NEPS
National Educational Panel Study

Research Data

NEPS Technical Report for Weighting: Weighting the Sample of Starting Cohort 3 of the National Educational Panel Study (Waves 1 to 5)

Hans Walter Steinhauer and Sabine Zinn

LIfBi
LEIBNIZ INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL TRAJECTORIES

Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi)
Wilhelmsplatz 3, 96047 Bamberg
Director: Prof. Dr. Hans-Günther Roßbach
Executive Director of Research: Dr. Jutta von Maurice
Executive Director of Administration: Dr. Robert Polgar
Bamberg, 2016

NEPS Technical Report for Weighting: Weighting the Sample of Starting Cohort 3 of the National Educational Panel Study (Waves 1 to 5)

Hans Walter Steinhauer, Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories
Sabine Zinn, Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories

Technical Report referring to
DOI:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:5.0.0

E-mail address of lead author:

methoden@lifbi.de

Bibliographic data:

Steinhauer, H. W. & Zinn, S. (2016). *NEPS Technical Report for Weighting: Weighting the Sample of Starting Cohort 3 of the National Educational Panel Study (Waves 1 to 5)*. Bamberg: Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, National Educational Panel Study.

NEPS Technical Report for Weighting: Weighting the Sample of Starting Cohort 3 of the National Educational Panel Study (Waves 1 to 5)

Abstract

The sample of Grade 5 students in the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS) respects different timings in transitions in lower secondary education. Some Federal States in Germany educate students in primary schools from Grade 1 to Grade 6, whereas the majority of primary schools educate students from Grade 1 to Grade 4. The transition to lower secondary education is also decoupled from primary and lower secondary education in some Federal States. These Federal States provide education to students in schools only covering Grade 5 and 6. Thus Grade 5 students sampled in NEPS will leave their institutional context in which they were originally sampled and surveyed in some Federal States. For this reason a refreshment sample of students in Grade 7 was established to compensate the loss of students in their institutional context. This report provides details on the sampling design, the derivation of design weights and the nonresponse adjustments for the refreshment sample. On the school level we find school type and Federal State of the school to be predictive of the schools decision to participate. On the student level we find grades in German and maths to significantly influence the students decision to participate in the panel.

Keywords

stratified multi-stage sampling, unit nonresponse, weighting, NEPS SC3

1. Introduction

Starting Cohort 3 (SC3) of the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS) focuses on students in Grade 5 and their pathway through lower secondary education.[1] To follow up Grade 5 students a main sample of students in regular schools and special-need schools was set up.[2] Besides the main sample, a supplement covering students with a migration background related to Turkey and the former Soviet Union was established. These samples are referred to as *original samples*. Because of the Federal-State-specific timing in transition in lower secondary education in regular schools a refreshment sample was drawn for students attending Grade 7.
To provide weights for the original samples as well as for the refreshment sample the different processes leading to the participation decision in a certain wave have to be considered. These decision processes include the schools initial decision to participate in the survey, the students initial decision to participate in the survey, and finally, the students successive decisions to participate in each wave again. The schools initial decision to participate enters a nonresponse adjusted design weight on the institutional level. The students initial decision to participate enters a nonresponse adjusted design weight on the individual level. The successive decisions of a student to participate in a certain wave enter the corresponding wave-specific cross-sectional and longitudinal weights.
In the progress of the panel it is possible that students cannot be surveyed within their institutional context for several reasons. For example, because they switch to another school, or because the school decides to refuse further cooperation. In these cases students are surveyed in an individual context, that is, the questionnaires are sent to their home address. Surveying students in this individual context is referred to as the field of individual retracking. Because these students are surveyed outside of their institutional context the participation propensity is lower for this group. Also we find native language, design information (strata) as well as participation in the previous wave to be significant explaining factors of student nonresponse. For weighting and the nonresponse adjustments of weights several particularities have to be considered. Therefore, this paper will provide details on the sampling designs applied within the different samples, the initial nonresponse adjustments on the school and on the student level as well as wave-specific nonresponse adjustments. The remainder of this report referring to Scientific Use File (SUF) Version 5.0.0 (DOI:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:5.0.0) is structured as follows: Section 2. gives information on the population and the sampling designs applied to realize the samples of SC3. Section 3. provides information on the initial sample and nonresponse processes leading to the final panel cohort of SC3. Section 4. documents the wave-specific nonresponse adjustments to provide cross-sectional and longitudinal weights. Section 5. documents the raking procedure applied to the nonresponse adjusted cross-sectional weights. Section 6. provides details on the trimming method applied to the entire set of target-specific weights and their final scaling. Finally, Section 7. concludes.

