



## **Generations and Gender Survey (Round II)**

### **Wave 2 Questionnaire**

#### **User module “Singlehood”**

Dimitri Mortelmans, University of Antwerp, Belgium

Detlev Lück, Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), Germany

Elke Claessens, University of Antwerp, Belgium

Dries Van Gasse, University of Antwerp, Belgium

Martin Bujard, Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), Germany

and University Heidelberg, Germany

Lena Frembs, Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), Germany

**Please cite as:** Mortelmans, D., Lück, D., Claessens, E., Van Gasse, D., Bujard, M., & Frembs, L. (2024). User module: "Singlehood" (GGS-II Wave 2 Questionnaire). GGP Working Paper Series. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14044075

## User Modules in the GGS-II Wave 2 Questionnaire

The GGS-II Wave 2 questionnaire was restructured to include new thematic sections, with space allocated for user-driven innovations. In 2023, an open call invited researchers to submit new content modules. The proposals were evaluated by a selection committee based on their scientific novelty and relevance to the GGS.

Five user modules were selected and integrated into the questionnaire, offering fresh insights into family dynamics, fertility, and related topics. This working paper series contains revised versions of the original submissions, including the finalized questions that were ultimately incorporated into the Wave 2 questionnaire.

**Andersson, G., Neyer, G., Lappegård, T., & Bujard, M. (2024).** *User module: "Global Uncertainty and Institutional Trust"* (GGS-II Wave 2 Questionnaire). GGP Working Paper Series. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14044105

**Berrington, A., & Perelli-Harris, B. (2024).** *User module: "Leaving and Returning to the Parental Home"* (GGS-II Wave 2 Questionnaire). GGP Working Paper Series. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14044047

**Billingsley, S., Mollborn, S., Olah, L., & Duvander, A.-Z. (2024).** *User module: "Intensive Parenting"* (GGS-II Wave 2 Questionnaire). GGP Working Paper Series. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14043910

**Mortelmans, D., Lück, D., Claessens, E., Van Gasse, D., Bujard, M., & Frembs, L. (2024).** *User module: "Singlehood"* (GGS-II Wave 2 Questionnaire). GGP Working Paper Series. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14044075

**Rouvroye, L., Fischer, M., Rampazzo, F., van der Vleuten, M., Fortes De Lena, F., Pao, C., de Vries, L., & Jin, Y. (2024).** *User module: "Sexual Orientation"* (GGS-II Wave 2 Questionnaire). GGP Working Paper Series. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14044062

## Abstract

In recent decades, research has increasingly focused on relationship forms that differ from the married or cohabitation setting, most notably blended families and Living Apart Together (LAT) relationships. Meanwhile, despite being one of the most prominent demographic evolutions of recent decades, the recent rise in singlehood remains far less scrutinised. In 2021, 35% of households across Europe were estimated to be occupied by a solo-living adult, which is one understanding of a “single”. Adults without a romantic relationship, representing another common understanding, are a large share of this number. Coupled with the postponement of committed relationship formation among young adults, increased risk of break-ups and increased longevity, being unpartnered is an increasingly prevalent experience across the life course in contemporary European societies that warrants research and policy attention. While it has been neglected by GGS-II wave 1, providing internationally comparable data on “singles” with wave 2 is important.

The Singlehood Module allows the GGS to fill essential theoretical and methodological lacunae by allowing for cross-country and cross-cohort considerations of i) the self-identification of singlehood, ii) reasons for being single, iii) satisfaction with singlehood, iv) partnering intentions, and v) expectations regarding remaining single. Understanding the lived experiences of the growing unpartnered and solo living population in various (country) contexts not only lays important groundwork for (comparative) academic research on its prevalence but is also directly needed to inform policies that affect the lives of singles in various life stages and across borders.

At the same time, the “singlehood” module helps the GGS to better represent the target population since it avoids the impression among unpartnered respondents that we are not interested in their lives and presumably increases their motivation to participate. It is a common result in survey methodological research that the personal interest of respondents in the topics of an interview increases the chance of participation and reduces nonresponse and attrition. It must be interpreted from this perspective that in GGS-II wave 1, at least in Germany, unmarried people, people living in single households as well as men have been underrepresented by three to six percentage points. A “single” module is easy to implement since it only increases the duration of interviews for respondents whose interviews, so far, have been particularly short. It also helps reduce the biases due to a lack of interest and improve the GGS’ data quality, supporting analyses on various topics.

