PAWCER - Public Attitudes to Welfare, Climate Change and Energy in the EU and Russia: European Social Survey (ESS); Cognitive Pretest

Neuert, Cornelia; Meitinger, Katharina; Stiegler, Angelika; Beitz, Clara; Schmidt, Robin

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

gesis **Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften**

PAWCER – Public Attitudes to Welfare, Climate Change and Energy in the EU and Russia

European Social Survey (ESS)

Cognitive Pretest
January/February 2017

*Cornelia Neuert, Katharina Meitinger,
Angelika Stiegler, Clara Beitz &
Robin Schmidt*

PAWCER – Public Attitudes to Welfare, Climate Change and Energy in the EU and Russia

European Social Survey (ESS)

Cognitive Pretest
January/February 2017

Cornelia Neuert, Katharina Meitinger, Angelika Stiegler, Clara Beitz & Robin Schmidt

GESIS Project Reports

Zitierweise
Neuert, C.; Meitinger, K. et. al. (2017): „PAWCER – Public Attitudes to Welfare, Climate Change and Energy in the EU and Russia – European Social Survey (ESS)". Cognitive Pretest. *GESIS Projektbericht. Version: 1.0*. GESIS - Pretestlabor. Text. http://doi.org/10.17173/pretest84

Contents

1   Aims of the Pretest

PAWCER – Public Attitudes to Welfare, Climate Change and Energy in the EU and Russia

The aim of the PAWCER project is to conduct comparative research on attitudes towards the welfare state, climate change and energy in order to deepen the understanding of conflict, identity and memory. Cross-country analyses of survey and contextual data explore similarities and differences between Europe and Russia, as well as converging or diverging trends in these areas. The research is based on the analysis of existing and forthcoming survey data. The data will be collected through the European Social Survey (ESS), a biennial academic survey. The project is funded by the initiative ERA.Net RUS Plus.

For the project described above, two questions will be tested for comprehensibility in a cognitive pretest. For this purpose, the GESIS pretest laboratory was commissioned to carry out the cognitive pretest. The contact person on the project side was Dr. Scheuer of GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences.

2   Sample

Number of cognitive interviews: 10

Selection of target population: Quota Sampling

Quotas: The selection of the target population was based on: Age (18 – 38 years, 39 – 59 years, 60 – 80 years) and sex.

Sex	Age 18 - 38	Age 39 - 59	Age 60 - 80	Total
Male	2	2	1	5
Female	2	1	2	5
Total	**4**	**3**	**3**	**10**

Key characteristics of the test persons:

Test person ID[1]	Sex	Age	Country of Birth	Country of Birth Father	Country of Birth Mother
01	male	38	Germany	Germany	Germany
02	male	21	Germany	Germany	Germany
03	male	47	Germany	Germany	Germany
04	male	52	Germany	Germany	Austria
05	male	81	Germany	Germany	Germany
07	female	23	Germany	Germany	Germany
08	female	32	Germany	Germany	Germany
09	female	56	Germany	Germany	Germany
11	female	61	Ukraine	Romania	Ukraine
12	female	64	Germany	Germany	Germany

---

[1] The test person IDs 06 and 10 were not assigned.

3   Methods

Field time:	02 February to 10 February 2017
Number of cognitive interviewers:	5
Pretests conducted in the lab (video-recorded):	10
Procedure:	Use of an evaluation questionnaire
Interview mode:	PAPI
Cognitive techniques:	General Probing, Specific Probing, Emergent Probing.
Incentives for respondents:	30 Euros
Language of questions and interviews:	German

4 Results

Question to be tested:

1. **In der Politik spricht man manchmal von „links" und „rechts".**

    [In politics one sometimes speaks of "left" and "right".]

    Wo auf der Skala auf dieser Liste würden Sie sich selbst einstufen, wenn 0 für links steht und 10 für rechts?

    [Where on the scale on this list would you rate yourself if 0 was left and 10 was right?]

Frequency distribution (N=10)

Answer	No. of mentions
00 Left	–
01	–
02	2
03	2
04	–
05	5
06	1
07	–
08	–
09	–
10 Right	–
Refusal	–
Dont't know	–

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Specific Probing, Emergent Probing.

