviews had been carried out correctly. Positive clarification was also achieved with the seven interviews where other household members had jumped to the premature conclusion in response to the quality control query that the interviews had not taken place.

	5 00	
No. of interviewers deployed	528	
No. of interviews carried out		
0 interviews	9	
up to 5 interviews	158	
6 to 10 interviews	117	
11 to 20 interviews	93	
21 to 30 interviews	61	
31 to 40 interviews	34	
41 to 50 interviews	15	
51 to 75 interviews	19	
more than 75 interviews	22	
Sex of the interviewers		
Male	280	53.0 %
Female	248	47.0 %
Age of the interviewers		
up to 30 years	16	3.0 %
30 up to 40 years	53	10.0 %
40 up to 50 years	116	22.0 %
50 up to 60 years	190	36.0 %
60 years and older	153	29.0 %
Education of the interviewers		
Primary school	97	18.4 %
Intermediate school	233	44.1 %
High school graduation	198	37.5 %

Tab. 8: Information on the interviewers deployed: No. of interviews carried out, sex, age and education

2.3 Data check

No subsequent intensive plausibility check or correction of the datasets was carried out in the GGS at the beginning. Instead, the possibility was used to integrate plausibility checks during the interview in the framework of the computer-aided survey. This covered above all data on years in the interview. The plausibility checks are documented in section 3 of the method report.

It was revealed here that, despite these plausibility checks, information relating to years was provided in the interview which was outside the values that had been anticipated. These plausibility checks were implemented in technical terms by a query screen appearing when values occurred outside the values anticipated and the interviewer enquiring once more of the respondent as to whether both responses were correct. It was possible here to correct the respective incorrect information or to confirm that the information was correct. After all, these values constitute information that has been confirmed twice by the respondents.

The data were subjected to an intensive examination by the client, and implausible information (especially with regard to the birth years of respondents' biological children and parents) was subsequently subjected to an attempt at a correction, largely using additional information that was already available, inter alia on the selection of respondents in the household. The correct approach in large numbers of cases turned out to be to include the alleged year information provided in the interview as age information since the two became mixed up in the interview. This ultimately led to a dataset which was as plausible as possible in this respect.

2.4 Weighting

An interview was not carried out in all of the households approached by the interviewers. These failures may be distribute disproportionately to the population, and hence cause distortions to the sample. Such distortions were compensated for by consecutive factor weightings in the same way as the selection chance for the respondent depending on the household size (so-called design weighting).

In a first step, the household sample was weighted, both by Federal *Länder* and municipality size classes (BIK), and by household size. This level corrects deviations from the original sample approach proportionate to the household.

After this initial step, the random route procedure by ADM design leads to a household representative sample, each household having had the same chance to become selected.

In each of the households selected, a systematic procedure (Kish selection grid) is used to produce equal selection chances within a household, only one person being determined as the respondent, regardless of how many persons belonging to the population lived in the household in question.

The chances for the persons living in private households to be selected as respondents were accordingly inversely proportionate to the number of persons belonging to the population in their households.

In order to receive a representative sample of persons, the actual sample was subsequently mathematically re-shaped in such a way that each person in the population received an equal chance of being selected in terms of sampling theory.

The overall sample was now adjusted to the target structures of the characteristics Federal *Land*, age groups, sex and education known from the official statistics. The current population extrapolation of the Federal Statistical Office (2003) served as a data basis for the characteristics Federal *Land*, age groups and sex. The information from the 2003 Microcensus served as reference statistics for the margin weighting by East/West, age groups and education.

In a final weighting level, the additional qualitative improvements achieved by the person weighting in the sample were projected back to the household sample, so that evaluations of household characteristics now also show the same degree of representation as person-weighted ones.

2.5 Willingness to be asked again

A central element of the GGS method is repeat questioning of the net sample in three to four years. For this to take place, however, the respondents have to be willing to make themselves available.

As can be derived from Table 9, a total of more than 60% of respondents declared their willingness to participate in repeat questioning on this topic. The differences between the old and new Federal *Länder* are virtually negligible in this respect. It is noticeable in the comparison between weighted and unweighted numbers that the share of persons willing to be asked again falls slightly after weighting.