2. Population and Sample

The target population of SC3 covers Grade 5 students in schools offering lower secondary education within the Federal Republic of Germany in school year 2010/11. Excluded are students

[1] For more specific information on research topics in the NEPS, see Blossfeld, Roßbach, and von Maurice (2011).
[2] Regular schools are all “allgemeinbildende Schulen´´, that is, schools of general education according to the definition of the Kultusministerkonferenz (2012).

attending schools with a predominant foreign teaching language and students who are not able to follow the normal testing procedure attending regular schools, see Aßmann et al. (2011). Access to this population was gained via the schools these students are educated in. SC3 consists of two samples in Wave 1 and Wave 2; the *main sample* and the *migrant supplement*. From Wave 3 on the *refreshment sample* is part of the SC3, too. The corresponding variable in the weighting data set is `sample`, see Table 1. School types, as provided in the sampling frame, which were relevant for sampling schools in SC3 are given in Table 2.

2.1 Main Sample and Migrant Supplement

Both samples are two-stage samples selecting schools as primary sampling units (PSU) on the first stage. In the main sample students are selected in classes (main sample) and according to their migration background (migrant supplement). The main sample is in parts overlapping with the sample of Starting Cohort 4 (SC4) and stratified by

- *Schools educating students in Grade 5 and in Grade 9* (overlap with SC4),
- *Schools educating students in Grade 5 but not in Grade 9*, and
- *Special-needs schools* (overlap with SC4),

see Variable `stratum_exp` in Table 1. For implicit stratification[3] of the main sample the characteristics, see Table 1, used are

- *school type* (`stratum_imp1`),
- *Federal State* (`stratum_imp2`),
- *regional classification* (`stratum_imp3`), and
- *funding institution* (`stratum_imp4`).

The variable `tstud_st` gives information on the study the student was first surveyed in. Here, the two strata covering the population of regular schools refer to study A28, special-needs schools refer to study A56 and the migrant supplement refers to study A63, see Table 1.[4] For more details on the sampling design and the derivation of design weights, see Steinhauer, Aßmann, Zinn, Goßmann, and Rässler (2015).

2.2 Refreshment

The refreshment sample is, with respect to the sampling design, similar to the main sample of regular schools. We applied a stratified two-stage sampling design with explicit and implicit stratification. The two explicit strata respect the different timings in transitions in lower secondary education. The first stratum $h = 1$ therefore consists of all regular schools located in the Federal States of Berlin and Brandenburg that do not have classes in Grade 5 and 6 but have at least one class in Grade 7. The second stratum $h = 2$ contains all regular schools located in

[3] Sorting the sampling frame by certain characteristics together with a systematic selection is referred to as implicit stratification.

[4] Reports from the studies can be accessed via the documentation section at (DOI:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:1.0.0). For successive waves the students of study A63 have been integrated into the follow ups of A28, that is, A29 and A30.

the remaining 14 Federal States of Germany having at least one class in Grade 7. The students of the refreshment sample are surveyed within the study A30A first. The $m = 100$ schools to be sampled were allocated to the strata as follows: In stratum $h = 1$ we sampled $m_1 = 20$ schools and in stratum $h = 2$ we sampled $m_2 = 80$ schools. Schools already sampled for SC3 or SC4 were excluded. Further we considered school type, Federal State, regional classification, and founding institution as characteristics for implicit stratification. Within the two strata schools were selected systematically on the first stage using probability proportional to size (pps) sampling. The total number of schools in the population is $M = \sum_{h=1}^{2} M_h$. For systematic pps sampling we define the measure of size for school j in stratum h as

$$mos_{jh} = \frac{C_{jh}^7}{\min\{C_{jh}^7; 2\}}, \tag{1}$$

where C_{jh}^7 denotes the number of classes in Grade 7 that school j in stratum h hosts according to the frame referring to school year 2008/09. The inclusion probability π_{jh} for school j in stratum h is computed as

$$\pi_{jh} = m_h \cdot \frac{\frac{C_{jh}^7}{\min\{C_{jh}^7;2\}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{M_h} \frac{C_{jh}^7}{\min\{C_{jh}^7;2\}}} \tag{2}$$