## Motivation and scientific foundation

Two teams have proposed to incorporate a module on “singles” in the GGS-II wave 2, a Belgian and a German one. The module that has finally entered the GGS questionnaire is a synthesis of their two proposals. The proposals of the two teams and the motivations behind them have been similar but not entirely identical but both teams stressed that “singlehood” is a relevant but overlooked research topic and a timely and valuable topic for the GGS.

### Terminology

There are various understandings of a “single” in social sciences (cp. Mortelmans et al. 2023; Bergström & Brée 2023). According to one common understanding, “being single is defined as the absence of a romantic relationship” (Tessler 2023: 445). However, as Tessler argues, the term “single” is somewhat “elusive, and its meaning has changed over time” (idem: 445). A further increasingly common understanding is “an individual who is not in a cohabiting romantic partnership” (idem: 445), which additionally includes people in non-cohabiting relationships, also referred to as “Living Apart Together (LAT) relationships”. This definition is often used implicitly when presenting statistics on the rise of singlehood because the number of single *households* is much better documented than the number of people without a steady partner (see e.g. Iacovou & Skew 2011; Eurostat 2023). On the other hand, the term “single” used to imply a particular lifestyle and, until today, comes with a row of connotations that narrow the understanding of “being single” further down, such as being young, being never-married, being in a transition phase between moving out of the parent’s home and having an own relationship, being unpartnered by choice, being childless and/or conducting a highly individualised and hedonistic lifestyle (Tessler, 2023; Mortelmans et al. 2023). Given that a large share of unpartnered adults in contemporary European societies is older and divorced or widowed rather than never-married, these understandings have a significant impact on the description of the family form of being “single” and its prevalence.

The German team’s proposal is founded on the definition of “singles” as adults without a romantic relationship. The Belgian proposal is based on the broader definition of “singles” as adults not in a cohabiting romantic partnership. Despite acknowledging that research on “singles” in the latter sense, including LAT relationships, is of high relevance and should be supported by the GGS, the operationalisation of the GGS’s single module focuses only on respondents without a romantic partnership since research on LAT relationship is already enabled by other sections of the GGS questionnaire.

### Scientific motivation

As part of the Second Demographic Transition, the nuclear family’s normative and statistical domination has decreased since the 1970s in Western European and North American societies. The nuclear family is still the most aspired family form in these societies and is attained by most people at some point in their life-course. However, several other family forms are increasingly visible and mark increasingly long phases in the life-course before or after the marriage with children. The various ways of being “single” – that is, living as a young adult without a partner, maintaining a LAT relationship or being unpartnered as an older adult after divorce or the death of the partner – are some

of these family forms which are rising as part of the Second Demographic Transition (Roy et al. 2021; Van de Kaa 1987; Macklin 1980).

To address changing and diversifying needs across nations, scientific attention has increasingly focused on blended and reconstituted families, (un)registered partnerships, and, most recently, Living Apart Together (LAT) relationships. Meanwhile, relatively little attention has recently been given to the state of singlehood in a more comprehensive understanding or in its understanding of being unpartnered. Also, the first wave of GGS-II does not collect data on the specific situation of adults outside of a steady partnership. This means that a highly relevant and increasingly widespread living arrangement is overlooked by family research in general and by GGS-based research in particular. This can also lead to a mismatch between the scientific perception of reality and people's lived experiences. Therefore, we have proposed to incorporate a singlehood module in the GGS Wave 2 questionnaire that enables and encourages family researchers to fill this gap. Three arguments have been brought forward by the Belgian team for doing so.

First, recent estimates state that 35% of households in Europe are occupied by a “solo living” adult (Eurostat 2023), which consists of non-partnered adults as well as LAT relationships. The potential concealment of LAT relationships notwithstanding, important catalysts of this evolution are the postponement of committed relationship formation among the younger population, an increased risk of couple dissolution and increased longevity. Considering the lack of economies of scale and the resulting elevated poverty risks in single-adult (versus multiple-adult) households (Lyssens-Danneboom and Mortelmans 2014; Hübgen 2018), tailored policy-informing research is required concerning their specific experiences and needs.