Findings:

Half of the ten test persons located themselves at scale point five in the exact middle on the left-right scale (TP 01, 05, 07, 11, 12). One test person (TP 03) chose the value six, and two test persons each placed themselves on the left half of the scale on the values two (TP 02, 09) and three (TP 04, 08). In this context, it is noticeable that two of the test persons first selected other scale values. Test subject 07 first classified himself on value six and, after closer consideration, preferred value five, since this

value is more neutral ("*I have now thought about it for a longer time and I see myself rather in the middle of left and right, since I am neither left nor right.*"[2]) Test person 11 also corrected the originally chosen scale value from ten to five, and would prefer a value between five and six. She explains her original choice for the value 10 as follows: "*Because I have no idea about the left. I have heard it, but what they do... I only know that the left has no great sympathy. They try everything possible, but still don't get through. Without success.*"[3] On the other hand, she justifies her final scale value (5.5) with a lack of political interest ("*If someone has no interest at all, he is best placed in the middle.*"[4])

Some test persons also spontaneously commented on the left-right scale. Test person 03 in particular rejects a query of political orientation on the basis of the left-right scale and would prefer the Hayekian value triangle instead ("*There is the Constitution of Freedom by Hayek. There is a triangular model. They say we have people who put the individual at the centre, people who put the community and the group at the centre. That's a wonderful model. You have three directions. You have the national conservatives, then you have the right-wing liberals, left-wing liberals, social democrats, communists and Nazis. This thing is wonderful for depicting such scenarios.*"[5]). In addition, some test persons expressed discomfort with this item due to their lack of political interest:

- "*Oh, politics. Those are always the dangerous questions. What was the question again? [...] Politics is so not my world.*"[6] (TP 01)

- "*God, it's full of political issues. [Laughs] almost unbearable. [Sighs] I don't know anything about that.*"[7] (TP 07)

- "*Please don't torture me with politics.*"[8] (TP 11)

The test persons were also asked to explain their choice of answers in more detail. The five test persons who had chosen the answer value five gave different reasons for their choice. Two of the test persons (TP 05, 12) chose the middle point of the scale because they are both socially liberal and conservative and saw this point as a kind of "middle value" between these orientations ("*I mean, I am somewhat socially oriented. It just moves me to then choose the four or the three. On the other hand, [...] I am a bit conservative. This goes more in the direction of 6 and 7.*"[9]). On the other hand, test person 01

---

[2] *„Ich habe jetzt länger darüber nachgedacht und ich sehe mich eher in der Mitte von Links und Rechts, da ich weder links noch rechts bin."* (TP 07)

[3] *„Weil ich von links keine Ahnung habe. Gehört habe ich es, aber konkret, was die treiben... Ich weiß nur, dass die links keine große Sympathie haben. Die versuchen alles Mögliche, aber kommen trotzdem nicht durch. Ohne Erfolg."* (TP 11)

[4] *„Wenn jemand überhaupt kein Interesse hat, der platziert sich am besten in der Mitte."* (TP 11)

[5] *„Es gibt von Hayek die Verfassung der Freiheit. Da gibt es ein Dreiecks-Modell. Man sagt, wir haben Leute, die das Individuum in den Mittelpunkt stellen, Leute die die Gemeinschaft und die Gruppe in den Mittelpunkt stellen. Das ist ein wunderbares Modell. Da hat man drei Richtungen. Da hat man die national-konservativen, dann hat man die rechts-liberalen, links-liberalen, Sozialdemokraten, Kommunisten und Nationalsozialisten. Das Ding ist wunderbar, um solche Szenarien darzustellen."* (TP 03)

[6] *„Oh, Politik. Das sind immer die gefährlichen Fragen. Wie war die Frage nochmal? [...] Politik ist absolut nicht meine Welt."* (TP 01)

[7] *„Oh Gott, voll politische Fragen. [Lacht], fast unerträglich. [Stöhnt] Da kenne ich mich nicht aus."* (TP 07)

[8] *„Bitte quälen Sie mich nicht mit Politik."* (TP 11)

[9] *„Ich meine, ich bin einigermaßen sozial eingestellt. Es bewegt mich eben, dann die vier oder die drei zu nehmen. Auf der anderen Seite [...] bin ich etwas konservativ. Das geht dann mehr Richtung 6 und 7."* (TP 05)

PAWCER – Public Attitudes to Welfare, Climate Change and Energy in the EU and Russia. Cognitive Pretest.

