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1 Introduction

The University of Hamburg (UHH) is a project partner in the research network MOTRA (Monitoring System and Transfer Platform Radicalization), a joint project of civil security research in which, besides the UHH, seven other partner organizations from universities and research centres throughout Germany are involved. Two primary objectives are pursued in the MOTRA research network: First, MOTRA will establish a central information hub for the comprehensive transfer of knowledge regarding radicalization. Second, MOTRA is to continuously monitor and analyse radicalization events in Germany using multiple empirical studies.

The study ‘People in Germany’ (Menschen in Deutschland, MiD) is a central component of the regular monitoring conducted in the MOTRA research network. Its primary purpose is to investigate trends in the prevalence of religiously and politically motivated extremist attitudes, intolerance, and the acceptance of politically motivated violence in Germany. The study is an annually repeated, representative population survey that will be carried out in four waves, commencing in 2021, by the University of Hamburg.

The survey focuses on political extremist attitudes in the sense of a rejection of fundamental principles and key elements of the free democratic system in Germany. It examines negative attitudes toward central fundamental rights and freedoms as well as essentials of a free democratic state organization. The objective is to measure extremist attitudes independently of ideology. Additionally, the survey evaluates phenomenon-specific forms of political extremist views, with a particular emphasis on right-wing extremism and Islamism (Brettfeld et al. 2021a).

Furthermore, the survey aims to identify relevant influencing factors and social contextual conditions that contribute to the development of politically extremist attitudes. In addition to exploring respondents’ own attitudes, the survey addresses their perceptions and evaluations of various manifestations of extremism within their immediate environment. This approach aims to gain insights into the social contexts in which such phenomena play a role.

This report provides a description of the survey instrument, sample designs, and the implementation of the first wave of the survey (MiD 2021). It also includes information on response rates and the demographic characteristics of the sample. The appendix contains the codebook for the dataset, which outlines the variables’ designation, content, and coding.

2 The survey instrument: theoretical considerations and central concepts

The survey instrument for the study ‘People in Germany 2021’ was collaboratively designed by the University of Hamburg, the Berlin Social Science Centre (WZB), the Ludwig Maximilian University Munich (LMU), and the field research institute Kantar Public GmbH (Kantar), which was responsible for conducting the survey.
The survey instrument aims to capture personal and social factors relevant to the analysis of the prevalence of extremist attitudes that have been identified in previous research as potential contextual conditions for corresponding developments. Additionally, the survey instrument includes both common and religion-specific questions on personal religiosity, beliefs, and religious values for members of Muslim and Christian religious communities (For further details, see Brettfeld et al. 2021b).

During the development of the questionnaire, the primary objective was to ensure that the essential constructs were captured in a valid and reliable manner, as well as being economically effective, in the context of a trend study. Simultaneously, the aim was to provide flexibility for future survey waves to respond sensitively to evolving changes and emerging phenomena, allowing for annual adaptations of parts of the instrument. The questionnaire was based on an item pool compiled from established measurement instruments in extremism research, supplemented with newly developed items and scales specifically tailored for this study.

In close coordination with the field research institute, and with the aim of encouraging participant response, an online survey duration of no more than 30 minutes was targeted. For the written survey format, the instrument was designed to fit within a maximum of 24 printed pages.

2.1 Cross-phenomenon and phenomenon-specific recording of individual extremist attitudes

One of the primary objectives of the MOTRA research network is to capture attitudes with an inclination towards extremism across different phenomena. This entails moving away from the instruments commonly used in previous research, which mainly focused on measuring left-wing extremist, right-wing extremist or Islamist attitudes specifically.

To achieve a comprehensive assessment of political extremist attitudes that transcends specific phenomena, the first step involved identifying the common essence underlying all forms of political extremism and developing suitable instruments to measure this essence. Additionally, to examine the effectiveness of such a cross-phenomena assessment in capturing different politically and/or religiously motivated attitudes, established instruments for measuring right-wing extremist and Islamist attitudes are also employed alongside the cross-phenomena survey. Comparing the results obtained from the cross-phenomena assessment with the phenomenon-specific assessment of extremist attitudes allows for a closer examination of potential characteristics specific to each phenomenon and their influencing factors.

The development of an instrument for the cross-phenomena assessment of extremist attitudes was informed by the lively debates within German research on the concept of extremism, particularly with contributions by Uwe Backes and Eckhard Jesse (Backes 1989, Backes & Jesse 1996). They emphasized the importance of the fundamental principles of liberal democracy for measuring extremist attitudes. This broad understanding of extremism enables the incorporation of not only phenomena classified within the traditional left-right spectrum but also extremist variations that may be located ideologically elsewhere, such as politico-religiously motivated
extremism (Arzheimer 2019: 296f.). Furthermore, this understanding allows for a nuanced differentiation of the concept by considering subdimensions of extremist attitudes (Mannewitz 2018: 52, Arzheimer 2019: 298, Beelmann 2019: 7f.).

Further insights into the core of those political attitudes are provided by the statements of the Federal Constitutional Court (BVerfG) in 2017, in which the court rendered a judgment on the prohibition of the NPD party. In that judgment, the court highlighted a few, but central, fundamental principles that are indispensable for the free democratic constitutional state (2017: 143f.). Specifically, the BVerfG emphasized the following key rights and principles: a) an egalitarian understanding of human dignity, b) the principle of democracy, which ensures equal opportunities for citizens’ participation and upholds popular sovereignty regardless of the specific mechanisms employed, and c) the rule of law, which involves the binding and constraining of public power and the oversight of state institutions (2017: 144-147). By incorporating these criteria, various forms of extremism can be described, surpassing a simple dichotomous comparison between democracy and extremism or left-wing and right-wing extremism. This leads to the following working definition of extremism:

Extremism refers to significantly deviant attitudes and actions that are characterized by a rejection of the fundamental principles of a liberal democracy and of the individual and general human rights guaranteed in the constitution. It aims to establish legal and normative systems that deviate from these principles, and is justified and legitimized by totalitarian political ideologies, notions of ethnic or national superiority, or religious fundamentalism.

This definition suggests that the concept of democracy-opposing attitudes comprises three main dimensions:

- Rejection of democratic freedoms
- Rejection of general equality rights
- Rejection of the constitutional nature of the German state

In addition to this cross-phenomena assessment of extremist attitudes, their ideological foundation is measured by respondents' self-positioning on the left-centre-right scale. This is complemented by additional scales capturing typical positions of the political left or right, which do not necessarily reflect specific extremist attitudes but serve to validate the information on political self-positioning.

Independent of attitudes toward fundamental democratic principles, it is also necessary to measure the acceptance of politically motivated violence. This enables a distinction between individuals who not only hold resistant attitudes toward democracy but are also willing to use violence to enforce them or tolerate and support such behaviour. By differentiating between negative attitudes toward basic democratic principles and the acceptance of violence to enforce them, it becomes possible to describe varying intensities and qualities of risk potentials and monitor their changes over time, as well as identifying relevant influencing factors.

To specifically capture right-wing extremist attitudes, the study relies on the ‘consensus definition’ (Decker et al. 2010: 18), which encompasses six dimensions in its basic form:

- Advocacy of a right-wing authoritarian dictatorship
- Chauvinism
• Social Darwinism
• Trivialization of National Socialism
• Anti-Semitic attitudes
• Xenophobia

This inclusion of a specific measurement for right-wing extremist attitudes ensures comparability with other German research projects, such as the Leipzig Authoritarianism Studies (Decker et al. 2013, 2020) and the Bielefeld Centre Studies (‘Mitte-Studien’; Zick et al. 2019, Küpper et al. 2021).

The consensus definition itself does not directly address the acceptance of politically motivated violence. Therefore, the general survey on the acceptance of politically motivated violence mentioned earlier can be utilized to compare corresponding risk potentials with those identified through the cross-phenomena recording.

For the assessment of religiously motivated politically extremist attitudes, we refer to findings of earlier studies (Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007, Koopmanns 2015). In the present study, religious extremism is characterized by the belief that one’s own religion should serve as a guiding principle for all aspects of life, including politics and society, even if this means undermining fundamental democratic principles. This particular form of anti-democratic attitude is coupled with a claim to the absolute dominance of one’s own religion and values, while devaluing other religions and societies.

In addition to questions on the acceptance of politically motivated violence, which were presented to all participants, specific modules were included for Christian and Muslim participants to measure politically-religiously motivated violence, focusing on violent defence or the use of violence to enforce one’s own politico-religious convictions.

Religious respondents will also be categorized into different religious orientations (Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007) to examine their significance in the development of extremist attitudes. To this end, constructs such as individual religiosity, orthodox and fundamental attitudes, the appreciation of one’s own religion, and the devaluation of foreign religions and societies are surveyed.

The differentiation between distance to democracy, attitudes toward politically motivated violence, political-ideological and religious self-positioning also enables, for the first time, an examination of overlaps between religiously motivated and politically motivated extremist attitudes in repeated, nationally representative surveys.

2.2 Observation and evaluation of political extremism

In addition to measuring individual attitudes, the survey also explores subjective perceptions and assessments of political extremism within the respondents’ immediate living environment over the past 12 months. In this way, the participants serve as ‘observers’ of social developments in their own communities.

On the one hand, the participants are asked about their observations that suggest political extremist actions. These include perceptions of insults or physical attacks on others, instances of extremist agitation (such as calls for violence against the existing
political system), and the prevalence of anti-Semitic slogans in the respondents’ immediate environment.

Furthermore, participants are asked general questions about the frequency of observations of left-wing and right-wing extremist or Islamist political activities in their place of residence. This is supplemented by questions about the extent of the subjectively perceived threat posed by left-wing, right-wing, or Islamist violence in their local area.

While these questions are asked of all participants, respondents with a Christian or Muslim religious affiliation are additionally asked about religion-specific experiences of discrimination. This includes questions regarding perceptions of discrimination in Germany, as well as perceptions of discrimination against members of their own religion in other countries.

2.3 Theoretical embedding and main concepts of risk factors for radicalization

In addition to describing political extremist attitudes in the population and respondents’ perception of such phenomena in their environment, the survey also seeks to investigate potential factors that contribute to the development of religious and political extremism. In this regard, the survey mainly relies on the principles of anomie theory and theories of social identity.

2.3.1 Anomie-theoretical analysis model

Our research focuses on the effects of individual dissatisfaction, perceptions of threat, and fears in the context of social deprivation experiences of discrimination as well as a lack of trust in state institutions. This research agenda draws on classical social anomie theories and, in particular, the General Strain Theory (Agnew 2006, 2017), which emphasizes the individual level of analysis. These theoretical frameworks form the basis of the analytical considerations of our surveys (see Figure 1).