Second, singlehood is a distinct experience in people's lives, which holds explicit meaning depending on the timing and duration. For example, for young adults, being unpartnered after leaving the parental home has become a vital part of the transition to adulthood (Billari and Liefbroer 2010; Rosenfeld 2007; van den Berg and Verbakel 2022), embedded in a cultural encouragement of independence and experimentation. The assumption that relationship formation follows a clear and straight trajectory into committed cohabitation or marriage has thus become far less plausible in recent years. At the same time, the risk of couples breaking up has increased over the last decades, resulting in further phases of singlehood during adult life, even if these are seldom permanent. Meanwhile, research into “gray singlehood” indicates the restrictiveness of the “widow(er)” status, as this conceals the growing group of active singles that re-enter the dating market at later ages (McElhaney 2019). Individuals' intentions and motivations matter, especially in light of projections concerning the prevalence of singlehood and the formulation of policy responses.

Third, understanding the lived experiences of these groups is necessary if we wish to correctly account for dynamics in relationship formation (Perelli-Harris and Lyons-Amos 2015b). Periods of singlehood may influence an individual's further relationship trajectory, be it through prolonged singlehood diminishing one's capacities of attracting a partner or through an individual's beliefs concerning their single status affecting dating

intentions. Identifying these lived experiences and intentions is crucial to understanding the potential relational and societal consequences of singlehood.

Existing research into singlehood is considerably fragmented on an empirical level. The definition and operationalisation of “single” varies widely (e.g. non-married, unpartnered, living solo) and hinders a comprehensive interpretation of results across studies. The lack of comparative data also means that most research is region-specific (López-Gay et al. 2014; Wiik and Dommermuth 2014; Yeung and Cheung 2015) and cohort-focused (van den Berg and Verbakel 2022; Tuval-Mashiach, et al. 2015) thus limiting its general utility. Moreover, Mortelmans et al. (2023) indicate that only a limited number of existing large-scale panel studies are capable of longitudinally disentangling the experience of living solo (with and without a LAT relationship) from being unpartnered, regardless of (co-)housing situation (Mortelmans et al. 2023). With its cross-national and multi-cohort nature, incorporating a singlehood module places the GGS at the forefront of singlehood studies, particularly alongside its already novel approach to LAT relationships. Furthermore, the possibility of linking one’s own definition of singlehood, reasons for being single and intentions surrounding partnering to family life projections and trajectories is highly innovative, especially from a comparative perspective. Understanding self-identified reasons for being or remaining single and concurrent partnering intentions is also crucial in terms of (re)directing existing policies. At the same time, projections on the development of singlehood across countries and the needs they identify are valuable in pre-emptively responding to, e.g., housing needs and mental health issues that this evolution entails (see below).

## Methodological motivation

Aside from scientific considerations regarding internationally comparable longitudinal research on “singles”, there is also a strong motivation to incorporate a single module from the perspective of survey methodology and data quality, brought forward by the German team. Inserting a module on “singlehood” into the GGS questionnaire is likely to support the analyses on all kinds of research questions by reducing biases and improving the representation of the target populations.

All analyses based on GGS data must trust that the net samples of the released data are good representations of the countries’ residential populations from which the samples were drawn. In particular, descriptive analyses must trust that the data and the outcomes are representative of the target population. This assumption, however, is only valid inasmuch as biases can be avoided or compensated by weighting. One instrument to prevent or reduce biases is the questionnaire design.

Among other common biases, surveys tend to be biased according to the topic they are conducting data on. People interested in this topic tend to participate at higher rates; people who are not interested tend to display higher ratios of unit nonresponse and higher attrition (Zillmann et al. 2014; Adua & Sharp 2010; Groves et al. 2004). This is also true for the GGS, at least in some countries: From the German GGS-II wave 1 and its interim waves, we know that male people, unmarried people, and people living in single households are underrepresented. The ratios of these groups differ between the survey data and the reference data by three to six percentage points (Bujard et al. 2024: fieldwork

reports, sections on “sample composition”). We must assume that people who are personally less concerned with family issues are less inclined to participate and to remain in the panel for consecutive waves. Reducing this bias must be a major concern for GGS countries. A promising measure is to make the interview interesting also for people without a partner and without children.

A “single” module, asking questions regarding the situation of being without a partner, very likely increases the motivation of singles to participate and thereby improves the representation of the target population. Inserting such a module is also quite safe: The GGS questionnaire has many questions on partnerships and children. While a GGS interview can be long and tiring for people with a complex family situation and history, the interview is rather disappointingly short for respondents with neither a partner nor children to report. So far, the GGS questionnaire contains a few questions about the personal life situation of these respondents only, so they may get the impression that GGS is not interested in their lives. Implementing a “single” module only increases the duration of interviews, which used to be particularly short so that the heterogeneity of interview durations is reduced. There is no issue of limited space in the questionnaire and no compromise to make. A decently long and profound “single” module helps to reduce the biases of GGS without causing any relevant burden to the respondents.

