

gesis

Leibniz Institute
for the Social Sciences



Panel

gesis



GESIS Panel - Campus File

Dataset Description

Study No. 5666

Documentation for data set version 1.0.0,

doi: 10.4232/1.12749

Content

Part I: About the GESIS Panel.....	1
1. General Overview	1
2. Data Collection.....	1
3. Access to Data and Documentation	2
4. GESIS Panel Team.....	2
4.1 Core Team Members.....	2
4.2 Quality Assurance Board Members.....	2
5. Acknowledgements.....	3
Part II: About the GESIS Panel Campus File	4
1. General Overview	4
2. Documentation and Data Access.....	4
3. Dataset description.....	4
Part III: Study Descriptions.....	6
ag: Environmental Spatial Strategies	6
ah: Cross-National Replication of Question Design Experiments.....	12
ai: Survey Evaluation Items.....	15
aj: Critical Elections in the European Union	17
ak: International panel comparison study.....	21
al: Standardization of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS).....	24
am: Short version of the Metacognitive Prospective Memory Battery (MPMBs).....	26
an: Leisure travel and subjective well-being.....	30
ao: Social and individual predictors of Doing Beauty	33
ap: Citizens Conception of Democracy and their Political Participation.....	36
aq: Pro-environmental Behavior in High Cost Situations.....	39
ar: Policy preferences for inheritance taxes and motives of intergenerational transfers.....	42
za: GESIS Panel Core Study – Survey Administration Variables.....	46
zb: GESIS Panel Core Study – Subjective Well-Being.....	48
zc: GESIS Panel Core Study – Social and Political Participation.....	52
zd: GESIS Panel Core Study – Environmental attitudes and behavior	59
ze: GESIS Panel Core Study – Personality and Personal Values	66
zf: GESIS Panel Core Study – Media Usage	72
zg: GESIS Panel Core Study – Work and Leisure	76
zh: GESIS Panel Core Study – Annual Update of Socio-Demography.....	80
zi: GESIS Panel Core Study – Panel survey participation evaluation & mode preferences.....	83

zq: GESIS Panel Core Study – Monitoring quality: survey exp. & mode characteristics.....87

Part I: About the GESIS Panel

1. General Overview

The GESIS Panel provides a probability-based Omnibus Access Panel infrastructure located at GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences in Mannheim, Germany. The project offers the social science community a unique opportunity to collect survey data from a representative sample of the German population free of charge.

The sample encompasses the German speaking population aged between 18 and 70 years (at the time of recruitment) and permanently residing in Germany. Fully operational from the beginning of 2014 the GESIS Panel includes over 4800 panelists.

The omnibus survey waves take place on a bi-monthly basis, each taking about 20 minutes and split up into two self-administered survey modes (online, offline). 62% of the panelists participate online (Web-based surveys), 38% of the panelists attend the surveys by mail.

Each survey wave consists of two major parts: About 15 minutes of survey time is reserved for the submitted studies. Fielded external studies have undergone a peer-review process. The second part of each survey wave (about five minutes of interviewing time) is reserved for longitudinal core study topics developed by GESIS.

One aim of the GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study is to measure frequently demanded characteristics beyond demographics, such as personality and human values, political behavior and orientations, well-being and quality-of-life, environmental attitudes and behavior, and information/communication technology usage. Moreover, a second aim of the GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study is to assess and to control for data quality (i.e., different sources of survey error) by measuring concepts such as survey participation evaluations, survey mode habits and preferences, and by including selected items from other benchmark surveys (e.g., German micro-census, ESS, ALLBUS, ISSP).

2. Data Collection

The data collection process employs two self-administered survey modes (online, offline). Data collection and panel maintenance is administered and organized by the GESIS Panel Team. From 2014 onwards, the GESIS Panel runs questionnaires submitted by the research community that underwent a review process.

The GESIS Panel omnibus survey waves take place on a bi-monthly basis, each encompassing about 20 minutes starting with wave aa¹ in August 2013. The regular field phase lasts until the beginning of the next wave for both modes.

Panel members were recruited in 2013 in face-to-face interviews followed by a self-administered welcome survey. The mode was chosen by the participants. All participants of the welcome survey are considered members of the panel and invited to the bi-monthly regular waves. Please refer to the methods report of the recruitment process.

From 2014 onwards all participants are invited by mail and receive an unconditional incentive of five Euros. For the online mode, all GESIS Panel questionnaires are implemented into the EFS Panel installation by Questback. In addition to the mail invitation, online participants

¹ Waves and studies are named after the GESIS Panel naming convention, for details take a look at the corresponding section in GESIS Panel Codebook

receive an invitation and two reminders by email. The online data collection process is conducted by the GESIS Panel team. The online field phase lasts about eight weeks.

Offline data are collected by the mail service provider SSM. They send out all paper questionnaires one day before the start of the online field phase. No reminders are sent out in the offline mode. In-coming paper questionnaires are processed by SSM until one day before the start of the next wave's field phase. The data is entered manually and all questionnaires are archived electronically.

3. Access to Data and Documentation

The scientific use file of the GESIS Panel is accessible for scientific purposes only via the GESIS Data Archive for the Social Sciences (DAS) in Cologne. Along with the dataset all documents are stored centrally in the data catalogue (DBK). The documentation comprises the wave reports, the questionnaires and a codebook that documents all variables in the dataset.

Every two months an updated edition of the master dataset is released that includes new data from the last wave as well as revisions from previous waves. Data will be accessible about two months after the end of the field period.

We provide two editions of this master dataset: a scientific use file accessible for research purposes (GESIS Panel Standard Edition: ZA5665) and a secure scientific use file that is only available for on-site use at the [Secure Data Center](#) in Cologne (GESIS Panel Extended Edition: ZA5664). To access the scientific use file, researchers need to sign a user contract. Upon approval of the data use request, the data archive will provide researchers with access to the current scientific use file via secure ftp download. Please follow the bilingual [GESIS Panel Data Access instruction](#).

Due to privacy protection rules some variables are not included in the scientific use file but are only included in the secure scientific use file that can only be accessed on-site via the [Secure Data Center](#) at the GESIS data archive in Cologne. Please refer to the conditions of the Secure Data Center for more information on this opportunity to use the GESIS Panel data.

4. GESIS Panel Team

4.1 Core Team Members

The GESIS Panel team members are Dr. Bernd Weiß (Team Leader), David Bretsch, Steffen Pötzschke, Ines Schaurer, Katharina Schmidt (Survey Project Management), Robert Bauer, Kai Weyandt (Survey Statistics and Data Quality Management), Gabriele Wahlig (Panel Management), and Kai Böge (Software Adjustment and Maintenance).

4.2 Quality Assurance Board Members

The members of the GESIS Panel Scientific Quality Assurance Board are Jun.-Prof. Dr. Annelies Blom (University of Mannheim), Prof. Dr. Alan Bryman (University of Leicester), Dr. Mario Callegaro, Prof. Dr. Mick Couper (University of Michigan), Prof. Dr. Marcel Das (CentERdata and Tilburg University), Prof. Dr. Don Dillman (Washington State University), Prof. Dr. Marek Fuchs (Technical University Darmstadt), Prof. Dr. Arie Kapteyn (University of Southern California), Prof. Dr. Jon Krosnick (Stanford University), Prof. Dr. Peter Lynn (University of Essex), Prof. Dr. Norbert Schwarz (University of Southern California), Ass.-Prof. Dr. Bella Struminskaya and Ass.-Prof. Dr. Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University).

5. Acknowledgements

The GESIS Panel thanks the researchers submitting proposals to and fielding studies in the GESIS Panel. We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers that provide valuable feedback to the submitted studies. We would also like to thank Dr. Tobias Enderle for his contributions to the conceptualization and development of the GESIS Panel Campus File, as well as Joachim Piepenburg for his support.

Part II: About the GESIS Panel Campus File

1. General Overview

The GESIS Panel Campus File is intended for teaching purposes only. It provides interested parties, such as students or lecturers, the opportunity to work with an easily accessible, high quality, panel data set that should satisfy many requirements put forth by the interested parties' teaching curriculum. In exchange for easy accessibility the GESIS Panel Campus File only contains selected portions of the original GESIS Panel scientific use file (ZA5665), the exact content of which will be discussed in the following section.

Researchers interested in using GESIS Panel data for scientific publication purposes should use the full data set, either the GESIS Panel Standard Edition or the GESIS Panel Extended Edition. The data users are strongly advised not to use the GESIS Panel Campus File for scientific publications other than for teaching purposes.

2. Documentation and Data Access

In order to ensure the anonymity of our panelists the GESIS Panel Campus File only contains a random 25% sample of all panel members who were still active at the start of the respective year. In other words, the Campus File for the year 2014, contains panel members who were still active in wave "ba" (N=4888). For the current Campus File the final sample size is N=1222, compared to the original sample size of N=7599 in the scientific use file (GESIS Panel Standard Edition: ZA5665) this Campus File is based on. Furthermore, selected demographic variables, such as age, weight and height, have been recoded into fewer categories in consideration of privacy concerns. These variables are denoted with a "z" at the end of their name. The last difference between the scientific use file and the Campus File is that latter does not include paradata (studies zr, zs and zp). For an exact documentation of studies and variables included in this year's GESIS Panel Campus File consult the study description and codebook.

Access to the GESIS Panel Campus File (ZA5666 / [doi:10.4232/1.12749](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12749)) can be acquired at the Data Catalogue (DBK).

3. Dataset description

In order to ease the access to the analytical potential, notes and references on general prerequisites follow. The complexity of the GESIS Panel dataset in general and as a subset the GESIS Panel Campus File is reflected in the variable naming convention, which you can find in the codebook. Briefly explained, each variable name carries information on the connection to a specific survey wave or instrument and the respective study or concept the variable belongs to, as well as a proxy for the position within the questionnaire. The section "Variable naming convention" within the codebook for the GESIS Panel Campus File offers a comprehensive description of the rationale for the specially developed variable naming scheme. Besides the variable names, the missing value scheme carries information on the subject level, trying to enable the data user to understand the data generating process, hence the routing within the questionnaire. This information is part of the codebook as well.

The Campus File allows cross-sectional as well as longitudinal data analysis. The following section illustrates briefly the analytical potential of the GESIS Panel Campus File with regards to topics, longitudinal analysis and experiments. The following part briefly describes the different kinds of studies within the panel.

The recruitment interview (a11) as well as the welcome survey (a12) contains topics of general interest, besides detailed information about the participants as core demographics (e.g. gender, age, education, vocational training, employment situation, income, marital status). Updates for demographic variables are included in wave be (employment situation) and bf (e.g. gender, age, education, vocational training, income, marital status).

As a data collection infrastructure the GESIS Panel offers the social science community the possibility, to collect data free of charge, after passing through a structured review process. Besides these external studies, GESIS Panel Core Studies on relevant topics of general interest are part of each data collection wave. These topics range from well-being (zb), social and political participation (zc), environmental attitudes and behavior (zd), over personality and personal values (ze), and media usage (zg) to studies aimed at the measuring survey evaluation each wave (zq) and survey experience on a yearly basis (zi). In the GESIS Panel Campus File these Core Studies appear as cross-sectional data collection events, since they are Longitudinal Core Studies, which are repeated on a yearly basis in the GESIS Panel. This originates from the reduction of the GESIS Panel Campus File on the year 2014 and the panel recruitment.

External studies conducted within the GESIS Panel are characterized by a wide variety of topics and aims. They are described in detail in Part III of this document. Some of the studies have had multiple data collection events; some of them being part of a true longitudinal data collection setting, some being multiple cross-sectional data collections. Table 1: Studies with multiple data collection events illustrates studies with multiple data collection events within the GESIS Panel Campus File.

Table 1: Studies with multiple data collection events

Study	Title	Wave					
		ba	bb	bc	bd	be	bf
ai	Survey Evaluation Items	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
aj	Critical Elections in the European Union		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
am	Short version of the Metacognitive Prospective Memory Battery (MPMBs)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
an	Leisure travel and subjective well-being			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
za	GESIS Panel Core Study – Survey Administration Variables	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
zq	GESIS Panel Core Study – Monitoring quality: survey exp. & mode characteristics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Besides studies with multiple data collection events experimental studies are part of the GESIS Panel. In 2014 only one external experimental study was fielded, namely study ah “Cross-National Replication of Question Design Experiments” in wave ba. This study implemented a variety of methodological question design experiments on response order, acquiescence, question wording, as well as the use of no opinion response option, question balance and question order.

Part III: Study Descriptions

ag: Environmental Spatial Strategies

Study Code

ag

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; March 31, 2014

Study title

Environmental Spatial Strategies

Subject classification

Psychology; Environmental Psychology

Keywords

Environmental Spatial Cognition, Self-Concept, Individual Differences, Technology Use

Data collection waves

ba

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Stefan Münzer University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany	http://scholar.google.de/citations?hl=de&user=wW2MU4gAAAAJ

Abstract

Navigation and spatial orientation in known and unknown real--world environments are important competences. However, individual differences in environmental spatial cognition are large. Self-report measures of „sense of direction“ and wayfinding strategies are reliable and valid predictors of spatial behavior in the real world, accounting for individual differences. Several instruments have been developed to measure self-reported aspects of environmental spatial cognition. The Santa Barbara Sense of Direction scale (SBSOD, Hegarty et al., 2002) is a one-dimensional scale that comprises different aspects of orientation and wayfinding (e.g., giving and understanding directions, remembering routes, reading maps, mental map formation). The scale correlates substantially with behavioral measures of spatial cognition (e.g., spatial learning from direct experience, path integration). The Questionnaire of Spatial Representation (QSR, Pazzaglia & de Beni, 2001) distinguishes five dimensions (general sense of direction, cardinal directions, survey-, landmark-, and route-centered preferences for the formation of a mental spatial representation).

The German Questionnaire of Spatial Strategies (Fragebogen Räumliche Strategien FRS, Münzer & Hölscher, 2011) comprises three dimensions: (1) global belief in competence to

orient oneself related to directional and route-based (egocentric) strategies, (2) survey-based strategies and (3) cardinal directions. This factor structure of the self-report measure reflects different strategic aspects in spatial orientation. The „global-egocentric orientation“ scale comprises indicators of general ability and egocentric strategies which are based on knowledge of directions and knowledge of routes. The „survey“ scale comprises indicators of mental map formation. The „cardinal directions“ scale comprises indicators of knowledge of cardinal directions. The scales predicted spatial learning in a real, unknown environment and showed incremental validity over relevant predictors of cognitive visual-spatial ability. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the dimensionality of the self-report measure FRS (Münzer & Hölscher, 2011). Gender differences were consistently found for self-reported sense of direction and spatial strategies as well as for behavioral data (Hegarty et al., 2002; Münzer & Hölscher, 2011).

However, representative data do not exist. Participants of the studies mentioned above were students. They were thus representative of a particular age group. This is unfortunate, because generalizable conclusions about individual differences in real-world navigation and spatial learning are not warranted, provided that age is correlated with experience. Moreover, instruments differ with respect to dimensionality. Thus, more research needs to be done regarding construct validity.

The German Questionnaire of Spatial Strategies (Fragebogen Räumliche Strategien, FRS, Münzer & Hölscher, 2011) is included in the first 2014 data collection wave of the GESISPanel. In addition, items about technical devices utilizable for navigation and route planning are included. The study based on the GESISPanel data collection pursues three goals:

- (1) The first goal is to obtain norm data about self-reported sense of direction and spatial strategies for different age groups, separated for women and men.
- (2) The second goal is to analyze the factorial structure of the questionnaire utilizing confirmatory factor analysis.
- (3) The third goal is to provide descriptive data about possession of technical devices for navigation in different age groups and to analyze relations between these data and self-reported sense of direction and spatial strategies.