On the second stage we randomly select two classes within sampled schools if at least three are present. Otherwise all available classes are selected. All students of the selected classes are then asked to participate. Finally, the inclusion probability π_{ijh} for student i in school j in stratum h is computed as

$$\pi_{ijh} = m_h \cdot \frac{\frac{C_{jh}^7}{\min\{C_{jh}^7;2\}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{M_h} \frac{C_{jh}^7}{\min\{C_{jh}^7;2\}}} \cdot \frac{\min\{\widetilde{C}_{jh}^7; 2\}}{\widetilde{C}_{jh}^7}, \tag{3}$$

where $\widetilde{C}_{jh}^7$ denotes the number of classes school j in stratum h hosts in school year 2012/13. Note that, when the number of classes a school j hosts in school year 2012/13 is the same as in the frame, then a self-weighting sample is realized. The design weight d_{jh} for a school j in stratum h and the design weight d_{ijh} for a student i are computed as

$$d_{jh} = \pi_{jh}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \tag{4}$$

$$d_{ijh} = \pi_{ijh}^{-1}. \tag{5}$$

3. Initial Nonresponse Adjustments

Sampling schools on the first stage and students in classes on the second stage forms a two-stage decision process. Within two-stage sampling designs nonresponse occurs at two different levels. On the first stage, schools decide weather to participate or not. On the second stage, students can decide again to participate or not, but only given a positive participation decision of the school. To account for the different nonresponse processes we use successive response

propensity modelling. Steinhauer et al. (2015) give more details on the replacement strategy to prevent bias caused by schools refusal together with nonresponse adjustments for initial nonresponse for the main sample and the migrant supplement.
In the refreshment sample 86 out of 374 contacted schools decided to participate, resulting in a response rate of 23.0%. Of the 288 nonparticipating schools only 178 explicitly refused, the remaining 110 schools just did not respond. On the school level we used cell weighting to adjust weights. The cells were formed by school type and Federal State, because these characteristics influence the participation propensities, see Table 3. Within each cell the sum of the design weights for schools was reallocated to the participating schools. Thus, the nonresponse adjusted weight for school j in stratum h arises as

$$w_{jh} \quad = \quad d_{jh} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_h} d_{jh}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m_h^R} d_{jh}}. \tag{6}$$

Here $\sum_{j=1}^{m_h} d_{jh}$ is the sum of design weights for all sampled schools j in stratum h and $\sum_{j=1}^{m_h^R} d_{jh}$ is the sum of design weights of the participating schools. This weight is included in the weighting data as `w_i`, see Table 1.
Table 4 gives the number of students initially sampled, the number of students participating in the panel study (panel sample), and the corresponding participation rates for the different samples of SC3. The table shows that the response rate on the student level for the refreshment sample is similar to the main sample. Analogue to the findings from the main sample (see Steinhauer et al., 2015) the participation propensity of a student is significantly positive influenced by having good grades in German and significantly negative by having missing values in the math grade, see Table 5. The estimated participation propensity δ_{ijh} for student i in institution j in stratum h from the model displayed in Table 5 is used to compute the weight according to

$$w_{ijh} \quad = \quad \underbrace{d_{jh} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_h} d_{jh}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m_h^R} d_{jh}}}_{w_{jh}} \cdot \frac{\min\{\widetilde{C}_{jh}^7; 2\}}{\widetilde{C}_{jh}^7} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta_{ijh}}. \tag{7}$$

This weight is included in the weighting data as `w_t`, see Table 1.

4. Wave-specific Nonresponse Adjustments

Students being part of the SC3 panel can decide in each wave wether they want to participate again or not. We distinguish three different participation statuses, namely: participant, temporary drop out, and final drop out. A student is considered as final drop out if the panel consent is withdrawn and the student refuses further participation in the panel. In contrast, a student is considered as temporary drop out if the student does not participate in the current wave but is generally willing to participate in future waves and has not withdrawn panel consent. Participants are all students that provide any information. Table 8 gives the number of students and their participation status by wave. To account for the wave-specific participation decision of students we use response propensity re-weighting to provide corresponding weights. To model binary participation decisions we use a random intercept model that accounts for clustering at the school level with probit link function. The coefficients for the estimated random