11

preferred the scale value five because she is impartial, test person 07 because she is neither left nor right and test person 11 because she is not interested in politics.

The respondents were also asked to explain their choice of answer in more detail. Test subject 03 chose the scale value six because she herself is in the conservative area. The two test persons, who were placed on the value two (TP 02, 09), justified this on the one hand with their own political background (TP 09: "*Falcon group founded with 14, in the district council with 16 and special permission, very active in the party at the time.*"[10]) and on the other hand with the social policy represented by the individual parties (TP 02). The two test persons, who chose the answer value three, named their own political thinking (TP 04) as well as the location of certain parties on the scale (TP 08: "*Of course, one always has one party in mind and knows the parties one would rather vote for, even where they are located.*"[11]) as an explanation.

Some respondents also explained how they used the scale in choosing the response value. Most test persons used the middle of the scale as an anchor point:

- "*I looked first, from 0 to 10, where the middle is. The middle is 5. And then I moved a little to the left and looked, 2/3 is where I see myself and 3 is perfect.*[12]" (TP 02)

- "*That's a good question. In the first step, I thought about it, it's an odd scale [...]. 5 is the middle out of feeling, I tend more to the right and have thought about what is on the far right. Then I assigned the scale values of 6-10 groupings. And the NPD is 9, the Ku Klux Klan is 10 [...]. So I graded, I am somewhere around 6.*[13]" (TP 03)

- "*I have assumed that 5 is social democracy, then I am a bit more left.*[14]" (TP 04)

- "*I have counted how many categories I have. To find out if we have a middle or not, but I do that with all scales. [...] I first looked to see if there was a middle point on this scale or not, and then I located myself there.*[15]" (TP 08)

On the other hand, some of the participants (TP 09, 11, 12) were located at the end of the scale due to the scale end points. Test person 12 explains: "*Not on the right side at all, I know what that means. On the left I also know that, they are too 'lenor-rinsed'. So, four or five.*"[16]

---

[10] *„Falkengruppe gegründet mit 14, im Bezirksrat mit 16 und Sondergenehmigung, sehr aktiv in der Partei zu der Zeit."* (TP 09)

[11] *„Ja klar hat man dabei auch immer eine Partei eher vor Augen und weiß selbst die Parteien, die man eher wählen würde, auch wo die sich eher verorten."* (TP 08)

[12] *„Ich habe erstmal geguckt, von 0 bis 10, wo ist die Mitte. Die Mitte ist 5. Und dann hab ich mich ein bisschen links eingeordnet und hab dann geguckt, 2/3 ist das wo ich mich sehe und 3 ist perfekt."* (TP 02)

[13] *„Das ist eine gute Frage. Im ersten Schritt habe ich überlegt, das ist eine ungerade Skala [...]. 5 ist die Mitte aus dem Empfinden heraus, ich tendiere eher nach rechts und habe überlegt, was steht rechts außen. Dann hab ich die Skalenwerte von 6-10 Gruppierungen zugeordnet. Und die NPD ist 9, der Ku-Klux-Klan ist 10 [...]. Da habe ich abgestuft, ich bin irgendwo bei 6."* (TP 03)

[14] *„Ich bin davon ausgegangen, 5 ist die Sozialdemokratie, dann bin ich noch ein bisschen mehr links."* (TP 04)

[15] *„Ich habe erstmal abgezählt, wie viele Kategorien ich habe. Um herauszufinden, ob wir eine Mitte haben oder nicht, aber das mache ich bei allen Skalen so. [...] Ich habe erstmal geguckt, ob es einen Mittelpunkt gibt bei dieser Skala oder halt nicht, und dann habe ich mich da verortet."* (TP 08)

