

Research Report No. 2

Young People in Germany 2022 (JuMiD)

*Methodology, survey design, description of the sample,
and codebook of the national representative survey
JuMiD 2022*

Diego Farren, Katrin Brettfeld, Rebecca Endtricht,
Jannik M.K. Fischer and Peter Wetzels



Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law, University of Hamburg

This report is a translated, updated and revised version of **MOTRA Forschungsbericht No. 5** which has been published in German language:

Farren, D., Brettfeld, K., Endtricht, R., Fischer, J.M.K. & Wetzels, P. (2022). *Junge Menschen in Deutschland 2022. Durchführung, Rücklauf, Erhebungsinstrumente und Codebuch der repräsentativen Befragung JuMiD 2022*. MOTRA Forschungsbericht No. 5 aus dem Institut für Kriminologie an der Fakultät für Rechtswissenschaft. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.
<http://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.10834>

Additional information about the project MOTRA and all our MOTRA Research Reports (Forschungsberichte) in German language can be obtained online via our website:

<https://www.jura.uni-hamburg.de/die-fakultaet/professuren/kriminologie/forschungsberichte.html>

University of Hamburg
Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Rothenbaumchaussee 33
20148 Hamburg

Hamburg, July 2023

© 2023 by the authors. All rights reserved.



Photo by UHH/RRZ/Mentz



Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2 | THE JUMID 2022 SURVEY AT A GLANCE | 2 |
| 3 | SAMPLING AND FIELDWORK..... | 2 |
| 3.1 | SAMPLING | 3 |
| 3.2 | FIELD WORK..... | 4 |
| 4 | RESPONSE RATES, WEIGHTING AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS..... | 4 |
| 4.1 | RESPONSE RATES | 5 |
| 4.2 | WEIGHTING | 6 |
| 4.3 | SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE..... | 7 |
| 5 | CENTRAL CONCEPTS AND MEASURES | 9 |
| 5.1 | POLITICAL-EXTREMIST ATTITUDES, INTOLERANCE TOWARDS OUTGROUPS, AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS POLITICALLY MOTIVATED VIOLENCE..... | 10 |
| 5.2 | INDIVIDUAL DISCRIMINATION AND COLLECTIVE MARGINALISATION | 11 |
| 5.3 | SUBJECTIVE EVALUATIONS OF NEW SOCIETAL CHALLENGES AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS..... | 12 |
| 5.4 | PERSONAL COPING SKILLS, SOCIAL RESOURCES, AND TRUST IN STATE INSTITUTIONS | 13 |
| 5.5 | USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA | 14 |
| 5.6 | SURVEY EXPERIMENT ON ATTITUDES TOWARDS REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS | 15 |
| 5.7 | PRETESTS OF MEASURES PARTICULARLY DEVELOPED FOR JUMID 2022 | 16 |
| 5.8 | OVERVIEW OF CONSTRUCTS AND MEASURES | 16 |
| | REFERENCES..... | 19 |
| | APPENDIX CODEBOOK..... | I |

Young People in Germany 2022 (JuMiD)

Methodology, survey design, description of the sample, and codebook of the national representative survey JuMiD 2022

Diego Farren, Katrin Brettfeld, Rebecca Endtricht, Jannik M.K. Fischer and Peter Wetzels

1 Introduction

The research network MOTRA (i.e. Monitoring System and Transfer Platform Radicalisation), which includes the Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law of the University of Hamburg as well as eight partner organizations from science and research,¹ has two central objectives: Firstly, it aims to conduct a continuous and comprehensive monitoring of political radicalization in Germany applying a multi-method approach that covers various phenomena of political extremism, the acceptance of politically motivated violence, and different forms of intolerance towards certain outgroups and minorities. Secondly, it strives to establish a sustainable and institutionalized knowledge transfer between politics, practice, and science on these issues of political extremism and radicalization.

Within the MOTRA research network, the research group at the Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law at the University of Hamburg is particularly responsible for analysing the prevalence, social distribution, and trends of political extremist attitudes in Germany. Furthermore, social prejudices and intolerance towards outgroups like islamophobia, xenophobia, and antisemitism as well as the acceptance of politically motivated violence will be analysed (cf. Brettfeld et al. 2021a). This research is embedded in a theory-based approach that considers both individual and social factors relevant for the formation of political extremist attitudes.

To achieve this, the University of Hamburg, in cooperation with the field research institute Kantar GmbH, conducts annually repeated, nationally representative surveys of the adult population living in Germany under the title "People in Germany" (MiD) (cf. Brettfeld et al. 2021b; Wetzels et al. 2022b; Endtricht et al. 2023).

The study "Young People in Germany" (JuMiD) is a complementary survey to these MiD studies, focusing specifically on young people and adolescents between 16 and 21 years of age living in Germany (Brettfeld et al. 2021a, p. 124). This representative survey of young people was conducted for the first time in 2022. The survey will be repeated in 2024. It is planned to repeat these surveys of young people in Germany every two years from then on.

The JuMiD study aims to explore factors influencing young people's perceptions and evaluations of current societal developments and their opinions on political and religious topics. Central themes of JuMiD insofar are young people's attitudes towards democracy and civil rights, the prevalence of right-wing extremism and Islamism in this age group, as well as the prevalence and social distribution of various forms of prejudices and intolerance directed against foreign groups and minorities that can be observed among young people in Germany.

¹ For more information about the MOTRA Partners see <https://www.motra.info/>

In addition to that the study aims to observe how juveniles and young adolescents in Germany perceive society and politics. Their needs and concerns will be analysed and their opinions with respect to recent social problems will be measured. As part of this their willingness to take social and/or political action will be looked at too. Insofar the JuMiD study seeks to gain insights into where young people perceive the need for social change and into their preparedness to actively address the actual social and political challenges our society is facing today.

In the long run the JuMiD studies aim to examine changes and developments of such perceptions, motives and political attitudes of young people in Germany over time.

This research report provides a detailed description of the methodology of the survey JuMiD 2022. The sampling procedures and the questionnaire used will be described. Furthermore, the response rates and the sociodemographic characteristics of the final sample obtained will be presented. Additionally, the report provides a comprehensive explanation of the weighting procedures employed. The accompanying appendix contains the code book for variables of the associated data set.

2 The JuMiD 2022 survey at a glance

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Type of survey | Nationwide representative online-survey |
| Field-Research Institute | Kantar GmbH |
| Time of Field-Work | 23 March - 19 May 2022 |
| Population | Residential population of Germany aged 16 to 21 years (born between 2000 and 2005) |
| Sample size projected | N=3 000 |
| Sampling procedure | Random sampling on the basis of the population registers |
| Survey method | Online survey (CAWI) |
| Survey language | German |
| Duration of survey | 26 minutes (median) |
| Realized sample | N=3 590 |
| Response rate | 31.7% |

3 Sampling and fieldwork

The sampling strategy and contact procedures for the JuMiD 2022 survey were based on the same methodology employed in the first wave of the nationally representative MiD 2021 survey, which targeted the adult population aged 18 and above (Brettfeld et al. 2021b, Endtricht et al. 2023). This ensures comparability of sampling strategies and measurement between this two surveys and allows for data integration.

However, there are some notable differences between the two surveys: In the survey MiD 2021, in addition to a population-representative core-sample two oversamples were included to increase the representation of individuals with a migration background and of individuals from muslim-majority countries. Due to budget constraints, it was decided not to include such additional oversamples in the JuMiD 2022 survey. Another decision was to

conduct the JuMiD 2022 survey exclusively in German. Since findings of our previous research conducted with juveniles showed that the majority of young people with a migration background who participated in such surveys were able to understand German (cf. among others Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007, p. 221 f, p. 341f; see also Wetzels & Brettfeld 2003), this decision seemed justifiable. In line with these findings of our earlier studies on juveniles, in the research recently conducted in the context of MOTRA we could observe, that young adults in the MiD 2021 study rarely made use of the possibility to answer the survey in one of the seven foreign languages, which were offered particularly to respondents with a migration background. Nonetheless it should be noted that the findings of JuMiD 2022 cannot be generalized to young migrants without a minimum knowledge of German language, since these young people could not actively take part in the JuMiD Survey. Furthermore, considering the affinity of young people towards internet-based communication, the JuMiD 2022 survey was designed as an online-based survey. This differs from the mixed-mode design employed in the MiD surveys for adults which combine paper-based (PAPI) and online-based (CAWI) questionnaires (Endtricht et al. 2023).

Additionally, the JuMiD study needed to consider that some respondents are under the age of 18 and thus legally minors at the time of the survey. For them parental consent was necessary for legal reasons. To address this, it was decided to contact the legal guardians of minors and seek their permission for their underage children to participate in the JuMiD 2022 survey.

Overall, there are some methodological differences between the MiD surveys conducted with adults and the JuMiD Survey, that account for the specific characteristics of the target population and the practical constraints a study including minors faces. These are methodological and practical decisions that needed to be made to ensure that data collection was feasible and in the same time that procedures applied also are appropriate for surveying this specific population of young people.

3.1 Sampling

The JuMiD 2022 study aimed to target the registered resident population in Germany between the age of 16 and 21. To achieve this, a random sample was obtained from residents' registration offices using a multi-step procedure.

Based on results of analyses of the MiD 2021 data on the prevalence of extreme right-wing political attitudes (Brettfeld et al. 2021a), a net sample of 3 000 people was deemed necessary to conduct meaningful analyses for subgroups and to identify changes over time based on the additional waves of JuMiD that are planned for the next years. Since the MiD 2021 Study yielded a total response rate of 23.6% a response rate of roughly 25% was expected for the survey of young people. Taking into consideration these calculations a gross sample of 12 000 addresses would be required to actually achieve the target size of a net sample of 3 000 respondents.

In the first step, a representative sample of 136 municipalities was randomly drawn, proportional to their resident population size.² Subsequently, addresses of persons of the targeted age groups were randomly selected from the residents' registration offices of these municipalities. Approximately 20 700 addresses were provided by the registration offices, exceeding the projected number of 12 000 addresses necessary to realize a sample of

² Small cities with a population of less than 5 000 inhabitants were removed from the selection a priori but systematically considered in the later design weighting.

n=3 000 participants of the target population. Therefore, in the third step, a n=12 000 addresses were randomly selected from this larger address pool.

The first step of the sampling process, drawing the municipality sample, was already conducted in the summer of 2021 due to the longer lead time required when using population registration office samples. Afterwards, the selected municipalities were contacted to request the randomly drawn addresses.

The sample was drawn independently of a potential migration background or a specific religious affiliation of participants. The aim was to obtain a representative sample of the German resident population between 16 and 21 years of age, including a proportion of individuals with a migration background as well as individuals with a Muslim religious affiliation that roughly corresponds to their distribution in the German population of this age group, although some restrictions were expected in achieving this goal.

3.2 Field work

The selected target persons were contacted via postal letters using their residential addresses provided by the residents' registration offices. Target persons aged 18 years and older were contacted directly, while for target persons under 18 years of age the legal guardians were contacted by letter and asked for the participation of their adolescent child.

The contact was made through a personalized letter in German, which provided information about the study, its objectives, the survey procedure, and the voluntary nature of participation. The cover letter also included a reference to a toll-free telephone number and an email address for participants or their guardians to contact the field research institute for any questions. A separate data protection sheet containing further relevant information was also included. All target persons were also informed that they would receive a post-paid incentive of 10 € after completing the survey.

The online questionnaire could be accessed and answered on a website created by the field research institute. Participants could access the questionnaire using the username and personal password provided to them in the cover letter.

The process of mailing the initial cover letter, which contained all the necessary information for survey participation and was sent to the gross sample of 12 000 individuals, was started on March 23, 2022. In response to this first letter, n=2 007 people were reached. A first reminder was sent on April 11, 2022, to all individuals who had not yet completed a questionnaire and were not listed as non-participants due to explicit refusal to participate or address-related issues.³ Finally, on May 3, 2022, the second and final reminder, clearly labelled as such, was sent to the target persons or their legal guardians. All reminders contained full information on how to participate in the study. Data collection was finished on May 19, 2022.

4 Response rates, weighting and sample characteristics

During the JuMiD 2022 survey, a total of n=12 000 individuals were initially contacted and invited to participate. From this initial sample, a total of n=3 590 usable interviews were completed, resulting in a response rate, adjusted for quality-neutral dropouts, of 31.7%.

³ Participants from Schleswig-Holstein were excluded here, as the Ministry of the Interior of Schleswig-Holstein prohibited multiple reminders. Targets from Schleswig-Holstein therefore only received the following 2nd reminder.

Subsequently, the data underwent a multi-stage weighting process conducted by the field research institute Kantar GmbH. The purpose of this weighting process was to align the distribution of the sample as closely as possible with the known socio-demographic characteristics of the population of young people aged 16 to 21. In the following sections a detailed description of the data cleaning process and the weighting procedures will be given. Furthermore, a comparison of the sample to the population of the corresponding age group in terms of important socio-demographic characteristics will be provided. These comparisons allow for the evaluation of the quality of the sample and the assessment of the generalizability of findings based on this sample onto the broader population of people aged 16 to 21 living in Germany.