We view the confrontation with social change as a potential factor that can lead to uncertainty. As such, the survey explores the extent to which the respondents feel concerned about current societal challenges. These challenges include migration, climate change, digitization, economic crises, Germany’s involvement in armed conflicts and the effects of the COVID19-pandemic.

The individual perception of these challenges as threatening can lead to generalized anomic insecurity, which is seen as a contributing factor to the emergence of extremist attitudes. Whether or not those attitudes develop depends, among other factors, on the perception of the competence of relevant institutions that are involved in overcoming these challenges. On the other hand, personal factors such as educational level and socioeconomic situation influence this relationship.
According to the General Strain Theory, the formation of extremist attitudes is understood as a specific coping strategy in response to feelings of anomie. In the model employed here, whether individuals develop such attitudes depends on various factors that influence the availability of alternative coping resources. These factors include:

- **Individual skills**: This refers as skills such as the trust in one's own political effectiveness.
- **Social support**: The availability of social networks and support systems.
- **Personality traits**: Traits such as a preference for simple explanations (e.g., dichotomous thinking).
- **System trust**: This includes the general trust individuals have in state institutions, which in turn is partly influenced by their experience with these institutions.

It is important to note that the acceptance of instrumental violence to achieve political goals is not considered a defining characteristic of extremist attitudes in this understanding. Instead, it is seen as an additional factor independent of extremist attitudes. Acceptance of instrumental violence may increase the dangerousness of such attitudes, but it is not a necessary component of them.

### 2.3.2 Identity-theoretical analysis model

In the context of the anomie-theoretical analyses, an identity-centred approach, based on the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner 1986), is used to examine the influence of respondents' own (group) identity on the formation of extremist attitudes. The analysis is rooted in the differentiation between in-groups and out-groups, where the evaluation of these groups serves as an indicator of ingroup distinctiveness. However, under certain circumstances, such evaluations can also contribute to the development of extremist attitudes characterized by intolerance or hostility.
One aspect that will be examined is the significance of different dimensions through which social identity is derived, along with the impact of individual experiences of discrimination on the emergence of group-based intolerance. This exploration aims to understand the relationship between social identity and the formation of extremist attitudes, particularly in terms of the influence of discriminatory experiences and their connection to intolerance towards other groups (see Figure 2).

**Figure 2: Conceptual analysis model: Relationship between social identity, perceptions of discrimination, and intolerance toward outgroups**

**Social identity** is captured through respondents' self-location on various collective dimensions, including ethnic, cultural, and ideological identity. Additionally, individual experiences of discrimination are recorded using the same categories such as skin colour, nationality, ethnic origin, gender, religion, and political affiliation. This allows for an analytical linkage between social identity and discrimination experiences to analyse the effect on attitudes, particularly when areas closely tied to one’s identity are affected. The model also considers experiences of disadvantages across different levels. All forms of discrimination or unfair treatments are connected to measurements of negative emotions, which contribute to the development of coping strategies.

The central question in these analyses is to what extent negative attitudes toward other social groups (i.e., outgroups) arise from identity threats associated with disadvantage, perceived marginalisation and/or discrimination, potentially leading to various forms of group-related intolerance, which can be seen as a dimension of broader extremist attitudes.

Furthermore, a survey experiment integrated into the instrument explores the role of social crises and threat perception in fostering hostility towards out-groups. Participants are randomly assigned to one of four groups (splits 1 to 4), with three groups receiving different threat scenarios presented as conspiracy theories related to diseases, economic crises, and wars. The fourth group serves as a control group. Following the treatments, respondents’ general attitudes toward various ethnic and
religious groups are assessed using a ‘feeling thermometer’, aiming to investigate the emergence of group-related intolerance as a consequence of perceived threats.

3 The MiD 2021 survey at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of survey</th>
<th>Nationwide representative survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Research Institute</td>
<td>Kantar GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey date</td>
<td>March 18 - June 10, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Resident population of Germany aged 18 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target persons</td>
<td>1. Representative population sample (n=2 000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Oversample of persons with migration background (n=1 000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Oversample of persons with Islamic religious affiliation (n=1 000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection procedure</td>
<td>Random sampling of resident registration offices, in the case of oversampling followed by onomastic screening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsamples (‘SP’)</td>
<td>SP 1: Population aged 18 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP 2: Persons with a migration background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP 3: Persons from Muslim countries, of which one third each:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persons from the region Asia/Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persons from the Middle East region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persons from the region Turkey/Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey method</td>
<td>Mixed-mode (written survey with online option, PAPI/CAWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey languages</td>
<td>PAPI: German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAWI: German, Arabic, Turkish, French, Farsi, English, Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire length</td>
<td>PAPI: 23 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAWI: 39 minutes (median)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized sample</td>
<td>Total: 4 483 participants with usable data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• of which PAPI: 2 761 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• of which CAWI: 1 722 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rates</td>
<td>Total: 23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP 1: 36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP 2: 22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP 3: 16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 The sampling design of the survey

The objectives of the study outlined above made it necessary to plan the sampling and the design of the survey in a way that population-representative statements on the prevalence of political extremist attitudes are possible.

Initially, a representative random sample of the German adult resident population (aged 18 and over) was surveyed, aiming for a target size of N=2 000 participants. This random sample was drawn from addresses of the resident population maintained by the registration offices (‘EMA’), using a stratified procedure.

Given the objective of investigating the prevalence of specific politico-religious attitudes and contextual conditions, it was crucial to ensure an adequate representation of individuals with a Muslim religious affiliation. Since the proportion of Muslims, expected to be around 6% of the population, within the representative population sample of N=2,000 is too small to yield meaningful findings, an oversample of individuals with a Muslim religious affiliation was conducted. This oversample should consist of N=1 000 Muslims. However, religious affiliation is not a characteristic recorded in the address files of the population registration offices. Therefore, the oversample was obtained by selecting individuals based on onomastic analysis of surnames from a randomly selected initial sample of the drawn addresses, focusing on names that likely indicate a Muslim-majority country of origin (Kantar 2022).

The planned analysis of contextual conditions related to Islamist political extremist attitudes and associated risk factors recognizes that Muslims in Germany are not a homogeneous group. They come from different regions of the world and may have had diverse experiences relevant for their political socialization. In this respect, it is theoretically to be expected that different subgroups within the Muslim population may exhibit different risk factors. Thus, the survey design aimed to include sufficient numbers of respondents from different regions of origin within the Muslim oversample. One-third of the sample is expected to come from the ‘Asia/Africa’ region, one-third from the ‘Middle East’ region, and one-third from the ‘Turkey/Balkans’ region. This approach ensures that the survey includes not only Muslims from the most prevalent region in Germany, which is the ‘Turkey/Balkans’ region.

Additionally, the sample design needed to account for the fact that a significant proportion of Muslims in Germany have an immigrant background. Consequently, questions related to experiences with integration and exclusion in German society were considered as potential factors influencing the development of political extremist attitudes. These social processes, in line with theoretical models of radicalization, can contribute to extremism development. To allow for comparative analyses, it was important to include a sufficiently large comparison group of individuals with an immigrant background but without a Muslim religious affiliation in the sample. Therefore, an additional oversample of N=1 000 individuals with a migration background (regardless of their religious affiliation) was included in the sampling design, ensuring sufficient sample sizes for comparative analyses across different subgroups.
5 Implementation of the field phase

The sample selection was based on information on the population aged 18 and over in Germany provided by the residents' registration offices and processed by Kantar in accordance with Section 46 of the Federal Registration Act. The process involved two stages. First, a representative sample of 121 municipalities was drawn from the entire population of municipalities in Germany. This stage ensured the inclusion of a diverse range of geographical locations. In the second stage, addresses of potential target persons were randomly selected within the chosen municipalities. This random selection of addresses aimed to provide a representative sample of the German adult resident population aged 18 and over.

5.1 Sampling

The two-stage selection process described above initially resulted in an address-based sample comprising 18,500 addresses from a total of 121 municipalities (see Kantar 2022).

For sample 1 (representative sample of the general population aged 18 and over), a total of 6,000 cases were drawn from the address pool. The aim was to conduct 2,000 interviews with individuals from this sample. This sample was drawn irrespective of any migrant background or religious affiliation. Thus, the respondents in sample 1 were to provide a representative picture of the German population, including both individuals with an immigrant background and individuals with a Muslim religious affiliation, approximate to the distribution of the German population.

For sample 2 (persons with a migration background), a further 3,500 addresses were drawn from the address pool, excluding those already included in sample 1. Onomastic screening was used to identify individuals likely to have a migration background. According to preliminary estimates based on previous studies with this target group, about 750 interviews were expected, i.e., three quarters of the targeted oversample of persons with a migration background.

Target persons for sample 3 (persons from Muslim countries of origin) were also selected based on onomastic screening. The criterion here was that the onomastic analysis revealed an origin of the target person from one of three specific regions of origin (Asia/Africa, Middle East, Turkey/Balkans) and that the target person was not already included in sample 1 or sample 2. All remaining 9,000 addresses were used for Sample 3 (2,700 addresses each for the subgroup with origin Asia/Africa (SP 3.1) and Middle East (SP 3.2), and 3,600 addresses for the subgroup with origin Turkey/Balkans (SP 3.3)). Based on experience from previous studies with this target group, it was estimated that these 9,000 addresses in total would result in approximately 1,000 interviews with members of a Muslim religious community. However, it was expected that some respondents from this sample might have no religious affiliation or belong to a religious affiliation other than Muslim, as they were

---

1 Municipalities with a population of less than 5,000 were removed from the selection a priori due to the required target sizes. However, these municipalities were taken into account in the subsequent design weighting.

2 Differences in selection probabilities at the person level that may arise from this procedure are compensated for by design weighting of the data (see section 6.3).
selected based on the onomastic screening for migration background. These participants served to complete the target group of sample 2.

During the field phase, it became apparent that the proportion of respondents from sample 3 who actually belonged to a Muslim religious community would be lower than assumed. In order to achieve the target oversample size of N=1 000, an additional 2 500 addresses were drawn as a ‘top-up sample’. This increased the total number of addresses used in sample 3 to 11 500.

5.2 Field access

The selected target persons were contacted in writing using their residential addresses obtained from the residents' registration offices. The initial contact involved sending a personalized cover letter in German, which explained the study's objectives and survey procedures. A separate data protection sheet and FAQ sheet were provided to address relevant information and common questions in a standardized form.