[16] *„Also rechts überhaupt nicht, das weiß ich ja, was das bedeutet. Links weiß ich auch, die sind mir zu 'lenor-gespült'. Also 4 oder 5."* (TP 12)

The respondents were also asked what it means to them when someone places themselves on the left, in the middle or on the right. In this question, respondents named a variety of different meanings for the different political directions. For the respondents, a ranking on the left side of the scale means that this person attaches particular importance to social justice (TP 02, 04, 09), that he or she is a socialist/communist (TP 02, 05) and that he or she stands up for workers' rights (TP 02). Respondents associated with the left scale endpoint also the ideas of community and equality (TP 03), as well as openness and tolerance (TP 09) and environmental protection (TP 02, 08). In addition, the respondents attributed a cosmopolitan and international orientation (TP 03, 08) to the "left", which is also reflected in a globalization and EU-friendly position (TP 08). Test person 12 considers the "left" to be too "*lenor-rinsed and wishy-washy*", and test person 07 was unable to give an answer here due to a lack of knowledge (*"Unfortunately, I cannot answer that. I don't know my way around that well. I do not know. Impossible to say.*"[17]).

On the other hand, the respondents equated the right-hand end of the scale with a conservative (TP 02) and national (TP 02, 09) orientation, which is not in line with Europeanization and globalization efforts (TP 08). Respondents also thought of concepts such as national pride (TP 08), National Socialism (TP 09) and described "right" as "totalitarian" (TP 04), "racist" and "discriminatory" (TP 02, 04), as well as "radical" or "radical right" (TP 07, 12). Test person 03 defined right as "*the community of my group, in which everyone should be equal and better than the others.*"[18] Two test subjects (TP 02, 05) assign an extremely capitalist attitude to the right.

Although the respondents had a clear idea of the meaning of "left" and "right", this does not seem to be the case for the "middle". Although two of the respondents name concrete associations such as liberalism, free market economy (TP 02) and social democracy (04), the remaining respondents describe the meaning of the political middle in very vague terms such as "*meeting in the middle*" (TP 01, 05, 08, 12), "*balanced*" (TP 12), "*neutral*" (TP 07), "*undecided" and "current situation*" (TP 08).

In addition, the test subjects were asked about political issues that they believe are usually represented by the left, right and center. A typical political topic of the left was social justice in general (TP 04, 08, 09), and wage justice, property justice (TP 03) and tax justice (TP 09) in particular. In this context, three test persons thought of a liberal asylum and refugee policy (TP 01, 08, 12) and two test persons thought of the support of socially disadvantaged persons by providing social housing and unemployment benefit/Hartz IV (TP 02, 12). Other political topics assigned to the left were the environment (TP 07) and the family (TP 09). Respondents to this demand also mentioned keywords such as "*nationalization*" (TP 05), "*the opposite of elite*" (TP 03) and "*EU-friendliness*" (TP 08).

Diametrically opposed to this, the scale points on the right were associated with restrictive refugee and integration policies (TP 01, 02), as well as xenophobia (TP 04, 09, 12) and national-focused policies that manifest themselves in economic protectionism and resistance to the EU and the EURO (TP 08). Furthermore, some test persons saw the right-wing issues as characterized by an improved position of the majority population (TP 07, 09, 12), elitist thinking, segregation and "*thinking in structures and order*" (TP 03). Test person 02 also thought of the "*historical processing of German history*" and a conservative family policy. Test person 05 associated a liberal economic policy with the right.

With regard to the political topics of the middle, the test persons thought of economic topics (TP 02, 04), such as "*minimum taxes for all*" and "*minimal political intervention in the market economy*" (TP 02), and social issues (TP 04). Test person 05 also mentioned a balanced relationship between unions

---

[17] *„Kann ich leider nicht beantworten. Ich kenn mich da nicht so gut aus. Weiß ich nicht. Unmöglich zu sagen."* (TP 07)

[18] [...] *„die Gemeinschaft meiner Gruppe, in der alle gleich sein sollen und besser als die anderen."* (TP 03)

and employers (TP 05). The remaining test subjects do not associate clear political issues with the centre and either describe the political issues of the centre vaguely (TP 12: "*what the chancellor does*"[19]) or cannot name any issues. Test person 03 assumes that the middle group "*have no statement. The middle does not exist*" and test person 01 sees the middle as "*impartial*". Subject 07 and 09 state that they have no idea what political issues the centre stands for. Interestingly, subject 07 has chosen the value five on the scale, i.e. the political middle.