## Previous use

The proposed questions in the module have all been developed and tested in existing studies. A similar module has been inserted in the FReDA interviews, starting in wave 2 (2022). The German panel infrastructure FReDA (Schneider et al. 2021; Hank et al. 2024; Bujard et al. 2024) includes the collection of the German GGS waves. The first FReDA wave is identical to the first wave of the German GGS-II panel. FReDA’s wave 2 is the first of two interim waves between GGS wave 1 and wave 2. In this wave, a module on “singlehood” has been implemented, which contains most of the questions of the module for GGS-II wave 2 in identical or very similar form. The source of inspiration for FReDA and for GGS-II wave 2 has been the preceding panel study pairfam, which also has had a quite similar “single” module (Huinink et al. 2011; Brüderl et al. 2024).

The self-identification of being single is a typical sample criterion in qualitative studies. Starting from self-definitions, qualitative studies have brought more profound insight into the daily lives of singles (Lahad 2017; Reynolds 2008; Simpson 2015), the reasons for staying single (Apostolou 2017), the discrimination of singles (Budgeon 2008; DePaulo and Morris 2016), singles’ life satisfaction (Kislev 2019; Klinenberg 2012), and their identity (Mavcvarish 2006). In most quantitative studies, however, we notice a rupture between pre-defining singlehood either through the status of being unpartnered or living in a single-person household. Considering the GGS’ attention to LAT relationships, this first definition may seem too restrictive in light of the lived experiences of solo-living but partnered individuals. However, LAT relationships can already be identified and studied based on GGS-II data without a further module, so they do not need to be considered in the proposed new questions, even if researchers choose to include them in their definition of “singles”. Also, several proposed new questions concerning “singlehood” do not apply to people in LAT relationships. Therefore, the filter instruction for the final

version of the module, as it is included in GGS-II wave 2, defines that only respondents without a romantic relationship will receive the questions in the module.

Meanwhile, even being unpartnered does not necessarily imply that one considers oneself “single” (e.g. widow(er)s), leading to diverging experiences that should not be heaped together. As such, adding a question on self-identification adds to the GGS’ strength of distinguishing between solo living and unpartnered individuals, as well as between people identifying as “single” and others who are “only” unpartnered. This approach is not novel; some of the abovementioned qualitative studies have already influenced quantitative surveys. This pertains, for example, to the voluntariness of singlehood (Adamczyk 2017b), which has been adopted as a module in the German panel study pairfam (Brüderl et al. 2022) as well as in the study FReDA (Bujard et al. 2024), both mentioned above. From these modules, we adopt the questions on satisfaction with singlehood.

Similarly, qualitative research has led to developing a quantitative research instrument on the reasons for being single (Apostolou 2017). This has been extensively tested and refined through factor analysis (Apostolou et al. 2020; Apostolou and Esposito 2020), giving way to the suggested six statements representing the highest and most consistent loading items within the three overarching dimensions.

Finally, the proposed questions on partnering intentions first explicitly consider the intention of partnering through the exact wording used by GGS for mobility, cohabitation, marriage, and fertility intentions. The second question efficiently looks into dating behaviour by compressing several pairfam items on online dating and adding the consideration of offline dating (which dating research has shown to be still relevant to consider (Paul 2014)). Combining these questions in one module brings together tried and tested elements in identifying and understanding singlehood, allowing for an efficient yet comprehensive (and comparative) understanding of the lived experiences of unpartnered individuals.

## Relevance to GGS-II wave 2 and all countries

The proposed module on singlehood fits the theoretical and methodological nature of the GGS. Theoretically, it allows for a deepening of the main themes on family life and life course trajectories and, in doing so, adds a crucial dimension to the GGS’ valuable insights into population and family dynamics. The experiences of those not in a committed relationship are hardly ever posed in a life course perspective. Instead, research tends to depart from a couple and family-centred perspective, which creates blind spots and research bias. The proposed module adds the individual to the family perspective and appreciates the potential importance of periods of non-involvement in romantic relationships to our understanding of relationship- and family formation (Eastwick et al. 2019). The longitudinal and comparative nature of the GGS is an exceptional strength in this respect, as it allows us to place the singlehood experience within the life course trajectory of various cohorts in multiple countries. As such, the potential for comparative academic research on singlehood using the GGS holds great



promise for identifying both country-specific and cross-national causes and consequences of singlehood.