intercept probit models are displayed in Table 6 and described below.
We provide cross-sectional weights for those students participating in a certain wave and longitudinal weights for students participating in all successive waves. The provided cross-sectional weights for students (`w_t1` to `w_t5`) refer to the participants of the main sample and the refreshment sample. Longitudinal weights for students (`w_t12`, `w_t123`, and so on) correspond to the participants of the main and the refreshment sample participating in all successive waves of the panel. For the group of students first surveyed in Wave 3 the longitudinal weights provided start with Wave 3 (`w_t34`, `w_t345`, and so on)
At Wave t there are $2^t - 1$ different binary participation patterns for students. To cope with the increasing number of weights, consecutive conditional modeling for participation decisions is helpful. Here, we model participation decisions conditional on auxiliary variables as well as on earlier participation statuses, see for example Kalton (1986) and Lepkowski (1989). Given the nonresponse adjusted design weight w_{ijh} for a participant i in institution j in stratum h, the wave-specific nonresponse adjusted weight is

$$\omega_{ijh}(t) = \quad w_{ijh} \cdot \lambda_{ijh}(t)^{-1}, \tag{8}$$

where $\lambda_{ijh}(t)$ is the participation propensity for participant i in institution j in stratum h at Wave t. Specifying $\lambda_{ijh}(t)$ depends on the subgroup which is considered for re-weighting, for example, students participating in Wave 2 or students continuously participating in all successive waves up to Wave 2. The two examples given relate to different types of weights, namely cross-sectional weights and longitudinal weights. For an explicit formulation of the re-weighting procedure and more details on the wave-specific nonresponse adjustments referring to the previous SUF versions DOI:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:1.0.0 and DOI:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:2.0.0 see Steinhauer, Zinn, and Aßmann (2016). For more information on version DOI:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:3.0.0 and the corresponding updated version DOI:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:3.1.0 see Steinhauer and Zinn (2016).
When modelling the participation decision of students, we exclude 242 students being part of the migrants supplement, because their field procedures as well as survey and test instruments differ significantly from those of the main sample. Moreover, we exclude cases finally dropping out of the panel cohort between the waves. This is because, first, their decision to not participate in future waves of the survey is different from the decision to temporarily refuse participation and, second, their quantity is too small to allow for an accordant modelling. Thus, analyses focus on the main sample and on the refreshment sample. These two groups are analyzed separately because at Wave 3 the students of the main sample are surveyed for the third time, whereas students of the refreshment sample are surveyed for the first time. Thus, the participation decisions are not the same.

4.1 Wave 1

In Wave 1 students being educated in special-needs schools have a higher propensity to participate, see Table 6. Students having a native language other than German or who have missing values in this variable have a significantly lower propensity to participate.

4.2 Wave 2

In Wave 2 students being educated in special-needs schools have a lower propensity to participate, see Table 6. The effect of having another native language than German is not significant

anymore and the effect of having missing values in the native language variable decreases in magnitude, though still negatively influencing participation decisions. Students being in the field of individual retracking (for various reasons) have a lower propensity to participate in Wave 2.

4.3 Wave 3

In Wave 3 students of the main sample being educated in special-needs schools have a lower propensity to participate, see Table 6. Here, the effect of being part of the younger half of the age group is significantly positive.[5] The effect of having missing values in the native language variable further decreases in magnitude and is still negatively influencing participation decisions. Students being in the field of individual retracking (for various reasons) have throughout a lower propensity to participate in Wave 3.
Because only 59 out of 2205 students of the refreshment sample do not participate in Wave 3 we do not find variables significantly influencing the participation decision. Thus, we only estimate the random intercept on the school level.

4.4 Wave 4

Again students educated in special-needs schools have a lower propensity to participate in Wave 4. Being part of the younger half of the age group as well as having participated in previous waves significantly influences the participation decision in Wave 4 positively. Students being in the field of individual retracking (for various reasons) have throughout a lower propensity to participate in Wave 4. After Wave 4 special-need students are not followed up any further. This also explains the large number of final drop outs after Wave 4 given in Table 8.
For students being part of the refreshment sample, and thus participating for the second time in Wave 4, we find female students to be more likely to participate. Furthermore, having participated in Wave 3 positively influences the participation decision in Wave 4.