Finally, the test persons were asked about political parties that are located on the left, right or in the middle. Most of the test persons associate the left end of the scale with the left (TP 02, 03, 04, 05, 07, 08, 09) and occasionally with the DKP, KPD (TP 04), the Greens [die Grünen] (TP 07), SPD (TP 09) and FDP (TP 12). Some test persons classified the Greens [die Grünen] (TP 05, 11) and the Punk Party [Punkpartei] (TP 04) as rather left-wing. For the test persons the SPD (TP 01, 03, 04, 07, 11), the CDU/CSU (TP 01, 03, 08, 12), the FDP (TP 02, 04, 05, 09) and the Greens [die Grünen] (TP 01, 12) are parties of the middle. On the right scale spectrum, some respondents rated the CDU/CSU as more to the right (TP 04, 05, 11) or right (TP 09). The AfD (TP 01, 02, 04, 07, 08, 09), the NPD (TP 03, 04, 05, 09, 12) and the Republicans [Republikaner] (TP 12) were also classified on the right. Test person 04 also named "Pegida" and the "Reichsdeutschen" in this context.

Table 1 Party classification on left–right scale (Number of respondents)

Left	Rather left	Middle	Rather right	Right
The Left [Die Linke] (8)	The Greens [Die Grünen] (2)	SPD (5)	CDU (3)	AfD (6)
DKP (1)	Punk Party [Punkpartei] (1)	CDU/CSU (4)		NPD (5)
KPD (1)		FDP (4)		CSU (1)
The Greens [Die Grünen] (1)		The Greens [Die Grünen] (2)		Republicans [Republikaner] (1)
SPD (1)				
FDP (1)				

---

[19] „[…] *was die Kanzlerin macht*" (TP 12)

Question to be tested:

---

2.   Bitte schauen Sie jetzt auf diese Liste und sagen Sie mir, wie sehr Sie der folgenden Aussage zustimmen oder wie sehr Sie diese ablehnen.

[Please look at this list now and tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statement.]

Der Staat sollte Maßnahmen ergreifen, um Einkommensunterschiede zu verringern.

[The state should take measures to reduce income disparities.]

Frequency distribution (N=10)

Answer	No. of mentions
Strongly agree	3
Agree	4
Neither	-
Reject	2
Strongly reject	1
Don't know	-
Refusal	-

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Specific Probing, Emergent Probing.

Findings:

The majority of the test persons indicate that they strongly agree (TP 04, 07, 11) or disagree (TP 01, 02, 05, 08) with the statement. Two subjects disagree with the statement (TP 09, 12) and one subject strongly disagrees (TP 03). No test person chooses the answer "neither nor".

Test persons who (strongly) agree with the statement usually justify their answers by stating that in their opinion the differences in salaries between rich and poor should be reduced or that the state must ensure that all citizens have an adequate standard of living (TP 01, 02, 04, 07, 08, 09):

- ▪ "*For example, that the minimum wage is rising. That every household with or without children can survive in any occupation. That it doesn't get to the point where you do four or five jobs a day to make ends meet.*" [20] (TP 01)

---

[20] „*Zum Beispiel, dass der Mindestlohn steigt. Dass jeder Haushalt mit oder ohne Kinder in jedem Beruf überleben kann. Dass es nicht so weit kommt wie in Amerika, dass man vier bis fünf Jobs täglich macht, um über die Runden zu kommen.*" (TP 01)

- *"I think it's important that people with low incomes get support from the state. I am personally very well. My family is also very well. Fortunately, we don't need any support from the state. I think it is important that all people in Germany, we are all doing so well, that it should be possible that everyone is doing relatively well. And I also think we need more support that also supports families. Because if I see now, for example, that people who get Hartz IV and have two children get just as much money as people who go to work and have two children. [...] It can't be that people who work get less money than people who don't work."* [21] (TP 02)