Shares of persons willing to be asked again	unweighted	weighted	
Western Germany			
Yes	64.1 %	63.4 %	
No	35.9 %	36.6 %	
Eastern Germany			
Yes	63.1 %	62.6 %	
No	36.9 %	37.4 %	
Total			
Yes	63.9 %	63.2 %	
No	36.1 %	36.8 %	

Tab. 9: Shares of persons willing to be asked again, sub-divided into East and West

In order to analyse why the share of those who are willing to be asked again "reduces" when the data are weighted, it seems sensible to take a look at the distribution of those who are willing to be asked again with regard to the sociodemographic background variables which were already considered in the net validation of the sample (cf. section 1.1). Tables 10 to 12 make it clear that willingness to be asked again is lower particularly among the elderly, among those with a lower level of education and in one-person households. This also explains the fact that the unweighted share of those willing to be asked again is somewhat higher than the weighted share since the respondents who in any case were slightly overrepresented in the sample are also somewhat more willing to be asked again. This is however at a very low level all in all, and does not make the GGS any less interesting since it is above all the younger respondents, who are more interesting in terms of their reproduction conduct, who are willing to be asked again, and particularly their development after three years in the panel is more interesting.

	Sub-sample of those willing to be asked again	Total sample (unweighted)	Target structure (population extrapolation 2003)
West / male			• · · · ·
18 to 24 years	4.8 %	5.1 %	5.1 %
25 to 34 years	6.0 %	6.3 %	8.4 %
35 to 44 years	10.4 %	10.0 %	11.4 %
45 to 54 years	8.5 %	8.2 %	8.9 %
55 to 64 years	8.4 %	8.0 %	7.7 %
65 to 79 years	8.9 %	9.0 %	7.9 %
Total	46.9 %	46.7 %	49.4 %
West / female			
18 to 24 years	4.8 %	4.9 %	5.1 %
25 to 34 years	9.4 %	8.8 %	8.2 %
35 to 44 years	14.1 %	13.2 %	10.9 %
45 to 54 years	9.9 %	10.1 %	8.9 %
55 to 64 years	7.1 %	7.2 %	7.8 %
65 to 79 years	7.7 %	9.1 %	9.8 %
Total	53.1 %	53.3 %	50.6 %
East / male			
18 to 24 years	5.7 %	5.3 %	6.2 %
25 to 34 years	5.6 %	5.5 %	7.8 %
35 to 44 years	8.5 %	8.1 %	10.7 %
45 to 54 years	8.3 %	8.0 %	9.6 %
55 to 64 years	7.1 %	7.9 %	7.6 %
65 to 79 years	8.4 %	8.8 %	7.9 %
Total	43.7 %	43.5 %	49.8 %
East / female			
18 to 24 years	5.9 %	5.8 %	5.5 %
25 to 34 years	8.8 %	7.9 %	6.8 %
35 to 44 years	11.7 %	11.3 %	10.0 %
45 to 54 years	11.5 %	11.6 %	9.3 %
55 to 64 years	9.1 %	9.1 %	8.0 %
65 to 79 years	9.4 %	10.8 %	10.6 %
Total	56.3 %	56.5 %	50.2 %

Tab. 10:Comparison of those willing to be asked again (unweighted) with the net sample and
official statistics: sex and age separated by East / West

Sub-sample willing to b agair	Sub-sample of those willing to be asked again		Target structure (population extrapolation 2003)
Education / West			
Still pupils	1.3 %	1.5 %	1.5 %
Low	37.6 %	40.2 %	51.9 %
Medium	30.1 %	30.3 %	23.2 %
High	31.0 %	28.0 %	23.3 %
Education / East			
Still pupils	0.7 %	0.7 %	1.9 %
Low	26.1 %	28.4 %	30.7 %
Medium	48.4 %	48.4 %	47.7 %
High	24.8 %	22.5 %	19.7 %
Household size / West			
1-person household	22.9 %	24.5 %	37.2 %
2-person household	32.9 %	33.7 %	33.5 %
Household with more than two persons	44.2 %	41.5 %	29.4 %
Household size / East			
1-person household	25.9 %	27.5 %	36.5 %
2-person household	38.5 %	38.9 %	35.3 %
Household with more than two persons	35.6 %	33.6 %	28.2 %

Tab. 11:	Comparison of those willing to be asked again (unweighted) with the net sample and
	official statistics: Education and household size separated by East and West