4.1 Response rates

Out of the 12 000 addresses that were randomly drawn from the residents' registration offices, 666 cases (5.6%) were identified as faulty as they did not reach the intended target person. These cases of address-related failure are classified as quality-neutral, as they do not depend on the content or nature of the survey.

As a result, the gross address sample, adjusted for quality-neutral dropouts, consists of 11 334 target persons. This adjusted sample size serves as the basis for calculating the response rates, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Calculation of response rate of the JuMiD 2022 survey

| | N | % |
|--|--------|-------|
| Number of addresses drawn (Gross-sample of addresses) | 12 000 | 100.0 |
| Address-related failures/addresses wrong (quality-neutral) | 666 | 5.6 |
| Gross sample adjusted for address failures | 11 334 | 100.0 |
| No return at all | 6 988 | 61.7 |
| Further failures | | |
| Explicit rejection | 50 | 0.4 |
| Online termination of participation | 537 | 4.7 |
| Invalid cases | 141 | 1.2 |
| unusable cases | 28 | 0.2 |
| final sample | 3 590 | 31.7 |

In n=6 988 cases (61.7%), neither the return of a questionnaire nor any other form of contact from the target person was registered. Thus, out of the adjusted gross sample of 11 334 target persons, detailed information is available for n=4 346 cases (38.3% of the adjusted gross sample).

Among these target persons, n=50 individuals (0.4%) explicitly *refused* to participate in the survey. These refusals were communicated to field research institute via the various different contact methods provided such as phone or email.

In a further n=537 cases (4.7%), the target person started but *abandoned finishing the online questionnaire*. An analysis revealed that the majority of these aborts occurred directly after logging in or at the beginning of the session, indicating a lack of intention to participate in the survey.

At the end of the field phase, a total of n=3 769 completed questionnaires remained. These were subjected to an initial data check and cleaning process by Kantar in

consultation with the UHH team. This cleaning process was based on information from the residents' registration offices, such as age and gender of the target persons, and on field monitoring information about the start and completion times of the questionnaire.

After applying these checks n=141 questionnaires were considered *invalid* for various reasons and removed from the data set.

- N=80 cases exhibited significant discrepancies between the information provided by the EMA (i.e. "Einwohnermeldeamt", registration office) and the information provided by the respondents themselves. Specifically, in n=27 cases, the gender (male/female) differed between the EMA information and the questionnaire responses. In n=52 cases, the reported age differed by more than 2 years compared to the EMA information. In one case both (gender and age) differed from the EMA data. These discrepancies indicate inconsistencies or errors in the provided information, leading to the exclusion of these cases from the final dataset.
- In n=61 cases, the validity of the data was assessed as highly questionable, as the duration of completing the entire questionnaire (median=26 minutes) was exceptionally short, with completion times of less than 7.5 minutes (so-called super speeder). Secondly, some questionnaires displayed conspicuous answering patterns where the same answer was consistently chosen across all items, particularly within item batteries (so-called straight liners). Given these indications of questionable data quality, these 61 cases were excluded from the final dataset.

After filtering out these cases, the resulting data set contained N=3 618 cases. The UHH team further checked these cases for inconsistencies in response behaviour and the total number of missing values ('item missing'). N=28 cases were identified as *unusable* due to a very high proportion of missing data and severe inconsistencies in the answers provided.

Thus, a final net dataset of N=3 590 usable cases remained. The response rate, calculated based on the usable cases in relation to the adjusted gross sample after accounting for quality-neutral dropouts, is 31.7%. This can be classified as an excellent response rate compared to other similar online-studies. Furthermore, this rate is higher than expected on the basis of our experiences in the MiD 2021 survey.

4.2 Weighting

The weighting procedure for the JuMiD 2022 dataset involve several stages, carried out by Kantar in consultation with the UHH. The following steps, based on the realized net sample of N = 3 590 of usable cases, were taken (cf. Kantar 2022):

(1) Design Weighting: This step addressed the different selection probabilities that arose during the sampling process based on basic statistical data. It involved balancing the distributions by federal state and political municipality size class.⁴

(2) Non-Response Weighting: Systematic failures during the field phase were addressed in this step. It involved estimating participation probabilities, considering various characteristics of the target persons, such as age, gender, nationality (German/non-German), federal state and municipality size class ('BIK').

⁴ In order to consider the distribution according to the political size class of the municipality, it was necessary to refer to estimates from regional data records for the population update, since official statistical data for the age group surveyed here are not available in this form.

(3) Calibration (Redressment): This step aimed to further correct deviations of the realized sample from official socio-structural data. Multiple variables, including nationality, gender, age, federal state, political municipality size class, were used in this process.

The resulting variable *"pfakt"* serves as the central weighting factor, allowing for population-representative analyses based on the weighted total sample of n=3 590. Additionally, the dataset includes the weighting factor *"dfakt"* as the design factor, representing only the first step of the weighting procedure.

4.3 Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample

The weighting ensures that the selection probabilities for the sample are balanced and that the realized cases are proportionally distributed based on regional areas of origin, reflecting the conditions of the total population of this age group living in Germany.

Since official statistical data on the distribution of residents by age and city size are not available in combination, the distribution was estimated by using regional data. This estimate is used here to evaluate the adjustment of the data after weighting.

Table 2: Sample distributions by federal states and city size

| | Total sample (N=3 590) | | | Reference % |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|----------|------|----------------|
| | unweighted | weighted | | |
| | valid N | % | % | |
| State | | | | |
| Schleswig-Holstein | 108 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Hamburg | 91 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| Lower Saxony | 377 | 10.5 | 10.2 | 10.2 |
| Bremen | 23 | 0.6 | .9 | .9 |
| North Rhine-Westphalia | 786 | 21.9 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Hessen | 324 | 9.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| Rhineland-Palatinate/Saarland | 198 | 5.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Baden-Württemberg | 485 | 13.5 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
| Bavaria | 628 | 17.5 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Berlin | 103 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| Brandenburg | 99 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania | 64 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Saxony | 177 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 4.3 |
| Saxony-Anhalt | 70 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Thuringia | 57 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| City Size | | | | |
| less than 2 000 inhabitants | 15 | .4 | .4 | 5.1 |
| 2 000 to under 5 000 inhabitants | 28 | .8 | .9 | 8.2 |
| 5 000 to under 20 000 inhabitants | 967 | 26.9 | 38.0 | 25.9 |
| 20 000 to under 50 000 inhabitants | 799 | 22.3 | 18.6 | 18.5 |
| 50 000 to under 100 000 inhabitants | 477 | 13.3 | 9.4 | 9.3 |
| 100 000 to under 500 000 inhabitants | 655 | 18.2 | 16.4 | 16.7 |
| 500 000 and more inhabitants | 649 | 18.1 | 16.3 | 16.4 |

Note: Source of reference values for distribution by federal state: Federal Statistical Office, Genesis Online, population update (16 to 21 years), as of 31.12.2020. Source of reference values for distribution by city size: estimate by the Kantar field research institute based on the Regional Report on Updates of the Population statistics.

Even before weighting, the distribution of the sample by federal state closely resembles the distribution in the population (cf. Table 2). The weighted data matches the reference data of the official statistics for the population even more closely. Specifically, the weighted sample accurately represents the distribution of 16- to 21-year-olds across the 16 federal states with only a minimal deviation of 0.1 percentage points observed in the federal state of Saxony compared to data from the Federal Statistical Office.

The distribution of respondents according to the size of the city in which they reside largely aligns with the estimates made by the field research institute as well. Since very small municipalities (under 5 000 inhabitants) were excluded from the initial drawing of the municipality sample, but were considered in the design weighting, deviations from the distribution are observed for municipalities with fewer than 5 000 inhabitants and the next largest municipalities (5 000 to under 20 000 inhabitants). However, for all other city sizes, the weighting process results in a good fit with the actual distribution, with deviations ranging between 0.1 and 0.3 percentage points.

Furthermore, there was a slight overrepresentation of female respondents in the unweighted sample (cf. Table 3). After weighting the distribution closely aligns with the reference data of the Federal Statistical Office with a deviation of only 0.1 percentage points.

In terms of age distribution, the weighted sample matches perfectly with the data from the Federal Statistical Office, indicating no deviations in this regard.

Table 3: Sampling distributions according to sex, age, and nationality

| | Total sample (N=3 590) | | | Reference % |
|--------------------|------------------------|------|---------------|----------------|
| | unweighted valid N | % | weighted % | |
| Gender* | | | | |
| female | 1 811 | 51.4 | 48.0 | 48.1 |
| male | 1 715 | 48.6 | 52.0 | 51.9 |
| Age | | | | |
| 16 years | 445 | 12.4 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
| 17 years | 649 | 18.1 | 15.7 | 15.7 |
| 18 years | 598 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| 19 years | 581 | 16.2 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| 20 years | 580 | 16.2 | 17.8 | 17.8 |
| 21 years** | 737 | 20.5 | 18.2 | 18.2 |
| Mean value | 3 590 | 18.7 | 18.6 | 18.6 |
| Nationality | | | | |
| German | 3 260 | 94.6 | 89.4 | 87.2 |
| Non-German | 187 | 5.4 | 10.6 | 12.8 |

Note: Source of reference data: Federal Statistical Office, Genesis Online, population update (16 to 21 years), as of 31.12.2020.

* Since the official reference data do not contain information on the proportion of persons with non-binary genders, only those respondents who indicated male or female as their gender were considered to determine the fit of the survey data with the reference data.

** The group of 21-year-olds includes n=129 people who became 22 years in the time between sampling and the time of the field work of the survey.

Upon examining the unweighted sample, it is evident that there were slight deviations in the representation of certain age groups. Participants aged 16 were slightly underrepresented, while 17-year-olds were overrepresented. This can be attributed to delays in the

processing times at residents' registration offices caused by the COVID-19 pandemic during the summer of 2021. As a result, respondents were, on average, around three-quarters of a year older at the time of the survey compared to the time of the draw. However, when considering the age information provided by the residents' registration offices, the participation rate of 16-year-olds is slightly higher than that of other age groups. Thus, contacting parents for underage participants did not result in a lower response rate within this age group.

The somewhat higher proportion of 21-year-old respondents in the unweighted sample is due to the inclusion of individuals who had turned 22 at the time of the survey but were listed as 21-year-olds at the time when the sample was drawn (n=129 individuals). However, these distortions were corrected by the weighting procedures.

In terms of nationality, there are somewhat larger deviations between the weighted sample and the data from the Federal Statistical Office. The unweighted distribution (5.4% foreign respondents, 94.6% Germans) already indicates a disproportionately low participation rate of foreign young people, likely due to the survey being conducted exclusively in German. The weighting could only partially compensate for this distortion, as applying larger weighting factors would have resulted in significant overcompensation. Consequently, the distribution of the respondents regarding nationality deviates by 2.2 percentage points from the official data. Therefore, it should be noted that the findings of JuMiD related to migrants can only be generalized to the particular part of the population of young migrants living in Germany who has at least a minimum understanding of the German language.

As for the level of education, a comparison between the sample and the population cannot be made, because a significant proportion of the respondents (44.1%) are still attending school and do not have an educational qualification at this stage. Their level of education remains open. Information on the educational qualification they are aspiring in the future was collected for them. However, this information is not adequate to be used for the weighting processes.

Overall, after applying weighting factors, only very little differences between the sample and the population can be identified. Therefore, generalization of findings based on this sample is justified.

5 Central concepts and measures

The questionnaire for the JuMiD 2022 study was designed by the University of Hamburg in cooperation with the Berlin Social Science Centre (WZB), the Ludwig-Maximilian University Munich (LMU), the German Institute for Global and Area Studies (GIGA), the Terrorism/Extremism Research Unit (FTE) at the German Federal Office of Criminal Police (BKA).

The questionnaire aimed to gather information on relevant individual and social factors that are theoretically relevant in influencing political extremist attitudes (cf. Brettfeld et al. 2021b, Endtricht et al. 2023, and Wetzels et al. 2022a). Additionally, the questionnaire included specific questions pertaining to beliefs and religious values of young muslims living in Germany.

The development of the questionnaire and the selection of the measurement instruments that were used in the JuMiD 2022 study were carried out with the goal of ensuring

comparability with the second wave of the “People in Germany” survey (MiD 2022) (c.f. Fischer, Farren et al. 2023). The data collection of MiD 2022 took place during the same time as the JuMiD Survey 2022. MiD 2022 is based on a national representative sample of the adult population of people living in Germany aged 18 and above.

However, in order to capture particular perspectives, concerns, and experiences of young people and their subjective perceptions of social issues, JuMiD also focuses on topics specific to young people, that are not considered in the MiD Surveys.

Drawing on the experience gained from MiD 2021 study (Wetzels et al. 2022a, 2022b; Endtricht et al. 2023), many of the established measurement instruments were also incorporated in JuMiD 2022. However, some adjustments were made to the questionnaire, which are also reflected in the second wave of the People in Germany study MiD 2022.

These modifications facilitate the comparison and linkage of data of the two surveys conducted in 2022, while still allowing for a comparison of findings with the first wave of the population-representative study MiD 2021.