- *"That's when I remembered the social injustice. That it's getting bigger and bigger, the gap between rich and poor. ...including in terms of wages and income."*[22] (TP 04)

- *"I strongly agree with this, as the gap between the poor and the rich is widening rather than narrowing and therefore something should be done about it."*[23] (TP 07)

- *"Minimum wages, for example, that the state should put a stop to companies in a certain way, that when people work, they get enough money to live on the job."*[24] (TP 08)

- *"For example, the pension, people are so dissatisfied."*[25] (TP 11)

One test person, on the other hand, refers to gender differences in salaries: *"I do think that regarding women and men there should be some corrections. This is a sector in which the state should definitely intervene if there are disparities. But at the end of the day we have all that. I can see the biggest gap between women and men."*[26] (TP 05).

Test persons, who (strongly) reject the statement, justify their answer either by stating that they are not in favor of state interference or by stating that this is also their own responsibility / the responsibility of the citizens:

---

[21] „*Ich finde wichtig, dass Leute mit geringem Einkommen Unterstützung vom Staat bekommen. Mir geht es persönlich sehr gut. Meiner Familie geht es auch sehr gut. Wir brauchen zum Glück keine Unterstützung vom Staat. Ich find es wichtig, dass es allen Leuten in Deutschland, uns geht es allen so gut, dass man es hinbekommen müsste, dass es allen relativ gut geht. Und ich finde auch, man bräuchte mehr Unterstützung, die auch Familien unterstützen. Weil wenn ich jetzt z.B. sehe, dass Leute, die Hartz IV bekommen und zwei Kinder haben, genau so viel Geld bekommen, wie Leute, die arbeiten gehen und zwei Kinder haben. [...] Es kann nicht sein, dass Leute, die arbeiten weniger Geld rausbekommen, als Leute, die nicht arbeiten.*" (TP 02)

[22] „*Da ist mir die soziale Ungerechtigkeit eingefallen. Dass es immer größer wird, die Spalte zwischen Arm und Reich. Auch was Gehälter und Einkommen angeht.*" (TP 04)

[23] „*Dem stimme ich stark zu, da die Kluft zwischen den Armen und Reichen größer wird, statt kleiner und deswegen sollte man dagegen was tun.*" (TP 07)

[24] „*An Mindestlohn zum Beispiel, dass der Staat den Unternehmen in gewisser Weise einen Riegel davor schieben soll, dass wenn die Leute arbeiten, dass sie auch genügend Geld kriegen, um von dem Job zu leben.*" (TP 08)

[25] „*Zum Beispiel die Rente, die Leute sind so unzufrieden.*" (TP 11)

[26] „*Ich meine schon, dass da Punkto Frauen und Männern, dass er da ein bisschen korrigieren kann. Das ist ein Sektor, wo durchaus der Staat eingreifen soll, wenn es Missverhältnisse gibt. Aber im Endeffekt haben wir ja das alles. Wo jetzt die größte Lücke [ist], das sehe ich zwischen Frauen und Männern.*" (TP 05)

- *"State intervention is in principle a very bad thing. The state only intervenes if there is a slip-up, at least that is what the inventors of the social market economy thought. If there is market failure. And income disparities, the state does not need to intervene."*[27] (TP 03)

- *"Because I think, in terms of minimum wage, it's pretty much gone to shit. On the bottom line, companies pay minimum wage now and the state still has to pay it. Through Hartz IV. And I don't think that's the point, if the unions would enforce decent collective agreements and accordingly there would be more people in the union, then I think it would be much easier. And that then everyone could really live on his salary."*[28] (TP 09)

- *"Well, I think that's a lot of things, it's at everyone's own discretion, I don't sit on the couch for the state to feed me. The state isn't there for everything, I have to stand up for myself and bear responsibility."*[29] (TP 12)

When asked what would be appropriate measures to reduce income disparities, the test persons on the one hand name "*regulation through taxes (or salaries)*" (5 TPs), such as a "*wealth tax*" (TP 08, 11), "*tax relief for low income earners*" (TP 02), or the "*capping of rodent salaries*" (TP 04) or the "increasing the *minimum wage*" (TP 01). On the other hand, "access to the labor market" is considered a suitable measure (TP 4). This is to be realized by better education and training (TP 03, 12), but also by own further training (TP 12). Test person 04 also includes the idea that jobs should be kept in Germany and not relocated abroad, and TP 05, which was mainly concerned with income differences between women and men, considers the provision of more childcare places as a suitable measure so that women can continue to work even if they have children.