Apart from identifying the prevalence and experience of singlehood in its various understandings, combining the singlehood module and the core questionnaire provides abundant research opportunities, many of which appear highly valuable in answering policy concerns. The housing situation and mobility of singles, single parenthood and aid for childcare, the educational and financial situation of singles, their life satisfaction and service use are all potentially crucial topics to consider if we wish to adequately (and pre-emptively) respond to the needs of this growing population. Meanwhile, the questions concerning partnered respondents also remain relevant in this respect. As indicated by the life course cube theory (Bernardi et al. 2019), educational and work trajectories can create time dependencies, which, in turn, can burden existing or hinder the formation of committed relationships. As most of the current research in this respect is couple-centred (Heckhausen et al. 2010; Kornblum et al. 2021; Eynde et al. 2020), being able to (longitudinally) link these experiences both from a coupled and unpartnered perspective can lead to inspiring insights.

Finally, the module is easy to incorporate into the core questionnaire, as it is entirely filtered through a filter question on being partnered or not, which is a question that GGS already asks. As such, those exempted from the partnership and relational questions (e.g. the division of household tasks, reproductive behaviour) receive meaningful questions concerning their own (unpartnered) status. The completion time, on average, is not excessively lengthened. And – even more important – it is lengthened only for respondents who otherwise would have particularly short and superficial interviews, resulting in more balanced interview durations, while a larger group of respondents may recognise themselves in the survey topics – two aspects that immediately translate to panel retention (Dillman et al. 2014; Tourangeau et al. 2000; Stoop 2010). All proposed questions have been tested in previous research (see above) and can be easily integrated into the GGS' CAWI or CAPI design.

In summary, covering the demographic picture of singlehood while answering questions on underlying reasons, experiences, and partnering intentions places the GGS at the forefront of the recently emerged and developing tradition of "Singlehood Studies" (DePaulo 2014).

# Implementation of the module in GGS-II wave 2

## Content

The module has 17 variables organised in the following five domains:

### **1. Self-identification of the single**

Variable b04SING07

### **2. Satisfaction with singlehood and desire to have a partner**

Variables b04SING01, b04SING02 (items b04SING02A + b04SING02B)

### **3. Partnering intentions and behaviour**

Variables b04SING03, b04SING04

### **4. Reasons for singlehood**

Variables b04SING05 (items b04SING05A – b04SING05J)

### **5. Expectation regarding remaining single (within the next three years)**

Variable b04SING06

## Survey Questions

IF (BUNIONS.b3UNI19 = 2)

**b04SING01** (Satisfaction with single: general) (DontKnow, Refusal)

How satisfied are you with being single?

Please express your satisfaction on a scale of 0 to 10.

0 not at all satisfied

1

2

3

4

5 about average

6

7

8

9

10 completely satisfied

**b04SING02** (Satisfaction with single: intro) (Empty)

The next two statements are about how you currently feel being single. Please indicate to what extent you agree with each of them.

**b04SING02A** (Satisfaction with singleness: easier) (DontKnow, Refusal)

Being single makes life easier since I don't have to constantly consider and adapt to someone else.

Strongly disagree

Disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Agree

Strongly agree

**b04SING02B** (Satisfaction with singleness: wanting partner) (DontKnow, Refusal)

I would like to have a partner.

Strongly disagree

Disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Agree

Strongly agree

**b04SING03** (Looking for partner) (DontKnow, Refusal)

Are you currently actively looking for a partner?

Yes

No

IF (b04SING03 = yes)

**b04SING04** (Dating behaviour) (DontKnow, Refusal)

Where do you look for a new partner? You can select multiple answers.

SET OF Through work or education (school, university, college etc.)

At church or equivalent

Through an online dating site

Through a mobile dating app

Through online social networks, chat rooms, etc. (e.g., Facebook, Instagram,

Twitter)

Vacation or business trip  
At a bar, nightclub or dance club  
Through a social organization, health club, gym or volunteer group  
Through dating events (e.g. speed-dating, singles' parties)  
At a private party or social event  
Through friends  
Through family  
Other

ENDIF

**b04SING05** (Reasons for singleness: intro) (Empty)

The next statements are about possible reasons why somebody might be single. To what extent do you agree or disagree they apply to your situation?

I am single because...

**b04SING05A** (Lost partner) (DontKnow, Refusal)

... I recently lost my partner (due to death or a break-up).