5.1 Political-extremist attitudes, intolerance towards outgroups, and attitudes towards politically motivated violence

In the MOTRA research political-extremist attitudes were measured in several ways. The measurement focuses on the one hand political-extremism detached from specific political or religious ideological motives, i.e. across phenomena. On the other hand, political-extremist attitudes were measured with respect to specific ideologies as well via phenomenon-specific measures. These include right-wing extremism as well as political extremist islamist attitudes as a specific form of religiously motivated political extremism.

Political-extremist attitudes independent of a particular political ideology were measured using the normative concept of *democracy-distance*. This concept contains three subdimensions: a) rejection of basic rights of freedom, b) rejection of basic rights of equal treatment, and c) rejection of core principles of a democratic state constitution (cf. Wetzels et al. 2022a, 2022b).

In the dimensions “rejection of basic rights of freedom” and “rejection of democratic state constitution”, the item wording was exactly the same in all the three studies conducted so far (MiD 2021, MiD 2022 and JuMiD 2022). However, slight adjustments were made to the dimension “rejection of basic rights of equal treatment” in the two recent surveys conducted in 2022: Specifically, the terms “must” and “may” in the items (e.g. people must not be disadvantaged because of their skin colour.) were replaced with the term “should” (e.g. people should not be discriminated against because of their skin colour.). This was done to address the normative/legal aspect associated with the term “may” in German law. The intention was to ensure that respondents’ answers reflected their attitudes rather than their mere knowledge of legal or constitutional regulations, such as the prohibition of unequal treatment according to Art. 3 GG.

In addition to assessing political extremist attitudes independent of specific political ideologies via measuring democracy-distance, *intolerant attitudes towards outgroups or minorities* were measured independently of specific political ideologies or motives as well. This included among others measures of hostility towards homosexuals (homophobia) as well as antisemitism, islamophobia, xenophobia and negative attitudes towards refugees or asylum-seekers.

Some of the items from MiD 2021 were retained, particularly in the subdimension of anti-Semitism. However, certain items were replaced or extended by additional items, while still focusing on the same sub-dimension. For example, the item “I think the talk about racism in Germany is exaggerated”, was not yet used in MiD 2021, but newly included in both surveys in 2022 (MiD 2022 and JuMiD 2022).

In addition to these cross-phenomena measures of intolerance and democracy-distance, the MiD and the JuMiD surveys also include phenomenon-specific manifestations of Islamist-extremist attitudes and right-wing extremist attitudes.

Right-wing extremist attitudes were measured by a scale based on the so called “consensus definition” (cf. Decker et al. 2010, p. 18). According to this definition, there are six subdimensions of right-wing extremist attitudes: a) advocacy for authoritarian dictatorship, b) nationalist chauvinism, c) social darwinism, d) trivialization of national socialism, e) anti-semitism and f) xenophobia. In the MiD 2021 survey, an additional seventh sub-dimension, g) islamophobia, was included to capture prejudices towards Islam and hostility towards muslims living in Germany. This seventh subdimension was also retained in the scales used for the JuMiD 2022 and MiD 2022 surveys.

In the JuMiD 2022 survey, the seven sub-dimensions of right-wing extremist attitudes are captured by one item each. This approach was chosen to ensure a shorter survey duration for the participants. In contrast, the MiD 2022 survey uses a more extensive measurement for right-wing extremist attitudes, with two items dedicated to each of the six basic sub-dimensions of the consensus definition. The decision to use a single item for each sub-dimension in JuMiD 2022 allows for a more concise assessment while still capturing the essence of these attitudes.

In all three surveys (MiD 2021; MiD 2022; JuMiD 2022), identical items were used to specifically capture *religiously motivated, Islamist political attitudes*. The items of the scale used focus on the primacy of Islam and religious rules over democratic principles, the general devaluation of Western cultures, and a general exaltation of Islam (cf. Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007; Koopmans 2015; Wetzels et al. 2022a, 2022b).

Additionally, the *acceptance of politically-motivated violence* and of *religiously-islamist motivated violence* was measured in the same way across all three surveys. This separate measurement of attitudes towards violence allows for differentiations within those respondents who have already shown negative attitudes towards democracy and/or support for specific forms of extremism. Specifically, this aims to identify the subgroup of individuals who are accepting the use violence to enforce their political or religious extremist goals.

The general *political orientation* of the respondents was assessed by capturing their self-positioning on the left-centre-right scale and their party preference (commonly known as the ‘Sunday question’).

For Muslim respondents, their individual religiosity and particular *forms of religious orientations* were also measured (cf. Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007, 2022a). The items used for these measurements are identical in all surveys, enabling comparisons between young people and the adult general population, as well as trend analyses with all MiD surveys conducted since 2021 and future survey waves.

5.2 Individual discrimination and collective marginalisation

The survey included questions about respondents’ subjective experiences of individual discrimination that were personally encountered within the last 12 months. Here participants were asked to indicate how frequently they have experienced *individual discrimination* because of the colour of their skin, their ethnic background or nationality, their religion, because of gender or sexual orientation, with respect to their language or their political opinions or because of the reputation of the region or places they actually live in.

Experiences of this kind were addressed in all three surveys. However, in the 2022 surveys, the aspects of "language" and "sexual orientation" were newly added to the questionnaire.

Additionally, the survey also included a reduced assessment of experiences of *collective marginalisation* related to one's own group. These questions about collective marginalisation experiences were framed with the phrase "here in our society people like me ..." in order to generally include subjective perceptions of social exclusion and unfair treatments of people from the particular group to which the respondents feel they belong to. In JuMiD 2022, respondents were asked to what extent they perceive a general disregard for their own group. Furthermore, they were asked whether they feel that people like them were not taken seriously by politicians, or were treated unfairly by the police.

The survey also asked about *negative emotions* accompanying such experiences of discrimination, such as anger, resentment or disappointment. These negative emotions were measured in the same way as in the survey of adults within the framework of MiD 2022.

For those who identified as belonging to a Muslim religious community, an additional question was included to assess to which extent young muslims in Germany perceive *muslims* in general being *disadvantaged within Germany* and/or *treated unfair on an international level*.

5.3 Subjective evaluations of new societal challenges and social problems

The theoretical model underlying our analyses is based on the General Strain Theory (Agnew 2006, 2017, Brettfeld et al. 2021b). This theory suggests that various forms of stress (so-called strains), resulting from both individual and societal changes and challenges, can lead to the development of negative emotions such as anger and resentment, as well as to feelings of insecurity and the fear of losing one's place or not being able to find one's place in a changing world.

People deal with such negative emotions in particular on an individual level. Extremist attitudes in the sense of a preference for clear leadership, authoritarian solutions, and political measures that claim to particularly support and protect exclusively one's own group can be seen as attempts to cope with such negative emotional states. While such attitudes and preferences are dysfunctional for social integration and cohesion, individuals may perceive them as subjectively useful (Fischer et al. 2022; Wetzels et al. 2022b).

Whether individuals ultimately find functional coping mechanisms or resort to deviant solutions in the form of extremist attitudes depends at least in part on additional individual and social factors that act as resources to enable alternative forms of coping.

In addition to experiences of collective marginalisation and individual discrimination, subjective perceptions of new societal challenges and risks can also represent such strains. Perceptions of new social problems and subjective concerns because of challenges and changes, our society is confronted with, can lead to a general sense of uncertainty and feelings of threat, often associated with a perceived loss of control.

The 2022 surveys addressed *concerns about current social challenges*, such as increased influx of refugees and other migrants, the economic and social consequences of climate change, potential involvement of Germany in a war, consequences of the Corona pandemic, and growing poverty due to economic crises.

While the general theme of these concerns was maintained from the MiD 2021 survey, the items used in the 2022 surveys were somewhat simplified in their statements (e.g. MiD 2021: Extent of

concern ... that the Corona pandemic will continue for a long time and could overburden the health system. MiD 2022/JuMiD 2022: level of concern "...that the Corona pandemic will continue for a long time").

The questionnaire for the JuMiD 2022 study also included specific concerns related to the ongoing *war in Ukraine*, which had intensified during the survey period. Participants were asked about their level of concern regarding a possible collapse of energy supply in Europe, the risk of Russian attacks on Germany or another NATO state, the resurgence of the "Cold War", or a potential nuclear war in Europe.

According to General Strain Theory of Terrorism (Agnew 2017) being confronted with symptoms of social or economic crises and new and difficult societal challenges can lead to a general sense of insecurity. This can be accompanied by uncertainty about one's own position in society and with growing distrust in social relations. The prevalence and intensity of such feelings of *anomic uncertainty* was measured in JuMiD 2022 using a slightly shortened version of an established scale already applied in the MiD 2021 and in the MiD 2022 study.

While the MiD 2022 survey assessed anomic uncertainty using five items, the JuMiD 2022 youth survey measured it using only three of these items. These three items capture sentiments such as: "These days everything has become so uncertain. You have to be ready for anything" or "Things today have become so difficult. You don't know what is going on".

In addition to such a general anomic uncertainty, JuMiD 2022 also includes a specific gendered form of perceived threat related to masculist ideologies and male narratives of victimhood. These items link *traditional male role norms* with *feelings of group threat* (Fischer & Farren 2023). This allows for a closer examination of how negative emotions stemming from perceived group threat to the social identity of "men" may contribute to intolerance or political extremist attitudes (Mokros et al. 2021).

Previous research has already linked concepts of violence legitimizing norms of masculinity, antifeminist beliefs, and misogynistic attitudes to right-wing extremism and authoritarianism (Enzmann, Brettfeld & Wetzels 2004; Birsl 2011; Baier et al. 2019; Höcker et al. 2020). By including items related to these concepts, the JuMiD 2022 study aims to explore the association between perceived threats to male social identity and attitudes towards extremism or intolerance in more detail.

5.4 Personal coping skills, social resources, and trust in state institutions

The capacity to effectively manage strains and negative emotions in a socially acceptable manner is influenced by various factors, including personal skills and expertise, as well as the availability of social resources that can support or hinder this process.

As one of such personal skills, *political self-efficacy* was measured using two items of an established Scale (Beierlein et al. 2012). These items relate to the ability to understand political issues and the competence to actively participate in conversations about political topics.

The surveys conducted in 2022 furthermore included a measure of *conspiracy mentality*, which is an individual personality trait, specifically capturing individuals' propensity to conspiratorial thinking (Bruder 2013; Imhoff & Bruder 2014; Imhoff et al. 2022). In both surveys the same scale with identical items was applied (Wetzels & Brettfeld 2022b). This allows for comparative analyses of the relationship between conspiratorial thinking and the endorsement of extremist attitudes.

The theoretical concept of *social identity* was employed consistently across all surveys. Social identity was measured via the respondents' self-location on various dimensions such as ethnic identity, cultural identity, place-based identity and ideological identity. This allows for an examination of how individual experiences of discrimination, particularly those that impact personally important identity dimensions, influence the development of inter-group intolerance and prejudices.

The subjective assessment of state actors' ability to act and the level of trust placed in them is another factor that theoretically are important factors influencing the development of politically extremist attitudes. To measure this, the JuMiD 2022 survey included a measure of *system trust*, which reflects individuals' general trust in the government, political parties, the police, and local politicians. The items used were similar to those applied in the MiD 2022 survey. However, in the JuMiD 2022 survey the scale was slightly abbreviated. Additionally, respondents were asked to evaluate the *competence of societal decision-makers*, a measurement that was included in both the JuMiD 2022 and the MiD 2022 survey.

Compared to the MiD 2022 survey, the item "The decision-makers in our country are not interested in the problems of ordinary people". was adapted in a youth-specific manner to focus on the "problems of young people".

Attitudes of individuals who are in regular contact with the respondents, particularly their parents and peers, play a central role in shaping the attitudes of young people. These attitudes form the *moral context* in which young individuals learn and make decisions.

To capture such attitudes in a situation-specific manner within the respondents' individual social environment, two vignettes were incorporated into the JuMiD 2022 survey, both of which depict scenarios involving intolerant attitudes. The first vignette portrays a situation in which the dismissal of a homosexual teacher from the school service is demanded. The second vignette revolves around disagreements between citizens and local politicians, including a violent threat against a female mayor. After presenting each vignette, the survey assesses the moral evaluations of these incidences by the interviewees themselves. Furthermore, the moral evaluations the respondents assume that persons close to them will make regarding these fictitious situations, are measured as well.

In addition, JuMiD 2022 asks how many *friends* respondents have and how important it is to respondents what their friends think of their views or opinions.

The JuMiD 2022 survey also included questions specifically related to social engagement, particularly tailored to young people. These questions were divided into two aspects. Firstly, the survey assessed the respondents' *willingness to act* in the sense of action potentials. Secondly, it captured the specific fields of action in which the respondents are currently active or aspire to be active in the near future. The former aspect includes questions about the extent and urgency of a *political need for action* felt by the respondent. As for the fields of action, the survey provided predefined options for potential activities (e.g., participating in demonstrations, changing one's diet, engaging in social causes), while also allowing respondents to provide open-ended responses.

5.5 Use of social media

As communication via social media is of enormous relevance in particular for young people, the questionnaires of MiD and JuMiD also contain questions about the usage of various forms of social media. These questions relate to popular platforms such as Twitter,

Facebook, Telegram and Instagram, as well as to less common ones like Reddit, Threema, or Snapchat.