An overall goal is to analyze changes in self-reported spatial competences related to use of technology that supports route planning, navigation and spatial learning over years.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
„Sense of direction“ (global self-confidence of successful orientation), combined with real-world spatial orientation strategies based on memorizing routes and directions	„Global / egocentric orientation“ scale (10 items)	ba

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	<p>Wenn ich durch eine unbekannte Stadt laufe, dann weiß ich, aus welcher Richtung ich gekommen bin und in welche Richtung ich mich bewege.</p> <p>In an unknown city, I usually know from which direction I came from and in which direction I am going.</p> <p>Ich bin sehr gut darin, von meinem gegenwärtigen Standort aus Richtungen zu anderen Orten anzugeben.</p> <p>I am very good at pointing towards other locations from where I am standing.</p> <p>In der freien Natur (z.B. Wald, Gebirge) kann ich mich an einen Weg sehr gut erinnern, wenn ich ihn einmal gegangen bin.</p> <p>In the wild (in the woods or in the mountains) I can remember a route very well if I have walked it before.</p> <p>Ich finde stets ohne Probleme zu meinem Ziel.</p> <p>I don't have any trouble finding my destination.</p> <p>In einer unbekanntem Umgebung finde ich mich gut zurecht.</p> <p>I can easily find my way in a new environment.</p> <p>Ich bin sehr gut darin, mir Wege zu merken und finde auch ohne Mühe den Rückweg.</p> <p>I am very good at remembering how to get somewhere and I don't have trouble finding the way back.</p> <p>In einem großen Gebäude habe ich keine Schwierigkeiten, einen Weg nochmals zu gehen, wenn ich den Weg einmal gegangen bin.</p> <p>If I have walked a route in a big building once before, I don't have trouble walking it again.</p> <p>Mein Orientierungssinn ist sehr gut.</p> <p>My „sense of direction“ is very good.</p>	

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	<p>In meiner Stadt/ meinem Ort kann ich von einem beliebigen Punkt aus spontan angeben, in welchen Richtungen markante Gebäude oder Bezugspunkte liegen.</p> <p>In my hometown, I can point quite accurately towards prominent buildings and other points of interest.</p> <p>In einem großen Gebäude weiß ich spontan, in welcher Richtung der Eingang liegt.</p> <p>In a big building I can spontaneously point towards the entrance.</p>	
<p>Orientation by formation of a mental map during navigation</p>	<p>„Allocentric / mental map“ scale (7 items)</p> <p>Wenn mich jemand in meiner Stadt/ meinem Ort nach dem Weg fragt, dann stelle ich mir meine Stadt/ meinen Ort wie auf einer Karte vor und ermittle daraus den Weg.</p> <p>If somebody were to ask me for directions in my hometown, I would picture a town map and describe the route based on that map.</p> <p>Wenn ich mich durch ein großes Gebäude bewege, dann stelle ich mir dabei eine Art Plan oder Grundriss (Überblicksansicht) vor.</p> <p>While walking through a big building, I usually picture it as a floor plan.</p> <p>Ich stelle mir die Umgebung stets wie auf einer „mentalen Karte“ (Überblicksansicht) vor.</p> <p>I typically picture my surroundings as a „mental map“ (i.e. from an aerial or overhead view).</p> <p>Wenn ich in meiner Stadt/ meinem Ort unterwegs bin, dann kann ich mir meine Position wie einen Punkt auf meiner „mentalen Karte“ vorstellen.</p> <p>When I wander about my hometown, I can picture my own position as a dot on a „mental map“.</p>	<p>ba</p>

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	<p data-bbox="528 309 1102 421">Ich verfüge über eine sehr gute Vorstellung von meiner Stadt/ meinem Ort, wie auf einer Karte.</p> <p data-bbox="528 443 1118 510">I can picture my hometown very well from a bird's-eye view, as if it were shown on a map.</p> <p data-bbox="528 533 1102 645">Wenn ich mich in einer unbekanntem Stadt bewege, dann bilde ich in meiner Vorstellung eine Art „mentale Karte“.</p> <p data-bbox="528 667 1118 734">When I move around a new city, I typically picture it as a map.</p>	
<p data-bbox="177 763 496 831">Knowledge of cardinal directions</p>	<p data-bbox="528 763 975 797">„Cardinal directions“ scale (2 items)</p> <p data-bbox="528 875 1086 943">Ich kann spontan zeigen, wo Norden, Süden, Osten und Westen liegt.</p> <p data-bbox="528 965 1086 1032">I can spontaneously point towards north, south, east and west.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1066 1086 1133">In der freien Natur kann ich spontan zeigen, wo Norden, Süden, Osten und Westen liegt.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1155 1118 1223">In an outdoor environment, I can point to north, south, east and west spontaneously.</p>	<p data-bbox="1134 763 1410 797">ba</p>
<p data-bbox="177 1240 496 1397">Possession of technical devices that support route planning and navigation</p>	<p data-bbox="528 1240 1102 1375">Wenn ich mit dem Auto zu einem neuen Ziel fahre, dann benutze ich regelmäßig ein Navigationssystem.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1397 1086 1464">When I am traveling to somewhere new with a car, I normally use a navigation system.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1487 1086 1554">Wenn ich eine neue Route plane, nutze ich regelmäßig einen Routenplaner im Internet.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1576 1070 1644">When planning a new route, I normally use a route planner on the internet.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1666 1086 1912">Wenn ich in einer fremden Stadt als Fußgänger unterwegs bin, nutze ich eine Navigationsanwendung auf meinem Smartphone (bzw. ein mobiles Navigationssystem), um mich zu orientieren und meinen Weg zu finden.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1912 1118 2024">When walking in a foreign city, I use a navigation application on my smart phone (or a mobile navigation system) to orient myself and to find my route.</p>	<p data-bbox="1134 1240 1410 1285">ba</p>

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	<p>Wenn ich eine neue Route plane, benutze ich regelmäßig gedrucktes Kartenmaterial.</p> <p>When planning a new route, I normally use printed maps.</p>	
	<p>Besitze ein mobiles Navigationsgerät, das für die Nutzung im Auto geeignet ist</p> <p>I have a mobile navigation system which is used in the car.</p>	
	<p>Besitze ein Smartphone mit Navigationsfunktion</p> <p>I have a smartphone with navigation application.</p>	
	<p>Besitze ein Auto mit einem fest eingebauten Navigationssystem</p> <p>I own a car with an integrated navigation system.</p>	

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.11947](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.11947)

References

- Hegarty, M., Richardson, A. E., Montello, D. R., Lovelace, K. & Subbiah, I. (2002). Development of a self-report measure of environmental spatial ability. *Intelligence*, 30, 425-447.
- Münzer, S., & Hölscher, C. (2011). Entwicklung und Validierung eines Fragebogens zu räumlichen Strategien (Development and validation of a self-report measure on environmental spatial strategies). *Diagnostica*, 57 (3), 111-125.
- Pazzaglia, F. & De Beni, R. (2001). Strategies of processing spatial information in survey and landmark-centered individuals. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 13, 493-508.

ah: Cross-National Replication of Question Design Experiments

Study Code

ah

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; March 12, 2014

Study title

Cross-National Replication of Question Design Experiments

Subject classification

Survey methodology

Keywords

Questionnaire Design, Cross-National Experiments, Split Ballot Design

Data collection waves

ba

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Jon Krosnick Stanford University (US)	
Henning Silber Göttingen University (DE)	
Tobias Stark Utrecht University (NL)	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=UH6UvgYAAAAJ&hl=de
Annelies Blom Mannheim University (DE)	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=v2TCnhAAAAAJ&hl=de
Michael Bosnjak Free University of Bozen-Bolzano (IT) and GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences (DE)	http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1431-8461 http://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.url?authoid=6701915757 http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael_Bosnjak/ http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=LgTlGpwAAAAJ

Abstract

Our research explores whether the principles of questionnaire design, along which many surveys today are developed and which are based primarily on American data, can legitimately be generalized across countries. For this purpose our research implements well-tested split-

ballot design experiments from single-country contexts in multiple countries to gauge country-specific differences in response behavior, satisficing, and social desirability response bias (De Maio 1984; Holbrook & Krosnick 2010; Johnson et al. 2001; Krosnick 1991; Yang et al. 2010). We conduct these experiments in Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK, and in the United States, with other countries potentially joining in the future. The data are collected during the same time period from longitudinal panels or cross-sectional surveys, all based on probability sampling methods. This study design enables us to compare response patterns across countries.

The cross-national survey design focuses on the replication of question design experiments from Schuman and Presser (1981) with the following variations:

- Response Order (6 Experiments):
- Acquiescence (4 Experiments)
- Question Wording (1 Experiment)
- No Opinion Response Option (3 Experiments)
- Question Balance (2 Experiments)
- Question Order (2 Experiments)

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Response Order	Oil Supply Oil Prizes Adequate Housing Global Warming Trust Inequality	
Acquiescence	Individuals vs. Social Conditions Jobs Women and Politics Complicated	
Question Wording	Free Speech	
No Opinion Response Option	Courts Leaders Smart Leaders Crooked	
Question Balance	Unions Fuel Shortage	
Question Order	Abortion Businesses vs. Unions	

Experimental design

We run a set of classic experiments (see Schuman & Presser 1981) for question evaluation. More precisely, we run eighteen split ballot design question experiments. The experiments test for the differences in response behavior by altering (a) the order in which the response options and (b) the questions are presented. Moreover, we test (c) for differences caused by acquiescence (a tendency to agree with any presented statement), (d) for effects of different no opinion filters (filter 1: not enough information; filter 2: no opinion; filter 3: don't know), (e) for differences in response behavior, if the questions are introduced by „some/others“ (e. g., „Some people think that it is healthy to eat chocolate every day, other people think that it is not healthy to eat chocolate every day. What is your opinion on this?“), (f) for question balance effects (balanced questions are completely neutral), and (g) for the impact of conversational conventions on response behavior (e.g., by starting the question with a negation).

To date, our proposal has been accepted by the „Innovation Panel“ (IP) in the UK, by the „Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences“ (LISS) in the Netherlands, by the „German Internet Panel“ (GIP), by the GESIS Online Panel in Germany, by the Citizen Panel in Sweden, by the Social Sciences Research Laboratories (SSRL) at the University of Saskatchewan in Canada, by the University of Aalborg in Denmark, by the University of Iceland, by the Gallup Organization in the United States, by the Citizen Panel in Norway, and by ELIPSS in France.

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.11947](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.11947)

References

- De Maio, T. D. (1984), Social desirability and survey measurement: A review. In Turner, C. E. & E. Martin (Eds.), *Surveying Subjective Phenomena*, Vol. 2, New York.
- Holbrook, A. L. & J. A. Krosnick (2010), Social Desirability Bias in Voter Turnout Reports Tests Using the Item Count Technique, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74, 37–67.
- Johnson, T. P., P. Kulesa, Y. I. Cho and S. Shavitt (2005), The relation between culture and response style: Evidence from 19 countries, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36, 264-277.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991), Response strategies for coping with cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys, *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 50, 537-567.
- Schuman, H., & S. Presser (1981), *Questions and answers in attitude surveys*, New York.
- Yang, Y., Harkness, Janet A., T.-Y. Chin & A. Villar (2010), Response Styles and Culture. In Harkness, J. A. et al. (Eds.), *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts*, New Jersey.

ai: Survey Evaluation Items

Study Code

ai

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; September 30, 2014

Study title

Survey Evaluation Items

Subject classification

Survey methodology

Keywords

Survey experience, interview situation

Data collection waves

ba, bb

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
---	---

Jon Krosnick Stanford University (US)	
--	--

Abstract

In addition to the GESIS Panel Core Study zq, another set of survey evaluation items developed by Jon Krosnick is included to cross-validate and supplement the GESIS Panel survey evaluation items.

The additional set of items focuses on respondents' effort and subjective experience of filling out the questionnaire and on respondents' expectations.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Survey evaluation	Difficulty of understanding the questionnaire	ba, bb
Survey evaluation	Difficulty of generating an answer	ba, bb
Survey evaluation	Respondents effort to generate adequate answers	ba, bb
Survey evaluation	Subjective evaluation of questionnaire length	ba, bb

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Survey evaluation	How well did this questionnaire allow you to convey your opinions on the issues asked about?	ba, bb
Survey evaluation	Overall enjoyment	ba, bb

Starting with wave bc parts of study ai (question 1 and 2) were included into the GESIS Panel core study on survey evaluation.

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.11947](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:5:1-63868-p0111-9)

aj: Critical Elections in the European Union

Study Code

aj

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; August 11, 2014

Study title

Critical Elections in the European Union. European Elections Study 2014, German Panel Survey

Subject classification

Elections

Keywords

European Parliament Elections, critical elections, ideological realignment, EU dimension

Data collection waves

bb, bc

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Hermann Schmitt University of Mannheim (MZES)	http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=9tCcx2IAAAAJ&hl=com
Sebastian Adrian Popa University of Mannheim (MZES)	http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=dfCXWbwAAAAJ&hl=en

Abstract

The general aim of the European Election Studies (EES) 2014 research program is to assess empirically the political consequences of the current sovereign debt crisis for political alignments. One aspect is persistence of behavioral consequences both at the occasion of the 2014 election to the European Parliament and in subsequent elections of members of national parliaments. Our main heuristic which guides the more specific research questions is that the 2014 EP elections could turn out to be a „critical election“ in the sense of V. O. Key (1955). More in particular, we are asking whether and under what conditions political oppositions over EU membership and EU policies (shorthand: the EU dimension ranging from outright opposition to full support of EU integration) have become central for political competition in Europe.

The contribution of this research program will be twofold. First, it will establish whether the recent growth in importance of the EU dimension (indicated e.g. by the roll-call behavior of members of the European Parliament), enforced by the current debt crisis, constitutes the base of a new ideological cleavage and leads to a socio-political realignment. Second, it will put the current politicization of EU integration into perspective. Processes of cleavage formation and

socio-political re-alignments can only be properly understood in a diachronic perspective which requires as long a time frame as there are data to base it on. For this reason, the current study, part of EES 2014 Panel Survey (<http://eeshomepage.net/panel-study-2014/>), will contribute to analyzing the dimensions of political competition at the time of the 2014 European Parliament election in comparison with those in place at the next German national election.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Partisanship	Partisanship: Party	bb
	Partisanship: Strength	bb
Retrospective economic evaluation	Retrospective economic evaluation: Household	bb
	Retrospective economic evaluation: Germany	bb
Impact of Crisis	Afraid of: Be able to pay bills in the own household	bb
	Afraid of: Reduce the standard of living	bb
	Afraid of: Have a job.	bb
	Afraid of: Be able to pay bank loans and mortgages	bb
Economic solidarity	Crisis aid Germany	bb
Salient political problem	Most important political problem Germany	bc
	Second most important political problem Germany	bc
	Most important political problem in EU	bc
	Second most important political problem in EU	bc
Recall participation EU elections	Vote recall EU elections	bc
Recall Vote Decision EU elections		
Satisfaction with political decisions	Satisfaction with national government	bc

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Satisfaction with European decisions	bc
Left-Right position	Left Right position EGO	bc
	Left Right position Party: CDU	bc
	Left Right position Party: CSU	bc
	Left Right position Party: SPD	bc
	Left Right position Party: FDP	bc
	Left Right position Party: Die LINKE	bc
	Left Right position Party: Bündnis 90/ Die Grünen	bc
	Left Right position Party: AfD	bc
EU Integration position	EU integration position EGO	bc
	EU integration position Party: CDU	bc
	EU integration position Party: CSU	bc
	EU integration position Party: SPD	bc
	EU integration position Party: FDP	bc
	EU integration position Party: Die LINKE	bc
	EU integration position Party: Bündnis 90/ Die Grünen	bc
	EU integration position Party: AfD	bc
Policy responsibility	German federal government	bc
	International Monetary Fund	bc
	Banks	bc
	European Union	bc
Vote recall national election 2013	Vote recall national election	bc
Propensities to vote	Propensity to vote: CDU/CSU	bc
	Propensity to vote: SPD	bc

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Propensity to vote: FDP	bc
	Propensity to vote: Die LINKE	bc
	Propensity to vote: Bündnis 90/ Die Grünen	bc
	Propensity to vote: AfD	bc

Comment

Two variables measuring the concept „retrospective economic evaluation“ were asked as part of study ak and therefore have this study indicator.