To accommodate participants who preferred other languages, the survey instrument was translated into six additional languages: Arabic, Turkish, French, Farsi, English, and Polish. An additional sheet summarizing key information about the study was included in all six languages along with the German-language cover letter. Participants received a paper questionnaire in German, along with a prepaid return envelope and a 5€ incentive as a token of appreciation.

In the main study, foreign language paper questionnaires were not sent out due to the results of a pretest conducted by the field research institute. The pretest indicated that individuals with a migration background were more likely to use the online questionnaire available in their respective languages rather than the foreign-language PAPI questionnaire (Kantar 2020).

To access the online questionnaire, target individuals could log in to the survey website with a username and password, which were provided in the cover letter.

The survey documents were mailed to the target persons starting on March 18, 2021. A first reminder was sent on April 8, 2021, to those who had not yet completed the questionnaire (PAPI or CAWI), providing information on how to access the online questionnaire. On April 22, 2021, a second reminder letter was sent to target persons who had not responded, again including all necessary documents and the questionnaire.

For the additional replenishment sample, the mailing of materials began on May 6, 2021. A first and only reminder was sent to these individuals on May 20, 2021. The field phase concluded on June 10, 2021.
6 Response rates and distributions among the target groups

6.1 Data cleaning and response rates

N=21,000 people were contacted under the addresses provided by the residents' registration offices. In n=1,994 cases (9.5%), the addresses proved to be incorrect.

This means that in these cases, the survey documents did not reach the intended addressees. The address-related failure rate was higher in the samples containing individuals with a migration background: 11.7% for sample 2 and 10.6% for sample 3. In contrast, the address-related failure rate for the population representative sample 1 was lower at 6.1%.

The address-related failure is to be classified as a quality-neutral failure, since in these cases the non-participation of the target person is independent of the content of the survey. This leaves n=19,006 addresses as the gross sample adjusted for quality-neutral dropouts, which is used as the starting point for calculating the response rates (see Table).

Out of the adjusted gross sample, in n=12,911 cases (67.9%), no questionnaire return or any other type of response from the target persons was registered. Therefore, more detailed information was available for a total of 6,095 target persons (32.1%). (Kantar 2022).

A total of n=924 target persons (4.9%) explicitly refused to participate in the survey. Refusals were most common in sample 1 (6.1%), but they also occurred to a somewhat lesser extent in the other samples (sample 2: 5.5%; sample 3: 4.0%). These refusals were communicated to Kantar via the telephone hotline or email.

In n=397 cases (2.1% of the total sample) the target person aborted the online questionnaire. Further analysis showed that the majority of these aborts occurred immediately after logging in or at the beginning of the session, indicating a lack of intention to participate in the survey. The proportion of these dropouts in sample 1 was significantly lower at 1.0% compared to sample 2 (2.2%) and sample 3 (2.7%). This corresponds to the higher utilization of the online questionnaire in the latter two samples, as foreign language translations were only available in online mode.

After the questionnaires were received back, the field research institute recorded the completed PAPI questionnaires and merged them with the interviews completed in CAWI mode. This was followed by an initial cleaning, which was carried out by Kantar.

Out of the total of n=4,774 questionnaires available at the end of the field phase, n=244 were identified as invalid for various reasons.

- In n=12 cases, target persons completed and returned two questionnaires (PAPI). In each case, the first questionnaire received was considered valid,

---

3 This might be due to the generally higher migration of non-German persons. In 2020, 49.4% of all departures across the borders of the federal states involved persons with non-German citizenship (Federal Statistical Office (2021), table 1.3).

4 The data sets of these n=397 cases were not provided to us by Kantar for data protection reasons.
and the second questionnaire (total of 6 cases) was removed from the dataset.

- In \( n=2 \) cases, participants explicitly stated that they had completed the questionnaire for someone else. \(^5\)

- In \( n=28 \) cases, both a PAPI questionnaire and a CAWI questionnaire were available. In these cases, a decision was made, in consultation with UHH, based on data quality as to which questionnaire would remain in the dataset. The other questionnaire - 14 in total - was removed from the dataset.

- In \( n=19 \) cases, the questionnaires contained 100% missing information.

- In \( n=203 \) cases there were significant discrepancies between the information in the questionnaire and EMA data, such as age differences of more than 2 years (\( n=94 \)), discrepancies in gender (\( n=40 \)), and discrepancies in both age and gender (\( n=69 \)). These cases were removed from the dataset.

After the cleaning process, the resulting dataset had \( n=4,530 \) valid cases. The UHH team performed additional checks for inconsistencies in response behavior and missing values, leading to the identification of \( n=47 \) cases as unusable. The proportion of such non usable cases was low in all three samples, ranging from 0.1% in sample 2 to 0.3% in sample 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Key figures on response rates across samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross address sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address-related failures (quality-neutral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross address sample adjusted for quality-neutral defaults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drop-outs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refusal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion of CAWI-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-usable cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usable cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the final net dataset consisted of \( n=4,483 \) cases. The overall response rate, based on the adjusted gross sample, was 23.6%, which is slightly above the

\(^5\) In two additional cases, after consultation with UHH, the processing of the questionnaires was considered valid. One case involved a blind target person, and the other case involved a target person who did not know the language of the questionnaire. In both instances, it was assured that the individuals assisting in the completion of the questionnaire did not provide their own assessment or influence the responses given by the target persons.
The response rate for the representative population sample (sample 1) was 36.6%, which is considered very good in comparison to other studies. In contrast, the response rate for the sample of individuals with an immigrant background (sample 2) was slightly lower at 22.6%, and the sample of individuals from Muslim areas of origin had the lowest response rate at 16.8%. (sample 3).

6.2 Sampling allocations

Based on the information provided by the residents' registration offices, including address, first and last names, gender, age, and nationality, the target persons were initially assigned to samples 2 and 3. This allocation was based on the information obtained from the EMA regarding citizenship and the results of the onomastic analysis. However, discrepancies arose when comparing the self-reported information provided by the participants. In the original samples 2 and 3, it was found that some individuals did not have a migration background, contrary to the results of the onomastic analysis. To address this discrepancy and ensure proper classification, the German micro census definition of migration background was applied. According to this definition, respondents are classified as having a migration background if they or at least one of their parents were born abroad and/or have non-German citizenship (including dual citizenship).

As a result, a total of 109 respondents in the net sample were affected by this reclassification. Among them, 59 individuals originally assigned to sample 2 (persons with a migration background) and 50 individuals originally assigned to sample 3 (persons from Muslim countries of origin) were found not to have a migration background according to the micro census definition. Consequently, they were subsequently assigned to sample 1 (representative sample of the general population).

Additionally, 6 individuals from the original sample 3 stated that they did have a migration background, but not from the specified regions of origin (Asia/Africa, Middle East, Turkey/Balkans) for sample 3. These individuals were reassigned to sample 2 to ensure appropriate sample representation. (see Kantar 2022).

The following Table 2 breaks down the shifts between samples and the resulting sample memberships.

---

6 The response rate in the study "Muslim Life in Germany" for the total sample (with and without a migration background) was 21.8%.

7 For example, the response rate in the 2020/2021 Mitte-study, which was, however, designed as a telephone survey, was 11.1% (see Rump et al. 2021).
Table 2: Shifts between projected samples and final sample membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample membership before shifts</th>
<th>Sample membership after shifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP 1: Population</td>
<td>SP 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2: Persons with MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3: Persons from Muslim-majority countries of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Africa (SP 3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East (SP 3.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey/Balkans (SP 3.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The realized interviews from the three samples, categorized by migration background and religious affiliation, are as follows:

- Sample 1 (population-representative sample): n=2,171
- Sample 2 (persons with a migration background): n=645
- Sample 3 (persons from Muslim countries of origin): n=1,667

To analyse the achievement of the original sample design goal, the realized interviews in all samples are presented as a function of the respondents' migration background and religious affiliation. This comparison is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Realized interviews in samples 1 to 3 according to migration background and religious affiliation of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Persons without MB(^8)</th>
<th>Persons with MB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Muslims</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1: General population</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2: Persons with MB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3: Persons from Muslim countries of origin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The target size of the population-representative sample (Sample 1) was successfully met, with a total of n=2,171 available interviews. Among these interviews, 552 respondents self-identified as having a migration background. Additionally, within Sample 1, 77 respondents, accounting for 3.5% of the sample, reported having a Muslim religious affiliation\(^9\).

---

\(^8\) Among the 1,619 respondents without an immigrant background, n=8 are Muslims who are not listed separately in this presentation.

\(^9\) If the 8 native Muslims are added, the percentage of Muslims is 3.9%.
The objective of oversampling approximately 1,000 individuals with a migration background was also achieved. This oversample consists of n=645 respondents from Sample 2 and n=582 respondents originally assigned to Sample 3 who do not identify with a Muslim religious affiliation but do have a migration background (highlighted in red in Table 7).

Furthermore, the aim of surveying an oversample of approximately 1,000 individuals with a Muslim religious affiliation was successfully implemented. Among the total respondents from Sample 3 (n=1,667), 1,085 participants indicated their affiliation with Islam (highlighted in green in Table 7).

6.3 Weightings

To address the disproportionate design of the survey, weighting factors were calculated to compensate for potential distortions and enable accurate estimates for the target populations. Kantar, in coordination with UHH, performed the weighting calculations based on the net number of realized cases in each sample, e.g., N=4,483 usable cases for the total sample. The weighting process involved several stages (Kantar 2022):

(1) Design Weighting: In the first step, a design weighting was applied to account for varying selection probabilities resulting from the disproportionate design of the sampling plan.

(2) Nonresponse weighting: The second step, involved nonresponse weighting, which considered systematic dropouts during the field phase. Estimated participation probabilities were used, taking into account various characteristics of the target individuals, such as age, gender, nationality, state and municipality size class.

(3) Calibration (Redressment): The third step involved calibration to further correct deviations of the realized sample from externally available official structural data. Multiple variables were used, including migration background, gender, marital status, age, nationality, school leaving certificate, population shares of the federal states and Nielsen areas. Calibration was initially performed separately for the three subsamples, and then the total sample was calibrated based on these subgroups.

The weighting factors generated through this three-step process were included in the dataset. The ‘pfaktges’ weighting variable is intended for weighting the total sample, allowing population-representative analyses using the total sample of n=4,483 and enhancing the precision of estimates.

Additionally, the dataset also includes the weighting factor ‘desgew’ that corrects for the disproportionate design of the sampling plan alone. This factor was calculated as part of the design weighting in the first step of the weighting process described above.