4.5 Wave 5

Between Wave 4 and Wave 5 some students have left their schools and entered vocational education. As in Starting Cohort 4 of the NEPS these students (of both groups) are surveyed individually and are less likely to participate in Wave 5. Similar negative effects are found for the other reasons of being in individual retracking. Also for both groups the previous wave's participation status and being part of the younger half of the age group is significantly influencing the participation decision. In the refreshment sample female students are more likely to participate in Wave 5 and students having a native language other than German (or missing information in this variable) are less likely to participate in the survey.

5. Calibration

To correct for sampling errors and undercoverage we use data from Official Statistics for post-stratification (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2011). We apply raking (Deville, Särndal, & Sautory, 1993) on the number of students by Federal State and school type. The information used for

[5] Students are categorized by their month and year of birth into an older and a younger half according to the median age of the entire cohort.

sampling was provided by Official Statistics and thus are measured in the same way. Because school types change over time we only have complete information on school type for Wave 1. Thus, yet only weights for Wave 1 are calibrated (`w_t1_cal`). Although Bayer, Goßmann, and Bela (2014) provide a generated school type variable based on information arising during the parent's CATI, this variable is incomplete.

6. Trimming and Scaling

With the aim of increasing statistical efficiency of weighted analysis, the adjusted design weights were trimmed. The general goal of weight trimming is to reduce sampling variance and, at the same time, to compensate for potential increase in bias. Trimming was performed using the so-called "Weight Distribution" approach (Potter, 1990). Here, design weights are assumed to follow an inverse beta distribution with a cumulative distribution function F_w. Parameters of the sampling weight distribution are estimated using the sampling weights, and a trimming level τ is computed whose occurrence probability is 1%, that is, $1 - F_w(\tau) = 0.01$. Sampling weights in excess of τ are trimmed to this level and the excess is distributed among the untrimmed weights. The parameters for the sampling weight distribution are then estimated again using the trimmed adjusted weights, and a revised trimming level $\tilde{\tau}$ is computed. The trimmed adjusted weights are compared to the revised level $\tilde{\tau}$. If any weights are in excess of $\tilde{\tau}$, they are trimmed to this level, and the excess is distributed among the untrimmed weights. This procedure is iteratively repeated until no weights are in excess of a newly revised trimming level. To ease statistical analysis, the trimmed design weights are standardized with mean one.

7. Conclusion

This paper provides an overview on the sampling design applied for establishing the refreshment sample of students in Grade 7 and the corresponding derivation of design weights. Further, nonresponse adjustments based on selectivity analyses taking the cluster structure on the school level into account are presented. These analyses highlight factors influencing the participation decision, where typical factors like native language, being in a special-needs school or being surveyed outside the institutional context of a school impact on the participation decision.

Acknowledgements This paper uses data from the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS): Starting Cohort 3 – 5th Grade, doi:10.5157/NEPS:SC3:5.0.0. From 2008 to 2013, NEPS data were collected as part of the Framework Programme for the Promotion of Empirical Educational Research funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). As of 2014, the NEPS survey is carried out by the Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi) at the University of Bamberg in cooperation with a nationwide network.

References

Aßmann, C., Steinhauer, H. W., Kiesl, H., Koch, S., Schönberger, B., Müller-Kuller, A., … Blossfeld, H.-P. (2011). Sampling designs of the National Educational Panel Study: challenges and solutions. In H.-P. Blossfeld, H. G. Roßbach, & J. von Maurice (Eds.), *Education as a lifelong process: The German National Educational Panel Study (NEPS) [Special Issue]: Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* (Vol. 14, p. 51-65). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. doi: 10.1007/s11618-011-0181-8

Bates, D., Maechler, M., & Bolker, B. (2012). *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using S4 classes.* Retrieved 03.06.2014, from http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4

Bayer, M., Goßmann, F., & Bela, D. (2014). *NEPS Technical Report: Generated school type variable t723080_g1 in Starting Cohorts 3 and 4* (NEPS Working Paper No. 46). Bamberg: Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, National Educational Panel Study. Retrieved 09.06.2015, from https://www.neps-data.de/Portals/0/Working%20Papers/WP_XLVI.pdf

Blossfeld, H.-P., Roßbach, H. G., & von Maurice, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Education as a lifelong process: The German National Educational Panel Study (NEPS) [Special Issue]: Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* (Vol. 14). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Deville, J.-C., Särndal, C.-E., & Sautory, O. (1993). Generalized raking procedures in survey sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *88*(423), 1013-1020. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1993.10476369

Kalton, G. (1986). Handling Wave Nonresponse in Panel Surveys. *Journal of Official Statistics*, *2*(3), 303-314.