The questions are to be repeated after the next German election.

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12003](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:5:1-63868-p0011-9)

References

Key, V. (1955). A Theory of Critical Elections. *The Journal of Politics*, 17(1), 145–155.

ak: International panel comparison study

Study Code

ak

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; August 11, 2014

Study title

International panel comparison study (GESIS Panel, GIP, LISS, ELIPSS)

Subject classification

Social behavior and attitudes

Keywords

Survey methodology

Data collection waves

bb

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Michael Bosnjak Free University of Bozen-Bolzano & GESIS Panel, GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1431-8461 http://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.url?authorId=6701915757 http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael_Bosnjak/ http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=LgTlgPwAAAAJ
Tanja Dannwolf GESIS Panel, GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tanja_Dannwolf
Bella Struminskaya GESIS Panel, GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=UBs7GvsAAAAJ
Ines Schaurer GESIS Panel, GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=x5wlrEkAAAAJ
Carina Cornesse GESIS Panel, GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=WD29nLIAAAAAJ&hl=de

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Annelies Blom University of Mannheim & GIP (German Internet Panel)	http://de.linkedin.com/pub/prof-dr-annelies-blom/2b/877/915
Ulrich Krieger University of Mannheim & GIP (German Internet Panel)	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=senHLLdsAAAAJ&hl=de
Franziska Gebhard University of Mannheim & GIP (German Internet Panel)	
Marcel Das CentERdata & LISS (Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences)	
Salima Douhou CentERdata & LISS (Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences)	https://www.linkedin.com/pub/salima-douhou/45/845/812
Anne Cornilleau SciencesPo & ELIPPS	
Laurent Lesnard SciencesPo & ELIPPS	
Anne-Sophie Cousteaux SciencesPo & ELIPPS	

Abstract

The overall aim of this study is to estimate the degree of measurement (in)congruence for selected items from the European Social Survey (Round 6 Questionnaire), Share (2013) and the European Election Study (2009) on a national level (i.e., within countries), and to explain the potential differences with the aid of three hierarchically related sets of independent variables: Country-level variables, data collection mode(s), and sample characteristics. The items summarized below are fielded simultaneously in (a) the GESIS Panel, (b) the German Internet Panel (GIP), (c) the LISS Panel (The Netherlands), and (d) the ELIPSS Panel (France).

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Personal/General Well-being	Satisfaction with life Personal Happiness	bb

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Social participation	Meeting friends Social active Active past 12 months: -volunteer work -participation in an advanced education -participation in clubs/ societies -participation in political organizations -read a book, magazine or newspaper -solve a crossword or number puzzle -play a card or board game -none of the above mentioned	bb
Social well-being	Feel appreciated people	bb
Satisfaction with economic	Satisfaction economy	bb
Satisfaction with government	Satisfaction government	bb
Role of state	Income differences	bb
Evaluation of German economy	Evaluation economy past Evaluation economy future	bb
Economic Well-Being	Evaluation financial situation past Evaluation financial situation future Evaluation financial situation own household	bb

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12003](https://www.gesis.org/en/data-portal/10.4232/1.12003)

References

European Social Survey, (2012). ESS Round 6 Source Questionnaire. London: Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University London.

Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (2013). SHARE English Generic Questionnaire. <http://www.share-project.org/data-access-documentation/questionnaires/questionnaire-wave-5.html>

European Election Study (2009) Voter Study Questionnaire. <http://eeshomepage.net/ees-2009-study/voter-study/>

al: Standardization of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

Study Code

al

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; February 12, 2014

Study title

Standardization of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

Subject classification

Psychology; Social Conditions and Indicators

Keywords

Positive Affect, Negative Affect, Emotion, PANAS, Standardization, Fairness

Data collection waves

bb

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Daniel Danner GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	

Abstract

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) measures dispositional affect that is how intense positive and negative affect are generally perceived. Positive affect is indicated by active and enthusiastic feelings, negative affect is indicated by hostile or distressed feelings. The PANAS has become the standard scale for measuring dispositional affect and has been used in various disciplines such as psychology, economics, politics, or medicine. The purpose of the present study is creating standardization data for the general population in Germany and investigating the fairness of the scale for different sub-groups. Creating standardization data will allow comparing the scores of specific samples or individuals with either the general population or sub-groups. The standardization data will cover means, standard deviations, and percentile ranks for the general population as well as for different levels of age, sex, and education. Investigating the fairness of the PANAS will reveal whether the instrument is equally applicable in different groups. The fairness of the PANAS will be evaluated using structural equation models. In particular, we will use measurement invariance models for determining whether factor loading differ between different levels of age, sex, and education.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Positive Affect	10 Items of the German Positive And Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - aktiv - interessiert - freudig erregt - stark - angeregt - stolz - begeistert - wach - entschlossen - aufmerksam 	bb
Negative Affect	10 Items of the German PANAS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bekümmert - verärgert - schuldig - erschrocken - feindselig - gereizt - beschämt - nervös - durcheinander - ängstlich 	bb

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12003](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:5:1-12003)

References

- Krohne, H. W., Egloff, B., Kohlmann, C.-W. & Tausch, A. (1996). Untersuchungen mit einer deutschen Version der „Positive and Negative Affect Schedule“ (PANAS). *Diagnostica*, 42(2), 139-156.
- Millsap, R. E. (2011). *Statistical approaches to measurement invariance*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063

am: Short version of the Metacognitive Prospective Memory Battery (MPMBs)

Study Code

am

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; September 1, 2014

Study title

A short version of the Metacognitive Prospective Memory Battery (MPMBs)

Subject classification

Psychology; memory; individual and age differences

Keywords

Prospective memory questionnaire; meta-memory; test validation

Data collection waves

bc, bf

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Jan Rummel Department of Psychology, Heidelberg University	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jan_Rummel
Beatrice G. Kuhlmann Institute of Experimental Psychology, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf	http://www.mendeley.com/profiles/beatrice-g-kuhlmann/

Abstract

Remembering to perform an intended action at the appropriate moment in the future is crucial for mastering our daily lives. This cognitive capacity requires retrieval of intentions from memory and has thus been named prospective memory. Prospective-memory deficits have been shown to occur in populations with attentional (e.g., ADHD) and cognitive (e.g., depression) deficits but also in normal populations, especially older adults. Therefore, a better understanding of variations in prospective memory across different populations is warranted. To differentiate between normal and non-normal variations, it is important to compare individual ability scores with norms derived from a representative sample. None of the existing prospective-memory questionnaires provides such norms for a German-speaking population. Furthermore, existing questionnaires often contain too many items for an efficient assessment in non-scientific (i.e., clinical) environments.

Therefore, the aim of the present study was to develop and test a short version of the Metacognitive Prospective Memory Battery (MPMB; Rummel & Kuhlmann, in preparation). Specifically, we aim to replicate the factor structure from the long version, develop age-specific norms for a German population, and investigate the test-retest reliability of the

MPMBs. Additionally, the structure of the GESIS Panel allows us investigating age-related prospective-memory declines as well as the use of internal and external memory-aid strategies in a representative sample.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Prospective memory capacity: Comprises eight items concerning prospective memory fulfilment and failures in every-day situations.	<p><i>Ich vergesse Verträge, wie etwa ein Probe-Zeitungsabonnement, fristgerecht zu kündigen.</i></p> <p>[I forget to cancel contracts on time, like trial subscriptions for newspapers.]</p> <p><i>Ich denke daran, Erledigungen zu machen, die in einem bestimmten Zeitfenster ausgeführt werden müssen, z.B. die Wäsche vor Ladenschluss aus der Reinigung zu holen.</i></p> <p>[I remember to run errands that need to be completed within a specific timeframe, like picking up my laundry from the dry cleaner before it closes.]</p> <p><i>Wenn ich von jemandem etwas länger ausgeliehen habe, denke ich bei der nächsten Verabredung daran, es ihm zurück zu geben.</i></p> <p>[If I borrow money from someone, I remember to pay that person back on my own.]</p> <p><i>Ich vergesse einen Freund erneut anzurufen, nachdem ich ihn beim ersten Versuch nicht erreicht habe.</i></p> <p>[I forget to call a friend again after having not reached him at first try]</p> <p><i>Ich bekomme Mahnungen, weil ich vergesse, offene Rechnungen zu begleichen.</i></p> <p>[I receive overdue notifications because I forget to pay bills on time.]</p> <p><i>Es gelingt mir, von alleine an unerledigte Anrufe zu denken, z.B. wenn ich einen Bekannten anrufen möchte, der heute Geburtstag hat.</i></p> <p>[I am able to remind myself of phone calls I need to make, such as calling a friend on their</p>	bc, bf

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	<p>birthday.]</p> <p><i>Mir fallen Termine, die ich in den nächsten Tagen wahrnehmen muss, rechtzeitig ein, auch wenn ich sie mir nirgends notiert habe.</i></p> <p>[I remember my appointments which are coming up in a few days without writing them down.]</p> <p><i>Ich versäume es, anfallende Briefe oder E-Mails rechtzeitig abzuschicken, obwohl ich es mir notiert habe.</i></p> <p>[I forget to send letters or Emails, even when I wrote myself a reminder.]</p>	
<p>Prospective memory strategies: Comprises sixteen items concerning different strategies people may use to better remember intentions in daily life.</p>	<p><i>Bestimmte Sachen (z.B. meinen Hausschlüssel) lege ich immer an den gleichen Ort, um sie nicht zu vergessen.</i></p> <p>[I put certain things (e.g., my keys) always at the same place, to not forget them.]</p> <p><i>Ich schreibe mir einen Merktettel mit Dingen, die ich noch zu tun habe.</i></p> <p>[I write myself a to-do list to remind me of things that I still need to accomplish.]</p> <p><i>Ich versuche, mir unerledigte Dinge immer wieder bewusst in Erinnerung zu bringen, damit ich sie nicht vergesse, auch wenn ich gerade etwas ganz anderes mache.</i></p> <p>[Even when I'm busy doing other things, I deliberately try to keep unfinished tasks in mind so that I don't forget them.]</p> <p><i>Ich versuche Dinge, die ich regelmäßig tun muss, immer zur selben Zeit zu tun (z.B. ein Medikament abends immer direkt vor dem Zähneputzen einzunehmen).</i></p> <p>[For things that I need to do on a regular basis, I plan to do them at the same time each day (for example, always taking my medication in the evening before brushing my teeth).]</p>	<p>bc, bf</p>

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	<p><i>Morgens gehe ich meinen Tagesablauf im Kopf durch, damit ich nicht vergesse, etwas zu erledigen.</i></p> <p>[In the morning, I go through the day's tasks in my head so that I don't forget to remember something.]</p> <p><i>Ich schreibe mir Einkaufszettel.</i></p> <p>[I write shopping lists.]</p> <p><i>Wenn ich mehrere Dinge in einer bestimmten Reihenfolge erledigen muss (z.B. beim Backen), stelle ich mir den Ablauf bildlich vor.</i></p> <p>[When I have to complete steps in a specific order, such as when I am baking, I visualize the sequence of steps before starting.]</p> <p><i>Wenn ich mit etwas fertig bin, überprüfe ich noch einmal, ob ich alles erledigt habe (wie die Herdplatte auszuschalten nach dem Kochen).</i></p> <p>[After completing a task, I check once again whether I took care of everything, like turning off the stove after cooking.]</p>	

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12045](https://www.gesis.org/en/data-portal/10.4232/1.12045)

References

Rummel J. & Kuhlmann B. G. (in preparation). *The Metacognitive Prospective Memory Battery (MPMB): Factor structure, reliability, and validity.*

an: Leisure travel and subjective well-being

Study Code

an

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; August 06, 2014

Study title

Leisure travel and subjective well-being

Subject classification

Leisure travel, tourism, subjective-well being

Keywords

Leisure, travel, subjective well-being, quality of life, travel satisfaction

Data collection waves

bc, bd, be

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Angela Tanner GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=P7AD_YEAAAAJ

Abstract

The study is aimed at investigating vacation effects on respondents' levels of subjective well-being. Three data collection waves were used to capture pre-visit constructs (antecedents) and their impact on well-being during summer/fall 2014. It was expected that a vacation affects respondents' levels of pre-visit subjective well-being in terms of anticipation, and their post-visit levels of subjective well-being in terms of a vacation effect (Nawijn, 2012). Properties of an expected vacation fade-out effect are addressed via repeated measures of subjective well-being in regular time intervals within the GESIS Panel waves.

Another aim of this study is to explore the relationship between the above mentioned constructs, travel motivations, and holiday related pre-visit and post-visit activities. Additionally, the characteristics of a travel trip will be evaluated in order to explore the impact of the vacation length and the chosen destination. Also, the duration between holiday trips will be considered as a moderator.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Well-being	Present happiness (OECD, 2013, p. 166)	bc, bd, be
	Present life satisfaction (OECD, 2013, p. 166)	bc, bd, be
Current holiday status at time of participation	Current status (holiday/no holiday)	bc, bd, be
	Reason for not travelling if not on holiday	bd
Time and duration of previous holiday	Time and duration of previous holiday	bc
Upcoming holiday characteristics	Categorization as vacationer or non-vacationer	bc, bd
	Duration of holiday trip	
	Timing of holiday trip	
	Planning of holiday trip	
	Destination of holiday trip	
	Reason for destination choice	
Pre-visit pleasant anticipation	Degree of pleasant holiday anticipation	bc, bd
Pre-visit activities	Planning of holiday trip	bc, bd
	Preparation for holiday trip	
Travel motivations	Motivations for holiday trip (Pearce & Lee, 2005)	bc, bd
	Fulfillment of travel motivations	bd, be
Post-visit satisfaction	Satisfaction with holiday trip (Meng, Tepanon, & Uysal, 2008)	bd, be
Post-visit experience sharing	Sharing holiday experiences (Munar & Jacobsen, 2014)	bd

Cross-references

This study makes also use of the GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Subjective Well-Being (DBK entry: [10.4232/1.11947](#)).