(4) Additional Weighting Factors: In the fourth step, Kantar created additional weighting factors based on the calibration of the overall sample. These factors were adapted and optimizes for specific selected subgroups in terms of range and effectiveness. These subgroup-specific weighting factors enable weighted analyses with individual subgroups or comparative analyses across different subgroups. In the latter case, a common weighting factor can be formed by combining the group factors.
for the desired analysis sample Table 4 provides an overview of the weighting factors available in the dataset.

**Table 4:** Assignment of weighting variables according to subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample affiliation</th>
<th>Migration status</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>pfaktges</td>
<td>4 483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>desgew</td>
<td>4 483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>SP 1</td>
<td>no MB</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>gr1fakt</td>
<td>1 619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>gr2fakt</td>
<td>2 864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims total</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>not relevant*</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>gr3fakt</td>
<td>1 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims from Asia and Africa</td>
<td>SP 3.1</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>gr4fakt</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims from Middle East</td>
<td>SP 3.2</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>gr5fakt</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims from Turkey/Balkans</td>
<td>SP 3.3</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>gr6fakt</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Muslim migrants</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>All except Islam</td>
<td>gr7fakt</td>
<td>1 562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MB = migration background.
* The 1 310 Muslims assigned here include 8 Muslims without an immigrant background.

**6.4 Sample quality and the effect of weighting**

The design weighting aims to address the disproportionate selection of target persons and achieve a proportional distribution of realized cases across regional areas that closely aligns with the population distribution. This can be evaluated by examining the distribution of the weighted sample according to federal states and political municipality size classes (‘BIK’).

As Table 5 shows, the unweighted overall sample exhibits an expected overrepresentation of city states (Hamburg, Berlin, and Bremen) as well as North Rhine-Westphalia, the most populous federal state. Conversely, all other states are underrepresented to varying degrees in the unweighted sample.

However, upon comparing the distributions after applying data weighting to the reference data, it becomes evident that the weighted sample effectively represents the actual distribution of the adult resident population across federal states. Schleswig-Holstein shows the highest deviation of 0.4 percentage points, while North Rhine-Westphalia and Saarland deviate by 0.2 percentage points each. More than half of the remaining states exhibit a proportion of cases that precisely corresponds to the reference size.

**Table 5:** Sampling distributions by region: federal states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total sample (N=4 483)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unweighted valid N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Saxony</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine-Westphalia</td>
<td>1 565</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesse</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhineland-Palatinate</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the political municipality size classes (see Table 6), the unweighted total sample exhibits an overrepresentation of large municipalities and an underrepresentation of small municipalities. For instance, the category "core areas with more than 500,000 inhabitants" shows a nearly double share of individuals compared to the actual population distribution. Conversely, the smallest municipality size class included in the MiD study (5,000 to 19,000 inhabitants) is significantly underrepresented at 1.8% compared to its actual share of 8.7% among municipalities.

Through weighting the total sample, an approximation to the distribution of the total population in Germany can be achieved, addressing these discrepancies. However, notable differences from the reference distribution still remain when considering the distribution by municipality size class. It is important to note that the decision to exclude very small municipalities (below 5,000 inhabitants) from the study due to economic constraints means that the 4.1% of the population represented by such municipalities is not accounted for in the distribution and cannot be fully equalized through weighting. Hence, the remaining differences are expected given the initial exclusion of these small municipalities.

Table 6: Sampling distributions by region: BIK community size classes

| Political municipality size class (BIK type)                  | Total sample (N=4,483) | Reference |  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
|                                                              | Total sample (N=4,483) | unweighted| weighted| % | % | % |
|                                                              | valid N | %     | %     |    |    |
| Core area over 500t inhabitants                              | 2,380   | 53.1  | 35.6  | 27.0 |    |    |
| Peripheral area over 500t inhabitants                        | 191     | 4.3   | 7.0   | 9.7  |    |    |
| Core area 100t-499t inhabitants                              | 1,101   | 24.6  | 22.6  | 15.0 |    |    |
| Peripheral area 100t-499t inhabitants                        | 367     | 8.2   | 13.1  | 14.9 |    |    |
| Core area 50t-99t inhabitants                                | 89      | 2.0   | 2.7   | 2.2  |    |    |
| Peripheral area 50t-99t inhabitants                          | 112     | 2.5   | 5.6   | 7.8  |    |    |
| Peripheral area 20t-49t inhabitants                          | 163     | 3.6   | 7.4   | 10.6 |    |    |
| 5t-19t inhabitants                                           | 80      | 1.8   | 6.1   | 8.7  |    |    |
| 2t to under 5t inhabitants                                   | -       | -     | -     | 2.4  |    |    |
| Less than 2t inhabitants                                     | -       | -     | -     | 1.7  |    |    |

The distribution of the weighted total sample across relevant sociodemographic variables plays a crucial role in determining whether the total sample is suitable for representative analyses of the entire population. It should be noted that not all sociodemographic information has official reference data available from government agencies. Therefore, for variables such as religious affiliation, reliance is placed on religion-specific reports and estimates (see Table 7).

When examining the distribution by gender, it is evident that it closely aligns with the target distribution and deviates from the reference data provided by the Federal Statistical Office by only 0.1 percentage points. After weighting, a perfect match is achieved in terms of both the average age of the respondents and the average age of the German population aged 18 years and older.

In the unweighted total sample, 63.9% of respondents have a migration background, primarily due to the oversampling of samples 2 and 3. Consequently, a substantial weighting factor needs to be applied during the representative analysis of the total sample to adjust this distribution to the actual value of 23.8% in Germany. The overall sample achieves this adjustment quite successfully, with a deviation of only 0.4 percentage points from the reference population.

The same principle applies to nationality. The inclusion of the two oversamples in the unweighted total sample leads to a considerable discrepancy compared to the official reference data. Therefore, the proportion of individuals with non-German citizenship is reduced by two-thirds through weighting. In the weighted data, there are only minor differences in the distribution of citizenship between the total sample and the reference data.

Table 7: Sampling distributions by individual characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample (N=4 483)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unweighted</td>
<td>weighted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valid N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>2 137</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2 286</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean value</td>
<td>4 380</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without MB</td>
<td>1 619</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With MB</td>
<td>2 864</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2 634</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German and others</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-German</td>
<td>1 344</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>1 610</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{10} Federal Statistical Office, Genesis Online, Population Update, as of Dec. 31, 2019
\textsuperscript{11} Federal Statistical Office, Genesis Online, Population Update, as of Dec. 31, 2019
\textsuperscript{12} Federal Statistical Office (2020a), here persons aged 15 and over
\textsuperscript{13} Federal Statistical Office (2020a)
\textsuperscript{14} Federal Statistical Office, Genesis Online, Population Update, as of Dec. 31, 2019
Regarding religious affiliation, the assessment of correspondence between samples and the population is limited due to the lack of sufficient official data. Various statements from religious communities, results from other studies, and their estimates are relied upon in this regard. The oversampling in sample 3 leads to an expected overrepresentation of Muslims in the unweighted overall sample, which is reduced to less than a quarter through weighting. However, even after weighting, the proportion of Muslims in the total sample, at 7.7%, remains higher than the estimates provided by the "Muslim Life in Germany" study, which range between 6.4% and 6.7% for Germany.

With regard to educational level, the unweighted sample of the MiD study exhibits a clear bias toward higher education, with more than half of the respondents (57.9%) holding a high-school degree (‘Abitur’), while individuals with a lower secondary school diploma are underrepresented with a share of 12.5%. This discrepancy is commonly observed in surveys of this nature when a sophisticated survey instrument is used, as was the case here. However, the applied weighting factor effectively compensates for this uneven distribution in the overall sample. After weighting, the highest deviation from the reference data is 1.1 percentage points in the category of lower secondary education (‘Hauptschule’).

Overall, the total sample demonstrates a good alignment with the distributions of relevant regional and sociodemographic data. Therefore, the presented overall sample is well-suited for representative analyses when utilizing the corresponding weighting factor.

---

Federal Statistical Office (2020b)

In the 2020/21 Mitte-study, the unweighted share of individuals with high-school degrees was also 59.4% % (Rump et al. 2021).
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Appendix: Codebook

This codebook provides an overview of the data collected in the first wave of the representative survey “People in Germany” (MiD 2021). The variables and codes correspond to those found in the dataset.

The first column in this codebook indicates the location of the variable in the questionnaire (e.g., F1_1 = Question 1_Item 1). The second column contains the variable name as given in the data set. The third column contains the wording of the questions or items along with the answer categories.

Missing values in the dataset are denoted by the codes as 7 and 9, or variations of these, such as 97, 99, 997 or 999. The value 7 is used to represent ambiguous or multiple answers, while the value 9 indicates a missing answer. Variables that were not applicable or skipped due to filtering contain system missing values.

In addition to the questionnaire variables, the dataset includes information on the survey implementation in the field, sample compositions, weighting factors for the total sample and various subsamples, as well as information on the respondent's place of residence.

The dataset also includes variables created by the UHH team through previous analyses. These variables encompass the respondent’s attitudes toward democracy, right-wing extremism and Islamism. Details on how these variables were constructed can be found at the end of this document.
Free time activities

Some people are actively involved in organised groups or clubs. What about you? How often in the last 12 months have you participated in activities undertaken by...

F1_1 verein1 groups or clubs relating to leisure, sport or culture?
F1_2 verein2 other non-profit organisations, for example voluntary fire brigade, German Life Saving Association (DLRG), environmental protection groups?
F1_3 verein3 other organised groups, for example citizen initiatives, parent-teacher associations and similar groups?
F1_4 verein4 charity or social organisations where you can be an active volunteer?

Dichotomous thinking; political effectiveness

The following statements refer to skills and personal preferences. To what extent do you think the following statements apply to you?

F2_1 polsw1 I can understand and evaluate important political issues well.
F2_2 dichot1 I don't like questions that can be answered in very different ways.
F2_3 dichot2 I like it when everything has its place and is in its place.
F2_4 dichot3 I don't like ambiguous opinions.
F2_5 polsw2 I am confident that I can actively participate in a discussion about political issues.
F2_6 dichot4 All questions have either a right or a wrong answer.
F2_7 dichot5 I see other people as either friends or enemies.
F2_8 dichot6 I want to know very clearly whether something is "good" or "bad".
F2_9 dichot7 I always want to know for sure who belongs to my group and who does not.
F2_10 polsw3 People like me have no influence on what the government does.

Collective identity

Now the questions are about what defines and characterises you as a person. How important are the aspects given here to your own sense of who you are?