Test person 09 sees the responsibility at this point less with the state, but rather with the trade unions, which, by concluding "*decent collective agreements*", could ensure that people "*can really live on their salary*".

Subject 07, who "strongly agrees" with the statement in question 2, states that he is not aware of any measures that the state could take to reduce income disparities.

Finally, the test persons were asked whether they had poor or rich people in mind when they answered this question. A total of five test persons thought primarily of "poor" people (TP 01, 02, 08, 11, 12), one test person stated that he thought of "rich" people (TP 04), and one thought of "both" equally (TP 07). The other three test persons state that they have neither thought of "poor" nor "rich" people, but rather of "*the middle class*" (TP 09), "*women*" (TP 05) or "*people who are willing to perform. I have thought of people who are willing to work [...] and that should be rewarded.*" (TP 03).

---

[27] *„Das Eingreifen des Staates ist prinzipiell eine ganz schlechte Sache. Der Staat greift nur dann ein, so haben es sich zumindest die Erfinder der sozialen Marktwirtschaft gedacht, wenn es zu Ausrutschern kommt. Wenn Marktversagen vorliegt. Und Einkommensunterschiede, da braucht der Staat nicht einzugreifen."* (TP 03)

[28] *„Weil ich denke, in Bezug auf den Mindestlohn, das ist ziemlich in die Hose gegangen. Im Endeffekt zahlen Firmen jetzt Mindestlohn und der Staat muss trotzdem draufzahlen. Eben durch Hartz IV. Und ich denke mal, das ist nicht Sinn der Sache, wenn die Gewerkschaften anständige Tarifverträge durchsetzen würden und dementsprechend wieder mehr Leute in der Gewerkschaft wären, dann glaube ich, wäre das viel einfacher. Und dass nämlich dann jeder von seinem Gehalt auch wirklich leben könnte."* (TP 09)

[29] *„Also ich finde das allerhand, das liegt doch in jedem eigenen Ermessen, ich hocke mich doch nicht auf die Couch, dass der Staat mich ernährt. [...] Der Staat ist doch nicht für alles da, ich muss doch auch für mich geradestehen und Verantwortung tragen."* (TP 12)

5 Glossary: Cognitive techniques

Think Aloud	Technique of thinking aloud: *„Please vocalize everything that comes to your mind while you answer the following question. Please also vocalize things that seem unimportant to you. The question is…".*
Comprehension Probing	Questions on understanding, e.g.: *„What do you understand by 'a highly responsible professional activity' in this question? "*
Category Selection Probing	Question about the choice of answer category, e.g.: *„You have said that you 'fully' agree with this statement. Why did you choose this answer?"*
Information Retrieval Probing	Questions on how information was obtained, e.g.: *„How did you remember that you had been to the doctor for the last 12 months?"*
General/Elaborative Probing	Non-specific questions, e.g.: *„Could you please explain your answer a little more?"*
Specific Probing	Specific questions, e.g.: *„You answered 'yes' in this question. Does this mean that you have already given up on career opportunities for your family, or that you might be willing to give them up but have not yet done so?"*
Emergent Probing	Spontaneous questioning in response to an utterance or behavior of the test person, e.g.: *„You just frowned and laughed when I read you the answer options. Can you please explain to me why you did that?"*
Difficulty Probing	How easy or difficult was it for you to answer this question? *If rather/very difficult:* *„Why did you find the answer to this question rather difficult / very difficult?"*
Paraphrasing	Test persons reproduce the question text in their own words: *„Please repeat the question I read to you in your own words."*
Confidence Rating	Assessment of the reliability of the response, e.g.: *„How sure are you that you've seen a doctor in the last 12 months?"*