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12045](#)

References

- Meng, F., Tepanon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2008). Measuring tourist satisfaction by attribute and motivation: The case of a nature-based resort. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14(1), 41-56. doi: 10.1177/1356766707084218
- Munar, A. M., & Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2014). Motivations for Sharing Tourism Experiences through Social Media. *Tourism Management*, 43, 46-54. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2014.01.012
- Nawijn, J. (2012). Leisure Travel and Happiness: An Empirical Study into the Effect of Holiday Trips on Individuals' Subjective Wellbeing. Retrieved from <http://repub.eur.nl/pub/32471>
- OECD. (2013). *OECD Guidelines on Measuring Subjective Well-being*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Pearce, P. L., & Lee, U.-I. (2005). Developing the Travel Career Approach to Tourist Motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 226-237. doi: 10.1177/0047287504272020

ao: Social and individual predictors of Doing Beauty

Study Code

ao

Version and date of last revision

Version 1, September 1, 2014

Study title

Social and individual predictors of Doing Beauty

Subject classification

Doing Beauty (Schönheitshandeln); plastic surgery; physical attractiveness

Keywords

Doing Beauty, dieting, plastic surgery, shaving, piercings, tattoos, attractiveness

Data collection waves

bd

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Ulrich Rosar Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf	https://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/soz-rosar/curriculum-vitae/
Johannes Krause Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf	https://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/soz-rosar/mitarbeiterinnen/homepage-johannes-krause/

Abstract

Everybody is *Doing Beauty* (which refers to the German term *Schönheitshandeln*). Some of these beauty-related actions are part of the daily routine and carried out in an unconscious way, while others are results of a rational process. However, they have one thing in common: *Doing Beauty* means both portraying yourself and securing one's identity (Degele 2004). *Doing Beauty* varies along the dimensions of social structure, in terms of gender as well as in terms of age or class (Penz 2010). Furthermore it is influenced by the personal values of the individual.

At the centre of this study are several indicators which will be used to generate an index of *Doing Beauty*. This index will measure the degree of *Doing Beauty* in terms of different forms of beauty-related actions, like shaving of body regions, piercings or cosmetic surgery. The degree of *Doing Beauty* is expected to differ along the lines of age, gender, class and personal values (measured by the *Schwartz Values*) (Bardi/Schwartz 2003). To sum up the Research goals of this study are twofold. First of all it will give further understanding of the ways in which *Doing Beauty* differs along the lines of sociality and secondly it may give answers to questions of the underlying values of *Doing Beauty*.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Doing Beauty (Krause 2014)	Body care products Brushing teeth Dental flossing Sport Solarium Hair dyeing Dieting Shaving of body regions Number of piercings/tattoos Cosmetic surgery	bd
Physical Attractiveness (Dunkake et al. 2012; Rosar/Klein 2009; Rosar 2009)	Physical attractiveness Body weight Body height	bd
Relevance of physical appearance (Didie/Sarwer 2003; Cash et al. 2003)	Importance of fashionable clothes Thinking about cosmetic surgery Probability of cosmetic surgery in the future Appearance Schemas Inventory (shortened version)	bd
Values (Schwartz/Bilsky 1987; Schwartz/Bilsky 1990; Schwartz 1992, 1994; Schwartz et al. 2012)	Schwartz-Values (part of the GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study „Personality and Personal Values“, study code: ze)	bd

Cross-references

This study makes also use of the GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Personality and Personal Values (DBK entry: [10.4232/1.12115](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12115)).

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12115](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12115)

References

Bardi, Anat; Schwartz, Shalom H. (2003): Values and Behavior: Strength and Structure of Relations. In: pers soc psychol bull 29 (10), S. 1207–1220.

- Cash, Thomas; Melnyk, Susan; Hrabosky, Joshua (2003): The Assessment of Body Image Investment: An Extensive Revision of the Appearance Schemas Inventory. In: *International Journal of Eating Disorders* 35, S. 305–316.
- Degele, Nina (2004): *Sich schön machen. Zur Soziologie von Geschlecht und Schönheitshandeln*. 1. Aufl. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Didie, Elizabeth; Sarwer, David (2003): Factors That Influence the Decision to Undergo Cosmetic Breast Augmentation Surgery. In: *Journal of Women's Health* 12 (3), S. 241–253.
- Dunkake, Imke; Kiechle, Thomas; Klein, Markus; Rosar, Ulrich (2012): Schöne Schüler, schöne Noten? Eine empirische Untersuchung zum Einfluss der physischen Attraktivität von Schülern auf die Notenvergabe durch das Lehrpersonal. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 41 (2), S. 142–161.
- Krause, Johannes (2014): Schönheitssoziologie - ein Überblick. In: *Analyse & Kritik* 36 (1), S. 153–175.
- Penz, Otto (2010): *Schönheit als Praxis. Über klassen- und geschlechtsspezifische Körperlichkeit*. 1. Aufl. Frankfurt am Main: New York: Campus.
- Rosar, Ulrich (2009): Fabulous Front-Runners. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Bedeutung der physischen Attraktivität von Spitzenkandidaten für den Wahlerfolg ihrer Parteien. In: *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 50 (4), S. 754–773.
- Rosar, Ulrich; Klein, Markus (2009): Mein(schöner)Prof.de. Die physische Attraktivität des akademischen Lehrpersonals und ihr Einfluss auf die Ergebnisse studentischer Lehrevaluationen. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 61 (4), S. 621–645.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992): Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries 25, S. 1–65.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1994): Are There Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values? In: *Journal of Social Issues* 50 (4), S. 19–45.
- Schwartz, Shalom H.; Bilsky, Wolfgang (1987): Toward A Universal Psychological Structure of Human Values. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 53 (3), S. 550–562.
- Schwartz, Shalom H.; Bilsky, Wolfgang (1990): Toward a Theory of the Universal Content and Structure of Values: Extensions an Cross-Cultural Replications. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 58 (5), S. 878–891.
- Schwartz, Shalom H.; Cieciuch, Jan; Vecchione, Michele; Davidov, Eldad; Fischer, Ronald; Beierlein, Constanze et al. (2012): Refining the theory of basic individual values. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 103 (4), S. 663–688.

ap: Citizens Conception of Democracy and their Political Participation

Study Code

ap

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; 17 October, 2014

Study title

Citizens' Conception of Democracy and their Political Participation in Germany

Subject classification

Mass political behavior, attitudes/opinion

Keywords

Conceptions of democracy, direct democracy, political participation, policy decisions, citizen involvement

Data collection waves

bd

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission

Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)

Brigitte Geissel
Department of Political Science, Goethe University Frankfurt

Sergiu Gherghina
Department of Political Science, Goethe University Frankfurt

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-6627-5598
<http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=7m3uYREAAA&hl=en&oi=ao>

Abstract

This study module is a one-way study within the GESIS Panel. Its idea is based on the documented disaffection of citizens with representative democracy. Earlier research showed how the existence of several important problems in the process of political representation led to a gradual abandon of the traditional modes of political involvement. So far, little attention has been paid to the connection between citizens' attitudes towards representative democracy, preferences for democratic alternatives and desire to get involved in new democratic procedures.

This study aims to investigate whether and how the critical attitudes of German citizens towards the functioning of representative democracies are reflected in their preferences for another type of democracy and in their subsequent involvement in politics and decision-making. It seeks to answer two interconnected research questions: 1) How do attitudes towards representative democracy influence (alternative) conceptions of democracy? and 2) How do these conceptions influence individual political participation?

To answer the first question we examine the linkage between degree and forms of discontent with representative democracy and the preference for four conceptions of democracy (representative, expert, direct, and participatory). Thus, we seek to understand whether people unhappy with the current system of government prefer other democratic alternatives and what their choices are. The study includes questions on the following concepts:

- Preferred form of democracy
- Politicians pursuit of the public interest
- Support for representative political institutions
- Perspectives over decision-making
- Conceptions of democracy

To answer the second question we focus on the effects produced by the preferences for conceptions of democracy on types of political participation (voting, use of referenda, deliberations etc.). In other words, we seek to explain if people who, for example, prefer direct democracy over other conceptions of democracy are consistently willing to get involved in referenda. The study includes questions on the following concepts:

- Retrospective political participation (including citizen involvement)
- Prospective political participation (including citizen involvement)

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Attitudes towards representative democracy	Attitudes towards the political system: representative democracy elected politicians representative institutions Possibilities of decision making in a representative democracy	bd
Conception of democracy	Importance of discussions and debates in decision-making processes Who should make the important policy decisions	bd
Political participation	Retrospective political participation Prospective political participation	bd

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12115](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12115)

References

Bengtsson, Åsa (2012) 'Citizens' perceptions of political processes. A Critical evaluation of preference consistency and survey items', *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 70(2): 45–64.

- Dalton Russell J. / Wattenberg, Michael (eds.) (2000) *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esaiasson, Peter / Gilljam, Mikael / Persson, Mikael (2012), 'Which decision-making arrangements generate the strongest legitimacy beliefs? Evidence from a randomized field experiment', *European Journal of Political Research* 51(6): 785-808.
- Fiorina, Morris P. (1981) *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Font, Joan / Alarcón, Pau (2011) 'The role of personality in the explanation of preferences for democratic processes', Paper presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Istanbul.
- Geissel, Brigitte/ Newton, Ken (2012) *Evaluating Democratic Innovations - Curing the Democratic Malaise?* London: Routledge.
- Heider, Fritz (1958) *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hibbing, John R. / Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth (2001) 'Process Preferences and American Politics: What the People Want Government to Be", *The American Political Science Review* 95(1): 145-153.
- Norris, Pippa (2011) *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zittel, Tomas / Fuchs, Dieter (eds.) (2007) *Participatory Democracy and Political Participation*. London: Routledge.

aq: Pro-environmental Behavior in High Cost Situations

Study Code

aq

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; August 7, 2014

Study title

Pro-environmental Behavior in High Cost Situations

Subject classification

Environmental behavior

Keywords

Decision theory, environmental concerns, rational choice

Data collection waves

be,

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Guido Mehlkop Universität Erfurt	https://www.uni-erfurt.de/esf/team/prof-dr-guido-mehlkop/
Robert Neumann Technische Universität Dresden	http://tu-dresden.de/die_tu_dresden/fakultaeten/philosophische_fakultaet/is/methoden/prof/mitarbeit/rn/index2_html

Abstract

Empirical studies reveal that pro-environmental concerns do not necessarily lead to pro-environmental action (among others Best 2009; Billig 1995; Huber 2001; Lappe et al 2000; Kuckartz and Rheingans-Heintze 2006; Seel 1995). Therefore, Diekmann and Preisendörfer (2001: 74) suggest to analyze pro-environmental behavior not only as a result of concerns, but also as a rational choice (see also Liebe and Preisendörfer 2011). Actors deliberate on the individual costs of pro-environmental behavior and for a quite large proportion of the population costs seem to be more important than concerns (Kuckartz and Rheingans-Heintze 2006). Diekmann and Preisendörfer (2009) conclude that in low-cost situations (for example separation of waste) acting according to one's pro-environmental concerns is likely while in high-cost situations (for example forgoing private cars in rural areas) it is far less likely. According to this so called „Low-Cost-Hypothesis“ on the one hand pro-environmental concerns only matter in situation where pro-environmental behavior is perceived as low-priced by the actors, pointing to additive effects of instrumental incentives (e.g. low costs) and concerns or a positive interaction between them (Best and Kroneberg 2012). On the other hand, dual process theories claim a negative interaction between pro-environmental concerns

and constraints, i.e. actors with strong concerns behave in an automatic-spontaneous way by neglecting the costs. Our study will operationalize both approaches to assess which one performs better in an empirical test. Furthermore we model the perceived definition of the situation (high vs. low-cost), check for framing effects regarding monetary gains or losses and test for private benefits of pro-environmental behavior. The study will focus on the decision to purchase food produced by regional farmers at a farmers market („Wochenmarkt“). This social situation has the characteristics to be described as a high cost situation because of limited opening hours (compared to conventional super-markets), unequal spatial distribution of the Wochenmärkte; higher prices for local organic food, and several existing inconveniences (small number of parking lots, vulnerability to weather). Additionally, we will use choice experiments regarding monetary investments in „green energy“ and „green stock market funds“ vs. conventional investments to control for the influence of environmental concern on behavior where the monetary consequences of the choices are framed differently as gains or expenditures.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Environmental behavior	Retrospective: Purchases at „Wochenmärkte“	be
	Retrospective: Purchases from local farmer at „Wochenmärkte“	be
	Retrospective: Purchases of organic food at „Wochenmärkte“	be
	Likelihood: Purchases at „Wochenmärkte“	be
	Choice Situation: Eco-Investment	be
	Likelihood of buying organic food at supermarket	be
Costs	Groceries at weekly markets are expensive	be
	Range of food products at weekly markets is limited	be
	Weekly markets are hard to reach	be
	Organic food is expensive	be
Benefits	Products have high quality	be
	Friends think it's positive: to buy at Wochenmärkte	be

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Friends think it's positive: to invest in env. be sustainable corporations	
	Friends think it's positive: to use only clean energy	
	Positive emotions when buying organic food.	be
	Buying organic food is positive for environment	be

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12161](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12161)

References

- Best, H. (2009). Kommt erst das Fressen und dann die Moral? Eine feldexperimentelle Überprüfung der Low-Cost Hypothese und des Modells der Frame-Selektion. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 38 (2), 131-151.
- Best, H. & Kroneberg, C. (2012). Die Low-Cost-Hypothese: theoretische Grundlagen und empirische Implikationen. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 64 (3) , 535-561.
- Billig, A. (1995). Umweltbewusstsein und Wertorientierung. In G. de Haan (Hrsg.), *Umweltbewusstsein und Massenmedien. Perspektiven ökologischer Kommunikation*. (S. 87-101). Berlin: Akad.
- Diekmann, A. & Preisendörfer, P. (1998). Umweltbewusstsein und Umweltverhalten in Low- und High-Cost Situationen: Eine empirische Überprüfung der Low-Cost-Hypothese. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 27 (6), 438-453.
- Diekmann, A & Preisendörfer, P. (2001). *Umweltsoziologie. Eine Einführung*. Reinbek: Rowohlt.
- Diekmann, A. & Preisendörfer, P. (2009). Das Feldexperiment von Best und die Low-Cost-Hypothese. Eine Erwiderung. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 38, 535–539.
- Kuckartz, U. & Rheingans-Heintze, A. (2006). *Trends im Umweltbewusstsein: Umweltgerechtigkeit, Lebensqualität und persönliches Engagement*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Lappe, L., Tully, C. J. & Wahler, P. (2000). *Berufliche Erfahrungen und die Entstehung von Umweltbewußtsein bei Jugendlichen*. München: DJI Verlag.
- Liebe, U. & Preisendörfer, P. (2011). Umweltsoziologie und Rational-Choice-Theorie. In M. Groß (Hrsg.), *Handbuch Umweltsoziologie* (S. 221-239). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

ar: Policy preferences for inheritance taxes and motives of intergenerational transfers

Study Code

ar

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; January 15, 2015

Study title

Policy preferences for inheritance taxes and motives of intergenerational transfers within families.

Subject classification

Income, property and investment/saving, policy preferences, fairness

Keywords

Intergenerational transfers, family, inheritance tax, fairness, wealth distribution, inequality

Data collection waves

bf

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Prof. Dr. Ivo Bischoff	http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ivo_Bischoff
Nataliya Kusa	http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nataliya_Kusa

Abstract

We propose two waves of questions on intergenerational transfers within the family. They include two vignettes designed to elicit their view on the motives behind intergenerational transfers: Is the relationship between generations viewed as a reciprocal relationship or one driven by empathy and altruism? There are different views on the primary motives that motivate intergenerational transfers (hereafter IGT). Some scholars argue that transfers from the older to the younger generation are motivated by the wish to support their offspring (altruistic motives, e.g., Barro, 1974; Coall and Hertwig, 2010). Others argue that IGT have to be interpreted in a model of exchange between generations (direct reciprocity). Accordingly, monetary support from the older to the younger generation is given in exchange for long-term care, attention and access to the grand-children (e.g., Bernheim et al., 1985; Guerts et al. 2012). A third strand of literature points at social norms fostering indirect reciprocity. Here, a certain generation of old people transfers monetary resources and time to the younger generation because they have received the same form support when they were young.