F3_1 ident1 My ethnic background
F3_2 ident2 My nationality
F3_3 ident3 My skin colour
F3_4 ident4 My language or my dialect
F3_5 ident5 My gender
F3_6 ident6 Being a part of a religious community or denomination
F3_7 ident7 My political views
F3_8 ident8 The region or area where I live
F3_9 ident9 Participating in German culture
F3_10 ident10 Participating in European culture
F3_11 ident11 Being a citizen of the world

(1) not important at all
(2) not that important
(3) quite important
(4) important
(5) very important
Anomie, cultural insecurity, misogyny


F4_1 anomie1 Everything changes so fast these days that it is often hard to know what to abide by.
F4_2 kultva1 Traditions that are important to me are given no room in this society.
F4_3 anomie2 These days, everything has become so uncertain. You have to be ready for anything.
F4_4 kultva2 The mixing of so many people with different origins in Germany cannot work.
F4_5 frauenf1 The men in a family must ensure that their wives and sisters abide by the rules of moral conduct.
F4_6 anomie3 Wenn man die Ereignisse der letzten Jahre betrachtet, wird man richtig unsicher.
F4_7 kultva3 In this society, men are increasingly being denied the right to protect their families themselves.
F4_8 anomie4 Things today have become so difficult. You don't know what is going on.
F4_9 frauenf2 If women want to avoid being harassed, they should not wear clothes that are too revealing in public.
F4_10 anomie5 Nowadays you can't rely on anyone.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree

Political self-location

F5 litre Many people use the terms "left" and "right" in order to identify different political views. Where would you position yourself, if 1 represents left and 10 right?

(1) 1 left
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6
(7) 7
(8) 8
(9) 9
(10) 10 right

Sunday question

F6 partei If the German federal election was taking place next Sunday, who would you vote for? Please answer this question even if you are not legally allowed to vote.

(1) CDU/CSU (Conservative alliance)
(2) SPD (Socialist party)
(3) Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (The Green Party)
(4) FDP (Liberal party)
(5) Die Linke (Far Left Party)
(6) AfD (Alternative for Germany party)
(7) A different party:
(8) I don't know which party I would vote for.
(9) I wouldn't vote for anyone.
Subsequent encodings of the variable partei:

(10) Die Partei
(11) Partei der Humanisten
(12) Tierschutzpartei
(13) Team Todenhöfer
(14) Die Basis
(15) Piraten
(16) Freie Wähler
(17) Volt
(18) Bündnis für Gerechtigkeit
(19) Allianz Deutscher Demokraten
(20) Bündnis C
(21) HDP
(22) Partei für Gesundheitsforschung
(23) WIR2020
(24) Graue Panther
(25) Ökologische Demokratische Partei (ÖDP).

Own experience of discrimination
How often in the last 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against for one or more of the reasons stated below? Please select all responses that apply.

F7_1 diskri1 Because of my skin colour
F7_2 diskri2 Because of my nationality
F7_3 diskri3 Because of my ethnic background
F7_4 diskri4 Because of the region or area where I live
F7_5 diskri5 Because of my religion or my faith
F7_6 diskri6 Because of my gender
F7_7 diskri7 Because of my political views

(0) never
(1) rarely
(2) sometimes
(3) often

Perceived marginalization
Being disadvantaged can also show itself in different ways. How much do you agree with the following statements?

Where we live, people like me are ...

F8_1 marg1 ... not acknowledged for what they achieve.
F8_2 marg2 ... held back from getting on in life.
F8_3 marg3 ... often not valued much by others.
F8_4 marg4 ... portrayed incorrectly in the media.
F8_5 marg5 ... disadvantaged regarding receiving social benefits.
F8_6 marg6 ... treated disrespectfully by authorities.
F8_7 marg7 ... not taken seriously by politicians.
F8_8 marg8 ... treated unfairly by the police.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree
**Emotions**

Please think about how you feel when you are disadvantaged or treated unfairly. In connection with that, how often in the last 12 months have you experienced the following feelings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F9_1</th>
<th>emotion1</th>
<th>Disappointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F9_2</td>
<td>emotion2</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9_3</td>
<td>emotion3</td>
<td>Determination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) never  
(2) rarely  
(3) sometimes  
(4) often

**Attitude towards democracy and freedom rights**

First, there are some questions on political rights and freedoms. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F10_1</th>
<th>frei1</th>
<th>Every citizen should have the right to go out and demonstrate for what they believe in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F10_2</td>
<td>frei2</td>
<td>Strikes and demonstrations pose a danger to public order and should be banned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_3</td>
<td>frei3</td>
<td>The freedom of the press in our country must be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_4</td>
<td>frei4</td>
<td>Homosexuality should be banned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_5</td>
<td>frei5</td>
<td>All minorities should have the right to freely express their views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_6</td>
<td>frei6</td>
<td>There are worthwhile and also worthless forms of human life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_7</td>
<td>konst1</td>
<td>Those who lose out in an election should not be allowed to criticise the business of government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_8</td>
<td>konst2</td>
<td>If a government is doing a good job, there is no reason to hold a new election after four years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_9</td>
<td>konst3</td>
<td>If Parliament makes a decision, it cannot be allowed to be overturned by a court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10_10</td>
<td>konst4</td>
<td>In order to have strong political leadership in Germany, Parliament should have less influence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree  
(2) Somewhat disagree  
(3) Somewhat agree  
(4) Completely agree

**Attitude towards political violence**

Next are some statements on the role of violence in a democratic society. Some people agree with the following statements, some disagree with these statements. What about you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F11_1</th>
<th>polgew1</th>
<th>Every democratic society has certain conflicts that have to be dealt with through violence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F11_2</td>
<td>polgew2</td>
<td>I reject violence against people, but violence against material objects can sometimes be justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11_3</td>
<td>polgew3</td>
<td>The changes needed in this society can only be achieved through violent revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11_4</td>
<td>polgew4</td>
<td>Sometimes you have to fight the representatives of the system using violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11_5</td>
<td>polgew5</td>
<td>Even in a democracy, it is sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve one's political goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree  
(2) Somewhat disagree  
(3) Somewhat agree  
(4) Completely agree
### Attitude towards equality rights

The next section deals with the extent to which you believe different groups of people should be equally treated. To what extent do you agree with the statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F12_1</td>
<td>gleich1</td>
<td>People should not be discriminated against because of their skin colour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12_2</td>
<td>gleich2</td>
<td>Women and men should receive equal pay for doing the same work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12_3</td>
<td>gleich3</td>
<td>Foreigners should not be treated differently to native citizens regarding allocation of housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12_4</td>
<td>gleich4</td>
<td>Muslims must be allowed to pursue their religion in the same way as Christians, Jews or followers of other religions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree  
(2) Somewhat disagree  
(3) Somewhat agree  
(4) Completely agree

### Authoritarianism

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F13_1</td>
<td>auto1</td>
<td>Society should take a very hard approach against outsiders or people who make no contribution to society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_2</td>
<td>antisem1</td>
<td>Jews have too much influence in Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_3</td>
<td>auto2</td>
<td>Troublemakers should be made to feel very clearly that they are not wanted in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_4</td>
<td>auto3</td>
<td>There should be no compassion involved when it comes to enforcing social rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_5</td>
<td>sozdarw</td>
<td>The strongest must prevail, otherwise progress is not possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_6</td>
<td>chauv1</td>
<td>We should at long last have the courage to feel a strong sense of national identity again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_7</td>
<td>chauv2</td>
<td>My people are superior to other peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_8</td>
<td>polgew6</td>
<td>Violence is the only method possible to confront Nazis and fascists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_9</td>
<td>homosex</td>
<td>It makes me angry when I see homosexuals holding hands or kissing in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_10</td>
<td>antisem2</td>
<td>You cannot trust Jews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13_11</td>
<td>redik</td>
<td>A state should have a leader who rules the country with a forceful hand for the good of everyone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree  
(2) Somewhat disagree  
(3) Somewhat agree  
(4) Completely agree

### Political orientation

How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F14_1</td>
<td>polo1</td>
<td>Through democracy we can solve the problems we have in Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_2</td>
<td>polo2</td>
<td>There are too many foreigners in Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_3</td>
<td>polo3</td>
<td>Socialism is a good idea that has just been poorly implemented up to now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_4</td>
<td>polo4</td>
<td>A people must have a homeland with its own traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_5</td>
<td>polo5</td>
<td>All things considered, Germany is very well governed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_6</td>
<td>polo6</td>
<td>Capitalism stands for exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_7</td>
<td>polo7</td>
<td>A lot of what has been said about the crimes committed by the national socialists is exaggerated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_8</td>
<td>polo8</td>
<td>Parliamentary democracy is still the best form of government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_9</td>
<td>polo9</td>
<td>If we are not careful, Germany will become an Islamic country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14_10</td>
<td>polo10</td>
<td>Private ownership of land should be abolished.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree  
(2) Somewhat disagree  
(3) Somewhat agree  
(4) Completely agree
Observations of radicalization and discrimination

The following questions concern events that you yourself have observed or experienced, e.g. among the people you know or your colleagues, in a pub or another situation where you yourself were present. Do not base your answers on things that you have only read about or seen in newspapers, on television or on the internet.

How often in the last 12 months in your personal environment have you …

F15_1  beob1  yourself experienced people being abused or attacked because of their ethnic background?
F15_2  beob2  yourself known about somebody looking at radical political material on the internet or in chat rooms?
F15_3  beob3  yourself known of people advocating an Islamic theocracy?
F15_4  beob4  yourself known of somebody saying that the political system in Germany would have to be changed through the use of violence if necessary?
F15_5  beob5  yourself heard of anybody insulting people of the Jewish faith?
F15_6  beob6  yourself found out that somebody had joined a radical political group?
F15_7  beob7  yourself experienced another person being insulted or attacked due to their skin colour?
F15_8  beob8  yourself seen any anti-Semitic graffiti or slogans anywhere?

(1) never
(2) rarely
(3) sometimes
(4) often

Observation of extremist activities/violence

How often in the last 12 months in your town or community have you observed the following stated types of political activity?

F16_1  beobli  Left-wing extremist political activity
F16_2  beobre  Right-wing extremist political activity
F16_3  beobis  Islamic political activity

(1) never
(2) rarely
(3) sometimes
(4) often

Threat of extremist violence

To what extent do you feel, in your town or your community, threatened by the following types of political violence?

F17_1  bedrohli  Left-wing extremist violence
F17_2  bedrohre  Right-wing extremist violence
F17_3  bedrohis  Islamic violence

(1) not at threatened
(2) not really threatened
(3) somewhat threatened
(4) very threatened
Fears about the future
To what extent are you worried about the following social developments and their impact on your life?