Kultusministerkonferenz. (2012). *Definitionenkatalog zur Schulstatistik 2012.* Retrieved 06.05.2014, from http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/pdf/Statistik/Defkat_2012.2_m_Anlagen.pdf

Lepkowski, J. M. (1989). Treatment of Wave Nonresponse in Panel Surveys. In D. Kasprzyk, G. J. Duncan, G. Kalton, & M. Singh (Eds.), *Panel surveys* (p. 348-374). New York: Wiley.

Potter, F. J. (1990). A study of procedures to identify and trim extreme sampling weights. In A. S. Association (Ed.), *Proceedings of the survey research methods section* (p. 225-230). Retrieved 17.02.2014, from http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/Proceedings/papers/1990_034.pdf

R Core Team. (2016). R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Computer software manual]. Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Statistisches Bundesamt. (2011). *Bildung und Kultur: Allgemeinbildende Schulen Schuljahr 2010/2011 (Fachserie 11, Reihe 1)*. Wiesbaden. Retrieved from https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Schulen/AllgemeinbildendeSchulen2110100117004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

Steinhauer, H. W., Aßmann, C., Zinn, S., Goßmann, S., & Rässler, S. (2015). Sampling and weighting cohort samples in institutional contexts. *AStA Wirtschafts- und Sozialstatistisches Archiv*, *9*(2), 131-157. doi: 10.1007/s11943-015-0162-0

Steinhauer, H. W., & Zinn, S. (2016). *NEPS Technical Report for Weighting: Weighting the Sample of Starting Cohort 3 of the National Educational Panel Study (Waves 1 to 3)* (Working Paper No. 63). Bamberg: Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, National Educational Panel Study. Retrieved from https://www.neps-data.de/Portals/0/Working%20Papers/WP_LXIII.pdf

Steinhauer, H. W., Zinn, S., & Aßmann, C. (2016). Weighting panel cohorts in institutional

contexts. In H.-P. Blossfeld, J. von Maurice, M. Bayer, & J. Skopek (Eds.), *Methodological issues of longitudinal surveys* (p. 39-62). Springer Science + Business Media. doi: 10.1007/978-3-658-11994-2_3

Appendix

A. Tables

Table 1: Variables included in the weighting data for SC3 version 5.0.0 of the SUF

Variable	Applies to	Content
Identifier		
ID_t	all	Identifier for target person
ID_i	all	Identifier for the school the target person was initially sampled in
Design information		
tstud_st	all	Study number the target person was first surveyed in (A28, A56, A63, A30A)
sample	all	Part of the sample the target person belongs to
stratum_exp	Main sample, Refreshment	Explicit sampling stratum referring to the school
stratum_imp1	Main sample, Refreshment	Implicit sampling stratum (school type according to sampling frame)
stratum_imp2	Main sample, Refreshment	Implicit sampling stratum (Federal State the school is located in according to sampling frame)
stratum_imp3	Main sample, Refreshment	Implicit sampling stratum (regional classification according to sampling frame)
stratum_imp4	Main sample, Refreshment	Implicit sampling stratum (funding according to sampling frame)
Design weights adjusted for initial nonresponse		
w_i	all	Weight for institution
w_t	all	Weight for target
Weights adjusted for wave-specific nonresponse, standardized		
w_t1	5,559 cases	Cross-sectional weight for targets participating in Wave 1
w_t1_cal	5,559 cases	Cross-sectional weight for targets participating in Wave 1, calibrated
w_t2	5,331 cases	Cross-sectional weight for targets participating in Wave 2
w_t3	7,114 cases	Cross-sectional weight for targets participating in Wave 3
w_t4	6,581 cases	Cross-sectional weight for targets participating in Wave 4
w_t5	5,648 cases	Cross-sectional weight for targets participating in Wave 5
w_t12	5,071 cases	Longitudinal weight for targets participating in Wave 1 and 2
w_t123	4,516 cases	Longitudinal weight for targets participating in Wave 1, 2, and 3
w_t1234	4,029 cases	Longitudinal weight for targets participating in Wave 1, 2, 3, and 4
w_t12345	3,203 cases	Longitudinal weight for targets participating in Wave 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

Table 1: Variables included in the weighting data for SC3 version 5.0.0 of the SUF