Similarly, the young provide the old with attention and long-term care because they observed their parents do the same when they were young (e.g., Arrondel and Masson, 2001).

While there is empirical support for all three motives, there is little systematic evidence on the proliferation of these motives in society (e.g., Kopczuk and Lupton, 2007, Alessie et al., 2014). We currently see a number of important political debates that require profound knowledge about the motives behind intergenerational transfers (e.g., Brandt and Deindl, 2013). The future of long-term care and the role of caring relatives is the obvious example for such a debate.

Beyond providing evidence on the proliferation of the ITG-related motives, we want to learn more about the factors that explain interpersonal differences in subjects' views on intergenerational transfers. We expect differences between subjects depending on their income, cultural background etc.

Some questions focus specifically on bequests and the inheritance tax. While the public generally accepts substantial taxes on income, the acceptance even for a very moderate taxation of bequest and gifts is low. The last decade has seen a reduction in the effective taxes on bequests and gifts many western countries (e.g. Conway and Rork, 2004, Berttochi, 2010). Given the amount of wealth to be transferred in the next decade and the financial restrictions of the public sector in many countries, it is puzzling to see that democratic societies leave this tax base largely untouched (e.g., Dowding, 2008; Prabhakar, 2008; Beckert, 2013). We are convinced that the solution to this puzzle requires a more profound understanding of intergenerational transfers and the motives behind them.

We want to learn more about the factors that make some subjects accept the inheritance tax as legitimate and others oppose it as illegitimate. Different views on the nature of intergenerational transfers are expected to be an important factor in this respect. The rich data set provided by the GESIS-survey helps to control for and test a number of additional hypotheses (e.g. the role of self-interest or general political attitudes, differences between men and women). The results inform the scientific community as well as policy-makers deciding about policies that interfere with intra-family relations within the family. The data generated by our questions is likely to be valuable for a number of additional research questions.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Policy Preferences: Inheritance Tax general	Postbank Erbschaftsstudie 2011	bf
Policy Preferences: Inheritance Tax allowances for beneficiaries providing long-term care	Own question	bf
Belief: Financial Independence of the old	Own question	bf
Belief: Ricardian equivalence	Own question	bf

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Belief: Minor impact of inheritance on life of heirs	Own question	bf
View on norm: Indirect reciprocity	Own question	bf
Belief: State intervenes in childcare	Own question	bf
Belief: regarding dominant reasons for inter-vivo transfers	Own question	bf
Belief: Concentration of inheritances	Own question	bf
Knowledge about inheritance tax	Own question	bf
Knowledge about inheritance tax 2	Own question	bf
Solidarity within own family	Own question	bf
Generations in own household	Own question	bf
Distance to parents	Own question	bf

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12204](https://www.gesis.org/en/data-portal/10.4232/1.12204)

References

Erben und vererben. Postbank Erbschaftsstudie 2011, <http://www.ifd-allensbach.de>

Alessie, R., Angelini, V. and Pasini, G. (2014). Is it True Love? Altruism versus Exchange in Time and Money Transfers. *De Economist* 162:193-213.

Arrondel, L. and Masson, A. (2001). Family transfers involving three generations. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 103(3): 415-443.

Barro, R. J. (1974). Are government bonds net wealth? *Journal of Political Economy* 82: 1095-1117.

Beckert, J. (2013). Are we still modern? Inheritance law and the broken promise of the enlightenment. MPIfG Working Paper 10/7. Cologne: Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung.

Bernheim, B.D, Schleifer, A. and Summers, L.H. (1985). The strategic bequest motive. *Journal of political economy* 93(6): 1045-1076

- Berttochi, G. (2010). The vanishing bequest tax. The comparative evolution of bequest taxation in historical perspective. IZA Working Paper 2578, revised version.
- Brandt, M. and Deindl, C. (2013). Intergenerational Transfers to Adult Children in Europe: Do Social Policies Matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75(1): 235-251.
- Coall, D. A. and Hertwig, R. (2010). Grandparental investment: Past, present, and future. *Behavioral and Brain Science* 33(1): 1-19.
- Conway, K.S. and Rork, J.C. (2004). Diagnosis Murder: The Death of State Death Taxes. *Economic Inquiry* 42 (4): 537-559.
- Dowding, K. (2008). Why are inheritance taxes unpopular? *Political Quarterly* 79(2): 179-183.
- Geurts, T., Poorman, A.-R. and T. D. Tilburg (2012). Older Parents Providing Child Care for Adult Children: Does It Pay Off? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74(2): 239-250.
- Kopczuk, W. and Lupton, J.P. (2007). To Leave or Not to Leave: The Distribution of Bequest Motives. *Review of Economic Studies* 74: 207-235.
- Prabhakar, R. (2008). Wealth taxes: Stories, metaphors and public attitudes. *Political Quarterly* 79(2): 172-178.

za: GESIS Panel Core Study – Survey Administration Variables

Study Code

za

Version and date of last revision

Version 1.0; September 09, 2015

Study title

GESIS Panel – Administration

Subject classification

Administrative data

Keywords

Administrative; Mode; Disposition Code;

Data collection waves

ba, bb, bc, bd, be, bf

Abstract

Regular waves of the GESIS Panel

The study on Survey Administration Variables comprises all administrative information that is required for fielding and analyzing the surveys of the GESIS Panel. The study is fielded each wave and does therefore allow monitoring longitudinal developments.

Since the GESIS Panel is a mixed-mode panel survey, both mode variables (i.e., invitation and participation) refer to the mode of the panelists for the current wave: online (i.e., web-based) or offline (i.e., paper questionnaire).

For administrative purpose we offer a simple dichotomously measured participation variable that reflects whether a panelist has filled in any item of the questionnaire or not. A more sophisticated measure for final disposition codes is given by the AAPOR wave code. The AAPOR wave code allows for calculating comprehensive outcome rates following the Standard Definitions of the AAPOR (2011).

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Mode	Mode of invitation	aa-
	Mode of participation	aa-
Participation	Participation, dichotomous	aa-
	AAPOR wave code	aa-

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Fielding	Date of field start	aa-
	Date of field end	aa-

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.11878](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:5-104232-1.11878)

References

AAPOR (2011). Standard Definitions. Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys.

Comments

Recruitment phase

Administrative variables are also collected for the recruitment surveys of the GESIS Panel (i.e., for face-to-face recruitment interviews as well as the profile surveys). Since the recruitment surveys differ in their naming convention (see the description in the GESIS Panel codebook), administrative variables are pooled under the term „construct a“ instead of study za.

Data Collection waves: a11, a12

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Bestätigung Übergabe Datenschutzblatt	a11
	Modus im Sinne der Studie	a11
	Panelbereitschaft, final	a11
	Einladungsmodus für Willkommensbefragung a12, final	a11
	Mode of invitation	a12-bf
	Mode of participation	a12-bf
	Participation, dichotomous	a12-bf
	Mode of invitation at first wave	a12
	Initial panel mode	a12
	Date of field start	a12-bf
	Date of field end	a12-bf
	AAPOR wave code	a12-bf

zb: GESIS Panel Core Study – Subjective Well-Being

Study Code

zb

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; February 12, 2014

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Subjective Well-Being

Subject classification

Psychology; Social Conditions and Indicators

Keywords

Subjective well-being, life-evaluation, time-dependent affect, quality-of-life

Data collection waves

ba

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
M. Joseph Sirgy Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University (Virginia Tech)	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=cMvRMtIAAAAJ http://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.url?authoid=55664093000
Carina Cornesse GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=WD29nLIAAAAJ
Michael Bosnjak Free University of Bozen-Bolzano and GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1431-8461 http://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.url?authoid=6701915757 http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael_Bosnjak/ http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=LgTlgPwAAAAJ

Abstract

This study is part of the GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study series. One aim of the GESIS Longitudinal Core Studies is to measure frequently demanded characteristics of enduring interest to the social sciences. Another aim is to assess indicators and proxy variables of data quality, facilitating estimation of potential survey errors and biases. Each GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study module is fielded once per year and does therefore allow monitoring longitudinal developments.

This study module belongs to the first category (frequently demanded characteristics of enduring interest) and relies on two facets of subjective well-being in line with OECD (2013) guidelines. Subjective well-being is broadly defined as follows: „Good mental states, including all of the various evaluations, positive and negative, that people make of their lives and the affective reactions of people to their experiences.“ (OECD, 2013, p. 10). According to OECD (2013) standards, subjective well-being encompasses three main elements: (1) A reflective assessment on a person’s life or some specific aspect of it (life-evaluation), (2) a person’s feelings or emotional states, typically measured with reference to a particular point in time (time-dependent affect), and (3) a sense of meaning and purpose in life, or good psychological functioning (Eudaimonia). Unfortunately, by early 2014, when this module was finalized, there is no consensus on how to measure Eudaimonia. Because the „level of potential relevance is not matched by an equally good understanding of what eudaimonic well-being actually ‘is’, and more specifically, how it should be measured“ (OECD, 2013, p. 168), eudaimonistic measures are not included in the GESIS Longitudinal Core Study.

The GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study on Subjective Well-Being focuses on the first two elements of subjective well-being (evaluation and affect) as follows:

- Life-evaluation measures:
 - Overall happiness (related to the past, the present, and the future)
 - Overall life-satisfaction (related to the past, the present, and the future)
 - Importance of and satisfaction with the following life domains: own family, work, leisure, friends, neighbors, and own financial situation.
 - Relative standards when evaluating one’s own subjective well-being in two selected life domains (family, financial situation)
- Time dependent affect measures:
 - Eight different affective states experienced during the last seven days (depressed, exhausted, restless sleep, happy, lonely, enjoyed life, sadness, couldn’t get going).

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Global measures of subjective well-being: Overall happiness (OECD, 2013, p. 166)	Global happiness(past)	ba
	Global happiness(present)	ba
	Global happiness(future)	ba
Global measures of subjective well-being: Overall life satisfaction (OECD, 2013, 166 f.)	Life satisfaction (past)	ba
	Life satisfaction (present)	ba
	Life satisfaction (future)	ba
Life-domain specific measures of subjective well-being: Life-domain importance	Importance: own family	ba
	Importance: work	ba

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
(OECD, 2013, 168 f.)	Importance: leisure	ba
	Importance: friends	ba
	Importance: neighbors	ba
	Importance: financial situation	ba
Life-domain specific measures of subjective well-being: Life-domain satisfaction (OECD, 2013, 168 f.)	Satisfaction: own family	ba
	Satisfaction: work	ba
	Satisfaction: leisure	ba
	Satisfaction: friends	ba
	Satisfaction: neighbors	ba
Affective measures of subjective well-being (OECD, 2013, 167 f.)	During last 7 days: felt depressed	ba
	During last 7 days: felt exhausted	ba
	During last 7 days: had restless sleep	ba
	During last 7 days: felt happy	ba
	During last 7 days: felt lonely	ba
	During last 7 days: enjoyed life	ba
	During last 7 days: felt sad	ba
Relative standards measures of subjective well-being for selected life-domains: Comparison with others in domain: Family (Diener & Lucas, 2000, p. 47)	Relevant other: family	ba
	Relevant other: family: importance	ba
	Relevant other: family: satisfaction	ba
Relative standards measures of subjective well-being for selected life-domains: Comparison with others in domain: Finance (Diener & Lucas, 2000, p. 47)	Relevant other: finance	ba
	Relevant other: finance: importance	ba
	Relevant other: finance: satisfaction	ba

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.11947](https://www.gesis.org/en/data-portal/10.4232/1.11947)

References

- OECD (2013). OECD Guidelines on Measuring Subjective Well-Being. Paris: OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/9789264191655
- Diener, E., & Lucas, R. E. (2000). Explaining Differences in Societal Levels of Happiness: Relative Standards, Need Fulfillment, Culture, and Evaluation Theory. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1, 41–78. doi: 10.1023/A:1010076127199
- Huppert, F.A., Marks, N., Clark, A., Siegrist, J., Stutzer, A., Vittersø, J., & Wahrendorf, M. (2009). Measuring Well-Being Across Europe: Description of the ESS Well-Being Module and Preliminary Findings. *Social Indicators Research*, 91, 301-315. doi: 10.1007/s11205-008-9346-0

zc: GESIS Panel Core Study – Social and Political Participation

Study Code

zc

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; June 17, 2014

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Social and Political Participation

Subject classification

Politics; elections; government, political system and organisations; political ideology, mass political behaviour, attitudes/opinion; social behaviour and attitudes

Keywords

Will be assigned according to archive standards.

Data collection waves

bb

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Dr. Gema M. García Albacete Department of Political Science and International Relations University Autònoma of Madrid	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Gema_Albacete
Prof. Dr. Jan W. van Deth Chair of Political Science and International Comparative Social Research University of Mannheim	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jan_W_van_Deth
Tanja Dannwolf GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tanja_Dannwolf

Abstract

This module measures citizens' active engagement in and attitudes towards social and political phenomena. The first component of the module refers to political participation, understood as voluntary activities by citizens aiming at influencing political and societal outcomes (van Deth 2001, 2010, p. 149). The measure used follows the ESF network 'Citizenship, involvement and Democracy' instrument (later integrated in the ESS and the US-CID project) in providing a list of pre-specified activities that might be used for the purpose of improving societal conditions or prevent them from getting worse (contacting a politician, working in a political party, boycotting or boycotting products, participating in a demonstration, signing petitions, etc.)

(see van Deth, Montero and Westholm 2007, p. 7). In addition, as part of citizens' engagement, social participation measures their involvement in voluntary associations. Due to the increasing relevance of social movements, which often imply less rigid ties to organizations, participants are asked about their collaboration – and not just membership – with broad categories of voluntary associations. Moreover, the module includes direct questions about informal contacts with friends or neighbours. Electoral behaviour and media attention are also included as part citizens' political behaviour. The design of the module is aimed at capturing citizens' broad repertoire of political actions and social activities. For this reason, standard political actions (included in international surveys such as the European Social Survey) are complemented with questions on the use of internet to search for information on societal and political issues, as well as the use of online tools for political action. Furthermore, to exploit the opportunities offered by the GESIS Online Panel, the module is designed to capture change over time. Thus main questions on political behaviour are framed within a temporal limit of twelve months.