Compared to the MiD 2021 survey, some additional online media were included in 2022. While the questions about social media usage in the MiD surveys does not specify a particular time frame, the JuMiD 2022 survey specifically asked about usage within the last 4 weeks.

Moreover, the JuMiD 2022 survey also includes questions about the utilization of other media types, such as online forums, magazines, music, streaming services, gaming platforms or video games, along with the frequency of their use.

An additional set of items concentrated on video games, exploring the respondents' motives for playing and inquiring about the games they played most frequently.

5.6 Survey Experiment on attitudes towards refugees and asylum seekers

In the JuMiD 2022 study a survey experiment was conducted to investigate two particular research questions with respect to attitudes towards refugees and asylum-seekers.

Firstly, the experiment aimed to analyse potential causal effects of perceiving socially deviant behaviour by individual refugees on attitudes and prejudices towards asylum seekers and refugees, as conveyed through media reports. Secondly, the experiment aimed to examine the extent to which different political motives for such violent behaviour have different effects on the formation of prejudices against refugees and asylum seekers.

In this experiment, all respondents were randomly assigned to one of nine groups (splits 1 to 9). Eight of these groups - the treatment groups (split 1 to 8) - were presented with different newspaper reports describing an assault committed by a male individual. The role of the attacker varied in the different scenarios: He was either a German attacker (Udo M.) or an asylum seeker (Ahmad A.) (variation a1 and a2).

The type of attack varied as well. The scenarios included either an Islamist or a right-wing politically motivated violent attack (b1), a general violent attack (b2), or a sexual assault (b3). The combination of both variations (a 1, a2, and b1, b2, b3) results in six different scenarios.

In the first six scenarios, the victim was a young German woman (Heike A.) who required treatment in the intensive care unit of a hospital due to the attack.

In the last two scenarios (7 and 8), the kind of violence was varied. Here a sexual assault was described, with variations of the perpetrators (a1, a2). In these two scenarios, the victim was a young foreign woman (Fatima A.). The ninth group (split 9) serves as the control group and was not presented with a scenario.

Following the presentation of the scenarios, negative *attitudes towards asylum seekers* as a form of group-related intolerance and the level of concern for general security in Germany were surveyed among all respondents.

Furthermore, the respondents in the eight treatment groups were asked to rate the severity of the offence described in the article and to indicate the punishment they deemed appropriate for the offender (who was apprehended by the police in all scenarios).

The aim of this part of the survey experiment is to examine the extent of punitive attitudes depending on the specific offender-victim constellations and to explore potential moderator effects by considering other personal and socio- demographic characteristics of the respondents.

5.7 Pretests of measures particularly developed for JuMiD 2022

The majority of the measures used in JuMiD 2022 had already been applied in the MiD 2021 survey and therefore had already undergone validity and reliability testing.

However, there are some new instruments that were developed specifically for the JuMiD 2022 survey. For those measures two pretests were conducted by the University of Hamburg using online access panels provided by a market research institute. For these two samples, quotas for age and gender of the respondents were specified and controlled for by the team of the UHH.

The first pretest took place from September 16 to 21, 2021, with a total of n=555 respondents (men and women aged 18 and over). This pretest covered the following topics:

- political self-positioning (left-centre-right scale)
- voting preferences
- democracy-distance
- conspiratorial thinking
- group-based hostility
- COVID-19 pandemic (experiences, professional and financial consequences of Corona measures, assessments of government measures)
- Socio-demographics

The second pretest took place from November 15 to 19, 2021, with 486 respondents between the ages of 16 and 25. This second pretest focused on the following topics:

- social identity
- masculinity (male role norms, masculist feelings of group threat)
- democracy-distance
- right-wing extremist attitudes
- action potential
- socio-demographics

Based on the findings from the analyses of the data of these pretest samples, including scale analyses on the factorial structure as well as on the reliability and concurrent validity of these measures the first preliminary version of the questionnaire for the JuMiD 2022 survey was revised in parts. Respondents feedback on single questions were taken into consideration as well, when revising the exact wording and the length of the survey.

5.8 Overview of constructs and measures

The following overview describes the questionnaire used in the first wave of the survey “Young People in Germany” that took place in 2022 (JuMiD 2022). Two tables are presented: Table 4 contains the constructs and the items used in the part of the questionnaire that was given to all participants, while Table 5 contains the religion-specific constructs and items of that part of the questionnaire that was presented only to those respondents who identified themselves as Muslims.

The presentation in the tables does not follow the exact order of the questions in the questionnaire, but the tables provide the corresponding question numbers. The codebook for the dataset is included in the appendix. This codebook contains the exact wording of the items used and the labels of the respective variables in the dataset.

Table 4: Overview of constructs and sources of questions presented to all participants

| Construct | Content/Measure | Source | Question (Items) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| Basic demographic data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age Gender Marital status | | 0, 48-50 |
| Education/Training | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education level Employment | | 43-44 |
| Income | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dependence on social welfare | | 51 |
| Ethnic/migration background | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country of birth (respondents and parents) Duration of stay in Germany Nationality (respondents and parents) | | 45-47 |
| Religious affiliation/religiosity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Religious affiliation Intensity of faith Importance of religion Frequency of praying | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007 | 25-28 |
| Democracy-distance | Rejection of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> basic rights of freedom basic rights of equal treatment democratic Constitutionalism | Own development based on Mannewitz 2018 and BVerfG 2017, Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007, Decker et al. 2013 | 17 (1-8), 18 (1-2, 4-5) |
| Right-wing extremist attitudes | Consensus definition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Xenophobia Trivialization of National Socialism Anti-Semitism Social Darwinism Chauvinism Advocacy of authoritarian dictatorship Islamophobia | Decker et al. 2013, Zick et al. 2019, Wilmers et al. 2002 | 19 (3,6,8,9, 10,12,13) |
| Group-related Intolerance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homophobia Sexism Anti-Semitism Negative Attitudes against Germans Xenophobia | Zick et al 2019, own development | 18 (3), 19 (1,2,4, 5,7,11) |
| Observation of extremist acts | Frequency of observations of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> extremist physical violence anti-Semitic slogans | own development | 22 |
| Acceptance of political violence | Acceptance of the use of violence to achieve political goals | Westle 1998, own development | 21 |
| Current societal challenges | Level of concern related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate change Corona Migration Economic crisis War | own development | 2 |
| Concerns related to the Ukraine war | Level of concern related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collapse of the energy supply Cold War between Russia and the West Attack on Germany or NATO state Nuclear war in Europe | own development | 7 |
| Action potential | Willingness to become active and to do something for change | own development | 3 |
| Conspiracy mentality | Propensity for conspiratorial thinking | Rees & Lamberty 2019 own development | 20 |
| Political self-efficacy | Competence to discuss political matters | Beierlein et al. 2012 | 14 |
| Moral context | Moral evaluation of intolerance and violence by respondents, their friends and parents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dismissal of a homosexual teacher Threatening a local Mayor | own development | 23, 24 |

Table 5: *Continued: Overview of constructs and sources of questions presented to all participants*

| Construct | Content/Measure | Source | Question (Items) |
|--|---|---|------------------|
| System trust | Trust in state institutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police • Parties • Government • local politicians | European Value Survey, adapted | 4 |
| Competence of societal institutions | Assessment of competences of societal decision-makers in business, science and politics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in problems • Ability to solve problems • Lack of willingness to act | own development | 5 |
| Personal political action potential | Willingness to act: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public demonstrations • Volunteer work • Change of one's diet • Other (open ended question) | own development | 6 |
| Friends | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of friends • Relevance of personal relations with friends | own development | 52-53 |
| Social identity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnic origin/nationality • Colour of Skin • Language • Gender • Religion • Political Opinion • Residential Area • Culture | Cheek & Cheek 2018, Boehnke et al. 2012 and own development | 8 |
| Masculinity and group threat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy of militant male role norms • Masculist feelings of group threat | Klingemann et al. 2008, Fischer & Farren 2023 | 9-10 |
| Political orientation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Location in left-centre-right scheme • Preference for political party in voting | European Value Survey | 15-16, |
| Discrimination | Frequency of discrimination because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colour of Skin • Ethnic background/nationality • Residential area • Religion • Gender • Sexual orientation • Political views • Languages/Dialect | own development | 11 |
| Collective marginalization | Disadvantages of members of one's own group (people like me): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being treated with Disregard • Not taken seriously by politicians • Unfair treatment by police | own development, Brettfeld et al. 2021b | 12 |
| Emotions | Experiencing negative emotions because of disadvantages | own development | 13 |
| Survey Experiment | Effect of being confronted with reports about violent/extremist attacks (2 vignettes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Punitive attitudes towards the offender • General Attitudes towards asylum seekers | own development in Cooperation with WZB | 38-42 |
| Use of social media | Frequency of use of social media and news formats | own development in cooperation with LMU | 34-37 |

The following questions contain religion-specific formulations. These questions were presented to respondents who identified themselves as members of a Muslim religious denomination only.

Table 6: *Overview of constructs and sources of questions presented to Muslim respondents only*

| Construct | Content/Measure | Source | Question (Items) |
|---|---|--|------------------|
| Orthodoxy | Attitude towards religious commands and prohibitions | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007 | 29 (1-3) |
| Fundamentalism | Attitudes towards interpretation and modernisation of islam and koran | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007 | 29 (4-7) |
| Upgrading one's own religion | Generalised exaggeration of one's own religion | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007 | 30 (1-2) |
| Downgrading of other religions and societies | Generalised downgrading and negative evaluation of other religions and of Western culture | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007 | 30 (3-4) |
| Acceptance of religiously motivated violence | Justification of violence to protect or enforce Islam | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007 | 31 |
| Attitude towards the relationship between religion and politics | Advocacy of an Islamic state; priority of religious rules over democratic principles | own development in Cooperation with GIGA | 32 |
| Marginalisation of Muslims in Germany | Perception of collective marginalisation of Muslims in Germany | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007, | 33 (1-3) |
| Marginalisation of Muslims international | Perception of collective marginalisation of Muslims on an international level | Brettfeld & Wetzels 2007, own development in Cooperation with GIGA | 33 (4-6) |

References

- Agnew, R. (2006). *Pressured into crime: An overview of general strain theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Agnew, R. (2017). General Strain Theory and Terrorism. In : G. LaFree & J. D. Freilich (Hrsg.), *The Handbook of the Criminology of Terrorism*, (pp. 121-132). Chichester: Wiley.
- Baier, D., Kamenowski, M., Manzoni, P. & Haymoz, S. (2019). „Toxische Männlichkeit“ - Die Folgen gewaltlegitimierender Männlichkeitsnormen für Einstellungen und Verhaltensweisen. *Kriminalistik*, 73(7), 465-471.
- Beck, D. (2021). Diskursive Brückenschläge: Medien Maskulismus, Rechtsextremismus. *ZRex - Zeitschrift für Rechtsextremismusforschung*, 1(1), 90-107.
<https://doi.org/10.3224/zrex.v1i1.06>
- Beierlein, C., Kemper, C. J., Kovaleva, A., & Rammstedt, B. (2012). *Ein Messinstrument zur Erfassung politischer Kompetenz- und Einflussüberzeugungen: Political Efficacy Kurzskala (PEKS)*. (GESIS-Working Papers, 2012/18). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssaoar-292361>.
- Birsl, U. (2011). Rechtsextremismus und Gender. In U. Birsl (Hrsg.), *Rechtsextremismus und Gender* (S. 11-28). Opladen: Budrich.
- Boehnke, K., Fülöp, M., Hadjar, A., Pichler, F. & Kuhn, T. (2012). *European Identity: Identification with Europe in a Time of Crisis and Rapprochement, Proposal for a New Module to be included in European Social Survey*.
https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/methodology/core_ess_questionnaire/ESS8_emotional_attachment_final_template.pdf
- Brettfeld, K., Endtricht, R., Farren, D., Fischer, J.M.K. & Wetzels, P. (2021a). Verbreitung politisch extremistischer Einstellungen und der Beobachtung von Intoleranz, Hass und Radikalisierung im eigenen Lebensumfeld. In: U. Kemmesies, P. Wetzels, B.