Strongly disagree  
Disagree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Agree  
Strongly agree

**b04SING05B** (Bad at dating) (DontKnow, Refusal)

... I am not good at dating.

Strongly disagree  
Disagree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Agree  
Strongly agree

**b04SING05C** (Freedom) (DontKnow, Refusal)

... I want to be free to do whatever I want.

Strongly disagree  
Disagree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Agree  
Strongly agree

**b04SING05D** (Afraid of hurt) (DontKnow, Refusal)

... I am afraid I will get hurt.

Strongly disagree  
Disagree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Agree  
Strongly agree

**b04SING05E** (Nobody interested) (DontKnow, Refusal)

... nobody is interested in me as a partner.

Strongly disagree  
Disagree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Agree  
Strongly agree

**b04SING05F** (*Too picky*) (*DontKnow, Refusal*)

... I am too picky.

*Strongly disagree*

*Disagree*

*Neither agree nor disagree*

*Agree*

*Strongly agree*

**b04SING05G** (*Health problems or disability*) (*DontKnow, Refusal*)

... I experience health problems or disability.

*Strongly disagree*

*Disagree*

*Neither agree nor disagree*

*Agree*

*Strongly agree*

**b04SING05H** (*No time*) (*DontKnow, Refusal*)

... I don't have time to date.

*Strongly disagree*

*Disagree*

*Neither agree nor disagree*

*Agree*

*Strongly agree*

**b04SING05I** (*Previous experience*) (*DontKnow, Refusal*)

... I've had (a) bad experience(s) in previous relationships.

*Strongly disagree*

*Disagree*

*Neither agree nor disagree*

*Agree*

*Strongly agree*

**b04SING05J** (*Not right person*) (*DontKnow, Refusal*)

... I haven't found the right person.

*Strongly disagree*

*Disagree*

*Neither agree nor disagree*

*Agree*

*Strongly agree*

**b04SING06** (*Partnering intention*) (*Refusal*)

Do you expect to have a partner within the next three years?

*Definitely not*

*Probably not*

*Unsure*

*Probably yes*

*Definitely yes*

**b04SING07** (*Self-definition of singleness*) (*DontKnow, Refusal*)

Thank you, we are at the end of the questions on being single. To sum up, which of the following descriptions best describes you at the moment?

*Convinced single, i.e. I do not want a committed relationship*

*Open to a relationship, but not actively looking*

*Actively looking for a partner*

*Incel*

*Relationship in the making, i.e. in the getting-to-know phase with someone*

*"On-again/off again relationship", i.e. repeatedly breaking up with someone and getting back together again shortly afterwards*

*"Friends with benefits", i.e. a sexual relationship with a friend, but not in a steady relationship with that person*

*Other*

ENDIF

## Specific points of attention

- **Start of the module:** The module is only asked when the respondent states that they do not have a relationship at this moment (*b3UNI19*= 2: Answer "No" to the question "Are you currently in a romantic (couple) relationship with someone you're not living with?" and *UNI11\_* = 2: Answer "No" to the question "Since that time, have you had any new partner(s) with whom you lived together as a couple in the same household or to whom you have been married?").
- **Translation of "single":** The term "single" is preserved in all languages if possible, unless the term has an explicit negative connotation (e.g. in Polish). We trust that respondents without a partner will identify with the term strong enough to answer the questions. Whether they fully identify with the term or prefer a different one is asked in question *b04SING07*, at the end of the module.
- **Reasons for singlehood:** In the original scale, we had not foreseen the item "I recently lost my partner (due to death or break-up)". We added this item to match the previous flow of the questionnaire and to avoid respondents feeling offended because our questionnaire does not recognise their situation. This item will, therefore, not be randomised and will always be presented as the first item in this battery.
- **B04SING07 – category "incel":** An incel is defined as "an involuntarily celibate man with misogynistic beliefs". We assume that not all respondents will know the meaning of this term. However, in parallel with questions on fertility treatments where GGS also refers to several less-known treatments, we decided to keep the category. Those who identify as incel will know the term, and it is important to get an insight into the size and the profile of this population among single individuals.

