## Multi-Item Scale for Project:

FGZ Cohesion Panel: Wave 2 – Questions on climate change, antisemitism, and gender equality (English Version)

## **Question Text:**

And to what extent do you agree with the following statements? [Und wie stehen Sie zu den folgenden Aussagen?]

## **Answer Categories:**

Strongly disagree [Stimme überhaupt nicht zu]
Rather disagree [Stimme eher nicht zu]
Neither agree nor disagree [Teils-teils]
Rather agree [Stimme eher zu]
Strongly agree [Stimme voll und ganz zu]

# Findings for Multi-Item Scale:

In question 4, too, there were no respondents who left items unanswered for all three items and, as before, the entire range of the response scale was used. The majority of respondents agreed with the three statements. Agreement was particularly pronounced for items b (78%) and c (79%).

The purpose of the pretest was to investigate how the respondents justified their answers to the individual items and whether the justifications matched the selected answer option. The corresponding cognitive probes (N1\_F3, see Appendix) were asked of the 124 test subjects in Group 1. About one third of these subjects were asked questions on items a, b, and c, respectively.

With the exception of a few test persons who did not give any evaluable answers to the cognitive follow-up questions, the reasons given by the respondents matched the answer they selected and no significant problems in comprehension could be identified.

#### Recommendations for Multi-Item Scale:

The results of the pretest do not indicate any problems with the question, so it can be left in its current form.

## **Cognitive Techniques:**

General Probing

# All Items for Question(Question Text):

And to what extent do you agree with the following statements? [Und wie stehen Sie zu den folgenden Aussagen?]

#### -> Tested Items:

#### Item Text:

a. I am concerned that immigration to Europe will increase because of climate change. [Mir macht Sorgen, dass die Zuwanderung nach Europa wegen des Klimawandels zunehmen wird.]

#### **Recommendations:**

The results of the pretest do not indicate any problems with the item, so it can be left in its current form.

# **Findings:**

For item a, those respondents who disagreed with the statement argued that immigration is good in itself and that it occurs primarily for other reasons (e.g., wars):

- "Immigration happens even without climate change." (TP235, response: rather disagree)
- ■"I think that migration from other countries has nothing to do with climate change, but rather with war and famine." (TP290, response: strongly disagree)
- "It will enrich our country." (TP391, response: strongly disagree).

Test persons who agreed with the statement justified their answers, among other things, with the concern that increased immigration could lead to overpopulation and make living together more difficult:

■ "We cannot be the welfare for the whole world." (TP255, response: strongly agree)

■ "More people means less housing or more needs to be built." (TP263, response: strongly agree)

## **Question Topic:**

Environment/ Climate protection

#### **Construct:**

Concerns: Impact of climate change

#### **Item Text:**

b. I am concerned that natural disasters will increase because of climate change. [Mir macht Sorgen, dass Naturkatastrophen wegen des Klimawandels zunehmen werden.]

#### **Recommendations:**

The results of the pretest do not indicate any problems with the item, so it can be left in its current form.

# **Findings:**

Those respondents who disagreed with the statement mainly justified their answers by saying that natural disasters rarely or never occur where they live, or that climate change is not man-made:

- "I live in an area where natural disasters rarely if ever occur." (TP239, response: rather disagree)
- "Because it is in nature that such things occur. In the past and in the future." (TP292, response: rather disagree)

Respondents who agreed with the statement justified their answers, among other things, by saying that they were already experiencing the increase and that a reversal of climate change was no longer possible:

■ "We already experience it that natural disasters increase and cause great damage." (TP234, response: strongly agree)

■"You can already see the effects of climate change on nature and weather, flora and fauna. And since we're almost past the point of making amends to nature, that's going to have a further intervening, negative impact on the world." (TP273, response: strongly agree)

## **Question Topic:**

Environment/ Climate protection

#### **Construct:**

Concerns: Impact of climate change

#### **Item Text:**

c. I am concerned that the biodiversity of animals and plants will decrease because of climate change. [Mir macht Sorgen, dass die Artenvielfalt von Tieren und Pflanzen wegen des Klimawandels abnehmen wird.]

#### **Recommendations:**

The results of the pretest do not indicate any problems with the item, so it can be left in its current form.

# **Findings:**

For item c, disagreement with the statement was based on the fact that species extinction has always existed and that this is not related to climate change:

- "There will always be some species dying and new ones emerging, so from that point of view it has nothing to do with climate change!" (TP277, response: rather disagree)
- ■"The world is so old, we humans will not shake anything negatively or positively. Every episode has its justification and nature is extremely resilient." (TP343, response: strongly disagree)

Respondents who agreed with the statement justified this by saying that animals could not adapt to climate change as quickly and that the extinction of species would also have an impact on humans (e.g., nutrition):

- "Because the loss of animals and plant diversity also affects our lives, our nutrition." (TP302, response: strongly agree)
- "Many species will no longer have a habitat under extreme climate change." (TP354, re-sponse: strongly agree)

# **Question Topic:**

Environment/ Climate protection

# **Construct:**

Concerns: Impact of climate change