- Austin, A. Dessecker, E. Grande, I. Kusche & D. Rieger. (Hrsg.), *MOTRA-Monitor 2020*, (S. 100-129). Wiesbaden: BKA. <https://doi.org/10.53168/isbn.978-3-9818469-9-7> 2020 MOTRA
- Brettfeld, K. Endtricht, R., Farren, D., Fischer, J.M.K. & Wetzels, P. (2021b). *Menschen in Deutschland 2021. Erste Welle der bundesweit repräsentativen Befragung. Entwicklung, Inhalt und Aufbau des Erhebungsinstruments*. MOTRA Forschungsbericht No. 1 aus dem Institut für Kriminologie an der Fakultät für Rechtswissenschaft. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg. <https://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.10257>
- Brettfeld, K. & Wetzels, P. (2007). *Muslimen in Deutschland. Integration, Integrationsbarrieren, Religion und Einstellungen zu Demokratie, Rechtsstaat und politisch-religiös motivierter Gewalt. Ergebnisse von Befragungen im Rahmen einer multizentrischen Studie in städtischen Lebensräumen*. Berlin: Bundesministerium des Inneren.
- Bruder, M., Haffke, P., Neave, N., Nouripana, N., Imhoff, R. (2013). Measuring individual differences in generic beliefs in conspiracy theories across cultures: conspiracy mentality questionnaire. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4(225), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00225>
- Bundesverfassungsgericht (2017). *Urteil des zweiten Senats vom 17. Januar 2017*. 2 BvB 1/13
- Butter, M. (2018). *Nichts ist wie es scheint. Über Verschwörungstheorien*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Cheek, N. N., & Cheek, J. M. (2018). Aspects of identity: From the inner-outer metaphor to a tetrapartite model of the self. *Self and Identity*, 17(4), 467-482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2017.1412347>.
- Decker, O., Kiess, J., Heller, A. & Brähler, E. (2022). Die Leipziger Autoritarismusstudie 2022 : Methode, Ergebnisse und Langzeitverlauf. In : O. Decker, J. Kies, A. Heller & E. Brähler (Hrsg.). *Autoritäre Dynamiken in unsicheren Zeiten. Neue Herausforderungen - alte Reaktionen? Leipziger Autoritarismus Studie 2022*, (S.31-90). Gießen : Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Decker, O. & Brähler, E. (2020). *Autoritäre Dynamiken. Alte Ressentiments - neue Realität. Leipziger Autoritarismusstudie 2020*. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Decker, O. & Brähler, E. (2018). *Flucht ins Autoritäre. Rechtsextreme Dynamiken in der Mitte der Gesellschaft. Die Leipziger-Autoritarismus-Studie 2018*. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Decker, O., Hinz, A., Geißler, N. & Brähler, E. (2013). Fragebogen zu rechtsextremen Einstellungen - Leipziger Form (FR-LF). In: O. Decker, J. Kiess & E. Brähler (Hrsg.). *Rechtsextremismus der Mitte. Eine sozialpsychologische Gegenwartsdiagnose*, (S. 197-212). Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Decker, O., Weißmann, M., Kiess, J. & Brähler, E. (2010). *Die Mitte in der Krise. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2010*. Berlin: FES.
- Endtricht, R., Farren, D., Fischer, J.M.K., Brettfeld, K. & Wetzels, P. (2022). *Menschen in Deutschland 2021. Erste Welle der bundesweit repräsentativen Befragung. Durchführung und Rücklauf der Erhebung - Methodenbericht*. MOTRA Forschungsbericht No. 2 aus dem Institut für Kriminologie an der Fakultät für Rechtswissenschaft. Hamburg: Universität. Hamburg. <https://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.10259>.
- Enzmann, D., Brettfeld, K. & Wetzels, P. (2004). Männlichkeitsnormen und die Kultur der Ehre. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. Sonderheft*, 43, 264-287. https://kzfss.uni-koeln.de/sites/kzfss/pdf/SH_43-2003.pdf

- Fischer, J.M.K. & Farren, D. (2023) Männliche Opfernarrative und rechtsextreme Einstellungen bei jungen Menschen: Validierung und Anwendung eines Instrumentes zur Erfassung maskulistischer Bedrohungsgefühle. *Monatsschrift für Kriminologie und Strafrechtsreform* (online, ahead of print).
<https://doi.org/10.1515/mks-2022-0017>
- Fischer, J.M.K. Endtricht, R. & Farren, D. (2022). Die Bedeutung kollektiver Marginalisierung und negativer sozialer Emotionen für die Erklärung extremismusaffiner politischer Einstellungen: Eine empirische Untersuchung auf Basis der General Strain Theory. *Praxis der Rechtspsychologie*, 8(2). S. 173-195.
<https://doi.org/10.5771/2365-1083-2022-2-173>
- Höcker, C. Pickel, G. & Decker, O. (2020). Antifeminismus - das Geschlecht im Autoritarismus. In Decker, O. & Brähler, E. (Hrsg.), *Autoritäre Dynamiken. Alte Ressentiments - neue Radikalität* (S. 27-88). Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Imhoff, R., Zimmer, F., Klein, O., António, J. H. C., Babinska, M., Bangerter, A., Bilewicz, M., Blanusa, N., Bovan, K., Buzarovska, R., Cichocka, A., Delouvée, S., Douglas, K. M., Dyrendal, A., Etienne, T., Gjoneska, B., Graf, S., Gualda, E., Hirschberger, G., Kende, A., Kutiyski, Y., Krekó, P., Krouwel, A., Mari, S., Dordević, J. M., Panasiti, M. S., Pantazi, M., Petkovski, L., Porciello, G., Rabelo, A., Radu, R. N., Sava, F. A., Schepisi, M., Sutton, R. M., Swami, V., Thórisdóttir, H., Turjacanin, V., Wagner-Egger, P., Zvezelj, I., van Prooijen, J-W. (2022). Conspiracy mentality and political orientation across 26 countries. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 6, 392-403.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01258-7>.
- Imhoff, R. & Bruder, M. (2014). Speaking (un-)truth to power: conspiracy mentality as a generalized political attitude. *European Journal of Personality*, 28, 25-43 (2014).
<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1930>
- Kantar (2022). *Junge Menschen in Deutschland 2022 (JuMiD 2022). Methodenbericht zur ersten Erhebungswelle*. München: Kantar.
- Kelly, C. R. (2020). *Apocalypse Man: The Death Drive and the Rhetoric of White Masculine Victimhood*. Columbus: Ohio State Press.
- Kimmel, M. (2017). *Angry White Men. American Masculinity at the End of an Era*. New York: Bold Type Books.
- Klingemann, H., Gomez, V. Egli, P. & Schlüsselberger, M. (2008). *Geschlechtsrollenorientierung und maskuline Identität. Dimensionalität und Therapierelevanz bei Patienten in der stationären Suchttherapie*. [Abschlussbericht].
<file:///C:/Users/UHH/Downloads/GenderstudieSchlussberichtSSA09.01.07.pdf>
- Koopmanns, R. (2015). Religious fundamentalism and hostility against out groups. A Comparison of Muslims and Christians in Western Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41, 33-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2014.935307>
- Mannewitz, T. (2018). Das normative Extremismuskonzept. In: U. Backes, A. Gallus, E. Jesse & T. Thieme (Hrsg.), *Jahrbuch Extremismus & Demokratie*, (S. 31-54). Baden-Baden: Nomos. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845296654-31>.
- Massanari, A. (2020). Reddit's Alt-Right: Toxic Masculinity, Free Speech, and /r/The_Donald. In : Zimdars, M. & McLeod, K. (Hrsg.), *Fake News. Understanding Media and Misinformation in the Digital Age* (pp. 179-190). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Mokros, N., Rump, M. & Küpper, B. (2021). Antigenderismus: Ideologie einer natürlichen Ordnung oder Verfolgungswahn? In A. Zick & B. Küpper (Hrsg.), *Die Geforderte Mitte. Rechtsextreme und demokratiegefährdende Einstellungen in Deutschland 2020/21*, (S. 246-261). Berlin: FES
- Rees, J.H. & Lamberty, P. (2019). Mitreißende Wahrheiten: Verschwörungsmythen als Gefahr für den gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhalt. In Zick, A., Küpper, B. & Berghan,

- W. (Hrsg.), *Verlorene Mitte - Feindselige Zustände* (S. 203-222). Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2021). *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Wanderungen*. Fachserie 1, Reihe 1.2. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.
- Westle, B. (1998). Konsens und Konflikt als Elemente der pluralistischen Demokratie: zum Demokratieverständnis von West- und Ostdeutschen. *ZUMA Nachrichten*, 22(43), 116-133.
- Wetzels, P. & Brettfeld, K. (2003). *Auge um Auge, Zahn um Zahn. Migration, Religion und Gewalt junger Menschen*. Münster: Lit.
- Wetzels, P. & Brettfeld, K. (2022a). Islamismusaffine Einstellungen bei in Deutschland lebenden Muslim*innen: Zur Bedeutung individueller Religiosität und sozialer Ausgrenzungserfahrungen. *Vortrag anlässlich der 17. wissenschaftlichen Fachtagung der Kriminologischen Gesellschaft (KrimG) in Hannover, 8.-9. September 2022*. Online verfügbar unter <https://www.jura.uni-hamburg.de/die-fakultaet/professuren/kriminologie/media/vortrag-wetzels-brettfeld-krimg2022-isalmismusaffinitaet-u-religiositaet.pdf>
- Wetzels, P. & Brettfeld, K. (2022b). *Auswirkungen verschwörungstheoretisch konnotierter Formen der Delegitimation von Politik, Wissenschaft und Medien im Kontext der COVID-19 Pandemie auf demokratieablehnende Einstellungen sowie Intoleranz und Vorurteile*. MOTRA Forschungsbericht No. 3 aus dem Institut für Kriminologie an der Fakultät für Rechtswissenschaft. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg. <https://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.10261>
- Wetzels, P., Brettfeld, K., Endtricht, R., Farren, D. & Fischer, J.M.K. (2022a). *Verbreitung extremismusaffiner politischer Einstellungen sowie Konfrontationen mit Intoleranz und politischem Extremismus in Deutschland 2021*. MOTRA Forschungsbericht No. 4 aus dem Institut für Kriminologie an der Fakultät für Rechtswissenschaft. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg. <https://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.10507>
- Wetzels, P., Brettfeld, K., Endtricht, R. Fischer, J. & Farren, D. (2022b). Zur Verbreitung extremismusaffiner Einstellungen in Deutschland: Befunde der repräsentativen Befragung „Menschen in Deutschland 2021“. In : U. Kemmesies, P. Wetzels, B. Austin, Ch. Büscher, A. Dessecker, E. Grande & D. Rieger. *MOTRA-Monitor 2021*, (S. 73-103). Wiesbaden: BKA. https://doi.org/10.53168/isbn.978-3-9818469-4-2_2022_MOTRA
- Wilmers, N., Enzmann, D., Schaefer, D., Herbers, K., Greve, W. & Wetzels, P. (2002). *Jugendliche in Deutschland zur Jahrtausendwende: Gefährlich oder gefährdet?* Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Zick, A., Berghan, W. & Mokros, N. (2019). Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit in Deutschland 2002-2018/19. In: A. Zick, B. Küpper & W. Berghan (Hrsg.), *Verlorene Mitte - Feindselige Zustände. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland*, (S. 53-116). Bonn: Dietz.
- Zick, A. & Küpper, B. (2021). *Die geforderte Mitte. Rechtsextreme und demokratiegefährdende Einstellungen in Deutschland 2020/21*. Bonn: Dietz.

APPENDIX : CODEBOOK

| | |
|---|-------|
| GENERAL INFORMATION | II |
| AGE..... | III |
| ANOMIC UNCERTAINTY | III |
| CONCERNS ABOUT CURRENT SOCIAL CHALLENGES..... | III |
| ACTION POTENTIAL..... | III |
| SYSTEM TRUST..... | III |
| COMPETENCE OF DECISION-MAKERS IN SOCIETY | IV |
| FIELDS OF ACTION..... | IV |
| CONCERNS ABOUT THE WAR IN UKRAINE..... | IV |
| SOCIAL IDENTITY..... | V |
| MALE ROLE NORMS | V |
| MASCULINITY-RELATED FEELINGS OF GROUP THREAT | V |
| EXPERIENCE OF DISCRIMINATION..... | VI |
| COLLECTIVE MARGINALISATION | VI |
| EMOTIONS..... | VI |
| POLITICAL SELF-EFFICACY..... | VI |
| POLITICAL SELF-LOCATION | VII |
| SUNDAY QUESTION | VII |
| ATTITUDES TOWARDS BASIC RIGHTS OF FREEDOM AND DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTIONALISM | VIII |
| ATTITUDES TOWARDS BASIC RIGHTS OF EQUAL TREATMENT..... | VIII |
| RIGHT-WING ATTITUDES AND INTOLERANCE..... | IX |
| CONSPIRACY MENTALITY | IX |
| ACCEPTANCE OF POLITICALLY-MOTIVATED VIOLENCE | IX |
| OBSERVATION OF RADICALISATION AND INTOLERANCE IN ONE’S OWN SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT | X |
| MORAL CONTEXT VIGNETTE I | X |
| MORAL CONTEXT VIGNETTE II | X |
| INDIVIDUAL RELIGIOSITY | X |
| RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION | XI |
| QUESTIONS FOR MUSLIMS ONLY | XI |
| ORTHODOXY, FUNDAMENTALISM | XI |
| RELIGIOUS UPGRADING AND DOWNGRADING | XI |
| ACCEPTANCE OF RELIGIOUSLY-MOTIVATED VIOLENCE | XII |
| RELIGION AND POLITICS..... | XII |
| PERCEIVED RELIGION-RELATED MARGINALISATION (NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL)..... | XII |
| MEDIA USE | XIII |
| EXPERIMENT..... | XV |
| SOCIODEMOGRAPHICS | XVI |
| FRIENDS..... | XVIII |
| FIELD INFORMATION | XIX |
| INFORMATION ABOUT THE LOCATION OF THE RESPONDENTS ADRESS | XIX |
| WEIGHTS..... | XIX |
| CREATION OF ADDITIONAL VARIABLES | XIX |
| MIGRATION STATUS AND MIGRANT GENERATION | XIX |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN OF THE RESPONDENTS..... | XX |
| DEMOCRACY-DISTANCE..... | XX |
| RIGHT-WING EXTREMIST ATTITUDES | XXII |

General information

This codebook describes the data of the first wave of the survey "Young People in Germany 2022" (JuMiD 2022). The variables and codes correspond to those contained in the data set "JuMiD 2022 Partner.sav".