Sub-sar to	nple of those willing be asked again	Total sample (unweighted)	Target structure (population extrapolation 2003)
/ West			
Core area 500,000+	27.9 %	28.9 %	24.2 %
Margin area 500,000+	8.6 %	8.2 %	9.1 %
Core area 100,000 - 499,999	17.9 %	18.0 %	16.3 %
Margin area 100,000 - 499,999	16.5 %	15.7 %	17.5 %
Core area 50,000 - 99,999	1.4 %	1.9 %	1.8 %
Margin area 50,000 - 99,999	6.5 %	6.8 %	7.3 %
20,000 - 49,999	9.6 %	9.6 %	11.1 %
5,000 - 9,999	7.6 %	7.4 %	8.3 %
2,000 - 4,999	1.9 %	1.9 %	2.5 %
to 1,999	2.1 %	1.7 %	1.8 %
BIK / East			
Core area 500,000+	17.1 %	16.9 %	16.6 %
Margin area 500,000+	6.0 %	6.6 %	6.8 %
Core area 100,000 - 499,999	17.5 %	15.7 %	14.0 %
Margin area 100,000 - 499,999	10.3 %	11.0 %	10.7 %
Core area 50,000 - 99,999	5.8 %	5.0 %	4.7 %
Margin area 50,000 - 99,999	12.0 %	12.0 %	13.0 %
20,000 - 49,999	16.7 %	16.5 %	15.3 %
5,000 - 9,999	7.8 %	8.6 %	9.0 %
2,000 - 4,999	3.9 %	4.1 %	5.4 %
to 1,999	3.1 %	3.5 %	4.4 %

Tab. 12:Comparison of those willing to be asked again (unweighted) with the net sample and
official statistics: municipality size class (BIK) separated by East and West

3 Data examinations in the interview

The statement of yearly figures was the subject of the following examinations

F010400 (the birth year of the respondent): is the subject of the following examinations:

F010700: residence Germany not before F010400 F010718: nationality not before F010400 F011002: biological children (F10100 = 2 or 3) not before F010400 + 13 F011200: joint household not before F010400 F012200: vocational training completed respondent not before F010400+13 F030100: joint household with partner not before F010400 F030302: marriage not before F010400+10 F030700: intimate rel. not before F010400+10 F031002: marriage not before F010400+5 F031004: divorce not before F010400+5 F032600: joint household not before F010400+ 5 F033100: end partnership not before F010400+ 5 F033402: divorce not before F010400+ 10 F050600: death biological mother not before F010400 F050700: birth biological mother not before F010400+ 15 F052100: birth biological father not before F010400+15 F053300: birth biological father not before F010400+15 F053700: birth biological mother not before F010400+ 15 F053800: death biological mother not before F010400 F057600: separation parents not before F010400 F060300: planned birth child not before F010400+ 10 F060800: pregnancy measures not before F010400+ 10 F061000: birth control not before F010400 F061302: sterilisation not before F010400 F061400: infertility not before F010400 F061900: pregnancy measures not before F010400+ 10 F062100: birth control not before F010400 F080300: maternity leave not before F010400+ 10 F080800: unemployment not before F010400+ 10 F081200: training not before F010400+ 10 F081600: pension not before F010400+10 F082200: house wife/husband not before F010400+10 F083300: current job not before F010400+ 10

F011002: the birth year of children (F010100=2-6) is the subject of the following examinations

F022000: end joint household with biological child not before F011002 F021601: biological child (23100=1) birth year not before F011002 F021700: child deceased not before F011002

F023000: the birth year of step children is the subject of the following examinations

F023200: move into household not before F023000 F023300: death not before F023000 F023400: end joint household with child not before F023000 F031100: the birth year of the partner outside the household is the subject of the following examinations

F031002: marriage not before F031100 F030700: start relationship not before F031100 F031203: stay in Germany not before F031100 F031208: nationality not before F031100

F010900: the birth year of the partner in the household is the subject of the following examinations

F030100: joint household not before F010900 F030202: marriage not before F010900+10 F030303: stay in Germany not before F010900 F030318: nationality not before F010900

F032600: Moving together with other partners is examined as followed:

F032800: birth of the partner: F032600-10 > F032800 F033100: separation not before F032600