F18_1  sorge1  That increasing digitalisation and computerisation could lead to job losses.
F18_2  sorge2  That the influx of refugees could lead to our social systems collapsing.
F18_3  sorge3  That climate change could lead more and more to droughts, crop losses and floods.
F18_4  sorge4  That economic crises could lead to more poverty.
F18_5  sorge5  That an increase in armed hostilities in the world could drag Germany into military conflicts more often.
F18_6  sorge6  That the Coronavirus pandemic will last for a long time and could overwhelm the health system.

(0) doesn't worry me at all
(1) doesn't worry me much
(2) slightly worries me
(3) worries me a lot

Trust in institutions
Please state how much confidence you have in the following institutions in Germany.

1 means "no confidence at all" and 6 means "complete confidence". You can use the in-between ratings to tailor your opinion.

How much confidence do you have in...

F19_1  systv1  the law courts?
F19_2  systv2  the police?
F19_3  systv3  the political parties?
F19_4  systv4  the government?
F19_5  systv5  the state authorities?
F19_6  systv6  publicly funded state media?
F19_7  systv7  social media?

(1) 1 no confidence at all
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6 complete confidence

Incompetence of decision-makers
Decision-makers from the business, science and political circles are, among others, also responsible for tackling the challenges in society. How do you rate their actions in general? Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

The decision-makers in our country ...

F20_1  inkomp1  ... are not interested in the problems experienced by normal people
F20_2  inkomp2  ... are incapable of tackling the current challenges in our society
F20_3  inkomp3  ... often act against better judgement contrary to the interests of the population

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree
Experiment on conspiracy theories

Split F21  exgruppe
(1) Split 1
(2) Split 2
(3) Split 3
(4) Split 4

F21x1  (Split 1)  extreat
Diseases are among the greatest problems of our time. Some people claim that certain groups are currently abusing this issue and even promoting it for their own purposes.
To what extent do you personally believe that certain groups are currently deliberately and actively contributing to the spread of disease in the world?

F21x2  (Split 2)
Economic crises are among the greatest problems of our time. Some people claim that certain groups are currently abusing this issue and even promoting it for their own purposes.
To what extent do you personally believe that certain groups are currently deliberately and actively creating economic crises?

F21x3  (Split 3)
Wars are among the greatest problems of our time. Some people claim that certain groups are currently abusing this issue and even promoting it for their own purposes.
To what extent do you personally believe that certain groups are currently deliberately and actively stirring up wars in the world?

F21x4  (Split 4)

1 means "I don't believe this is true at all" and 6 means "I fully believe that this is true". You can use the in-between ratings to tailor your opinion.

(1) 1 don't believe this is true at all
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6 fully believe that this is true

Please indicate how positive you view the following groups?
The number 0 means "very negatively" and 10 means "very positively".

F22_1  exav1  US Americans
F22_2  exav2  Jews
F22_3  exav3  Chinese
F22_4  exav4  Muslims
F22_5  exav5  Russians
F22_6  exav6  Refugees
F22_7  exav7  Christians

(0) 0 very negatively
(1) 1
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6
(7) 7
(8) 8
(9) 9
(10) 10 very positively
Several religions are named below. Please indicate which religion you belong to or feel an affiliation for.

1. Christian (e.g. Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, Evangelical Free Church Christians)
2. Islamic (e.g. Sunni, Shia, Alevi, Ahmadi)
3. Another religion (e.g. Jews, Buddhists, Hindus)
4. No religion

Questions only for Christians
Please only complete the questions with a blue background (up to question 32) if you feel you belong to a Christian religious community.

To which denomination of Christianity do you feel you belong?

1. Roman Catholic
2. Protestant (Lutheran, reformed)
3. Evangelical free church
4. Orthodox
5. A different religious denomination, i.e.: _________
6. No specific religious denomination

How important is religion for you personally in your everyday life?

1. Not important at all
2. Not very important
3. Quite important
4. Very important

Please state how religious you personally believe you are.

1. Not religious
2. Not that religious
3. Quite religious
4. Religious
5. Very religious

How often do you pray?

1. Never
2. A few times a year
3. Once a month at most
4. A few times a month
5. Once a week
6. Several times a week
7. Every day
8. Several times a day

How often do you attend a church / place of prayer or worship?

1. Never
2. A few times a year
3. Once a month at most
4. A few times a month
5. Once a week
6. Several times a week
7. Every day
8. Several times a day
Orthodoxy and fundamentalism

The next section is about religious beliefs. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F28_1</td>
<td>orthoc1</td>
<td>My faith serves as a guideline for all my decisions in everyday life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_2</td>
<td>orthoc2</td>
<td>A marriage entered into before God may never be divorced by man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_3</td>
<td>orthoc3</td>
<td>If I have lived my life as a righteous Christian, I will go to heaven.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_4</td>
<td>orthoc4</td>
<td>I believe that the Bible represents the true revelation of God.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_5</td>
<td>fundc1</td>
<td>Whoever does not precisely follow the teachings of the Bible and the ten commandments is not a true Christian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_6</td>
<td>fundc2</td>
<td>I believe that every good Christian is obliged to convert other people to Christianity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_7</td>
<td>fundc3</td>
<td>People who are modernising Christian teaching are destroying the true message.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_8</td>
<td>fundc4</td>
<td>There is only one correct interpretation of the Bible that all Christians must adhere to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28_9</td>
<td>fundc5</td>
<td>People who turn their backs on the Christian faith should be severely punished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree

Religious overappreciation and devaluation

Below are certain views that some people have about different religions. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F29_1</td>
<td>aufwc1</td>
<td>Christianity is the only true religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29_2</td>
<td>aufwc2</td>
<td>Only Christianity is capable of solving the problems of our time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29_3</td>
<td>abwc1</td>
<td>In countries such as Iran, Egypt or India, you can see that other religions are not able to ensure peaceful coexistence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29_4</td>
<td>abwc2</td>
<td>Countries where Islam rules are mostly inhumane and uncivilised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29_5</td>
<td>abwc3</td>
<td>Muslims are backward and intolerant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29_6</td>
<td>abwc4</td>
<td>People of the Jewish faith are arrogant and greedy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree

Attitude towards religiously motivated acceptance of violence

During every age and in all religions, there have been, and still are, people who believe that violent defence of their religion can be justified. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F30_1</td>
<td>relgewc1</td>
<td>The threat posed to Christianity in the world justifies Christians defending themselves by using violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30_2</td>
<td>relgewc2</td>
<td>I have understanding for violence committed against people who insult God or Jesus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30_3</td>
<td>relgewc3</td>
<td>Violence is justified when it concerns spreading and enforcing Christianity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30_4</td>
<td>relgewc4</td>
<td>If it is for the benefit of the Christian community, I am prepared to use physical violence against others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30_5</td>
<td>relgewc5</td>
<td>Terrorist attacks committed in the name of God must be opposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree
**Religion and politics**

The next questions concern the relationship between religion and politics. How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F31_1</th>
<th>repolc1</th>
<th>A Christian theocracy is the best form of government.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F31_2</td>
<td>repolc2</td>
<td>The Christian commandments and the Bible are more important to me than the laws in Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F31_3</td>
<td>repolc3</td>
<td>German society should be structured up much more closely in line with Christian principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F31_4</td>
<td>repolc4</td>
<td>I think a religious leader supported by a council is better than the democratic system in Germany.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree  
(2) Somewhat disagree  
(3) Somewhat agree  
(4) Completely agree

**Perceived religion-related marginalization (national and international)**

Now, we move on to how you view the way Christians are treated in Germany and in the world. To what extent do the following statements reflect the way you view things?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F32_1</th>
<th>margdc1</th>
<th>In Germany, devout Christians are often shunned by other people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F32_2</td>
<td>margdc2</td>
<td>In Germany, children of Christian parents often experience exclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F32_3</td>
<td>margdc3</td>
<td>Christians are treated much worse in Germany compared to other religious communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F32_4</td>
<td>margic1</td>
<td>I am very concerned that in cases of abuse, many people think of Christian priests mainly as perpetrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F32_5</td>
<td>margic2</td>
<td>I think it is terrible that violence is used against Christians in some communist states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F32_6</td>
<td>margic3</td>
<td>The suppression of Christians on other countries, like in Egypt or Pakistan makes me angry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly disagree  
(2) Somewhat disagree  
(3) Somewhat agree  
(4) Completely agree

**Questions only for Muslims**

*Please only complete the questions with a green background (up to question 41) if you feel you belong to an Islamic religious community.*

**Denomination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F33</th>
<th>relartm</th>
<th>To which denomination of Islam do you feel you belong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         |         | (1) Sunni  
|         |         | (2) Shiite  
|         |         | (3) Alevite  
|         |         | (4) Ahmadi  

| F33_txt | relartm_s | (5) A different religious denomination, i.e.: ________  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) No specific religious denomination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religiosity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F34</th>
<th>relwigm</th>
<th>How important is religion for you personally in your everyday life?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         |          | (1) Not important at all  
|         |          | (2) Not very important  
|         |          | (3) Quite important  
|         |          | (4) Very important  
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Please state how religious you personally believe you are.

(1) Not religious
(2) Not that religious
(3) Quite religious
(4) Religious
(5) Very religious

How often do you pray?

(1) Never
(2) A few times a year
(3) Once a month at most
(4) A few times a month
(5) Once a week
(6) Several times a week
(7) Every day
(8) Several times a day

How often do you attend a church / place of prayer or worship?

(1) Never
(2) A few times a year
(3) Once a month at most
(4) A few times a month
(5) Once a week
(6) Several times a week
(7) Every day
(8) Several times a day

The next section is about religious beliefs. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

My faith serves as a guideline for all my decisions in everyday life.

It is important to me to strictly follow the rules on fasting.

If I have lived my life as a righteous Muslim, I will go to heaven.

I believe that the Koran represents the true revelation of God.

Anyone who does not strictly abide by the Koran is not a real Muslim.

I believe that every good Muslim is obliged to convert unbelievers to Islam.

People who modernise Islam destroy its true teaching.

There is only one correct interpretation of the Koran that all Muslims must adhere to.