The first column indicates the location of the variable in the questionnaire (e.g. F1_1 = Question 1_Item 1). In the second column, the corresponding variable name is given as in the data set. The third column contains the wording of the questions/items and the response categories.

Missing values are defined as 7 and 9 (or 97, 99 or 997, 999). The value 7 means an ambiguous answer (= multiple answers). The value 9 means a missing answer. If individual questions did not have to be answered due to filtering, the corresponding variables contain a system missing.

In addition to the variables collected in the questionnaire and a unique identifier of the case (idnr), the dataset contains additional information about how the survey was conducted. Furthermore, the weights and additional information on the place of residence of the respondents (district code) are included in the dataset too.

The data set also contains some variables, created by the UHH-Team. These are indicators or scales that are based on the items included in the dataset. These include among others indicators of democracy distance, right-wing extremist attitudes, and islamist attitudes. A description of how these variables were formed can be found at the end of this document.

Age

F0 alter First we ask you to state your age in years. I am ____ years old.

Anomic uncertainty

There are currently many social changes and challenges. How do you rate these current developments overall? Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

- F1_1 anomie2 These days everything has become so uncertain. You have to be ready for anything.
F1_2 anomie3 When you look at the events of the last few years, you become really uncertain.
F1_3 anomie4 Things today have become so difficult. You don't know what is going on.
- (1) strongly disagree
(2) somewhat disagree
(3) somewhat agree
(4) completely agree

Concerns about current social challenges

To what extent are you concerned about the following challenges and their potential impact?

- F2_1 surge7 The consequences of climate change for our everyday lives ...
F2_2 surge9 That the Corona pandemic will continue for a long time ...
F2_3 surge12 The immigration of refugees to Germany ...
F2_4 surge4 That economic crises could lead to more poverty ...
F2_5 surge13 That Germany could be dragged into a war ...
- (1) doesn't worry me at all
(2) doesn't worry me much
(3) slightly worries me
(4) worries me a lot

Action potential

How do you feel about the following statements?

- F3_1 xfakt1 Looking at the recent situation in our country, something needs to be changed urgently.
F3_2 xfakt2 If we do not act now, it will be too late.
F3_3 xfakt3 I don't want to wait any longer until everyone understands what has to be done.
F3_4 xfakt4 Since most are indifferent to the problems we have, at least I have to act now.
- (1) strongly disagree
(2) somewhat disagree
(3) somewhat agree
(4) completely agree

System trust

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

1 stands for "no trust at all" and 6 means "full trust". You can grade your opinion with the values in between.

How much confidence do you have in ...

- F4_1 systv2 ... the police
F4_2 systv3 ... the political parties
F4_3 systv4 ... the government
F4_4 systv8 ... the politicians in your city/county
- (1) 1 no confidence at all
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6 complete confidence

Competence of decision-makers in society

Decision-makers from business, science and politics, among others, are responsible for tackling the challenges our society is confronted with. How do you assess their actions in general? Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

The decision-makers in our country ...

- | | | |
|------|---------|--|
| F5_1 | inkomp5 | ... are not interested in the problems of young people. |
| F5_2 | inkomp2 | ... are incapable of tackling the current challenges in our society. |
| F5_3 | inkomp4 | ... just talk and don't solve the problems. |
- (1) strongly disagree
(2) somewhat disagree
(3) somewhat agree
(4) completely agree

Fields of action

There are different options how young people can get politically involved. To what extent can you imagine doing the following things yourself in the future?

- | | | |
|--------|---------|---|
| F6_1 | enga1 | participate in a demonstration (e.g. for climate protection or better education). |
| F6_2 | enga2 | volunteer (e.g. in refugee aid or tutoring in school). |
| F6_3 | enga3 | change my diet (e.g. give up meat, pay attention to FairTrade). |
| F6_4 | enga4 | something else, namely: _____ |
| F6_txt | enga4_s | |
- (1) not likely at all
(2) rather unlikely
(3) rather likely
(4) very likely

Concerns about the war in Ukraine

In view of the situation in Ukraine, people are worried about various things. What is it like for you?

How big is your concern that ...

- | | | |
|------|----------|--|
| F7_1 | ukraine1 | ... the energy supply in Europe could collapse? |
| F7_2 | ukraine2 | ... there could be a new "Cold War" between Russia and the West? |
| F7_3 | ukraine3 | ... Germany or another NATO state could be attacked? |
| F7_4 | ukraine4 | ... there could be a nuclear war in Europe? |
- (1) very small
(2) small
(3) large
(4) very large

Social identity

Now it's about what makes and shapes you as a person.

How important are the following aspects mentioned for your sense of who you are?

| | | |
|-------|---------|------------------------------------|
| F8_1 | ident12 | my ethnic background/nationality |
| F8_2 | ident3 | the colour of my skin |
| F8_3 | ident4 | my language or dialect |
| F8_4 | ident5 | my gender |
| F8_5 | ident13 | my religion/faith |
| F8_6 | ident7 | my political views |
| F8_7 | ident8 | the region or area where I live in |
| F8_8 | ident9 | being a part of German culture |
| F8_9 | ident10 | being a part of European culture |
| F8_10 | ident11 | being a citizen of the world |

- (1) not important at all
- (2) not that important
- (3) quite important
- (4) important
- (5) very important

Male role norms

There is currently a discussion about what it means to be a real man. What do you think about the following statements?

| | | |
|------|-----|---|
| F9_1 | mn1 | In some situation a man should be prepared to use his fists. |
| F9_2 | mn2 | It bothers me when a man does something that I think is feminine. |
| F9_3 | mn3 | A man who lets others take advantage of him does not deserve respect. |
| F9_4 | mn4 | There is a warrior inside every real man. |

- (1) strongly disagree
- (2) somewhat disagree
- (3) somewhat agree
- (4) completely agree

Masculinity-related feelings of group threat

The understanding of what a real man should be is changing. Some people are concerned about such developments. How concerned are you about the following issues?

| | | |
|-------|----------|--|
| F10_1 | sorgemn1 | That many men at present are behaving more and more feminine ... |
| F10_2 | sorgemn2 | That real men are increasingly marginalised in our society ... |
| F10_3 | sorgemn3 | That we no longer have enough real men who know how to fight ... |
| F10_4 | sorgemn4 | That masculine values such as strength, courage and honour are becoming less important ... |

- (1) doesn't worry me at all
- (2) doesn't worry me much
- (3) slightly worries me
- (4) worries me a lot
- (5) I don't think that's true.

Experience of discrimination

In the last 12 months, how often have you personally felt discriminated against for one or more of the following reasons?

| | | |
|-------|----------|---|
| F11_1 | diskri1 | because of the colour of my skin |
| F11_2 | diskri8 | because of my ethnic background/nationality |
| F11_3 | diskri4 | because of the region or area I live in |
| F11_4 | diskri5 | because of my religion or my faith |
| F11_5 | diskri6 | because of my gender |
| F11_6 | diskri10 | because of my sexual orientation |
| F11_7 | diskri7 | because of my political views |
| F11_8 | diskri9 | because of my language or my dialect |

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

Collective marginalisation

Disadvantages can also arise in other ways. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Where we live, people like me are....

| | | |
|-------|-------|---|
| F12_1 | marg3 | ... often not valued much by others. |
| F12_2 | marg7 | ... not taken seriously by politicians. |
| F12_3 | 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. How often have you felt in such situations the following emotions during the last 12 months?

| | | |
|-------|----------|----------------|
| F13_1 | emotion1 | disappointment |
| F13_2 | emotion2 | anger |
| F13_3 | emotion5 | resentment |

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

Political self-efficacy

How do you rate your ability to participate in political discussions?

| | | |
|-------|--------|--|
| F14_1 | polsw1 | I can understand and evaluate important political issues well. |
| F14_2 | polsw2 | I am confident that I can actively participate in a discussion about political issues. |

- (1) doesn't apply at all
- (2) rather not applicable
- (3) rather applies
- (4) fully applies

Political self-location

| | | |
|-----|------|--|
| F15 | lire | <p>Many people use the terms "left" and "right" in order to identify different political views. How would you describe your political views if 1 stands for completely left and 10 for completely right?</p> <p>(1) left</p> <p>(2)</p> <p>(3)</p> <p>(4)</p> <p>(5)</p> <p>(6)</p> <p>(7)</p> <p>(8)</p> <p>(9)</p> <p>(10) right</p> |
|-----|------|--|

Sunday question

| | | |
|---------|----------|---|
| F16 | partei | <p>If the German federal election would take place next Sunday, which party would you vote for?</p> <p><i>Please answer even if you are not eligible to vote. Please indicate only one party!</i></p> <p>(1) CDU/CSU</p> <p>(2) SPD</p> <p>(3) Bündnis 90/Die Grünen</p> <p>(4) FDP</p> <p>(5) Die Linke</p> <p>(6) AfD</p> |
| F16_txt | partei_s | <p>(7) A different party, namely _____ (string variable coded after the survey is finished)</p> <p>(8) I am undecided which party I would vote for.</p> <p>(9) I would not vote.</p> <p><i>Subsequent codings of the variable "different party":</i></p> <p>(10) Die Partei</p> <p>(11) Partei der Humanisten</p> <p>(12) Tierschutzpartei</p> <p>(13) Team Todenhöfer</p> <p>(14) Die Basis</p> <p>(15) Piraten</p> <p>(16) Freie Wähler</p> <p>(17) Volt</p> <p>(18) Bündnis für Innovation und Gerechtigkeit</p> <p>(19) Allianz Deutscher Demokraten</p> <p>(20) Bündnis C</p> <p>(21) HDP</p> <p>(22) Partei für Gesundheitsforschung</p> <p>(23) WIR2020</p> <p>(24) Graue Panther</p> <p>(25) Ökologische Demokratische Partei (ÖDP).</p> <p>(26) Anarchistische Pogo-Partei</p> <p>(27) Bergpartei/Überpartei</p> <p>(28) DKP</p> <p>(29) Der III. Weg</p> <p>(30) Die Grauen</p> |

- (31) Die Urbane
- (32) MLPD
- (33) Partei bibeltreuer Christen
- (34) Partei des Fortschritts
- (35) Südschleswigscher Wählerverband
- (36) V-Partei 3
- (37) Rentnerpartei

Attitudes towards basic rights of freedom and democratic constitutionalism

In the following you will find some statements about policy and basic rights of freedom. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

- | | | |
|-------|--------|---|
| F17_1 | frei1 | Every citizen should have the right to go out and demonstrate for what they believe in. |
| F17_2 | frei2 | Strikes and demonstrations pose a danger to public order and should be banned. |
| F17_3 | frei3 | The freedom of the press in our country must be protected. |
| F17_4 | frei5 | All minorities should have the right to freely express their views. |
| F17_5 | konst1 | Those who lose out in an election should not be allowed to criticise the business of government. |
| F17_6 | konst2 | If a government does a good job, there is no reason to hold a new election after four years. |
| F17_7 | konst3 | If the Parliament makes a decision, courts should not be allowed to overturn that. |
| F17_8 | konst4 | In order to have a strong political leadership in Germany, Parliament should have less influence. |

- (1) strongly disagree
- (2) somewhat disagree
- (3) somewhat agree
- (4) completely agree

Attitudes towards basic rights of equal treatment

This is about your view on how different groups of people should be treated in Germany.
How much do you agree with the following statements?