Variable	Applies to	Content
w_t34	6,291 cases	Longitudinal weight for targets participating in Wave 3 and 4
w_t345	5,119 cases	Longitudinal weight for targets participating in Wave 3, 4, and 5

Table 2: Abbreviations for school types contained in the variable `stratum_imp1`

Abbreviation	School type
GS	elementary schools (*Grundschule*)
GY	schools leading to upper secondary education and university entrance qualification (*Gymnasium*)
HS	schools for basic secondary education (*Hauptschule*)
RS	intermediate secondary schools (*Realschule*)
IG	comprehensive schools (*Integrierte Gesamtschule*)
MB	schools with several courses of education (*Schule mit mehreren Bildungsgängen*)
FS	schools offering schooling to students with special educational needs in the area of learning (*Förderschule*)
SU	schools only covering the orientation stage (*Schulartunabhängige Orientierungsstufe*)

Table 3: Model estimating the participation propensities for contacted schools in the refreshment sample

	Estimate
(Intercept)	-0.486^{***}
	(0.003)
School type MB	0.410^{***}
	(0.003)
School type RS	0.146^{***}
	(0.003)
School type IG	-0.553^{***}
	(0.003)
School type GY	-0.112^{***}
	(0.003)
σ^2	0.691
Federal State	
Number of schools	374

Notes: Abbreviations are MB: Schule mit mehreren Bildungsgängen, RS: Realschule, IG: Integrierte Gesamtschule, GY: Gymnasium, and HS: Hauptschule being the reference category. To model institutional participation, the `glmer` function with a probit link provided by `lme4` package (Bates, Maechler, & Bolker, 2012) in R (R Core Team, 2016) was used.

***, ** and * denote significance at the 0.1%, 1% and 5% level, respectively. Standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table 4: Sample sizes (initial and panel) and participation rates for the different samples of SC3

	Sample size		**Participation**
Samples	Initial sample	Panel sample	**rate**
Main sample	10,686	5,870	54.9%
Migrant supplement	877	242	27.6%
Refreshment sample	3,944	2,205	55.9%
Total	15,507	8,317	53.6%

Table 5: Model estimating the individual propensities to participate in the panel for students of the refreshment sample used to derive adjustment factors for unit nonresponse adjusted design weights

	Estimate
(Intercept)	0.065
	(0.070)
Grade in German	0.190**
1 to 3	(0.061)
Grade in German	0.493
Missing	(0.411)
Grade in maths	0.044
1 to 3	(0.056)
Grade in maths	−0.937*
Missing	(0.422)
σ^2	0.175
School level	
Number of students	3,716

Notes: Reference categories are: Grade in German 4 to 6 and Grade in maths 4 to 6. To model individual participation, the `glmer` function with a probit link provided by `lme4` package (Bates et al., 2012) in R (R Core Team, 2016) was used.

***, ** and * denote significance at the 0.1%, 1% and 5% level, respectively. Standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table 6: Models estimating the individual participation propensities for students in Wave 1, Wave 2, and Wave 3 of SC3 used to derive adjustment factors for adjusted wave-specific cross-sectional and longitudinal weights

	Wave 1	**Wave 2**	**Wave 3**	
	Main sample	Main sample	Main sample	Refreshment sample
(Intercept)	1.891***	1.726***	0.783***	2.022***
	(0.049)	(0.040)	(0.083)	(0.087)
stratum_exp	0.032	−0.062	−0.014	
Grade 5 but not Grade 9	(0.134)	(0.118)	(0.172)	
stratum_exp	0.498**	−0.391***	−0.323***	
Special-needs schools	(0.157)	(0.089)	(0.093)	
Native language	−0.202*	0.066	−0.076	
other than German	(0.098)	(0.089)	(0.079)	
Native language	−4.067***	−0.753***	−0.699***	
missing	(0.272)	(0.136)	(0.143)	
Reason for individual retracking		−1.204***	−0.394*	
Individualized main survey		(0.257)	(0.196)	
Reason for individual retracking		−1.502***	−1.322***	
School refused		(0.134)	(0.115)	
Reason for individual retracking		−1.466*	−1.704*	
School shut down		(0.633)	(0.688)	
Reason for individual retracking			−1.330***	
Age group expired			(0.200)	
Reason for individual retracking		−1.926***	−1.509***	
Switched school		(0.098)	(0.071)	
Attrition		−6.579	−7.093	
in the wave		(306.399)	(42.667)	
Age group			0.108*	
Younger half			(0.051)	
Student participated in			0.922***	
Wave 2			(0.073)	
Random intercept School level	0.045	0.077	0.092	0.105
Number of students	5,870	5,856	5,823	2,205