People who turn their backs on Islam should be severely punished.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree
Religious overappreciation and devaluation

Below are certain views that some people have about different religions. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

F38_1 aufwm1 Islam is the only true religion.
F38_2 aufwm2 Only Islam is capable of solving the problems of our time.
F38_3 abwm1 In Germany, you can clearly see that the Christian religions are not able to uphold morality.
F38_4 abwm5 Non-Muslims are cursed by Allah.
F38_5 abwm2 The sexual morality of Western societies has completely degenerated.
F38_6 abwm3 Christians are backward and intolerant.
F38_7 abwm4 People of the Jewish faith are arrogant and greedy.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree

Attitude towards religiously motivated acceptance of violence

During every age and in all religions, there have been, and still are, people who believe that violent defence of their religion can be justified. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

F39_1 relgewm1 The threat to Islam presented by the Western world justifies Muslims defending themselves with violence.
F39_2 relgewm2 I have understanding for violence committed against people who insult Allah or the prophet Mohammed.
F39_3 relgewm3 Violence is justified when it concerns spreading and enforcing Islam.
F39_4 relgewm4 If it is for the benefit of the Muslim community, I am prepared to use physical violence against non-believers.
F39_5 relgewm5 Terrorist attacks committed in the name of Allah should be opposed.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree

Religion und politics

The next questions concern the relationship between religion and politics. How much do you agree with the following statements?

F40_1 relpolm1 An Islamic theocracy is the best form of government.
F40_2 relpolm2 The rules in the Koran are more important to me than the laws in Germany.
F40_3 relpolm3 German society should be structured up much more closely in line with Islamic principles.
F40_4 relpolm4 I think a religious leader supported by a council is better than the democratic system in Germany.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Somewhat agree
(4) Completely agree
Perceived religion-related marginalization (national and international)

Now, we move on to how you view the way Muslims are treated in Germany and in the world. To what extent do the following statements reflect the way you view things?

F41_1 margdm1 In Germany, devout Muslims are often shunned by other people.
F41_2 margdm2 In Germany, children of Muslim parents often experience exclusion.
F41_3 margdm3 Muslims are treated much worse in Germany compared to other religious communities.
F41_4 margim1 I am very concerned that, when attacks occur in Europe, it is Muslims who are the first to be suspected.
F41_5 margim2 I think it's terrible that the US is able to wage wars against Muslim states with impunity.
F41_6 margim3 The suppression of Muslims in other countries, e.g. in Palestine, makes me angry.

1. Not my view at all
2. Not really my view
3. Partly my view
4. Definitely my view

Media usage

How often do you use the following social media?

F42_1 sozmed1 Twitter
F42_2 sozmed2 Facebook
F42_3 sozmed3 V-Kontakte
F42_4 sozmed4 Instagram
F42_5 sozmed5 TikTok
F42_6 sozmed6 YouTube
F42_7 sozmed7 BitChute
F42_8 sozmed8 Discord
F42_9 sozmed9 Telegram
F42_10 sozmed10 WhatsApp
F42_11 sozmed11 Other social media platform, i.e. __________
F42_txt sozmed_s

1. never
2. rarely
3. sometimes
4. often
5. very often

Which media platforms, channels or websites have you used in the last week in order to follow the news? Please name these, either using a general term (e.g. television, radio, print media, social media) or specifically naming them (e.g. the Bild newspaper, Tagesschau TV news, gmx.de).

F43_txt nachricht_s __________
F43 nachricht I don't follow the news

1. not checked
2. checked
A lot of new news formats have emerged in recent years which also distribute their content via social media. Which of the following news websites do you use to access the news?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Webpage</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F44_1</td>
<td>Junge Freiheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_2</td>
<td>Tichys Einblick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_3</td>
<td>PI News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_4</td>
<td>KenFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_5</td>
<td>Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_6</td>
<td>Indymedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_7</td>
<td>Jungle World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_8</td>
<td>Junge Welt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_9</td>
<td>IslamIQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_10</td>
<td>Al Jazeera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_11</td>
<td>Islamische Zeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44_12</td>
<td>Other new website, i.e. __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics 1 (qualification, employment)

The following are questions about your qualifications and your job.

What is the highest school-leaver's qualification you have?

*If you have a school-leaver's certificate from another country, please select which qualification listed most closely matches yours.*

1. No school-leaving qualifications (still attending school, left school with no qualifications)
2. Qualifications acquired after a max. of 7 years' school attendance
3. Lower secondary school (Hauptschule) or elementary school (Volksschule)
4. Middle secondary school (Realschule), Middle secondary school certificate (Mittlere Reife), Polytechnic / college certificate (POS)
5. General qualification for university entrance (Abitur), general or restricted higher education entrance qualification (Hochschulreife), certificate from extended secondary school in ex-GDR (EOS), qualification from an advanced technical college, etc. (Fachhochschulreife)

What is the highest vocational qualification you have?

*If you obtained your vocational qualification outside Germany, please select the qualification listed that most closely matches yours.*

1. No qualification, still in vocational training (e.g. student, trainee, pre-vocational training year, intern).
2. No vocational qualification and not in training
3. Apprenticeship, i.e. in-company training qualification
4. Training at a specialist vocational school, commercial school, i.e. vocational school-based training
5. Vocational school, e.g. vocational/technical school, cooperative education college or trade & technical school/academy
6. University of applied sciences, engineering school
7. University
8. A different training qualification, i.e.:
What is your current main occupational activity? If you are doing several activities, please just tell us the most important one. You are currently...

1. in full-time employment (35 hours per week or more)?
2. in part-time employment (fewer than 35 hours per week)?
3. unemployed?
4. housewife/house husband?
5. retired, a pensioner, in early retirement?

(1 to 5: continue with question 48)

6. in training or education (school pupil, re-trainee, trainee, apprentice, volunteer)?
7. student?
8. Other (e.g. on a pre-vocational training scheme, internship, full-time military service, voluntary military service, voluntary social service year or similar)?

(6 to 8: continue with question 50)

In what position are you employed in your main job?

If you are currently not, or no longer, employed, please state the last employment position you held.

1. Salaried employee
2. Worker
3. Civil servant (also a trainee civil servant ('Anwärter'))
4. Full-time farmer
5. Self-employed with employees
6. Self-employed with no employees
7. Family worker (unpaid)
8. Never had a paid job

Do you hold a management position, i.e. are you authorised to give instructions to employees who are not trainees?

1. Yes, as a manager (authorised to make decisions on personnel, budgets, strategy)
2. Yes, as a supervisor (instructing/supervising/delegating/monitoring work)
3. No

Different types of income are listed below. Please tick all the types of income that contribute to your household's income.

- (1) Income from employment
- (2) Unemployment benefit (Arbeitslosengeld 1)
- (3) Unemployment benefit II ("Hartz IV") or social support payment or other social benefits
- (4) Early retirement pension or standard pension
- (5) Other income (e.g. parents allowance, child allowance)

What gender are you?

1. Male
2. Female
3. Diverse

Please give your age in years.

I am _ _ years old.

What is your marital status?

1. Single
2. Married
3. In a registered partnership
4. Divorced
Are you in a permanent relationship?
(0) No
(1) Yes

In which country were you, your mother and your father born?
→ If the country in which you or your parents were born no longer exists, please enter the current name of the country.

Your country of birth

Your mother's country of birth

Your father's country of birth

For how many years have you been living in Germany?

Since I was born

(0) not checked
(1) checked

Of which country do you, your mother and your father have citizenship?
→ If you, your mother or your father have citizenship of more than one country, please indicate all of these countries.

Your citizenship (1.)

Your mother's citizenship (1.)

Your father's citizenship (1.)

(1) Germany
(2) Turkey
(3) Syria
(4) Iran
(5) Iraq
(6) Afghanistan
(7) Morocco
(8) Poland
(9) Russian Federation
(10) Other
**Linguistic and social integration**

Which is your native language?

*If you have more than one native language, please indicate all of them.*

F58_1  mspr1  German
F58_2  mspr2  Turkish
F58_3  mspr3  English
F58_4  mspr4  Polish
F58_5  mspr5  Farsi
F58_6  mspr6  Arabic
F58_7  mspr7  French
F58_8  mspr8  Kurdish
F58_9  mspr9  Russian
F58_10 mspr10 A different language, namely:

(0) not checked
(1) checked

→ **Only for those whose native language is not German.**

How often do you speak German day to day?

F59_1  sprachd1 When you meet up with friends in your free time: How often do you speak German?
F59_2  sprachd2 When you read newspapers/magazines/books: How often do you read them in German?
F59_3  sprachd3 When you watch television or stream programmes: How often do you watch German-language programmes?
F59_4  sprachd4 When you are with your family: How often do you speak German with each other?

(1) never
(2) rarely
(3) often
(4) always

F60  frddt How many friends do you have who are native Germans, and how many of your friends have foreign roots?

(1) I don't have any friends who are native Germans. All my friends have foreign roots.
(2) I don't have many friends who are native Germans. Most of my friends have foreign roots.
(3) About half of my friends are native Germans, the other half have foreign roots.
(4) I don't have many friends with foreign roots. Most of my friends are native Germans.
(5) I don't have any friends with foreign roots. All my friends are native Germans.
**Demographics 3 (income; number of people in the household)**

What is the approximate total monthly net income of your household? Please calculate the monthly income of all your household members (including parental allowance, child benefit, etc.) after tax and social-security payment deductions.

\[ \text{F61 netto} \] The monthly net income of my household is about \__________ \text{€}.

How many people live in your household? Don't forget to count yourself as a member of your household.

\( \rightarrow \) Persons for whom all expenses are paid from a joint household fund.

\text{F62_1 haushki} \quad \text{Children aged below 14}

(0) keine

(1) 1

(2) 2

(3) 3

(4) 4

(5) 5

(6) 6

(7) 7 and over

\text{F62_2 haushju} \quad \text{Children aged between 14 and under 18}

(1) 1

(2) 2

(3) 3

(4) 4

(5) 5

(6) 6

(7) 7 and over

\text{F62_3 hausherw} \quad \text{Adults aged 18 and above}

(1) 1

(2) 2

(3) 3

(4) 4

(5) 5

(6) 6

(7) 7 and over

End of the survey
### Field information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>idnr</td>
<td>Unambiguous numbering of the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode</td>
<td>Survey mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) PAPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) CAWI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>Survey language (online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Turkish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Arab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Polish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Farsi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>datumfb</td>
<td>Date of entry (PAPI)/end of processing (CAWI) of the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information about the survey location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kkz</td>
<td>Official district code of the respondent's place of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bula</td>
<td>Federal state of residence of the respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Hamburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Lower Saxony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Bremen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) NRW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Hesse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Rhineland-Palatinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Baden-Wuerttemberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Bavaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Saarland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Berlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Brandenburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Saxony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Saxony-Anhalt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Thuringia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gkpol</td>
<td>Political community size of the respondent's place of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 1 bis u. 2000 residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 2000 bis u. 5000 residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 5000 EW bis u. 20t residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 20t bis u. 50t residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 50t bis u. 100t residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 100t bis u. 500t residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) 500t + residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wo</td>
<td>West/East classification of respondent's place of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teilstp_netto</td>
<td>Sample membership based on the net data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp_tg</td>
<td>Country-of-origin groups in the total sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG_end</td>
<td>Migration background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muslim_hkl31</td>
<td>Muslims from country of origin 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muslim_hkl32</td>
<td>Muslims from country of origin 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muslim_hkl33</td>
<td>Muslims from country of origin 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>desgew</td>
<td>Design weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfaktges</td>
<td>Total weighting factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfakt1</td>
<td>Weight population sample (SP 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr1fakt</td>
<td>Group factor people without migration background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr2fakt</td>
<td>Group factor people with migration background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr3fakt</td>
<td>Group factor Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr4fakt</td>
<td>Group factor Muslims, country 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr5fakt</td>
<td>Group factor Muslims, country 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr6fakt</td>
<td>Group factor Muslims, country 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr7fakt</td>
<td>Group factor people without migration background, not Muslims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Newly created variables (area of origin)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>herkunft</td>
<td>newly created variables (area of origin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) East Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) North/West Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) South Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Balkans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Middle East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) America/Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99) Stateless/unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Newly created variables (DVs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>konsens</td>
<td>right-wing extremism by consensus definition (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konsens_3</td>
<td>right-wing extremism by three-level consensus definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) open to right-wing ideologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) closed right-wing world view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konsens_di</td>
<td>right-wing extremism by dichotomous consensus definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>islam</td>
<td>Islamist attitudes (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>islam_di</td>
<td>Islamist attitudes dichotomous (&gt;2,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demo</td>
<td>Democracy distance (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demodis</td>
<td>Democracy distance dichotomous (max 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of the construction of additional variables