- | | | |
|-------|---------|---|
| F18_1 | gleich5 | People should not be discriminated against because of their skin colour. |
| F18_2 | gleich6 | Women and men should receive equal payment for the same work. |
| F18_3 | frei4 | Homosexuality should be forbidden. |
| F18_4 | gleich7 | Foreigners should not be treated differently from natives when it comes to allocation of housing. |
| F18_5 | gleich8 | Muslims must be allowed to pursue their religion in the same way as Christians, Jews or followers of other religions. |

- (1) strongly disagree
- (2) somewhat disagree
- (3) somewhat agree
- (4) completely agree

Right-Wing attitudes and Intolerance

And how much do you agree with the following statements?

| | | |
|--------|----------|--|
| F19_1 | rass1 | I think the discussions about racism in Germany are exaggerated. |
| F19_2 | antid1 | Most Germans do not make an effort to understand the special situation of foreigners in Germany. |
| F19_3 | auslf2 | There are too many foreigners in Germany. |
| F19_4 | frauenf3 | Women do not belong in leadership positions. |
| F19_5 | antisem2 | You cannot trust Jews. |
| F19_6 | islamf1 | If we are not careful, Germany will become an Islamic country. |
| F19_7 | auslf4 | Most foreigners living in Germany do not abide by the rules that are customary here. |
| F19_8 | sozdarw1 | The strongest must prevail, otherwise there is no progress. |
| F19_9 | chauv2 | My people are superior to other peoples. |
| F19_10 | redik2 | In the national interest, a dictatorship is the better form of government under certain circumstances. |
| F19_11 | antid2 | Germans are intolerant and dismissive of other cultures. |
| F19_12 | natsoz1 | National Socialism also had its good sides. |
| F19_13 | antisem1 | Jews have too much influence in Germany. |

- (1) strongly disagree
- (2) somewhat disagree
- (3) somewhat agree
- (4) completely agree

Conspiracy mentality

Now it's about who influences political decisions. How much do you agree with the following views?

| | | |
|-------|---------|--|
| F20_1 | conspi1 | The true origin of the Corona virus is deliberately kept secret by our government. |
| F20_2 | conspi2 | There are secret organisations that have great influence on political decisions. |
| F20_3 | conspi3 | The dangerous side effects of vaccinations are deliberately concealed. |
| F20_4 | conspi4 | Politicians and other leaders are only puppets of the powers behind them. |
| F20_5 | conspi5 | Studies that prove climate change are mostly fake. |

- (1) strongly disagree
- (2) somewhat disagree
- (3) somewhat agree
- (4) completely agree

Acceptance of politically-motivated violence

Now follow some statements on the role of violence in a democratic society. Some people agree with the following statements, some people disagree with these statements. How about you?

| | | |
|-------|---------|--|
| F21_1 | polgew1 | Every democratic society has certain conflicts that have to be dealt with through violence. |
| F21_2 | polgew3 | Changes needed in this society can only be achieved by a violent revolution. |
| F21_3 | polgew4 | Sometimes you have to fight the representatives of the system using violence. |
| F21_4 | polgew5 | Even in a democracy, it is sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve one's political goals. |

- (1) strongly disagree
- (2) somewhat disagree
- (3) somewhat agree
- (4) completely agree

Observation of radicalisation and intolerance in one's own social environment

The following questions concern events that you yourself have observed or experienced in the place you live in. In the last 12 months, how often have you yourself observed ...

- F22_1 beob1 ... that people were insulted or attacked because of their ethnic background?
F22_2 beob9 ... anti-Semitic graffiti or slogans?
- (1) never
 - (2) rarely
 - (3) sometimes
 - (4) often

Moral Context vignette I

Now please imagine the following situations ...

A young person tells his uncle that one of his teachers is homosexual and living together with a man. The uncle gets angry and says: "Such a person must not be allowed to work as a teacher, he has to be dismissed immediately!"

How bad would the following people from your environment find this statement made by the uncle?

- F23_1 mkont1p1 your friends
F23_2 mkont1e your parents
F23_3 mkont1p2 other people who are important to you
F23_4 mkont1s and yourself? I find this statement ...
- (1) not bad at all
 - (2) not so bad
 - (3) rather bad
 - (4) very bad

Moral Context vignette II

A dispute arises in a city over an important political decision. Many citizens are very dissatisfied and angry. After the mayor has given an interview about it, she finds an anonymous letter on her doorstep the next day. It asks her to "reconsider" her views and threatens her with the words: "A punch in the face helps to come to your senses."

How bad would the following people from your environment find the behaviour of the author of this letter?

- F24_1 mkont2p1 your friends
F24_2 mkont2e your parents
F24_3 mkont2p2 other people who are important to you
F24_4 mkont2s and yourself? I find this behaviour ...
- (1) not bad at all
 - (2) not so bad
 - (3) rather bad
 - (4) very bad

Individual Religiosity

Now the topic is faith and religion.

- F25 glaubig **Please state how religious you personally think you are.**
- (1) not religious
 - (2) not that religious
 - (3) somehow religious
 - (4) religious
 - (5) very religious
- F26 relwich **How important is religion for you personally?**
- (1) not important at all
 - (2) not very important
 - (3) quite important
 - (4) very important

| | | |
|-----|-------|-------------------------------|
| F27 | beten | 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 |

Religious denomination

| | | |
|-----|----------|--|
| F28 | religion | Several religions are mentioned below. Please indicate which religion you belong to or feel most closely associated with. |
| | | (1) Christian religion (e.g. Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox, Evangelical Free Church Christians) |
| | | (2) Islamic religion (e.g. Sunni, Shia, Alevi, Ahmadi) |
| | | (3) another religion (e.g. Jews, Buddhists, Hinduists) |
| | | (4) no religion |

Questions for Muslims only

Orthodoxy, Fundamentalism

In the following you will find some statements about religious beliefs.

Please indicate how much you agree with these statements.

| | | |
|-------|---------|--|
| F29_1 | orthom2 | It is important for me to strictly follow the rules on fasting. |
| F29_2 | orthom3 | If I have lived my life as a righteous Muslim, I will come into heavenly paradise. |
| F29_3 | orthom4 | I believe that the Koran is the true revelation of God. |
| F29_4 | fundm1 | Anyone who does not strictly abide by the Koran is not a real Muslim. |
| F29_5 | fundm2 | I believe that every good Muslim is obliged to convert nonbelievers to Islam. |
| F29_6 | fundm3 | People who modernise Islam destroy its true message. |
| F29_7 | fundm4 | There is only one correct interpretation of the Koran that all Muslims must adhere to. |
| | | (1) strongly disagree |
| | | (2) somewhat disagree |
| | | (3) somewhat agree |
| | | (4) completely agree |

Religious upgrading and downgrading

Now we ask about your opinion about different religions.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

| | | |
|-------|--------|---|
| F30_1 | aufwm1 | Islam is the only true religion. |
| F30_2 | aufwm2 | Only Islam is capable of solving the problems of our time. |
| F30_3 | abwm1 | In Germany, you can clearly see that the Christian religions are not able to uphold morality. |
| F30_4 | abwm2 | The sexual morality of Western societies is completely degenerated. |
| | | (1) strongly disagree |
| | | (2) somewhat disagree |
| | | (3) somewhat agree |
| | | (4) completely agree |

Acceptance of religiously-motivated violence

At all times and in all religions, there are people who believe that the violent defence of their religion can be justified. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

- | | | |
|-------|----------|---|
| F31_1 | relgewm1 | The threat to Islam by the Western world justifies Muslims defending themselves with violence. |
| F31_2 | relgewm2 | I have sympathy for people committing violence against people who insult Allah or the prophet Mohammed. |
| F31_3 | relgewm3 | Violence is justified for the spreading and enforcement of Islam. |
| F31_4 | relgewm4 | If it is for the benefit of the Muslim community, I am prepared to use physical violence against non-believers. |
- (1) strongly disagree
(2) somewhat disagree
(3) somewhat agree
(4) completely agree

Religion and politics

Now it's about the relationship between religion and politics. To what extent do you agree with the statements mentioned here?

- | | | |
|-------|----------|--|
| F32_1 | relpolm1 | An Islamic State is the best form of government. |
| F32_2 | relpolm2 | The rules of the Koran are more important to me than the laws in Germany. |
| F32_3 | relpolm3 | German society should be ruled more closely in line with Islamic principles. |
| F32_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 marginalisation (national and international)

Now we are talking about your perceptions of how Muslims are treated in Germany and in the world. To what extent do you think the following statements are true?

- | | | |
|-------|---------|--|
| F33_1 | margdm1 | In Germany, faithful Muslims are often rejected by other people. |
| F33_2 | margdm2 | In Germany, children of Muslim parents often experience exclusion by others. |
| F33_3 | margdm3 | Muslims are treated much worse in Germany compared to other religious communities. |
| F33_4 | margim1 | I am very concerned that, if terrorist attacks occur in Europe, Muslims are the first to be suspected. |
| F33_5 | margim2 | In my view it's terrible that the US can go on war against Muslim states without any sanctions. |
| F33_6 | margim3 | The oppression 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 use

Now we would like to know something about what media you use.

How often have you used the following media for entertainment within the last four weeks?

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|--|
| F34_1 | medien1 | streaming services (e.g. Netflix, Amazon, Sky, etc.) |
| F34_2 | medien2 | online videos (e.g. YouTube, TikTok, Instagram Reels, etc.) |
| F34_3 | medien3 | online forums |
| F34_4 | medien4 | live streaming (e.g. Twitch, Dlive, etc.) |
| F34_5 | medien5 | music & Podcasts (e.g. Spotify, iTunes, Radio, CD, MP3, etc.) |
| F34_6 | medien6 | journals, magazines, books etc. (online or print) |
| F34_7 | medien7 | computer, video games, digital games (e.g. mobile, computer and console games) |
| F34_8 | medien8 | others, namely _____ |
| F34_8_txt | medien8_s | |

(1) never

(2) rarely

(3) sometimes

(4) often

(5) very often

FILTER: IF VIDEOGAMES HAVE AT LEAST BEEN USED RARELY (items rotated at random)

Why do you currently play computer and video games? I play these games, ...

| | | |
|--------|-----------|---|
| F35_1 | gamemot1 | ... because it's fun. |
| F35_2 | gamemot2 | ... to be in company or with friends. |
| F35_3 | gamemot3 | ... because I enjoy defeating others. |
| F35_4 | gamemot4 | ... because I like to win. |
| F35_5 | gamemot5 | ... to get rid of stress, fear, or negative emotions. |
| F35_6 | gamemot6 | ... to get some distance from my everyday problems. |
| F35_7 | gamemot7 | ... because they make me forget about real life. |
| F35_8 | gamemot8 | ... to pass the time. |
| F35_9 | gamemot9 | ... to be appreciated by my friends and to be considered an expert in my environment. |
| F35_10 | gamemot10 | ... to meet new or interesting people. |

(1) yes

(2) no

What computer or video games do you currently play?

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|
| F36_1_txt | game1 | Most often I play _____ |
| F36_2_txt | game2 | I also play _____ |
| | game1_codes | <i>Missing in game1</i> |
| | game2_codes | <i>Missing in game2</i> |

FROM HERE AGAIN ALL

Now we would like to know about your use of social media. How often have you used the following services within the last four weeks?

| | | |
|---------|------------|---------------------|
| F37_1 | sozmed4w1 | Twitter |
| F37_2 | sozmed4w2 | Facebook |
| F37_3 | sozmed4w3 | V-contacts |
| F37_4 | sozmed4w4 | Instagram |
| F37_5 | sozmed4w15 | Snapchat |
| F37_6 | sozmed4w5 | TikTok |
| F37_7 | sozmed4w6 | YouTube |
| F37_8 | sozmed4w7 | BitChute |
| F37_9 | sozmed4w8 | Discord |
| F37_10 | sozmed4w13 | Twitch |
| F37_11 | sozmed4w9 | Telegram |
| F37_12 | sozmed4w10 | WhatsApp |
| F37_13 | sozmed4w14 | Threema |
| F37_14 | sozmed4w12 | Reddit |
| F37_15 | sozmed4w11 | others, namely_____ |
| F37_txt | sozmed4w_s | |

- (1) never
- (2) rarely
- (3) sometimes
- (4) often
- (5) very often

Experiment

| | | |
|-------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| Split | exgroup3 | [Group membership in the experiment] |
| | | (1) Split 1 |
| | | (2) Split 2 |
| | | (3) Split 3 |
| | | (4) Split 4 |
| | | (5) Split 5 |
| | | (6) Split 6 |
| | | (7) Split 7 |
| | | (8) Split 8 |
| | | (9) Split 9 |

The following news item was recently published in a newspaper:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| [Split 1] | A young woman, Heike A., was the victim of a violent attack yesterday by the 24-year-old asylum seeker Ahmad M. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 2] | A young woman, Heike A., was the victim of a violent attack yesterday by the 24-year-old German Udo M. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 3] | A young woman, Heike A., was the victim of an Islamist attack yesterday by the 24-year-old asylum seeker Ahmad M. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 4] | A young woman, Heike A., was the victim of a right-wing extremist attack yesterday by 24-year-old German Udo M. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 5] | A young woman, Heike A., was the victim of a sexual assault yesterday by the 24-year-old asylum seeker Ahmad M. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 6] | A young woman, Heike A., was the victim of a sexual assault yesterday by the 24-year-old German Udo M. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 7] | A young woman, Fatima A., was the victim of a sexual assault by 24-year-old German Udo M. yesterday. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 8] | A young woman, Fatima A., was the victim of a sexual assault yesterday by the 24-year-old asylum seeker Ahmad M. She is currently in intensive care in hospital. The perpetrator was arrested and is in police custody. |
| [Split 9] | <i>(no news item presented; control group)</i> |

Split 1 to 8 only:

| | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| F38 | chk | How old was the perpetrator in the article just shown? |
| | | (1) 14 |
| | | (2) 24 |
| | | (3) 34 |
| | | (4) 44 |
| | | (5) 54 |
| | | (6) I don't know. |

How bad is the offence described in the article above according your opinion and what punishment should be imposed on this offender by a court?

| | | |
|-----|---------|---|
| F39 | schlimm | How bad do you think the act described above is? |
| | | (1) not bad at all |
| | | (2) 2 |
| | | (3) 3 |
| | | (4) 4 |
| | | (5) 5 |
| | | (6) 6 |
| | | (7) 7 |
| | | (8) 8 |
| | | (9) 9 |
| | | (10) very bad |

Assume that for such an offence a court can impose a sentence of between 1 and 10 years' imprisonment.