## References

- Adamczyk, K. (2017). Voluntary and involuntary singlehood and young adults' mental health: An investigation of mediating role of romantic loneliness. *Current Psychology*, 36(4), 888-904.
- Adua, L., & Sharp, J.S. (2010). Examining survey participation and response quality: The significance of topic salience and incentives. *Survey Methodology*, 36(1), 95-109, Statistics Canada.
- Apostolou, M. (2017). Why people stay single: An evolutionary perspective. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 111, 263-271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.02.034>
- Apostolou, M., O, J., & Esposito, G. (2020). Singles' reasons for being single: Empirical evidence from an evolutionary perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 746. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00746/full>
- Apostolou, M., Papadopoulou, I., & Georgiadou, P. (2019). Are people single by choice? Involuntary singlehood in an evolutionary perspective. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, 5, 98-103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-018-0169-1>
- Bergström, M., Courtel, F., & Vivier, G. (2019). Uncoupled: Experiences of singlehood in contemporary France. *Population*, 74(1), 101-126. <https://doi.org/10.3917/popu.1901.0103>
- Bergström, M., & Brée, S. (2023). Not a single meaning: Definition and evolution of singlehood in France and the United States. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 15(3), 465-484. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12519>
- Bernardi, L., Huinink, J., & Settersten Jr, R.A. (2019). The life course cube: A tool for studying lives. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 41, 100258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2018.11.004>
- Billari, F., & Liefbroer, A. (2010). Towards a new pattern of transition to adulthood? *Advances in Life Course Research*, 15(2-3), 59-75.
- Brüderl, J., Drobnič, S., Hank, K., Neyer, F.J., Walper, S., Alt, P., Borschel, E., Bozoyan, C., Garrett, M., Geissler, S., Avilés, T.G., Gröpler, N., Hajek, K., Herzig, M., Lenke, R., Lorenz, R., Lutz, K., Peter, T., Preetz, R., & Wetzel, M. (2022). *The German family panel (pairfam)*. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5678 Data file Version 13.0.0. <https://doi.org/10.4232/pairfam.5678.13.0.0>
- Brüderl, J., Drobnič, S., Hank, K., Neyer, F.J., Walper, S., Wolf, C. Alt, P., Bauer, I., Böhm, S., Borschel, E., Bozoyan, C. Christmann, P., Edinger, R., Eigenbrodt, F., Garrett, M., Geissler, S., Avilés, T., Gröpler, N., Gummer, T., ..., Wetzel, M. (2024). *The German Family Panel (pairfam)*. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5678 Data file Version 14.2.0, [doi.org/10.4232/pairfam.5678.14.2.0](https://doi.org/10.4232/pairfam.5678.14.2.0)

Budgeon, S. (2008). Couple culture and the production of singleness. *Sexualities*, 11(3), 301-325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460708089422>

Bujard, M., Gummer, T., Hank, K., Neyer, F.J., Pollak, R., Schneider, N.F., Spieß, C.K., Wolf, C., Bauer, I., Börlin, S., Bretsch, D., Brüggemann, K., Christmann, P., Edinger, R., Eigenbrodt, F., Firl, K., Frembs, L., Groß, K., Hoherz, S., ..., Ullrich, E. (2024). *FReDA – Das familiendemografische Panel*. GESIS, Köln. ZA7777 Datenfile Version 4.0.0. <https://doi.org/10.4232/1.14195>

DePaulo, B.M., & Morris, W.L. (2016). The unrecognized stereotyping and discrimination against singles. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(5), 251-254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00446.x>

Eastwick, P.W., Finkel, E.J., & Simpson, J.A. (2019). Relationship trajectories: A meta-theoretical framework and theoretical applications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 30(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2019.1577072>

Eurostat. (2023). *Distribution of households by household type from 2003 onwards - EU-SILC survey*. Retrieved March 13, 2023, from [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/ilc\\_lvph03/default/table?lang=en](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/ilc_lvph03/default/table?lang=en)

Groves, R.M., Presser, S., Dipko, S. (2004). The role of topic interest in survey participation decisions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68(1), 2-31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfh002>

Hank, K., Gummer, T., Bujard, M., Neyer, F.J., Pollak, R., Spieß, C.K., Wolf, C., Christmann, P., Kunz, T., Lück, D., Naderi, R., Nutz, T., Schmid, L., & Thönnissen, C. (2024). A new data infrastructure for family research and demographic analysis: The German Family Demography Panel Study (FReDA). *European Sociological Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcae019>

Heckhausen, J., Wrosch, C., & Schulz, R. (2010). A motivational theory of life-span development. *Psychological Review*, 117(1), 32-60. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017668>

Hübgen, S. (2018). Only a husband away from poverty? Lone mothers' poverty risks in a European comparison. In L. Bernardi & D. Mortelmans (Eds.), *Lone parenthood in a life course perspective* (pp. 167-190). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63295-7\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63295-7_8)

Huinink, J., Brüderl, J., Nauck, B., Walper, S., Castiglioni, L., & Feldhaus, M. (2011). Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics (pairfam): Conceptual framework and design. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung - Journal of Family Research*, 23(1), 77-101. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ss0ar-376463>

Iacovou, M., & Skew, A.J. (2011). Household composition across the new Europe: Where do the new Member States fit in? *Demographic Research*, 25, 465-490.