Notes: Reference categories are: Explicit stratum (SC3: Grade 5 and Grade 9), Age group (older half), Native language (German), Student participated in Wave 1/2 (no), Reasons for individual retracking (none, main survey). To model individual participation, the `glmer` function with a probit link provided by `lme4` package (Bates et al., 2012) in R (R Core Team, 2016) was used.

***, **, and * denote significance at the 0.1%, 1%, and 5% level, respectively. Standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table 7: Models estimating the individual participation propensities for students in Wave 4, and Wave 5 of SC3 used to derive adjustment factors for adjusted wave-specific cross-sectional and longitudinal weights

	Wave 4		**Wave 5**	
	Main sample	Refreshment sample	Main sample	Refreshment sample
(Intercept)	−0.032	0.650**	−0.496***	0.356
	(0.100)	(0.213)	(0.109)	(0.257)
stratum_exp	−0.060		0.116	
Grade 5 but not Grade 9	(0.174)		(0.126)	
stratum_exp	−0.379***			
Special-needs schools	(0.090)			
Native language				−0.400***
other than German				(0.096)
Native language				−1.334*
missing				(0.664)
Age group	0.144**		0.133**	0.183*
Younger half	(0.051)		(0.049)	(0.077)
Gender		0.165*		0.182*
Female		(0.082)		(0.076)
Student participated in	0.487***		0.337***	
Wave 2	(0.082)		(0.090)	
Student participated in	1.234***	0.681***	0.684***	0.459*
Wave 3	(0.064)	(0.199)	(0.073)	(0.231)
Student participated in			1.039***	0.593***
Wave 4			(0.063)	(0.106)
Reason for individual retracking	−0.912***		−0.487**	−0.456
Individualized main survey	(0.130)		(0.165)	(0.272)
Reason for individual retracking	−1.312***		−0.954***	−1.178***
School refused	(0.100)		(0.078)	(0.100)
Reason for individual retracking	−1.208		−0.816	
School shut down	(0.760)		(0.684)	
Reason for individual retracking	−1.052***		−1.101***	
Age group expired	(0.204)		(0.146)	
Reason for individual retracking	−1.492***		−1.311***	−1.665***
Switched school	(0.066)		(0.063)	(0.119)
Reason for individual retracking			−2.452***	−2.182***
Vocational track			(0.503)	(0.604)
Attrition	−6.375		−6.948	−6.921
in the wave	(28.622)		(42.669)	(72.581)
Random intercept School level	0.087	0.542		
Number of students	5,814	2,205	5,216	2,191

Notes: Reference categories are: Explicit stratum (SC3: Grade 5 and Grade 9), Age group (older half), Gender (male), Native language (German), Student participated in Wave 1/2 (no), Reasons for individual retracking (none, main survey). To model individual participation, the `glmer` function with a probit link provided by `lme4` package (Bates et al., 2012) in R (R Core Team, 2016) was used.

***, **, and * denote significance at the 0.1%, 1%, and 5% level, respectively. Standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table 8: Panelprogress of Starting Cohort 3 by wave.

		Panel Cohort			Status at the end of the wave			
Wave	Sample	Total size	Not used	Used sample	Participants	Temporary dropout	Final dropout (in wave)	Final dropout (after wave)
1	**Main**	6112	-	6112	5778	334		13
2	**Main**	6099	-	6099	5539	559	1	8
3	**All**	8256	-	8256	7280	986	29	10
	Main	6090	-	6090	5134	927	29	10
	Refr.	2205	-	2205	2146	59	0	0
4	**All**	8256	-	8256	6718	1505	33	580
	Main	6051	-	6051	4783	1249	19	[a]580
	Refr.	2205	-	2205	1935	256	14	0
5	**All**	7643	-	7643	5778	1625	240	0
	Main	5452	-	5452	4001	1273	178	0
	Refr.	2191	-	2191	1777	352	62	0

Notes: ”-” does not apply. [a] Special-need students are excluded from the panel cohort after Wave 4. ”n.a.” not available.