F40 sanktion How many years of imprisonment do you think the court should impose for this crime?

- (1) 1 year
- (2) 2 years
- (3) 3 years
- (4) 4 years
- (5) 5 years
- (6) 6 years
- (7) 7 years
- (8) 8 years
- (9) 9 years
- (10) 10 years

Onwards for all:

In view of this and similar recent news, we would like to know from you how worried you are about security in Germany.

Alternative introduction for Split 9:

In view of the recent news, we would like to know from you how worried you are about security in Germany

F41 sorgesi How concerned are you about security in Germany?

- (1) not at all concerned
- (2) hardly concerned
- (3) a little worried
- (4) very concerned

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements about asylum seekers and refugees.

- | | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| F42_1 | asyl1 | Asylum seekers whose applications have been approved should have the right to bring their close family members to Germany. |
| F42_2 | asyl2 | Refugees bring more violent criminals into our country. |
| F42_3 | asyl3 | The state should be generous when examining asylum applications. |
| F42_4 | asyl4 | Asylum seekers only want to take advantage of the good social welfare in Germany. |
| F42_5 | asyl5 | Politicians should condemn violence against refugees in Germany more strongly. |
| F42_6 | asyl6 | In reality, most refugees are not politically persecuted at all. |
| F42_7 | asyl7 | No matter what you think of asylum seekers, violent attacks on refugees are always wrong. |
- (1) strongly disagree
 - (2) somewhat disagree
 - (3) somewhat agree
 - (4) completely agree

Sociodemographics

Finally, a few questions about yourself

F43 schab3 What is the highest educational level you got with respect to school?

If you are still at school, please indicate which level you are aspiring.

- (1) basic level (Hapt- oder Volksschule)
- (2) middle level (Mittlere Reife, Mittlerer Schulabschluss (e.g. Realschule, Polytechnische Oberschule (POS)))
- (3) highest level (Abitur oder vergleichbarer Abschluss)
- (4) another school-leaving qualification, namely: _____
- (5) no degree

F43_txt schab_s

| | | |
|--|-----------|--|
| F44 | taet | What is your current main occupation? (1) I am still attending school. (2) I study. (3) I am employed. (4) I am doing an apprenticeship. (5) I am doing voluntary service. (6) I am a jobseeker. (7) I am doing something else, and that is: _____ |
| F44_txt | taet_s | |
| In which country were you, your mother and your father born? <i>If the state in which you or your parents were born no longer exists, please enter the current state name.</i> | | |
| F45_1 | geblandk | country of birth short |
| F45_2 | geblandmk | country of birth mother short |
| F45_3 | geblandvk | country of birth father short |
| | | (1) Germany (2) Turkey (3) Russian Federation (4) Kazakhstan (5) Poland (6) Italy (7) Syria (8) other (998) don't know (999) not specified |
| How many years have you lived in Germany? | | |
| F46_1 | jahreind | for about ____ years |
| F46_2 | sgebind | since my birth |
| | | (1) ticked |
| What is the nationality of you, your mother and your father? <i>If you have more than one nationality, please indicate all of them.</i> | | |
| F47_1 | stang1 | first nationality short |
| F47_2 | stangm1 | first nationality mother short |
| F47_3 | stangv1 | first nationality father short |
| | | (1) Germany (2) Turkey (3) Russian Federation (4) Kazakhstan (5) Poland (6) Italy (7) Syria (8) Other (998) Don't know (999) not specified |
| F48 | geschl | What gender are you? (1) male (2) female (3) divers |

F49 bezieh **Are you living in a committed relationship?**
 (1) yes
 (2) no

F50 famst **What is your marital status?**
 (1) single
 (2) married
 (3) registered civil partnership
 (4) divorced
 (5) widowed

Do you or your parents social welfare or unemployment benefits (e.g. ALG I, ALG II, Hartz IV or social assistance)?

F51_1 sozhilfs myself
F51_2 sozhilfe my parents
 (0) no
 (1) yes

Friends

Lastly, we would like to know something about your friends.

F52 frd How many friends do you have?
 (1) none
 (2) very few
 (3) a few
 (4) rather many
 (5) very many

F53 frdwich How important is it to you what your friends think of your views or opinions?
 (1) completely unimportant
 (2) rather unimportant
 (3) rather important
 (4) very important

End of the questionnaire

| Field information | |
|--|--|
| idnr | unique number of the questionnaire |
| Information about the location of the respondents adress | |
| kkz | official district code of the respondent's place of residence |
| bula | State of residence of the respondent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Schleswig-Holstein (2) Hamburg (3) Lower Saxony (4) Bremen (5) NRW (6) Hessen (7) Rhineland-Palatinate/Saarland (8) Baaden-Württemberg (9) Bavaria (11) Berlin (12) Brandenburg (13) Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (14) Saxony (15) Saxony-Anhalt (16) Thuringia |
| wo | West/East classification of the respondent's place of residence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) West (2) East |
| Weights | |
| dfakt | Design weight |
| pfakt | Total weighting factor |

Creation of additional variables

In the following text it will be described, how additional variables were created by the UHH-Team. The exact syntax used is not shown here, since the creation of variables can be done in different ways by using different software packages. Necessary steps for the creation of variables are therefore explained below verbally.

Migration status and migrant generation

To determine the migration status, information from the respondents on the country of birth, the countries of birth of the respondents' parents and the respective nationalities of the respondents and their parents were used.¹ If both the respondents and their parents were born in Germany and only Germany was named as the

¹ The information on country of birth and nationality was provided in great detail in the JuMiD 2022 survey. Due to data protection regulations, this information cannot be passed on to the network partners in the complete form as it was collected. The countries of birth of the respondent and the parents as well as the first, second and third nationality of the respondent and the parents of the respondent were collected. If German citizenship was mentioned in one of the statements, the information was coded in such a way that German citizenship was defined as the first citizenship. An abbreviated list of the countries of birth and the first citizenship of the respondent and his/her parents can be passed on to the collaborative partners and other researchers who need that on request.

nationality of the respondents and their parents, the respondents were defined as persons without a migration background.

If the respondents themselves or one of their parents were not born in Germany, the respondents were defined as migrants. The same applies to the nationality of the respondents and the parents. If the respondents themselves or one of the parents have a non-German nationality, the respondents were classified as migrants.

If an allocation could not be made due to missing information, information from the residents' registration offices (German/non-German) was used to determine the migration status. In a few cases, the information on the length of stay was used to determine the migration status. The variable label of the variable that depicts migration status is *migrant*.

The variable *miggen* contains information about the migrant generation. If respondents were not classified as migrants, this classification was also adopted for the variable *miggen*. Migrants who were not born in Germany were defined as first-generation migrants. Migrants who were born in Germany were classified as second-generation migrants.

If no classification of the migrant generation could be made due to missing information on the place of birth, in a few cases the duration of residence was used to make an classification.

National origin of the respondents

For persons without a migration background, the variable *origin* was set to "Germany". The further allocation of respondents to the regions of origin shown here took place successively. If respondents could already be assigned on the basis of the following information, the assignment determined in this way was retained.

The basis for the allocation was first the information on the first nationality of the respondent. In the next step, the assignment was made according to the information on the second and then the third nationality. Insofar as these steps could not yet lead to an allocation to a region of origin, the origin was determined by the country of birth of the interviewee. In the next steps, the information on the first, second and third nationality of the father was used, followed by the corresponding information on the mother.

In the last step, the information on the father's country of birth and - if no assignment could be made - the mother's country of birth was used to determine the respondents' origin.

Democracy-distance

For the variable "*Democracy-distance*" those items that address rejection of basic rights of freedom, core element of the democratic state constitution, or the rejection of basic rights equal treatment were used. These are the variables listed below (the information in brackets refers to the variable name in the data set):

- Rejection of basic rights of freedom (frei...).
 - Every citizen should have the right to go out and demonstrate for what they believe in (frei1).
 - Strikes and demonstrations pose a danger to public order and should be banned (frei2).
 - The freedom of the press in our country must be protected (frei3).
 - All minorities should have the right to freely express their views (frei5).
- Rejection of core elements of the democratic state constitution (konst...).
 - Those who lose out in an election should not be allowed to criticise the business of government (konst1).
 - If a government is doing a good job, there is no reason to hold a new election after four years (konst2).
 - If Parliament come to a decision, it cannot be allowed to be overturned by a court (konst3).
 - In order to have strong political leadership in Germany, Parliament should have less influence (konst4).
- Rejection of basic rights of equal treatment (gleich...).
 - People should not be discriminated against because of their skin colour (gleich1).
 - Women and men should receive equal pay for doing the same work (gleich2).
 - Foreigners should not be treated differently to native citizens regarding allocation of housing (gleich3).
 - Muslims must be allowed to pursue their religion in the same way as Christians, Jews or followers of other religions (gleich4).

In all three sub-dimensions, necessary recoding (inversion) of individual variables was first carried out. This concerns the variables frei1, frei3, frei5 as well as the variables gleich5, gleich6, gleich7, and gleich8. These variables were recoded so that high values correspond to a rejection of the respective rights.

Subsequently, subscales were formed for each of the three sub-dimensions by determining the mean value of items belonging to that subscale. Prerequisite was that there are at least three valid items per subscale (SPSS: mean.3). The subscales represent the degree of rejection of the respective dimensions (rights of freedom, equal treatment, democratic constitutionality).

To create the dichotomous variable *demodis*, the three subscales were dichotomised at the numerical scale centre. Persons with a value of 2.50 or less were assigned the value 0; persons with a value greater than 2.50 were assigned the value 1.

The variable *demodis* was formed in such a way that persons who have a value of 1 in at least one of the three subscales are also assigned the value of 1 in the variable *demodis*. The prerequisite for taking the respondents' statements into account in the variable *demodis* was the presence of at least one valid value >0 in one of the three subscales (SPSS: max.1).

The continuous variable *demo* was formed by determining the mean value of the expressions of all twelve individual items of the three subscales. Prerequisite was the presence of at least four valid values (SPSS: mean.4). Furthermore respondents only

were coded as a valid case in the variable *demo* if there was also a valid value in the dichotomous variable *demodis*.

Right-wing extremist attitudes

The formation of the variable "*right-wing extremist attitudes*" is based on the so called consensus definition. All six dimensions of the consensus definition (xenophobia, trivialisation of National Socialism, anti-Semitism, social Darwinism, chauvinism, support for a right-wing authoritarian dictatorship) as well as the additional dimension "anti-Islamic attitude" were included in the survey. For reasons of limiting the duration of the survey, the number of items had to be reduced compared to the complete instrument usually applied with adults (Decker et al. 2013). The respective dimensions are therefore represented by one item each. The following items are included in the calculation (the information in brackets refers to the variable name in the data set):

- Xenophobia
 - There are too many foreigners in Germany (auslf2).
- Trivialisation of National Socialism
 - National Socialism also had its good sides (natsoz1).
- Anti-Semitism
 - Jews have too much influence in Germany (antisem1).
- Social Darwinism
 - The strongest must prevail, otherwise there is no progress (sozdarw1).
- Chauvinism
 - My people are superior to other peoples (chauv2).
- Advocacy of a right-wing authoritarian dictatorship
 - In the national interest, a dictatorship is the better form of state under certain circumstances (redik2).
- Additional dimension: Islamophobia
 - If we are not careful, Germany will become an Islamic country (islamf1).

The coding of the categorical scale is based on the procedures of the Leipzig Authoritarianism Study (Decker et al. 2013) and the Mitte Study (Zick et al. 2021, pp. 84, 85). The continuous variable *konsens_k* was formed by determining the mean value across all seven items. A prerequisite was the presence of at least three valid values (SPSS: mean.3).

A categorical three-level variable was formed from the continuous variable *konsens_k* a way, that the maximum value depicts the existence of a clear right-wing worldview while the middle category depicts openness to right-wing ideologies in a similar way to the Mitte studies (cf. Zick 2021). The lowest value depicts the rejection of right-wing statements, i.e. no right winged attitude at all.

When comparing the JuMiD scale with the Scale of other Studies it should be considered that in the Mitte Studies (Zick 2021) and the Leipzig Studies (Decker et al. 2022), agreement with the respective statements was recorded on a 5-point Likert scale, whereas in the JuMiD 2022 survey, the answer categories were recorded on a 4-point scale. This decision was made in order to base the estimation of potentials of clearly right-wing extremist attitudes on clear agreement and not to over-interpret the indifferent middle category of a 5-point scale. Therefore, an adjustment of the respective cut-off values was made.

The three-level variable *konsens_k3* was formed as follows: Persons with a value of 2.0 or less on the continuous scale *konsens_k* were assigned the value 1 (this value indicates the clear rejection of right-wing ideologies); persons with a value greater than 2.0 and less than or equal to 2.8 were assigned the value 2 (this value indicates openness to right-wing ideologies) and persons with a value greater than 2.8 were assigned the value 3 (this value indicates the existence of a closed right-wing world view).



Photo by UHH/RRZ/Mentz

Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law, University of Hamburg