To comprehend citizens' involvement, the second component of the module refers to basic political orientations and main determinants of political behaviour. The module includes standard questions on interest in politics, saliency of politics, political efficacy, norms of citizenship, political confidence, social trust, satisfaction with democracy and party identification. Political interest refers to the degree to which politics arouses a citizen's curiosity (van Deth, 1990, p. 278). Saliency of politics provides an evaluation of the relevance of politics for citizens in comparison to other main areas such as their work, their family or religious beliefs. Political efficacy refers to the feeling that an individual can have an impact on the political process (Campbell et al. [1960]1980, p. 517; Milbrath 1965, p. 58) and can be separated into two dimensions: internal and external. Internal efficacy refers to the feeling that one can influence the political process, whereas external political efficacy refers to the belief that the political system will be responsive to citizens' demands (Lane, 1959, p. 149). The module also measures the cultural aspects of social capital, which are usually divided between trust, on the one hand, and civic norms and values on the other hand (van Deth, 2003, p. 82). Political confidence refers to the confidence citizens' place in institutions such as the parliament, the government, the media, etc. Meanwhile, social trust refers to confidence in fellow citizens. The last measure of cultural social capital, norms of citizenship, explores citizens' conception of the characteristics of a good citizen. Satisfaction with democracy asks participants to evaluate the functioning of democracy in Germany. Finally, party identification explores participants feeling of closeness to a specific political party.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
<i>Interest in politics</i>	Strength interest in politics	bb
<i>Political participation</i> (last 12 months)	Contacted a politician	bb
	Worked in a political party	bb
	Signed a petition	bb

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Participated in a demonstration	bb
	Boycotted or bought specific products	bb
	Collaborated in a citizens' initiative	bb
	Discussed politics with friends or	bb
	Sent a letter on a social or political issue to a magazine or newspaper	bb
	Other actions	bb
<i>Electoral participation</i>	Past participation (local, regional, national, European elections)	bb
	Future participation and vote choice	bb
<i>Political information</i>	Frequency of exposure to political news	bb
<i>Use of internet</i>	Frequency use of Internet	bb
<i>Use of internet for politics</i>	Search of information, last 12 months: Friends	bb
	Sport, culture or free-time activities	bb
	Work, studies or other education	bb
	Products, shopping	bb
	Social and political issues	bb
	Services (i.e. health, law)	bb
	Other topics	bb
<i>Use of internet for social or political actions</i>	Use of internet for social and political activities, last 12 months: Make up my mind	bb
	Discuss	bb
	Redirect emails	bb
	Signing a petition	bb

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	To participate in other manner	bb
	To keep me informed	bb
	Other issues	bb
<i>Use of social media platforms</i>	Facebook	bb
	Twitter	bb
	Other	bb
<i>Participation in organizations</i>	Sports or leisure club	bb
	Church or religious organization	bb
	Association for art, music or culture	bb
	Social movement	bb
	Political party	bb
	Union	bb
	Youth organization	bb
	Humanitarian or charity organization	bb
	Parents' or school association	bb
	Others	bb
<i>Social contacts</i>	Frequency meeting friends	bb
<i>Contacts in neighbourhood</i>	Visits to neighbors	bb
	Help neighbors	bb
	Conflict with neighbors	bb
<i>Sallence of politics</i>	Importance: own family	bb
	Importance: friends	bb
	Importance: free-time	bb
	Importance: politics	bb

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Importance: work	bb
	Importance: religion	bb
<i>External and internal political efficacy</i>	Agreement with statements:	
	Politics is too complicated	bb
	I find it easy to form an opinion about political topics	bb
	Politicians only care about votes and not about people's opinions	bb
	Politics do not care about what people like me think	bb
<i>Norms of citizenship</i>	To show solidarity with people who are worse off than yourself	bb
	To vote in public elections	bb
	Never to try to evade taxes	bb
	To form your own opinion, independently of others	bb
	Always to obey laws and regulations	bb
	To be active in organizations	bb
	To subject your own opinions to critical examinations	bb
<i>Confidence in institutions</i>	Parliament	bb
	Government	bb
	Political parties	bb
	Judicial courts	bb
	Police	bb
	Politicians	bb
	Media	bb

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	European Union	bb
	United Nations	bb
	Federal Constitutional Court	bb
<i>Social trust</i>	Agreement, most people can be trusted / you can never be too careful	bb
<i>Satisfaction with democracy</i>	Satisfaction with how democracy works in Germany	bb
<i>Party identification</i>	Closeness to a political party	bb
	Which party	bb
	Strength of support	bb

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12002](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12002)

References

- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. ([1960]1980). *The American voter*. Unabridged edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lane, R. E. (1959). *Political life: Why people get involved in politics*. Glencoe, ILL: The Free Press.
- Milbrath, L. W. (1965). *Political participation. How and why do people get involved in politics?* Chicago: Rand McNally College.
- van Deth, J. W. (2001). *Studying political participation: Towards a theory of everything?*. Paper presented at the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Grenoble, April 6-11th.
- van Deth, J. W. (2003). *Measuring social capital: Orthodoxies and continuing controversies*. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6(1), 79-92. doi: 10.1080/13645570305057.
- van Deth, J. W. (2010). *Is creative participation good for democracy?*. In M. Micheletti, & A. McFarland (Eds.), *Creative participation. Responsibility-taking in the political world* (págs. 148-172). Boulder and London: Paradigm Publishers.
- van Deth, J. W., Montero, J. R., & Westholm, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Citizenship and Involvement in European Democracies. A comparative analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.

Comments

Although considered to be a core concept, in wave bb party identification was included as part of study aj submitted by the European Election Study and thus has the study identifier aj.

In 2015 party identification was part of another submission that is included in wave cc and was therefore dropped from the core module that runs in the April waves.

zd: GESIS Panel Core Study – Environmental attitudes and behavior

Study Code

zd

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; October 15, 2014

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Environmental attitudes and behavior

Subject classification

Environmental attitudes; environmental behavior; environmental values, environmental concern

Keywords

Environment; Attitudes; Behavior

Data collection waves

bc

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Prof. Dr. Henning Best Chair of Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences University of Würzburg	http://www.politikwissenschaft.uni-wuerzburg.de/lehrbereiche/empirische/prof_dr_henning_best/ https://www.xing.com/profile/Henning_Best http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Henning_Best
Tanja Dannwolf GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tanja_Dannwolf

Abstract

The question of sustainable development is one of the central challenges of our time. Global environmental problems, especially climate change, can be understood as the results of societal action. At the same time these actions have consequences on the availability of resources, the weather, the sea level or changes of harvests and thereby come back to society requiring adaptation processes (IPCC 2007).

The analysis of environmental attitudes and behavior is at the core of environmental research in the social sciences. According to the central assumptions of the structural individualistic paradigm, environmental problems like acid rain, air pollution or climate change, can be understood as unintended consequences of individual action (Coleman 1995). Accordingly, action, or more specifically the preceding decisions are influenced by attitudes, costs of

behaviour or opportunity structures (see in general Ajzen/Fishbein, Opp 1999, Preisendorfer und Franzen 1996, Best und Kneip 2011 or Best und Mayerl 2013 for applications in environmental sociology).

The core module environmental attitudes and behaviour aims to collect and make available panel data that allow to empirically test these research questions. So far, longitudinal data on the topic is lacking in Germany.

The constructs included in this core module pertain to measuring general environmental attitudes, willingness to pay and attitudes toward climate change. While these draw on established measurement instruments, a item battery measuring attitudes towards the Energiewende has been developed for this core module. The idea being that this is a central topic in the upcoming years in Germany that is of key societal interest. Concerning behaviour the measured concepts concentrate on every day travelling and consumption. As background characteristics, information on the respondent's living environment is collected.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Distance to next city	Großstadtnähe Wohngegend <i>Distance between residential area and large city</i>	bc
Subjective exposure to environmental hazards	Beeinträchtigung Umwelteinflüsse: Lärmbelästigung <i>Exposure to environmental hazards: noise pollution</i>	bc
	Beeinträchtigung Umwelteinflüsse: Luftverschmutzung <i>Exposure to environmental hazards: air pollution</i>	bc
	Beeinträchtigung Umwelteinflüsse: Fehlende Grünflächen <i>Exposure to environmental hazards: lack of green space</i>	bc
General attitudes towards the environment	NEP-Skala: Nähern uns Höchstzahl an Menschen <i>NEP-scale: Approaching to maximum number of humans</i>	bc
New environmental paradigm scale	NEP-Skala: Recht Umwelt an Bedürfnisse anzupassen <i>NEP-scale: The right to adapt environment to the needs</i>	bc

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	NEP-Skala: Folgen von menschlichem Eingriff <i>NEP-scale: Consequences of human intervention</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Menschlicher Einfallsreichtum <i>NEP-scale: Human ingenuity</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Missbrauch der Umwelt durch Menschen <i>NEP-scale: Abuse of the environment by humans</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Genügend natürliche Rohstoffe <i>NEP-scale: Sufficient natural resources</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Pflanzen und Tiere gleiches Recht <i>NEP-scale: Equal rights for plants and animals</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Gleichgewicht der Natur stabil genug <i>NEP-scale: Balance of nature stable enough</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Menschen Naturgesetzen unterworfen <i>NEP-scale: Humans are subjected to natural laws</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Umweltkrise stark übertrieben <i>NEP-scale: Environmental crisis greatly exaggerated</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Erde ist wie Raumschiff <i>NEP-scale: Earth is like spaceship</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Menschen zur Herrschaft über Natur bestimmt <i>NEP-scale: Humans were assigned to rule over nature</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Gleichgewicht der Natur ist sehr empfindlich <i>NEP-scale: Balance of nature is very sensitive</i>	bc

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	NEP-Skala: Natur kontrollieren <i>NEP-scale: Control nature</i>	bc
	NEP-Skala: Umweltkatastrophe <i>NEP-scale: Environmental disaster</i>	bc
Willingness to pay	Zahlungsbereitschaft Umwelt: Höhere Preise <i>Willingness to pay environment: Higher prices</i>	bc
	Zahlungsbereitschaft Umwelt: Höhere Steuern <i>Willingness to pay environment: Higher taxes</i>	bc
	Zahlungsbereitschaft Umwelt: Abstriche von Lebensstandard <i>Willingness to pay environment: Cut standard of living</i>	bc
Attitudes: Energiewende	Energiewende: Erneuerbare Energien nicht ausreichend <i>Energy Transition: Renewable energies are not sufficient</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Energiewende schadet mehr als sie nutzt <i>Energy transition: Energy transition does more harm than good</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Weg von den fossilen Brennstoffen <i>Energy transition: Away from fossil fuels</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Erneuerbare Energien machen Deutschland unabhängig von anderen Ländern <i>Energy transition: Renewable energies make Germany independent of other countries</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Große Kraftwerke sind unerlässlich <i>Energy transition: Large power plants are essential</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Die Zukunft liegt in erneuerbaren Energien <i>Energy transition: The future lies in renewable energies</i>	bc

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Energiewende: Energiesparmaßnahmen sind übertrieben <i>Energy transition: Energy-saving measures are exaggerated</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Atomkraftwerke sind Gefahr <i>Energy Transition: Nuclear power plants are danger</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Energiewende zerstört Industriestandort Deutschland <i>Energy Transition: Energy Transition destroys industrial location Germany</i>	bc
	Energiewende: Zur Umstellung gibt es keine Alternative <i>Energy Transition: There is no alternative to energy conversion</i>	bc
Attitudes: Nuclear Energy	Meinung Atomausstieg <i>Opinion nuclear phase-out</i>	bc
Speed of climate politics	Klimaschutzpolitik – Tempo <i>Climate protection policy - Pace</i>	bc
Attitudes: Climate Change	Ernsthaftigkeit Problem Klimawandel <i>Seriousness of climate change problem</i>	bc
Consumption: Everyday Travel	Besitz ÖPNV-Karte <i>Property Public transport season ticket</i>	bc
	Verfügbarkeit Auto <i>Car availability</i>	bc
	Nutzungshäufigkeit: Auto <i>Frequency of use: Car</i>	bc
	Nutzungshäufigkeit: Fahrrad <i>Frequency of use: Bike</i>	bc
	Nutzungshäufigkeit: Bus oder Bahn in der Region <i>Frequency of use: Bus or train in the region</i>	bc

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Nutzungshäufigkeit: Bahn auf längeren Strecken <i>Frequency of use: Train on longer distances</i>	bc
Consumption: Leisure Travel	Nutzung Flugzeug für Privatreise <i>Usage Plane for leisure travel</i>	bc
Consumption: Food	Einkauf Bio-Lebensmittel <i>Purchase organic groceries</i>	bc
	Einkauf Regionale Lebensmittel <i>Purchase regional food</i>	bc
Consumption: Sustainable energy	Bezug Ökostrom <i>Purchase green energy</i>	bc

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12045](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12045)

References

- IPCC, 2007: Climate Change 2007 (IPCC Fourth Assessment Report). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Best, Henning, 2011: Methodische Herausforderungen: Umweltbewusstsein, Feldexperimente und die Analyse umweltbezogener Entscheidungen. S. 240-258 in: Matthias Groß (Hg.): Handbuch Umweltsoziologie. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / Springer VS.
- Best, Henning und Thorsten Kneip, 2011: The impact of attitudes and behavioral costs on environmental behavior: a natural experiment on household waste recycling. *Social Science Research* 40(3): 917-930.
- Best, Henning und Jochen Mayerl, 2013: Values, Beliefs, Attitudes. An Empirical Study on the Structure of Environmental Concern and Recycling Participation. *Social Science Quarterly* (early view). DOI: [10.1111/ssqu.12010](https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12010).
- Coleman, J. S., 1994: Foundations of social theory. Belknap Press.
- Diekmann, Andreas, 2000: Umweltsoziologie. Eine Einführung. Reinbek: Rowolt.
- Dunlap, Riley E., et al., 2002: „New trends in measuring environmental attitudes: measuring endorsement of the new ecological paradigm: a revised NEP scale.“ *Journal of social issues* 56(3): 425-442.
- Franzen, A., Vogl, D., 2013: Two decades of measuring environmental attitudes: A comparative analysis of 33 countries. *Global Environ. Change* (2013), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.03.009>
- Opp, Karl-Dieter, 1999: Contending Conceptions of the Theory of Rational Action. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 11(2): 171-202

Preisendörfer, Peter und Axel Franzen, 1996: „Der schöne Schein des Umweltbewusstseins: Zu den Ursachen und Konsequenzen von Umwelteinstellungen in der Bevölkerung. S. 219-244 in: A. Diekmann und CC Jaeger (Hg.): Umweltsoziologie: Sonderheft 36 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie.“. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.

ze: GESIS Panel Core Study – Personality and Personal Values

Study Code

ze

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; October 14, 2014

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Personality and Personal Values

Subject classification

Psychology

Keywords

Values, personality, higher order values, conservation, openness to change, self-transcendence, self-enhancement, BFI-10, big five, short scales

Data collection waves

bd

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Constanze Beierlein GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim	Research gate: Constanze Beierlein;
Beatrice Rammstedt GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim	Research gate: Beatrice Rammstedt
Eldad Davidov University of Zurich	Research gate: Eldad Davidov
Shalom H. Schwartz Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Research gate: Shalom H Schwartz

Abstract

Values:

Schwartz' basic human values predict different kinds of attitudes and behaviors. For example, values are related to political and social attitudes and behaviors (Schwartz, 2012). While the structure of basic human values has been found to be universal across cultures, there is evidence that systematic differences in value priorities exist with respect to different cultural and sociodemographic groups. Given the predictive power of values, survey researchers have become more and more interested in basic human values during the last years. Measures for values have been introduced to several international large scale surveys.

According to Schwartz (1992, 1994) basic human values are usually defined as desirable, transsituational goals. They can be conceived as motivationally distinct constructs which vary in importance. Values serve as guiding principles in people's lives. According to the theory of basic human values, values form a motivational continuum, represented in a quasi-circumplex model (Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004). Values with congruent underlying motivational needs are located closer within the circle whereas values which conflicting or incompatible underlying motives are located on opposite ends of the circle.

In his earlier work, Schwartz (1992) differentiated between 10 motivationally distinct values. In 2012, the value circle was further refined yielding 19 theoretically and empirically distinguishable values. Recently, Schwartz proposed a new psychometrically improved measure (PVQ-R) for measuring the

19 values of the refined value circle using 57 items (Schwartz et al., 2012). However, due to limited resources in time and money, surveys require short, valid, and reliable instruments.