The following descriptions are intended to describe the construction of core variables by the UHH. Please note that the specific syntax for creating these variables is not provided here as it can vary depending on the software used for data analysis. Necessary steps for the construction of the variables are therefore explained in the following text.

Respondents’ origin

This additional variable was created by the UHH based on the definitions used in the "Muslim Life in Germany" (MLD) study (BAMF 2019: 37). For respondents without a migration background (MB), the origin variable was set to "Germany". The assignment of respondents to specific regions of origin was done in a step-by-step manner, using various available information. If a respondent could be assigned to a region of origin based on the available information, that assignment was used.

The initial basis for assignment was the respondent's first nationality. If there was additional information on a second nationality, that was considered in the assignment process. If nationality information was not sufficient for assignment, the country of birth of the respondent was taken into account. If necessary, the information on the father's nationality and then the mother's nationality were used. If the nationalities of the parents were also not sufficient, the country of birth of the father and, if necessary, the country of birth of the mother were considered. In cases where further clarification was needed, information on the respondent's first language and onomastic identifier were taken into account.

If the assignment based on the available information was not clear, a decision was made following the procedure used in the "Muslim Life in Germany" study. For respondents with multiple relevant (non-German) nationalities, the nationality corresponding to the respondent's country of birth was given priority. If the nationalities and/or countries of birth of the parents differed, the region of origin was determined based on the father's information.

Negative attitudes towards democracy

The variables related to ‘democracy-distant attitudes’ were created by using variables that capture potential rejection or negative views towards democratic freedoms, Germany's constitutional structure, and equality rights. The variables listed below correspond to this concept (the information in parentheses indicates the variable name in the dataset):
• Rejection of democratic freedoms (frei...).
  o Every citizen should have the right to go out and demonstrate for what they believe in (frei1).
  o Strikes and demonstrations pose a danger to public order and should be banned (frei2).
  o The freedom of the press in our country must be protected (frei3).
  o All minorities should have the right to freely express their views (frei5).
• Rejection of constitutionalism (konst...).
  o Those who lose out in an election should not be allowed to criticise the business of government (konst1).
  o If a government is doing a good job, there is no reason to hold a new election after four years (konst2).
  o If Parliament makes a decision, it cannot be allowed to be overturned by a court (konst3).
  o In order to have strong political leadership in Germany, Parliament should have less influence (konst4).
• Rejection of equality rights (gleich...).
  o People should not be discriminated against because of their skin colour (gleich1).
  o Women and men should receive equal pay for doing the same work (gleich2).
  o Foreigners should not be treated differently to native citizens regarding allocation of housing (gleich3).
  o Muslims must be allowed to pursue their religion in the same way as Christians, Jews or followers of other religions (gleich4).

The construction of variables related to the three subdimensions of ‘democracy-distant attitudes’ involved several steps and recoding procedures. Initially, individual variables, namely free1, free3, free5, equal1, equal2, equal3, and equal4, were recoded to ensure that higher values reflect a higher degree of rejection of the respective statements.

Subsequently, subscales were formed for each subdimension by calculating the mean value of the recorded items, considering the necessary recoding. Inclusion in the subscale calculation required a minimum of three valid values per subscale (SPSS: mean.3). The subscales represent the degree of rejection of the respective dimensions ("freedom rights," "equality rights," "constitutionality").

To create the dichotomous variable demodis, the three subscales were dichotomized at the midpoint of the numerical scale. Respondents with a score of 2.50 or lower were assigned a value of 0, while those with a score of 2.51 or higher were assigned a value of 1. The variable demodis was designed so that individuals with a value of 1 in at least one of the three subscales were also assigned a value of 1. Inclusion in the variable demodis required the presence of at least one value greater than 0 in any of the three subscales (SPSS: max.1).

Furthermore, a continuous variable, demo, was formed by calculating the mean value of all twelve items (after recoding). To be considered for inclusion in this scale, respondents were required to have a minimum of four valid values across the twelve items (SPSS: mean.4). Additionally, valid values in the dichotomous variable
demodis were necessary to ensure consistency in missing values between the two variables.

**Right-wing extremist attitudes**

To construct the dependent variable 'right-wing extremist attitudes,' the consensus definition of right-wing extremism served as the basis. The survey included six dimensions of the consensus definition: xenophobia, trivialization of National Socialism, anti-Semitism, social Darwinism, chauvinism, and advocacy of a right-wing authoritarian dictatorship. Additionally, a new dimension of "anti-Islamic attitude" was included. Due to constraints on survey duration, however, the number of items had to be reduced compared to the standard measurement instrument (Decker et al., 2013). Each dimension is represented by one or two items. The calculation of the variable includes the following variables (the information in parentheses refers to the variable name in the dataset):

- **Xenophobia**
  - There are too many foreigners in Germany (polo2).

- **Trivialization of National Socialism**
  - A lot of what has been said about the crimes committed by the national socialists is exaggerated (polo7).

- **Antisemitism**
  - Jews have too much influence in Germany (antisem1).
  - You cannot trust Jews (antisem2).

- **Social Darwinism**
  - The strongest must prevail, otherwise progress is not possible (sozdarw).
  - There are worthwhile and also worthless forms of human life (frei6).

- **Chauvinism**
  - We should at long last have the courage to feel a strong sense of national identity again (chauv1).
  - My people are superior to other peoples (chauv2).

- **Advocacy of a right-wing authoritarian dictatorship**
  - A state should have a leader who rules the country with a forceful hand for the good of everyone (redik).

- **Additional dimension: anti-Islamic attitude**
  - If we are not careful, Germany will become an Islamic country (polo9).

The scaling was conducted based on the methodologies employed in the Leipzig Authoritarianism Study (2018) and the Center Study ('Mitte-Studie') (Zick et al. 2021: 84, 85).

To ensure equal weighting across dimensions with varying numbers of items, mean values were calculated for subdimensions consisting of two items. This calculation was applied to the subdimensions of Anti-Semitism, Chauvinism, and Social Darwinism. At least one valid value in one of the two items was required for inclusion (SPSS: mean.1).
The continuous variable *konsens* was created by calculating the mean value of the three subscales and the remaining four individual items. Respondents were included in this scale if they had at least three valid values (SPSS: mean.3).

For the dichotomous variable *konsens_di*, the konsens scale was dichotomized at the center of the numerical scale. Individuals with a value of 2.50 or lower were assigned the value 0, while individuals with a value of 2.51 or higher were assigned the value 1.

Furthermore, to facilitate comparison with previous studies, a categorical three-level variable was constructed, capturing the presence of a closed right-wing worldview or openness to right-wing ideologies, similar to the approach used in the Mitte studies (Zick, 2021). However, it should be noted that while previous studies employed a 5-point Likert scale to measure agreement, the MiD 2021 survey utilized a 4-point response scale. Therefore, the corresponding cutoff values were adjusted.

The three-level variable *konsens_3* was formed as follows: Individuals with a value of 2.0 or lower on the continuous scale *konsens* were assigned a value of 1, indicating a clear rejection of right-wing ideologies. Individuals with a value greater than 2.0 and up to 2.8 were assigned a value of 2, indicating openness to right-wing ideologies. Individuals with a value greater than 2.8 were assigned a value of 3, indicating the presence of a closed right-wing worldview.

**Islamist attitudes**

The variables pertaining to Islamist attitudes were exclusively gathered and utilized for respondents who expressed an affiliation with an Islamic religion.

The construction of this scale involved variables that captured a broad revaluation of Islam, the devaluation of other religions or Western societies, and the prioritization of religiously sanctioned laws over democratically sanctioned laws and political decision-making processes. The following variables were incorporated in the formation of this scale (the information in parentheses refers to the variable name in the dataset):

- **Revaluation of Islam**
  - Only Islam is capable of solving the problems of our time (aufwm2).
- **Devaluation of other religions and societies**
  - You cannot trust Jews (antisem2).
  - In Germany, you can clearly see that the Christian religions are not able to uphold morality (abwm1).
  - The sexual morality of Western societies has completely degenerated (abwm2).
- **Primacy of Islamic religion over democracy (religiously motivated democracy distance)**
  - An Islamic theocracy is the best form of government (relpolm1).
  - The rules in the Koran are more important to me than the laws in Germany (relpolm2).
  - German society should be structured up much more closely in line with Islamic principles (relpolm3).
I think a religious leader supported by a council is better than the democratic system in Germany (repolm4).

The variation in the number of items within the subdimensions was intentionally maintained, as the three dimensions were meant to be included in the scale with different weights.

The continuous variable *Islam*, representing positive attitudes toward Islamism, was derived by calculating the mean value of the responses to the eight individual items. Respondents were required to have at least six valid values for their responses to be considered (SPSS: mean.6).

To create the dichotomous variable *Islam_di*, the scale *Islam* was dichotomized at the midpoint of the scale. Persons with a value of 2.50 or below were assigned a value of 0, while those with a value of 2.51 or above were assigned the value 1.

After scaling, which was only performed for individuals who identified as Muslims, the variable *Islam_di* was set to 0 for all non-Muslims individuals in population estimates.
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