Kislev, E. (2019). *Happy singlehood: The rising acceptance and celebration of solo living*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvd1c7r2>



Klinenberg, E. (2012). *Going solo: The extraordinary rise and surprising appeal of living alone*. Penguin Press.

Kornblum, A., Unger, D., & Grote, G. (2021). How romantic relationships affect individual career goal attainment: A transactive goal dynamics perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.>

Lahad, K. (2017). *A table for one: A critical reading of singlehood, gender and time*. Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1wn0s66>

López-Gay, A., Esteve, A., López-Colás, J., Permanyer, I., Turu, A., Kennedy, S., Laplante, B., & Lesthaeghe, R. (2014). A geography of unmarried cohabitation in the Americas. *Demographic Research*, 30, 1621. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2014.30.59>

Lyssens-Danneboom, V., & Mortelmans, D. (2014). Living apart together and money: New partnerships, traditional gender roles. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(5), 949-966. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12136>

Macklin, E.D. (1980). Nontraditional Family Forms: A Decade of Research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 42(4), 905-922. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351832>

Macvarish, J. (2006). What is 'the problem' of singleness? *Sociological Research Online*, 11(3). Retrieved June 2, 2023, from <https://www.socresonline.org.uk/11/3/macvarish.html>

McElhaney, L. (2019). Dating and courtship in the later years: A neglected topic of research. In L. Burton (Ed.), *Families and aging* (pp. 43-48). Routledge.

Mortelmans, D., Claessens, E., & Thielemans, G. (2023). Defining and measuring singlehood in family studies. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 15(3), 485-505. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12520>

Paul, A. (2014). Is online better than offline for meeting partners? Depends: Are you looking to marry or to date? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 17(10), 664-667. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2014.0302>

Perelli-Harris, B., & Lyons-Amos, M. (2015). Changes in partnership patterns across the life course: An examination of 14 countries in Europe and the United States. *Demographic Research*, 33, 145-178. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2015.33.6>

Reynolds, J. (2008). *The single woman: A discursive investigation*. Routledge.

Rosenfeld, M. (2007). *The age of independence: Interracial unions, same-sex unions, and the changing American family*. Harvard University Press.

Roy, U., Maity, I., & Karak, S. (2021). New Paradigm of Family Formation: From Coupling to Multinuclear Family. *Indian Journal of Landscape Systems and Ecological Studies*, 44(1), 5-25.

Schneider, N.F., Bujard, M., Wolf, C., Gummer, T., Hank, K., Neyer, F.J. (2021). Family Research and Demographic Analysis (FReDA): Evolution, Framework, Objectives, and Design of “The German Family Demography Panel Study”. *Comparative Population Studies*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.12765/CPoS-2021-06>

Simpson, R. (2015). Singleness and self-identity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33(3), 385-400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407515611884>

Tessler, H. (2023). The stability of singlehood: Limitations of the relationship status paradigm and a new theoretical framework for reimagining singlehood. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 15(3), 444–464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12506>

Tuval-Mashiach, R., Hanson, J., & Shulman, S. (2015). Turning points in the romantic history of emerging adults. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18(4), 434-450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2014.963533>

Van De Kaa, D.J. (1987). Europe's second demographic transition. *Population Bulletin*, 42(1), 1-59.

van den Berg, L., & Verbakel, E. (2022). Trends in singlehood in young adulthood in Europe. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 51, 100449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2021.100449>

Wiik, K. A., & Dommermuth, L. (2014). Who remains unpartnered by mid-life in Norway? Differentials by gender and education. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 45(3), 405-424. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.45.3.405>

Yeung, W.-J. J., & Cheung, A. K.-L. (2015). Living alone: One-person households in Asia. *Demographic Research*, 32, 1099-1112. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2015.32.40>

Zillmann, D., Schmitz, A., Skopek, J. et al. (2014). Survey topic and unit nonresponse. Evidence from an online survey on mating. *Quality and Quantity*, 48, 2069-2088. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9880-y>