In order to obtain a short scale for large-scale survey research, we reduced the number of constructs assessed. Instead of assessing all nineteen values, we selected PVQ-R-items that serve as good indicators for the four higher order value dimensions (Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004): Self-Enhancement, Self-Transcendence, Openness to Change, Conservation. The construct definitions as well as the indicators are presented in the following table. We measure the four poles with three to five items of the two to four values that combine to form that pole. The principles of item construction followed the approach presented by Schwartz and colleagues in 2001. Each of the items in our item pool included a short verbal portrait of a person. The portraits describe a person's desires, wishes, and aspirations that are linked to a specific value within the value circle (Schwartz, 2012). Respondents are asked to rate on a six-point scale how similar each person described in each portrait is to them. Response categories range from „not like me at all“ to „very much like me“. The items of the GESIS panel values scale are not gender-matched as in the original short scale due to mixed methods restrictions.

Using data from cross-cultural population representative as well as convenience samples from Germany and six other countries, we identified items that are close to the specific pole. For this purpose, we combined different statistical analytical strategies (e.g., Multiple Groups Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Multidimensional Scaling). Our investigations yielded a set of items that consistently represented the four global value dimensions best throughout the different cross-cultural samples. Scales scores for the four resulting scales were obtained by calculating the scale mean on the basis of the responses to the items of the respective scale.

There is strong empirical evidence that the measurement properties (reliability, factorial validity, convergent and discriminant validity, predictive power) of the Schwartz Values Short Scale-4 are satisfactory. In a heterogeneous German online panel sample (N = 520), the

reliability estimates for the four scales were found to be satisfactory for the four higher order value scales and for group comparisons ($\omega = .62$ to $.70$). The scale also yielded the expected relations with established value scales in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. First results also support the criterion validity of the new scales.

BFI-10:

During the last years the interest of assessing personality in large-scale social surveys has increased considerably. At the same time, the Five-Factor Model as the predominant model for describing personality has been further established in Personality Psychology. However, since earlier measures for assessing the Big Five are too time-consuming and costly for social surveys, the authors developed the ultra-short BFI-10 assessing the five dimensions with a total of ten items, respectively an average duration of approximately one minute (Rammstedt et al., 2012, 2013). The BFI-10 is an abbreviation of the longer BFI-44 (John, Donahue & Kentle, 1991; German version: Rammstedt, 2007). In the process of short scale development, the original English items of the BFI-44 were translated into German. Rammstedt and John (2007, p. 205) describe the item selection process in detail: „We selected 2 BFI items for each Big Five dimension following five criteria: (1) We represented both the high and low pole of each factor, so that each BFI - 10 scale would consist of one true-scored and one false-scored item. (2) We covered as broad a bandwidth as possible for each scale by selecting two items that both measured core aspects of a Big Five dimension but were not highly redundant in content. (3) We constructed identical English language and German-language versions, so that the resulting instrument would be usable for cross-cultural research and to minimize capitalizing on chance. (4) To the extent that there still were item choices to be made, we selected items on the basis of two empirical criteria, namely their corrected item-total correlations with the full BFI scales (thus favoring more central over more peripheral item content) and the simple-structure pattern of their loadings in factor analyses of all 44 items (thus favoring items related uniquely to one factor and not to the other four factors).“ The respondents rate their answers on a five-point rating scale from „trifft überhaupt nicht zu“ (1) to „trifft voll und ganz zu“ (5). Scale scores are obtained by calculating the mean of the two items scores that measure the same dimension while taking into account that one of the two items has to be inversely coded. There is empirical evidence for the construct- and criterion-validity of the BFI-10. Furthermore, the reliability estimates for the BFI-10 are satisfactory, given the breadth of the constructs assessed as well as the brevity of the measures for each construct (Rammstedt et al., 2012, 2013; Rammstedt & John, 2007).

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Values:

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding (survey measures)	indicators	Data collection waves
Self-Transcendence <i>(Importance of transcending selfish concerns and of promoting the welfare of other people)</i>	1. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, sich um die Natur zu kümmern. 5. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, tolerant gegenüber vielen verschiedenen Menschen und gesellschaftlichen Gruppen zu sein. 9. Es ist ihr/ihm sehr wichtig, den Menschen zu helfen, die ihr/ihm am		bd

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding (survey measures)	indicators	Data collection waves
Self-Enhancement <i>(Importance of enhancing one's own interests, even at the expense of others)</i>	<p>Herzen liegen.</p> <p>13. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, sich um jedes Bedürfnis der Menschen zu kümmern, die ihr/ihm am Herzen liegen.</p> <p>16. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, dass alle Menschen gerecht behandelt werden, selbst die, die sie/er nicht kennt.</p> <p>2. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig zu zeigen, dass ihre/seine Leistungen besser sind als die Leistungen anderer.</p> <p>6. 6. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, reich zu sein.</p> <p>11. 11. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, diejenige/derjenige zu sein, die/der anderen sagt, was sie tun sollen.</p> <p>15. 15. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, dass die Menschen ihre/seine Leistung anerkennen.</p>	bd	
Openness to Change <i>(Importance of following one's own intellectual and emotional interests, esp. in new situations)</i>	<p>3. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, sich immer eine eigene Meinung zu bilden.</p> <p>8. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, ihr/sein Wissen zu erweitern.</p> <p>10. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, eine Vielzahl von neuen Erfahrungen zu machen.</p> <p>14. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, dass sie/er die Freiheit hat, zu wählen, was sie/er tut.</p> <p>17. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, dass sie/er den Dingen selbst auf den Grund geht und sie versteht.</p>	bd	
Conservation <i>(Importance of sticking to the rules of the society or the group, of seeking certainty, and of preserving the status quo)</i>	<p>4. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, traditionelle Werte und Überzeugungen zu bewahren.</p> <p>7. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, in einem starken Staat zu leben, der seine Bürger verteidigen</p> <p>12. Es ist ihr/ihm wichtig, alle Gesetze zu befolgen.</p>		

BFI-10:

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding (survey measures)	indicators	Data waves	collection
Extraversion	1. Ich bin eher zurückhaltend, reserviert. (inverted) 6. Ich gehe aus mir heraus, bin gesellig.		bd	
Openness	5. Ich habe nur wenig künstlerisches Interesse. (inverted) 10. Ich habe eine aktive Vorstellungskraft, bin fantasievoll.		bd	
Agreeableness	2. Ich schenke anderen leicht Vertrauen, glaube an das Gute im Menschen. 7. Ich neige dazu, andere zu kritisieren. (inverted)		bd	
Conscientiousness	3. Ich bin bequem, neige zur Faulheit. (inverted) 8. Ich erledige Aufgaben gründlich.		bd	
Neuroticism	4. Ich bin entspannt, lasse mich durch Stress nicht aus der Ruhe bringen. (inverted) 9. Ich werde leicht nervös und unsicher. (inverted)		bd	

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12115](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12115)

References

- John, O. P., E. M. Donahue, & Kentle, R. L. (1991). The Big Five Inventory – versions 4a and 5. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Rammstedt, B. (1997). Die deutsche Version des Big Five Inventory (BFI): Übersetzung und Validierung eines Fragebogens zur Erfassung des Fünf-Faktoren-Modells der Persönlichkeit. Unpublished thesis. University of Bielefeld, Germany.
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 203-212.
- Rammstedt, B., Kemper, C. J., Klein, M. C., Beierlein, C., & Kovaleva, A. (2013). Eine kurze Skala zur Messung der fünf Dimensionen der Persönlichkeit: 10 Item Big Five Inventory (BFI-10). *Methoden, Daten, Analysen (mda)*, 7(2), 233-249.

- Rammstedt, B., Kemper, C. J., Klein, M.C., Beierlein, C., & Kovaleva, A. (2012). Eine kurze Skala zur Messung der fünf Dimensionen der Persönlichkeit: Big-Five-Inventury-10 (BFI-10). GESIS Working Papers 2012|23. Köln: GESIS.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advantages and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental and Social Psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19-45.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2, 1-20.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Boehnke K. (2004). Evaluating the Structure of Human Values with Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 230-255.
- Schwartz, S.H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 519– 542.

zf: GESIS Panel Core Study – Media Usage

Study Code

zf

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; September 3, 2014

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Media Usage

Subject classification

Media usage and media behavior

Keywords

Media usage, technology usage, social networks, internet usage, internet activities

Data collection waves

be

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Wolfgang Bandilla GESIS Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences	
Walter Klingler Südwestrundfunk (SWR)	
Albrecht Kutteroff	
Angela Tanner GESIS Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=P7AD_YEAAAAJ

Abstract

The study is part of the GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Studies series and will be fielded on a yearly basis starting in October 2014 (wave be). The repeated measurements of the GESIS Panel Core Study topics allow the investigation of longitudinal developments. Within the Core Study „Media Usage“ it is therefore an important goal to investigate longitudinal changes in respondents' media and technology usage and their Internet and social network behavior.

The first part of the study captures respondents' usage of several electronic devices including different ways to get Internet access (e.g. radio set, radio set with Internet access). Beyond the usage of these devices it is also of interest, how often several kinds of media are used (e.g. listen to the radio). The distinction between device usage and media usage is important as the

landscape of media is changing more and more due to the increasing importance and opportunities of the Internet (e.g. watching television via the Internet etc.). Another focus is therefore on Internet usage and activities within the Internet including questions about social network memberships and activities.

This core study builds on experiences of other studies in this research field (e.g. JIM-Studie (Jugend, Information, (Multi)-Media), KIM-Studie (Kinder + Medien, Computer + Internet), ARD-Studie Erlebniswelt Radio 2013) and the study development took place in close collaboration with field experts (Walter Klingler and Albrecht Kutteroff) which also enables the comparison of the core study results with the above mentioned studies.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Values:

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Media Device Usage	Welche der folgenden elektronischen Geräte oder Internetmöglichkeiten haben Sie in den letzten 14 Tagen genutzt? Which of the following electronic devices did you use during the past 14 days?	be
Personal Media Usage	Wie häufig nutzen Sie die folgenden Medien bzw. Möglichkeiten? How often do you use the following media or opportunities?	be
Internet Usage	Wie oft nutzen Sie das Internet, das World Wide Web oder E-Mails für private Zwecke, egal ob zu Hause, am Arbeitsplatz oder irgendwo anders? How often do you use the Internet, the World Wide Web or E-Mails for private reasons at home, at work or elsewhere?	be
Importance of Internet possibilities	Wie wichtig sind Ihnen persönlich die folgenden Möglichkeiten des Internets? How important are the following possibilities of the Internet for you personally?	be
Membership in social networks	Sind Sie bei einem sozialen Netzwerk angemeldet (z.B. Facebook oder Twitter)? Are you a member in a social network (eg. Facebook or Twitter)?	be

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Most frequently used social network	<p>Welches soziale Netzwerk nutzen Sie am häufigsten?</p> <p>Which social network do you use most frequently?</p>	be
Frequency of social network usage	<p>Bitte denken Sie nun an das Netzwerk, das Sie am häufigsten nutzen. Wie oft nutzen Sie dieses?</p> <p>Please think of the network you use most frequently. How often do you use this network?</p>	be
Social network activities	<p>Wenn Sie nun an Ihren Kontakt mit Freunden oder Bekannten denken, wie häufig tun Sie die folgenden Dinge in diesem sozialen Netzwerk?</p> <p>If you think of your contacts with friends or acquaintances, how often do you do the following things in social networks?</p> <p>Wenn Sie nun an Ihren Kontakt mit Organisationen, Vereinen oder Initiativen denken, wie häufig tun Sie die folgenden Dinge in diesem sozialen Netzwerk?</p> <p>If you think of your contacts with organizations, associations or initiatives, how often do you do the following things in social networks?</p>	be

Experimental design

To test for item order effects within the online questionnaire the construct of media device usage and the importance of Internet possibilities was measured with a treatment of item rotation and non-rotation to which respondents were randomly assigned.

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12162](https://www.gesis.org/data-portal/10.4232/1.12162)

References

ARD-Projektgruppe Jugend (2013): Erlebnisswelt Radio. Kontaktwege zwischen Radioprogrammen und ihren Hörern am Beispiel der Zwölf- bis 29-Jährigen. In: Media Perspektiven 11/2103, p.510 – 521.

Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest (Hrsg.) (2013): KIM-Studie 2012. Kinder + Medien, Computer + Internet. Basisuntersuchung zum Medienumgang 6- bis 13-Jähriger in Deutschland Stuttgart 2013.

Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest (Hrsg.) (2013): JIM-Studie 2013. Jugend, Information, (Multi-) Media. Stuttgart 2013.

zg: GESIS Panel Core Study – Work and Leisure

Study Code

zg

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; October, 2014

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Work and Leisure

Keywords

Work, employment, job, job stressors, job resources, leisure

Data collection waves

be

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Sabine Sonnentag University of Mannheim	http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9464-4653 https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sabine_Sonnentag
Ines Schaurer GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=x5wlrEkAAAAJ&hl=de

Abstract

This study module measures variables related to work and leisure. Paid work is an important part of many people's lives, not only providing an income, but also enabling participation in society and offering opportunities for being active, among others (cf., Jahoda, 1981). Specific working conditions influence employees' health and well-being. For instance, job stressors such as time pressure or organizational constraints contribute to an increase in strain symptoms (e.g., exhaustion, depression, physical symptoms) over time (Ford et al., 2014) whereas job resources such as job control or learning opportunities increase positive well-being indicators, for instance work engagement (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014).

Leisure time is often seen as an antithesis to paid work, allowing for compensatory activities; but leisure time can also be affected by paid work through spillover processes (Kabanoff, 1980). Mentally detachment from work during leisure time has been shown to be important in buffering the negative impact of job stressors on well-being (Sonnentag & Fritz, in press). Importantly, leisure time is not only an antithesis to paid work, but is also a part of everyday life in retired or unemployed persons, housekeepers, or students.

The GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study on Work and Leisure assesses work-related variables in person who are currently employed. Specifically it assesses:

- Job conditions: Sitting at work, contact with customers etc., leadership position, type of contract, weekly working time, job position, position, occupation, industry type
- Job description: contract characteristics, working hours, detail description of the current occupation, NACE-classification
- Job stressors: Quantitative demands, situational constraints, emotional demands, concentration demands, physical demands, job insecurity
- Job resources: Learning opportunities, job control, social support,
- Individual differences: Job involvement
- Cognitive and affective reactions: Perceived prosocial impact, job satisfaction, exhaustion, psychological detachment from work

The GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study on Work and Leisure assesses leisure-related variables as follows:

- Leisure activities: Establishing useful contacts, relaxing and recovering, learning skills, staying fit, helping others and voluntary work, spending time on hobby, spend time with family
- Affective reaction: Leisure satisfaction

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Values:

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
<i>Please describe the constructs or concepts</i>	<i>Please list the indicators (items)</i>	be
Job satisfaction	Job satisfaction	be
Job description	contract characteristics, working hours (according to contract and actual), detail description of the current occupation, NACE-classification	be
Job conditions 1	Sitting at work (amount of working time) Contact with customers, patients, students (amount of working time)	be
Job stressors 1: Quantitative demands	High pace High workload	be
Job stressors 2: Situational constraints	Technical problems Organizational constraints	be
Job stressors 1: Other demands	Understand and react to emotions of others (emotional demands) Concentration demands	be

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	Physical demands	
Job resources 1: Learning opportunities	Learning and developmental opportunities	be
Job insecurity	Afraid to loose job	be
Job resources 2: Job control	Decide about how to do my work	be
Job resources 3: Social support	Co-workers and supervisors help when needed	be
Perceived prosocial impact	Positive impact on others	be
Job involvement	Job plays important role in life	be
Exhaustion	Exhausted by job	be
Psychological detachment	Thinking about work during free time (reverse coded) (Scholz et al., 2009, p. 9)	be
Job conditions 2	Leadership position Temporary contract Weekly working time without overtime Weekly total working time Position Occupation Industry type (NACE code)	be
Leisure satisfaction	Leisure satisfaction	be
Leisure activities	Establish useful contacts (Scholz et al., 2009, p. 9) Relax and recovery (Scholz et al., 2009, p. 9) Try to learn or develop skills (Scholz et al., 2009, p. 9) Stay fit Help others or work for a „good cause“ (voluntary work) Spend time on hobby Spend time with family	be

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12162](https://www.gesis.org/data-portal/entry/10.4232/1.12162)

References

- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 389-411. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235
- Ford, M. T., Matthews, R. A., Wooldridge, J. D., Mishra, V., Kakar, U. M., & Strahan, S. R. (2014). How do occupational stressor-strain effects vary with time? A review and meta-analysis of the relevance of time lags in longitudinal studies. *Work & Stress*, 28, 9-30.
- Jahoda, M. (1981). Work, employment, and unemployment: Values, theories and approaches in social research. *American Psychologist*, 36, 184-191. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.36.2.184
- Kabanoff, B. (1980). Work and nonwork: A review of models, methods, and findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 60-77. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.88.1.60
- Scholz, E., Lenzner, T., & Heller, M. (2009). ISSP 2007 Germany Leisure Time and Sports. GESIS report on the German study GESIS-Technical reports 2009/08. Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (in press). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. doi: 10.1002/job.1924

zh: GESIS Panel Core Study – Annual Update of Socio-Demography

Study Code

zh

Version and date of last revision

Version 2; September 4, 2015

Study title

GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study Module –Annual Update of Socio-Demography

Subject classification

Demography, education, income, citizenship, gender

Keywords

Demography, education, income, citizenship, gender

Data collection waves

be, bf

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Dr. Tanja Dannwolf GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tanja_Dannwolf
Dr. Silke Schneider GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Silke_Schneider
Ines Schaurer GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	https://scholar.google.de/citations?user=x5wlrEkAAAAJ

Abstract

This questionnaire updates basic socio-demographic information about respondents, which was initially collected in the recruitment interview, once a year. Characteristics that are stable over time are excluded from the annual update (e.g. country of birth of respondent and parents). The exceptions to this rule are year of birth and gender.

The aim of the demography update in the core module is to provide researchers with basic up-to-date socio-demographic information about respondents and to assess the development of representativeness of the panel over time.

The questions are based on the recommendations of the Federal Statistical Office (Hoffmeier-Zlotnik et al. 2010). Some of the questions were adapted to accommodate the requirements of

the self-administered mode. As of 2014 no specific recommendations exist for measuring socio-demographic variables in web surveys in the recommendations by the Federal Statistical Office, the „Demographische Standards“. The questions on education and training are designed to allow coding into the ISCED classification (Unesco, 2012).

The main part of the demographic update is collected in the last wave of each year (bf, cf, etc.). However, because the information on the employment status is central for the core study on work and leisure (study zg) this information is collected in the preceding wave.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Geschlecht <i>Gender</i>	Geschlecht <i>Gender</i>	bf
Geburtsjahr <i>Year of birth</i>	Geburtsjahr <i>Year of birth</i>	bf
Staatsangehörigkeit <i>Citizenship</i>	Deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit <i>German citizenship</i>	bf
	Ausländische Staatsangehörigkeit <i>Foreign citizenship</i>	bf
Familienstatus <i>Marital status</i>	Familienstand <i>Marital status</i>	bf
	Lebenspartner <i>Partner</i>	bf
	Zusammenleben <i>Living with partner</i>	bf
Bildung und Ausbildung <i>Education and training</i>	Höchster allgemeinbildender Schulabschluss <i>Highest school leaving certificate</i>	bf
	Aktuelle berufliche Ausbildung/aktuelles Studium <i>Ongoing vocational training or Higher education</i>	bf
	Hochschulabschluss <i>Higher education degree</i>	bf
	Höchster beruflicher Ausbildungsabschluss	bf

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
	<i>Highest vocational qualification</i>	
Haushaltsgröße & - zusammensetzung <i>Household size & composition</i>	Haushaltsgröße <i>Household size</i>	bf
	Anzahl Kinder unter 16 Jahren <i>Number of children below age 16 living in household</i>	bf
Einkommen <i>Income</i>	Persönliches Einkommen <i>Personal income</i>	bf
	Haushaltseinkommen <i>Household income</i>	bf
Erwerbsstatus <i>Employment status</i>	Erwerbsstatus <i>Employment status</i>	be
	Grund für nicht-Erwerbstätigkeit <i>Reason for not working for pay</i>	be

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.11878](https://www.gesis.org/data-portal/10.4232/1.11878)

References

Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J. H. P., Glemser, A., Heckel, C., Heyde, C. v. d., Quitt, H., Hanefeld, U., . . . Mohr, S. (2010). Demographische Standards Ausgabe 2010 (5 ed.) Vol. 17 of Statistik und Wissenschaft. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2012). International Standard Classification of Education - ISCED 2011. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

zi: GESIS Panel Core Study – Panel survey participation evaluation & mode preferences

Study Code

zi

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; March 31, 2015

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study Module – Panel survey participation evaluation & mode preferences

Subject classification

Survey methodology

Keywords

Survey experience, survey attitude, survey mode, devices

Data collection waves

bf

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Bella Struminskaya GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=UBs7GvsAAAAJ
Michael Bosnjak Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences and University of Mannheim	http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1431-8461 http://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.url?authoid=6701915757 http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael_Bosnjak/ http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=LgTlgPwAAAAJ
Edith de Leeuw Utrecht University	
Peter Lugtig Utrecht University	
Vera Toepoel Utrecht University	

Abstract

This study is a part of the GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study series. One aim of the GESIS Longitudinal Core Studies is to measure frequently demanded characteristics of enduring interest to the social sciences. Another aim is to assess indicators and proxy variables of data quality, facilitating estimation of potential survey errors and biases.

This study module belongs to the second category and focuses on quality indicators. It has three distinct areas of focus: (1) respondent's attitudes towards surveys; (2) respondent's overall experience within the panel; (3) ownership of devices to complete questionnaires and respondents' mode/device preferences.

The respondents' general attitudes towards surveys include several items about survey enjoyment, survey value, and survey burden. These items were replicated from the survey attitude scale from the research project „Access panel and mixed-mode internet survey“ of the Priority Programme on Survey Methodology (PPSM), as well as asked in the LISS Panel (www.lissdata.nl).

In the second part, respondents were asked about their overall experience within the GESIS Panel. One of the goals of this part is to provide insights into the processes of panel attrition. For this part, several items of the survey attitudes scale were adjusted to the GESIS Panel specific experience. Several items pertinent to survey participation focusing on commitment and compliance, habit, social embedding, and self-congruity were asked in addition. Furthermore, respondents were asked two questions aimed to evaluate their experience within the panel in the previous year as a whole and provide the likelihood of them recommending the GESIS Panel to a friend. In the online version, respondents were asked whether they participate in other online panel studies.

For the third part, respondents were asked about ownership and frequency of use of the following devices: PC, laptop, tablet, and smartphone. Two items focused on the possibility of using the Internet from home and on-the-go with these devices. Two further items focused on preferred device/preferred mode of answering GESIS Panel questionnaires.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
General survey attitudes	Surveys important for society Important things can be learned from surveys Survey participation is a waste of time Enjoy answering mail/Internet surveys Surveys are invasion of privacy Enjoy being interviewed Surveys are interesting Asked too often to participate in surveys Survey participation is exhausting	bf

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Reasons to participate in surveys	Three main reasons for participation in the GESIS Panel	bf
Attitudes about survey experience as a GESIS Panel respondent (reference period: current year)	<p>Regularly discuss GESIS Panel participation with others</p> <p>Felt obliged to participate</p> <p>Participation in GESIS Panel as a result of habit</p> <p>It suits me to participate in GESIS Panel</p> <p>I can identify with the GESIS Panel</p> <p>GESIS Panel surveys important for society</p> <p>Important things can be learned from GESIS Panel surveys</p> <p>Survey participation in the GESIS Panel is a waste of time</p> <p>Enjoyed answering GESIS Panel surveys</p> <p>GESIS Panel surveys were invasion of privacy</p> <p>GESIS Panel surveys were interesting</p> <p>Asked too often to participate in GESIS Panel surveys</p> <p>Survey participation in the GESIS Panel was exhausting</p> <p>Overall evaluation of the participation</p> <p>Overall evaluation of the GESIS Panel (school mark)</p> <p>Would recommend GESIS Panel to a friend</p>	bf
Membership in other online panels	If and how many other online panels is respondent member of?	bf

Constructs/concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Ownership & use of devices	Ownership of PC, Laptop, Tablet, Smartphone Use of devices Internet access devices (at home and on-the-go)	bf
Mode preference	Probability to participate in a particular mode/via particular device Preferred mode/device to complete the questionnaires	bf

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.12204](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:5:1-12204)

zq: GESIS Panel Core Study – Monitoring quality: survey exp. & mode characteristics

Study Code

zq

Version and date of last revision

Version 1; April 29, 2014

Study title

GESIS Panel Core Study – Monitoring quality: survey experience & mode characteristics

Subject classification

Survey methodology

Keywords

Survey experience, survey mode, duration, interview situation

Data collection waves

a12, ba, bb, bc, bd, be, bf

Principal investigators

Name(s) and affiliations of principal investigators at time of submission	Persistent digital identifier(s) of principal investigator(s)
Bella Struminskaya GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=UBs7GvsAAAAJ
Michael Bosnjak Free University of Bozen-Bolzano and GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1431-8461 http://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.url?authid=6701915757 http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael_Bosnjak/ http://scholar.google.de/citations?user=LgTlgPwAAAAJ
Lars Kaczmirek GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	Web of Science ResearcherID: D-8951-2012 ResearchGate: http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lars_Kaczmirek

Abstract

This study is a part of the GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study series. One aim of the GESIS Longitudinal Core Studies is to measure frequently demanded characteristics of enduring interest to the social sciences. Another aim is to assess indicators and proxy variables of data quality, facilitating estimation of potential survey errors and biases. As opposed to other GESIS Panel Longitudinal Core Study modules which are fielded once per year, this study is fielded in every questionnaire.

This study module belongs to the second category and focuses on quality indicators. It has four distinct areas of focus: (1) respondent's assessment of the questionnaire; (2) characteristics of the answering process; (3) characteristics of the survey situation and (4) respondent's feedback.

The respondent's assessment of the questionnaire has several measures: one survey evaluation matrix consisting of six items, and three separate questions: whether the questions were clear, whether they made the respondent think and the overall evaluation. The items of the matrix question (interesting, diverse, important for science, long, difficult, too personal) as well as overall assessment were developed and tested in the project GESIS Online Panel Pilot (Kaczmirek, Bandilla, Schaurer & Struminskaya, 2014).

The first goal of the evaluation matrix was to measure how respondents perceive the questionnaire to understand how well respondents differentiate between the questionnaires. The second goal was to study the effects of respondents' survey experience on panel attrition (see Struminskaya, Kaczmirek, De Leeuw, in preparation). The adjectives which make up the items in the evaluation matrix were developed on the basis of the content analysis of the data of over 4000 respondents in six other unrelated surveys where respondents completed a sentence similar to „I felt/perceived the questions were...” (Kaczmirek, Baier, & Zuell, 2010). The item „important for science” was not based on the content analysis but was included in addition to capture the influence of the sponsor because previous research showed that academic and government sponsorship („science”) opposed to commercial sponsorship („company research”) increases respondent cooperation (e.g., Walston, Lissitz, & Rudner, 2006). In the GESIS Panel, the scale for the matrix question was changed from an original 4-point to a 5-point scale with the inclusion of the middle category.

The overall evaluation question was also replicated from the GESIS Online Panel Pilot. The items „questions made you think” and „questions were clear” were replicated from the LISS Panel (<http://lissdata.nl>).

Survey duration and timing have several goals: self-assessed duration of the answering process is to be analyzed with the actual duration (online) and analyze the longitudinal relationship between the perceptions of the questionnaire length (survey evaluation matrix) and an 'objective' indicator of the duration (both online and offline). The date of filling out of the questionnaire (offline provided by respondents, online generated automatically) is among other factors an important covariate for substantial analysis, for example, for election studies during the race. Break during an answering process allows to identify outliers for the variable duration in an easy way and calculate the approximate self-estimated duration for the offline questionnaire. The item „break” was also tested in GESIS Online Panel Pilot.

The items describing the survey situation were developed ad hoc and include the information on presence of other persons during the response process, the place of participation (home or other place), and for the online mode the question on the device the respondent completed the survey with (PC, laptop, mobile phone etc.).

The item „remark” is a replicate from GESIS Panel Online Pilot, where it was tested, and allows to gather respondent's feedback on the dimensions not covered by the survey evaluation items.

Measured constructs/concepts and corresponding data collection waves

Constructs/ concepts	Corresponding indicators (survey measures)	Data collection waves
Assessment of the questionnaire	Questionnaire evaluation matrix: interesting Questionnaire evaluation matrix: diverse Questionnaire evaluation matrix: important for science Questionnaire evaluation matrix: long Questionnaire evaluation matrix: difficult Questionnaire evaluation matrix: too personal Questions were clear Questions lead to thinking about things Overall evaluation	a12, ba, bb, bc, bd, be, bf
Survey duration & timing	Self-assessed duration of the answering process Break during the answering process Date of filling out the questionnaire	ba, bb, bc, bd, be, bf
Survey situation	Other people present Place of participation Survey participation device (online)	a12, ba, bb, bc, bd, be, bf
Respondents' feedback	Remark	a12, ba, bb, bc, bd, be, bf

Cross-references

DOI of corresponding GESIS Data Portal (DBK) entry: [10.4232/1.11878](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.11878)

References

Kaczmirek, Lars; Bandilla, Wolfgang; Schaurer, Ines; Struminskaya, Bella (2014): GESIS Online Panel Pilot: multitopic introductory wave (survey 1). GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5582 Data file Version 1.0.0, [doi:10.4232/1.11570](https://doi.org/10.4232/1.11570)

Kaczmirek, L., Baier, C., & Zuell, C. (2010). Wie empfinden Teilnehmer die Fragen in Online-Befragungen? Entwicklung eines Diktionsars für die automatische Codierung freier Antworten [How participants feel about questions in online surveys? Development of the dictionary for the automatic coding of open answers]. In M. Welker & C. Wuensch (Eds.), *Die Online-Inhaltsanalyse: Forschungsobjekt Internet [Online content analysis: Internet as a research object]* (pp. 191-223). Cologne: Herbert von Hamel Verlag.

Struminskaya, B., Kaczmirek, L., & De Leeuw, E. D. (forthcoming): Determinants of panel attrition in a probability-based online panel. *Manuscript in preparation.*

Walston, J. T., Lissitz, R. W., & Rudner, L. M. (2006). The influence of web-based questionnaire presentation variations on survey cooperation and perceptions of survey quality. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 22(2), 271-291